



**CATÓLICA
LISBON**
BUSINESS & ECONOMICS



FGV
EBAPE

Predicting Attitudes to Diversity:

**The relationship between personal characteristics and prejudice towards
diversity**

Johan Hildingsson

Dissertation written under the supervision of Ishani Aggarwal

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the MSc in International Master in Management, at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa and for the MSc Program in Executive Master's in Business Administration, at the Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública, Fundação Getulio Vargas, 22-09-2021.

Dedication page

I want to dedicate this thesis to my family having always supported and enabled me to live the life I've wanted and to pursue a higher education. I work hard to make them proud and without them, none of this would have been possible, I'm forever grateful.

Acknowledgments

This paper is the culmination of a long and bumpy ride spanning what feels like a lifetime of studies and knowledge. I want to thank all the teachers I've had from my first day in school, a day after which I proclaimed, "this is going to be tough" and 22 years later, I can indeed concur with my own words all those years ago. I will never stop learning, but this thesis will mark the end of my studies. In 2014, I first started my university studies and I'm now grateful to be done.

It's been difficult to write this thesis especially considering the unusually challenging times caused by the pandemic that forced me to study and write the thesis online from home. This caused greater challenges for me, but it also makes me all the more grateful for the people who helped me achieve this feat of writing my thesis, a feat I dreaded before even enrolling in university.

I want to give a very special thank you to my thesis advisor, Dr. Ishani Aggarwal. Without her advice and recommendations, I would have been completely lost and not been able to produce a thesis at all. Her great knowledge on the matter of diversity proved an invaluable asset assisting me greatly in all aspects of writing. She also helped inspire me to write this thesis after teaching "cross cultural management" in 2020 when I otherwise didn't have a clue about a thesis topic.

I also want to give a very warm thank you to Gabriela Cuconato for her very delicate explanations and for her prompt & unwavering help in untangling and understanding the data derived from the survey of the thesis which I otherwise would have found myself hopelessly lost in.

Lastly, I want to thank all the friends I've made throughout this journey as well as my family, all of whom have always supported me greatly and none of this would have been possible without them.

Thank you all.

Table of Content

Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 8
 - 1.1 Justification..... 9
 - 1.2 Objectives 10
- 2. Literature review 11
 - 2.1 Diversity..... 11
 - 2.2 Predicting attitudes to workplace diversity 13
 - 2.3 Predictors of Attitudes toward Diversity and Hypotheses Generation 15
- 3. Methodology 23
 - 3.1 Procedure 23
 - 3.2 Measurements 25
 - 3.3 Sample 29
- 4. Data analysis..... 30
 - 4.1 Results 30
 - 4.2 Discussion 39
- 5. Limitations, recommendations, and conclusion 42
 - 5.1 Limitations/delimitations 42
 - 5.2 Future Research & Recommendations..... 43
 - 5.3 Conclusion 44
- Bibliography..... 44
- Appendices 49

List of Illustrations

Figure 1. Correlations of main variables..... 30

Figure 2. Correlation of attitudes to diversity and subcategories.....32

Figure 3. Bivariate correlation of variables regarding attitudes to diversity.....35

Figure 4. Regression of variables regarding attitudes to diversity.....36

Figure 5. Hypothesis testing.....37

Figure 6. Means of attitudes to diversity items.....52

Abstract

Predicting Attitudes to Diversity:

-The relationship between personal characteristics and prejudice towards diversity

By:

Johan Hildingsson

The aim of the current study was to evaluate the extent to which certain values, traits, cognitive styles, and cultural dimensions can predict diversity attitudes of individuals. A sample of 104 respondents from a broad range of 39 nationalities represented answered a 5–10 minutes survey testing respondents' views using the shorter TIPI (ten item personality index) of the Big Five personality traits dimension, SSVS (Short Schwartz's Value Survey), Gelfand's tightness/looseness dimension, cognitive conformity style & Hofstede's masculinity dimension in addition to the attitudes to diversity scale focusing on two scales of prejudice against females and foreign ethnics.

The study established strong links of findings clearly pointing to a distinct connection between harboring fewer negative attitudes to diversity and openness to experiences, benevolence, universalism, self-direction, and self-transcendence, whereas higher levels of conformity, conservation, power, and tradition in addition to the male gender all were found of harboring more negative attitudes to diversity.

Keywords: Attitudes to diversity, values, traits, tightness/looseness, cognitive style, masculinity

Paper category: Master Thesis

Resumo

O objetivo do presente estudo foi avaliar como certos valores, traços, estilos cognitivos e culturas podem prever com precisão os resultados de atitudes de diversidade. Uma amostra de 104 entrevistados de uma ampla gama de 39 nacionalidades representadas respondeu a uma pesquisa de 5 a 10 minutos testando as opiniões dos entrevistados usando o TIPI (índice de personalidade de dez itens) mais curto da dimensão dos Cinco Grandes traços de personalidade, SSVS (Pesquisa de Valor Curto de Schwartz), A dimensão de rigidez / frouxidão de Gelfand, o estilo de conformidade cognitiva e a dimensão de masculinidade de Hofstede, além da escala de atitudes em relação à diversidade com foco em duas escalas de preconceito contra mulheres e etnias estrangeiras.

O estudo estabeleceu fortes ligações de resultados que apontam claramente para uma conexão distinta entre abrigar menos atitudes negativas em relação à diversidade e abertura para experiências, benevolência, universalismo, autodireção e autotranscendência, enquanto níveis mais elevados de conformidade, conservação, poder e tradição além do gênero masculino, todos nutriram atitudes mais negativas em relação à diversidade.

Palavras-chave: Atitudes em relação à diversidade, valores, traços, rigidez / frouxidão, estilo cognitivo, masculinidade

Categoria de trabalho: Dissertação de Mestrado

1. Introduction

Diversity is a concept that has the potential of stirring up many mixed emotions in people whether positive or negative and is also something that has many mixed meanings depending on who's asked. In today's world, diversity is becoming an ever-important concept to deal with for societies in general just as it is for companies specifically due to the ever intertwining of our world with people of different backgrounds coming together at unprecedented rates (USBLS, 2019).

The effects of the increased diversity for companies have been widely studied in previous research. Research that has praised the effects of diversity for its many benefits like (Lorenzo et al, 2018; Smith & Turner, 2015; Sakpal, 2019) establishing diversity to increase revenues, increased productivity, and higher job satisfaction for companies, while others have criticized diversity for bringing more miscommunication problems, and a more hostile work environment leading to loss of productivity for companies (Kochan et al, 2003; Martin, 2014), which in truth makes any real consensus of the implications of diversity clearly lacking. Martin (2014) Armache, (2012) also concludes that diversity can be very positive for companies just as it can be negative, depending on how it's managed and perceived.

The previous mentioned lack of consensus of diversity effects on companies begs the question, why? Why is it that diversity hasn't been completely established as an either positive or negative variable for companies to strive for? The answer is perhaps that diversity in its definition is as different as its name entails (Roberson, 2016). Diversity is a complex phenomenon, and many different types of diversity make it difficult to assess diversity as a one construct especially considering that diversity also can have different meanings for different people, entities, and at different levels in the organization. Its vague nature also makes it difficult to determine what or when something actually is truly diverse which further adds to the problem of establishing a positive or negative consensus of diversity implications.

This leaves us with a growing concept that can't be easily comprehended and analyzed across research fields and cultures, obstructing real insight of diversity effects. Diversity can indeed prove very positive for companies, but it might as well be negative depending on who's asked and how diversity has been managed or treated in any given company and its underlying workforce prejudices (Shemla et al, 2014; Martin, 2014; Armache, 2012). The effects of diversity thus become less interesting in themselves and the attitudes to diversity among the workforce become more important since the attitudes to diversity and their underlying

prejudices seem to be highly indicative if diversity will be a positive or negative attribute for a company (Shemla et al, 2014).

1.1 Justification

Considering a more connected world with increasing diversity in populations, it becomes very important indeed to establish the effects of diversity. Since effects of diversity seem to differentiate from study to study, the perception of diversity becomes more important since the effects of diversity and the perception of diversity might differ greatly. Ultimately considering the fact that perceptions of diversity can indicate whether increasing diversity will be more successful or not, this makes predicting and evaluating attitudes to diversity highly interesting.

The world has become more diverse and at the same time in my perception, more and more western countries have become more conservative and protective of their own countries seen in the US with Trump, the UK with Brexit, and my own native country of Sweden with a surging right conservative alliance and a rightwing party now one of the largest parties in the country among others. The perception of diversity and especially that of cultural diversity in the world seems to be pointing downwards and better understanding these perceptions as well as better predicting them becomes important especially for companies not to lose out on potential positive effects of diversity which makes this paper important.

Measuring attitudes to diversity is easier done than measuring the effects of diversity for companies which can be done by simple anonymous questionnaires. When combined with personality and values tests, it's possible to determine certain traits or values to be more or less appreciative of diversity which again makes measuring attitudes to diversity and predicting outcomes more salient than trying to measure the effects of diversity for companies on given metrics because it will always be more difficult to accurately account for all the variables affecting companies other than diversity alone.

Considering the fact that attitudes to diversity also seems to indicate whether an increase in diversity will be providing a more positive or negative outcome for teams (Shemla et al, 2014) it becomes of great importance to establish predictions of how people will likely view diversity as it thus offers a chance for example managers to better combat the negativity and

gain the boost that diversity can indeed provide when increasing diversity in a company as previously stated.

1.2 Objectives

The objective of this paper is to establish correlations between certain individual traits, values, and other characteristics and attitudes toward diversity in order to better predict which characteristics in people are related to their view of diversity as more or less favorable.

Understanding which types of personality characteristics of different traits and values that hold a more positive attitude to diversity and which types that hold more negative attitudes to diversity is thus the main objective of this study.

In order to achieve the main goal of the study, a questionnaire was made for respondents to answer anonymously answering well-established tests of personality traits, values as well as other items of more demographic nature together with items of attitudes to diversity and tested using correlations and regressions with attitudes to diversity as the dependent variable tested against the independent variables of traits, values etc. Other independent variables included respondents' cultural background from the Hofstede masculinity/femininity dimension as well as respondents' perception on their national culture on the tight/loose culture scale to see if national culture can also a determining factor .

