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ABSTRACT

Two studies examine the effects of an individual’s experience of conflict or compatibility among multiple identities on his/her interpersonal problem solving. Conflict among one’s multiple identities is hypothesized to decrease integrative problem solving while compatibility among one’s multiple identities is hypothesized to increase integrative problem solving. In Study 1, I use a measure of chronic intrapsychic conflict and compatibility among multiple identities to assess self-reported problem solving. In Study 2, I experimentally manipulate conflict or compatibility among multiple identities and measure the impact on the outcome of an actual dyadic negotiation. The results suggest that conflict among multiple identities decreases integrative problem solving. In addition, although compatibility among multiple identities does not enhance integrative problem solving, it does decrease distributive outcomes.
WHO AM I?
THE INFLUENCE OF MULTIPLE IDENTITIES ON INTEGRATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

In a recent book, Nobel laureate Amartya Sen (2006) stated “it is … easy for a person to be a professor, a woman, a lesbian, etc. all at the same time (emphasis added).” He further argued that the existence of multiple identities is an advantage in a world of violence because individuals are not limited in how they see themselves, and hence they interact with others in a cooperative manner. Is this true? Does one’s ease in managing multiple identities matter for understanding one’s conflict with others? This paper investigates the influence of individuals’ experiences of intrapsychic conflict or compatibility among their multiple identities on their interpersonal problem-solving.

Past identity research attests to the importance of a single identity as a motivation for intergroup and interpersonal conflict behavior (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Aquino & Douglas, 2003). However, many of us have numerous answers to the question, “Who am I?” In terms of work-related identities alone, an individual may think of herself as a member of the marketing group, a corporate executive, an employee, a manager and an engineer. Psychologists, sociologists and philosophers have long believed in principle that individuals have many identities (James, 1890; Thoits, 1983; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Rosenberg, 1997; Hermans & Kempen, 1993; Deaux, 1996), but empirical research on multiple (more than two) identities is just emerging. Recent literature on multiple identities has focused on the level of identification with multiple targets, examining the effects of each identity separately (Moskalenko et al., 2006). For instance, Johnson and colleagues (2006) assessed veterinarians’ professional, organizational
and workgroup identifications separately and showed different effects of identification with each source on veterinarians’ job satisfaction. Brewer and colleagues (Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Brewer & Pierce, 2005) take a different route and show that social identity complexity, or the extent to which an individual differentiates between her social identities, influences her tolerance of outgroup members. However, these recent approaches do not examine the extent to which individuals experience their multiple identities as conflicting or compatible, nor do they examine interpersonal outcomes such as problem solving.

Research on two identities (such as work-family or bicultural identities) has elaborated on the effects of identity conflict. The experience of struggle and tension in reconciling demands between two identities, has been shown to have a detrimental impact on outcomes such as job satisfaction, performance and well-being (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Settles, 2004; Thoits, 1991; Van Sell, Brief & Schuler, 1981). Similarly, conflict between cultural identities predicts adjustment to the host country, well-being and cognitive complexity (Berry, 1990, 1997; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Benet-Martinez, Lee & Leu, 2006; Sussman, 2000). In this paper, I draw from existing role identity and cultural identity research to theoretically and empirically investigate the effects of conflict and compatible among multiple identities on integrative problem solving in interpersonal negotiations. Below, I define conflict and compatibility among multiple identities.

The Nature of Conflict and Compatibility Among Multiple Identities

Conflict among Identities
Identity conflict arises from perceptions or experiences of constraints imposed on the individual’s identity expressions. For instance, in the immigrant acculturation literature (La Fromboise et al., 1993), individuals with dual cultural identities experience conflict when they must choose between the values they hold, the language they use, and the audience to which they speak, giving precedence to one set of values and behaviors over another (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Safdar et al, 2003; Verkuyten & Pouliasi, 2006). In role theory (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), these constraints are external competing demands and expectations of role consistent behavior. Individuals experience role identity conflict to the extent that they cannot satisfy role requirements in terms of time or resources. Thus, research shows that individuals often experience role conflict or role interference, in which the performance of obligations related to one identity interfere or conflict with the performance of obligations associated with another, such as women’s conflicts between the roles of woman and scientist for female scientists and student-athletes struggles between their roles as student and athlete (Settles, 2001; Settles et al 2002). Thus, I define relationships between identities as conflicting to the extent that when an individual accesses both identity A and identity B, s/he thinks or feels that the information associated with identity A and those of identity B are experienced as constraints or antithetical, creating struggle, tension and opposition between identities.

Compatibility among Identities

On the other hand, the notion of identity compatibility is not well discussed in the immigrant acculturation literature; rather compatibility between identities is seen as low conflict (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). In role theory, role enhancement suggests that individuals experience benefits from multiple roles, transferring skills and knowledge from one to the other.
(Settles et al., 2002). Extending this conception from role theory to the relationships between all types of identities more generally, I argue that identity compatibility implies the existence of synergy rather than simply the absence of a constraint. I define relationships between identities as *compatible* to the extent that when an individual accesses both identity A and identity B, s/he thinks or feels that the information associated with both identities is experienced as complementary or amenable to synthesis.

*The Independence of Conflict and Compatibility*

Simply because identities may be experienced as not conflicting, they may not necessarily be experienced as compatible either. For example, a manager may experience conflict between her view of herself as an engineer and her managerial identity when discussing the details of a specific product with her team and finds that her technical involvement is damaging her ability to lead the group. On the other hand, in the very same situation, she may find that she is better able to build team spirit and communicate with her group as a manager to the extent that she draws on her engineering identity, experiencing compatibility between these identities. Specifically, when identities co-occur, some information between identities may be conflicting, while other information may be compatible. A particular state or context, such as a work engagement or a team meeting may highlight one type of relationship over another, but cumulatively, individuals can experience co-occurring identities as both conflicting and compatible.

