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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the last ten years, there has been much research on the antecedents of organizational justice and the effects arising out of employees’ perceptions of fairness or lack of fairness related to organizational outcomes and procedures (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Schminke, Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2000). Perceptions of fairness have been associated with job satisfaction (Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997), organizational citizenship behaviors (Moorman, 1991; Organ & Moorman, 1993), organizational commitment (Daley & Geyer, 1995), employee theft (Greenberg, 1990), job performance (Gilliland, 1994; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991), turnover (Dailey & Kirk), organizational retaliatory behaviors (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), and stress (Zohar, 1995). Furthermore, organizational justice has been examined in a variety of organizational contexts, including drug testing (Konovsky & Cropanzano), personnel selection (Gilliland, 1993, 1994; Smither, Reilly, Milsap, Perlman & Stoffey, 1993), performance appraisal (Greenberg, 1986), restructuring of job classifications (Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995), and workplace status (Greenberg, 1988). Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) discussed the notion that some aspects of organizational justice might be context sensitive. This study will focus on fairness perceptions in the context of personnel selection and the impact of team membership and racial demographics on such perceptions.
Several researchers have examined or proposed various factors that may influence perceptions of justice in selection outcomes and procedures, with most emphasis placed on the perceptions of applicants (Arvey & Sackett, 1993; Gilliland, 1993, 1994; see Ryan & Ployhart, 2000 for a review of this literature). In addition, there is support that perceptions of fairness in the outcomes and procedures related to selection may be influenced by demographic characteristics, such as race or gender (Ryan & Ployhart). In studies involving the choice of one of two candidates, perceptions of justice may be influenced by the race or gender of the selected candidate, the race or gender of the other candidate, and in the situation of a third party evaluator, the race or gender of such evaluator (Saal & Moore, 1993; Sherman, Smith & Sherman, 1983). Saal and Moore found that men and women evaluated the promotion of a candidate of the opposite sex over an equally qualified candidate of the same sex as less fair than the promotion of a candidate of the same sex over an equally qualified candidate of the opposite sex. Sherman, Smith and Sherman found that Black evaluators perceived the promotion of a White candidate over a Black candidate as more unfair than the promotion of a Black candidate over a White candidate, the promotion of a White candidate over a White candidate, or the promotion of a Black candidate over a Black candidate.

Self-categorization theory (Turner, 1985), social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), the similarity–attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971) and other social psychology theories suggest that individuals will generally prefer the selection of a candidate with similar salient demographic characteristics over an equally qualified dissimilar candidate. Accordingly, White individuals may prefer the selection of a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate. This preference combined with the
organizational justice theories of relative deprivation (Crosby, 1984) and referent cognitions (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Folger & Martin, 1986) suggests that White individuals will perceive the selection of a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate as more fair than the selection of a Black candidate over an equally qualified White candidate. One purpose of this study is to examine this proposal.

Most research with respect to perceptions of selection decisions has focused on the perceptions of the candidates or of neutral third parties. In the work place, however, selection decisions, whether related to initial hiring, promotion or lateral transfers, also affect and may be assessed by other employees. It is anticipated, for example, that the preference for one candidate over another will be stronger if the individual assessing the selection decision is a member of a team for which the selection is being made. Presumably, a team member will have more at stake than a third party because he or she will have the opportunity to actually interact and work with the selected candidate. Thus, another purpose of this study is to examine differences in perceptions of selection fairness between members and nonmembers of a team for which the candidate is being considered. In addition, relational demography, which focuses on the similarities and dissimilarities between an individual’s demographic characteristics and the demographic characteristics of a group of which the individual is a member, proposes that it is an individual’s relative demographic characteristics rather than an individual’s absolute demographic characteristic that may influence work-related attitudes (Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). The preference felt by a White individual for a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate may be tempered or heightened depending on the proportion of Blacks and Whites already on the team. The
third purpose of this study is to show that the racial composition of the team for which a
candidate is selected may also influence the perception of selection fairness.
CHAPTER 2
THE EFFECTS OF CANDIDATE RACE, TEAM MEMBERSHIP, AND TEAM RACIAL COMPOSITION ON FAIRNESS PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTION DECISIONS

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to an individual’s or a group’s perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from an organization and the behavioral responses arising out of such perceptions (James, 1993). It does not specify what should be done; rather it focuses on perceptions of what is fair (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). An event is just or fair if someone perceives it to be just or fair (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, preface). In this context, the terms justice and fairness can be used interchangeably (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). Questions about justice in an organizational setting arise whenever resources are allocated (Cropanzano & Greenberg).

Whether the concept of organizational justice is unidimensional or consists of two, three or four distinct factors is still unsettled. The two most studied dimensions of organizational justice are 1) distributive justice, the fairness of decision outcomes (Adams, 1965; Leventhal, 1976), and 2) procedural justice, the fairness of the processes that lead to decision outcomes (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). These two dimensions of organizational justice are now well accepted by most researchers (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Schminke, Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2000). Several researchers also identify a third dimension of organizational
justice, interactional justice, which is the interpersonal treatment people receive as procedures are enacted (Bies & Moag, 1986). Other researchers, however, view interactional justice as a subset of procedural justice (Colquitt; Schminke, Ambrose & Cropanzano). Greenberg (1993) suggested a four factor model by distinguishing interpersonal justice, the respect and sensitivity aspect of interactional justice, and informational justice, the explanation aspect of interactional justice. According to Colquitt, there are many reasons for the confusion, including researchers’ use of overlapping definitions and item measures of the four dimensions.

The different dimensions of justice are difficult to untangle. Moorman (1991) demonstrated that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice are distinct, yet correlated. Colquitt (2001) found evidence to support the validity of a four factor approach. Evidence also exists that procedural justice and distributive justice may interact (Brokner and Wiesenfeld, 1996; Greenberg, 1987; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992), although there are also findings that they are simply additive (research cited in Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). Under different circumstances, either distributive or procedural justice may be more important. Folger and Konovsky (1989) found that distributive justice accounted for more variance with respect to pay satisfaction and that procedural justice accounted for more variance with respect to trust in supervisor and organizational commitment. McFarlin and Sweeney found that distributive justice was a more important predictor of pay satisfaction and job satisfaction, while procedural justice was a better predictor of organizational commitment and evaluation of supervisor. Other studies have found procedural justice a better predictor of job satisfaction (research cited in Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Cropanzano and Greenberg suggested
that distributive justice primarily influences one’s satisfaction with the outcome or the results of some decision, and procedural justice primarily influences attitudes and behaviors that are relevant to the larger organization, such as trust in management or loyalty. The relationship between the two dimensions, however, may also fluctuate over time (Lowe and Vodanavich, 1995).

Fairness perceptions of selection outcomes, whether with respect to hiring or promotion, have been identified with distributive justice, and fairness perceptions of the procedures followed with respect to selection decisions have been identified with procedural justice (Gilliland, 1993). The purpose here is not to tease apart the separate effects of outcome and procedure, but to examine a situation where the outcome is known and the procedure is ambiguous.

**Perceptions of Justice in Personnel Selection**

Fairness has been viewed as an important aspect of an applicant’s perception of selection outcomes and methods (Arvey & Sackett, 1993; Gilliland, 1993; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000). Such perceptions may affect how applicants perceive the organization, whether applicants join the organization, and future behaviors of applicants whether or not they join the organization (Ryan & Ployhart). Based on empirical findings and theory, several researchers have proposed models or lists of determinants that are likely to impact fairness perceptions of selection systems. Arvey and Sackett proposed a set of factors, including job relatedness, use of illegal variables, invasiveness, ability to fake, consistency across candidates, confidentiality, opportunity for reconsideration, company history, selection ratio, opportunity to review score and scoring, company history, and thoroughness of coverage of knowledge, skills, and abilities. Gilliland proposed a model
in which overall fairness perceptions of the selection outcome and overall fairness perceptions of the selection process are determined by the extent to which distributive justice rules and procedural justice rules, respectively, have been satisfied or violated. The procedural justice rules include job relatedness, opportunity to perform, reconsideration opportunity, consistency of administration, feedback, selection information, and interpersonal treatment. The primary distributive justice factors are the hiring decision itself and expectations of the likelihood of obtaining the job based on comparisons to past qualifications and past success or failure in obtaining a job. Furthermore, Gilliland proposed that the satisfaction or violation of the procedural rules moderates the distributive relationship, and the satisfaction or violation of the distributive rules moderates the procedural relationship.

Reviewing the literature from 1985 to 1999 with respect to assessments of selection systems, Ryan and Ployhart (2000) concluded that the outcome of the process is a major determinant of favorable perceptions. An applicant who is hired is more likely to view the outcome and the process as fair. Other determinants of selection perceptions include the type of job for which the applicant is applying, job and organization attractiveness, information provided to the applicant about the procedure, information provided to the applicant about the decision, the combination of tests and procedures used, the presence of affirmative action efforts, the organization’s history of discrimination, individual differences, and racial differences. With respect to promotional decisions, current members of the organization are also influenced by identification with the organization, and possibly, by the degree and kind of information that individuals might have in their possession regarding selection procedures (Ryan & Ployhart).
The Impact of Race and Gender on Perceptions of Fairness in Personnel Selection

Most of the studies examining the impact of race or gender on perceptions of fairness in the context of personnel selection have focused on reactions to affirmative action and preferential hiring. For example, perceptions of affirmative action and preferential hiring have been found to be a function of the demographics of the targeted (beneficiary) group. Murrell, Dietz-Uhler, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Drout (1994) found that affirmative action was resisted by Whites when the targets were Black, but supported when the targets were elderly or handicapped. Richard and Kirby (1997) found that White male undergraduates who were asked to imagine they were not hired for a job because of the preferential hiring of either a black male or a white woman under an affirmative action plan felt less resentment and had a more favorable opinion of the diversity program when the beneficiary was a black male. Doverspike and Arthur (1995) suggested that although selection based on affirmative action often leads to negative reactions, the effects are moderated by numerous factors including sex, race, type of action, implementation procedure, qualifications or information on competence of applicants, and history of affirmative action in the firm. They further speculated that reactions of women and Blacks, although both are targeted by affirmative action, may be different, and that such differences may be related to judgments about past discrimination and relative group deprivation.