2. Literature review

2.1 Diversity

Diversity is by its definition by Merriam-webster the following “*..condition of having or being composed of differing elements..*” which is a rather easy and straightforward definition. However, its vague nature by simply being of “differing elements” leaves undoubtedly several different interpretations of what diversity actually is or when something actually can be called diverse. Ironically this creates as diverse definitions of diversity as the diversity definition itself and has led to the discussions of so called “true diversity” in workplace diversity (Roberson, 2019; Areiqat et al, 2020).

Diversity is also divided into aspects of “surface level” and “deep level” diversity. The major differences between the two are the visual observability of attributes, i.e. things that can be obtained by a person often simply by looking at another person such as, but not always, characteristics like gender, age group, overt religion practices. These surface-level attributes are also those that are usually associated with stereotypes and assumptions we all make about other people without necessarily knowing them. Contrary to surface-level characteristics, deep-level characteristics are less obvious and take more time to understand which can include education, values, cultures, and beliefs among others. These are less obvious/observable characteristics which we might make assumptions on by judging on the surface level attributes but can’t at all really predict accurately without knowing and observing the persons in question (Mannix & Neale, 2005; Harrison et al, 1998, 2002).

It’s important to note that the surface-level attributes might appear one way and we might have any given stereotype about any given person depending on the surface-level attributes, but these assumptions might very well be wrong all the same as some surface-level attributes might lead to wrong predictions about deep-level characteristics. This also makes diversity a more complex subject since diversity can appear very different at the surface level based on the most observable attributes from the deep level that may not be easily observable. This could lead to several types of compositions of a group of people who might look the same on the surface level but might actually be diverse in their values and beliefs; similarly, a group of people who might look very different at the surface level might have very similar values and beliefs. The disconnect between mere appearances (i.e. surface-level attributes) and the less

observable but powerful attributes that guide individual behavior (i.e. deep-level attributes) makes diversity a complex issue.

While different ways of measuring diversity exist such as Simpson's diversity index that can determine the diversity of a group in singular elements such as gender or ethnic diversity of groups, true diversity is often missed. Diversity is not just measured as easily as singular numbers as if someone is male or female, Swedish or Brazilian because it doesn't necessarily translate into a true diversity number. Considering a group of 10 individuals and 5 of them are male and the rest female, such a group would look well diverse and gain a high diversity score as the group is mixed 50/50 with a diversity index calculation. If the group is actually comprised of individuals all born in the same city, having received similar education and otherwise have similar to near identical life experiences, the group suddenly is not as diverse anymore because they are all people with similar background and experiences which is called misrepresentation as the numbers are misleading/misrepresenting the actual diversity and inclusion level.

Misrepresentation can thus mean that certain groups of people albeit for example all male should actually be considered more diverse if they are comprised of different nationalities coming from different backgrounds and differing life experiences (Harries et al, 2018). Another problem when measuring diversity as reported by eye witness account such as employees in companies is that the employees perception of the diversity level at their varying companies are often inaccurate to reality, either as too high or too low (Lindzon, 2017) making the perceived diversity not necessary representative of true diversity. All of this thus becomes a problem for measuring diversity and inclusivity in companies as well as the perceptions of companies and their varying structures of diversity. This also offers one of many intriguing ways for companies to appear diverse "on paper" while not actually being it in reality just as a situation of not appearing diverse on paper but being it in reality can exist which again makes perception an important piece to reaching true diversity.

Tokenism is another term extending from the same problem where certain employees in companies might have been hired to make their company appear more diverse on paper such as females or foreign ethnic workers are hired in low value positions or otherwise away from the core business of the company such as "diverse workers" are hired as security guards and cleaning crews in a bank while all the actual bankers and management, etc in the core business of the bank are male or from the same ethnic background making up the majority of the employees. Research tackling this topic has shed light on the importance of understanding

the complexities of workplace diversity for example such that less than normal social functioning was established among coworkers with few other-ethnic coworkers (Enchautegui-de-Jesús et al, 2006)

Similarly, affirmative actions have had mixed results. Forcing people to be more appreciative of diversity by various actions like mandatory training programs on diversity has actually had the opposite effects and has instead reduced diversity among managers over a five year period whereas when voluntary, managerial diversity increased over the same period (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). Quotas are another strong-arming affirmative action that doesn't have any desirable outcome. It is aimed at making it impossible for less diverse people to be considered for certain positions despite them perhaps not being the better candidate and new hires can often face a more hostile work environment and more prejudice stemming from them being hired more for the diversity they bring and not for their competencies whether high or low (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016).

Much research has been conducted into the field of workplace diversity and many studies too, have been made into calculating the effects of workplace diversity on all diversity subcategories of organizational, group and individual diversity sections. Research seems to be rather inconclusive however about the benefits or costs diversity bring despite much of it pointing into a positive correlation between diversity and different measures such as performance, creativity etc while much research also points to downright negative attributes which might seem contradictory but can perhaps also be explained by the differing scenarios and their unique situations every study has been applied to. One such study found that diversity bring many benefits but also emphasize its many challenges and problems that can potentially arise with increased diversity for different levels and situations (Armache, 2012).

2.2 Attitudes to workplace diversity

Attitudes to diversity are largely based on prejudices held against certain individuals or groups of people. In the workplace, these prejudices and attitudes can manifest themselves as certain people to be viewed as less capable to perform certain tasks or be more difficult to work with just to mention two examples (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001). Often, those prejudices are completely unfounded and untrue. Especially women and other minority

groups like certain foreign ethnic groups have experienced to a greater degree more mistreatment and discrimination over the past 100 years (Colella et al, 2017).

Attitudes to diversity can also very be important determinants of how successful workplace diversity can be (Van Oudenhoven-van der Zee et al, 2009) which makes attitudes to diversity an important factor of measuring the success of diversity in the work environment. A more hostile attitude among the general coworkers in a company towards diversity yield a less favorable outcome while a more positive attitude is more likely to be more favorable of increased diversity and increase the performance or success of increased diversity (Shemla et al, 2014).

In/out group biases can have a great impact on workplace diversity. The “in group” is comprised of the idea of “us” which is construed of different elements that a group of people share collectively which can be culture, education, gender etc. The “out group” is the idea of “them” and can comprise any person that is of a different element other than the shared elements of an “in group” such as again education, culture, language etc. These thus create biases that arise for “in group” persons against persons belonging to an “out group” that are different from our own “in group” and the biases can be implicit as well as explicit (Brewer, 1979).

We typically appreciate more the in group as we have something shared that we value collectively. Similar to caring more for our close family (in group) compared to complete strangers (out group). The same bias is found in the workplace and is thus a great hinder for diversity since diversity means increasing heterogeneity creating stronger “out groups” that are different from the major “in group” within a company. Trust and cooperation among “in groups” are typically higher than “out groups” creating further obstacles for workplace diversity to overcome (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al, 1987; Van Knippenberg et al 2013).

Merely increasing or decreasing diversity therefore does not by themselves determine a boost or loss in any given metric such as productivity caused by diversity. The implementation of increased diversity becomes important just as the core attitudes to diversity are since a higher negative attitude to diversity is likely to yield a more hostile coworking environment if diversity is increased and this will result in a performance loss rather than a boost from increased diversity. Addressing such attitudes to try and change them to something more favorable is therefore important (Aberson, 2007). Changing attitudes can however be difficult,

and to at the very least extent be able to better predict where such negative or positive attitudes exist, becomes ever more important (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001).

Negative attitudes to workplace diversity are derived from different prejudices such as prejudice against people of certain skin color or ethnicity, cultural affinity, gender, handicap, age and much more. Persons might have more prejudice towards certain groups and thus generally a more negative attitude to diversity as a whole, but it's therefore also important to break down diversity into different segments since this also means that certain persons can have no prejudice against certain no groups and very high to others which can result in a less (or higher) overall negative attitude to diversity (Shaefer, 2007).

Previous research has found certain groups of people to have both more and less prejudice to other particular groups of people and more (or less) negative attitudes to diversity as a whole. This includes studies that have determined males to having increased prejudice against female leaders/managers (Case et al, 2008) just as increased prejudice against foreigners by people having achieved lower educational levels (Haegel, 1999; Winkler, 1999;).

2.3 Predictors of Attitudes toward Diversity and Hypotheses Generation

Considering the objective of the study and the previous literature review of what has been studied about diversity, its effects and how it is related to perceptions and attitudes based of personal characteristics, values cultures etc. I propose the following hypotheses based of the different variables as follow below.

Values

Values have been widely used as predictors of attitudes to diversity in previous research and have been used as determinants of evaluating things prioritized and appreciated in people's lives as well as their behaviors and approaches to things. Values are a sense the guiding principles of persons and are often social constructs dictating how people view certain things and accordingly live their lives. Any given person can have many values represented in their life just as it's possible to have few values. Universal values are values shared cross culturally while other values exist as well. Values can often be shared as well as differentiated from person to person even within cultures (Schwartz, 1992).

The Schwartz value survey (SVS) has been commonly used to determine respondents' personal values. The SVS is comprised of around 56 items aimed at measuring ten specific universal values recognized globally. The values measured are universalism (understanding and appreciative, seeking equality and justice), benevolence (helpful, honest and taking care of others), conformity (obedience and politeness, restraining from seeking things to upset others), tradition (respecting of what has been and being humble), security (safety and harmony, emphasizing belonging), power (status and prestige seeking wealth & recognition), achievement (succeeding by demonstrating competence, being ambitious and capable), hedonism (self-indulgency, seeks pleasure and enjoyment of life), stimulation (seeks excitement and challenges), and self-direction (emphasis on freedom and independence, want to choose and act independently) (Schwartz, 1992).

The 10 specific values simultaneously make up four broad values on a circular pie chart or 2-dimensional graph which are “conservation” (conformity, tradition, security) versus “openness to change” (stimulation, self-direction) and “self-transcendence” (universalism, benevolence) versus “self-enhancement” (power, achievement, hedonism) (Schwartz, 1992).