Some work on role identities indicates preliminary evidence for conceptualizing conflict and compatibility as separate dimensions. For example, Tiedje et al. (1990) show in a sample of women college professors with at least one child that role conflict and role enhancement are
often experienced between the same roles. In a study of role enrichment (experiencing benefits from multiple roles) and depletion (experiencing drain from multiple roles), Rothbard (2001) shows that women experienced enrichment from family to work roles, but depletion from work to family roles, while men experienced enrichment from work to family roles. Critical to this argument is Rothbard’s (2001) evidence that negative and positive emotions are important mediators of enrichment and depletion processes, respectively. Extending this finding to the relationships between identities more generally, negative and positive emotions are also likely to be important correlates of the experience of identity conflict and identity compatibility. Since research on affect indicates that negative and positive emotions are separate dimensions that can be experienced simultaneously, particularly over time (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988; Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994), it is likely that conflict or tensions experienced between identities and compatibility or harmony experienced between identities also co-exist.

Another theoretical framework that is consistent with conceptualizing identity conflict and compatibility as separate dimensions is the work on Behavioral Activation and Behavioral Inhibition Systems (BAS/BIS) (Carver & White, 1994; Gray, 1990; Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991). The BAS/BIS framework rests on the notion that there are two orthogonal underlying dimensions of motivation and behavior: 1) a behavioral approach or activation system, generally associated with positive affect and characterized by activation of impulsivity and approach towards goals and 2) a behavioral inhibition system, generally associated with negative affect and characterized by anxiety and withdrawal from goals. In the case of a pair of identities, if identity A and identity B are co-occurring, the individual can see identity B as either a rewarding stimuli, in which case the BA system is engaged and the individual experiences positive affect and approaches the second identity. On the other hand, if the individual sees identity B as
threatening or punishing stimuli, say in the case of conflicting expectations, this can induce anxiety and the individual will withdraw from or suppress the second identity. Again, similar to the orthogonal structure of positive and negative affect, BAS/BIS theorists argue that the two dimensions are independent, and individuals can experience all combinations of high and low BAS and BIS. Thus, I argue that conflict and compatibility between identities A and B are two independent dimensions, rather than opposite ends of the same dimension.

*Relationships among Multiple Identities in the Identity Network*

Extending the relationship between any two identities to multiple identities leads to the concept of an identity network, in which the nodes are the identities and the ties or relationships are the experiences of conflict or compatibility between identities described above. Since relationships between identities can be both conflicting and compatible, each individual has a network depicting the conflicting relationships among their identities and another depicting the compatible relationships among their identities.

Continuing with the network terminology, conflict or compatibility among multiple identities in the network can be captured as the overall density of relationships among identities in the network (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). If identities are organized in a highly dense network, information associated with each identity is drawn upon when other identities also occur. On the other hand, a sparse identity network suggests that information associated with one identity is not frequently accessed when other identities occur.
In studies of social networks, examining all of the ties between nodes at a network level is a commonly accepted practice (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Social network density in particular conveys information about the degree to which the entire network is filled with ties. Aggregating the data to the level of the entire network, in this case, to the individual, allows for a picture of relationships across multiple identities simultaneously. The density measure conveys information about the degree to which the person overall is experiencing identity conflict and compatibility. Current research is focused on just the features of a single identity or the relationship between a pair of identities, while a network approach may help encompass the person’s multiple identities simultaneously.

For example, consider a woman who has three identities: as engineer, manager and team member. If the woman frequently experienced conflict among all three of her identities (i.e., engineer and manager, engineer and team member, and manager and team member), her identity network would be dense in terms of conflicting relationships. On the other hand, if only her engineer and manager identities were conflicting, and the others were unrelated or compatible, the extent of conflict in her identity network would be lower. Likewise, if the woman experienced frequent compatibility among all three of her identities, she would be dense in terms of the compatibility of her identity network. But, if the woman experienced compatibility only between consultant and team member, then she would have an identity network with less compatibility.

**Trait and State Considerations**

Identities can be dormant or activated. Activation is the level of excitation of knowledge in the brain (Higgins, 1986; 1991). Activation has also been defined as the process of thinking
(Cronin, 2004), thus people are always activating knowledge. If you think about cats, you activate the knowledge of cats that you have stored in the brain. If you think about yourself, you activate self-knowledge. Identity is one type of self-knowledge that can be activated. Identities that one is not thinking about are dormant, i.e., they remain as inactive knowledge. Activated knowledge can vary in the degree of activation. Knowledge can be activated to the point of conscious awareness or remain subconscious but still activated (Cronin, 2004).¹

Similarly, parts of the individual’s identity network (i.e., both identities and the relationships between them) can be activated. That is, specific identities and the ties between them (i.e., a part of the identity network) can be activated at a given time. For example, an individual with the identities of engineer, manager, father, Canadian, Catholic, Italian, son, husband, Wharton graduate, basketball player and United Way steering committee member, may have at any point in time, only his engineer and manager identities activated, and thus only part of the underlying potential identity network is activated. In this paper, the term identity network refers only to the activated parts of the network; i.e., those identities that the person is consciously responding about rather than the entire potential network he or she may have.

Parts of the identity network can be activated based on chronic or temporary activation. Chronic activation is a constant state of activation of any mental construct. The construct is constantly accessible to an individual. For instance, if one constantly thinks of oneself as a professor, this identity would be in a chronic state of activation. Temporary activation is the priming of a mental construct that may not actually exist for the individual but can be

