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CHAPTER 1
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Many organization leaders know that diversity is important in order to be in accordance with Equal Employment Opportunity laws, but they do not necessarily understand why it is important for the effectiveness of their business. By not having this understanding, business leaders are unknowingly limiting their companies and employees from reaching their full potential, and therefore themselves from reaching the bottom line – making the most profit (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). Instead, organizations should go beyond thinking of diversity as simply a numbers game and embrace it “as the varied perspectives and approaches to work that members of different identity groups bring” (Thomas & Ely, 1996, p. 80). By having and effectively utilizing diverse employees, companies can greatly increase their organizational effectiveness by enhancing creativity, insight, learning, growth, and renewal (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2002; Cox, 1991; Cox, 1993; Cox, 2001; Cox & Beale, 1997; Herring, 2009; Hubbard, 2004; Dora C. Lau & Murnighan, 1998; McDaniel & Walls, 1997; Richard, 2000; Smedley, Butler, & Bistow, 2004; Thomas & Ely, 1996), thus amplifying their bottom line.

Rather than being a complex problem to be solved, organizational diversity can be a strategic advantage for doing business in a complex world. As the world is ever-changing, organizations need to be also by continuously learning from and paying attention to new and different perspectives (McDaniel & Walls, 1997). Diverse employees can help to reduce homogeneity of an organization by bringing a variety of opinions and ideas about new
appointures, strategies, processes, and practices which can lead to enhanced individual and organizational productivity. They can provide constructive challenges which can help companies to be more adaptable to changes in the market, and they can provide better access to new consumer bases (D. A. Thomas & Ely, 1996). Having a diverse workforce “is associated with increased sales revenue, more customers, greater market share, and greater relative profits” (Herring, 2009, p. 219). Although if handled incorrectly, diversity issues can also be very expensive. As organizations create better recruiting strategies for diverse employees, many of them struggle with utilizing appropriate retention strategies and “increase costs through higher turnover rates, interpersonal conflict, and communication breakdowns” (Cox, 1991, p. 34), and sometimes costly legal repercussions. In order for the diversity of recruits to be truly beneficial, organizations need to retain their new employees by incorporating “an inclusive organizational culture that embraces the idea of diversity in all actions and activities” (Scott, Heathcote, & Gruman, 2011, p. 736). Retention of new, more diverse employees, particularly if they are “token” representatives of their social category (such as in their ethnicity or gender), requires additional forethought and sensitivity to their experience in an organization.

Although tokenism is not a new concept in organizational research, no other study has attempted to explore individual differences within the ethnic token population. For the present study, the researchers looked deeper into the lives of ethnic token employees in an effort to better understand their varying experiences in the workplace. First, three organizational variables, work engagement, turnover intentions, and burnout, were measured in relation to perceived tokenism. Second, two potential moderators, ethnic identity and locus of control, were examined within the aforementioned regressions. The contributions of this research have implications for both research and practice. Modern research on the effects of tokenism and the individual
differences within the token community may help token employees to better understand their working condition and how the extra pressures they may be facing can impact their work and well-being. It may also bring to light new strategies to help token employees understand tokenism’s effects on engagement, burnout, and turnover intentions in order to circumvent them, and to regain their confidence thus allowing tokens to work both productively and satisfactorily. Finally, organizational effectiveness may be improved by understanding the nature and power of tokenism within an interpretive framework of why some tokens succeed while others do not.

**Token Employees**

Employees are considered tokens when they work in organizations that have a skewed multicultural representation in a dominant group (usually Caucasian), such as a ratio of 15:85, making up 15% or less of the workgroup (Kanter, 1977). Due to the treatment that manifests commonly held stereotypes and biases (Stephan & Stephan, 1985), token employees have a very different experience in the workplace than do their dominant society colleagues. Token employees tend to be socially stigmatized as being more of a representative of their race rather than as individuals and contributors (Flores Niemann & Dovidio, 1998; Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Kanter, 1977; Pollak & Flores Niemann, 1998; D. Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2002; Denise Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2003; Denise Sekaquaptewa, Waldman, & Thompson, 2007; Thompson & Sekaquaptewa, 2002). Such designation often comes with being perceived by others in the organization as being different beyond ethnicity but rather in terms of ability. A token is often presumed by others to be an “‘incompetent, affirmative action employee” (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987, p. 8) who was hired over a more competent dominant society individual because of preferential treatment in order to fill a diversity quota rather than for being adequately qualified for the position (Heilman, Block, & Stathatos, 1997; Heilman, Block, &
Lucas, 1992; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Rosen & Jerdee, 1979; Thomas, Mack, & Montaglani, 2004). Negative, often subconscious, viewpoints such as these are heightened when a token’s diverse qualities are physically obvious (such as skin color) and when the token’s ethnic category is both different and new to the organization (Kanter, 1977).

Even when dominant society colleagues are unaware of their prejudices and even if they have good intentions toward the tokens, such prejudices tend to come out unknowingly in the ways in which they interact. With token employees’ heightened awareness of such damaging perceptions from coworkers and supervisors, they may experience stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995) in which the situation creates an extra set of pressures and standards which they feel they must overcome, and they experience feelings of or actual isolation from the rest of their workgroup. Previous studies have found that token employees tend to experience a sense of extreme visibility, of forced duality (between being a person of their ethnicity or being a competent employee), feelings of alienation and lack of trust of their colleagues and supervisors, and emotional labor from expending extra effort to conform to the mainstream culture of their workplace while hiding their true cultural self (Flores, 2011; Flores Niemann, 1999; Kanter, 1977; Pollak & Flores Niemann, 1998).

In Kanter’s (1977) original introduction to the topic of tokenism, she performed a field study of solo businesswomen and found them to experience high visibility, negative stereotyping, and being evaluated more harshly than their male counterparts. In a study of ethnic minority token faculty members in university psychology departments, Flores Niemann & Dovidio (1998) found that such tokens reported lower job satisfaction and more feelings of distinctiveness than their white colleagues. Pollak & Flores Niemann (1998) found that African American students on predominantly white campuses experience chronic distinctiveness, which
included feelings of racial awareness, responsibility and accountability to their own race, feeling isolated, alienated, and discriminated against. They found that such feelings of distinctiveness were heightened in situations in which they were in solo situations, such as being the only person of their race in a classroom setting. They also found that white students, who do not feel chronically distinctive, do experience some feelings of distinctiveness in solo situations, but not as much as their African American peers who do experience it consistently. Sekaquaptewa & Thompson (2007) also found that African American female students experienced increased collective self-construal (Markus & Kitamaya, 1991; Singelis, 1994), that is, the level that an individual feels tied to their social group, in solo situations in which their race became more salient. As a consequence, the women felt so much pressure to be good representatives of their race that it had a negative effect on their performance. Most recently, Flores (2011) found that token Latina teachers in grade schools with predominantly white teachers and administration experienced subtle racism, were dissuaded from expressing their culture, were given heavier workloads, experienced more conflicts, perceived a lack of upward mobility, and reported exclusion in the teacher’s lounge.