Perceptions of justice with respect to preferential hiring and affirmative action are complicated by the fact that affirmative action is often viewed as leading to the hiring of unqualified individuals (Nacoste, 1987). Furthermore the perceptions of fairness are influenced by justifications or reasons given for the preferential treatment. Bobocel and
Farrell (1996) found that perceptions of justice by White male observers following a sex-based promotion decision were influenced by the type of justification given for the decision. Similarly, Richard and Kirby (1999) found that the justification of a diversity program influenced perceptions of procedural justice, even when distributive justice was positive. Singer (1992), using undergraduates to assess the fairness of certain scenarios dealing with the preferential selection of one of two candidates for a training program, found that both male and females participants (all European New Zealanders) viewed preferential selection of female candidates over male candidates or ethnic minority candidates over white candidates as unfair. Males perceived sex-based selection (females over males) as unfair, and Whites perceived ethnic-based selection as unfair. The unfairness was also felt by the minority (female) it was intended to protect. Furthermore, the degree of unfairness increased as the discrepancy in performance relevant merits (scores on a qualification test) between the two candidates increased. Similar results were found in a second study where participants were asked to assume they were one of the candidates in determining fairness with respect to ethnic minority issues.

**Selection Between Equally Qualified Candidates Without Stated Demographic Preference**

Few studies have examined perceptions of hiring or promotional fairness with respect to the race or gender of the candidates when the selection decision is made between two equally qualified candidates and no explanation is given for the decision. Sherman, Smith and Sherman (1983) gave Black and White undergraduates a court case scenario involving a clothing manufacturer and the hiring of one of two employees. The participants were told that the non-promoted employee “filed a suit appealing the
company’s decision because he felt that variables other than performance had been taken into account.” In the materials given to the participants, both employees were described as in their early thirties with similar job experiences and high ratings on their work. There was no indication that one employee was more qualified than the other. Due to the lack of information about qualifications and other inputs, the researchers described the scenario as an ambiguous situation where participants might imagine that racial bias could be operating. Participants were asked to assess the fairness of the promotion. The difference in conditions was the race of the two (male) employees: White promoted over White, Black promoted over White, White promoted over Black, and Black promoted over Black. The researchers found significant main effects for race and sex of participants. More specifically, Black participants perceived the company’s decisions as more unfair than the White participants. Female participants found the decisions more unfair than male participants. Black participants, however, viewed the promotion of a White employee over a Black employee as more unfair than the other conditions. Thus, the researchers qualified their finding of a main effect for race of participants stating that Black participants see the decisions more unfairly than Whites, except when a Black employee is promoted over a White employee. Female participants, like Blacks, perceived more injustice than male participants. The researchers speculated this result might be related to women’s own experience with discrimination, which might make them more sensitive to the possibility of racial discrimination. Unexpectedly, however, White participants saw no differences with respect to fairness across the different racial conditions. The researchers concluded that because of discrimination due to their race, Blacks were more sensitive to the racial context of the selection decision than Whites.
Saal and Moore (1993) extended Sherman, Smith and Sherman’s (1983) research with respect to sex differences to also look at the sex type of the job. Using undergraduate students reading summaries of fictitious court cases with respect to promotion decisions, they found that men and women perceived promotion of a member of the opposite sex instead of a member of their own sex as less fair than any of the other three possible scenarios (opposite sex instead of opposite sex, same sex instead of same sex, or same sex instead of opposite sex). This was regardless of whether the job in question was perceived as masculine or sex-neutral. Yet perceptions of the candidates’ qualifications were not influenced by subjects’ sex, job sex-type, or promotion decision. This was not surprising since a pilot study had indicated that the qualifications of the male and female candidates were viewed as equivalent based on their fictional biographies. The researchers questioned how such different perceptions of fairness, however, could be explained in the situation where the participants saw the candidates as equally qualified. The researchers speculated that “Women who see a man promoted over an equally qualified woman may interpret that promotion decision as unfair because it violates the spirit of affirmative action, which advocates promotion … of members of historically disadvantaged… groups when majority- and disadvantaged group members’ job-related qualifications are perceived as equal….On the other hand, men who see a woman promoted over an equally qualified man may view the promotion as unfair because it is consistent with the spirit of affirmative action…. [which is] sex-based, preferential organizational treatment” (p.108). Looking at the results of Sherman, Smith and Sherman as well as their own results, the researchers in Saal and Moore suggested that employers who assume that workers are now willing to focus exclusively on
candidates’ qualifications in assessing promotion fairness, without to regard to race or
gender, may be very much mistaken.

Saal and Moore (1993) did not attempt to explain the discrepancies between their
findings and the Sherman, Smith and Sherman (1983) findings with respect to
perceptions of promotional fairness by the dominant group across experimental
conditions (lack of same-race bias in Whites in one study; presence of same-sex bias in
males in the other study) simply referring to the years between studies, different subject
samples, different procedures, and the possibility that sex and race may no longer
influence perceptions of promotion fairness in the same way. The lack of differentiation
across experimental conditions for the White participants in Sherman, Smith and
Sherman is indeed puzzling, however. It is interesting to note that participants in
Sherman, Smith and Sherman were told that the purpose of the study was to examine
student perceptions of court decisions “as part of an inquiry into the judicial system.”
Participants were also asked to state their race, sex, and age, as well as the race, sex and
age of the worker who filed the law suit, before answering questions about fairness. In
addition, they were asked about only one scenario. In contrast, participants in Saal and
Moore, were told the study was to examine decision making processes of court judges
and were first given a distracting scenario of an ice cream manufacturer involving a
dispute over butterfat content. Finally, the White participants in Sherman, Smith and
Sherman came from a private college in Maryland and the participants in Saal and Moore
came from Kansas State University.

In a study that does not directly address fairness, but examined recommendations
of job candidates, Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) asked samples of White college
undergraduates in 1988-1989, as well as in 1998-1999, to review a description of a job
candidate in a 2 (race of candidate) by 3 (qualifications: clearly strong, ambiguous,
clearly weak) design. When the qualifications of the candidates were ambiguous (i.e.,
having neither strong qualifications nor weak qualifications), Black candidates were
recommended less strongly than comparably equal White candidates. There was a
tendency to respond to ambiguous qualifications of Blacks as if they were weak
qualifications, and to respond to ambiguous qualifications of Whites as if they were
strong qualifications. No differences in recommendations were found for candidates with
clearly strong qualifications or for candidates with clearly weak qualifications; that is,
Black and White candidates with high qualifications were equally recommended, and
Black and White candidates with low qualifications were equally not recommended.
Although fairness of selection was not directly addressed, one could assume that the
participants would have viewed as more fair the hiring of the candidate that they
recommended. Thus, when qualifications were neither very strong nor very weak, the
hiring of a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate presumably would
have been viewed as more fair than the hiring of a Black candidate over an equally
qualified White candidate. Dovidio and Gaertner explained their results as a
manifestation of aversive racism, which they speculated may be rooted in social
categorization processes, reflecting in-group favoritism and out-group derogation.

**Possible Explanations for Impact of Candidates’ Race or Gender on Fairness Perceptions**

James (1993) has suggested that social categories and intergroup relations can
have a significant impact on perceptions of organizational justice. According to James,
this possibility may be explained by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner,
(1979) which proposes that one’s self-identity and sense of self-worth may be derived in part from group memberships. The importance of group membership can in turn lead to the development and application of two sets of rules for assessing outcomes and procedures, one set for members of “our” group and one set for members of the “other” group. Thus, according to James, perceptions of the fairness of organizational events may vary if they are viewed pursuant to salient group identities. James also points out that in the United States racial/ethnic and sex distinctions are highly salient across many situations (citing Allen, Wilder & Atkinson, 1983; Tajfel & Turner).

In addition, the similarity-attraction paradigm and self-categorization theory, both of which are complementary to social identity theory, suggest that individuals will prefer to associate with other individuals who are perceived as similar. The similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971) proposes that individuals tend to be more attracted to, and more comfortable with, other individuals who are more similar to them (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). According to Tsui, Xin, & Egan (1995), “similarity in demographics leads to an inference or assumption about similarity in values, beliefs and attitudes. Such perceived or assumed similarity enhances attraction because of the self-enhancing motivation similar to that predicted by social identity theory. Furthermore, a presumed knowledge of the other individual’s values, beliefs and attitudes leads to a sense of predictability, comfort, and confidence regarding the other individual’s likely behavior in the future” (p. 108). Outwardly apparent demographics are often used as a basis to infer similarity in values, beliefs, and attitudes and to form instantaneous interpersonal attraction (Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui, Xin & Egan, 1995). According to Haertel, Douthitt, Haertel & Douthitt (1999), perceptual similarity to others has been
shown to be related to managers’ evaluations of subordinates, leader-member exchanges, and recruiter evaluations of applicants. Self-categorization theory (Turner, 1985) proposes that “individuals take socially defined categories or groups into account when making evaluations about others… [And that] groups including the self are likely to be regarded positively whereas outgroup individuals are regarded in opposite terms. This can lead to anxiety in dealing with outgroup individuals and avoidance of them” (Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997 p. 353). According to Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly (1992), individuals may use social characteristics such as age, race or organizational membership to classify themselves into social groups.

Furthermore, White evaluators may prefer the selection of a White candidate over a Black candidate due to specific negative feelings and beliefs about Blacks. This factor has impact not only with respect to individuals who openly (or at least to themselves) admit such attitudes, but also with respect to Whites who believe they are not prejudiced, even egalitarian, but still maintain unconscious negative attitudes toward Blacks (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000). This aversive racism arises out of two widespread, conflicting influences: a) biases related to normal cognitive (e.g., in-group favoritism), motivational (e.g., personal or group self-interest), and sociocultural processes (e.g., historical racist traditions) that may create negative racial feelings, and b) sincere convictions about fairness, justice and racial equality (Dovidio & Gaertner; Murrell, Dietz-Uhler, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Drout, 1994). Due to these conflicting influences, it is presumed that the racial attitudes of a large portion of well-educated, liberal Whites in the United States are subject to the aversive racism framework (Dovidio & Gaertner). Aversive racists will not discriminate when such discrimination would be obvious to others or to themselves, but
are likely to discriminate when the bias is not obvious or can be justified on the basis of some other factor (Dovidio & Gaertner).