¹ Conscious knowledge is more easily accessible to individuals than subconscious knowledge. Although there is no concrete definition of the threshold of consciousness, studies on subliminal priming show that primes presented at very fast speeds (33 ms (Olsson & Phelps, 2004) or 40-120 ms (Stapel & Koomen, 2005)), masked (another object or character is presented right after the prime) or presented in the parafoveal vision (between two to six degrees of visual angle between the stimulus and a fixation point at the center of the screen, see Bargh & Pietromonaco, 1982) are not consciously perceived by the individual but can influence his/her thoughts, emotions and actions. In this study, I consider identity networks that are activated and conscious, that is, I only examine identities and relationships about which individuals can report consciously and explicitly.
temporarily created and is temporarily accessible to the person. For instance, if one has thoughts of oneself as elderly because one read something about elderly people, this construct would be in a temporary state of activation (Bargh, Chen & Burrows, 1996). Studies have shown that chronically and temporarily activated constructs function similarly (Maddux & Galinsky, 2006; Higgins, 1986). In one study, Maddux and Galinsky (2006) primed (that is, temporarily activated) individuals with a multicultural learning mindset by asking them to recall a time when they had been able to learn the underlying reasons for a new behavior in another culture and then tested participants creativity with a creativity task (the Duncker candle task). They found that participants primed with the multicultural learning mindset were more creative than participants assigned to a control condition. More important, participants who had been primed with the multicultural learning mindset performed similarly to another group of students for whom multicultural learning experience was measured as a chronically activated variable, i.e., people who had lived abroad. This activation of the identity network could be an important leverage point for organizations. Organizations may be able to prime and bring into temporary states of activation, compatibility among multiple identities such as ethnic, national identities, professional and organizational identities. In this paper I will examine both temporary (state induced identities and relationships) and chronic (accessible trait-like identities and relationships) activation of the identity network. The procedures for measuring the chronic and temporary identity network will be explained further in the Methods section for each study. In the next section, I develop my hypotheses regarding the influence of conflict and compatibility among multiple identities on problem solving.
Multiple Identities and Integrative Problem Solving

*Integrative Problem solving*

Although identification with a single group or role has been related to interpersonal and intergroup conflict, how individuals experience multiple identities as intrapsychically conflicting or compatible may also influence their likelihood of engaging in interpersonal and intergroup conflict. In this paper integrative problem solving is an umbrella term that refers to motivations, behaviors and outcomes that are oriented towards fulfilling the goals of both parties in an interpersonal or intergroup conflict situation.

Cooperativeness in the negotiation and conflict management literature is a motivational construct that defines the goals of the negotiator. When individuals have a cooperative orientation, negotiation theory suggests that they will pursue both their own goals as well as the goals of the other party and they will attempt to maximize joint gains through collaboration or integrative problem solving (Deutsch, 1982). Conflicts involving individuals with a cooperative orientation are often characterized by “effective communication, friendliness and helpfulness, and willingness to enhance the other’s power (Deutsch, 1982).” Problem solving behaviors in turn, are behaviors such as exchanging information, making concessions (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; de Dreu, Weingart & Kwon, 2000) and making trade-offs and multiple issue offers (Olekalns & Smith, 2003). Integrative outcomes or win-win solutions are those in which both parties can benefit. All three of these variables have been related to one another in prior research. For instance, cooperative orientation is directly related to integrative bargaining outcomes (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986) while problem-solving behaviors are directly linked to integrative outcomes (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; Weingart, Bennett & Brett, 1993).
The Influence Of Conflicting Relationships Among Multiple Identities On Problem Solving

Conflict among multiple identities is predicted to decrease integrative problem solving. There are both cognitive and affective mechanisms that are likely to lead to this situation. First, research on identity indicates that individuals generally experience little conflict between identities, partially due to a functional inhibition mechanism (Hugenburg & Bodenhausen, 2004). That is, when individuals are faced with a situation in which choices or norms regarding identities are conflicting, they inhibit other identities and generally choose one identity that is most functional in the circumstances. Functional inhibition occurs due to the need to reduce environmental uncertainty and complexity, which leads to cognitive simplification and the act of categorizing the self and other on the basis of a single group (Turner et al., 1987).

In effect, functional inhibition or antagonism between identities suggests that when individuals face conflicts between identities, they are more likely to respond on the basis of one identity rather than several identities (Hugenburg & Bodenhausen, 2004). This view is also consistent with work on cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Since individuals are generally motivated to search for cognitive consistency, when faced with conflicting attitudes or cognitions, cognitive dissonance theory suggests that they are likely to fall back on a single attitude or cognition, especially if they are not motivated or do not have time to come up with a way to reconcile their conflicting views. When individuals make a choice of a single identity they are expressing a commitment to that identity in the situation. This may make them unable or unwilling to acknowledge the diverse perspectives they may hold if they were thinking in a less conflicted manner about themselves and they “become unaware of alternate conceptions” (Langer, 1994 cited in Carnevale & Probst, 1998) of the self.
Even if the individual is taking into account different views that derive from their multiple identities, conflict among identities may also operate similarly to a framing effect. Carnevale and Probst (1998) argue that a conflict mental frame is likely to be induced by external social conflict, but there is little reason to believe that it cannot be induced by internal/intrapsychic conflict. When in a conflict mental frame, individuals tend to retain black and white, rigid thinking; thinking that inhibits integrative thinking and problem solving behavior (Carnevale & Probst, 1998).

As argued above, individuals who have multiple identities simultaneously salient in which one identity is perceived as threatening or conflicting in some way, may be engaged in behavioral inhibition. This internal conflict among identities is therefore also likely to generate stress and negative emotion. In highly stressful situations, individuals often shut down and think more rigidly (Staw, Sandelands & Dutton, 1981), which may also decrease their complexity and integrative problem solving behavior. In terms of problem solving behavior in particular, negative emotions can reduce effectiveness in problem solving, as individuals struggle between different identities they may ruminate and overthink. For example, individuals who were in depressed, negative emotional states and showed increased self-focused rumination were also ineffective at interpersonal problem solving (Lyubomirsky & Noel-Hoeksema, 1995).

