Running Head: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A REVIEW OF ITS EFFECTS

Affirmative Action: A Review of Its Psychological Effects, Effectiveness, and Implications for Scientists and Practitioners

Wendy C. Gradwohl and Michael A. McDaniel

The University of Akron

Paper presented in M. A. McDaniel (Chair), Research in Affirmative Action. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists, Inc., Nashville, TN.

We gratefully acknowledge the following persons for their helpful comments on previous versions of this paper: Susan Clayton, Dennis Doverspike, John Dovidio, Linda Gottfredson, David Kravitz, and Mary Ann Taylor.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Wendy C. Gradwohl, Department of Psychology, University of Akron, Ohio 44325.

Abstract

Most industrial/organizational psychologists view affirmative action as a policy or a legal issue and not a topic of psychological research. The purpose of this paper is to raise the awareness of affirmative action as a research topic and is intended to extensively review the diversely published psychological literature on affirmative action. The psychological reactions, effects, and theories relating to affirmative action are detailed. The program evaluation literature for affirmative action is also summarized. Finally, the paper concludes with the recommendations based on the psychological literature for practitioners when implementing an affirmative action program as well as implications for future research.

Introduction

Affirmative action has been a heavily debated policy since the signing of Executive Order 11246 by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965. The Executive Order mandated federal contractors and subcontractors to 'take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin' (quoted in Holloway, 1989, p. 9). The order was enacted for several reasons. First, it was seen as a remedy for past discriminatory practices by organizations. Second, it was an attempt to ensure employers and employees were more attentive to certain target groups' job-related abilities (Holloway, 1989).

Although many Americans will agree that discriminatory practices were prevalent thirty years ago and are still currently present in today's society, there is question as to whether affirmative action is the appropriate way to handle this inequity. Affirmative action has faced support and resistance on legal, moral, and psychological grounds. Past research has seemed to focus more on the legal and moral issues regarding the appropriateness of affirmative action programs; yet, recently, there has been an increasing interest in affirmative action perceptions, effects, and effectiveness in the psychological literature.

Whereas affirmative action has had an impact on personnel practices and society as a whole, a review of the pertinent issues is well deserved. The purpose of the paper is provide a comprehensive review of the psychological literature surrounding affirmative action, such as perceptions and beliefs regarding affirmative action programs, effects and consequences of affirmative action, effectiveness and evaluation of affirmative action, implications and recommendations for organizations, and research needs. Although the main emphasis will center on the psychological literature and research, an understanding of the American ideology and sociological processes is warranted to complete the puzzle. Legal aspects will only be discussed when pertinent to understanding people's perceptions regarding affirmative action. For a discussion of the limitations of affirmative action programs (e.g., there must be evidence of past discrimination, the plan must be

narrowly tailored, temporary, and must not trample the rights of non-minorities) as determined by court cases, see Barrett and Stems (1994).

What is affirmative action?

Before discussing the impact of affirmative action, a description of what affirmative action does and does not entail is essential. It is important to stress this portion of the review due to prevalent misconceptions of affirmative action as will be noted in the forthcoming sections.

Defining Affirmative Action

Holloway (1989) defined three aspects of affirmative action programs. First, it is a directive for organizations/employers to uncover and remove barriers to employment that have a differential impact on specific groups of individuals. This differential impact is evident when conducting workforce analysis that depicts highly underrepresented groups. Second, it calls for the evaluation of all policies and programs' intended and unintended effects for members of target groups. And finally, it is a temporary program to be discontinued once target groups are no longer underrepresented in the workforce.

Involuntary vs. Voluntary Affirmative Action Programs. An important distinction should be made concerning involuntary and voluntary affirmative action programs. Involuntary affirmative action programs are under specific mandates by the government under Executive Order 11246, court order, or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission action (Caruth, Noe, & Mondy, 1988). Specifically, Executive Order 11246 affects almost all aspects of personnel, including selection, recruitment, training, promotion/demotion, layoff/termination, and compensation. However, voluntary affirmative action programs are just that: they are not demanded by government and therefore need not follow the specific requirements outlined in Executive Order 11246 but must adhere to legal guidelines (see Barrett & Stems, 1994). Executive Order 11246 applies to all contractors and subcontractors receiving $50,000 or more in federal funds and the requirements of the Order are enforced by the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP). The Order defines

two groups of individuals as "target groups," women and minorities (such as Native American, Native Alaskan, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, and Hispanic).

Contractors and subcontractors of which this Order applies are required to conduct specific tasks. The following is a list of a few, but not all, of the requirements: (a) organizations are prohibited from maintaining a segregated workforce by race or sex; (b) employee selection criteria may not be discriminatory; (c) organizations must generate and maintain a written affirmative action program; (d) organizations should disseminate this policy to employees; (e) organizations must allow periodic compliance reviews of employment policies, practices, and affirmative action program by the OFCCP; (f) organizations must remedy inadequacies in their affirmative action program as identified by the OFCCP (Caruth, Noe, Mondy, 1988; Holloway, 1989).

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 added two more groups to the affirmative action "target groups." The acts applied to individuals with disabilities and Vietnam veterans, respectively, and impacted the same contractors affected by Executive Order 11246. Contractors were expected to follow essentially the same requirements outlined in Executive Order 11246; however, there were a few exceptions (see Holloway, 1989).

Equal Opportunity vs. Affirmative Action. Equal opportunity and affirmative action are similar in that they have the same goal, "the creation and maintenance of a social world that is gender and race neutral" (Crosby & Clayton, 1990, p. 63). Yet, affirmative action can be seen to extend past equal opportunity efforts (Glazer, 1988). Crosby and Clayton (1990) made the clear distinction between affirmative action and equal opportunity based on the means in which the goal is achieved for each. For example, equal opportunity is seen as a passive process in avoiding discrimination whereas affirmative action is more of an active process. Affirmative action can use a variety of implemental devices such as recruitment, preferential treatment of qualified candidates, and training of candidates to attain this goal; however, equal opportunity only relies on evaluating individuals in a nondiscriminatory manner using the same performance standards. In addition, affirmative action recognizes past discrimination and injustices whereas equal opportunity does not. Equal opportunity

suggests by just removing the barriers, equity in employment is established; yet, affirmative action acknowledges that past discrimination has been a setback for many groups of individuals and simply telling them "you are free to compete with all the others" (President Johnson as quoted in Glasser, 1988) does not render equal opportunities. Related to this point, affirmative action assumes individuals are not race- and sex-blind which is why active measures are needed (Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Judging from existing research, this assumption is probably a more accurate reflection of society today than equal opportunity which assumes we can be race- and sex-blind. For example, women are often perceived as less competent than men in male sex-typed jobs, even when qualifications may be the same as men's (see Heilman, 1983).

Why Affirmative Action?

Many question the need for affirmative action programs. Although employment decisions are usually made by individuals, barriers in employment practices are also much to blame for the underrepresentation of certain groups in specific jobs (Braddock & McPartland, 1987). For instance, Braddock and McPartland (1987) conducted a survey of employment practices among 4,078 public and private employers in the U.S. and found that there were three stages in employment in which Blacks were less likely to receive an equal opportunity. At the job candidate stage, Blacks were at a disadvantage in terms of learning of job openings. Whereas many organizations are comprised of a larger proportion of Whites and many vacancies are filled through informal networks outside the organization (employees notifying an acquaintance of the opening), Blacks are placed at a greater disadvantage. At the job entry stage, employment decisions are often made based on impressions of job candidates' qualifications which are not objectively determined. Third, at the job promotion stage, private organizations are less likely to announce openings and tend to select from within the organization. Again, with many organizations having a larger constituent of Whites, Whites have a greater chance of filling those positions.

Glasser (1988) listed three ways in which to view affirmative action which can also be perceived as reasons for implementing an affirmative action program. First, affirmative action can be

seen as a legal remedy. As noted above, employment practices can often be unintentionally discriminatory. For example, a study conducted by Twiss, Tabb, and Crosby (1989) showed that the format of presented information can influence whether discrimination is detected or not. Subjects receiving materials, containing evidence of sex discrimination, for each department separately rather than in aggregate form perceived there was less discrimination. These results replicate other findings of the same effect (Crosby, Burris, Censor, & MacKethan, 1986; Crosby, Clayton, Alksnis, & Hemker, 1986). Hence, one good reason for conducting workforce analyses in aggregate form is that there is greater probability of exposing the existence of discrimination and thus defending the establishment of an affirmative action plan to mitigate the effects of past discrimination.

Also, selecting qualifications for successful job performance and then evaluating applicants accordingly can serve a discriminatory function if these qualifications are not essential to performing the job. Recent court cases have influenced employers to become more cautious when defining qualifications needed for successful job performance (Glasser, 1988; Holloway, 1989) and to develop less discriminatory measures to evaluate candidates (Glasser, 1988). However, opponents of the legal remedy view state affirmative action serves as a quota system (establishing numerical goals and timetables). This view assumes that all affirmative action programs entail strong preferential treatment which is a common misconception about the nature of affirmative action. Although all affirmative action programs do not and should not consist of quota systems, Glasser (1988) argued that it would be difficult to determine improvements in employment practices without some quantifiable measure, such as a numerical goal or timetable.

Second, Glasser (1988) noted that some forms of affirmative action can be seen as compensatory opportunity. Members of certain groups are given credit for their race, gender, or status due to being discriminated against in the past on this very basis. For example, veterans as a group were drafted into the war without a choice and consequently lost time, education, and economic benefits. The Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 was enacted to compensate for this. Some could argue that Blacks as a group were oppressed for years and were disadvantaged

because of this; thus, affirmative action was enacted to redress this . Yet, some believe race-based or sex-based compensation is not the same as it is for veterans. Blits and Gottfredson (1990) state "preferential consideration on the basis of race differs from grateful repayment for service to the nation; more generally, granting people rights merely because of their race differs from grouping together individuals with the same preexisting rights and claims" (p. 24).

It seems that whether affirmative action is viewed as a compensatory opportunity depends upon the beneficiary group in question. Because veterans have "contributed" to the welfare of this great nation and in the process lost valuables such as time and education, veterans were accorded protective status. On the other hand, Blacks and women would be given special status only on the basis of ethnic background or gender. In many people's eyes, this should not constitute compensatory action. Research has shown that there are varying levels of deservingness when it comes to compensatory opportunity. For example, several studies have shown negative reactions toward affirmative action programs directed at minorities and women but not toward the elderly (Murrell, Dietz-Uhler, Gaertner, & Drout, 1994) or individuals with disabilities (Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Murrell et al., 1994). Thus, the question of what should constitute compensatory opportunity has created much debate.

Third, it is argued that affirmative action is needed for social/political effectiveness reasons (Glasser, 1988). It serves as a mechanism through which fair and visible representation for minorities and women can be attained. One criticism of this stance is that affirmative action programs will give preference to underqualified minorities and women (e.g. Loury, 1986). Conversely, it will discriminate against equally qualified or more qualified Whites. Holloway (1989) asserted that this is one common misperception of affirmative action programs. Affirmative action programs can be implemented in different ways and do not necessarily suggest underqualified minorities and women will be hired (Glasser, 1988). Affirmative action programs designed to remedy employers' past discriminatory practices allow the use race or gender as a plus factor in the selection process after the determination that applicants have met qualifications (Bennett-Alexander, 1990; Glasser, 1988; Pettigrew & Martin,

1987; Turner, 1990). However, Gottfredson (1988, 1990) stated this can lead to a lowering of standards or a minimum cutoff, rather than selecting from the most qualified. Another concern is that Whites, who have not been directly responsible for discrimination are being penalized, often called reverse discrimination.

Summary

In summary, affirmative action is mandatory for contractors receiving federal funds and involuntary for other organizations wishing to remedy past discriminatory practices within their organization specifically. Because there has been much controversy over the policy of affirmative action, it is quite possible that organizations have begun to reconsider implementing voluntary affirmative action programs. In order to shed more light on the issue, it is appropriate to review and discuss empirical data rather than relying on political opinions in assessing affirmative action. In the next section, individuals' perceptions, attitudes, and reactions to affirmative action programs will be discussed, as well as possible theories for these reactions.

Reactions to and perceptions of affirmative action

There have been several studies conducted with the goal of describing people's reactions to affirmative action programs. Consistent differences between men and women, and Whites and minorities in their attitudes toward affirmative action programs have been found (e.g., Kravitz, 1992; Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Research also indicates that individuals' beliefs regarding components of affirmative action programs are related to their attitudes toward such programs (e.g., Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Thus, reactions to affirmative action plans and the theories that have been applied to explain these reactions will be discussed.