In addition to the emotional labor they have to expend, many token employees are expected to take on all diversity efforts in the workplace, placing additional responsibilities on the tokens that are not compensated for or recognized as an addition to the regular workload. Having to dole out all of this extra effort causes tokens to feel stretched too thin and it can affect their well-being. It can also impact their capability to accomplish the regular duties expected of all employees, making them appear to be ineffective in comparison to their mainstream colleagues and destined for failure (Flores, 2011; Flores Niemann, 1999), which can then can hinder their ability to engage in their work and feel burned out.
Relational Demography

Another factor that can impede on a token employee’s experience in the workplace is the relational demography of their work group. People tend to categorize themselves and others using demographic traits into social categories such as age, gender, race, and status, and then use those categories to decipher how well they fit into a particular group, such as a work unit (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). The level of similarity that an individual judges themselves to have with a particular group can play a significant role in how that person will feel about, interact with, and integrate themselves into that group, as people tend to feel more comfortable around people they feel the most similar to (Tsui et al., 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Tsui et al. (1992) found in their study of 151 work units in three large organizations that the majority groups of whites and males expressed more psychological discomfort and less attachment as their workgroups became more heterogeneous, even when the number of minority employees was relatively small. Stewart & Garcia-Prieto (2008) studied university students in simulated workgroup situations and found that in racially dissimilar groups in which whites where the majority, black participants communicated less and identified with their workgroups less than in more racially similar groups.

As new token employees enter a homogeneous work group, both the token employees and the original dominant society employees may experience feelings of tension and uneasiness with the difference in employee demographics. Such intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 1985) can affect the behavior, cognitions, and affective reactions of both groups in anticipation of negative consequences of their interaction. New token employees would likely feel an intense lack of belonging to the new work group while dominant employees may likely feel intrusion from outsiders who do not belong. Group demographic faultlines (Lau & Murnighan, 2005; Lau
& Murnighan, 1998) support this as well. As group members differ by demographic characteristics they can divide into distanced subgroups, especially in instances of new minority members to an established workgroup, or workgroups that contain only moderate diversity. In these instances the minority group members, even when there is a critical mass present-in which their race is perceived to be adequately represented (Rogers & Molina, 2007), will typically be limited to the lower ranks of the organization with no hope for upward mobility. The presence of such subgroups then creates a lack of cohesiveness which becomes grounds for interpersonal conflicts and subgroup power struggles (Lau & Murnighan, 2005; Lau & Murnighan, 1998).

In summary, the experience of being an ethnic token takes a heavy toll on a person in many ways. No matter how competent or hardworking a token employee may be, they may never feel or been seen as a quality worker. Tokens are consistently subjected to stereotypes and stigma as well as a lack of similarity that may impair their opportunities for desirable work outcomes. This experience seems highly likely to be damaging to an individual’s personal well-being and ability to engage in their work.

**Work Engagement**

While token minority employees consistently experience feelings of isolation, conflict, and unworthiness in their workplaces, it seems natural that they would begin to experience a lack of engagement in their work. Engagement is a persistent affective-cognitive state in which an employee has “a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities, and they see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their jobs” (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006, p. 702). Employee engagement is an important component for higher levels of energy, enthusiasm, and immersion in one’s work (Bakker & Leiter, 2010; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004) which leads to better worker, and ultimately, organizational performance. Work
Engagement incorporates vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002), in which

vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Finally, absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p. 417).

When experiencing a lack of inclusion in predominantly White environments, ethnic minorities tend to disengage psychologically (Schmader, Major, & Gramzow, 2001). Ethnic minority employees’ engagement has also been found to be negatively impacted when their organizations or majority-group colleagues subscribe to colorblindness over multiculturalism (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Token employees would likely have difficulty becoming or remaining engaged in their work as they also have the extra pressures of feeling incompetent and a need to represent their race taking away from concentration on work-related objectives. By having disengaged employees, organizations will also suffer from organizational ineffectiveness and lesser quality production of products or services.

**Turnover Intentions**

Factors leading to a lack of work engagement can also lead employees to increased turnover intentions. Turnover intentions, in this case, refers to intentions of voluntary turnover “due to a strong dissatisfaction over one or more job aspects” (Hofhuis, Van der Zee, and Otten, 2014), rather than from simply perceiving better opportunities elsewhere (Hom and Kinicki,
2001) or involuntary turnover in which one is forced to leave (McElroy, Morrow, and Rude, 2001). Employee absence and turnover is highly problematic for organizations as lost employee time and the recruitment and training of new employees is extremely expensive (Cascio, 1991; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998). Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner (2000) found that proximal precursors and work environment in the withdrawal process were shown to be among the best predictors of voluntary turnover. Relevant predictors include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, stress, work group cohesion, autonomy, and promotional opportunities.

There are many different factors that come into play for minority employee turnover intentions. Organizational culture, or how diversity is perceived within the organization, can be a strong predictor of absenteeism and turnover among minority groups (McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez, and Hebl, 2007; Singh and Selvarajan, 2013). Employees who perceive discrimination or who are afraid of receiving discrimination from their coworkers are more likely to manage their social identity by suppressing it in the workplace (e.g., Ellison, Russinova, MacDonald-Wilson, & Lyass, 2003; Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell, 2007). Such identity management can influence work attitudes including perceived discrimination (Madera, King, & Hebl, 2012), job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Griffith & Hebl, 2002).

Hofhuis, Van der Zee, & Otten (2014) found that ethnic minority employees differ in their reasons for turnover intentions from majority members in many ways. According to their study of 499 public service employees, minority employees often considered resigning due to a lack of perceived career opportunities, less satisfaction with their job benefits and work content, and more negative social interactions with supervisors and peers. In fact, diverse employees may choose to leave an organization because they are isolated from their majority-group colleagues, and the experience of isolation may influence turnover (Hom, Robertson, and Ellis, 2008;
Leonard & Levine, 2006; Smith & Calasanti, 2005). Ethnic token employees may be at an increased risk of turnover since their uniqueness is more obvious due to a lack of critical mass of their ethnicity in their workplace. Indeed, Williams & O’Reilly (1998) found that ethnic minorities are more vulnerable to exit when they lack a critical mass.