Furthermore, negative emotions have also been linked to less problem solving behavior in general among older adults (Thompson & Heller, 1993). Although some literature suggests that negative emotions do increase judgment accuracy (Alloy & Abramson, 1979) and under certain circumstances can increase creativity (George & Zhou, 2002) (integrative thinking is often considered to be creative, see Carnevale & Probst, 1998; Carnevale & Isen, 1986), the empirical
evidence weighs heavily that negative emotions are inversely correlated with better decision making and creativity (Lyubomrsy, King & Diener, 2005). Therefore,

**Hypothesis 1: The greater the degree of conflict measured among an individual’s multiple identities the less integrative problem solving the individual will engage in.**

*The Influence Of Compatible Relationships Among Multiple Identities On Integrative Problem Solving*

On the other hand, compatibility in the identity network is likely to be positively associated with integrative problem solving, for both cognitive and affective reasons. As compatibility between identities is defined as the synergy and integration of information, feelings and memories from different identities, it should also involve a certain amount of cognitive flexibility. That is, individuals who experience flexibility in terms of defining themselves across multiple identity categories may also be likely to think broadly across categories in general. Research on creativity in problem solving tasks offers support for the above as it shows that bilinguals, immigrants and those with multicultural living experience are creative partly because learning another language, or living in another culture adds to their ability to think integratively and broadly about ideas (Maddux & Galinsky, 2006; Simonton, 1999, 2000; Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). Although these authors do not specifically study multiple identities, identification with multiple groups may act in a similar manner as multicultural experience or multilingual skills, allowing for integrative thinking. Research also shows that bicultural individuals exhibit more integrative complexity than monocultural individuals when dealing with cultural problems and
situations (Benet-Martinez, Lee & Leu, 2006). Similarly, a study of gender roles in organizations in relation to conflict management styles indicates that managers with androgynous gender role identifications, that is, individuals who identify with both masculine and feminine gender role identities, were more likely to rate highly on integrative approaches to problem solving, controlling for their actual sex (Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002). Konik and Crawford (2004) show that bisexuals rated higher on cognitive flexibility compared to both heterosexual and gay/lesbian participants. What is interesting about these studies is that it seems to be the non-exclusivity of gender role or sexual identities that is most associated with integrative thinking. That is, *intrapersonal* comfort with crossing social group or role boundaries, such as sexual orientation or gender role identification seems to be an indicator of general cognitive comfort with crossing categories and boundaries. Within the organizational domain, negotiations scholars have also found that greater cognitive flexibility and ability to consider broad categories is related to problem solving behavior and integrative outcomes in negotiations (Carnevale & Probst, 1998).

When multiple identities are compatible, identities are perceived as rewarding and synergistically related, in which case, the individuals’ behavioral activation system is engaged (Carver & White, 1994) generating a positive orientation. Social identity theory also suggests that as individuals feel satisfied in their need to belong to social groups they also exhibit greater levels of positive affect (Carvallo & Gabriel, 2006; Baumeister & Twenge, 2003). Indeed, research on role enrichment (Rothbard, 2001) indicates that enrichment between roles is often

---

2 However, interestingly, when they compare amongst bicultural individuals themselves, they find that individuals with high conflict between their cultural identities are more likely to exhibit integratively complexity compared to individuals with low conflict between their identities. It is possible that low levels of conflict act differently than compatibility. Thus, a separation of conflict and compatibility may be necessary to tease out this effect, and perhaps both high conflict and high compatibility co-existed for the highest degrees of integrative complexity. Also, as the authors themselves point out, their conclusion deserves greater investigation.
accompanied by underlying positive emotions that spillover from one role identity to another. Individuals with high compatibility are therefore likely to experience high positive affect.

Literature on positive emotion indicates that positive affect alone also can lead to integrative thought processes through increasing the ability to make connections across categories and cognitive flexibility (Isen, Daubman, Nowicki, 1987; Frederickson, 2001). For example, in a study of physicians, Estrada, Isen and Young (1997) showed that positive affect reduced the anchoring in clinical reasoning and increased divergent flexible thinking. The positive emotion generated by identity compatibility is also likely to result in greater problem solving behavior and integrative outcomes in negotiations and conflict resolution (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; Carnevale & Isen, 1986). Furthermore, positive emotion often influences cooperative orientation (Baron, 1990; Staw & Barsade, 1993). In a study of negotiators, Forgas (1998) showed that individuals in a positive mood were more likely to be cooperative in their planned behavior as well as actual negotiation. In a study of emotional contagion in workgroups, Barsade (2002) shows that positive emotion induced through emotional contagion led to greater cooperativeness at both the individual and group level. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2: The greater the degree of compatibility measured among an individual’s multiple identities the more integrative problem solving the individual will engage in.**

To summarize, the goal of the present research is to investigate the effect of individuals’ psychological experience of intrapsychic conflict and compatibility among multiple identities on their integrative problem solving. I predict that conflict among multiple identities will be associated with a decrease in integrative problem solving while compatibility among multiple
identities will be associated with an increase in integrative problem solving. Conflict and compatibility among multiple identities are considered as both chronically and temporarily activated constructs. Study 1 measures the chronically activated identity network and measures self-reported interpersonal problem solving orientation in a negotiations scenario. Study 2 induces conflict and compatibility among experimentally assigned identities and involves actual interpersonal problem solving in a dyadic negotiation.

**Study 1**

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of chronically activated conflict and compatibility among multiple identities on integrative problem solving. Chronically activated conflict and compatibility among multiple identities was assessed using a self-report measure of the identity network, i.e., a network in which identities are the nodes and conflict and compatibility among identities are the ties of the network. This measure has been validated in prior research (Ramarajan, 2007). Conflict and compatibility factor separately in both exploratory and confirmatory analyses and the measures of conflict and compatibility in the identity network consistently correlate as expected with a wide variety of variables across multiple samples (Ramarajan, 2007). Integrative problem solving was assessed using a negotiations scenario.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 76 undergraduate students recruited through the school’s behavioral lab at a private university in the Northeastern United States. Participants’ age ranged from 17 to 30
years with a mean age of 20.33 years (s.d. 2.24). 41.49 % were male. 30% were Asian, 37% were White, 10 % were Black and 3% were Hispanic. 9% considered themselves as “other” or of mixed ethnic background. In addition, questions were asked about foreign living experience as recent research (Maddux & Galinsky, 2006) indicates that cross-cultural experiences are related to creativity in problem solving. 36% said they had lived in a foreign country.

Design

Students were asked to complete a survey that included the identity network questions, the control variables and the negotiations scenario. Individuals were randomly assigned to one of four ordered conditions. First, the order of the questions on conflict and compatibility among identities was counterbalanced, such that some students responded to conflict questions first while others responded to compatibility questions first. Second, the order of the negotiations task and identity conflict/compatibility questions were also counterbalanced, such that some students completed the tasks first and then the network questions and vice-versa. There were no order effects due to either of these manipulations so responses from all participants were analyzed collectively.