For many reasons, it is clear that individuals may prefer the selection of a candidate with similar salient demographic characteristics over a candidate who is dissimilar. Demographic attributes that are highly visible, such as race and gender, are routinely used as behavior guides by people in everyday life (Jackson, Stone & Alvarez, 1993; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui, Xin & Egan, 1995). It is therefore expected that evaluators of a selection decision, in general, will prefer the selection of a demographically similar candidate over the selection of an equally qualified dissimilar candidate. For example, Davis and Burnstein (1981) asked Black and White undergraduates to select from a list of potential group members those individuals with whom they would like to share a group. Overall, White participants chose fewer Blacks from the list than Black participants.

If an evaluator has a preference with respect to which candidate is selected, this preference can influence perceptions of justice with respect to the selection decision. As discussed by Folger and Cropanzano (1998, chap. 8), self-interest often biases perceptions of fairness. Folger (1998) has suggested that both distributive justice and procedural justice are little more than concerns about selfishness and self-interest. The impact of preferred outcomes on perceptions of justice can be further understood by examining organizational justice theories such as relative deprivation and referent cognitions theory which suggest that an evaluator will perceive the selection of a preferred outcome as more fair than the selection of a non-preferred outcome, especially
if the evaluator can also imagine a different procedure that would have produced the preferred outcome.

Relative Deprivation and Referent Cognition Theory

One of the earliest theories of organizational justice came out of a study by Stouffer and his colleagues of differences in promotion satisfaction between officers in the army air corps and officers in the military police in World War II (as described by Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). Officers in the air corps were promoted at a fast and steady rate while officers in the military police were promoted more slowly. Satisfaction with promotions, however, was higher in the military police. The researchers concluded that the difference was due to the use of different frames of reference. The officers in the air corps compared themselves to peers who moved rapidly up the ranks and thus saw themselves as unfairly treated. The officers in the military police compared themselves to peers who moved very slowly up the ranks and thus saw themselves as more fairly treated. The researchers suggested that perceptions of justice are determined in reference to some standard, and coined the term relative deprivation to describe the phenomenon that the deprivation and injustice felt by the officers was not absolute, but relative to some reference point (Cropanzano & Randall). Under this approach, perceptions of justice will vary depending on the nature of the comparison of the outcome (Cropanzano & Randall). Similarly, studies have shown that pay satisfaction is not highly correlated with the absolute amount of pay, but more influenced by the amount of pay received by members of the group with which the pay recipient compares him or herself (Martin, Price, Bies & Powers, 1979; Miceli & Lane, 1991; Sweeney, McFarlin & Inderrieden, 1990, all cited by Cropanzano & Randall). As discussed by Tolbert, Graham and
Andrews (1999), Crosby applied the concept of relative deprivation to explain the finding that men and women have similar levels of job satisfaction despite women’s lower earnings and less favorable working conditions, suggesting that women compare themselves to other women in assessing desired and actual outcomes, and thus have lower work expectations than men. Crosby’s early models of relative deprivation dealt only with outcomes, or distributive justice considerations, and had several preconditions for feelings of deprivation with respect to a desired outcome. These preconditions included a perception of entitlement to the outcome, a perception someone else possesses the outcome, thinking it is feasible to obtain the outcome, and having a lack of personal responsibility for not having the outcome (Crosby, 1984). Later modifications of the model took procedural justice into account, and reduced the number of preconditions. Crosby’s revised model has only two preconditions: the alternative outcome must be wanted (distributive aspect) and the individual must feel he or she deserves the alternative outcome (the procedural aspect; Crosby; Cropanzano & Randall). Under the revised model, people experience deprivation and a sense of grievance when there is a discrepancy between the actual outcome and the outcome they want and a discrepancy between the actual outcome and the outcome they deserve (Crosby). Crosby also predicted that “procedural resentments often masquerade as distributive resentments…” (p. 85).

As further pointed out by Crosby (1984), the term relative deprivation is sometimes used to refer to the “felt” deprivation, and other times to a theory of propositions about the antecedents and consequences of the emotion of discontent. The sense of felt deprivation is sometimes described or operationalized as a sense of
grievance, resentment, deprivation, dissatisfaction, unfairness, discontent, injustice, or getting less than one deserves (Crosby, 1984; Martin, 1981). Cropanzano and Randall (1995) refer to this aspect of relative deprivation as an attitude with cognitive, affective and behavioral components. The cognitive component includes perceptions of unfair or unjust treatment, and the affective component includes a sense of indignation and resentment.

Folger and colleagues (Folger, 1987; Mark & Folger, 1987) also propose a model of relative deprivation called referent cognitions theory (RCT). Under this theory relative deprivation may occur if the individual can imagine an alternative, more favorable outcome, and there is a low chance of receiving the alternative outcome in the future (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). The comparison standard is called a referent. The sources of referents may be prior experiences, social standards, or a person’s imagination (Folger, Rosenfield, Rheaueme, & Martin, 1983; Folger, Rosenfield, & Robinson, 1983). Two people with the same outcome may perceive different levels of fairness if they are using different referents (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998, preface). Folger and colleagues (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Folger & Martin, 1986) have added a procedural component to the RCT model requiring not only that the individual believe that he or she could have received an alternative outcome, but that he or she would have received the alternative outcome if alternative procedures were followed, and that such other procedures should have been followed (Cropanzano & Folger; Cropanzano & Randall, 1993). Thus, not only are there referent outcomes, but also referent procedures. Studies examining the RCT model have found that people are most likely to perceive they have been treated unfairly when they believe they would have received a better outcome if
different procedures had been used (Cropanzano & Folger; Grienberger, Rutte, & van Knippenberg, 1997). In addition, Folger (1987) has suggested that perceptions of unfairness will also depend on the likelihood of amelioration. Thus, if the alternative outcome is not likely to happen or be received in the near future, the sense of unfairness will be heightened.

With respect to the role of preferred outcomes and perceptions of fairness, Crosby’s revised relative deprivation model and Folger’s revised RCT model are very much alike. They both contain as key components (a) the possibility of another more desired outcome and (b) the possibility that if another procedure had been used the more desired outcome would have been obtained. In the context of selection between two candidates, the actual outcome (the selection of one candidate) and an alternative outcome (the selection of the other candidate) are salient and easily compared. If the alternative outcome is more desired, and if another procedure could have been used to select the more desired outcome, then it is likely that the selection will be viewed as unfair. Accordingly, it is expected that when selection procedures are ambiguous a White participant will view the selection of a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate to be more fair than the selection of a Black candidate over an equally qualified White candidate, especially if it is unlikely that the selection will be ameliorated in the near future. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H1. There will be a main effect of race of the selected candidate, such that White participants will perceive the selection of a White candidate as more fair than the selection of a Black candidate.
Team Membership

Research with respect to selection fairness has focused on perceptions by the candidates or by third party, neutral evaluators. In the workplace, however, the demographics of an employee who may be assessing the fairness of a hiring or promotion decision and the demographics of the candidates can not be considered without also considering a larger context. Many employees work in groups, committees, or teams. One purpose of this study is to extend the research with respect to perceptions of selection fairness to members of a team or group for which the candidate is being considered, e.g., a third party stakeholder. Self-categorization theory, social identity theory, and the similarity–attraction paradigm all suggest that many individuals prefer to work with individuals who are perceived to be similar, often based on demographic characteristics (Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Thus an evaluator of selection outcomes or procedures who will have the opportunity to work with one of the selected candidates may be more influenced by his or her perceived similarity to the candidates being considered for selection. It is proposed that team members looking at the possibility of a new member, assuming qualifications and skills of candidates to be equal, may be attracted to and feel more comfortable with a similar person, and more anxious about a dissimilar person, and these feelings in turn may heighten the team member’s perceptions of justice in the selection decision. According to Cox (1993, Chap. 8), when all else is equal, which frequently occurs in selection and promotion settings, in-group favoritism is likely to have an impact to some extent, because working with similar others has several benefits, including a sense that the behavior of others is more predictable and an increased likelihood of establishing a rapport. Accordingly, it is also hypothesized that:
H2. There will be an interaction between race of selected candidate and team membership on perceptions of fairness, such that (a) White participants who are members of a team for which the candidate is being selected will perceive the selection of a Black candidate as less fair than White participants who are not members of such team, and (b) White participants who are members of a team for which the candidate is being selected will perceive the selection of a White candidate as more fair than White participants who are not members of such team.

Research in the area of relational demography has shown that group racial composition and group gender composition can affect a group member’s behaviors and attitudes, and that such effects may vary depending on whether the member shares a salient demographic characteristic with the majority of the group or the minority of the group. Thus, it is possible that the demographics of the team to which an employee belongs may also influence perceptions of justice.

Relational Demography

There are three general approaches to the study of demographic characteristics in organizations: the categorical approach, the compositional approach, and the relational approach (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & Gutek, 1999, Chap. 2). The categorical approach, also referred to as simple demography (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989), focuses on the demographic characteristics of the individual independent of the demographic characteristics of any group or the organization as a whole. The compositional approach focuses on the distribution of demographic characteristics of a group or entity under study and its relation to group outcomes (Tsui & Gutek). Relational demographics combines the emphasis of the categorical approach and the compositional
approach and focuses on the relationship (similarities and dissimilarities) between an individual’s demographic characteristics and the demographic characteristics of a group of which the individual is a member (Tsui & O’Reilly; Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly; Tsui & Gutek). For example, the experience of a Black individual in a group consisting of mostly Black members (e.g. comfort) may be different than the experience of that same individual in a group of mostly White members (e.g. discomfort) (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly; Tsui & Gutek). Tsui and O’Reilly coined the term “relational demography” with respect to “the comparative demographic characteristics of members of dyads or groups who are in a position to engage in regular interactions” (p.403). The definition was later revised to refer to the similarity or dissimilarity between an individual and others in a group with respect to particular demographic characteristics (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly; Tsui, Egan & Xin, 1995). Actual interpersonal interaction is no longer assumed necessary for the effects of demographic similarity or dissimilarity (Tsui, Egan & Xin).