Reactions to Affirmative Action Programs

There have been various research studies focusing on people's opinion about affirmative action. For example, Goldsmith, Cordova, Dwyer, Langlois, and Crosby (1989) conducted a case study analysis on individuals' attitudes toward a newly implemented affirmative action program at a liberal arts college for women. Because a group of students protested due to their lack of input into

this decision, the administration conducted sessions to provide information to the campus. Noting the campus' informational concern, the researchers predicted a positive relationship between the amount of information subjects had regarding the affirmative action program and attitudes toward the program. Attitudes toward affirmative action were generally positive with no differences existing between students, faculty, support staff, or administrators. Only a moderate relationship was found between attitudes and amount of knowledge of the affirmative action program. Gender effects were explored using only faculty, support staff, and administration for analyses (n = 47), since there were no males in the student sample. Women tended to have more positive attitudes than men, yet both gender groups were similar in their knowledge of affirmative action.

Goldsmith et al.'s (1989) research concluded that providing information may not affect one's attitudes toward affirmative action. However, Goldsmith et al.'s (1989) results should be interpreted with caution for several reasons, including small sample size (n=62) and the possibility that subjects in the study may have been reacting to only the affirmative action program implemented at the college. This second potential limitation is supported by studies that will be discussed later which indicate different components of affirmative action have a differential effect on attitudes. Regardless of whether subjects were responding to affirmative action at the university or to affirmative action in general, Goldsmith et al.'s conclusion conflicts with recommendations for implementing effective affirmative action programs. For example, some researchers have emphasized the importance of informing/educating employees about affirmative action (e.g., Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Providing subjects/employees with information about the nature of affirmative action plans may prove to have a positive effect on attitudes toward affirmative action programs. Research has shown that many individuals are both misinformed and uninformed (Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993; Kravitz, Stinson, & Mello, 1994); they do not know these programs are designed to be temporary and can have many different components.

Another study was conducted using affirmative action officers and administrators at numerous research, doctorate granting, and comprehensive universities (Tickamyer, Scollay, Bokemeier, &

Wood, 1989). The sample consisted of 1,894 administrators and 151 affirmative action officers; only 6.7% of administrators were non-White whereas 44% of affirmative action officers were non-White. Although both groups believed affirmative action was needed, administrators were less likely than affirmative action officers to believe affirmative action had made an impact on their campus. For administrators, gender, age, and years in position influenced attitudes about the impact of affirmative action but this did not hold for affirmative action officers. More specifically, women administrators, younger administrators, and administrators who had been in their position a shorter length of time tended to disagree that affirmative action programs had made an impact on their campus. Also, non-White administrators believed that advancements had been made for women but not for non-Whites. Administrators tended to disagree that hiring goals for women and minorities were needed; whereas, affirmative action officers agreed these goals were needed. However, younger, less senior administrators were more likely to see a need for affirmative action goals than older, more senior administrators. This study illustrates the differing of opinion of officers and administrators regarding perceptions of affirmative action's impact and hiring goals.

Kluegel and Smith (1983) stated that although Whites may approve of programs which aid minorities in receiving an equal opportunity for jobs and education, they tend to oppose affirmative action. But there are various components of affirmative action that can have a differential impact on attitudes. First, framing can have an effect on the respondent's reaction to the affirmative action plan (Kinder & Sanders, 1990). Second, specific components of an affirmative action plan can influence reactions as well. For example, individuals least like quota hiring, where a certain number or proportion of a minority group are hired, and preferential treatment, where a minority applicant is preferred if qualifications are comparable (Johnson, 1980; Kluegel, 1985; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993; Kravitz, Stinson, & Mello, 1994; Veilleux & Tougas, 1989). However, individuals are more favorable toward training and recruitment efforts (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992).

Framing. The concept of framing refers to an organizing mechanism which produces structure among its elements and meaning of those elements (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987). Kinder and Sanders (1990) hypothesized providing a particular frame would influence how individuals understand and react to a particular subject matter. By using a 1985 National Election Pilot Study of 380 people, the researchers varied the frame of affirmative action programs designed to help Blacks; one reflected the opinion of advocates by stating it was needed for "remedial action" and two reflected the opinion of opponents by stating it was an "unfair advantage" or "reverse discrimination." Results profiled Whites as contesting affirmative action in personnel selection and college admissions in all three framing conditions. However, feelings of anger, disgust, and "infuriated" were expressed more in the unfair advantage frame. Framing effects were also found when considering dominant antecedents of opinions of affirmative action. For example, when asked to think of affirmative action in reverse discrimination terms, self-interest, collective group's interest, and enhancement or violation of principles were important considerations in formation of an opinion. For the unfair advantage frame, racial prejudice attitudes toward the policy's beneficiaries was the most important antecedent in forming an opinion of affirmative action. Antecedent analyses were not conducted for the remedial action frame. One last finding depicted individuals who were less politically informed were more affected by the frames than individuals who were more informed. One main implication of the study is that attitudes toward affirmative action may change depending on how the policy is presented. Another, less obvious, implication is that frames are provided by the political culture and, to some extent, our opinions are dependent upon this political climate.

Similarly, Taylor, Doverspike, and Alexander (1991) found that how the program is communicated will affect people's reactions. Although most organizations justify affirmative action programs based on remedying past discrimination, their research suggested the focus should be on equity. Tougas and Veilleux (1988) noted that women in their study preferred affirmative action programs that ensured fair treatment rather than programs emphasizing the remedying of past discrimination. Yet, Nacoste (1985) found that by providing historical information regarding the

institution's past discrimination served to heighten subjects' reactions of fairness toward the procedure utilized. Subjects receiving this information felt more deserving of the outcome than subjects not given this information. Similarly, Kravitz et al.'s (1994) study respondents favorably evaluated affirmative action programs for organizations with a history of discrimination.

Murrell et al. (1994) conducted a recent framing study in which they hypothesized and found support for a policy effect. Affirmative action policies phrased as preferential treatment or reverse discrimination were seen as giving no justification for the program and consequently were negatively evaluated. However, policies framed as remediating historical injustices or achieving diversity were perceived as providing justification for the program and positively influenced one's attitude toward the affirmative action policy.

Components and Targets of Affirmative Action. Several studies have assessed the beliefs regarding components of affirmative action programs, evaluation of those components, the relationship between attitudes and beliefs and evaluation, and demographical differences in this relationship. Kravitz and Platania (1992) had 103 student subjects complete a questionnaire asking their attitudes toward components of a race-based affirmative action plan. The components seen as most likely to be true of an affirmative action plan were provision of information to the government, use of quotas, and hiring and promoting a certain number of Blacks. The use of quotas and hiring/promoting a certain number of Blacks were negatively related to attitudes toward affirmative action programs; yet, the strongest negative relationship between a component of a race-based affirmative action program and attitudes toward that program occurred when the component dealt with forcing organizations to hire unqualified Blacks. Although this component received the strongest negative reactions, it should also be noted that this component is not an element of legally-defensible affirmative action plan and was rated as being very unlikely of an affirmative action plan by subjects. However, for some affirmative action programs that illegally function as quotas, hiring unqualified Blacks (or any other "target group" members) may be a likely component of the program.

When evaluating each component, subjects indicated that a race-based affirmative action program that forced hiring of unqualified Blacks and used preferential treatment were most unfavorable; programs that eliminated discrimination, ignored race, used recruitment and training potential employees rather than training present employees were among the most favorable. Evaluations of the components were more highly correlated with attitudes toward the race-based affirmative action program than ratings of how likely each component would be included in an affirmative action program. Demographic differences were noted as females held more positive attitudes regarding race-based affirmative action than men; Blacks rated race-based affirmative action more positively than Whites with Latinos falling between these two groups.

Kravitz and Platania (1993) conducted a similar study to their 1992 research. Instead of using race-based affirmative action in general, this study manipulated the target of the affirmative action (Blacks, Women, and individuals with disabilities). With 349 subjects completing the same scales used in their 1992 study, results showed that most respondents believed affirmative action would involve providing information to the government, using quotas, hiring and promoting a certain number of people of a given status, considering status when making employment decisions, and additional recruiting. Most respondents did not believe affirmative action programs would require organizations to hire unqualified applicants, to hire on the basis of strict proportional hiring ignoring applicant qualifications, or to disregard race.

As in their 1992 study, the researchers found that evaluation of the component was more related to attitudes toward affirmative action than how likely the component was perceived to be true. For many unfavorable components, the greater the likelihood the component was perceived to be true of an affirmative action plan, the more unfavorable the attitude toward affirmative action. Likewise, for several favorable items, the greater the likelihood the component was seen to be true of the plan, the more favorable the attitude toward affirmative action. Women tended to evaluate affirmative action more favorably than men and Blacks tended to evaluate it more positively than Hispanics or Whites. Other research has found the same in which women and minority students held more positive

attitudes toward affirmative action than white men (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Murrell, 1994). On the other hand, Murrell et al. (1994) found the opposite; women held more negative attitudes toward affirmative action than men.

Kravitz and Platania (1993) also concluded that the affirmative action target did not affect overall attitudes toward affirmative action but did affect evaluation of individual components. For the most part, individuals were less inclined to oppose consideration of status, preferential treatment, hiring of unqualified employees, and more favorable of training employees when the target was an individual with a disability.

Based on past research, Kravitz et al. (1994) further explored people's reactions to affirmative action by first determining how people define quotas and preferential treatment. The most common definition of quotas was a procedure in which a certain number of a minority group are hired. Preferential treatment definitions were more ambiguous with most respondents mentioning special treatment or favoritism. Surprisingly enough, 40% of the respondents did not know any information regarding affirmative action. Overall, the results replicated their other research. Proportional hiring based on the number of qualified minority applicants was preferred to quotas and proportional hiring ignoring qualifications. Although weak preferential treatment was evaluated more positively than strong preferential treatment, it was still disliked by those groups who would benefit the most.

Kravitz et al. (1992, 1993, 1994) noted that although respondents supported the abolishment of discrimination and proportional hiring based on the number of qualified applicants, they did not believe these components would be included in affirmative action programs. Instead, they believed quotas were more likely and consequently were less favorable. This indicated respondents were not well informed regarding the law underlying affirmative action, since quotas are illegal unless mandated by the court. Alternatively, their beliefs may be an accurate reflection of some affirmative action programs which, counter to law, function as quota programs. Lack of information or misinformation regarding legally-administered affirmative action plans could have influenced their negative perceptions of such plans. However, Goldsmith et al.'s (1989) study may argue against such an interpretation as

there were no differences between individuals' amount of knowledge of the affirmative action plan and attitude toward affirmative action. Meaning, individuals with a greater knowledge of affirmative action programs were not more likely to have favorable attitudes toward such programs.

Theories and Concepts To Explain Reactions

For the number of reactions to affirmative action, there seems to be an equal number of theories to explain them. To fully understand people's reactions to affirmative action and their perceptions and attitudes of affirmative action, it would be useful to discuss underlying themes in these reactions.

Process-level Issues. Many researchers have taken the approach that in order to understand affirmative action reactions, it is also necessary to emphasize the specific process involved rather than just the outcomes of the process (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Nacoste, 1987b, 1990; Outtz, 1990). Hence, a distinction between distributive and procedural justice is important. Distributive justice, macrojustice, encompasses issues surrounding the fairness in resulting outcomes; it is an outcome-based level of analysis. On the other hand, procedural justice, microjustice, pertains to the means or mechanisms in which an outcome or decision is reached; it is based on process-level analysis (Austin, Friedman, Martz, Hooe, & Pregerson Ball, 1977; Clayton & Tangri, 1989; Nacoste, 1985, 1987b). Whether analysis of affirmative action programs should be approached from an outcome-level (e.g., Clayton & Tangri, 1989) or from a process-level (e.g., Nacoste, 1987b) is still in debate. Most people recognize there are important psychological outcomes concerning affirmative action, along with economic and political ones (Nacoste, 1987b, 1990). Yet, Nacoste (1987b) stated that relying on the identification of outcomes alone brings us no closer to understanding why these effects occur or how to prevent negative consequences. Thus, by analyzing and understanding process-level variables underlying affirmative action, policies can be designed and changed in order to meet greater approval and lessen unfavorable outcomes (Nacoste, 1987b).