Materials and Procedure

Students entered the computer lab and were told they would complete an online survey. The section of the survey with the identity conflict/compatibility questions was introduced as a study that was investigating how they thought about themselves. The section of the survey with the negotiations scenario was presented as a separate task. The negotiation scenario was adapted from Kellogg’s DRRC negotiation case, College Town Apartments. In the scenario, students are
asked to read a situation about a conflict with their roommate over a late payment of their rent that is intentionally ambiguous regarding the responsibility of one party over another in the situation. In order to facilitate students’ investment in the scenario prior to the dependent variable items, students were asked to respond with an open ended question regarding how they would approach the situation. Control variables were collected at the end.

Independent Variables

Conflict and Compatibility among Multiple identities. Individuals were first asked to list their different identities based on the “I am” scale (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954) and then pick the five most important ones. Past research has shown that individuals on average tend to hold about five to seven important identities (Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Thoits, 1983). A pre-test in a similar population showed that this was true in a sample similar to the study sample.

Then, for each pair of identities, individuals were asked to respond to questions regarding their experiences of conflict and compatibility between that particular pair of identities. For five identities, imagine a 5x5 identity matrix that similar to a social network matrix. Thus there are 25 pairs in total. Consistent with a large portion of the network literature, I assumed that the relationships were bidirectional, i.e., conflict and compatibility between a person’s Asian and American identities was the same as conflict and compatibility between their American and Asian identities. Therefore, removing 10 pairs in the top-right corner of the matrix and 5 pairs along the diagonal, there were a total of 10 unique pairs of identities for each person to consider. However, rather than a single item on the relationship between two identities (as would be common in a social network questionnaire), I ask for responses to four items on conflict and four items on compatibility. The specific items for conflict and compatibility are listed in Appendix 1.
Therefore, there was an identity network matrix with 10 pairwise responses for each item (see Figure 2).

Conflict and compatibility among multiple identities are calculated by averaging the item-level scores from each pair of identities and then averaging across the entire network. (Cronbach’s alpha for conflict = .87 and compatibility = .87).

**Dependent Variables**

*Integrative Problem Solving.* Two measures of integrative problem solving were assessed. First, an integrative problem solving approach is often characterized by a combination of high concern for self as well as high concern for others (Rahim, 1983). However, empirically, a commonly used measure of integrative problem solving behavior is concession making (Harinck, De Dreu & Van Vianen, 2000). Often this is hard to separate empirically from a complete yielding or accommodating approach that is driven only by concern for the other party and is taken in conjunction with other measures, such as integrative outcomes. Since integrative outcomes cannot be assessed in a single-person scenario design, concession making here is taken as a preliminary indicator of integrative problem solving behavior, however, full support for this will only become apparent with Study 2. Participants were asked: “How much of the $70 late fee would you agree to pay, in principle, if you and Chris could reach some sort of agreement?” Second, students were asked the following question. “How much do you think Chris is at fault in this situation?” (responses were measured on a scale of 1=not at all to 5=very much). Since a cooperative orientation is the motivation to understand the other party’s goals and interests, the less they blamed the other party, i.e., found Chris at fault, the more this would indicate they were motivated to cooperatively resolve the problem.
Control Variables

Anger. Students were also asked to rate their current specific emotions related to anger as a control variable for how intensely they responded to the scenario. Students rated how they felt towards Chris on a scale of 1-a little to 5-extremely. Sample items used for anger included grumpy and angry.

Demographic variables. Experience in a foreign country was a dichotomous variable measured as 1 = yes and 2 = no. It was used as a control variable based on prior research (Maddux & Galinsky, 2006) showing that foreign country experience was related to creative problem solving.

Results

For illustrative purposes, a participant’s compatibility among multiple identities in the identity network is shown in Figure 3. One can see the identities mentioned (Chinese, Engineer, etc.) and the mean compatibility score for each pair of identities. A similar network of conflicting relationships among multiple identities exists for each participant.

INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE

The means, standard deviations and correlations of the variables collected including conflict and compatibility in the identity network are shown in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
Conflict and compatibility among identities do show a moderate but significant positive correlation (r=.27, p<.05) in this sample. In order to show that conflict is differentiable from compatibility among identities a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the conflict and compatibility items. The following fit statistics were examined: chi-square test, comparative fit index (CFI), RMSEA and standardized root mean-square residual (SRMR). The CFA showed that the two-factor model had good fit $\chi^2 (18, N=128) =25.947, p=.1, \text{RMSEA}=.059, \text{CFI}=.976, \text{SRMR}=.07$ and when compared to a one-factor model ($\chi^2 (20, N=128) =174.5, p=.000, \text{RMSEA}=.246, \text{CFI}=.541, \text{SRMR}=.192$), a chi-square difference test indicated that the two-factor model fit the data significantly better than the one-factor model, $\chi^2 (2, N=128) = 148.5, p<.000$. Thus, there is support for considering conflict and compatibility among identities to be independent rather than opposites of one another.

Ordinary least squares regression was used to test the hypotheses. Hypothesis 1, regarding the negative association between conflict among multiple identities and integrative interpersonal problem solving was supported using both measures of problem solving. As shown in Table 2, Regression 1, there was support using the measure of concession making, such that, that the greater an individual’s conflict among his/her identities the less likely individuals were to make concessions to the hypothetical other party, in the form of willingness to pay any part of the fee to the other party ($B=-0.24, p=.03$). Likewise, as shown in Table 2, Regression 2, the greater an individuals’ experience of conflict among their identities the more likely they are to indicate that the other party is at fault, i.e., the less cooperatively oriented they are (i.e., the coefficient for conflict among identities is significant and positive, $B=0.19, p=.05$). However,
Hypothesis 2 regarding the positive effects of compatibility on integrative problem solving was not supported.