The effects of relational demography are explained by the same theories that were previously discussed with respect to the impact of demographics on perceptions of justice, such as the similarity-attraction paradigm (Riordan & Shore, 1997; Tolbert, Graham & Andrews, 1999; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui, Xin & Egan, 1995), self-categorization theory (Riordan & Shore; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997), and social identity theory (Riordan & Shore; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly). Each of these theories suggest that when individuals use race as a social category or for self-definition, their attitudes, affective responses and behaviors may be influenced not only by their racial similarity to other individuals, but also by the
racial composition of groups of individuals of which they are a member (Riordan & Shore; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly).

Demographic similarity or dissimilarity has been studied with respect to many job-related variables. Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) looked at six demographic variables (age, gender, race, education, company tenure and job tenure) with respect to superior-subordinate dyads. They found that increasing overall dissimilarity was associated with decreased perceived effectiveness by superiors, less personal attraction on the part of superiors for subordinates, and increased role ambiguity experienced by subordinates. Differences in sex and race were specifically associated with increased role ambiguity and unfavorable performance evaluations on the part of subordinates, and decreased attraction by the supervisors toward their subordinates. Tsui, Egan and O’Reilly (1992) found that increasing work unit diversity (especially sex and race) was associated with lower levels of organizational commitment, intent to stay, and psychological attachment among group members, and that Whites and men showed larger negative effects for increased heterogeneity than non-whites and women. Riordan and Shore (1997) studied gender, race-ethnicity and tenure in 98 work groups in a life insurance company. Similarity in race-ethnicity (but not gender or tenure) affected perceptions of advancement, group productivity and commitment to the work group. The patterns for Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, however, were not the same. Blacks had consistent attitudes toward advancement and perception of productivity across all three types of demographic composition (mostly white, 50/50, mostly minority). Work group commitment for Blacks, however, increased as group similarity increased. Whites perceived higher levels of work group productivity, advancement opportunities and work
group commitment in mostly White and 50/50 groups. That is, Whites reported lower levels of work group productivity, advancement opportunities and work group commitment only when in mostly minority groups. Hispanic subjects reported higher levels of all three work attitudes in the 50/50 group.

Wesolowski & Mossholder (1997) found that subordinates in mixed-race dyads had lower measures of job satisfaction and lower perceptions of procedural justice than subordinates in same-race dyads. They found no differences in mixed-age, mixed-gender, or mixed-education dyads. In a field study of cross functional project teams, members in teams that varied with respect to gender or racial composition, rated their teams as less effective than members of all-male or all-white teams, even though ratings by external evaluators showed no difference (Baugh & Graen, 1997). In the study described earlier by Davis and Burnstein (1981), where Black and White undergraduates were asked to select from a list of potential group members those individuals with whom they would like to share a group, the number of Black group members chosen increased for both Black and White participants as the number of Blacks on the list increased. Davis, Strube, and Cheng (1995) found that for both Black and White participants, perceptions of group atmosphere, group success, satisfaction with the group’s decision, and enjoyment of working with the others in the group, all varied as a function of the proportion of Blacks and Whites in the group (25%, 50%, or 75%). The relationship was not linear for most of the measures, however, with more positive perceptions occurring at a 50/50 proportion.

Influence of Group Composition on the Relationship Between Two Group Members

The demographic composition of a group may also have an impact on the reactions of one member of the group with respect to another member of the group. In a
discussion about the impact of demographic differences in supervisor-subordinate dyads, Tsui, Xin & Egan (1995) pointed out that the dyad must be considered in the context of the group proportions of the entire group of the supervisor’s subordinates. They proposed that “[c]ontextualizing the supervisor-subordinate dyad in the work group presents the possibility that both positive and negative aspects of social identification with the work group may moderate the impact of relational demography on the exchange relationship in any of the vertical dyads in the small group” (p.116). In other words, the relationship and dynamics between a female supervisor and a female subordinate may be very different in the context of all other subordinates being female as compared to the context of all other subordinates being male. Thus, the attraction and salience of gender similarity felt by both the supervisor and the subordinate toward each other may be heightened if the other subordinates are mostly male and may be diluted if the other subordinates are mostly female. When the other subordinates are also female, both the supervisor and the subordinate have other people with whom to interact and identify. On the other hand, it is suggested “that the reduced opportunity for social interaction with similar others [when the other subordinates are mostly male] may enhance the attractiveness of the only other female in the group for both the subordinate and the supervisor…” They point out that although they use gender to describe this situation, it would apply as well to race or other demographic attributes.

The possible impact of relational demography on perceptions related to new team members was recognized by Jackson, Stone and Alvarez (1993) who proposed that “Oldtimers (both individually and as a group) will be attracted to newcomers to the degree their relational demographic similarity is high….The anxiety experienced by
oldtimers (both individually and as a group) will be greater to the degree their relational demographic similarity to newcomers is low...[and]...[O]ldtimers will make negative judgments of [newcomers] to the degree their relational dissimilarity is large” (pp. 77, 78 & 80). Applying (a) the perspective of Tsui, Xin & Egan (1995) with respect to the heightening or dilution of similarity and attraction depending on group composition to (b) perceptions related to prospective new team members as described by Jackson, Stone and Alvarez, it appears that the similarity and preference felt for a new team member will be heightened or diluted by the particular demographic composition of the team.

Although these studies do not address perceptions of organizational fairness, it is clear that relational demography has an impact on a wide variety of organizational attitudes, outcomes and behaviors. As previously discussed, the formation of social/demographic categories and the resultant preference felt for others in similar demographic categories can influence fairness perceptions. Accordingly, it is proposed that the similarity and preference felt for a candidate with similar demographic characteristics will be stronger if the team composition includes fewer members of the relevant demographic group. Thus, the similarity and preference felt by a White member with respect to a White candidate may be stronger when there are fewer Whites on the team, and the similarity and preference felt by a Black member with respect to a Black candidate may be stronger if there are fewer Blacks on the team. Therefore, it is expected that

H3. There will be an interaction between race of selected candidate and team racial composition on perceptions of fairness, such that White participants (a) will perceive the selection of a Black candidate as more fair when the team consists of
a lower proportion of Blacks and less fair when the team the team consists of a higher proportion of Blacks, and (b) will perceive the selection of a White candidate as less fair when the team consists of a lower proportion of Blacks and more fair when the team consists of a higher proportion of Blacks.

Furthermore, it is also possible that when there are more Whites on the team the interaction between race of selected candidate and team membership will be different than when there are more Blacks on the team. This three-way interaction will be examined, although no prediction about the result is made.

As discussed and summarized by Folger and Cropanzano (1998, preface) employee perceptions of justice have been linked to job performance, withdrawal behaviors, cooperation with coworkers, work quality, theft, and stress. Perceptions of unfairness can lead to reduced employee morale, increased likelihood of turnover, and possibly, retaliation. Perceptions of fairness on the other hand can lead to commitment, intentions to stay, and helpful citizenship behaviors. Accordingly, employee perceptions of justice, including with respect to selection decisions, is a legitimate concern of organizations. As pointed out by Saal and Moore (1993), however, focusing exclusively on candidates’ qualifications may not be sufficient to understand fairness perceptions of selection decisions. Promotions of one of two equally qualified individuals will not always be seen as equally fair. Decisions that appear to be just to management may not appear just to other employees or to third parties.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The goal of this study was to investigate the effects of team membership, race of selected candidate, and team racial composition on fairness perceptions of a selection decision. A factorial design was utilized to examine the study’s hypotheses. The methodology of the pilot study is set forth in Appendix A. The methodology of the experimental study is set forth in this Chapter.

Participants

Six hundred sixty nine participants were recruited from the University of Georgia Department of Psychology research pool. These participants received course credit for their participation. The study was open to individuals of all racial and ethnic backgrounds in order to deter any awareness that the study was focusing on perceptions of White participants, although only data from participants self-identifying as White/Caucasian were used in the study. The percentage of participants who self-identified as White/Caucasian was 82.5%, reducing the number of participants available for the study to 552. Participants who did not pass any one of five manipulation checks (see below) together with one participant who did not complete the Reaction to Selection Survey were also eliminated, reducing the final number of participants to 440.

The final sample consisted of 310 (70.5%) females, 129 (29.3%) males, and one not giving such information; 202 (45.9%) freshman, 118 (26.8%) sophomores, 80 (18.2%) juniors, 39 (8.9%) seniors, and 1 other. Approximately 55% had never held a full
time job. Only 13.8% had ever held a full time job for more than six months. There were 19 (4.3%) physical science majors, 57 (13%) social science majors, 4 (.9%) math or math related majors, 120 (27.3%) business, IS or related majors, 46 (10.5%) education majors, 70 (15.9%) pre-professional majors, and 124 (28.2%) other majors. Two hundred eighty-four (64.5%) of the participants were age 18 or 19, and 143 (32.5%) were age 20 to 22.

Design and Procedure

The study was a 2 (race of selected candidate: Black or White) x 2 (team membership: team member or consultant) x 3 (team racial composition: low, medium or high Black proportion) between subjects experimental design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the twelve experimental conditions. The average number of participants per experimental condition was 36.7, with a range from 32 to 40. A power analysis was conducted based on the procedures recommended by Cohen (1988). Based on a 2 x 2 x 3 factorial design, with an effect size = .2, \( \alpha = .05 \), and power = .8, results indicated that a total sample of 252 participants with 21 participants per experimental condition was sufficient with respect to the hypotheses to be tested. Thus, the number of participants per cell exceeded the minimum sample size recommended pursuant to the power analysis.

Participants were told that the purpose of the study was to investigate organizational decision making processes. Each participant was given an envelope containing (a) general directions, (b) a brief description of a fictitious company, its executive committee, and a selection decision made by that company with respect to its executive committee, (c) a Reaction to Selection Decision Survey, asking for
participants’ opinions about the described selection decision, (d) a Recall Survey, asking for participants recall of certain information about the scenario, (e) a Social Interaction Survey, (f) a Culture and Ethnic Survey, and, (g) a Background Survey. The first three items were printed on white paper and the remaining items were printed on blue paper. Participants were instructed to remove the materials printed on white paper, to carefully read the instructions and description of the company and to answer the given questions. They were further instructed that upon completion of the questions on the white material, they were to return the white materials to the envelope, remove the blue materials and proceed to answer the questions on the blue paper. Participants took 15 to 30 minutes to complete the study.