Previous studies like Sawyerr et al (2005) and Anglim et al (2019) have rather expectedly found specific values with a high score in especially universalism and benevolence to be correlated with less negative attitudes to diversity since kindness is linked with benevolence wanting to care for others and to fight injustice just as universalism is linked with a higher appreciation for everyone and everyone's equal worth thus indicting fewer negative attitudes to diversity from such persons. While higher scores in values such as tradition, security, and power have been found to be correlated with higher negative attitudes to diversity since these focus on the protection of the self, for things to be as they are and to a higher extent prioritize the self-interest over others, unsurprisingly leaving little room to appreciate diversity (Sawyerr et al, 2005; Anglim et al, 2019).

The specific values thus also transition some of their affects into the four broader values. This should thus be true for “self-transcendence” resulting in less negative attitudes to diversity because it is completely comprised of the two specific values that are already correlated to less negative attitudes to diversity of universalism and benevolence. While higher “conservation” scores have been linked to more negative attitudes to diversity (Grigoryan & Schwartz, 2020) albeit not unanimously (Sawyerr et al, 2005).

The broader values should thus summarize up the specific values into four groups that are more easily interpreted than the ten specific values separately, but the effects on the broad values should not be significant without them also being at least partially significant for the specific values separately as well. Persons of more traditional and power-seeking values should result in more broad conservation values which will show an increased negative attitude to diversity. Whereas persons of more universalistic and benevolent values making up more the broad value of self-transcendence should be more appreciative of diversity and show fewer negative attitudes to diversity.

Hypothesis H. 1: Values will influence attitudes to diversity.

Specific hypotheses:

H1a: Persons of higher conservation values will show more negative attitudes to diversity

H1b: Persons of higher self-transcendence values will show fewer negative attitudes to diversity.

Personality traits

Personality traits are distinctive characteristics indicative to how people are and act but is more uncontrollable in that people for the most part can't actively choose the traits to possess or not. Traits are similar to values indicating how people live, but traits are more descriptive of how people are whereas values act more as guiding principles for people's lives of what they appreciate in life. Values also don't have to be shared in that people don't have to have many values in life whereas all humans have some personality traits indicating the kind of person they are from the descriptive point of view (Parks-Leduc et al, 2014).

Personality traits such as the "big 5" personalities have been historically used in research as a determinant of different personalities using a 60 item large inventory (Costa Jr & McCrae, 1978) and has offered a link in studies of determining attitudes to diversity based of these traits. Studies like (Ackermann & Ackermann, 2015; Miville et al, 1999; Han & Pistole, 2017) found among the big 5 traits made up of "extraversion", "agreeableness", "conscientiousness", "neuroticism" (or sometimes "emotional stability"), and "openness to experiences" that high agreeableness and openness to experiences held greater appreciation for diversity while (Anglim et al, 2019) also found extraversion as an important trait correlated with less negative attitudes to diversity.

Extraversion is defined as a person being talkative and socially outgoing, often more energetic and sociable as well as forceful. Agreeableness define persons who are more forgiving, kind and considerate of others often showing more modesty and higher trust of others.

Conscientiousness defines persons who are more efficient and organized as well as thorough and not acting carelessly. Neuroticism or emotional stability define persons who are more moody and easier irritable as well as more vulnerable and tends to worry a lot and be more nervous than others. Openness to experiences define persons who are more curious and imaginative and are often artistic with an active imagination and original ideas inventory (Costa Jr & McCrae, 1978).

The Hexaco personality trait test differs from the original big 5 as it adds a 6th personality trait to the already established “big 5” which is “honesty-humility” where a high score aims to signify people who are less manipulative with less temptations to break rules or otherwise enrich themselves unfairly (Ashton & Lee, 2007). The Hexaco test has become increasingly popular among researchers and while the original big 5 remain most highly used, the Hexaco test has been deemed the better predictor of deviance in the work environment or otherwise classified as negative attitudes to diversity (Pletzer et al, 2019).

Personality traits should thus influence attitudes to diversity but only openness to experiences seems to be correlating of statistical significance continuously in previous research and only that one trait will be tested as a hypothesis although the others will naturally be used and presented in the study as well.

Hypothesis H. 2: Personality traits will influence attitudes to diversity.

Specific hypothesis: H2a: Persons more open to experiences will show fewer negative attitudes to diversity

Tight/loose cultural orientation

Tightness/looseness of cultures measures how societies view divergent behavior. Tighter cultures are more conformity in that in such societies, people are expected to act in certain ways and deviant behaviors outside of the norm are more frowned or looked down upon. Looser cultures are the complete opposite of the tighter ones in that such societies are more acceptive of deviant behavior. People who act in different/divergent ways or behaviors are not frowned down upon, at least not to the same extent as in tighter cultures. (Gelfand et al,

2011). Tightness/looseness have been used in studies such as determining perceptions on leadership for both type of cultures (Aktaş, Gelfand, Hanges, 2015). How tight/loose cultures act in times of crises such as attitudes and responses to the covid-19 pandemic which found rather expectedly tighter cultures to face fewer cases and deaths from faster cooperation than in looser cultures (Gelfand et al, 2021).

Tightness/looseness cultures have also been found to vary greatly within countries, thus potentially making the tool less reliable for specific predictions on individual levels as these are more adapted from local or regional environments as compared to countrywide generalizations (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014). The study also concluded that tighter cultures (in the US) among other things have higher social stability but also higher inequalities than looser cultures. The tightness/looseness doesn't necessarily mean the same thing across nations.

A Chinese study (Chua, Huang, Jin, 2019) found that Chinese tight culture provinces are more developed and show a higher tolerance for diversity such as higher gender equality than their looser counterparts. Such a result seems highly counterintuitive to previous research and therefore highlights a potential weakness of the tight/loose culture tool, as it alone cannot fully explain metrics like "attitudes to diversity" and that other supplemental indicators or moderators are probably needed to fully capture these effects.

Despite the contradicting research about tight/loose cultures on attitudes to diversity, the hypothesis saying persons of tighter cultures to show more negative attitudes to diversity will be tested. Few Chinese respondents are likely to answer the survey and establishing where in China or exactly which other regions within countries respondents report from is simply not possible for this study. Therefore, the more general approach will be used and here the research seems indicative that tighter cultures should indicate more negative attitudes to diversity.

Hypothesis H. 3: Tightness/looseness cultures will influence attitudes to diversity.

Specific hypothesis: H3a: Persons of a tighter culture will show more negative attitudes to diversity.

Cognitive conformity

Because the tight/loose culture tool use items that might indicate more towards values for countries on a national level which is not necessarily shared by individual respondents'

beliefs, the tool might not be as an important indicator/moderator linked to attitudes to diversity. Cognitive conformity could better depict individual personal beliefs as indicators of how tight/loose people/respondents actually are themselves. Since tighter cultures are linked to higher conformity levels and looser cultures are associated with lower levels of conformity (Gelfand et al, 2011). Cognitive conformity, therefore, can potentially offer a greater tool of determining personal tightness/looseness cultures than the more general and countrywide tight/loose cultural tool do.

The cognitive style of people determines the way any given person perceive things as well as dealing with how they act in certain situations, think, and learn. The cognitive style can thus have a great impact on how people function in teams versus work alone as well as how persons take in and use information they perceive (Ausburn & Ausburn , 1978; Messick , 1984).

Cognitive conformity style is about how persons try to fit in within societies and groups by changing and adapting to what is expected of them. The expectations are and given person's own perceived expectations and can differ from person to person even within groups or cultures. Persons with less cognitive conformity styles will likely not care so much about adapting to what is expected of them, either because they don't think certain things are expected of them or they don't care about it and will likely engage more in "deviant behavior" compared to persons of higher cognitive conformity styles (Crutchfield, 1955).

The cognitive conformity part of the larger conformity-creativity (Kirton, 1976; Miron et al, 2004) examines how personal characteristics affect innovation and quality/performance and found that innovation and performance can indeed go hand in hand and does not have to exclude each other pending on the initiative level of creative coworkers. Which further adds to the previous established research found in tight/loose cultures, that more conformity cultures do not have to be any less innovative than looser ones and also that a person of a higher conformity level therefore does not have to be any more or less negative to diversity than persons of less conformity.

The hypothesis 4 thus will test if respondents of a higher cognitive conformity style will show more negative attitudes to diversity since they are likely to frown upon deviancies that increases of diversity and new ways of thinking and doing can bring. This as persons of higher cognitive conformity will likely prefer things to be as they have always been and thus not appreciate diversity.

Hypothesis H. 4: Cognitive Conformity Style will influence attitudes to diversity.

Specific hypothesis: H4a: Respondents of higher conformity cognitive style will show more negative attitudes to diversity.

Feminine/Masculine Cultural Orientation

The Hofstede national culture “6-D” model offers the most, in previous research, dominant tool of measuring interculturally values ranging from 20 to around 40 items and it’s made up of Power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity vs femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Hofstede, 2001).

The dimensions are as noted by Hofstede himself not to be used as an individual person’s views but should be used as a general indicator for countrywide views overall shared by the general public of any nation. Thus, using it as a kind of predictor for individuals’ personal views can indeed be completely erroneous just as it can be correct, making it less than desirable for individual predictions of smaller samples but achieve a higher validity in larger samples predicting more general views (Hofstede & Minkov 2013).

The masculinity vs femininity dimension determines how societies view ideas of success & cooperation. Masculine orientated cultures strive more for personal success through achievements and material rewards by competing while feminine orientated cultures strive more for cooperation seeking modesty and balance to achieve higher equality in their societies seeking consensus (Hofstede, 2001).

There have been several studies comparing Hofstede’s 6-D with the SVS (Ng, Lee, Soutar, 2007) and at least one have especially looked and found convergence for higher femininity scores from Hofstede correlated with the broader value of higher self-transcendence from the SVS (Gouveia & Ros, 2000) since femininity means more empathy and desire for social equality directly linked to the specific values of benevolence and universalism. Masculinity is instead the opposite, valuing more personal gain and prioritizing self-interests first just as the broader self-enhancement value is comprised of specific values of power and achievement that value the same thing (Hofstede, 1984; Schwartz, 1990).

Respondents of more feminine defined cultures will likely show fewer negative attitudes to diversity since they tend to come from societies valuing equality and justice similar to the values of universalism and benevolence. Hypothesis 5 will thus test this assumption.

Hypothesis H. 5: Hofstede masculinity dimension will influence attitudes to diversity.

Specific hypothesis: H5a: Feminine cultural orientation will show fewer negative attitudes to diversity.