**Discussion**

Study 1 shows that the more individuals’ chronically experienced conflict among multiple identities the less likely they were to report being willing to engage in integrative problem solving. However there are several concerns with Study 1. First, as this was a correlational study, there could be an omitted variable that causes both identity conflict and less integrative problem solving. Participants were also allowed to choose the identities about which they responded, so it is possible individuals selected identities that were inherently conflicting or compatible. So in Study 2, I experimentally assign identities and manipulate conflict or compatibility among the identities.

**Study 2**

The purpose of Study 2 was to experimentally assign identities and manipulate conflict or compatibility so that the identities were standardized and comparable across individuals. Random assignment in the experiment allows for addressing omitted variable bias which is a limitation of Study 1. In addition, this study also served as a test of whether the temporary activation of conflict or compatibility among identities has an effect on integrative problem solving.

**Method**
Participants

As part of a negotiation class, 46 dyads of MBA and undergraduate business students taking a negotiation class at the University of Pennsylvania participated in the experiment. Of these 6 dyads were dropped from the analyses because they negotiated with observers or teammates and this altered the dynamics of the negotiation. Of the 40 dyads retained, 15 dyads were undergraduate pairs and 25 dyads were MBA pairs.

Design

This was a 3 condition between-subjects experiment: the conditions were 1) conflicting identities 2) compatible identities and 3) control group. Participants were dyadic negotiating partners in a simulated intra-organizational negotiation using the El Tek negotiation. There were 16 dyads in the conflict condition, 13 in the compatibility condition and 11 in the control condition. The experiment was part of a class on negotiations and the participants were not naïve negotiators. The negotiation was not graded. Students were randomly assigned to their condition. One student in each pair, representing one of the roles in the negotiation (i.e., Chris Carlson) received the manipulation for either the conflict or compatibility conditions. The Chris Carlson’s in the control group just received the basic information in the case with no manipulation. In addition to the random assignment to condition, participants were also randomly assigned to their partners and to their roles (i.e., whether they were the partner in the dyad that received the manipulation or not).

Materials and Procedure
Participants read the El-Tek negotiations scenario from the Kellogg DRRC. The case itself is an intra-organizational negotiation, in which the individual already carries two identities, as a Corporate employee of El-tek and as a Division President (as either the Manufacturing or the Sales Division – Chris Carlson was the President of the Manufacturing Division). In the manipulation conditions (conflict and compatibility) a paragraph was added at the end of the case in which the participants were told that they also had two other identities family member (son/daughter) and volunteer in a charity organization. These identities were chosen as they had the potential to be realistic for any of the students. In addition, these identities were completely unrelated to the issues to be negotiated in the case. Conflict or compatibility between these identities was induced with a paragraph describing how these identities were conflicting or compatible with other identities. The stimulus paragraph is included in Appendix 2.

The participants received their role materials a week before the case. Upon coming to class the following week, the students were told to read over their case materials once more just to refresh their memories (this was to reinforce the manipulation paragraph for those in the experimental conditions). After reading their materials, the participants negotiated for an hour and then completed a post-hoc survey on the negotiation process. During the in-class debrief participants reported that they were unaware of the manipulation.

**Independent Variables**

The experimental conditions (conflict and compatibility compared to the control group) were used as independent variables.

**Dependent Variables**
The case has an integrative outcome, based on the joint gains for the dyad (i.e., which represents the gain for the corporation El-Tek as a whole) and a distributive component, based on the individual gains for each person in the dyad (which represents the gain for each division that the participants represent within the corporation). Individuals reported both outcomes. The mean level of joint gain was used as a dependent variable for integrative problem solving, since individuals needed to focus on both their own and the other party’s goals and interests to arrive at a high joint gain. The case was also structured such that there was one solution which maximized the joint gain (the pareto-efficient solution). Whether dyads reached the pareto-efficient solution or not was used as another dependent variable.

In addition, psychological measures of perceptions of both parties in the dyad were captured. One measure was a scale of affective trust (McAllister, 1996) indicating openness and constructive listening and sharing of ideas which consisted of four items asked of the counterpart (the person who did NOT get the manipulated role of Chris Carlson). Sample items included “We both freely shared our ideas, feeling and hopes for MA and AC”, “I talked freely to my counterpart about his/her difficulties and felt s/he was listening”, and “My counterpart responded constructively to my problems” (responses were scored on a 5-point Likert scale of 1=not at all to 5=very much) (Mean=4.16 s.d=.87; Cronbach’s alpha=.89). A second measure was of cooperativeness and consisted of three items. This was asked of the participants who were in the manipulated role of Chris Carlson, and they rated both themselves and their counterpart on cooperativeness. Sample items included “My counterpart was extremely cooperative during the negotiation” and “My counterpart was extremely affiliative during the negotiation” (responses were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=not at all to 5=very much) (Mean for
cooperativeness of other = 4.13, s.d.=.78; Cronbach’s alpha=.85 and Mean for cooperativeness of self = 4.02, s.d.=.75; Cronbach’s alpha=.81)

A manipulation check using the conflict and compatibility items from Study 1 was included, however, items only referred to the two identities of El-tek and Corporate President. Consistent with the manipulation, since Division and El-Ttek identities were specifically not treated differently across the conditions in the stimulus design, there were no differences across conditions regarding the amount of conflict and compatibility experienced among the Division and El-Tek identities. In addition, a single item measure asking how positively they felt was used. This should be related to the manipulation of conflict and compatibility among the other identities, as one of the underlying mechanisms for the influence of conflict and compatibility among multiple identities is through emotion. Individuals in the compatibility condition reported feeling significantly more positive than individuals in the control condition (Mean positive mood for compatibility condition 4.4 (0.81) < Mean positive mood for control condition 3.80 (0.78)), t(29)=2.59, p<.05) and marginally more positive than individuals in the conflict condition (t(29)=1.74, p=.09).