In the current study, the researcher expects that ethnic token employees in a tokenized working environment will experience lowered engagement to their work and heightened turnover intentions from their place of employment. Thus,

**Hypothesis 1**

Perceptions of tokenism will have a significant and negative relationship on an employees' work engagement.

**Hypothesis 2**

Perceptions of tokenism will have a significant and positive relationship on an employees' turnover intentions.

**Burnout**

A person who is experiencing high stress from a token situation, who has to expend extra energy to conform to the mainstream culture of their workplace as well as on performing their expected duties, will experience difficulty in being able perform at their highest ability level and may struggle to complete assigned responsibilities (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). Tokens are likely to be prone to burnout, which stems from ongoing interpersonal and emotional stressors in the workplace. Sometimes described as the direct opposite of the three core characteristics of engagement, the three core aspects of burnout include exhaustion, a cynical attitude about and depersonalization with work, and personal inefficacy (Maslach et al., 2001).
In a study of 52 nurses, Leiter & Maslach (1988) created a model which describes these core aspects as occurring in a sequential progression over time, in which exhaustion (e.g. stressful interactions with supervisors and lack of support from coworkers) precipitates the development of cynicism, which then leads to inefficacy. Employees who experience burnout in their jobs tend to withdraw from their work with higher turnover intentions, have lower personal productivity and effectiveness, and have reduced job satisfaction and commitment to their workplace (Maslach et al., 2001). As mentioned above, employees who lack engagement and who are burned out are costly to employers by producing lesser quality goods and services. While research in this area on ethnic minorities is still limited, the main job characteristics that have been found to create burnout in employees are also characteristic of being in a token situation, such as work overload, role conflict and ambiguity, a lack of autonomy and ability to participate in decision making, and a lack of social support, particularly from superiors (Maslach et al., 2001). While in the midst of this experience, it is likely that the token would not be aware this particular hardship is due to the situation rather than their true ability, which can cause the token to experience burnout.

In the current study, the researcher expects that ethnic token employees in a tokenized working environment will experience burnout. Thus,

**Hypothesis 3a**

*Perceptions of tokenism will have a significant and positive relationship with employee’s burnout.*

Thus far, the common consequences of tokenism have been discussed, but also of interest in this study is whether or not there are individual differences in how people respond to being a
Token. Tokenism can lead to a host of negative outcomes, but is this true for everyone who is a token? Locus of control and ethnic identity may shed light on this dynamic.

**Locus of Control**

According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, symptoms of burnout may be developed by a specific arrangement of work conditions in which job demands are high and job resources are low (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Job demands include “physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort” (Demerouti et al, 2001, p. 501) which become associated with exhaustion. Job resources include physical, psychological, social, and organizational factors that work as protective factors against job demands, which when lacking, are predictive of disengagement. While token employees deal with the demands that come with the experience of tokenism, a psychological factor that may play a key role as a potential job resource is their locus of control. Locus of control is a personality variable in which one expects “that rewards, reinforcements or outcomes in life [or at work] are controlled either by one's own actions (internality) or by other forces (externality)” (Spector, 1988, p. 335).

Employees with an external locus tend to be less likely to perceive personal control over their fate and attribute personal outcomes to external factors or luck (Rotter, 1966). Externals often “fail to see a relationship between their behaviors and consequences, whether positive or negative, and therefore are not responsive to external reinforcement” (Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006, p. 1058). They generally take on a passive role with their external environment, and are typically more compliant with supervisors’ directives and more conforming to social demands (Spector, 1982; Phares, 1976). In this case, it seems reasonable that ethnic token employees with an external locus may be more receptive to and likely to internalize the negative messages they
receive from their tokenized work environment. This may also indicate a loss of a potential job resource which could protect from experiencing disengagement with work.

On the other hand, employees with an internal locus tend to perceive greater personal control over their life and work outcomes, and therefore exert more effort in anticipation of greater rewards (Ng et al., 2006; Spector, 1982). An internal locus has been associated with better general well-being (e.g. Ng et al., 2006; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Spector, Cooper, Sanchez, O’Driscoll, & Sparks, 2002) as people often desire more control over their lives (Langer, 1983). In fact, the mere perception of control in itself is psychologically beneficial, even if no actual control is achieved (Miller, 1980). Compared to externals, employees with an internal locus tend to have stronger needs for achievement and set more difficult goals for themselves (Yukl & Latham, 1978), perceive work stressors as more manageable and less threatening (Gatchel, 1980; Wanberg, 1997), and have better social relationships with managers (Martin, Thomas, Charles, Epitropaki, & McNamara, 2005) and peers (Turban & Dougherty, 1994). Hence, internals are known to experience greater satisfaction, motivation, performance, and leadership at work than externals (Judge & Bono, 2001; Spector, 1982).

Token employees may therefore have different work outcomes depending on their locus of control acting as either an additional or a lacking job resource. According to Spector (1982), externals are more anxious, more compliant followers, more submissive to social demands, and less likely to take the action to leave a dissatisfying job, which may lead to higher levels of burnout. However, the literature has long debated how internals are likely to react to negative work situations and whether or not they are more likely to stick it out and attempt to prove their worth or leave for a healthier working environment. On one hand, some say that internals are
more independent and resistant to control by managers and peers and so are less likely to stay in
dissatisfying jobs (Spector, 1982; 1983; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Giles, 1977). On the other
hand, as internals have the tendency to believe that hard work and good performance will lead to
rewards, they also tend to perceive job situations as more equitable (Spector, 1982). In fact, “if
they perceive the opportunity to leave but do not, they will be under some internal cognitive
pressure to evaluate the job situation as favorable, thus justifying their behavior” (Spector, 1982,
p. 490). Internals are also resistant to social influence (Phares, 1976) and persuasive messages
(Hjelle & Clouser, 1970) such as those they may receive from hostile coworkers, and may
demonstrate psychological resistance to such influences (Spector, 1983; Brehm, 1966), such as
attempting to prove their worth in a company. In the end, the type and amount of control
attempted depends on the rewards one perceives to be available, as “when effort on the job does
not lead to rewards, internals may adopt a more external perspective” (Spector, 1982, p. 487).

Given the inconsistent nature of the current literature on internals, the question arises of whether
or not tokens with an internal locus would experience higher levels of burnout.