3. Methodology

In the following section, the methodology for the current study will be presented. It will describe how the current study has been conducted including details for its different parts for each variable and these measurements as well as the different sample demographical elements.

3.1 Procedure

The underlying goal of the study was to explore the relationship between attitudes to diversity, especially negative ones, in relation to different characteristics such as personal values & traits, cultural values and personal cognition. Such characteristics would be gathered from established research already discussed in the literature review. Thus, the study aimed to predict attitudes to diversity, such that predictions about certain people of a certain value, trait or similar would likely feel a certain way about diversity. The real goal was to test and potentially solidify certain values and traits as strong predictors of attitudes to diversity whether negative or positive, from already established research in addition to also identifying new indicating predictors that have not been used as much before or otherwise not found to be strongly correlated.

A hybrid of both primary and secondary data collection was used. Primary data was collected from a quantitative survey made of international respondents. Secondary data was collected from already established comparison sources, combined in part with primary data of survey respondents' answers. Specifically, the secondary data was collected from Hofstede, but also the "big 5 personalities" and Gelfand's' tight/loose culture dimensions.

In respect for the outstanding pandemic times with its many restrictions, a quantitative survey was deemed the best approach to receiving substantial responses on a global scale. Interviews were deemed too time consuming and potentially much more limited to conduct due to the pandemic. Such an approach would likely also only focus on one culture and wouldn't therefore necessarily provide valuable insights since national culture might eschew findings in certain directions and would also render any attempt at establishing links between national cultures and attitudes to diversity impossible without taking into consideration other cultural values. The survey method approach also enables easier analysis of testing the relationships between variables and their strength.

The survey was constructed using the survey program “Qualtrics” and data was from there exported and analyzed using “Excel” as well as the data analytics program “SPSS 28”. The survey was distributed via social media as social media offers a great global distribution network. The survey was answered in full anonymity offering survey responders a more secure way to reply with full honesty reducing some possible biases potentially otherwise caused from feeling pressure or fear from answering in any certain way that a monitored survey could inflict. A smaller survey was deemed the most effective since a longer survey would likely make survey respondents lose interest and result in incomplete surveys or at the very least result in untrue replies from the loss of interest respondents could face as documented in previous research(Galesic & Bosnjak, 2009).

Naturally, certain questions had to be asked in the survey to gather data for the hypotheses testing and a too short survey would otherwise not gather enough answers. Open ended questions were avoided for easier analysis of the results. Items were derived from established tests and surveys using Likert scales for results. Therefore, a survey of around 5-10 minutes was deemed the most effective length of survey while still receiving substantial replies enough to analyze over the dataset. The completion time ended up varying between survey responders from 22 minutes at most to 2 minutes at the lowest. The median time it took responders to finish the survey was however 6 minutes which seemed like the most credible completion time across the sample.

A survey sample of 10 students was also tested before launching the survey and it took them about 10 minutes to complete which was deemed too long to make the survey efficient in completion time in regard to useful measurements. The survey was thus cut shorter by removing some wording, sequencing, and other less useful questions in particular related to demographics that didn't add any real value to the survey.

Another problem that arose through the testing phase was the simplicity to guess and understand what the survey aimed at testing from the responder's views. This was solved by the sequencing and randomization of questions from dividing certain groups of questions into smaller groups. This problem could otherwise have made respondents answer questions dishonestly from their actual thoughts because they could have easier understood what the survey aimed to achieve and thus answered a certain way to “fit” the expected answer which naturally would have been a problem creating untrue answers.

3.2 Measurements

The survey used 5 different scales for measuring survey respondents' different values, traits, attitudes, 1 of these was a dependent variable which is the "attitudes to diversity" also broken down into 2 sub-groups of "female" & "ethnic" prejudice, with the other 4 being independent variables related to the dependent variable of "attitudes to diversity". On top of aforementioned scales, a sixth dimension of an independent variable was used as derived from respondents' demographics of nationality pre-classified by Hofstede's cultural dimension of "masculinity". Other demographics were also measured such as gender, education, country of residence, and more. The 5 scales were derived from existing literature (covered in the literature review section previously) and were used for different reasons to be discussed in the next paragraphs.

Attitudes to diversity

Measuring attitudes to diversity was the core of the whole thesis and to measure it a strong scale was needed. The attitudes to diversity scale was derived from existing research (Montei et al, 1996; Anglim et al, 2019) in order to measure attitudes to diversity in the survey responding sample. The scale comprises 18 items, measured on a 1-5 Likert scale with 1 meaning very inaccurate and 5 meaning very accurate with 10 non-reversed items and 8 reversed items. These items were especially taken from the Anglim et al 2019 report but not in their entirety. The current report focused on female and ethnic items while the Anglim report included other items of disability and elders too which again was not the aim of the current study.

Certain items were also rephrased after the testing phase for the current study had some reports of misunderstandings/confusions. This was particularly true for the word "ethnic" as used in the Anglim paper which was reported unclear whether it focused on which type of ethnic group that was concerned. The Anglim report also focused only on Australia whereas the current study took a more global view. For this reason too, the word "ethnic" was better rephrased to "foreign ethnicity" or "other ethnic group" were used to make the distinction clear that it was a foreign group other than the respondents own ethnic group that was in question. The items gathered a strong reliability nonetheless with a Cronbach alpha of 0,893109.

Values

The SVS is a well-used and established tool of measuring intercultural values that are shared/recognized globally (Weeden, 2011; Spini, 2003). The SVS has however also faced validity criticism for values having different meanings across cultures despite being recognized globally which has resulted in the SVS suffering potential validity losses in certain scenarios cross culturally when the SVS is relied on solely (Peng et al, 1997). The SVS has also been made into the Short Schwartz Value Survey (SSVS) which aims to capture the same values as the original SVS but by a shorter 10 item survey and has achieved high validity scores compared to the original SVS (Lindeman, Verkasalo, 2005) making the SSVS a more efficient tool for shorter surveys.

In order to measure respondents' values, the "Short Schwartz's Value Survey" (SSVS) (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 2005) was used using a 10 item test ultimately derived from the "SVS" (Schwartz's Value Survey), (Schwartz, 1992, 1996) as mentioned previously. The scales were used on a Likert scale from 0-8 with 0 meaning "opposed to my principles" and 8 meaning "of supreme importance". There are 10 values existing in the Schwartz value survey and each item signified a different value where respondents thus indicated the level of importance each value meant to them making each item synonymous to a specific certain value.

There were also a 2-dimensional broader value chart made up of the 10 different specific values of which 4 broad values were construed. These 4 broad values were calculated from the 10 items in regards to the specific values and didn't need any further items to be tested. These were as previously stated, conservatism vs openness to change and self-transcendence vs self-fulfillment. The alpha value for the SSVS items was a reported 0,732725 which is considered a reliable result.

Personality traits

Shorter measurements of the big 5 personality traits such as the SIMP (Wood & Hampson, 2005), TIPI (Gosling et al, 2003), short version of big 5 (Rammstedt & John, 2007) have been constructed to offer easier methods of measuring the big 5 personality traits and have been found to reach a similar relationship with the original big 5, 60 item inventory measurement. The TIPI achieved a somewhat stronger validity score when compared of the three shorter measures (Furnham, 2008) with the three being otherwise similar in completion time.

The short completion time and high validity score indicates a great use for the TIPI in the field of correlating personality traits with negative attitudes to diversity as it's arguably faster yet valid as an instrument compared to the longer 60 (or 100) items comprised of the Hexaco or original big 5 testing. However, in my own literature review research, surprisingly few studies seemed to have actually used the TIPI as a moderator between personality traits and negative attitudes to diversity as opposed to the more popular Hexaco and the original big 5 tests.

10 Items were thus used to measure respondents character traits. These items were tested using the TIPI test (Gosling et al, 2003) as mentioned above. The items were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale with 1 meaning "strongly disagree" and 7 meaning "strongly agree". The 10 items determine 5 different personality traits known as "the big 5" and these are derived from 5 pairs of the 10 items of one reversed item and one non-reversed. This much shorter 10 item test indicates a much effective personality tool rather than the longer 200 item HEXACO test or others.

The individual alphas for each pair of items signifying 5 different traits with 5 different alphas were 0,637 for "Extraversion", 0,102 for "Agreeableness", 0,645 for "Conscientiousness", 0,631 for "Emotional Stability", and 0,212 for "Openness to Experiences". Which makes the alphas for "agreeableness" and "openness to experiences" highly unreliable according to the Cronbach alpha test. Low alphas are nonetheless not very surprising for a short item survey and is also noticed by Gosling (the creator of the TIPI test) who argues that "*the aim of the TIPI is not to achieve a high alpha score but rather high validity*". A low alpha reliability has also been discussed heavily in research in that alphas can be misleading especially for scales using fewer items (Kline, 2000; Hinton et al, 2004; Wood & Hampson, 2005). Therefore, the low alphas point to a poor reliability of the TIPI but also that the low alphas are not necessarily indicative of a poor and unreliable test considering its size.

Tight/loose cultural orientation

6 items were used to measure the tightness/looseness of respondents using the tight/loose scale from existing literature (Gelfand et al, 2011) as mentioned in the literature review. The scale also used a Likert scale but of values ranging from 1-6 with 1 meaning "strongly disagree" and 6 meaning "strongly agree". One of the items was reversed and the rest non-reversed which was justified by Gelfand as otherwise having many reversed items doesn't

have much meaning and could otherwise “*introduce method factors that supersede substantive factors*”. The scales were used to measure respondents’ views in light of their own countries of residence that was otherwise unclear from the original formatting of the items. The items scale reached an alpha of 0,652578 which makes it less reliable but using the same logic and argument as previously for the TIPI, the alpha is not necessarily crucial for shorter item scales while the alpha above 0.6 being nevertheless acceptable albeit weak.

Cognitive Conformity

4 items were used to measure the cognitive conformity of survey respondents using the subcategory conformity scale of cognitive style (Miron et al, 2004) as already mentioned in the literature review. The scale consisted of a 1-7 Likert scale with 1 meaning “strongly disagree” and 7 meaning “strongly agree”. The items is the subcategory of cognitive style as mentioned and originally consists of 2 other subcategories of “*attention to detail*” and “*creativity*”, each consisting of 4 items on a similar scale. However, only the “conformity” category was used as the others didn’t add value in a desired way.