Equity can be seen as one of three principles underlying distributive justice (Clayton & Tangri, 1989). One major problem with the equity approach, however, is that it does not allow one to predict

how the beneficiary and nonbeneficiary will try to restore equity. Beneficiaries may exert more effort in order to compensate for the "plus" factor added to their equation that Whites did not receive (i.e., see Imposter Syndrome and Productivity section below). On the other hand, nonbeneficiaries may decrease performance efforts in order to bring about a perceived balance. A second criticism of equity theory is that it fails to consider the fact that not all affirmative action programs are the same; these programs are implemented in a variety of ways (Rosenbloom, 1984) and emphasize different components in the process (Nacoste, 1987a, 1990) which can result in more or less fair reactions to the affirmative action program. For example, procedural justice considers factors such as deservingness in reaching an outcome. In affirmative action and employment terms, deservingness is evaluated in terms of performance or achievement criteria. Affirmative action programs may vary in their emphasis on universalistic criteria (e.g., performance) versus particularistic criteria (e.g., race, gender) which impacts perceptions of fairness (Leventhal, 1980; Nacoste, 1987a). As one might guess, universalistic criteria are seen as more favorable because they are associated with the merit principle which states the most qualified will be hired (e.g., Gottfredson, 1990). On the other hand, particularistic criteria would be viewed as less favorable because they are seen to violate the merit principle.

In support of this differential effect of universalistic versus particularistic criteria, Nacoste (1985) replicated Austin, Friedman, Martz, Hooe, and Pregerson Ball's (1977) research. Austin and colleagues (1977) researched the effects of "favorable, or benignly motivated, discrimination." Their operationalization of favorable discrimination was defined as an affirmative action program with total weighting on particularistic criteria. From the study, the authors concluded that recipients and nonrecipients of the favorable affirmative action plan rated the decision process as unfair even though the standards of distributive justice were met. Nacoste (1985) critiqued the research in that only one type of procedure was manipulated. Thus, Nacoste (1985) included two procedures in his study to make a comparison. The preferential treatment condition stated that group membership as well as achievement were used in determining the selection decision; whereas, the reverse discrimination

condition stated group membership was the only factor in basing a decision. Therefore, one emphasized universalistic criteria and the other particularistic. According to Austin et al. (1977), affirmative action is seen as generally unfair; this is most likely due to the fact that many people believe affirmative action programs to consist of quota systems (Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993). Yet, the results from Nacoste's (1985) study depicted a main effect for procedure in which subjects in the universalistic condition viewed the selection procedure and decision as more positive and more fair than subjects in the particularistic condition. Thus, one may argue against Austin et al. (1977) and conclude that all affirmative action programs are not necessarily seen as unfair.

Not only can the decision criteria of affirmative action influence people's reactions, but also the stage in which these programs target can make a difference. For example, Arthur et al. (1992) make the distinction between "soft" and "hard" forms of affirmative action. Beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries tend to respond more favorably toward "softer" forms (e.g., recruiting, training, or goal-setting), than "harder" forms (e.g., emphasizing quotas). This idea is supported by Tougas and Veilleux's (1989) finding that subjects favored the elimination of discriminatory administrative procedures for women and training women in interview skills more than preferential treatment.

In all, research suggests affirmative action is not perceived as being absolutely unfair. For example, by weighting the decision on more favorable criteria, such as universalistic, and providing this information to beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries, negative responses to affirmative action may be reduced. Also, affirmative action programs targeted at other stages of the selection process, such as training programs for applicants and recruitment, may face less disagreement (Arthur et al., 1992; Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993).

Collective Relative Deprivation. Collective relative deprivation is an individual feeling of discontent based on the comparison between one's group and an outgroup. This is linked to social identity theory which states individuals wish to gain a positive identity by associating with a particular group as long as there are favorable outcomes of belonging to that group (Tajfel, 1978; Taylor & Dube', 1986). However, if one is unable to dissociate with the group due to a salient classification

characteristic (e.g., gender, race), then collective actions may be seen as more favorable if collective deprivation is present. Affirmative action has been likened to a collective action. For example, Tougas and Veilleux's (1988) findings showed individuals who identified with one's group and experienced collective relative deprivation were more likely to support affirmative action programs as long as the procedure did not include preferential treatment.

Tougas, Dube', and Veilleux (1987) found that men who felt discontent after perceiving women as having been unfairly treated in the workforce (relative deprivation on behalf of others) were more likely to support affirmative action and believe women's circumstances should be improved. Veilleux and Tougas (1989) found that when men had strong feelings of collective relative deprivation, negative reactions to affirmative action were incurred; yet, when men held feelings of relative deprivation on behalf of others, a more favorable attitude toward affirmative action resulted. The procedure had a moderating effect as men with strong feelings of collective deprivation and men with feelings of relative deprivation on behalf of others held unfavorable attitudes toward preferential treatment programs; however, programs promoting equal opportunity structure were endorsed more favorably by men with feelings of relative deprivation on behalf of others compared to men with feelings of collective deprivation.

Similarly, Tougas and Veilleux (1989) found that the more attached men were to their group, the less likely they were to recognize the unfair treatment of women. Thus, if men acknowledge sex discrimination does exist and feel discontent for the discriminated group, they will be more likely to support affirmative action efforts than men who do not feel discontent for women. This can be explained by social identity theory; threats impending upon one's group, in which a member is unable to leave the group, can result in active efforts to reestablish positive social identity. The researchers concluded that positive attitudes toward affirmative action programs can come about if individuals recognize a group has been mistreated, feel discontent with the group's standing, and identify with their own group to a greater extent if in the mistreated group or to a lesser extent if in the non-mistreated group. Advocates of the collective relative deprivation theory believe that affirmative action

programs should emphasize eliminating barriers for the mistreated group and stress abilities and qualifications of individuals rather than focusing on preferential treatment.

Related to social identity groups is the idea of individualism and collectivism. Individualism refers to the degree in which individual efforts and competitiveness are stressed; whereas collectivism is a concern for cooperation and sacrifice of personal goals for the good of the in-group (e.g., Loebe & Rodriguez, 1987). The in-group can be seen as being similar to the social identity group (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). The Arthur et al. (1992) study included the individualism-collectivism variable in a study looking at reactions to affirmative action. They hypothesized individuals who were more individualistic would be less favorable of affirmative action than collectivist individuals. However, their hypothesis was not supported. One problem noted in their study was the probability of having identified an inappropriate in-group related to the individualism-collectivism construct; the effects of individualism are a function of how the in-group is identified. In their study, they defined the in-group as society at large which may have been too broad for the construct of interest. In which case, misidentifying the in-group could lead to difficulties in predicting differential responses to affirmative action as a function of individualism or collectivism.

Structural Limitations. Tougas and Veilleux (1989) noted that it was important for individuals to notice a group as being treated unfairly. However, Kluegel and Smith's (1982, 1983) research suggested that whether or not people believe structural limitations (inequality of opportunity) exist can influence reactions to affirmative action. Based on 1,309 interviews, Kluegel and Smith (1982) concluded that Whites tend not to believe Blacks face any structural limitations. This opinion is probably shaped by the American ideology that one's location in the social stratification is a result of effort and ability, rather than structural limitations (such as discrimination). Kluegel and Smith (1983) stated that if equal opportunity programs could be developed to highlight individualism and equity, they would be met with much less adversity by Whites.

Traditional and Modern Racism. Other researchers have discussed modern racism as an explanation for negative reactions to race-based affirmative action (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kinder &

Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976). Dovidio, Mann, and Gaertner (1989) defined aversive racism as a tendency for individuals to possess biased views against Blacks but are reluctant to display their prejudice against Blacks, unlike dominative racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Dovidio and colleagues (1989) explained that two processes occur. First, due to the "historically racist culture of the U.S." and white individuals' tendency to place themselves in the superior group amongst the "we" and "they," they acquire negative feelings toward Blacks. At the same time, individuals are socialized to support traditional egalitarian values such as fairness. Thus, biases may exist but may not be expressed. This is analogous to support of what affirmative action represents but opposition to the plan itself. One point of interest is that researchers in this area have yet to incorporate sexism into their definitions of modern/aversive racism. One could extrapolate from the existing definition by replacing "Whites" with "males" and "Blacks" with females. However, there has been no research on the effects of modern/aversive sexism.

Dovidio and colleagues stated that most white individuals would not display their biases and prejudices against Blacks when it would be interpreted as a clearly racist action. However, when the situation is one in which the person would be less likely to be labeled a racist, there would be a much greater likelihood that Whites would express their "true" feelings about Blacks. Also, Whites would be more likely to display their prejudiced feelings if they were able to give some other reason besides race for their negative response toward Blacks. The authors noted research they had conducted supporting the existence of modern racism. For instance, when Whites are asked to rate Whites versus Blacks in general along positive and negative dimensions, Whites are rated more favorably; however, this effect only seems to apply across positive dimensions because Blacks are not rated more negatively than Whites. Also, when Whites are asked to evaluate other Whites and Blacks in comparison to self, subjects tend to rate themselves higher than other Whites but even more so than Blacks.

McConahay (1983) defined a similar type of racism called "modern" or "symbolic" racism. Symbolic racism occurs when individuals learn negative reactions toward Blacks while growing up and

express these attitudes later in life through symbolic rather than in direct ways. McConahay (1983) conducted a study in which it was hypothesized that more prejudiced subjects would be more likely to rate a black applicant lower than a white applicant in a context with few explicit norms for egalitarian behavior and would be more likely to rate a black applicant higher in contexts with explicit norms for egalitarian behavior. When there were few explicit norms for egalitarian behavior (i.e., rating the race manipulated applicant first without knowing the race of the other applicants), it was expected that more prejudiced subjects would be more likely to rate the race manipulated applicant lower when the applicant was black. Subjects' prejudice was assessed using the Modern Racism scale score. The results supported the hypotheses; as subjects increased in their racism score, they were more likely to rate the black applicant higher than the white applicant when norms for egalitarian behavior were explicit (i.e., race manipulated applicant was rated after two white applicants) but were more likely to rate the black applicant lower when there were few explicit norms. Subjects with lower racism scores showed more consistency in their behavior toward the black and white applicants under both conditions.

These results tend to explain why many individuals state there should be equality between the races yet are not willing to endorse programs which can possibly make equality a reality. Dovidio et al. (1989) suggested that aversive racism can have important effects on reactions to affirmative action. Individuals' aversive racism may be concealed by focusing on non-race-related issues, such as qualifications of Blacks, in order to justify their negative response to Blacks. In this instance, opposition to affirmative action programs are likely to be based on arguments of underqualifications of Blacks compared to one's own qualifications, rather than due to racial animosity.

As mentioned previously, Murrell et al. (1994) found that framing an affirmative action policy in such a way that did not provide justification (e.g., preferential treatment) for the policy led to greater resistance, especially when the beneficiary group was Blacks. The authors concluded the results supported aversive racism because a policy without justification allowed aversive racists to resist affirmative action on the basis of justice factors rather than race-related factors. Drawing from the

procedural justice literature, preferential treatment and reverse discrimination are considered micro-level justifications; their justification occurs at an individual level of analysis. On the other hand, achieving diversity and remediating past discrimination are macro-level justifications; they are policies that take a broader level of analysis. For example, hiring a qualified minority over an equally qualified White would be considered unfair at an individual level of analysis. However, if this process were continued over time, it would result in greater diversity in the workforce or remedy past discrimination in the organization which is more likely to be perceived as fair at a broader level of analysis. Because the policy framing effect occurred in the no justification condition and for Blacks but not elderly or individuals with disabilities, the authors interpreted this to mean subtle prejudice toward Blacks occurred. Yet, other research has found that not all groups are considered equally deserving for special treatment; the elderly and individuals with disabilities are seen to be disadvantaged due to factors outside of their control. Since aversive racism was not measured, it is difficult to determine whether the significant policy effect for Blacks is due to aversive racism or the fact that as a group they are not perceived to be of equal deservingness for special treatment when no justification is provided.

Dovidio, Gaertner, and Murrell (1994) conducted a similar study by manipulating the policy frame (justification or no justification) and assessed attitude toward Blacks. Again, when the affirmative action policy was presented with justification, in macrojustice terms, it was seen as more acceptable. But, fairness was not a complete explanation of people's attitudes. When the framing effect was partialed, attitudes toward Blacks predicted negative attitudes toward the affirmative action program over and above policy frame and perceived fairness. When the target was Black, Whites' attitudes toward affirmative action was most negative. Thus, when the justification is ambiguous, subtle racism may guide reactions to affirmative action programs.