In the current study, the researcher anticipates that the tokenized employees’ locus of
control will moderate the relationship between the token situation and burnout. Thus,

**Hypothesis 3b**

The relationship between perceived tokenism and burnout will be moderated by
locus of control (internal or external), such that the more external an employee’s
locus of control becomes, the stronger the relationship between tokenism and
burnout will be.
Figure 1. Hypothesized model of locus of control modifying the relationship between an employee being in a token situation and a heightened level of burnout.

**Ethnic Identity**

According to the outgroup homogeneity effect (Jones, Wood, & Quattrone, 1981; Park & Rothbart, 1982; Mullen & Hu, 1989), people tend to focus on only the phenotype difference of a minority group in comparison to their own group, rather than noticing separate identities within minority groups. However, people within the same ethnic group differ in many ways, including their levels of ethnic identity. Tajfel (1981) defines ethnic identity as a “part of an individuals’ self-concept that derives from his or her knowledge of membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (as cited by Phinney, 1992, p. 156). A person self-identifies with their ethnic group by means of their parents’ ethnic label and from “their sense of belonging to their group, their attitudes toward the group, their ethnic behaviors, and their understanding of the meaning of their ethnicity” (Phinney, 1992, p. 159), and in their response to discrimination. People generally prefer to associate themselves in homogeneous groups, in which they interact with similar others, more so than heterogeneous groups, which encompass dissimilar others (Tsui et al., 1992).

Although the importance that people tend to place on their ethnicity varies widely, ethnic minority individuals tend to place higher importance on it than do majority individuals. This tends to occur because ethnic minorities typically have more experiences in which they are
forced think about and process their ethnic identity, yet it tends to be situationally specific (Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Phinney (1992) found that white students who were the minority in their schools scored similarly on measures of ethnic identity and self-esteem as minorities do typically, indicating that “when Whites are in the minority, they show traits like ethnic minorities in society” (p. 170).

Like personal identity, the level of a person’s ethnic identity changes and develops over time as they have different experiences that cause them to progress or regress into different stages along a continuum. According to Phinney’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), ethnic identity ranges from ethnic identity diffusion incorporated by “the lack of exploration and commitment (low interest and awareness and little clarity concerning one’s ethnicity)” (Phinney, 1992, p. 161), to ethnic identity achievement, in which there is “evidence of both exploration and commitment, reflected in efforts to learn more about one’s background and a clear understanding of the role of ethnicity for oneself” (Phinney, 1992, p. 161). Reaching identity achievement is characterized as the optimal outcome of the identity formation process that results in a secure sense of self (Erikson, 1968).

In the current study, the researcher seeks to explore if and how the level of an ethnic token employee’s ethnic identity will moderate the relationship between their levels of engagement and turnover intentions. Thus,

**Exploratory 1**

The relationship between perceived tokenism and engagement may be moderated by ethnic identity, such that the level of ethnic identity will change the nature of the relationship between tokenism and engagement.
**Exploratory 2**

The relationship between perceived tokenism and turnover intentions may be moderated by ethnic identity, such that the level of ethnic identity will change the nature of the relationship between tokenism and turnover intentions.

![Diagram](Perceived Tokenism → Ethnic Identity → Engagement, Turnover Intentions)

*Figure 2.* Model of ethnic identity modifying the relationship between an employee being in a token situation and their reduced level of engagement and heightened level of turnover intentions.

In summary, with increasing diversity in today’s workforce, the levels of that diversity are still not equal across many jobs and organizations. In many workplaces in our country there are ethnic token employees who struggle to prove their worth and competence in the companies they work for. Previous studies have found that ethnic tokens face a myriad of negative experiences at work, such as extreme visibility and distinctiveness, forced duality, accountability to and for their race, negative stereotyping, and alienation and a lack of trust (e.g., Flores, 2011; Flores Niemann, 1999; Kanter, 1977; Pollak & Flores Niemann, 1998). The purpose of this study was to discover some of the work-related outcomes of having this experience and to explore if ethnic identity and locus of control act as moderators that contribute to different outcomes for tokens.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Procedure

An online questionnaire was developed and distributed in three ways. First, it was posted on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) where qualifying participants were paid a small incentive to participate in the survey. These participants were paid $0.10 to take the initial qualifying questions to determine if they were numerical tokens. Those who qualified to take the rest of the survey were paid a $0.50 bonus. Second, the survey was emailed to a sample of ethnic minority workers with requests to forward the invitation to participate to others in their network, resulting in a snowball sample. Finally, invitations to participate were posted on two social media sites, LinkedIn and Facebook. The same invitation used for the snowball email sample was used on LinkedIn as posts in a number of ethnic minority professional association pages. An open event page was created on Facebook which was promoted via open invitations to ethnic minority workers.

Participants

Participants of this study included 311\(^1\) full-time working individuals in a variety of sectors across the United States, age 18 and above. While 2,043 attempted the survey, 15.22\% were ultimately used, as 1,732 participants did not meet the study requirement of being an ethnic token in their workgroup. 205 (65.9\%) participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and 106 (34.1\%) were recruited via email or social media. The average age of participants was 35 (SD=11.145). The sample consisted of 56.6\% (n=176) females, 38.3\%

\(^1\)A power analysis was performed using G*Power software. For an effect size of .15 with 3 predictors and a 95\% confidence interval, results indicated a necessary sample size of 119 with a Critical F value of 2.68.
(n=119) males, and 0.6% (n=2) other. 22.5% (n=70) of the participants classified themselves as African American/Black, 17% (n=53) as Asian American, 20.3% (n=63) as Caucasian/White (Non-Hispanic), 2.9% (n=9) as Indian American/South Asian American, 12.9% (n=40) as Latino American/Hispanic (Non-White), 1% (n=3) as Middle Eastern American, 6.8% (n=21) as Native American/American Indian, 12.2% (n=38) as Other or Mixed Race. Most participants were living in a committed relationship (37%) or were single (never married) (33.1%), while 10% were married and 15.1% were widowed.