The conformity aspect was used to measure individual conformity from a set of items, which is different from the “conformity value” derived from a single item from the “SSVS”. It was also used as a compliment to the tight/loose scale offering a more personal reflection of each of the respondent’s individual views which the more general tight/loose cultural tool might otherwise not capture. The conformity items reached an alpha of 0,628799 which is similar to the tight/loose culture items alpha which again is acceptable for the same reasons as before while only using 4 items.

Demographics & Hofstede Masculinity

Several single demographical items were also used in the survey, but without any previous research to back them up. These were “gender”, “educational level”, “national identity”, “country of residence”, and “industry of profession”. It’s against the nationality demography where the last scale using Hofstede’s masculinity/femininity dimension was used as mentioned in the literature review and was not a set of items respondents otherwise answered to specifically in the survey. The reported nationality by each of the survey responders was calculated afterwards using the score each nationality scores in “masculinity” according to

Hofstede from 0-99 and converted to a Likert scale of 0-9 with 0 meaning more feminine culture and 9 meaning more masculine culture since the original dimension measures “masculinity” with a high score indicating masculine culture, and a low, feminine (Hofstede, 1980, 1988, 2001, 2021).

3.3 Sample

The sample of survey responders gathered a sample of 104 responders from around the world comprised of 39 nationalities globally. From those, 78 responders were female (75%), 25 male (24.04%), and 1 reported non-binary/third gender (0.96%). The sample consisted mainly of higher education responders due likely to the fact of social media distribution aimed at other students conducting their own surveys responding as a favor although a few were of lesser educational levels too. The sample consisted of 23 graduates (master education or higher), 64 undergraduates (bachelor), 7 of some university, 7 completed high school, and 2 uncompleted high school while 1 respondent preferred not to say.

This means that overall, 83.66% of the sample had at least completed a bachelor’s degree which is important to remember for this sample making it less representative of the general population. It’s also important to note that 55.77% of the sample reported being born in the reported country of residence while 40.38% were not and 3.85% being born in the same country, but by foreign born parents which again makes this sample less representative of the population as a whole and potentially less representative of the cultures reported. The survey was run in an almost month-long period from May 9th until June 2nd, 2021. In addition, the test survey was run mid-April ‘21.

4. Data analysis

In the following section, data analyzed from the survey will be presented in the form of both text and some visuals. This will be followed by a discussion of the results and interesting findings. Following the analysis of the results, the hypotheses as presented previously, will be tested and accordingly accepted or rejected based on the presented results.

For the analysis, data analytics program “SPSS” was used as well as “Excel” in addition to the survey tool “Qualtrics” used to create the survey. Correlations between variables from survey items will be presented both in respect to each other as well as to the dependent variable of “negative attitudes to diversity” with its adjoining two subcategories of “female” & “ethnic” prejudice. In addition, regressions of the prementioned variables will also be presented as well as the means and standard deviations.

4.1 General results

The objective of the study was to study the relationship between personal values, traits and more regarding attitudes to diversity in order to better predict how certain values, traits etc. will likely correspond to certain attitudes to diversity. The different statistics are presented in the following figures below detailing the correlations between the variables tested, and in regard to attitudes to diversity as well as a regression analysis of the same variables.

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach alphas are also presented as well as the different significance levels (p) of which certain variables are correlating with others. $p < .01$ significance levels are indicated with three stars, $p < .05$ with two stars, and $p < .1$ is indicated with bold text. With the focus being on $p < .05$ significance levels, the author found it interesting to highlight the $p < .1$ significance levels as well while keeping in mind those findings to be less reliable to generalize and make predictions about.

Figure 1. Correlations of main variables

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.

Demographics	-												
1.Male													
2.Educational level	.064	-											
3.Foreigner	-.139	.174	-										
Hofstede	-.201*	-.058	.160	-									
Masculinity													
4.Masculine country													
Personality traits	.002	.030	-.149	-.294**	(.637)								
5.Extraversion													
6.Agreeableness	-.105	.070	-.030	.041	-.051	(.102)							
7.Conscientiousness	-.113	.034	.022	-.051	-.033	.126	(.645)						
8.Emotional stability	.299**	.149	.046	-.320**	.123	.239*	.190	(.631)					
9.Openness to experiences	-.157	.069	.147	-.159	.185	.116	.134	.106	(.212)				
Values	.127	-.003	.050	.052	-.164	.027	.087	.206*	-.415**	(.733)			
10.Conservative													
11.Self-transcendence	-.059	.080	0	.045	-.266**	.302**	.076	.109	-.107	.208*	(.733)		
Tight/loose Culture	.049	-.005	.155	.128	.015	-.040	-.034	-.105	.064	-.017	-.153	(.653)	
12.Tight country													
Cognitive Personal	-.042	.104	.145	.047	-.099	.180	.256**	.093	.005	.118	.267**	.227*	(.629)
13.Cognitive Conformity													
Mean	.240	3.98	.440	4.28	4.255	4.663	5.144	4.390	5.245	.868	-1.235	4.002	4.906
Std. Deviation	.429	.881	.500	2.19	1.270	.991	1.226	1.392	.953	.844	.611	.679	.884

** = p< .01, * = p< .05, Bold text = p< .1. Parenthesis = Cronbach Alpha values

Some of the correlations and variables worth mentioning in Figure 1 is that the “Masculinity” and “Tightness” variables are not necessarily the respondents’ personal beliefs. Masculinity was captured from the nationality reported by the respondents and scored by the pre-classified Hofstede dimensions for each country. Therefore, the negative correlation between “male” respondents and “masculinity” simply means that the male respondents in the survey came from more feminine countries and not that they are any less or more masculine themselves.

The tightness variable asked respondents' items that were applicable for the country they were currently in and does also not necessarily capture the personal ideas, values etc. which the respondents might have themselves, but instead more aimed at what they think of how people in their country think in general, which naturally can differ a great deal from person to person. That is why the cognitive conformity variable was used to better capture respondents' personal views in regard to conformity which, as previously established, is closely linked to tightness/looseness. This relationship is also supported in the data with $p < .05$ and $r = .227$ linking higher conformity respondents to tighter cultures.

The only strong demographic difference is seen in males being more emotionally stable compared to females with an $r = .299$ linked to respondents from more masculine countries consisting of more females, as already established, reported less emotional stability $r = -.320$ while respondents with higher traits of extraversion showed a negative correlation to more masculine cultures of $r = -.294$. Something less expected perhaps is that respondents of higher Self-transcendence reported a correlation of $r = .208$, $p < .05$ in relation to Conservatism. More expectedly was that conservatism was strongly negatively correlated to openness to experiences at $p < .01$ with $r = -.415$.

Figure 2. Correlation of attitudes to diversity and subcategories

Variables	1.	2.	3.
1. Negative attitudes to diversity	(.893)		
2. Female prejudice	.856**	(.774)	
3. Foreign ethnic prejudice	.932**	.652**	(.847)
Mean	2.133	2.258	2.043
Std Deviation	.602	.738	.651

** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$, Bold text = $p < .1$. Parenthesis = Cronbach Alpha values

Figure 2 shows a high correlation between the more general negative attitudes to diversity variable in addition to the more specific subcategories of prejudice (negative attitudes) to females and foreign ethnics. These results were all reliable with the Cronbach Alphas ensuring a

reliability and consistency among items, as well as statistically significant findings of $p < .01$. The subcategories of female & foreign ethnic prejudices had values of $r = .856$ & $.932$ respectively in regard to general negative attitudes to diversity.

The correlation is also high between the two subcategories with $r = .652$ albeit slightly lower compared to the general attitudes to diversity which is expected since people might have more prejudice against certain groups of diversity but less to some. The data does indicate however that respondents with prejudice against either diversity group of female or ethnic, have some prejudice against the other as well albeit not necessarily as strong.

4.2 Results

Figures 3 and 4 below show the correlation and regression analyses of variables regarding attitudes to diversity. In terms of demographics, the results show that males reported more prejudice against foreign ethnic groups of ($r = .252$, $p < .05$) and against females ($r = .360$, $p < .05$) as well as ($r = .337$, $p < .01$) to negative attitudes to diversity as a whole.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) predicted that values will influence attitudes to diversity and that hypothesis 1a (H1a) specifically tested persons of more conservation values should have more negative attitudes to diversity while hypothesis 1b (H1b) tested persons of more self-transcendence values to have fewer negative attitudes to diversity. H1a did indeed show a positive correlation to negative attitudes to diversity ($b = .366$, $r = .498$, $p < .01$). H1b did show the predicted negative correlation to negative attitudes to diversity but only in the regression analysis (figure 4) with ($b = -.216$, $p < .01$). The specific values of benevolence ($r = -.316$, $r = -.109$, $p < .01$) and universalism ($r = -.361$, $p < .01$) making up the self-transcendence broader value did however show strong predicted correlation in the bivariate correlation as well (figure 3) although only benevolence proved statistically significant in the regression (figure 4). Hypothesis 1 and the sub hypotheses H1a and H1b are therefore supported.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) predicted that personality traits would influence attitudes to diversity and H2a tested that relationship for the one traits openness to experiences specifically. Among the traits, indeed also only openness to experiences shows a high statistical significance of $p < .05$ which again is the main focus of the study. It shows an $r = -.352$ to negative diversity attitudes and $r = -.354$ to ethnic prejudice both with $p < .01$ It shows also a negative correlation to female specific prejudice at $r = -.218$ but less significant with $p < .05$. Openness to experiences to negative attitudes to diversity ($b = -.197$, $r = -.352$, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 and H2a were both supported.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) predicted that tight/loose cultures would influence negative attitudes to diversity and H3a tested that relationship specifically were respondents of tighter cultures would have more negative attitudes to diversity. Tightness to negative attitudes to diversity ($b=.031$, $r=.041$, $p=>.05$) thus, H3, H3a were not supported.

Hypothesis 4 (H4), H4a predicted that higher scores of conformity cognitive styles would indicate more negative attitudes to diversity. Cognitive conformity to negative attitudes to diversity ($b=-.047$, $r=-.094$, $p=>.05$) thus, H4, H4a were not supported.