**Results**

An ANOVA examining the average joint gains by condition showed that the overall F (2, 37)=6.581, p=.006 was significant, and subsequent a-priori contrast analyses showed that dyads in the conflicting identities condition made significantly lower joint gains than those in the compatible identities or control conditions (Mean joint gains in the conflict condition = 143.25 (s.d.=11.98) < Mean joint gain in the compatibility condition 152.45 (4.15), t(37)=-2.853, p=.007and the control condition 153.33 (4.24),t(37)=-3.258, p=.002) (See Table 3). Thus,
hypothesis 1 is supported; an individual’s experience of conflict among multiple identities can decrease integrative interpersonal problem solving, such that they experience lower joint gains.

INSERT TABLE 3

Similarly, only 30% of dyads in the conflicting identities condition reached the pareto-efficient solution compared to over 60% of dyads in the compatible identities condition and over 70% of dyads in the control condition. A logistic regression with two dummies for conflicting identities and compatible identities (comparing both categories to the control category) showed that this difference between conditions was significant, such that the odds of dyads in the conflicting identities condition reaching the pareto efficient solution is less by a factor of 10 than the odds of dyads in the control condition (B=-2.30, Exp (B)=0.1, p=.009), while there was no difference between the compatible identities condition and the control in reaching the pareto efficient solution (See Table 4).

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Furthermore, counterparts in the dyad, i.e., those in the role that did not receive the manipulation but negotiated with a partner that had received the conflicting identities manipulation, rated the openness and constructive sharing and listening to problems in the dyad as significantly lower than counterparts in the compatibility conditions (Mean of counterpart’s rating of openness in the conflicting identities condition=3.97 (1.02)< Mean of counterpart’s rating of openness in the
compatible identities condition = 4.39 (.78), t(37) = -2.15, p < .05) although these differences were not different between compatibility and control conditions (see Figure 4).

There was no support for hypothesis 2 regarding compatibility among multiple identities. Indeed, in terms of joint gains, dyads in the compatibility condition did as well as those in the control condition. However, a closer look at the distributive component of the agreements reached indicates that individuals in the compatibility condition were more likely to give away a portion of the greater joint gains than those in the control condition. As the means in Table 3 show, contrast analyses indicate that individuals in the compatibility condition made less profit themselves than those in the control condition (Mean AC profit in the compatibility condition = 64.7, s.d. = 10.41 < Mean AC profit in the control condition = 83.74, s.d. = 15.47) and gave more of the profit to their counterparts than those in the control condition (Mean MA profit in the compatibility condition = 87.75, s.d. = 9.324 > Mean MA profit in the control condition = 69.59, s.d. = 16.79).

Consistent with the above, participants in the compatibility condition rated the other party as being significantly more cooperative than the control condition (Mean cooperativeness of counterpart in the compatibility condition = 4.3 (.72) > Mean cooperativeness of counterpart in the control condition = 3.7 (.64), t(29) = 2.496, p < .05), and participants in the compatibility condition also rated themselves as being more cooperative than those in the control condition (Mean cooperativeness of self in the compatibility condition = 4.24 (.70) > 3.83 (.86), t(29) = 2.218, p < .05). Thus, even though compatibility among identities did not serve to enhance integrative
interpersonal problem solving in comparison to the control group, it did serve to enhance an extremely positive and cooperative approach to the other party, and decreased participant’s performance in looking after their own interests in resolving the problem (See Figure 5).

INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE

Discussion

The results of Study 2 are consistent with the findings of Study 1 that compatibility among identities may not increase the ability to integratively problem solve, but conflict among identities certainly hinders integrative problem solving. The findings indicate that conflict among identities is sufficient to induce more self-focused and competitive motives and behaviors in an interpersonal problem solving situation, such that individuals are not able to maximize joint gains. Indeed, the counterpart’s ratings of the interaction indicate that the effect of conflicting identities on one party is experienced and felt by the other party in a problem situation, even though only one party received the direct effects of the manipulation. It seems as though an individual’s internal state of conflict among identities was manifested such that the counterpart who did not receive the manipulation was also psychologically and behaviorally influenced. On the other hand, compatibility may not increase the ability to reach an integrative solution compared to the control group, but the findings of Study 2 suggest that compatibility among identities may influence individuals to be less distributive, such that individuals experiencing compatibility among identities are claiming a smaller share of a larger pie they helped create.

General Discussion
The results of the above studies show that individual’s intrapsychic experiences of conflict and compatibility across multiple identities can influence their interactions with others, specifically in terms of problem solving motivations and behaviors that are relevant to work relationships. In Study 1, individuals reported their chronic experiences of conflict and compatibility among multiple identities and conflict among their identities was negatively associated with integrative interpersonal problem solving orientation. In Study 2, individuals were subject to an experimental manipulation of conflict and compatibility among multiple identities, and conflict among identities had a negative impact on dyadic outcomes. However, temporary activation of compatibility among identities in Study 2 led to an increase in cooperativeness with participants giving more away on on the distributive outcomes in a problem situation. One reason the compatibility and control conditions may be similar is because the El-Tek negotiation is set within an organization, thus even the control condition may have a certain level of compatibility inherent in the organizational structure and identities embedded in the case. Future work should try to see if the control and compatibility conditions may differ in an inter-organizational negotiation setting.

Some of the findings have implications for managers and policymakers attempting to reduce and manage interpersonal conflict. One implication of both these studies is the negative effect of intrapsychic identity conflict on interpersonal outcomes. A second implication arising from the temporary activation of conflict and compatibility in Study 2 is the potential for organizational intervention. For instance, if we think of organizations that require individuals to enact organizational identities, while leaving other important identities at the door, such as their ethnic, racial or religious identities, managers could unintentionally be sowing the seeds for interpersonal conflict and aggression at work. On the other hand, compatibility among identities
alone may enhance accommodation rather than integrative solutions to problems at work. Ultimately, helping members who carry multiple identities and affiliations manage the degree of conflict or compatibility amongst their identities, through leadership or policies could have implications for conflict or violence experienced in organizations.