Despite some support for the Modern Racism theory, there are several criticisms concerning the construct of "modern racism" or "symbolic racism." Sniderman and Tetlock (1986a, 1986b) provided a list of arguments against the construct and theory itself. First, the authors noted that the

three main advocates of modern racism (Kinder, McConahay, and Sears) define the construct differently but do not attempt to reconcile their definition to the other existing definitions. Second, because the construct is defined differently, one can imagine the trouble in operationalizing it. Sniderman and Tetlock (1986a, 1986b) stated that the measures that have been developed are similar in nature but also include some differences. They cautioned that even small differences in wording can have an effect on one's response as well as what is being measured. Also, because it is an unconscious process, it cannot be assessed using self-report measures. This makes it difficult to measure. Third, the cause and effect relationship between anti-black affect and traditional values, two of the basic variables underlying modern racism, is unknown. And finally, the authors suggest modern racism may not be a separate construct from overt racism or "old-fashioned" racism as advocates of modern racism tend to believe. They stated that past studies have found at least a moderate relationship between the types of racism. However, Sidanius, Devereux, and Pratto (1992) tested Sears' (1988) model of symbolic racism using LISREL and found some support for the existence of two separate constructs of symbolic racism and traditional racism. Dovidio et al., (1994) also attempted to show indirect evidence that aversive racism is separate from overt racism when they held expressed racial attitude constant and found no decrease in the effect size for the framing condition.

Self-interest. Another theory which may explain negative reactions to affirmative action, especially by the majority group, concerns self-interest. Positive reactions to affirmative action by minority groups would tend to support self-interest as well (Dovidio et al., 1994; Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993). By advancing minority status in employment, education, etc., individuals may feel a sense of racial threat, fearing possible economic and status losses (Jacobson, 1985). Yet, proponents of the modern racism view have not found much support for the self-interest model.

Jacobson (1985) reviewed old racism (i.e., opposition to integration), modern racism, and self-interest as they related to affirmative action programs. Jacobson posited that all three may be contained within attitudes toward affirmative action programs. By using a 1978 national poll of 1,584 white respondents, subjects were asked a series of questions pertaining to modern racism, old racism,

and self-interest. Also, a series of control variables were assessed to explain what kinds of reactions were being tapped by the racism and self-interest questions; a few of these control variables were black stereotypes, tolerance of interpersonal intimacy (measuring social distance), and demographic variables. Using regression analyses, Jacobson found that the two types of racism and self-interest were significantly related to attitudes toward affirmative action programs, even when the control variables were entered into the equation. However, modern racism had a stronger relationship to attitudes than old racism or self-interest. Jacobson noted that because his research was based on a national sample, the results were more generalizable than previous studies on symbolic racism that have used small, local samples.

Summary of Theories. In an effort to understand the different theories of reactions to affirmative action programs, Kravitz (1993) conducted a study comparing Leventhal's (1980) justice judgment, racism and self-interest (e.g., Jacobson, 1985), collective deprivation and relative deprivation on behalf of others (Veilleux & Tougas, 1989), and Kluegel and Smith's (1982, 1983, 1986) perspective. Leventhal's (1980) justice judgment stated procedures are seen as fair as long as they satisfy six justice rules: consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. Kluegel and Smith (1982, 1983, 1986) purported three factors as determining attitudes toward affirmative action: (a) belief in the dominant ideology (belief that everyone has the opportunity to be successful economically, individual rather than structural factors determine success/failure, inequality is due to unequal efforts); (b) self-interest; (c) specific beliefs and attitudes. In the study, 194 students evaluated eight different programs with different emphases (e.g., race blind procedures, training, weak preferential treatment, quota) and provided their attitude toward race-based affirmative in general and toward various variables relating to the theories described above.

The results depicted subjects as preferring programs in which race did not influence employment decisions; as noted in previously discussed studies, preferential treatment was very disliked. In evaluating the different theories, no support was found for Kluegel and Smith's ideological explanation for attitudes toward affirmative action. However, there was a weak relationship between

relative deprivation on behalf of others and attitudes of affirmative action in general; yet, racism beliefs and self-interest concerns were strongly related to attitudes of affirmative action in general. But the most interesting finding was that results supported Leventhal's justice judgment. Fairness ratings of specific affirmative action programs were strongly related to programs being perceived as consistent, representative, ethical, and unbiased.

Kravitz et al. (1994) conducted another study which found that personal and collective self-interest were strongly related to attitudes toward affirmative action. The authors hypothesized that collective self-interest would mediate personal self-interest and attitudes but did not find support for this. Personal self-interest and effectiveness were significant predictors of attitudes while collective relative deprivation and relative deprivation were not. Thus, if the affirmative action program was perceived to help one advance their self-interest and was seen as being effective in aiding the target group(s), respondents supported affirmative action.

In a similar study, Kravitz (1994) concluded that attitude toward affirmative action in general did not predict attitudes toward specific affirmative action programs. Specific affirmative action components rather than an individual difference variable seem to play a role in attitude development. Specific affirmative action programs and attitude toward specific affirmative action programs was mediated by fairness judgments and partially mediated by personal self-interest; however, collective self-interest did not mediate this relationship. Although racism and self-interest in general predicted attitude toward affirmative action in general, affirmative action in general did not mediate the relationship between these variables and attitude toward specific affirmative action programs. As in his 1993 study, ideological factors did not predict attitude toward affirmative in general.

Effects/consequences of affirmative action

Information regarding people's reaction to affirmative action can aid our understanding in the unintended effects and consequences of affirmative action. Although most research concludes it has a negative effect on beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries alike (Chacko, 1982; Garcia, Erskine, Hawn, & Casmay, 1981; Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992), many of these studies disregard procedural

components of the program. As discussed previously, procedural components of specific programs can influence reactions to affirmative action and may also neutralize such negative effects.

Affirmative action has been directly linked to attractiveness of jobs (Heilman & Herlihy, 1984), the stigmatization of incompetence (e.g., Heilman, 1994), adverse affects in leadership positions (Heilman, Kaplow, Amato, Stathatos, 1993), promotion and turnover problems (Ferdman, 1989; Stephenson & Krebs, 1993), social structure issues (Bell, 1989), and indirectly to organizational commitment (Tsui, Egan, O'Reilly, 1992). Yet, it has not been found to negatively affect organizational rewards (Daum & Ryan, 1993) or productivity (Leonard, 1984a; Lovrich, Steel, & Hood, 1986; Steel & Lovrich, 1987).

Attractiveness of Jobs

There is evidence that as the ratio of women within male sex-typed jobs increases, women will become more interested in these jobs while men become disinterested (e.g., Heilman, 1979). However, affirmative action plays a moderating role in this relationship (Heilman & Herlihy, 1984). Heilman and Herlihy (1984) used 175 high school students in a project manipulating the proportion of women in sales positions (a male sex-typed job) and the basis in which the positions were acquired (merit, preferential treatment, no information). Subjects were then asked to indicate their degree of interest in the job. When balanced sex ratios were due to preferential treatment, negative reactions occurred among men and women. Women were more interested in the job when the proportion of women in the job was high and merit was responsible for their position. Men showed less interest in the position when it involved preferential treatment, regardless of the proportion of women in the position. And finally, in the no information condition, when the proportion of women in the job was high males assumed women had attained those positions through preferential treatment whereas women believed the women had attained them through merit.

It seems that men believed women were less qualified for the job and thus the only way they could have received the job was if affirmative action was responsible for their hire. This interpretation is consistent with other research (see Heilman et al., 1992 below). Women believed less male sex-

typed characteristics were needed for the job when there was a balanced sex ratio and when the position was attained through merit or when no information was provided. This effect did not hold true in the preferential treatment condition which implies job sex-typing, the proportion of women in the job, and how the women came to the position all influence women's interest in the job.

The stigmatization of incompetence

One possible consequence of affirmative action programs that has been evident in much of research is the stigma hypothesis (Austin et al., 1977; Chacko, 1982; Nacoste, 1989). The stigma hypothesis predicts that using sex or race or some group variable inevitably results in a decrement weighting of merit. Thus, individuals belonging to a particular group are left wondering whether they were hired, promoted, etc. based on their qualifications or group membership. This can have a profound effect on beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. Stronger forms of affirmative action might require Whites and members of target groups to input the same amount of effort but result in unequal outcomes because a plus factor would be given to target groups while none would be given to Whites. This inequality or unfairness between Whites and target groups could result in the resentment of beneficiaries, guilt and self-doubt among the beneficiaries (Nacoste, 1990), and increased hostility among nonbeneficiaries (Johnson, 1980).

Whether there are discrepancies between affirmative action programs stating only target member applicants meeting qualifications will be hired and whether these applicants are actually qualified is an issue. Yet, even if there are no discrepancies, nonbeneficiaries' perceptions of the program can influence their reaction to the programs and its beneficiaries. For example, Garcia et al. (1981) hypothesized that minority applicants to a graduate program with an affirmative action plan would be viewed as being less qualified for acceptance into the school, regardless of whether the applicant was accepted or rejected; yet, nonminority applicants would be viewed as having more qualifications. Their lab study results showed that minority applicants were rated higher when the college did not have an affirmative action program; yet, whether the college had an affirmative action program or not had no effect on ratings of qualification for nonminority applicants. In the second

study, a replication was done with correction of two confounds from the first study. Again, the results were similar. Garcia et al. (1981) found evidence of a discounting and augmenting effect for minorities and were able to reject alternative explanations of the results. When minorities were accepted into the program, subjects tended to discount ability and when rejected from the program subjects tended to augment ability. Thus, differential attribution effects occurred.

Heilman et al. (1992) conducted a similar study in which they hypothesized that hiring associated with an affirmative action program would lead subjects to attribute selection of women into a position being due to the program rather than qualifications, viewing the woman as less competent. If discounting of qualifications does occur, then it was expected to equally affect a job in which women were seen to be typically less qualified and one in which women would not be seen as typically less qualified. By manipulating the job as either a male sex-typed job or a slightly male sex-typed job, subjects were asked to evaluate the hiree (man, woman, affirmative action woman) on perceived competence. When no mention was made of affirmative action, women were viewed as less competent than men for the male sex-typed job but not the slightly male sex-typed job. However, when affirmative action was mentioned, women were perceived as less competent for both types of jobs. Moreover, affirmative action women were described as being less active and less likely to have been selected on the basis of qualifications.

In order to generalize from the lab study to the field, a second study was conducted to explore perceived competence of affirmative action individuals in one's workplace. Subjects were confronted in train stations, airports, and outdoor sitting areas and were asked to fill out a questionnaire. Subjects were to indicate a close co-worker belonging to a target group for their organization and were asked to rate the co-worker on the extent to which they felt affirmative action had played a role in the co-worker's hire and perceived competence of the co-worker. Over 50% of the variance was accounted for in competence ratings by the degree in which subjects viewed affirmative action had played a part in the co-workers' hire. Subjects believing affirmative action had a great deal to do with their co-worker's hire tended to rate them lower in competency. These results seem to hold

regardless of gender, race (Black or White), position level in the organization, or length of time in contact with the co-worker. In adjectival descriptions, co-workers were perceived as less favorable when subjects believed they were selected on the basis of an affirmative action plan. Thus, both studies tend to support the discounting of qualifications when associated with an affirmative action program.

There are several criticisms of this research, however. First, the nature of the second study was a non-controlled setting. Soliciting responses from individuals at the mentioned locations may not control for many confounds. For example, if responses were gathered at lunch time from workers, is there a difference between those who venture outside the work area for lunch versus individuals who do not? Second, the study did not control for attitudes toward affirmative action programs. For instance, research has found that individuals who hold more positive attitudes toward affirmative action are not afflicted with self-perceptions of incompetence (Nacoste, 1989). Similarly, it may be that workers who have more positive attitudes toward their affirmative action program may not view their target member co-workers as incompetent. Third, process-level issues of affirmative action programs were not controlled; as mentioned previously, different components of affirmative action programs may meet with more or less adversity. Finally, it is possible that subjects make judgments of competence first and then made inferences regarding the role affirmative action played in their selection. The authors noted that in the first study, subjects were given the same application with no performance indicants which would make it difficult for subjects to make judgments of competence first; yet, this explanation cannot be completely ruled out.

Summers (1991) made similar inferences from a leadership viewpoint by comparing perceptions of women's qualifications in organizations which had adopted an affirmative action program (pro-affirmative action) versus organizations which had rejected an affirmative action plan (anti-affirmative action). Subjects were given materials describing a woman being considered for a managerial promotion. The materials depicted the woman with an equal amount of favorable and unfavorable qualities and was at least 50% qualified for the position. All subjects were told the woman

was to be promoted. Men and women in the pro-affirmative action organization condition discounted the woman's qualifications and rated her as being less than 50% qualified for the position. However, women, but not men, in the anti-affirmative action program viewed the woman to be more than 50% qualified. It was suggested that the women were probably more capable of recognizing barriers in succeeding in managerial positions; anti-affirmative action programs might be perceived as hindrances in promotion to a male-dominated, male sex-typed position. Because of this, women viewed the promotion candidate as having had higher qualifications in order to have overcome these barriers. Males, on the other hand, probably failed to recognize these issues and relied on stereotypical views of women in male sex-typed positions and assumed they were less qualified. These findings somewhat support contentions that recognizing unfair treatment and rejecting stereotypical views of women is necessary in order for affirmative action programs to be viewed as favorable (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989).