The majority of these working professionals held a Bachelor’s (27.7%) or Master’s degree (21.5%), with the next largest groups holding a high school diploma or GED (14.1%) or a Doctoral degree (10.3%). A myriad of work industries and sectors were represented in the sample with the greatest percentages being in Education (19.6%), Other (14.1%), and Medical/Healthcare (8.4%). Of those whose working environments were relevant to corporate position levels, the majority were in Administrative Support (19.6%), Technical (17.7%), or Managers (10%). Most participants had been employed their particular position for one year (26%), two years (16.4%), or three years (14.8%), as well as most had also been with the same organization for one (19.3%), two (14.8%), or three years (13.5%). The size of participants’ organizations varied greatly, in which the most prevalent organization sizes employed 50 (4.8%) or 100 (4.8%) workers and the second most prevalent size employed 200 (4.2%) workers. Lastly, 29.9% indicated that they make $20,000-30,000, while 22.8% made $40,000-60,000, making up the majority of the amount of yearly individual salary. For a visual depiction of these demographics, please refer to Table 1.
Table 1

Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>19 - 72</td>
<td>35.32 ± 11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
<td>4.43 ± 5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Organization</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0 - 26</td>
<td>5.11 ± 5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/South Asian American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/American Indian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Mixed Race</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Never Married</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a Committed Relationship</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or GED</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training or Apprenticeship</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry (most common responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Healthcare</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology/Computers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Wholesale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

Qualifier Variable

Relational Demography. Participants were first asked to rate their level of relational demography as qualifier for survey participation. The participants were asked to provide the approximate percentage of the number of individuals who are of the same race/ethnicity as themselves in their workgroup or department. Those who indicated that they were in the 0-20% range were considered as working in a workgroup of low relational demography. The range was raised from the 0-15% indicated by Kanter (1977) was deemed appropriate in order to gain a larger number of participants for the sample.

Independent Variable

Perceived Tokenism. Participants were given 10 items from the Karrasch (2003) Perceived Tokenism Scale. The items assess whether participants feel more visible or salient than other group members, the extent of isolation or polarization a participant feels, and the extent to which a participant feels stereotypic treatment. Examples of items in this scale include: “I receive a disproportionate amount of attention or scrutiny from my peers” (visibility), “I feel that I do not fit or belong with my peers” (isolation), and “I feel ‘pegged’ for certain duties that do not challenge my full capabilities” (treatment). The items for this scale are rated on a four (4)-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “Strongly Disagree” to (4) “Strongly Agree.” Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .83, while previous studies’ alpha has been .76. Correlation analyses and alpha coefficients can be found in Table 2.
Table 2

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of all Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Tokenism</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of Control</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work Engagement</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Burnout</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*
Moderator Variables

Ethnic Identity. Participant’s ethnic identity was assessed using the 12 item Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) revised by Roberts et al. (1999). The composite measure captures three factors—affirmation/belonging/commitment, ethnic identity search, and ethnic behaviors. Some example items include: “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group” (affirmation/belonging/commitment), “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me” (search), and “I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs” (behaviors). The items are rated using a (4)-point Likert scale from (4) Strongly Agree to (1) Strongly Disagree. Cronbach’s alpha for the composite measure was .90, while in previous studies is has ranged from .81 through .89 across varying ethnic groups.

Locus of Control. Locus of Control was measured using Spector’s (1988) 16-item Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS). Items are rated using a (6)-point Likert scale of level of agreement from 1 (Disagree Very Much) to 6 (Agree Very Much) to items such as “Getting the job you want is mostly a matter or luck” (external) and “A job is what you make of it” (internal). Validation evidence has been provided by the relationships between locus of control and eight organizational variables. Cronbach’s alpha for the composite measure was .85, while previous studies have ranged from .75 through .85 across six samples.

Dependent Variables

Work Engagement. Work engagement was assessed using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) by Schaufeli, et al. (2006). The scale uses a (7)-point Likert scale of how often participants experience the items on a range of 0 (Never) to 6 (Always). The 9 item scale incorporates vigor, dedication, and absorption with the company. Example items include: “I feel
strong and vigorous in my job” (vigor), “I am enthusiastic in my job” (dedication), and “I feel happy when I’m engrossed in my work” (absorption). Cronbach’s alpha for the composite measure was .93, while it has previously varied across 10 countries between .85 and .92 (median = .92).

**Turnover Intentions.** Employees’ turnover intentions were evaluated using the Cammann et al. (1979) 3 item measure. Using a (5)-point Likert scale, respondents answer the following items: “I will probably look for a new job in the near future,” “I will likely search for a new job in the near future,” and “I often think of leaving the organization.” Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .94, while previous reliability and validity for this scale have been established with general and ethnic minority populations by a coefficient alpha of .83.

**Burnout.** Burnout was measured using the 16 item Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) by Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996. This measure uses a (7)-point frequency Likert scale ranging from 6 (Every day) to 0 (Never). The scale was comprises of 3 subscales including exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy. Example items include: “I feel used up at the end of a work day” (exhaustion), “I doubt the significance of my work” (cynicism), and “I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work” (efficacy). Cronbach’s alpha for the composite measure was .89, while internal consistencies across the various countries have ranged between .72 and .90, .73 and .86, and .73 and .83 for EX, CY, and PE, respectively (mean .79).
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RESULTS

Data Analyses

A number of predictions were made regarding the relationship between ethnic
token employees’ level of perceived tokenism and their experience in organizations. These
relationships were explored using moderated multiple regression analyses (Cohen, Cohen, West,
& Aiken, 2003). All but one of the hypothesized relationships were supported, while neither of
the two exploratory relationships were supported. SPSS software was used to conduct the
analyses.

Moderated Regression

Hypothesis 1 predicted that perceptions of tokenism would have a significant and
negative relationship to employee work engagement. This hypothesis was supported. In order to
explore Hypothesis 1, engagement was regressed on perceived tokenism. The $R^2$ was .09
($F=15.13$, $p<.00$). A significant linear effect for perceived tokenism on engagement existed
($\beta = -.47$, $p<.00$).

Exploratory 1 predicted that the relationship between perceived tokenism and
engagement would be moderated by ethnic identity, such that the level of ethnic identity would
change the nature of the relationship between tokenism and engagement. Exploratory 1 was not
supported. Moderated regression was used to test Exploratory 1. Ethnic identity was included in
the regression equation (Perceived Tokenism and Engagement) in Hypothesis 1. The $R^2$ was .09
($F=10.59$, $p<.00$). The beta for perceived tokenism was -.42 ($p<.00$) and the beta for ethnic
identity was .45 (p<.00). The interaction term (Perceived Tokenism x Ethnic Identity) was entered in the next step. This equation was not significant. The $R^2$ change was .00 (F change=1.46, p<.23). The inclusion of the interaction term (beta=.23, p<.23) did not significantly contribute to the prediction of engagement. Ethnic Identity did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between perceived tokenism and engagement. These analyses are depicted in Table 3.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that perceptions of tokenism would have a significant and positive relationship on employee turnover intentions. This hypothesis was supported. In order to explore Hypothesis 2, turnover intentions was regressed on perceived tokenism. The $R^2$ was .06 (F=9.37, p<.00). A significant linear effect for perceived tokenism on turnover intentions existed (beta=.54, p<.00).