Hypothesis 5 (H5), H5a predicted that more masculine orientated cultures would show more negative attitudes to diversity. Masculinity to negative attitudes to diversity ($b=.073$, $r=-.069$, $p=>.05$) thus, H5, H5a were not supported.

Detailed results pertaining to Values

The specific power value indicates many strong correlations both positive and negative ones. People valuing power more show more negative attitudes to diversity and against female and ethnic specifically at $r= .251$, $r= .248$ and $r= .188$ respectively all being statistically significant albeit only below $p< .1$ significance for ethnic prejudice specifically. Respondents of more conformity values as well as traditional values also showed more negative attitudes to diversity in all groups with $p<.01$. These also make up the broader value of conservatism to a higher extent which shows as a higher conservation value too indicating more negative attitudes to diversity on all categories with $p= <.01$ and values of $r = >.35$ and closer to $r= .5$ for ethnic and general diversity negativity.

Values that had the opposite effect in reducing negative attitudes to diversity were especially self-direction, universalism, and benevolence. Self-direction value showed a strong significance to less ethnic prejudice specifically which also both universalism and benevolence did although they showed significance $p<.05$ values for less female specific prejudice as well. They all showed r values above $-.3$ for ethnic prejudice, around $-.3$ for negativity to diversity as a whole and around $-.2$ for female prejudice. Interestingly the broader value of self-transcendence which is highly made up of these three values showed no significance in regard to attitudes to diversity at all in the bivariate correlation from figure 3 whereas it becomes much more important for the regression analysis seen in figure 4 below.

The specific values become less significant in figure 4 with only conformity and benevolence showing statistical significance. Benevolence decreased negative attitudes to diversity with $p=$

<.05 for general and ethnic specific prejudice but only $p = <.1$ for female specific prejudice with b values around $-.1$. Conformity has the opposite effect but is less powerful with b values less than $.1$ and similarly $p = <.05$ for general diversity and ethnic prejudice but only $p = <.1$ for female specific prejudice.

Figure 3. Bivariate correlation of variables regarding attitudes to diversity

Variables	Negative attitudes to diversity	Female prejudice	Foreign ethnic prejudice
Demographics	.337**	.360**	.252*
Male			
Educational level	.032	.031	.034
Foreigner	-.063	-.036	-.069
Masculinity	-.069	-.153	-.007
Hofstede dimension			
Masculine country			
Personality traits	-.015	.106	-.100
Extraversion			
Agreeableness	-.183	-.158	-.169
Conscientiousness	-.168	-.161	-.165
Emotional stability	.161	.136	.157
Openness to experiences	-.352**	-.218*	-.354**
Specific values	.251**	.248*	.188
Power			
Achievement	-.117	-.022	-.171
Hedonism	-.037	.020	-.097
Stimulation	-.108	.012	-.168
Self-direction	-.299**	-.168	-.336**
Universalism	-.361**	-.218*	-.401**
Benevolence	-.316**	-.199*	-.353**

Tradition	.311**	.264**	.259**
Conformity	.336**	.270**	.294**
Security	.112	.119	.031
Broad values	.498**	.359**	.473**
Conservation			
Self-Transcendence	- .128	- .146	- .092
Tight/loose culture	.041	.075	.009
Tight country			
Cognitive style	- .094	- .052	- .121
Conformity			

** = p < .01, * = p < .05, Bold text = p < .1

Figure 4. Regression of variables regarding attitudes to diversity

Variables	Negative attitudes to diversity	Female prejudice	Foreign ethnic prejudice
Personality traits			
Extraversion	- .002	.068	- .052
Agreeableness	- .093	- .070	- .114
Conscientiousness	- .056	- .061	- .071
Emotional stability	.076	.042	.106*
Openness to experiences	- .197**	- .140	- .215**
Specific values			
Power	.056	.054	.060
Achievement	- .023	- .014	- .029
Hedonism	.035	.035	.019
Stimulation	.041	.076	.038
Self-direction	- .070	- .062	- .078
Universalism	- .053	- .038	- .062

Benevolence	-.109*	-.096	-.117*
Tradition	.044	.040	.041
Conformity	.075*	.078	.075*
Security	.037	.029	.016
Broad values	.366**	.311**	.382**
Conservation			
Self-Transcendence	-.216**	-.241*	-.199*
Tight/loose culture	.031	.069	.008
Tight country			
Cognitive style	-.047	-.024	-.075
Conformity			
Masculinity	.073	-.051	.224
Hofstede dimension			
Masculine country			

** = p < .01, * = p < .05, Bold text = p < .1

The analysis from the above presented figures and text, result in the following testing of the previously stated hypotheses shown below in figure 5. Variables need to show the pre-anticipated positive or negative correlations (r or b = +/-) of which the hypotheses are construed of and only variables below p = <.05 are supported, otherwise any hypotheses was found not supported from a lack of enough statistically significant support.

Figure 5. Hypothesis testing

Variable	Variable results	Hypothesis results
H. 1: Values will influence attitudes to diversity.	Expected correlation and statistically significant	Supported
H. 1a: Persons of higher conservation values will show more negative attitudes to diversity	b= .366 p= <.05	Supported
H. 1b: Persons of higher self-transcendence values will show	b= - .216 p= <.05	Supported

less negative attitudes to diversity.		
H. 2: Personality traits will influence attitudes to diversity	Expected correlation and statistically significant	Supported
H. 2a: Persons more open to experiences will show fewer negative attitudes to diversity	b= - .197 p= <.05	Supported
H. 3: Tightness/looseness cultures will influence attitudes to diversity	Not statistically significant	Not supported
H. 3a: Persons of a tighter culture will show more negative attitudes to diversity	b = .031 p= >.05	Not supported
H. 4: Cognitive Conformity will influence attitudes to diversity	Not statistically significant	Not supported
H. 4a: Respondents of higher conformity cognitive style will show more negative attitudes to diversity.	b= - .047 p= >.05	Not supported
H. 5: Hofstede masculinity dimension will influence attitudes to diversity	Not statistically significant	Not supported
H. 5a: Feminine defined culture will show fewer negative attitudes to diversity.	b= .073 p= >.05	Not supported

4.3 Discussion

From the presented table of figure 5 in addition to the previous figures and text in the result section it's visible to see that about half of the hypotheses were accepted and the rest rejected. The hypotheses with more backing from previous studies in the literature review linking certain traits and values to certain attitudes to diversity are seen in hypotheses 1 and 2, these also turned out to be supported. The more novel hypotheses, linking general culture views to personal views on attitudes to diversity of hypothesis 3 as well as trying to establish a link between cognitive conformity to attitudes to diversity both were not supported without statistical significance. The link might still be true but there was no evidence for these hypotheses from the current study presented above.

Hypothesis 1 has the sub-hypotheses of H1a and H1b that test the broad values of conservation closely linked to the specific values of tradition, security, conformity relied more heavily on the specific values of universalism and benevolence. Instead of testing all these different specific values, the above-mentioned broader values were determined to represent the specific values well in only two hypotheses which also turned out to be true. Although, it must be reiterated that the self-transcendence value did not show statistical significance in the pure bivariate correlation test. The specific values of universalism and benevolence that make up self-transcendence did, and self-transcendence later did in the regression analysis as well, but the specific values of universalism and benevolence didn't show significance in the regression analysis. Considering the fact that many of the specific values also showed statistical significance either positively or negatively correlating to negative attitudes to diversity (figure 3, 4), makes the main hypothesis 1 undeniably supported (figure 5) meaning that values indeed influences attitudes to diversity although not all nor to the same degree unanimously.

Hypothesis 2 only tested one trait (H2a) as only openness to experiences had consequently been found to be supported in previous research. The trait was found correlating negatively to negative attitudes to diversity in the current study with high statistical significance of $p < .05$ making the hypothesis supported. Hypothesis 3 tested a conceivable correlation between tighter cultures valuing diversity less favorably, but no correlation of significance was found. This is however not too surprisingly since, as previously stated, the items ask respondents to answer in accordance with how they think the general population in their specific countries fall on the tightness/looseness scale which is more applicable to larger sample sizes. In the current sample many respondents were also reported as some kind of foreigner in the country of residence which

also can eschew any links. In addition, the sample was likely too small to establish general significance across cultures since 104 respondents were distributed over almost 40 nationalities making it the sample on average only about 2-3 respondents per national culture.

The cognitive conformity hypothesis 4 tested more the personal conformity cognitive style of respondents to better capture the individual views. Higher conformity levels have been found to correlated to tighter cultures which was true in the current study. The hypothesis 4 however, just like hypothesis 3, turned out to be not supported from a lack of statistical support. This is also not entirely unexpected since there had been some findings contradicting the assumptions of tighter and more conformity cultures harboring less appreciation for diversity, as previously presented in the literature review.

The Hofstede masculinity/femininity dimension should have yielded a more negative correlation of femininity to negative attitudes to diversity. Feminine cultures are classified as more caring for others and justice seeking which should have corresponded well with universalism and benevolence which thus meant that masculinity should have showed a positive relationship to negative attitudes to diversity but ultimately showed no statistical significance. The generalization of cultures not applicable to smaller samples and of personal views, likely made this assumption lack statistical support, much like hypothesis 3, and was not supported.

Stronger support for demographics correlation to negative attitudes to diversity whether positive or negative were also expected but without hypotheses. A higher educational level should have indicated less negative attitudes to diversity. Considering that the vast majority of the sample population had higher education, and the small sample population indicating a lower educational level, it's perhaps not usurpingly that said correlation lacked statistical support.

The gender variable is however a rather interesting find in that males showed more negative attitudes to diversity as a whole, but also showed more prejudice against ethnic and females specifically and was correlating in addition to showing high statistical significance across the board. This, in light of having a highly educated sample population, makes the male variable all the more fascinating. Males did however only represent about a fourth of the sample and the few males might have had more extreme views than the average male. The results show however, that males on average show more negativity towards females as well as other ethnicities, perhaps indicating a real problem in today's society that ought to be studied further.

Overall, it's evident that certain characteristics of personal traits and values indeed are significantly correlated to negative attitudes to diversity. Persons of more conservation and

conformity values shows a significant increase of negative attitudes to diversity just as males do whereas persons of more openness to experiences and self-transcendence together with benevolence and universalism show significant decreases of negative attitudes to diversity. These traits and values are important to mention as they can indicate whether persons are more or less prone to harboring negative attitudes to diversity.