Affirmative action may not only affect nonbeneficiaries' perceptions of a beneficiaries' competence in leadership roles but also the beneficiaries' self-perception of competence. Heilman, Simon, and Repper (1987) hypothesized selection of a female leader using preferential treatment rather than merit would have a negative effect on her self-perceptions and persistence in the role, regardless of performance information. Based on research indicating women are less likely to be confident in leadership roles than men because leadership roles are seen as male sex-typed positions, it was expected that women would have lower expectations for performance and evaluate performance accordingly regardless of their actual performance. Supporting their hypotheses, women in the preferential treatment condition were more negative in evaluating their performance, took less responsibility for positive outcomes, rated persistence in the leadership role as less desirable, and viewed leadership ability as lacking. However, men were not affected by the process of leader selection.

One process-level variable of affirmative action programs that seems to affect the stigma hypothesis is stressing the beneficiaries' qualifications for the job to the beneficiaries and to other

employees (e.g., Tougas & Veilleux, 1989). Nacoste (1985) manipulated the qualifications of the recipient of the affirmative action program as either being superior or inferior to another applicant. He found that subjects in the superior qualification condition felt more weight was given to universalistic criteria (e.g., performance) than particularistic (e.g., race) than those in the inferior qualification condition. Superior qualification subjects also displayed more positive affect, perceived the selection procedure and decision to be more fair, and felt more worthy of the outcome than subjects in the inferior qualification condition. One question that comes to mind is what would be a beneficiary's response if his/her qualifications were equal to a nontarget member applicant, since this is what most affirmative action programs purport to do.

Heilman, Lucas, and Kaplow (1990) conducted an extension of the Heilman et al. (1987) study by positing confidence levels in women act as a moderating variable in the preferential selection and self-perception of leadership ability relationship. Results showed that women in the preferential selection condition provided with no performance information held significantly more negative self-perceptions regarding their performance and leadership ability and were less likely to persist in the leadership role than women in merit based and preferential treatment with positive performance information. Also, women in the preferential selection condition provided with negative performance information showed similar effects as women provided with no information. However, women in the preferential treatment provided with positive performance information were no different than women in the merit based selection. On the other hand, men in the preferential treatment with no performance information, men in the preferential treatment condition with positive performance information, and men in the merit based selection depicted no differences in performance evaluation, leadership ability, or desire to persist in the leadership role. Finally, men and women in the preferential selection negative performance information condition both exhibited negative self-views than men and women in merit based conditions. Yet, it should be noted that differences still existed between men and women in this condition; women receiving negative performance information were more negative in their self-view of leadership ability and were less likely to persist than men receiving the same information. This

supports other research that finds women are less likely to be confident about their leadership ability than men (Heilman, 1983).

Thus, providing performance information seems to mitigate the stigma effects of affirmative action; however, other research has indicated that the specificity of the information is important. Heilman, Block, and Stathatos (1994) replicated other studies' results in which individuals hired under an affirmative action program were seen as less competent and qualifications were perceived to play a minor role in selection decisions. In fact, these individuals were seen as performing no differently than individuals who performed poorly on the job. The same effect occurred for personnel recommendations which indicates a domino effect that could potentially affect promotion and retention. Only when performance information was clearly success information did it mitigate negative competence judgments due to being associated with an affirmative action program; if the information was success but not clear success, it had no effect on modifying negative competence inferences. These results fit with schematic information-processing models that suggest once a schema is formed, ambiguous information can be distorted to support one's schema or filtered (see Stangor & McMillan, 1992). It is only when the information clearly disconfirms the schema that it is noticed. On a more positive note, though, negativity arising from being associated with an affirmative action program did not generalize to other characteristics of the individual such as interpersonal skills.

These results indicate that when preferentially selected without being given any performance information, women tend to view themselves below average whereas men perceive themselves above average. Thus, women can be differentially affected by preferential treatment situations. The authors suggested that their findings do not imply that this situation will result for all women and all positions. Women with higher levels of confidence and women applying for female-sex-typed jobs may not fall victims to such negative consequences of preferential treatment. Yet, as indicated by in the present study, such negative effects can be prevented by focusing on the woman's qualifications and providing clear success performance information in preferential selection situations (when accurate).

Related to leadership issues, Heilman, Rivero, and Brett (1991) performed a study in which it was proposed that perceived, not just actual, preferential selection situations would differentially affect task selection for women but not men. The authors noted that task selection can have important implications for employees advancing up the organizational ladder. Selecting more difficult tasks can improve one's chances of providing competence and ambition information to one's supervisor. Males and females were randomly placed into either the merit based or preferential treatment selection conditions. Then, subjects were given a choice between two tasks, one more demanding than the other. Results characterized preferential treatment women choosing the less demanding of the two tasks and evaluating their managerial ability less favorably than merit based women. On the other hand, there were no significant differences between men in the preferential treatment condition and merit based men.

A second study in Heilman et al. (1991) was conducted to explore the effects of women's self-confidence on the selection method and task selection relationship. Women were randomly placed into one of three conditions (merit based selection, preferential selection with positive performance information, and preferential selection with no information). Confidence level was found to moderate the relationship between selection method and task selection. Preferential selection women provided with positive performance information were more likely to select the more difficult of the two tasks and evaluated their ability favorably; these women were not significantly different from merit-based selection women. However, preferential selection women not provided with this information were significantly more likely to select the easier of the two tasks and evaluated their ability unfavorably. Also, in both studies (i.e., Heilman et al., 1990, 1991), subjects chosen on the basis of merit always felt the procedure was more fair than subjects in preferential selection methods.

And finally, in a recent study, preferential selection of women in decision-making positions was seen as having an adverse effect on the selection of same-sex applicants (Heilman, Kaplow, Amato, & Stathatos, 1993). The basis for the argument was based on social identity theory and negative perceptions of self. First, previous research has indicated the likelihood of negative self-evaluation as

a result of association with preferential treatment. Second, social identity theory states if there are negative associations of belonging to one's group, individuals will attempt to distance themselves from that group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, it was hypothesized that women having negative self-evaluations based on preferential selection would reject other women. Male and female subjects were asked to play the role of a manager and to evaluate a male or female applicant for a subordinate position. Elaborate care was taken to ensure subjects were aware of how they were selected for the position (on the basis of merit or preferential treatment) and that the qualifications of the male and female candidates were the same. Results supported the hypotheses as women in the preferential treatment condition were more negative toward other women. They were less favorable in their hiring recommendations, evaluation of competency, affective reaction, and hiring preference of women candidates. Men, on the other hand, did not differ along these dimensions as a function of selection procedure.

In Heilman and colleagues' (1993) second study, the researchers were interested in the effects of manipulating the degree of self-confidence in work-related ability. As discussed above (Heilman et al., 1990, 1991), this variable has moderated selection effects on perceptions of ability. The researchers hypothesized that women hired under preferential treatment provided with favorable ability information and women selected on the basis of merit would evaluate male and female applicants similarly due to a bolstering of confidence levels. However, preferential treatment women not given this ability information would tend to exhibit self-perceptions of incompetence in a typically male job which results in a lower evaluation for women than men applicants. This relationship suggested a mediation effect of confidence levels or self-perceptions of competence on the selection process and evaluation of the same-sex applicants. Again, the hypotheses were sustained for evaluations on hiring recommendations, competence, affective reactions, and hiring preference. Furthermore, preferential selection-no information women had lower performance expectations for themselves than those in the preferential selection-positive information and the merit-based conditions. When performance expectations were held constant, the significant relationship between selection method and evaluation

of same-sex applicants disappeared. This provides support for a mediation effect. In summary, self-perceptions of competence mediated the relationship between selection method and evaluations of other women.

Another important concept in the affirmative action literature which relates to the stigma effect is attributions and reward allocation. The research discussed thus far has shown that individuals make differential attributions about applicant hires and performance based upon whether an organization has an affirmative action program or not. For organizations with affirmative action programs, non-target group members are likely to believe target members were selected on the basis of preferential treatment instead of merit. Furthermore, non-target group members are likely to attribute good performance to luck or chance and poor performance to effort or ability for target group members (Crosby & Clayton, 1990; Daum & Ryan, 1993). Based on past findings that performance attributions can affect reward allocation (Heilman & Guzzo, 1978; Pazy, 1986), Daum and Ryan (1993) hypothesized performance attributions would be different for Blacks than for Whites in non-affirmative action versus affirmative action organizations which would impact allocation of organizational rewards. Deaux (1976) found that expected events were more likely to be attributed to internal, stable factors. Meanwhile, events that were unexpected were attributed to external, unstable factors. Thus, the authors hypothesized that the performance of Blacks who were associated with an affirmative action program would more likely be attributed to internal factors when performance was low and to external factors when performance was high to a greater degree than Blacks associated with a non-affirmative action program. Yet, this effect would be moderated by subjects' attitudes toward affirmative action. On this basis, organizational rewards would be dependent upon internal attributions which would result in Whites being highly recommended for organizational rewards over Blacks in general; yet, Blacks in the non-affirmative action condition would be recommended over Blacks in the affirmative action condition.

Results found that subjects were less favorable toward programs in which gender or race rather than merit prevailed. However, the presence or absence of an affirmative action program and

the applicant's race did not effect attributions of performance or organizational rewards; instead, performance was related to attributions and significantly related to organizational rewards. This suggests that individuals hired under an affirmative action or a non-affirmative action program may not be disadvantaged when being considered for organizational rewards. This is true as long as they are considered competent performers. However, performance was experimentally manipulated in the study by providing subjects with target profiles that clearly indicated high, average, or low performance. These results may not be generalizable due to the fact that such clear profiles may not exist in a real setting. Previous research has shown that expectancy effects and stereotypes can infiltrate the evaluation of performance process (e.g., Heilman, 1983).

Finally, being selected under an affirmative action program can potentially affect work outcome variables. For example, Chacko (1982) conducted a field study which assessed the effects of affirmative action on organizational outcome variables in the employment of managers. Seventy women were surveyed to indicate the extent to which they felt factors such as ability and gender were important in their hiring. Organizational outcome variables of interest were role conflict, role ambiguity, organizational commitment, and satisfaction with work to name a few. The greater the women perceived gender was an important factor in their selection, the lower their organizational commitment, satisfaction with work, supervisors, co-workers, and overall index of satisfaction compared to women perceiving ability as an important factor in selection. Also, the more likely women perceived their selection was due to gender rather than ability, the greater their role conflict and role ambiguity.

Graves and Powell (1994) also performed a field study of job attitudes and affirmative action and found the opposite of Chacko's 1982 study. Equity theory would hypothesize that job attitudes would decrease if a group was discriminated against but would not show an increase in job attitudes if given preferential treatment. Based on other research, the authors believed that self-confidence would moderate the relationship between preferential treatment and job attitudes. Women, who are more likely to have lower self-confidence, would be more likely to hold negative job attitudes if preferentially treated. Contrary to their predictions, they found that organizational commitment and satisfaction for

males increased when discrimination against them decreased, leveled off when gender did not play a role in employment decisions, and increased when preferentially treated. The same pattern resulted for organizational commitment but not satisfaction. Commitment and intent to stay were linearly and curvilinearly related to perceptions of affirmative action for females and males, respectively.

Taylor (1994) found that white women employed by organizations with affirmative action programs showed no differences in work-outcome variables such as job and life satisfaction compared to women in organizations without affirmative action programs. In one of the few articles to include minority perceptions, Taylor indicated that black men and black women employed by an affirmative action organization only differed from black men and black women not employed by an affirmative action organization in their desire for an enriched job; there was a greater desire for an enriched job for those employed by an affirmative action organization. Taylor also found that black men who did not work for an affirmative action organization and black women who did work for an affirmative action organization reported a higher degree of excitement in life.

To summarize the stigma of incompetence literature, the above results signify the extensive effects of affirmative action (preferential treatment component of a plan) on nonbeneficiaries' perceptions of affirmative action beneficiaries and beneficiaries' self-perceptions. For nonbeneficiaries, preferential treatment results in discounting the ability of minorities in successful performance situations, augmenting ability in unsuccessful performance, and judging beneficiaries as less competent. Preferential treatment may cause beneficiaries to view themselves as less competent in general and leadership positions which can lead to differential task selection. In the long run, this affects beneficiaries' promotion opportunities. However, emphasis on qualifications and performance may preclude the negative behavioral consequences of preferential treatment for beneficiaries. Most of the research has involved women as the target group and has indicated that their self-perceptions are moderated by self-confidence. Also, the majority of research in this area has been conducted in lab instead of field settings. Future research needs to replicate these findings in the field.