Stimulus Materials and Manipulations

The stimulus materials, general instructions and descriptions of a fictitious company, are attached as Appendices B through I. Team membership was manipulated in the general instructions by asking the participants to imagine that they were either (a) a member of the committee for which the candidate is chosen or (b) a consultant hired by the company, and further reinforced in the instructions to the Reaction to Decision Survey. Several previous studies have asked participants to imagine that they are job applicants (Richard & Kirby, 1999; Smither, Millsap, Stoffey, Reilly, & Pearlman, 1996) or group members (Davis & Burnstein, 1981). Accordingly, asking participants to imagine they are committee members appeared feasible. Other studies have asked participants to assess fictitious court cases to obtain third party evaluations of fairness (Saal & Moore 1993; Sherman, Smith & Sherman, 1983). Participants in this study,
however, were asked to imagine they were consultants rather than reviewers of court decisions to avoid any confound between perceptions of fairness and legal rights.

The race of the selected applicant was manipulated in the description of the fictitious company by stating whether (a) the Black candidate was selected over the White candidate or (b) the White candidate was selected over the Black candidate. Team racial composition was manipulated in the description of the fictitious company by directly indicating the numbers of Blacks and Whites on the committee prior to the selection decision as either (a) nine Whites and one Black (low Black proportion), or (b) seven Whites and three Blacks (medium Black proportion), or (c) five Whites and five Blacks (high Black proportion).

The six descriptions of the fictitious company differed only with respect to the race of the selected and nonselected candidate and with respect to the number of Blacks and Whites on the executive committee. The description of the fictitious company was developed by the researcher incorporating references to the internet and snack foods to spark interest and catch the attention of college age participants. It was expected that the differing races of the candidates and the information with respect to the racial composition of the committee would reinforce race as a salient social category. To increase the salience of ongoing interactions with the selected candidate, the description of the committee referred to weekly meetings, evening meetings, social events, and the need to work together to resolve conflicts with respect to complex and controversial issues. The description also included the fact that it may be a long time before another member is chosen to emphasize the lack of amelioration in the near future (Folger, 1987). The salience of an alternative outcome, which is part of relative deprivation and referent
cognition theory, was increased by the decision to select a White over a Black, or a Black over a White. Procedures related to the selection decision were purposely left ambiguous to reflect real world conditions where employees do not always know what goes on behind closed doors or how decisions are made when equally qualified candidates are considered.

Measures

A questionnaire, consisting of four surveys was presented to each participant as part of the experimental materials. The four surveys are reproduced in Appendices J through M. The Reaction to Selection Decision Survey (items 1 – 10) was used to measure the dependent variable as well as certain exploratory variables. The Recall Survey (items 11 – 16) was used to assess experimental manipulations. The Social Interaction Survey (items 17-33) contained questions based on the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale, another exploratory variable. The Culture and Ethnic Survey (items 34 –53) contained questions from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, another exploratory variable. The Background Survey (items 54 – 59) requested demographic information.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was measured by one 6 point item, assessing to what extent the selection of the chosen candidate was fair (1 = very unfair; 2 = moderately unfair; 3 = slightly unfair; 4 = slightly fair; 5 = moderately fair; 6 = very fair). This measure is a direct measure of distributive justice. With respect to fairness assessments of a limited event, several researchers have used a one item measure for distributive justice (Cropanzano & Randall, 1995; Gilliland, 1983; Sherman, Smith & Sherman, 1983), and
others have used a composite of several items (Doverspike & Arthur, 1995; Richard & Kirby, 1999). There is no qualitative support in this context that one approach is more valid or reliable than the other, and a review of the items asked in the composite scales raises the question of whether more than one construct is being measured (e.g., satisfaction, fairness, agreement, or likelihood of reaching same decision). Therefore, a one item scale was chosen for this study. It should be noted, however, that a measure of distributive justice may also capture perceptions of procedural justice (Crosby, 1984; Gilliland, 1983). In this study, the selection procedures were purposely left ambiguous or missing. There is no information about how the selection decision was made other than the reference to “after serious consideration.” The intent is to capture the situation as it might appear in the workplace, where full information about the procedures is not fully known. Thus, participants may or may not imagine procedural unfairness.

Exploratory Variables

**Expected perception of fairness by others.** Using a one item 6 point scale, (1 = very unfair; 2 = moderately unfair; 3 = slightly unfair; 4 = slightly fair; 5 = moderately fair; 6 = very fair), participants were asked to indicate “To what extent will others view the decision as fair?”

**Candidate Ethnic Group Belonging.** Participants were asked to indicate “To which candidate’s ethnic group do you belong?” A choice of the White candidate was coded “1”, and a choice of the Black candidate was coded “2.”

**Candidate similarity.** Participants were asked to indicate “To which candidate do you feel most similar?” A choice of the White candidate was coded “1”, and a choice of the Black candidate was coded “2.”
Choice of candidate. Participants were asked to indicate “Which candidate would you have selected for the executive committee?” A choice of the White candidate was coded “1”, and a choice of the Black candidate was coded “2.”

Moderator Variables

Sex. Participants were asked to indicate whether they were male or female. Males were coded “1” and females were coded “2.”

Session Racial Composition. The presence of an obviously visible minority member at the experimental session could have increased the saliency of ethnicity or attitudes toward minorities. If any participant appeared to be other than White/Caucasian (in the sole opinion of the researcher) the session was coded “1.” If no minorities were present the session was coded “0.”

Ethnic Identity. Each participant’s ethnic identity was measured using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992). Phinney (1992, 1996) conceptualizes ethnic identity as a continuum beginning at a point where ethnicity is not considered, to an increasing exploration about ethnicity, and finally to a stage where individuals have achieved a secure, confident sense of group membership and openness to other groups. The development of White ethnic identity also includes increasing awareness of the existence of racism, the privileges associated with being White, and the development of a nonracist attitude (Phinney 1996). The scale contains 14 positively and negatively worded items rated on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). An example is “I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.” An ethnic identity score was determined by computing the mean of the 14 items. Negatively worded items were reversed scored, and
a participant’s mean score was substituted for any missing data. Phinney (1992) found reliability (Crohnbach’s alpha) of .90 for a sample of college students, and Phinney and Alipuria (1996) found reliability (Crohnbach’s alpha) of .83 for a sample of monoethnic high school and college students.

**Other-group orientation.** Each participant’s attitude toward other ethnic groups was measured by a 6 item measure of embedded in the MEIM. This scale assesses attitudes toward, and interactions with, ethnic groups other than one’s own, and contains both positively and negatively scored items (Phinney, 1992). An example is “I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.” Negatively worded items were reversed scored, and a participant’s mean score was substituted for any missing data. Phinney (1992) found reliability (Crohnbach’s alpha) of .74 for a sample of college students, and Phinney and Alipuria (1996) found reliability (Crohnbach’s alpha) of .76 for a sample of monoethnic high school and college students.

**Motivation to control prejudiced reactions.** Each participant’s motivation to control prejudiced reactions was measured using the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). This scale consists of 17 positively and negatively worded items, rated on a 6 point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). An example is “It’s important to me that that other people think I am not prejudiced.” Three items from the original scale that referred to a “Black Person” or Black student” were changed to refer to “a person of a different race or ethnic group.” Negatively worded items were reversed scored, and a participant’s mean score was substituted for any missing data. Reliabilities (Crohnbach’s alpha) for the scale with respect to college students have been found to be .81, .76, and .77(Dunton & Fazio). Research has shown
that individuals motivated to control prejudiced reactions are less likely to express prejudiced responses even if stereotypical negative racial attitudes are automatically activated (Dunton & Fazio).

Manipulation Checks

The results of the manipulation checks based on the 551 participants who self-identified as White/Caucasian were as follows: (1) 504 participants (91.5%) correctly recalled their assigned role, (2) 529 participants (96%) correctly recalled the number of Blacks and Whites on the committee, (3) 536 participants (97.3%) correctly recalled the race of the selected candidate, (4) 538 participants (97.6%) correctly recalled the race of the nonselected candidate, and (5) 511 participants (92.7%) determined that both candidates were qualified for the position to the same extent. The number of participants was reduced by eliminating any participant who did not pass any one of five manipulation checks (N= 440). Due to missing data on some survey items the sample size for certain analysis was reduced further as indicated in the relevant Tables.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine group differences in this study. This technique allowed for the examination of the effects of the categorical independent variables on a continuous dependent variable. The current study focused on the between-subject factors of team membership (team member or consultant), race of selected candidate (Black or White), and team racial composition (low, medium, or high) in order to understand differences in fairness perceptions of a selection decision (adding a new member to the team).

The data used in the analysis were based on 440 participants who self-identified as “White/Caucasian” and who responded correctly with respect to the five manipulation checks described in CHAPTER 3, METHOD, above. (One participant who did not complete the Reaction to Selection Survey was also eliminated.) The number of participants in each of the 12 experimental conditions were 32, 34, 35, 36, 36, 36, 37, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 40. The number of participants who responded to the measures of the dependent and exploratory variables, together with the means and standard deviations for all study variables, are presented in Table 1. The correlations among the independent, dependent, and exploratory variables are set forth in Table 2.