Exploratory 2 predicted that the relationship between perceived tokenism and turnover intentions would be moderated by ethnic identity, such that the level of ethnic identity would change the nature of the relationship between tokenism and turnover intentions. Exploratory 2 was not supported. Moderated regression was used to examine Exploratory 2. Ethnic identity was included in the regression equation (Perceived Tokenism and Turnover Intentions) in Hypothesis 2. The $R^2$ was .060 (F=9.37, p<.00). The beta for perceived tokenism was .53 (p<.00) and the beta for ethnic identity was -.13 (p<.31). The interaction term (Perceived Tokenism x Ethnic Identity) was entered in the following step. This equation was not significant. The $R^2$ change was .00 (F change=0.00, p<.98). The inclusion of the interaction term (beta= -.01, p<.98) did not significantly contributed to the prediction of turnover. Ethnic Identity did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between perceived tokenism and turnover intentions. These analyses are depicted in Table 4.
Table 3

*Moderated Regression Results of Perceived Tokenism Predicting Engagement by the Subject’s Ethnic Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE_B$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Adjusted. R^2$</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p<.001$
Table 4

*Moderated Regression Results of Perceived Tokenism Predicting Turnover Intentions by the Subject’s Ethnic Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism X</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.001
Hypothesis 3a predicted that perceptions of tokenism would have a significant and positive relationship on employee burnout. This hypothesis was supported. In order to explore Hypothesis 3a, burnout was regressed on perceived tokenism. The $R^2$ was .31 ($F=70.17$, $p<.00$). A significant linear effect for perceived tokenism on burnout existed ($\beta=.26$, $p<.00$).

Hypothesis 3b predicted that the relationship between perceived tokenism and burnout would be moderated by locus of control, such that the more external an employee’s locus of control, the stronger the relationship between tokenism and burnout would be. This hypothesis was not supported. Moderated regression was used to examine Hypothesis 3b. Locus of control was included in the regression equation (Perceived Tokenism and Burnout) in Hypothesis 3a. The $R^2$ was .31 ($F=46.70$, $p<.00$). The beta for perceived tokenism was .27 ($p<.00$) and the beta for locus of control was .69 ($p<.00$). The interaction term (Perceived Tokenism x Locus of Control) was entered in the next step. This equation was not significant. The $R^2$ change was .00 ($F_{\text{change}}=0.15$, $p<.70$). The inclusion of the interaction term ($\beta=.04$, $p<.70$) did not significantly contributed to the prediction of burnout. Locus of control did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between perceived tokenism and burnout. These analyses are depicted in Table 5.
Table 5

*Moderated Regression Results of Perceived Tokenism Predicting Burnout by the Subject’s Locus of Control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism X Locus of Control</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
R^2 = .31  \\
\Delta R^2 = .31  \\
Adjusted. R^2 = .31
\]

**p<.001
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to discover some of the work-related outcomes of the experience of tokenism and to explore if ethnic identity and locus of control act as moderators that contribute to different outcomes for tokens. The study’s results demonstrate that for ethnic token employees, tokenism was related to less engagement, more burnout, and higher turnover intentions. Ethnic identity and locus of control did not appear to impact these findings. These findings are important for both research and practice. Researchers can use these results in furthering the search for potential moderators and to explore methods for helping organizations circumvent negative outcomes. Practitioners and employers can use this information to inform their diversity initiatives to create a more supportive and inclusive climate.

The findings of Hypothesis 1 demonstrated that strong feelings of tokenism leads to lowered work engagement. Work engagement, which incorporates vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002), is a persistent affective-cognitive state in which an employee has “a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities, and they see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their jobs” (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006, p. 702). As hypothesized, the findings make clear that ethnic token employees may have difficulty becoming or remaining engaged in their work as they experience the extra pressures in the workplace as a token. Perhaps being made to feel incompetent and a need to represent their race therefore has the effect of taking away from token employees’ concentration on work-related objectives. Lacking this engagement may lead token
employees vulnerable to feeling as though their work is not important or personally satisfying, which may lead them down a path of lowered self-esteem and self-worth. Organizations with disengaged employees may then suffer by lesser quality worker and organizational performance.

The findings of Hypothesis 2 demonstrated that strong feelings of tokenism leads to higher turnover intentions. Turnover intentions for this study referred to intentions of voluntary turnover “due to a strong dissatisfaction over one or more job aspects” (Hofhuis, Van der Zee, and Otten, 2014, p. 736). This outcome is in line with previous research findings that ethnic minorities are prone to exit when they are underrepresented in the workplace (Williams and O’Reilly, 1998). Perhaps, also in line with past research on ethnic minorities, ethnic tokens experiences’ of isolation (Hom, Robertson, and Ellis, 2008; Leonard & Levine, 2006; Smith & Calasanti, 2005), identity management (Madera, King, and Hebl, 2012; Griffith, and Hebl, 2002), lack of career mobility, and negative social interactions (Hofhuis, Van der Zee, and Otten, 2014) along with their obvious uniqueness also play a role in their increased intentions to turnover.

Organizations stand to pay a high price for employees who engage in counterproductive workplace behaviors related to turnover intentions such as absenteeism or job searching. Levine (2006) asserts that the many organizational costs of employee conflict can include direct, productivity, continuity, and emotional costs. It is even more expensive when actual turnover takes place and employers are left dealing with lost expertise and worktime, payout of unused benefits and vacation time, and recruitment and training for new hires (Cascio, 1991; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998; Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001). Employee turnover is estimated to cost companies between $10,000-30,000 for about 2/3 of job positions (Bernstein, 1998; Mitchell et al., 2001; McKinney, Bartlett, & Mulvaney, 2007). Organization leaders may
also find that the affirmative action efforts they may be enacting are not successful when they struggle to retain the ethnic minority workers they hire.

The findings of Hypothesis 3a demonstrated that strong feelings of tokenism leads to greater burnout. The main job characteristics that have been found to create employee burnout include work overload, role conflict and ambiguity, a lack of autonomy and ability to participate in decision making, and a lack of social support, particularly from superiors (Maslach et al., 2001). These job characteristics are basically identical to many of the characteristics experienced by token employees. This finding shows that the ongoing interpersonal and emotional stressors ethnic tokens endure in the workplace can lead to an experience of burnout, which incorporates a progression of exhaustion, a cynical attitude about and depersonalization with work, and personal inefficacy (Maslach et al., 2001).