This paper contributes to our understanding of multiple identities by showing the negative effects of conflict among multiple identities and by showing some effects of compatibility that might be positive or negative depending upon the organization’s goals. Subsequent research can begin to untangle important mediators and moderators of how people experience multiple identities, for example, by examining mediators such as cognitive flexibility or affect and moderators such as situational constraints. Furthermore, in this paper, the identity network approach is only just being introduced (as explained in Study 1), future research could also explore how the network structure influences interpersonal problem solving. While the current literature on a wide range of conflict behaviors has proven the importance of a single identity in motivating individuals’ engagement in conflict, these studies provides a more fine-grained picture of the relationship between multiple identities and problem solving. The ideas proposed in these studies represent part of a larger research agenda on multiple identities and identity networks in relation to intergroup and interpersonal conflict (Ramarajan, 2007). In a world where social, political and organizational boundaries are constantly being crossed, individuals’ sense of themselves as members of multiple social groups and enactors of multiple roles will only increase (Ashforth, 2001; Appadurai, 1996). Our understanding of the challenges and opportunities presented by multiple bases of identification for managing social conflict in diverse and fluid societies should keep pace.
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Figure 1: Conflicting and Compatible Relationships in the Identity Network

Conflicting Relationships Among Multiple Identities

Compatible Relationships Among Multiple Identities

Note: Thickness of line represents level of conflict or compatibility between any pair of identities.
Figure 2. Identity Network Matrix for a sample Conflict or Compatibility item (Q1)

Note: X1-X5 are separate identities listed by the student, and each y1 is the score for the relationship between that pair of identities for this particular item.

Q1: I struggle to maintain a(n) A and B way of doing things (conflict identity question)
Q?: Give a compatibility identity question here too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 Compatibility Network of a participant

Note: weight of line = level of compatibility (numbers on the line correspond represent 1=low compatibility 5=high compatibility)
Figure 4. Study 2 Counterpart’s Rating of Openness during the Negotiation

![Graph showing Openness ratings for Conflict, Compatibility, and Control conditions.]

Note: Only conflict and compatibility are significantly different.

Figure 5. Study 2 Ratings of Cooperativeness of Other Party and Cooperativeness of Self by Participant in the Experimental Role

![Graph showing Cooperativeness ratings for Other Party and Self conditions, comparing Compatibility and Control groups.]
Table 1: Study 1 Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</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 Conflict Among Identities</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Compatibility Among Identities</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.274(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other Party's Fault</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Amount of Fee Shared</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>0.226(*)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.684(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Anger</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.614(**)</td>
<td>-0.329(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Foreign Country Experience</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=76
* p<.05, ** p<.01
Table 2: Study 1 Regression with Dependent Variables Amount of Fee Shared (Concession-making) and Other Party’s Fault (Lack of Cooperative Orientation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regression 1 (Amount of Fee Shared)</th>
<th>Regression 2 (Other Party's Fault)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>68.74***</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Country Experience</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Among Identities</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility Among Identities</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=70. Entries in columns represent standardized regression coefficients.

Table 3. Study 2 Average Joint and Individual Gains Across Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>El-Tek Profit (Integrative Problem Solving Indicator)</th>
<th>Profit of Counterpart’s Division</th>
<th>Profit of Experimental Role’s Division (Distributive Problem Solving Indicator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>143.25 (11.98) $^{a,b}$</td>
<td>71.08 (16.61)$^a$</td>
<td>72.17 (16.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>152.45 (4.15) $^b$</td>
<td>87.75 (9.32)$^b$</td>
<td>64.7 (10.41)$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>153.33 (4.24)</td>
<td>69.59 (16.79)</td>
<td>83.74 (15.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$ indicates that means differs from the compatibility condition at p<.05 and $^b$ indicates that means differs from control condition at p<.05.

Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 4. Study 2 Logistic Regression with Pareto-Efficient Solution as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-2.303</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>6.916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 Conflict and Compatibility Among Multiple Identities

Several items for the frequency of conflicting and compatible relations between identities A and B, were adapted from Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, (2005) (Bicultural identity integration scale); Settles et al., (2002) (role interference and role enhancement scale). The rest were generated based upon the theoretical definition of conflicting and compatible relationships provided above. All responses were rated from very rarely=1 to very frequently =5.

Conflicting relationships between identities:
Of the times when you think of yourself as a(n) A AND a(n) B, how often do you think:
1) I struggle to maintain a(n) A and B way of doing things
2) Life would be easier if I was a(n) A OR a(n) B
3) Being a “good” A interferes with being a “good” B
4) I feel an A way of doing things and a B way of doing things are opposed

Compatible relationships between identities:
Of the times when you think of yourself as a(n) A AND a(n) B, how often do you think:
5) I am glad I am both a(n) A and a(n) B
6) I rely on both a(n) A and a(n) B way of doing things
7) I am a better A because of my B identity
8) I appreciate being a(n) A more because I am also a(n) B
Appendix 2:

Conflicting Identities Condition:

In addition to your roles as Division President and Corporate employee, you are also balancing other responsibilities, primarily to your family and community. Your role as Audio Components’ President is often opposed to your role as a family member. For instance, today, just as you were getting ready for your meeting with Magnetics, your parents called because they had not spoken to you in months. You are also going to attend the board meeting of a community charity for which you volunteer. You feel that you often have to make trade-offs between your Audio Components’ responsibilities and your responsibilities to your family and community. Last week, you ran into the El-tek CEO at your charity’s fundraiser and couldn’t decide if you should talk about the charity or work. It is easier to think about yourself as the Audio Components’ President, rather than also as a family member or community member. But these other roles are very important to you, too, and you find that you are often struggling to choose between one role and another.

Compatible Identities Condition:

In addition to your roles as Division President and Corporate employee, you are also balancing other responsibilities, primarily to your family and community. Your role as Audio Components’ President is often enhanced by your role as a family member. For instance, today, just as you were getting ready for your meeting with Magnetics, you spoke with your parents. You are also going to attend the board meeting of a community charity for which you volunteer. You feel that you often have complementarities between your Audio Components’ responsibilities and your responsibilities to your family and community. Last week, you ran into the El-tek CEO at your charity’s fundraiser and you talked about both the charity and work. It is easy to think about yourself as the Audio Components’ President and also as a family member or community member. Since these other roles are very important to you, too, you find that you are often appreciative of the fact that you can move between one role and another.