5. Limitations, recommendations, and conclusion

In this final section, the de/limitations regarding the current study will be presented and discussed followed by future research recommendations and a conclusion to summarize the details of the current study previously presented.

5.1 Limitations/delimitations

The study was conducted using a survey style research with self-reporting data collection. This means that survey respondents might very well have answered survey items in any way they saw fit which can mean that reported results might be completely untrue of what the respondents actually think themselves. Some respondents did also answer the survey surprisingly fast which might mean that they rushed through the survey without really giving much thought of their answers although not necessarily. Respondents did also answer with complete anonymity but as the test was distributed mainly on social medias, respondents might have some unfounded fears that they were indeed being monitored which together with general social pressures might have caused respondents to answer items in a different way than they actually thought.

The survey was also completed with a very ethnically diverse crowd of respondents answering the survey in English which can also eschew findings as respondents might have different understandings of some words from culture to culture as well as from English as a first versus second language might mean that some respondents might have different thoughts that would better have been captured in their own language, but not as much, or more, in English also thus perhaps eschewing the reported final results whether over or under valuating actual results. The somewhat smaller sample size just above 100 responses which in itself is a small but decent sized sample is hampered further by the many different nationalities represented which makes generalizations over nationalities much more difficult which represents another limitation problem. More respondents from could have offered greater possibilities of making nationality based generalization findings statistically significant.

The sample of the survey was also limited to containing mainly women at $\frac{3}{4}$ of the sample and higher educated persons with at least some university education representing over 85% of the sample which naturally isn't at all very representing of population in general. The sample did also contain many "foreigners" in the country of residency again not representing general

populations very accurately as well as the sample contained many different nationalities in general which makes generalizations based off of nationalities much more difficult which could otherwise have been interesting to establish any possible links to attitudes to diversity whether existing or not.

The survey was focused on attitudes to diversity by only two main diversity attributes of female and ethnic. The survey could thus have included other types of diversity as well like prejudices against elders/teenagers, non-binary gender, any type of handicapped people and more. Considering that diversity can be very broad and include many types, the two types of female and ethnic prejudice were deemed some of the more important considering general populations as well as perhaps more easily understood cross-culturally. Needless to say, this left many fields of diversity to be studied further.

5.2 Future Research & Recommendations

Future research should include attitudes to more diversity subgroups than the two of female and ethnic used in this study to see if similar attitudes would remain for persons of certain traits, values etc. or if they would change, and in that case how they would change. A larger sample not necessarily representing more nationalities but better representing the nationalities as used in the current study could enable a better correlation among certain cultures and nationalities. The tight/loose aspect as well as the Hofstede masculinity/femininity dimensions are interesting potential indicators of attitudes to diversity but ones that ought to change from culture to culture as well and further dissecting the attitudes to diversity could offer interesting patterns, especially considering that tight/loose doesn't mean the same across all countries and cultures.

Demographics better depicting the real population would also likely enable a clear distinction among education in regard to attitudes to diversity for instance which should be interesting to see if such is the case. In the current study it was impossible to establish that higher educational levels decreased negative attitudes to diversity although it should have. On the opposite was the gender demography which was highly indicative of certain attitudes to diversity such as males harboring more negativity towards diversity than females. The sample was once again not 50/50 or even very close to being 50/50 and further research should try to look further into that and see if a more balanced sample still shows clear correlations of attitudes to diversity based on gender alone. Increasing non-binary genders in the sample could also be interesting to see how this group would react to diversity statistically, since only

one person in the current study identified as such making any analysis naturally impossible from a statistically significant point.

5.3 Conclusion

The ample number of studies done on diversity provided a good foundation for the current study to be built on. Considering that today's world is ever diversifying and becoming ever intertwined, makes diversity a crucial factor for not only businesses, but in general society. How diversity is affecting companies in particular thus becomes extremely important but considering that actual number don't necessarily mean much as to compared to what people's perceptions of things are, it instead becomes more urgent to understand and predict people's attitudes to diversity than the impacts of diversity by itself which is the exact reason this study was made. Being able to accurately predict certain attitudes to various groups of diversity can help companies as well as society in general to function better and allow for better use of resources to combat and overcome such problems stemming from negativity towards diversity.

Looking at the results from the current study once again it's evident that indeed certain characteristics whether they are traits or values, do predict certain attitudes to diversity whether positive or negative ones. Such links have been established in earlier research as recognized in the literature review previously, but the fact that the current study can corroborate such links is highly interesting, showing the worth of the research.

Persons of higher indicated values in universalism and benevolence meaning the broader value of self-transcendence did indeed show fewer negative attitudes to diversity. Just as persons more valuing conformity and tradition meaning the broader value of conservation showed more negative attitudes to diversity which is exactly what was proposed in the study objective. Similarly, persons more open to new experiences showed much fewer negative attitudes to diversity as expected.

The more novel research in the current study aimed to link tight/loose- and masculinity cultures as well as cognitive conformity levels to certain attitudes to diversity that didn't show the statistical significance as expected and thus couldn't establish any links in either direction. This shows that certain individual characteristics are more predictive of negative attitudes toward diversity than others.

Bibliography

- 2019 home : U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved September 18, 2021, from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2019/>
- Aberson, C. L. (2007). Diversity Experiences Predict Changes in Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*(4), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.13.4.285>
- Ackermann, K., & Ackermann, M. (2015). The Big Five in Context: Personality, Diversity and Attitudes toward Equal Opportunities for Immigrants in Switzerland. *Swiss Political Science Review, 21*(3), 396–418. <https://doi.org/10.1111/SPSR.12170>
- Allen, C. T., Machleit, K. A., & Kleine, S. S. (1992). A Comparison of Attitudes and Emotions as Predictors of Behavior at Diverse Levels of Behavioral Experience. *Journal of Consumer Research, 18*(4), 493–504. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209276>
- Anglim, J., Sojo, V., Ashford, L. J., Newman, A., & Marty, A. (2019). Predicting employee attitudes to workplace diversity from personality, values, and cognitive ability. *Journal of Research in Personality, 83*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JRP.2019.103865>
- Areiqat Al-Ahliyya, A., Hamdan Al-Ahliyya, Y., Ahmad Zamil, A. M., & Aldabbagh Al-Ahliyya, I. (2020). *True Workplace Diversity: A Key Ingredient for Business Success, Regardless of the Industry or Company Size CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS (CSFOS) IN HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION View project Rethinking scenario planning potential role in strategy making: Investigating literature trends towards scenarios role in strategy making View project.* <http://www.iratde.com>
- Armache, J. (2012). Diversity in the Workplace: Benefits and Challenges. *Journal of International Diversity, 2012* (1).
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (2016). Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, and Job-Related Attitudes in a Culturally Diverse Work Group: <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0022022194252005>, 25(2), 233–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022194252005>
- Case, K. A., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2008). CURRENT RESEARCH IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY PERSONALITY, PREJUDICE, AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN AND HOMOSEXUALS. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 14*(2). <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.html>
- Chow, T., Fulmer, I., & Olson, B. (2010). Development of an instrument to measure manager attitudes toward workplace breastfeeding support. *The FASEB Journal, 24*(S1). https://doi.org/10.1096/FASEBJ.24.1_SUPPLEMENT.556.15
- Chua, R. Y. J., Huang, K. G., & Jin, M. (2019). Mapping cultural tightness and its links to innovation, urbanization, and happiness across 31 provinces in China. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(14), 6720–6725. <https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1815723116>
- Colella, A., Hebl, M., King, E. B. (2017). One Hundred Years of Discrimination Research in Journal of Applied Psychology: A Sobering Synopsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology 102*(3) DOI:10.1037/apl0000084
- Country Comparison - Hofstede Insights. (n.d.). Retrieved September 17, 2021, from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/sweden/>

- De Meuse, K. P., & Hostager, T. J. (2001). Developing an instrument for measuring attitudes toward and perceptions of workplace diversity: An initial report. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 33-51.
- Diversity | Definition of Diversity by Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Retrieved September 18, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diversity>
- Eddy, S. W., & Burke, R. J. (2004). Cultural values as predictors of attitudes towards equality and diversity: a Canadian experience. *Women in Management Review*, 19(6), 317–324. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420410555088>
- Enchautegui-de-Jesús, N., Hughes, D., Johnston, K. E., & Oh, H. J. (2006). Well-being in the context of workplace ethnic diversity. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(2), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JCOP.20091>
- Fischer, R., Vauclair, C.-M., Fontaine, J. R. J., & Schwartz, S. H. (2010). Are Individual-Level and Country-Level Value Structures Different? Testing Hofstede's Legacy With the Schwartz Value Survey: [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0022022109354377](http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0022022109354377), 41(2), 135–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022109354377>
- Frank Dobbin, & Alexandra Kalev. (n.d.). *Why Diversity Programs Fail*. Retrieved September 18, 2021, from <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail>
- Gelfand, M. J. (2019). Universal and culture-specific patterns of tightness-looseness across the 31 Chinese provinces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(14), 6522–6524. <https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1902401116>
- Gelfand, MJ. (2011). Differences Between Tight and Loose Cultures: A 33-Nation Study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754>
- Gelfand, MJ., Nishii, LH., & Raver, JL. (2006). On the nature and importance of cultural tightness-looseness. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1225–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1225>
- Gouveia, V. V., & Ros, M. (2000). Hofstede and Schwartz's models for classifying individualism at the cultural level: Their relation to macro-social and macro-economic variables. *Psicothema*, 12(Suppl), 25–33.
- Grigoryan, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2020). Values and attitudes towards cultural diversity: Exploring alternative moderators of the value–attitude link: [Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1368430220929077](https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220929077). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220929077>
- Han, S., & Pistle, M. C. (2017). Big Five Personality Factors and Facets as Predictors of Openness to Diversity. [Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/00223980.2017.1393377](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2017.1393377), 151(8), 752–766. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2017.1393377>
- Harrington, JR., & Gelfand, MJ. (2014). Tightness-looseness across the 50 United States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 111(22), 7990–7995. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317937111>
- Hiemstra, A. M. F., Derous, E., & Born, M. P. (2017). Psychological predictors of cultural diversity support at work. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 23(3), 312–322. <https://doi.org/10.1037/CDP0000141>

- Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2013). *V S M 2013 VALUES SURVEY MODULE 2013 MANUAL Contents Page*. www.geerthofstede.eu
- How Diverse Leadership Teams Boost Innovation*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 18, 2021, from <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2018/how-diverse-leadership-teams-boost-innovation>
- Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Jackson, S. E. (2006). Cross-Level Effects of Workplace Diversity on Sales Performance and Pay. *Https://Doi.Org/10.5465/Amj.2006.21794664*, 49(3), 459–481. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.21794664>
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management*, 42(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/HRM.10061>
- Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (2005). Measuring values with the Short Schwartz's Value Survey. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 85(2), 170–178. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8502_09
- Kline, p. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). pp.13.
- Martin, G. C. (2014). The Effects Of Cultural Diversity In The Workplace. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM)*, 9(2), 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.19030/JDM.V9I2.8974>
- Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other? *Journal of Organizational Behavior J. Organiz. Behav*, 25, 175–199. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.237>
- Ozgen, C., Nijkamp, P., & Poot, J. (2017). The elusive effects of workplace diversity on innovation. *Papers in Regional Science*, 96, S29–S49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/PIRS.12176>
- Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G., Bardi, A. (2014). Personality Traits and Personal Values: A Meta-Analysis. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314538548>
- (PDF) *True Workplace Diversity: A Key Ingredient for Business Success, Regardless of the Industry or Company Size*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 17, 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344726486_True_Workplace_Diversity_A_Key_Ingredient_for_Business_Success_Regardless_of_the_Industry_or_Company_Size
- Perceptions of diversity often don't match reality — Quartz at Work*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 17, 2021, from <https://qz.com/work/1121879/perceptions-of-diversity-often-dont-match-reality/>
- Peretz, H., Levi, A., & Fried, Y. (2015). Organizational diversity programs across cultures: effects on absenteeism, turnover, performance and innovation. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/09585192.2014.991344*, 26(6), 875–903. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.991344>
- Pletzer, J. L., Bentvelzen, M., Oostrom, J. K., & de Vries, R. E. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big Five versus HEXACO. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 112, 369–383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JVB.2019.04.004>
- Roberson, Q. M. (2016). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations: *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1059601104273064*, 31(2), 212–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273064>

- Roberson, Q. M. (2019). Diversity in the Workplace: A Review, Synthesis, and Future Research Agenda. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev-Orgpsych-012218-015243*, 6, 69–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-ORGPSYCH-012218-015243>
- Sawyerr, O. O., Strauss, J., & Yan, J. (2005). Individual value structure and diversity attitudes: The moderating effects of age, gender, race, and religiosity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(6), 498–521. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510615442>
- Schaefer, R. T. (2007). Regional differences in prejudice. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/09595237500185011*, 9(1), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09595237500185011>
- Scott, A., & Kapor Klein, F. (2017). *AUTHORS*.
- Shemla, M., Meyer, B., Greer, L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A review of perceived diversity in teams: Does how members perceive their team’s composition affect team processes and outcomes? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, S89–S106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.1957>
- SIMPSON, E. H. (1949). Measurement of Diversity. *Nature 1949 163:4148*, 163(4148), 688–688.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/163688a0>
- Smith, C., & Turner, S. (n.d.). *The Radical Transformation of Diversity and Inclusion The Millennial Influence for inclusion*.
- Strauss, J. P., & Connerley, M. L. (2003). Demographics, personality, contact, and universal-diverse orientation: An exploratory examination. *Human Resource Management*, 42(2), 159–174.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/HRM.10074>
- Ten Item Personality Measure (TIPI) | Gosling*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 17, 2021, from <http://gosling.psy.utexas.edu/scales-weve-developed/ten-item-personality-measure-tipi/>
- Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (n.d.). *Diversity Policies Rarely Make Companies Fairer, and They Feel Threatening to White Men*. Retrieved September 18, 2021, from <https://hbr.org/2016/01/diversity-policies-dont-help-women-or-minorities-and-they-make-white-men-feel-threatened>
- Thompson, R. L., Brossart, D. F., Carlozzi, A. F., & Miville, M. L. (2002). Five-factor model (big five) personality traits and universal-diverse orientation in counselor trainees. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 136(5), 561–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209605551>
- View of The Effects Of Cultural Diversity In The Workplace*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 17, 2021, from <https://clutejournals.com/index.php/JDM/article/view/8974/8934>
- Woods, S. A., & Hampson, S. E. (2005). Measuring the Big Five with Single Items using a Bipolar Response Scale. *European Journal of Personality*, 19(5), 373–390.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.542>
- Zee, K. van O. der, Paulus, P., Vos, M., & Parthasarathy, N. (2009). The Impact of Group Composition and Attitudes Towards Diversity on Anticipated Outcomes of Diversity in Groups: *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1368430208101347*, 12(2), 257–280.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208101347>

Appendices

Survey items:

Consent

- Participation in this survey is voluntary and it takes around 10 minutes to complete. Your answers will be given anonymously and will not be traced back to you, nor will any additional personal data be collected about you.
By clicking and confirming the CAPTCHA, you give your consent for your answers to be used by the survey creators.

Demographics

Q2.1 Your gender

- Male
- Female
- Nonbinary/third gender
- Prefer not to say

Q2.2 Your current country of residence

- Country:
- Prefer not to say

Q2.3 Your nationality

- Same as country of residence
- Country of national identity:
- Prefer not to say

Q2.4 Were you born in your current country of residence?

- Yes
- Yes, by foreign born parent/s
- No
- Prefer not to say

Q4.1 Which is your highest achieved educational level?

- Uncompleted high school
- High school
- Some university
- Undergrad(bachelor)
- Graduate(master or higher)
- Prefer not to say

Q5.1 What is your industry of profession?

- Industry:
- Prefer not to say

Email update

Thank you for participating in this survey, you have now reached the end.

Would you like to receive a copy of the report when finished?

- Yes, my email is:
- No

The short Schwartz's value survey (SSVS) items

On a scale of 0-8 (0=less important, 8=more important) rate yourself on the following values of importance to you:

1. POWER (social power, authority, wealth)
2. ACHIEVEMENT (success, capability, ambition, influence on people and events)
3. HEDONISM (gratification of desires, enjoyment in life, self-indulgence)
4. STIMULATION (daring, a varied and challenging life, an exciting life)
5. SELF-DIRECTION (creativity, freedom, curiosity, independence, choosing one's own goals)

6. UNIVERSALISM (broad-mindedness, beauty of nature and arts, social justice, a world at peace, equality, wisdom, unity with nature, environmental protection)
7. BENEVOLENCE (helpfulness, honesty, forgiveness, loyalty, responsibility)
8. TRADITION (respect for tradition, humbleness, accepting one's portion in life, devotion, modesty)
9. CONFORMITY (obedience, honoring parents and elders, self-discipline, politeness)
10. SECURITY (national security, family security, social order, cleanliness, reciprocation of favors)

TUPI personality items

On a scale of 1-7 (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) rate yourself on your personality by:

1. Extraverted, enthusiastic
2. Critical, quarrelsome (Reversed)
3. Dependable, self-disciplined
4. Anxious, easily upset (Reversed)
5. Open to new experiences, complex
6. Reserved, quiet (Reversed)
7. Sympathetic, warm
8. Disorganized, careless (Reversed)
9. Calm, emotionally stable
10. Conventional, uncreative(Reversed)

Attitudes & prejudice towards diversity (female and ethnic)

On a scale of 1-5 (1=very inaccurate, 5=very accurate) please rate the following statements applicability to your views:

1. I find that foreign ethnic workers seem to be less productive on average
2. I have known many more qualified non foreigners who should have been hired instead of some of the foreign individuals that have been hired previously
3. The most qualified workers in my job seem to be male
4. I feel that women have a more difficult time handling positions of authority relative to men

5. I know some workers who would be fired if they were not of a different ethnic origin
6. The foreign ethnic individuals in my organization have a greater degree of difficulty getting along with others
7. Under most circumstances, I would prefer a male supervisor
8. Some of the members of my previous organizations were hired just because they are women
9. It seems that foreign ethnic individuals in supervisory positions are ineffective relative to other supervisors
10. Relative to male supervisors, female supervisors seem to be less effective

(Reversed items 11-18)

11. We would have a more creative work environment if more women and different ethnic individuals were hired
12. Workers who are prejudiced have no place in an organization
13. Most of the women in management positions do an outstanding job
14. I do not feel comfortable with co-workers who are racist
15. All in all, I would say that foreign ethnic workers are just as productive as other workers
16. I feel that diversity is good for an organization even if it means I will have a supervisor who is of a different ethnic origin
17. I feel that increasing the hiring of women and foreign ethnic individuals can only help an organization
18. I would feel just as comfortable with a foreign ethnic supervisor as I do with a non-foreign supervisor

Figure 6. Means of attitudes to diversity items

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	1,961538462	0,903069
2.	2,509615385	1,148066
3.	2,413461538	0,966533
4.	2,576923077	1,118743
5.	2,461538462	0,793692

6.	2,788461538	0,873164
7.	2,326923077	0,875727
8.	2,365384615	0,732207
9.	2	0,994383
10.	1,778846	1,061188
11. *	2	1,120078
12. *	2,451923077	1,259468
13. *	2,086538462	1,051334
14. *	1,721153846	1,001679
15. *	1,673076923	1,028169
16. *	1,682692308	1,123947
17. *	2,009615385	1,042774
18. *	1,586538462	0,934316

*=Reversed items recalculated into normal scale

Cognitive conformity style items

On a scale of 1-7 (1=very inaccurate, 7=very accurate) please rate the following statements applicability to you:

1. I try not to oppose team members
2. I adapt myself to the system
3. I adhere to accepted rules in my area of work
4. I avoid cutting corners

Tightness looseness

On a scale from 1-6 (1= strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree) rate the statements applicability for your current country of residence

1. There are many social norms that people are supposed to abide by in your country.
2. In your country, there are very clear expectations for how people should act in most situations.
3. People agree upon what behaviors are appropriate versus inappropriate in most situations in your country.

4. People in your country have a great deal of freedom in deciding how they want to behave in most situations. (Reverse coded)
5. In your country, if someone acts in an inappropriate way, others will strongly disapprove.
6. People in your country almost always comply with social norms.