Before conducting any analysis, the data were examined to determine whether the three underlying assumptions of an ANOVA test were met. The assumptions are that observations of the dependent variable are (1) normally distributed across the treatment
Table 1

Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Independent, Dependent, and Exploratory variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team Membership</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Race of Selected Candidate</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team Racial Composition</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Fairness of Selection</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expected Perception of Fairness by Others</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choice of Candidate</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidate Similarity</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Candidate Preference</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sex</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other Group Orientation</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Session Racial Composition</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Exploratory variables are italicized.
Table 2

Correlations among Independent, Dependent and Exploratory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Team membership(^a)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Race of Selected Candidate(^b)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Team Racial Composition(^c)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Perceived Fairness of Selection</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Expected Perception of Fairness by Others</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Choice of Candidate(^d)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Candidate Similarity(^e)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8    Candidate Ethnic Group Belonging</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9    Sex</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10   Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11   Other Group Orientation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12   Motivation to Control Prejudiced reactions</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13   Session Racial Composition</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Exploratory variables are italicized. Cronbach’s alpha for Ethnic Identity and Motivation to Control Prejudice reactions are in parentheses. Pair-wise deletion used for missing data. * p ≤ .05   **p ≤ .01

| a | team member coded 1, consultant coded 2 |
| b | Black candidate coded 1, White candidate coded 2 |
| c | low coded 1, medium coded 2, high coded 3 |
| d | White candidate coded 1, Black candidate coded 2 |
| e | White candidate coded 1, Black candidate coded 2 |
| f | White candidate coded 1, Black candidate coded 2 |
| g | male coded 1, female coded 2 |
| h | no minority coded 0, minority present coded 1 |
population, (2) have equal variances among the treatment groups (homogeneity of
variance), and (3) are independent from (uninfluenced by) any other observation either
within the same treatment group or between treatment groups (Keppel, 1991, p. 97-99;
Keppel & Zedeck, 1989, p.108). The first two assumptions were examined by statistical
tests. Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated that observations of perceptions
of selection fairness significantly differed from a normal distribution (K-S Z = 5.62; p ≤ .00). In addition, results of the Levene test indicated that such observations did not have
equal variances across the treatment groups (F(11, 427) = 2.34; p ≤ .01). However, research
has shown that even sizable violations of the assumption of normality or the assumption
of homogeneity of variance have a minimal effect on the F statistic (Keppel & Zedeck,

Of the three assumptions, a violation of the independence of observations is the
most serious. Independence can be achieved by randomly assigning participants to
treatment conditions and by individual testing of the participants (Keppel, 1991). In the
present study, independence of observations can be logically assessed from the manner in
which the experimental sessions were conducted. First, participants were randomly
assigned to treatment conditions. Second, although participants were in a group setting,
there was no verbal or physical interaction among participants. Each participant
completed his or her questionnaire independently of any other participant. Accordingly,
the assumption of independence of observations was not violated. Since the three
assumptions were either met or found not likely to distort the F statistic, the data analysis
proceeded as planned.
Hypotheses Testing

This study was concerned with effect of three independent variables (team membership, race of selected candidate, and team racial composition) on perceptions of selection fairness. An ANOVA was conducted to examine mean differences in perceptions of fairness among experimental conditions. Recall, that Hypothesis 1 predicted a main effect for race of selected candidate; Hypothesis 2 predicted a two-way interaction between team membership and race of selected candidate; and Hypothesis 3 predicted a two-way interaction between race of selected candidate and team racial composition.

Table 3 depicts the results from the ANOVA for the perception of selection fairness, as well as with respect to the exploratory dependent variable, expected perception of fairness by others. The results demonstrate that none of the hypotheses were supported. With respect to Hypothesis 1, there was no main effect for race of selected candidate ($F_{(1,439)} = .26, p = ns$). With respect to Hypothesis 2, there was no significant interaction between team membership and race of selected candidate ($F_{(1,439)} = .26; p = ns$), and with respect to Hypothesis 3, there was no interaction between race of selected candidate and team racial composition ($F_{(2,439)} = 2.23; p = ns$). Unexpectedly, a main effect for team racial composition was significant ($F_{(1,439)} = 2.95; p = .054$). As the proportion of Blacks on the committee increased, the perception of selection fairness also increased. The mean score for perception of fairness for participants in the low proportion condition of team racial composition was 4.44, in the medium proportion condition it was 4.50, and in the high proportion condition it was 4.78.
### Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Dependent and Exploratory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Perceived Fairness of Selection</th>
<th>Expected Perception of Fairness by Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Membership (TM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Selected Candidate (Race)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Racial Composition (Comp)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Model</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (between subjects) &amp; df error</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
<td>(1.59 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[427]</td>
<td>[422]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors. Values enclosed in brackets represent df for error term. *p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01
Moderator Analysis

To examine the impact of sex and session racial composition, both categorical variables, two additional ANOVA’s were performed adding sex and session racial composition, respectively, as an additional independent variable. As indicated in Tables 4 and 5, neither of these variables had a main effect on perceptions of selection fairness nor interacted with any of the other independent variables or interaction terms from the original analysis. Because ethnic identity, other group orientation, and motivation to control prejudiced are continuous variables, hierarchical regression analysis was used to assess their impact as possible moderators. None of these variables or their interaction terms significantly increased the variance accounted for by the original independent variables or their interaction terms.

Exploratory Analysis

An exploratory dependent variable, expected perception of fairness by others, was also examined. Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated that observations of expected perception of fairness by others significantly differed from a normal distribution (K-S Z = 3.74; p ≤.00). Results of the Levene test, however, indicated that such observations did have equal variances across the treatment groups (F11,422 = .30; p = ns). Because the same method was used to collect this data as was used to collect perceptions of fairness, independence of observations can be logically assumed. Accordingly, the three assumptions underlying an ANOVA were either met or found not likely to distort the F statistic, and the analysis of the exploratory dependent variable was continued. Based on the results of the ANOVA set forth in Table 3, race of the selected candidate was found to have a significant main effect on expected perceptions of fairness.
Table 4
Analysis of Variance for Moderation Effect of Sex on Variables Predicting Perceptions of Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Perceived Fairness of Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Membership (TM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Selected Candidate (Race)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Racial Composition (Comp)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Comp x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Comp x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Comp x Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (between subjects) &amp; df error</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error. Value enclosed in brackets represents df for error term. No F value was significant at ≤ .05
Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Moderation Effect of Presence of Minorities at Experimental Session on Variables Predicting Perceptions of Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Membership (TM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Selected Candidate (Race)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Racial Composition (Comp)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Minorities (POM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x POM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x POM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x POM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp x POM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Comp x POM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Comp x POM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM x Race x Comp x POM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (between subjects) &amp; df error</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Value enclosed in parentheses represents mean square error. Value enclosed in brackets represents df for error term. * p ≤ .05
by others ($F_{(1, 433)} = 12.88; p = \leq .01$). Participants expected that others would find the selection of the Black candidate to be more fair ($M = 3.99$) than the selection of the White candidate ($M = 3.56$).

In order to gain more insight upon the possible effects of the race of the selected candidate on perceptions of selection fairness, three additional questions were asked. Table 6 states the percentages of participants who chose the Black candidate and the percentages of participants who chose the White candidate when asked to indicate (1) to which candidate’s ethnic group do they belong (ethnic group belonging), (2) with which candidate they felt more similar (candidate similarity), and (3) which candidate they would have selected for the executive committee (choice of candidate). As expected, almost all of the candidates indicated they belonged to the White candidate’s ethnic group (99%), and a large percentage of the participants (93%) felt more similar to the White candidate. Only 46%, however, would have chosen the White candidate to join the executive committee. Those participants whose choice of candidate was also the candidate chosen in the scenario reported higher perceptions of selection fairness ($M = 4.8$) than participants whose choice of candidate was not selected ($M= 4.26$) ($t = 4.61; p \leq .00$).
Table 6

Percentages of Participants Choosing the Black or White Candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage choosing the Black Candidate</th>
<th>Percentage Choosing the White Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group Belonging(^a)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Similarity</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Candidate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) .5% chose neither candidate
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of team membership, race of selected candidate, and team racial composition on perceptions of fairness in the context of a selection decision. Hypothesis 1 predicted a main effect for the race of the selected candidate on perceptions of fairness selections. However, no main effect for race of the selected candidate was found. This hypothesis was based on the theory that white participants would feel a stronger sense of belonging to the same ethnic group as the White candidate and a stronger sense of similarity to the White candidate, both of which would, in turn, translate into a preference for the White candidate to be selected and an increased perception of fairness when the White candidate was chosen over the Black candidate. Although most participants reported that they belonged to the White candidate’s ethnic group (99%) and felt more similar to the White candidate (93%), this sense of belonging and similarity did not translate into a preference (as measured by participant’s own choice of candidate) that the White candidate be chosen for the executive committee (46%). Without this preference, it was then not surprising that there was no main effect for race of the selected candidate on selection fairness. Likewise, it was then not unexpected to find no interaction between race of selected candidate and team membership (Hypothesis 2) nor an interaction between race of candidate and team racial composition (Hypothesis 3).
The question that remains is why the sense of belonging and similarity did not influence participants’ choice of candidate, that is, the one they would have selected for the executive committee. One explanation may be related to events occurring on campus at the time data for this study were being collected. During the 2001-2002 academic year the University of Georgia was involved in a highly publicized law suit concerning preferential admissions for Black students. The fact that Blacks were underrepresented on campus and that the school was looking for remedies to this situation were probably well known by many of the participants. Thus, students had the opportunity prior to the study to be sensitized to the issues of choice based on race, and may have purposely used another basis on which to make their decision.

Also recall that participants in the portion of the pilot study that “implied” the race of the candidates rather than expressly stating the race of the candidates, were apparently sensitive to making incorrect assumptions about race. Accordingly they declined to assume that the candidate who was chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and mentored disadvantaged Black youths was Black, or that the candidate who was chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation was White. Furthermore, participants in the main study reported that others would find the selection of a Black candidate as more fair than the selection of a White candidate. So race was considered by the participants in that scenario, although in an unexpected direction. These considerations suggest the participants were motivated to act as if colorblind in determining their preferred choice of candidate.
Another possible explanation is that the White participants simply saw no differences in the selection of a White candidate over a Black candidate compared to the selection of a Black candidate over a White candidate. Recall, that in Sherman, Smith and Sherman (1983) participants were asked to assess the fairness of employee promotion where the difference in experimental conditions was the race of the two (male) employees: White promoted over White, Black promoted over White, White promoted over Black, and Black promoted over Black. Although Black participants viewed the promotion of a White employee over a Black employee as more unfair than the other conditions, White participants saw no differences with respect to fairness across the different racial conditions. On the other hand, findings in Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) clearly show that White college students tended to recommend White candidates over Black candidates when their qualifications were neither strong nor weak.

Finally, it is possible that the scenario described in the materials was not relevant to undergraduate students. Perhaps an appointment to a graduate school admissions committee or a governing body of a student organization would have made the decision more salient.