Those who experience burnout often experience psychological and physiological strain that can lead to depression and stress-related physical health symptoms (Lee & Ashforth, 1990; Maslach, 2001) such as cardiovascular disease and psychological disorders (Karasek & Theorell 1990; Sauter Murphy, Hurrell, & Levi, 1998; Schnall, Belkic, Landsbergis, & Baker, 2000). This can then lead to organizations having to pay more in medical benefits and costs of lost productivity, absenteeism, and presenteeism (continuing to work when ill) (Cocker, Nicholson, Graves, Oldenburg, Palmer, Martin, Scott, Venn, & Sanderson, 2014). Token employees who experience burnout may be internalizing the negative messages they receive in their work environment and again experience a lack of self-esteem and self-worth (Flores Niemann, 1999). This may then influence their capability to accomplish the regular duties, making them feel ineffective in comparison to their mainstream colleagues and destined for failure (Flores, 2011;
Flores Niemann, 1999). Feeling this way will likely lead to lesser quality performance which hinders the organization’s overall production of goods and services.

The findings of Exploratory 1 and 2, and Hypothesis 3b showed that ethnic identity and locus of control do not moderate the relationships between perceived tokenism and engagement, burnout, or turnover intentions. In the case of locus of control, the current findings seem to have fallen in line with the inconsistent nature of the literature on employees with an internal locus. It was hypothesized that internal tokens would be less affected by the relationship of tokenism and burnout than external tokens, as they tend to perceive work stressors as more manageable/under their control and less threatening (Gatchel, 1980; Wanberg, 1997), which may act as a protective job resource. However, they apparently experience burnout just as much those with an external locus of control. External tokens most likely experience greater exhaustion because of their nature to be submissive and receptive of the messages they receive in their workplace environment (Spector, 1982). Internal tokens may attempt to prove such messages wrong by exerting more effort in anticipation of greater rewards (Ng et al., 2006; Spector, 1982), and while those rewards are never realized they may begin experiencing disengagement.

In the case of ethnic identity, the current findings make clear that the level of one’s ethnic identity does not affect how one experiences tokenism. It was explored to see if the level of ethnic identity would have an impact on an ethnic tokens’ engagement and turnover intentions, and if so, in what direction. As perhaps the most disturbing finding of all, it was found that no matter the level of ethnic identity achieved, token employees still experienced a lack of engagement and greater intentions to turnover. This leads to the conclusion that the experience of tokenism is so damaging that even the most confident and secure employees are just as affected as those still exploring their sense of self in the world. While this finding seems
disheartening, it may come as a sense of comfort for token employees to understand that no matter how confident and competent they are, they all experience the same damaging and demoralizing effects of tokenism. It may also provide a necessary wake up call for organization leaders to implement new efforts to minimize the effects of tokenism. Perhaps the most obvious solution is to make an intentional effort hire a critical mass of ethnic minority employees to avoid tokenism all together. However in the meantime, employers could look into implementing new inclusion and team building strategies and make extra efforts to check in on the needs and wellbeing of their token employees.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations of this study that are necessary to consider. One limitation is that the mean of perceived tokenism \((M = 2.94)\) was low overall. This may have affected the significance of the findings because the participants in the sample tended to have a low perception of tokenism despite their numerical representation in the workplace. The mean of ethnic identity \((M = 1.97)\) was also low overall. Those with a lower level of ethnic identity may not yet have fully internalized their identity for a secure and stable sense of self (Phinney & Ong, 2007). The lack of variation of the participants’ levels of ethnic identity may have made it more difficult to find significance in a potential moderation effect.

Another limitation is that there were some potential issues with the use of multiple sources of participants for data collection. There were some significant differences between the MTurk and snowball samples, although they did not affect the results of the analyses. Another limitation of this study is that it focused solely on ethnic tokens. Additional information may have been gleaned from including samples of tokens based on other social identities, such as gender, religion, sexual orientation, or others. Intersectionalities of such social identities could
also have been included as variables in this study. Finally, a lack of qualitative data left some questions unanswered. The inclusion of supporting qualitative data could have assisted in a better understanding of potential moderators as well as a more thorough understanding of the participants’ personal experiences.

**Contributions of the Study**

The contributions of this study are useful for both research and practice. This research provides new and current information for a deeper understanding of what token ethnic minorities face in the contemporary American workforce. While the search continues for what factors determine the difference between “successful” and “unsuccessful” token employees, it can now be known that locus of control and ethnic identity are likely not such indicators. It is also important to discern to ethnic minorities who are currently or who have in the past experienced tokenism that no matter how secure they are in their own identity or how well they understood their fate as being in their own hands, they all still endure the powerful effects of the token experience. Hopefully with this new information new strategies can be created to help in the healing process to regaining a sense of competence and a realization that they are, or were, a victim of their circumstances. Of utmost importance however, is the need for employers to understand how hiring less than a critical mass of ethnic minorities can cause these problems for their employees. This research highlights how absolutely necessary it is for organizations to be intentional in how they operationalize diversity inclusion in their everyday work. Organizational effectiveness may be improved by understanding the nature and power of tokenism. Organizations could use this information to inform their hiring and retention practices with ethnic minority employees in hopes of improving performance and turnover costs. They may
also use this information in constructing a intentionally supportive climate for minority and token employees.

**Future Research**

There are many ways in which future research could extend the findings of this study. Future research may incorporate actual turnover rates and exit data of tokens to explore if and how often turnover intentions lead to actual turnover. It would be interesting to see if and how long token employees stay and continue to engage in the counterproductive workplace behaviors associated with turnover intentions rather than to actually leave for a better environment. One may also narrow their focus to solo and/or pioneer tokens to see how those situations effect a tokens’ experience in the workplace. As something of a special class of tokens, they may be at heightened risk for negative workplace outcomes. A study on Caucasian tokens alone, or in comparison to ethnic minority tokens may provide useful insight into different power dynamics between groups. Perhaps there would be intriguing differences in looking at tokens whose ethnicity is represented at the top level of an organization and not in the lower levels. For example, Caucasian tokens in the lower levels of a company with strong demographic faultlines in which the lower ranks of the organization are typically comprised of ethnic minorities while the upper power structure is comprised of Caucasian executives.