Furthermore, research needs to address whether or not the same negative effects occur for racial minorities, as well as if their self-perceptions are moderated by self-confidence.

Expectancy Effects

Related to effects on competency, expectancy effects based on stereotypes rather than actual performance or qualifications can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies which further exacerbate negative effects of affirmative action (Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Crosby and Clayton (1990) mentioned that affirmative action programs may automatically stimulate stereotypical views of minorities and the belief that unqualified applicants are being hired. Thus, individuals will come to expect less performance from those individuals and may treat them in a manner that is consistent with this view. Beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries may then attribute high performance to situational factors and low performance to dispositional factors. If beneficiaries internalize these low expectations, a steam-rolling effect of negative consequences is likely to occur (Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Also, if preferential policies grant special aid to target group members who lack ability compared to other applicants and workers (e.g., hiring minimally qualified applicants), it will be difficult for these people to reach acceptable performance levels. This only serves to perpetuate prejudicial and stereotypical beliefs (Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Therefore, expectancy effects and the attribution process are yet other factors which should be considered in attempting to negate unfavorable consequences of affirmative action.

Retention and Promotion

One concern regarding affirmative action relates to the retention and promotion of the beneficiaries of affirmative action. Although affirmative action programs may be successful in increasing the number of target members that are hired, these programs may be unsuccessful at retention and promotion (Ferdman, 1989). Ferdman (1989) demonstrated in his research that cultural dissimilarities between the majority and target groups may result in less favorable evaluations of target group members. By manipulating normative and non-normative behaviors which were representative of cultural dissimilarities, Ferdman found that white managers reacted more negatively to a Hispanic subordinate's handling of a situation when the subordinate displayed non-normative behaviors rather

than normative ones. Ferdman warned that disregarding these kinds of effects and group labels can only serve to verify prejudices. Therefore, Ferdman suggested a good affirmative action program is one in which new hirees become socialized into the organization and there is a reduction in the emphasis placed on normative behaviors. Otherwise, target members may find it difficult to climb the promotional ladder. When there is a low rate of promotion due to lower favorability ratings for non-normative behavior, frequent and voluntary turnover rates for targeted groups could result.

Indirect Effects

There are two noted indirect effects of affirmative action that are important to mention. First, if affirmative action is effective in increasing the number or proportion of underrepresented groups in an organization, diversity issues are pertinent. Tsui et al. (1992) hypothesized that as the workforce became more heterogeneous, the members would experience less organizational attachment. This was based on previous research involving demographical variables (e.g., Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989), the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971), and self-categorization theory (e.g., Turner, 1987). Organizational attachment was inferred from three variables: psychological commitment (organizational commitment), absences, and intent to stay. Supporting their hypotheses, as organizations became more sex-balanced, men showed lower organizational attachment while women expressed higher attachment. Similarly, as the organization became less white dominated, Whites exhibited lower attachment whereas non-Whites did not. Thus, males and Whites had lower attachment levels in balanced than in male-dominated or all-male settings, and mixed race settings, rather than same race settings, respectively. The results support self-categorization or social identity theories. Yet, women and minorities were unaffected by heterogeneity effects in their work units. What may be more important, however, is not the effect of increasing heterogeneity in the workforce, but how this heterogeneity came about. Although affirmative action programs seem to indirectly influence work outcome variables through increasing workforce heterogeneity, it may also be workers' attitudes toward the affirmative action programs which directly affect their organizational commitment. It may be that workers perceive specific affirmative action policies to be unfair, a procedural justice

issue, which has a negative impact on work outcome variables such as organizational commitment, intentions to stay in the organization, and absenteeism.

Another indirect effect of affirmative action concerns black women. Bell (1989) noted black women are purported to benefit twice as much than black men from affirmative action efforts because they are women and because they are minorities. Leonard (1984b) noted that as black women have been entering the workforce in increasing numbers, black males' workforce entrance has been declining. Black males' employment growth increased 3.8% faster in contractor versus noncontractor firms; yet, black women's growth rose 12.3% faster. Also, while black women have been advancing in educational settings, black men have not. These trends have resulted in a sex-ratio disparity among black men and women professionals. Black women professionals have been more likely to remain "single and childless" due to the lower proportion of available black men professionals.

From past and present research, the negative effects of affirmative action may seem overwhelming. Yet, in many of the studies affirmative action was not defined or specific components noted which may have forced subjects to base their opinion on limited knowledge or inaccurate information in regard to affirmative action. Hence, it is important to consider affirmative action research which has taken these issues into account and found less negative effects. Also, although there has been much research on the negative effects of affirmative action, there is a lack of studies identifying the positive aspects of affirmative action programs. For example, affirmative action can lead to a decrease in lawsuits (Kleiman & Faley, 1988) and a greater competitive edge when there are no competency differences (Cox & Blake, 1991; Outtz, 1990). Due to the deficiency of studies on the favorable effects of affirmative action, the following sections focus on research which contradicts some of the negative effects or assumed negative effects of affirmative action.

The Imposter Syndrome and Productivity

One recurring effect of affirmative action has been the issue of competence. Linked with competence is the idea of the imposter syndrome. This syndrome involves overcompensating for imagined inadequacies which results in initially high performance and then drops due to exhaustion.

Nacoste (1989) argued that, at the individual level, affirmative action does not always promote the imposter syndrome.

Nacoste (1989) analyzed data collected by the Institution for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina. He was mainly interested in perceptions of competence and productivity among affirmative action beneficiaries. Results delineated a main effect for selection method and a main effect of one's opinion of affirmative action. Subjects' creativity self-evaluations were not affected if they were in the standard selection procedure; however, if they were in the affirmative action selection procedure, their self-evaluations on the creativity exercise were degraded. Also, subjects with more positive opinions toward affirmative action had higher creativity self-evaluations than subjects with negative opinions. There was a significant interaction between gender and selection procedure. Men and women in the standard selection condition estimated higher creativity scores than men and women in the affirmative action selection condition; however, there was a greater difference for males between the two selection conditions. A marginally significant interaction between attitudes toward affirmative action and selection procedure meant that subjects with more positive attitudes toward affirmative action were unaffected by the selection procedure in their self-evaluation of their performance. On the other hand, subjects with more negative attitudes regarding affirmative action were significantly affected by the selection procedure in making their self-evaluation. No significant differences were found for productivity and time spent on a task as a result of the conditions. Finally, subjects in the affirmative action condition that held more negative attitudes toward affirmative action tended to be more efficient than other subjects, lending some support to overcompensation in the imposter syndrome. Results of this study suggest that attitudes toward the program can influence perceptions of beneficiaries; those with more positive attitudes are less likely to assume beneficiaries are underqualified for the position.

On the other hand, Hattrup's (1994) research suggests that there are negative performance consequences due to being associated with and affirmative action program. Hattrup took a reactions to help perspective by drawing from Turner and Pratkanis' work (1991, 1993). Hattrup noted that

policies like preferential treatment are threatening to the self-concept because they imply that the beneficiary may not have been hired or promoted without such aid. This can result in one of two reactions - helplessness or reactance. Individuals with low self-efficacy regarding their abilities in a job/task and who are given "help" in a selection situation should respond by displaying helplessness. They perceive they were hired not because of qualifications but because of some other variable. Thus, they believe they have very little control over performance outcomes. Past research has shown that women tend to be less confident and have lower self-efficacy, especially in masculine sex-typed roles; therefore, females should respond to help by displaying helplessness whereas men, who are generally more confident in their abilities, should respond by displaying reactance, exerting more effort to prove their abilities. Hattrup's results supported the helplessness/reactance perspective. He also found that self-efficacy was related to judgments of distributive and procedural justice. For subjects in the merit selection condition, individuals with high self-efficacy had higher perceptions of distributive and procedural justice. For subjects in the preferential selection condition, self-efficacy was related to distributive justice but less so than in the merit condition; yet, preferential selection lowered perceptions of procedural fairness for high and low self-efficacy subjects alike. As discussed previously, preferential treatment may been perceived as procedurally unfair (e.g., Murrell et al., 1994).

The above studies suggest mixed views of productivity at the organizational level as a result of being hired under an affirmative action program. Many opponents of affirmative action perceive a reduction in productivity because they believe less than qualified target group members are being hired. However, several studies would dispute this perspective (Leonard, 1984a; Lovrich, Steel, & Hood, 1986; Steel & Lovrich, 1987). For example, Leonard (1984a) criticized that much of the productivity research has suffered from confounds due to indirect estimates of productivity, such as earnings. Leonard (1984a) took a more appropriate and direct approach by measuring worker output. Yet, Leonard mentioned one limitation of the study in that caution was needed in drawing inferences from the highly aggregated data. By analyzing Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Reports from 555 state by 2-digit SIC industry cells within manufacturing for 1966 and 1977, Leonard (1984a)

concluded Title VII, Executive Order 11246 (affirmative action), and fear of litigation have been successful in increasing the numbers of women and minorities in the workplace. However, affirmative action alone cannot take credit for this increase nor was it possible to separate its effects from the others. Moreover, Leonard (1984a) did not find a significant difference in the productivity of minorities or females relative to white males. Ford, Kraiger, and Schechtman's (1986) conducted a meta-analysis that focused on the differences between effect sizes for ratee race on objective and subjective performance. Although black workers were rated as being lower performers as compared to white workers, results showed a smaller mean effect size of ratee race on objective indicants ($\underline{r}$ = .159, $\underline{n}$ = 4,287) compared to subjective indicants ($\underline{r}$ = .221, $\underline{n}$ = 4,130). However, their results underestimate true race differences in performance because they did not correct for measurement error in the performance measure. A significant difference between objective and subjective performance indicants was demonstrated which meant there was a greater Black/White difference in ratings on subjective measures as compared to objective measures of performance.

Similar to Leonard's (1984a) conclusion, Lovrich, Steel, and Hood (1986) and Steel and Lovrich (1987) found that high effort affirmative action programs did not result in a decline in productivity and efficiency. Both studies compared high- and low-effort police agencies in carrying out affirmative action programs' municipal police services and assessed differences between the two groups in productivity. High- and low-effort was calculated by subtracting minority ratios (%minority officers divided by % minority population in census) from time 1 to time 2. Lovrich et al. (1986), focusing on minority affirmative action, found that for the time period from 1974 to 1984, there were no real differences between high- and low-effort affirmative action police services in their average costs of operation, crime statistics, or apprehension of criminals. It had been posited that productivity could also be assessed by reviewing the extent to which resources needed to be reallocated to affirmative action programs from support services, such as community-oriented programs. Yet, there was no indication of a decrease in the allocation of resources that would support services as a function of maintaining a high affirmative action effort.

Steel and Lovrich (1987) focused on affirmative action targeted at women in policing from 1978 to 1981. Assessing the same measures of productivity, such as apprehension of criminals, the researchers again found no differences between high- and low-effort affirmative action police agencies on productivity. In addition, data from a 1981 public opinion surveying citizens across the nation asked whether they felt confident in their police services in their city. The researchers were able to identify how people perceived service in their city and the level of utilization of women officers in their city for 562 people in over 80 cities. Thus, it was possible to compare high and low affirmative action efforts and respondents' perceptions of their police services. No significant differences were found between high- and low-effort affirmative action police services on respondents' perceptions of confidence in their police services in their city.

Evaluation of affirmative action

Sowell (1990) stated that preferential polices, such as affirmative action, have shown negative patterns over time. First, group polarization has escalated rather than dissipated. Second, although these programs that are expected to be "temporary," it is not uncommon for them to extend past their intended cutoff dates and begin to encompass a much larger target group. Third, many of the justifications for preferential policies are devoid of any data that describe the consequences of the programs, such as the program's effectiveness. Opponents and proponents of affirmative action have both been interested in the efficacy of its intended effects - increasing the numbers of underrepresented groups of individuals. As Tickamyer et al. (1989) reported in their study, affirmative action officers were more likely to perceive affirmative action had an impact on their campuses than administrators and faculty. However, analysis of objective data rather than subjective ratings is more appropriate due to the possible effect of attitudes toward affirmative action on respondents' evaluation of affirmative action's success.

Problems With Evaluation Research

Several studies have been conducted to assess affirmative action's effect on the advancement of underrepresented groups in organizations. One problem with many of the studies is that

comparisons are done between contractors and noncontractors. The assumption is that, if affirmative action is effective, contractors subject to Executive Order 11246 will show greater increases in target groups than noncontractors who are not subject to the Order. This assumption may be faulty because many noncontractors have implemented voluntary affirmative action programs. These programs may not be as rigorously supervised as with contractor firms, but may still show positive effects. Therefore, studies reporting no differences between the two types of firms should be careful in making the conclusion that affirmative action is ineffective, unless it can also be shown that the noncontractors did not have a voluntary program in place.