The study leaves unanswered the question of how or what factors were used by participants to assess fairness of the selection decision. Several individual differences (sex, ethnic identity, other group orientation, and motivation to control prejudice) were examined in this study as possible moderators of the anticipated effects. It is interesting to note that none of these had a main effect on perceptions of selection fairness. There was an association between choice of candidate and fairness, however, as evidenced by the finding that participants whose choice of candidate was also the candidate chosen in
the scenario reported higher perceptions of selection fairness than participants whose choice of candidate was not selected. This is consistent with Folger’s revised model of referent cognition theory (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Cropanzano & Randall, 1993; Folger, 1987; Mark & Folger, 1987) and Crosby’s revised model of relative deprivation (Cropanzano & Randall, 1993; Cropanzano & Randall, 1995; Crosby, 1984) both of which suggest that the selection of a desired outcome is more likely to be viewed as fair and that the selection of a less desired outcome is more likely to be viewed as unfair. An unexpected, but interesting finding was that fairness perceptions were influenced by the proportion of Blacks on the committee irrespective of whether the Black candidate or the White candidate was selected. As the proportion of Blacks on the committee increased, so did the perception of fairness with respect to the selection of a new member. This finding is consistent with theories of relational demography, in that individuals consider not just the demographic characteristics of other individuals, but the relationship between such individual demographics and the demographic characteristics of a group in which the individual is (or could potentially be) a member (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & Gutek, 1999; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui, Xin & Egan, 1995). Once again, the participants appear to display a sensitivity to race.

Another explanation for this finding with respect to group racial composition is fairness heuristic theory (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; van den Bos, 2001). Under this theory, when there is little information on which to base the fairness of an event, the fairness decision may be based instead on whatever information is available, whether such information is relevant or not. In the present study, very little information was available about how or why the decision to choose the new committee member was
made. However, the participants did know the existing racial composition of the executive committee. A higher proportion of Blacks on the committee may have led the participants to an initial assessment of fairness about the organization. To the extent more blacks were on the committee, the more fair the organization appeared to be. Thus, when asked about the fairness of a specific decision made by the organization, the participants may have relied on the initial assessment to make the second assessment. Van de Bos points out that when relevant information is not available, people will use whatever other information is available as a heuristic substitute to assess what is fair.

The importance of this finding should not be overlooked. The presence of Blacks on the executive committee in the present study did not appear to result in any backlash or negative reaction. Any fears about appointing Blacks or minorities to highly visible positions and committees may be viewed as a positive action, increasing the perception of the organization as a fair place to work or do business.

Limitations and Future Research

One frequent criticism of studies concerning race is that most such studies ignore within group individual differences. Although this study attempted to remedy such complaint by exploring several individual differences, such as ethnic identity, sex, other group orientation, and motivation to control prejudice within the sample of white participants, many other individual differences could be examined in this regard, such as personality, openness to diversity, and life experiences with other ethnic groups and members. Our understanding of such within-race variability will in turn enhance our understanding of employee reactions to organizational decisions and events (Cox, 1993; Nkomo, 1992).
Similarly, many situational variables may moderate the findings. In the work place, many other features of the organizational environment will influence perceptions of fairness. In addition, it is likely that more information about each candidate would be available.

Another potential limitation concerns the stimulus materials used in the study. Memberships in different organizations and different activities were used to describe the two candidates. Perhaps, some of these activities or memberships are viewed with more prestige or interest than others. If this was the case, such differences may have influenced the participants’ responses. On the other hand, the effect of such differences may have been minimal since only data from participants who rated each candidate as equally qualified were included in the analysis. Additionally, the scenario may have been more relevant if a college or student committee had been used. In the future, researchers can take steps to ensure the biographical information of the candidates is more similar and that the fictitious setting is more relevant to students.

Other limitations involve the demographic composition of the sample. First, only 3% of the participants were over the age of 22, and less than 15% of the participants had ever held a full-time job for more than 6 months. Accordingly, the findings are at best limited to young and inexperienced workers. Researchers may want to focus future studies on older, more experienced workers. White undergraduate students may have very different perceptions about fairness in the work place than older, more experienced (and ethnically different) workers. Second, more than 90% of the participants were in their first three years of post high school education. In the work force, employees will have more or less education. Future research can look for differences in educational
background. The study could be extended with a more experienced and more diverse population.

As with all lab studies using an undergraduate pool of participants, there is a significant question regarding external validity. It is difficult to determine to what extent these findings are reflective of real life work situations. In real life, fairness of selection decisions are influenced by a variety of factors, not just the variables investigated in this study. Finally, all measures in this study were self-reports and limited to the biases associated with use of same method of collection.

Contributions

Although the study’s original intent to shed light on employee’s perceptions of fairness in a selection setting was not met, the current study contributes to the literature in several ways. It became clear that similarity does not automatically translate into a selection choice even when qualifications are equal. Furthermore, perceptions of selection fairness may be influenced by relational demography as well as fairness heuristic theory. The study provides researchers with an indication that the antecedents of perceptions of selection fairness are worth additional study.
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APPENDIX A
PILOT TESTING

A pilot test was conducted to ensure the materials used in the larger study accomplished the desired manipulation of conditions. Six scenarios were prepared, each describing a company and a decision made by the company with respect to its executive committee. The scenarios varied in the description of the number of Blacks and Whites on the committee (one Black and nine Whites; three Blacks and seven Whites; five Blacks and five Whites) and in the implication of whether the candidate chosen by the company to join the executive committee was Black or White. One candidate was described as “chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation.” The other candidate was described as “chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youths.”

Additionally, the assigned role of the participant was manipulated in the general instructions, such that participants were asked to imagine that they were “a member of the executive committee” or “a consultant hired by the company to assess the decision.” After reading the scenario describing the company and its decision, this assigned role was further reinforced in the specific instruction to circle the best answer from the participant’s perspective as “a member of the existing executive committee” or as “a consultant hired by the company to assess its decision.” This resulted in 12 sets of
materials (2 x 2 x 3) which were administered to thirty-six participants recruited from the University of Georgia Psychology Department’s research pool.

To assess the manipulations, participants were asked to what extent each candidate was qualified for the position, and to recall the number of Black and White committee members, the proportion of Blacks on the committee, the race of the selected candidate, the race of the nonselected candidate, and the participant’s assigned role. After completion of the written questions, the researcher orally asked the participants several questions about the study including their opinion regarding the race of the candidates. After the pilot had been administered to 18 participants it became obvious to the researcher that the manipulations for race of the selected candidate and the race of the nonselected candidate was not effective. This was consistent with discussions between the researcher and several of the participants in which the participants indicated their suspicion that the study concerned whether they would incorrectly assume that the candidates were of one race or the other when it was not explicitly stated. Therefore, they purposely refused to assume that the candidate who mentored black youths and was chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund was Black, or that the other candidate was White.

At this point the pilot materials were changed to explicitly state the race of the candidates by altering one paragraph to read as follows: “Several employees have asked to be considered for the committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with the company for about six years and have
similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youths.” The materials were then administered to the other 18 participants, for a total of 36 participants in the pilot study.

Thirty-two participants (88.9%) correctly recalled their assigned role (83.3% of the first 18 participants; 94.4% of the final 18 participants). Of the 33 participants who did not choose “don’t remember” or “information not given”, 32 (97%) correctly recalled their assigned role.

Thirty-three participants (91.7%) equally ranked both candidates as qualified for the position (88.9% of the first 18 participants; 94.4% of the final 18 participants).

Thirty-five participants (97.2%) correctly recalled the number of Blacks and Whites on the committee (100% of the first 18 participants; 94.4% of the final 18 participants). Participants were also asked to recall the “proportion” (low, medium or high) of Blacks on the committee. Thirty four participants gave a specific answer with respect to proportion; two participants chose “information not given.” Using only those participants who gave a specific answer, a one way ANOVA among the 3 proportions of Blacks on the committee and the perceived proportion of Blacks on the committee was significant (F (2, 34) = 32.728; p < .0001).

Twenty-nine participants (80.6%) correctly recalled the race of the selected candidate. With respect to the first 18 participants, 11 participants (61.1 %) correctly recalled the race of the selected candidate and 7 participants (38.9%) chose “information
not given.” With respect to the final 18 participants, 18 (100%) correctly recalled the race of the selected candidate.

Twenty-five participants (69.4%) correctly recalled the race of the nonselected candidate. With respect to the first 18 participants, 7 participants (38.9%) correctly recalled the race of the nonselected candidate and 11 participants (61.1%) chose either “don’t remember” or “information not given.” With respect to the final 18 participants, 18 (100%) correctly recalled the race of the nonselected candidate.

Based on these findings it was decided that the explicit reference to the candidates’ race would be retained and that an additional reference to the participants’ assigned role would be added to the final materials. In addition, the format of the materials was changed to allow electronic scanning of answers. Small grammatical changes were also made in the final materials.
INSTRUCTIONS
PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

Thank you for participating in today’s study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Please notify the researcher right now if you are not at least 18.

The purpose of the study is to investigate decision making processes in organizations. Attached you will find a brief description of a fictitious company and a description of an important decision that the company has made about its executive committee. As you read the description, imagine that you are a member of the executive committee.

After you read the description, please give us your reaction to the decision by answering the questions that follow on the separate answer sheet. Please do not mark on any piece of paper except the computer-scored answer sheet. When you have completed the questions, please return all materials printed on white paper to the envelope and then remove the additional four surveys printed on blue paper.

All answers and information will be kept confidential.
APPENDIX C

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: CONSULTANT

INSTRUCTIONS
PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

Thank you for participating in today’s study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Please notify the researcher right now if you are not at least 18.

The purpose of the study is to investigate decision making processes in organizations. Attached you will find a brief description of a fictitious company and a description of an important decision that the company has made about its executive committee. As you read the description, imagine that you are a consultant hired by the company to assess the decision.

After you read the description, please give us your reaction to the decision by answering the questions that follow on the separate answer sheet. Please do not mark on any piece of paper except the computer-scored answer sheet. When you have completed the questions, please return all materials printed on white paper to the envelope and then remove the additional four surveys printed on blue paper.

All answers and information will be kept confidential.
Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, seven of the members are White and three of the members are Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with
the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select David Morrow to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX E

COMPANY DESCRIPTION: SELECTION OF WHITE CANDIDATE AND LOW PROPORTION

Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, nine of the members are White and one of the members is Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For
example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select David Morrow to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX F

COMPANY DESCRIPTION: SELECTION OF WHITE CANDIDATE AND HIGH PROPORTION

Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, five of the members are White and five of the members are Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with
the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select David Morrow to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX G

COMPANY DESCRIPTION: SELECTION OF BLACK CANDIDATE AND MEDIUM PROPORTION

Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, seven of the members are White and three of the members are Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with
the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select George Williams to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX H

COMPANY DESCRIPTION: SELECTION OF WHITE CANDIDATE AND LOW PROPORTION

Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, nine of the members are White and one of the members is Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For
example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select George Williams to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX I

COMPANY DESCRIPTION: SELECTION OF WHITE CANDIDATE AND HIGH PROPORTION

Description of Cornerstone Inc.