Future research might also incorporate tokens’ networks outside of the organization for which they work. It may be interesting to see what types of networks they may have or create outside of the workplace for protective effects. The imposter phenomenon (Clance & Imes, 1978), in which one attributes their successes to external uncontrollable causes and their failures to internal controllable causes (Kelley, 1967) may be a more appropriate moderator to study in place of locus of control. Or perhaps as another dependent variable as a result of the extra
pressures tokens face of bearing the burden of the “incompetent” stereotype. Qualitative studies on tokens could be beneficial in getting a closer glimpse into the personal experiences of tokens, as well as in what ways token experiences differ. Future research might also incorporate different types of tokens with different social histories in the United States, such as by ethnic group, international employees, gender or sexual minorities, or employees with disabilities. They may also incorporate the intersectionalities of these different social identities.
REFERENCES


Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for lesbians and gay men:


doi:10.1207/s15324834basp1003_3


doi:10.1177/074355489272003


doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271


doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1103


APPENDICES

Appendix A

RELATIONAL DEMOGRAPHY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Approximately what percentage of individuals who work in your particular workgroup or department are of the same racial/ethnic group as you? ______________

2. Approximately what percentage of individuals who work in your entire organization are of the same racial/ethnic group as you? ______________
Appendix B

PERCEIVED TOKENISM SCALE

Use the numbers below to indicate how often you agree or disagree with each statement.

(4) Very often; (3) Often; (2) Sometimes; (1) Rarely

1. I receive a disproportionate amount of attention or scrutiny from my peers. ____

2. I receive a disproportionate amount of attention or scrutiny from my boss/supervisor. ____

3. I feel that my boss/supervisor or peers take special note of my mistakes. ____

4. I feel that I do not fit or belong with my peers. ____

5. I discuss general topics such as politics or current events with my boss/supervisor. ____*

6. I discuss general topics such as politics or current events with my peers. ____*

7. I feel that I lack peer acceptance. ____

8. I feel that differences between employees at my level and myself are exaggerated or made a big deal of. ____

9. The people I work with utilize my input and skills effectively. ____*

10. I feel “pegged” for certain duties that do not challenge my full capabilities. ____

*These items are reverse scored.
Appendix C
MULTIGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, Native American, Irish-American, and White. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

1. Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ______________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
(4) Strongly agree; (3) Agree; (2) Disagree; (1) Strongly disagree

2. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. ____

3. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. ____

4. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. ____

5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. ____

6. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. ____
7. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. ____
8. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me. ____
9. To learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. ____
10. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments. ____
11. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. ____
12. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. ____
13. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. ____
Appendix D

WORK LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
1=disagree very much, 2 = disagree moderately, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = agree slightly, 5 = agree moderately, 6 = agree very much

1. A job is what you make of it.*
2. On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.*
3. If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.*
4. If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it.*
5. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.
6. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.
7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.*
8. In order to get a really good job you need to have family members or friends in high places.
9. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.
10. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know.
11. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.*
12. To make a lot of money you have to know the right people.

13. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.

14. People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.*

15. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.*

16. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck.

*These items are reverse scored.
Appendix E

UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE

The following 9 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, write “0” (zero) in the space preceding the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A few times a year or less</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Every day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy. ____
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous. ____
3. I am enthusiastic about my job. ____
4. My job inspires me. ____
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work. ____
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely. ____
7. I am proud of the work that I do. ____
8. I am immersed in my job. ____
9. I get carried away when I am working. ____
Appendix F

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY-GENERAL SURVEY

On the following page are 16 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, write the number “0” (zero) in the space before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a year or less</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _________ I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. _________ I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. _________ I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. _________ Working all day is really a strain for me.
5. _________ I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work.*
6. _________ I feel burned out from my work.
7. _________ I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does.*
8. _________ I've become less interested in my work since I started this job.
9. _________ I have become less enthusiastic about my work.

10. _________ In my opinion, I am good at my job.*

11. _________ I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work.*

12. _________ I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.*

13. _________ I just want to do my job and not be bothered.

14. _________ I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything.

15. _________ I doubt the significance of my work.

16. _________ At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done.*

*These items are reverse scored.
Appendix G

TURNOVER INTENTIONS MEASURE

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(5) Strongly agree; (4) Agree; (3) Neutral; (2) Disagree; (1) Strongly disagree

1. I will probably look for a new job in the near future. ____
2. I will likely search for a new job in the near future. ____
3. I often think of leaving the organization. ____
Appendix H

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. African American / Black
   b. Asian American
   c. Caucasian / White (Non-Hispanic)
   d. Indian American / South Asian American
   e. Latino American / Hispanic (Non-White)
   f. Middle Eastern American
   g. Native American / American Indian
   h. Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander
   i. Other (please specify) _________________________

2. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male

3. What is your age? ______

4. What is marital status?
   a. Single (Never Married)
   b. Married
   c. Divorced or Separated
5. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?
   a. Elementary/Middle School (grades 1-8)
   b. High school or GED (General Equivalency Diploma)
   c. Technical training or apprenticeship
   d. Associate’s degree
   e. Bachelor’s degree (e.g., B.A., B.S.)
   f. Master’s degree (e.g., M.S., M.Ed., M.A.)
   g. Professional degree (e.g., J.D., M.Div., D.V.M.)
   h. Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)

6. What state do you live in? (If you live outside the United States, please indicate which country you live in): ______________________

7. What industry do you work in?
   a. Advertising/Marketing/Public Relations
   b. Arts/Entertainment/Media
   c. Banking/Financial Services/Accounting/Auditing
   d. Consulting Services
   e. Education
   f. Engineering
   g. Government and Policy
   h. Medical/Healthcare
   i. Human Resources/Recruiting
j. Information Technology/Computers
k. Internet/e-Commerce
l. Legal
m. Non-profit
n. Publishing
o. Real Estate
p. Retail/Wholesale
q. Sales
r. Science/Biotechnology/Pharmaceuticals
s. Telecommunications
t. Other (please specify): _____________________

8. If you work in a business/corporate environment please indicate the level of your position.
   a. Administrative/Support
   b. Technical
   c. Supervisor
   d. Manager
   e. Director
   f. Senior Director
   g. Vice President
   h. Senior/Executive Vice President
   i. CEO/Executive
   j. N/A
k. Other (please specify): ________________________

9. How many people work in your organization? Please estimate the approximate number of employees. __________

10. How many years have you been in your current position? __________

11. How many years have you been with your organization? __________

12. Please indicate your years of experience in your current field. __________

13. What is your yearly individual salary (not household combined income)?
   a. 10,000-20,000
   b. 20,000-40,000
   c. 40,000-60,000
   d. 60,000-80,000
   e. 80,000-100,000
   f. 100,000+

14. Which racial/ethnic group makes up the majority of your organization?
   a. African American / Black
   b. Asian American
   c. Caucasian / White
   d. Indian American / South Asian American
   e. Latino American / Hispanic (Non-White)
   f. Middle Eastern American
   g. Native American / American Indian
   h. Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander
   i. Other (please specify) _____________________________
15. Which gender group makes up the majority of your organization?

   a. Male
   b. Female