Another problem with assessing effectiveness is determining whether advancements in the workforce are due to specific affirmative action plans within the organization or to other factors. For example, increasing educational opportunities have served to raise qualifications and abilities of target groups which alone has resulted in a greater number of minorities hired (Crosby & Clayton, 1990). Also, it is unclear whether growth rates of organizations or other factors rather than affirmative action have caused the reported increases in underrepresented groups (Leonard 1984b, 1986; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994).

Effectiveness of Affirmative Action

A study that assessed whether reverse discrimination is as prevalent as society has depicted it to be was conducted by Romero (1986). The author reasoned that, if reverse discrimination was a reality, there should be a noticeable decline in white male dominance in managerial positions and an increase of minorities and women who enter these positions. Romero suggested the greatest benefits should be afforded to minority women since they are counted twice--once as a female and once as a minority. Thus, a comparison was done between Chicana females and white males among public and private employers and labor unions in Texas, California, and Illinois. Although there are differences between Chicana, Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Spanish backgrounds, most reports do not differentiate between them. Instead, they are included in one category, such as "Hispanic". Therefore, in the study Chicana females referred to all females with any of the listed backgrounds. Annual reports of the

organizations identified the occupational distribution of white males and Chicana females in nine job categories ranging from professional to unskilled.

No statistical tests were performed to determine if differences were significant; however, percent comparisons showed that Chicana females were not increasing in numbers into higher paying jobs. White males still dominated in professional and managerial roles but were underrepresented in the lower paying jobs. Romero concluded "reverse discrimination" may not be the case for white males, while "preferential treatment" may not be the case for Chicano females. However, affirmative action has been shown to be more effective for some groups (e.g., black females) than others (Leonard, 1984b, 1986).

In another study, Espinosa (1992) assessed affirmative action's effectiveness in an organization that was considered the "best-case scenario." It was considered as such because top officials were committed to the program, the organization was under mandates of Executive Order 11246, and growth in the organization was minimal which served to nullify any possibilities that growth rather than affirmative action increased employment opportunities. Data from 1974 to 1984 was evaluated for achievement of affirmative action goals. Goals were set for three levels in the organization--total workforce, pay group, and occupational group. Although total employment of women and minorities increased, occupational group goals were not met. Espinosa criticized the reports for not controlling for inflation, comparing the 1974 statistics with each year rather than year-to-year comparisons, and failing to provide specific amounts of increases in occupational groups. Espinosa determined the results reported by the organization were stated in "the most favorable light." He commented that, had he examined only the reports without looking at the data, he would have concluded that goals were met. After analyzing the data from which the reports were based, controlling for inflation, making specific occupational group comparisons and year-to-year comparisons, the results were not favorable. For example, when Espinosa controlled for inflation, minority and female pay group goals were not attained, except for the lowest pay groups. Moreover, when the data was broken down into occupational groups that were highly underrepresented in

minorities and women, results showed that minority and female goals had not been reached in 1974 and only two occupational groups had met the goals for 1964. Thus, Espinosa concluded affirmative action may not result in reverse discrimination for white men. Furthermore, these results question the effectiveness of affirmative action.

Moreover, Altman and Promis' (1992) study looked at affirmative action's effectiveness in promotion from within for managerial positions in academic libraries. The authors obtained information regarding the racial and gender make-up of the applicant pool, those who were interviewed, and those who were hired. There was an equal number of men and women who applied for the positions; however, only 143 out of 2,848 applicants were minorities. Results showed that affirmative action had virtually no effect on the hiring process.

Although some research results question affirmative action's effectiveness, other research supports it. For example, Taylor (1989) reported that, in a 1981 study conducted by the OFCCP (Department of Labor, 1984), greater percentages of male minorities and women were represented in federal contracting agencies as opposed to noncontractors. Approximately 49,000 contractors and 28,000 noncontractors' equal opportunity reports were reviewed from the period 1974 to 1980. Although total employment increased more for noncontractors than contractors, noncontractors depicted only an increase of 12.3% of minorities and 2.2% of women in their workforce representation as compared to an increase of 20.1% and 15.2%, respectively, for contractors. Moreover, earlier economic studies have shown affirmative action to be generally effective for black males (Goldstein & Smith, 1976; Heckman & Wolpin, 1976). Leonard (1984b, 1986), using U.S. Department of Labor data, compared employment records from 68,690 contractors and noncontractors with a grand total of 16 million employees. Leonard (1984b, 1986) discovered black males and females and white females' employment representation increased significantly between 1974 and 1980 in contractor firms. More specifically, within contractor firms black males, minority males, white females, and black females showed increases in representation of 3.8%, 7.9%, 2.8%, and 12.3% faster, respectively, than white males.

Leonard (1984b, 1986) questioned what factors have served to produce this increase. He first looked at compliance reviews and concluded that although there are weaknesses in the selection process for reviews, those who have been reviewed have shown an increase in the numbers of black males by 7.9%, 15.2% for other minority males, 6.1% for black females. Second, growth of the contractor firms is an important factor affecting affirmative action's effectiveness. Among those contractors that were growing and had more positions available, affirmative action had a greater impact on increasing the numbers of target group members in the organization. Related to growth, corporate size rather than establishment size was associated with greater gains in minority and female representation. And finally, greater increments were made for black males and black females' employment within non-clerical, white-collar contracting agencies (Leonard, 1986).

Affirmative action goals have also been associated with gains in underrepresented groups reviewed for compliance (e.g., Leonard, 1985). Although goals are seen as an inflexible quota, Leonard (1985) stated goals are not as effective as quotas are expected to be. Leonard explained that oftentimes affirmative action goals are "inflated." They overestimate the increase in employment for target groups to be attained. In general, Leonard concluded organizations are not making empty promises--those projecting increases do show increases. Leonard also pointed out that most of these organizations are not only predicting and setting goals for underrepresented groups but also for white males.

On the other hand, other researchers have posited that affirmative action has been too effective. Herrnstein and Murray (1994) used data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1983, 1989) and the U.S. Department of Labor (1991) to make an illustration of misleading statements of the lack of employment advancements for Black men and women. The percentage of Blacks employed was graphed for different time periods (e.g., 1964 Civil Rights Act passed, Griggs decision handed down, Uniform Guidelines adopted). For clerical jobs, the there was an increase in the slope of the line for employed Blacks after the passing of the Civil Rights Act but a slower rate of increase after this. For professional and technical jobs, there was little increase in the slope after the passing of the Civil

Rights Act indicating little change in the rates of increase in the proportion of employed Blacks due to antidiscrimination legislation. However, when Herrnstein and Murray (1994) controlled for cognitive ability, they found opposite results. First, 1990 data showed that there was at least a one standard deviation Black/White difference in cognitive ability for different job categories (e.g., professionals, clerical, low-skill labor). The authors suggested that employers are hiring Blacks with lower cognitive ability compared to Whites. In theory, Blacks and Whites in each job category should be equal in their cognitive ability if hiring procedures were race-blind. However, the authors proposed this discrepancy between reality and theory is due to affirmative action programs. The authors showed that when cognitive ability is held constant the Black/White employment ratio exceeds equality in which Blacks are more likely to be hired than Whites. By 1964, the Black/White ratio in professional and technical jobs had reached equality but then continued to increase above one in the following years. The Black/White ratio in clerical jobs did not reach equality until approximately 1967 and then it too began to rise above one. Because equality was obtained before or soon after the passing of antidiscrimination laws, the authors suggested other forces (i.e., affirmative action programs) in addition to such legislation increased the proportion of employed Blacks. Because the trend has continued to the point of inequality against Whites, Herrnstein and Murray implied that affirmative action has been too effective.

Implications/recommendations for practitioners

Although it is still being debated as to whether affirmative action is an appropriate policy or not, the reality is that some organizations do not have a choice if they are receiving monies from the federal government. Also, it has been argued that affirmative action in the 1990s will no longer be thought of as just a "good program to implement." Instead, it will be seen as an "economic life line" for organizations responding to the labor pool (Outtz, 1990). Turner (1990) reported that The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that in the year 2000, 47% of the labor force will consist of women, 12% Blacks, 10% Hispanics, and 4% Asians and other minorities. The Bureau has also approximated that 43 million people will be entering the workforce between 1988 and the year 2000. Of those 43 million

workers, White, non-Hispanics will make up 66%, while Hispanics and African-Americans will make up 15% and 13%, respectively. Many have speculated that affirmative action programs will influence the success and competitiveness of organizations (McEnrue, 1993; Outtz, 1990).

Based on the review, there are many implications and recommendations for practitioners in considering, developing, and implementing an affirmative action program. Although it may be difficult to determine affirmative action's overall effectiveness, what may be more important is identifying components of programs which have been found to be effective. Variations across programs may create differences in effectiveness just as they create differences in reactions by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. The sections that will follow serve to identify those components which have been found to be effective or have been suggested as favorable implemental devices.

Components of the Affirmative Action Program

1. Affirmative action plans should include specific numeric hiring and retention goals. These can be used to assess the program's effectiveness (Leonard, 1985).

2. Whether the plan should state as its goal and/or justification the remediation of discrimination in selection and promotion is still being debated. Some research supports this view (Dovidio et al., 1994; Kravitz et al., 1992, 1993, 1994; Murrell et al., 1994; Nacoste, 1985) while other research suggests remedial action is unfair (Kinder & Sanders, 1990). Others suggest the focus should be equity (Taylor et al., 1991) or fair treatment (Tougas & Veilleux, 1988) rather than remedying past discrimination.

3. It is not only important to attain underrepresented target group members but to also break down barriers to promotion (Blanchard, 1989; Moore & Hass, 1990); otherwise, "ghettos" of target members will form in lower-level positions (O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984).

4. The plan should be designed to hire proportionally based on the number of qualified applicants or community members (Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Kravitz et al., 1994).

5. Practitioners should attempt to keep weighting of demographic status to a minimum. As the weighting of demographic status increases, so does the extent of resistance to affirmative action

(Kravitz, 1993; Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Nacoste, 1985). Affirmative action programs that focus on merit hiring will be perceived as more favorable. However, most research tends to show that the best predictors of job performance are cognitive ability tests on which Blacks consistently score lower (e.g., Gottfredson, 1988; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994).

6. Hiring qualified minority applicants within an affirmative action program will reduce the competency difference between hired minority and majority employees (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994). This may also eliminate the stigmatization of incompetence that exists for beneficiaries of affirmative action programs.

7. Actively recruit underrepresented groups (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Blanchard, 1989; Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Marino, 1980; O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984). When the number of qualified minority and women applicants are noticeable to employees, top management's commitment to the program will be evident and employees are more likely to experience perceptions of fairness.

a. Recruitment efforts should be geared toward minority colleges and universities, minority-oriented newspapers and publications, etc. (Marino, 1980).

b. When recruiting, it has been suggested that providing adequate information (e.g., required job duties, minimum qualifications, etc.) to applicants will allow them to make informed choices (O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984).

8. As part of an affirmative action program, training geared toward potential minority, women, and applicants with disabilities are more favorable than ones that target current employees (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). However, training programs in general are perceived to be more favorable than other components such as preferential treatment (Arthur et al., 1992). Organizations should be aware that selecting individuals for training on the sole basis of gender or race may be seen as discriminatory against the majority and may be illegal.

Providing Information

1. Educate employees on affirmative action issues--define what it is, what it entails, and how it will be implemented in the organization (Kravitz et al., 1994; Marino, 1980; Moore & Hass, 1990;

O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984). This can be done either in employee publications (Marino, 1980) or seminars. Research indicates people do not understand affirmative action in general and specific policies in particular. For example:

a. Affirmative action programs should be structured such that goals do not become quotas or appear to be quotas. Employees should be made aware that affirmative action is not the same as a quota system. Many believe the two policies to be one in the same but in actuality quotas are illegal unless court mandated (Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993; Kravitz et al., 1994).

b. Employees should be informed as to whether the affirmative action is voluntary or involuntary. If involuntary, then employees should be provided with information in regard to Executive Order 11246. If voluntary, then employees should be provided with information that pertains to the organization's specific plan.

c. Organizations should stress qualifications of hirees under affirmative action programs (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Summers, 1991; Tougas & Veilleux, 1989). Although affirmative action counts demographic status, it should only do so after qualification levels are first discerned (Kravitz & Platania, 1993).

d. Bolstering the confidence of qualified target groups can lessen the negative effects from the stigma of affirmative action. Based on Heilman et al.'s, (1992) study, it was found that negative consequences of preferential selection only held for women and not men. This could be extended to other target groups. Therefore, bolstering their confidence by possibly focusing on their qualifications and competence may reduce or prevent negative consequences (Heilman et al., 1990, 1994; Nacoste, 1985).

e. Training programs designed to change attitudes toward affirmative action and target groups may result in better interpersonal and mentoring relationships and networks (O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984).