Cornerstone Inc. is a medium sized producer of specialty snack foods. Cornerstone has approximately 400 employees and annual sales in excess of $150 million. Cornerstone has recently made plans to increase marketing efforts outside of the United States due to growing sales to internet customers from other countries.

Most decisions with respect to Cornerstone’s strategic planning, including resource allocation, marketing, product development, and employee benefits are made by an executive committee consisting of selected managers from within the company. The executive committee is considered to be the most powerful committee in the company. The executive committee meets at least once a week, often a dinner meeting and into the evening. The issues tackled by the executive committee are often complex and controversial. Executive committee members must be able to tolerate conflict among themselves and be able to work toward a consensus that will benefit the company in the long run. Social events for the executive committee members and their spouses are held at least once every few weeks.

The members of the executive committee are viewed as Cornerstone’s brightest and most promising employees. They generally have several years of experience and are considered to be exceptional performers, highly intelligent, and creative. At the present time, the executive committee consists of ten members. The executive committee members represent diverse functional areas of the company such as marketing, operations, human resources, and finance. The executive committee is also diverse with respect to age, race and gender. For example, five of the members are White and five of the members are Black. The company has decided to add one new member to the executive committee, bringing the total number of members to eleven. Based on past history, it will probably be a long time before another member is added to the executive committee.

Several employees have asked to be considered for the executive committee, and the company has narrowed the choice down to two candidates: David Morrow, who is a thirty something White male, and George Williams, a Black male who is also in his thirties. Both candidates are married and have one child. Both candidates have been with the company for about six years and have similar work histories and performance.
evaluations. In addition, both are active participants in community activities. For example, David Morrow is chairman of the local United Way campaign and a significant fundraiser for the World Wildlife Federation. George Williams is chairman of the local chapter of the United Negro College Fund and a mentor for disadvantaged Black youth. After serious consideration, the decision was made to select George Williams to join the executive committee.
APPENDIX J

REACTION SURVEY: TEAM MEMBER

Reaction to Selection Decision Survey

You are a member of the executive committee of Cornerstone Inc. and you have been asked to assess the selection decision described above. For each question, please indicate on the separate answer sheet the best answer from your perspective as a member of such executive committee:

1. To what extent was the choice of the selected candidate fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

2. To what extent will the selected candidate be a successful member of the executive committee?
   a. Very unsuccessful
   b. Moderately unsuccessful
   c. Slightly unsuccessful
   d. Slightly successful
   e. Moderately successful
   f. Very successful

3. To what extent was George Williams qualified for the position?
   a. Very unqualified
   b. Moderately unqualified
   c. Slightly unqualified
   d. Slightly qualified
   e. Moderately qualified
   f. Very qualified
4. To what extent was David Morrow qualified for the position?
   a. Very unqualified
   b. Moderately unqualified
   c. Slightly unqualified
   d. Slightly qualified
   e. Moderately qualified
   f. Very qualified

5. To what extent were the procedures used to select the candidate fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

6. To what extent will others view the decision as fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

7. Which candidate would you have selected for the executive committee?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams

8. To which candidate do you feel most similar?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams

9. With which candidate would you prefer to spend time?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams
10. To which candidate’s ethnic group do you belong?
   
a. David Morrow  
b. George Williams  
c. Neither candidate

*** STOP ***

End of Reaction survey. Please return the description of Cornerstone Inc. and this Reaction Survey to the envelope and remove the four surveys printed on blue paper. Then complete the four additional surveys.
APPENDIX K

REACTION SURVEY: CONSULTANT

Reaction to Selection Decision Survey

You have been hired as a consultant by Cornerstone Inc. to assess the selection decision described above. For each question, please indicate on the separate answer sheet the best answer from your perspective as a consultant hired by the company:

1. To what extent was the choice of the selected candidate fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

2. To what extent will the selected candidate be a successful member of the executive committee?
   a. Very unsuccessful
   b. Moderately unsuccessful
   c. Slightly unsuccessful
   d. Slightly successful
   e. Moderately successful
   f. Very successful

3. To what extent was George Williams qualified for the position?
   a. Very unqualified
   b. Moderately unqualified
   c. Slightly unqualified
   d. Slightly qualified
   e. Moderately qualified
   f. Very qualified
4. To what extent was David Morrow qualified for the position?
   a. Very unqualified
   b. Moderately unqualified
   c. Slightly unqualified
   d. Slightly qualified
   e. Moderately qualified
   f. Very qualified

5. To what extent were the procedures used to select the candidate fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

6. To what extent will others view the decision as fair?
   a. Very unfair
   b. Moderately unfair
   c. Slightly unfair
   d. Slightly fair
   e. Moderately fair
   f. Very fair

7. Which candidate would you have selected for the executive committee?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams

8. To which candidate do you feel more similar?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams

9. With which candidate would you prefer to spend time?
   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams
10. To which candidate’s ethnic group do you feel you belong?

   a. David Morrow
   b. George Williams
   c. Neither candidate

*** STOP ***

End of Reaction survey. Please return the description of Cornerstone Inc. and this Reaction Survey to the envelope and remove the four surveys printed on blue paper. Then complete the four additional surveys.
APPENDIX L

RECALL SURVEY

Please answer the following questions based on what you remember about Cornerstone Inc.’s selection of a new member for its executive committee. Mark your answer only on the separate answer sheet. Make sure you are beginning with question # 11 on your answer sheet.

11. What does the company produce?
   (a) snack foods
   (b) clothing
   (c) automobiles
   (d) don’t remember
   (e) information not given

12. In your opinion, what was the proportion of Black committee members relative to White committee members prior to the selection of a new member?
   (a) low proportion
   (b) medium proportion
   (c) high proportion
   (d) don’t remember
   (e) information not given

13. What is the race of the selected candidate?
   (a) Black
   (b) White
   (c) don’t remember
   (d) information not given

14. What is the race of the non-selected candidate?
   (a) Black
   (b) White
   (c) don’t remember
   (d) information not given

15. What was your assigned role?
   (a) member of the executive committee
   (b) consultant
   (c) vice president
   (d) don’t remember
   (e) information not given
16. What were the numbers of Black and White committee members prior to the selection of a new member?
   (a) one Black member and nine White members
   (b) three Black members and seven White members
   (c) five Black members and five White members
   (d) don’t remember
   (e) information not given

APPENDIX M

SOCIAL INTERACTION SURVEY
[MOTIVATION TO CONTROL PREJUDICE]

Social Interaction Survey

Please use the letters below to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Mark your answer only on the separate answer sheet. Make sure you are beginning with question # 17 on your answer sheet.

17. In today’s society, it is important that one not be perceived as prejudiced in any manner.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Modestly agree
   g. Strongly agree

18. I always express my thoughts and feelings, regardless of how controversial they might be.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Modestly agree
   g. Strongly agree

19. I get angry with myself when I have a thought or feeling that might be considered prejudiced.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Modestly agree
   g. Strongly agree
20. If I were participating in a class discussion and a person of a different race or ethnic group expressed an opinion with which I disagreed, I would be hesitant to express my own viewpoint.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

21. Going through life worrying about whether you might offend someone is just more trouble than it’s worth.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

22. It’s important to me that other people not think I’m prejudiced.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

23. I feel it’s important to behave according to society’s standards.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree
24. I’m careful not to offend my friends, but I don’t worry about offending people I don’t know or don’t like.

   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

25. I think that it is important to speak one’s mind rather than to worry about offending someone.

   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

26. It’s never acceptable to express one’s prejudices.

   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

27. I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about a person of a different race or ethnic group.

   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree
28. When speaking to a person of a different race or ethnic group, it’s important to me that he/she not think I’m prejudiced.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

29. It bothers me a great deal when I think I have offended someone, so I’m always careful to consider other people’s feelings.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

30. If I have a prejudiced thought or feeling, I keep it to myself.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

31. I would never tell jokes that would offend others.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree
32. I’m not afraid to tell others what I think, even when I know they disagree with me.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

33. If someone who made me uncomfortable sat next to me on a bus, I would not hesitate to move to another seat.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Moderately disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Moderately agree
   g. Strongly agree

End of Social Interaction Survey. Please continue to the Cultural and Ethnic Survey.
Culture and Ethnic Survey

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words used to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes, two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Use the letters below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Mark your answer only on the separate answer sheet. Make sure you are beginning with question # 34 on your answer sheet.

34. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

35. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree
36. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

37. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

38. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

39. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

40. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn’t try to mix together.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree
41. I am not very clear about the role of ethnicity in my life.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

42. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

43. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

44. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

45. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree
46. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

47. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group, and its accomplishments.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

48. I don’t try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

49. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

50. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree
51. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

52. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

53. I feel good about my ethnic or cultural background.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Somewhat disagree
   c. Somewhat agree
   d. Strongly agree

End of Culture and Ethnic Survey. Please continue to the Background Survey.
APPENDIX O

BACKGROUND SURVEY

Please give us some information about yourself. Make sure you are beginning with question 
# 54 on your answer sheet.

54. What is your age?
   a. 18 –19
   b. 20 –22
   c. 23-28
   d. 29-35
   e. 36 or over

55. What is your gender?
   a. male
   b. female

56. What is your major?
   a. Physical science
   b. Social science
   c. Math or math related subject
   d. Business, accounting, IS or related subject
   e. Education
   f. Pre-professional
   g. other

57. What is your Ethnicity?
   a. White/Caucasian
   b. Black /African American
   c. Asian
   d. Hispanic/Latino
   e. Biracial/Multiracial
   f. Other
58. Have you ever held a full time job(s)?
   a. no
   b. yes, for less than 2 months
   c. yes, for 2-6 months
   d. yes, for 7-12 months
   e. yes, for more than 12 months

59. What year are you in school?
   a. freshman
   b. sophomore
   c. junior
   d. senior
   e. other

End of Background Survey. Please place all of your materials inside the envelope and give them to the researcher. Don’t forget to have your white card signed!