2. Organizations should stress the positive points of the program (e.g., Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1991) and provide information in regard to the competitive advantages of having a diverse workforce and managing diversity.

Gaining Commitment

1. Strong, public commitment is needed from top level management (Hitt & Keats, 1984; Hitt, Keats, & Purdum, 1983; Marino, 1980; O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984). There are several reasons why top level management is necessary. First, top level management controls all resources and makes final decisions (Clark, 1953). Second, top level management affects organizational norms (e.g., Schein, 1985) and thus can influence individuals to look past their stereotypes, prejudices, etc.

2. Commitment is needed from all levels in the organization (Blanchard, 1989; Ledvinka & Hildreth, 1984). This may seem easier said than done; however, there are several ways this can be accomplished.

a. Encouraging line managers/supervisors to become involved in the development of affirmative action hiring goals may stimulate their support (Marino, 1980; O'Farrell & Harlan, 1984).

b. Tying support to the reward system could also bring about support for the program. Factors could be included in the promotion or appraisal process evaluating contributions or violations of the affirmative action program, such as rewarding for recruiting qualified individuals of underrepresented groups or punishing for discriminatory behavior (Blanchard, 1989; Marino, 1980; Moore & Hass, 1990). These sanctions should be formalized, communicated, and implemented in a non-discriminatory fashion (Marino, 1980; Moore & Hass, 1990).

Other

1. Advancement opportunities for all employees such as tuition refund plans should be offered (Marino, 1980).

2. Job analysis information on specific jobs should be provided to schools, colleges, and vocational institutions (Outtz, 1990). These institutions may be able to alter the material taught so that they may enhance the qualifications of their graduates for certain jobs.

3. Recategorize social boundaries--changing people's perspective from separate groups (e.g., Black versus White) to a more inclusive group, like a diversity goal for the organization as a whole. Studies

suggest that providing a common identity may mitigate negative reactions to affirmative action (Murrell et al., 1994; Tougas & Veilleux, 1989; Tougas, Dubé, & Veilleux, 1987; Veilleux & Tougas, 1989).

Although the above suggestions may be good guidelines and may increase the likelihood of favorable response to affirmative action programs, there is one major problem. Resources such as time and money will be necessary in order to implement most of the recommendations. However, organizations also need to consider these short-term costs in terms of possible long-term gains.

Research needs

Based on the following review, there are many implications for future research in the area of affirmative action. Although there have been considerable advancements in understanding reactions, effects, and consequences of affirmative action, many unanswered questions remain. One limitation of the existing research is that much of the research examines sex-based affirmative action. It is unclear how well these results generalize to other target groups such as minorities. For example, Heilman et al. (1992) suggested a need to determine whether there are differential effects for different target groups as a result of labeling with affirmative action. Also, Kravitz's work suggests that not all beneficiaries of affirmative action are viewed as equally deserving. For example, an affirmative action program based on disability is seen as more fair than one based on race.

Another research implication that is clear is that research should continue to study the effects of affirmative action on beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. To date the research has considered the impact on both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Kleiman and Faley (1988) stated this trend should be continued because it has been shown that both groups are affected. Research should extend past the immediate effects of affirmative action and uncover the distal effects such as organizational commitment and other work outcome variables.

Third, process-level components of affirmative action programs should be the focus of much of the research (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Nacoste, 1987a, 1987b). As Nacoste (1989) suggested, by learning which components are most favorable and which ones are not, we can throw out the bad and implement what is good to result in an affirmative action program that is agreeable to

most people. Also, using the justice literature as a framework for researching affirmative action programs may lead to the development of affirmative action programs that are perceived as procedurally and distributively fair.

Fourth, there is a need to research moderating conditions on reactions to affirmative action. For example, Taylor et al. (1991) found more accurate predictions of people's reactions to the affirmative action program when they believed they might benefit from the program. The authors suggested if people are made aware of how they may benefit from the affirmative action program, negative reaction toward the program may be lessened. Training programs could be designed to highlight their benefits for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries alike. Also, training programs designed to educate employees on affirmative action programs in general and the organization's specific program need to be evaluated for effectiveness--whether there are changes in attitudes as well as behaviors.

Fifth, Heilman et al.'s (1992, 1994) results of the study on affirmative action's effects on people's perceptions of applicants as being competent or incompetent showed that there are moderators of the incompetence stigma. Providing success performance information appears to mitigate the negative effects of being associated with an affirmative action program. However, in the work setting, it may be difficult to obtain such clear information; many times the information received is ambiguous. More research needs to address real-life work situations and determine what conditions aid people to process disconfirming information. The information processing literature should be the basis for such research.

Sixth, Heilman et al. (1992) noted it was unclear from their results whether affirmative action led to the attribution of incompetence or whether negative stereotypes of incompetence led to the attribution that the employee was hired under an affirmative action program. This is difficult to determine because their lab study did not provide subjects with any performance data on the affirmative action applicant when subjects rated the applicant's competence level.

Seventh, Heilman et al. (1993) stated they do not know whether a woman hired on the basis of an affirmative action program and not provided with any information would negatively evaluate her supervisor and other peers if these individuals were women. Their study only focused on the woman manager's negative evaluations of a female subordinate. Finally, Heilman et al. (1993) also noted that whether or not these negative effects dissipate over time is not known.

Eighth, future research on affirmative action should explore issues from an information processing approach. Minorities and women can be placed easily into race or gender-based categories and many have preconceived notions or impressions of these target members based on stereotypes and, probably, inaccurate beliefs. Affirmative action may exacerbate this process by making race and gender even more salient. Thus, understanding the underlying process in which one ascribes characteristics to individuals based on such category information and selection methods has significant implications. For example, Lord and Maher (1991) discussed problems women are likely to face in leadership positions from an information processing perspective. They stated that if women are perceived to have received a leadership position due to sex-based selection, then sex-related categories will be more likely to play a role in follower's perceptions of the women rather than leadership categories. As discussed previously in the paper, relying on sex-related categories can have a detrimental effect on women but not men.

Ninth, the costs and benefits associated with implementing affirmative action programs is an important area for research for several reasons. Affirmative action's effects on organization utility can be used in providing information to employees regarding its effectiveness. Possible costs of the program include recruitment (Kroeck, Barrett, & Alexander, 1983) and litigation if more qualified applicants are bypassed (Kleiman & Faley, 1988). Benefits include an improved organizational image (Cox & Blake, 1991; Kleiman & Faley, 1988), decrements in EEO lawsuits (Kleiman & Faley, 1988), and greater competitive edge when there are no competency differences (Cox & Blake, 1991; Outtz, 1990). Indirect benefits of affirmative action programs include greater creativity and improved decision-making (Jackson, 1991) while indirect costs are lower cohesion, lower commitment, and

higher turnover (Jackson, 1991; Tsui et al., 1992). There may also be direct costs of affirmative action such as lower organizational commitment if individuals perceive affirmative action as being unfair and as violating procedural justice and distributive justice issues.

Tenth, better methodological studies need to be conducted. For example, studies focusing on whether or not target groups have shown an occupational advancement due to affirmative action programs (Kleiman & Faley, 1988) are often confounded by variables, such as increasing educational opportunities for minorities. In which case, it is difficult to distinguish what caused the effect. Also, most of the research that has been conducted to date has consisted of lab studies and very few field studies. More research needs to be done in field settings that uses representative samples from the U.S. population.

Also, Tsui et al.'s (1992) results found that males and Whites have lower organizational attachment in balanced rather than in male-dominated or all-male settings. Although most of the research has focused on the minority group, the authors suggested more research needs to focus on the majority's reactions to diversity issues and to the adjustment process. It is equally important to comprehend the challenges faced by majority members, minorities, and women; all are adjusting to a changing workforce.

Kravitz (1994) suggested future research needs to consider contextual variables in organizations such as history of discrimination and demographic make-up or employees in the organization. Kravitz et al. (1994) found respondents who worked for organizations with an affirmative action program tended to support affirmative action. They also reported that respondents approved of affirmative action programs in organizations with histories of discrimination. Research should begin by finding organizations with affirmative action programs in which the employees approve of the programs. Then, possibly by case study analysis, identify similarities between those organizations and affirmative action programs. This may result in a set of organizational factors that, when coupled with particular affirmative action components, create policies that are favorable to the employees.

Finally, research should be continued to uncover what psychological concepts underlie people's reactions to affirmative action (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Once we have attained a better knowledge base of these attitudes and reactions, specific steps can be taken to possibly alter those attitudes or lessen negative outcomes.

Conclusion

From the previous review, it should be evident that affirmative action programs have had an immense impact on employment practices and employees which has stimulated much of the psychological research. Regardless of whether affirmative action is morally correct or not, individuals need to be aware of the implications of such programs. Because many organizations are required by law to implement affirmative action programs, organizations should make an active effort to prevent possible negative effects and instead create conditions which will foster positive reactions to the affirmative action plans. As long as affirmative action programs are mandated by the government or accepted by the courts as a voluntary action to remedy past discrimination within the organization, the issue of affirmative action and its effects are deserving of future research.

References

Arthur, W., Doverspike, D., & Fuentes, R. (1992). Recipients' effective responses to affirmative action interventions: A cross-cultural perspective. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 10, 229-243.

Austin, W., Friedman, J. S., Martz, R. A., Hooe, G. S., & Pregerson Ball, K. (1977). Responses to favorable sex discrimination. Law and Human Behavior, 1(3), 283-296.

Barrett, G. V., & Sterns, A. A. (1992, August). Legal and personal psychological perspectives on affirmative action & quotas. Unpublished manuscript.

Bell, D. (1989). The effects of affirmative action on male-female relationships among African Americans. Sex Roles, 21(1/2), 13-24.

Bennett-Alexander, D.D. (1990). The state of affirmative action in employment: A post-Stotts retrospective. American Business Law Journal, 27(4), 565-597.

Blanchard, F. A. (1989). Effective affirmative action programs. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 193-206). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Blits, J. H., & Gottfredson, L. S. (1990). Employment testing and job performance. The Public Interest, 98, 18-25.

Braddock, J. H. II, & McPartland, J. M. (1987). How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities: Research on labor market and institutional barriers. Journal of Social Issues, 43(1), 5-39.

Byrne, D. E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press.

Caruth, D. L., Noe, R. M., III, & Mondy, R. W. (1988). The uniform guidelines, adverse impact, and affirmative action programs. In Staffing the contemporary organization (pp. 61-83). New York: Quorum Books.

Chacko, T. I. (1982). Women and equal employment opportunity: Some unintended effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67(1), 119-123.

Clark, K. (1953). Desegregation: An appraisal of the evidence. Journal of Social Issues, 9(4), 2-76.

Clayton, S. D., & Tangri, S. S. (1989). The justice of affirmative action. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 177-192). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cox, T., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. The Executive, 5, 45-56.

Crosby, F., Burris, L., Censor, C., & MacKethan, E. R. (1986). Two rotten apples spoil the justice barrel. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L., Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.) Justice in social relations (pp. 267-281). New York: Plenum Press.

Crosby, F., & Clayton, S. (1990). Affirmative action and the issue of expectancies. Journal of Social Issues, 46(2), 61-79.

Crosby, F., Clayton, S., Alksnis, O., & Hemker, K. (1986). Cognitive biases in the failure to perceive discrimination. Sex Roles, 14, 637-646.

Daum, D. L., & Ryan, A. M. (1993, May). The effects of affirmative action programs on attributions and organizational rewards. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39, 105-116.

Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance. (1984). Employment patterns of minorities in federal contractor and noncontractor establishments 1974-1980. Washington, D.C.: Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Murrell, A. J. (1994, August). Why people resist affirmative action. In S. M. Burn (Chair), Psychological Perspectives on Affirmative Action. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Dovidio, J. F., Mann, J., & Gaertner, S. L. (1989). Resistance to affirmative action: The implications of aversive racism. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 83-102). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Espinosa, D. J. (1992). Affirmative action: A case study of an organizational effort. Sociological Perspectives, 35(1), 119-136.

Ferdman, B. M. (1989). Affirmative action and the challenge of the color-blind perspective. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 169-176). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ford, J. K., Kraiger, K., Schechtman, S. L. (1986). Study of race effects in objective indices and subjective evaluations of performance: A meta-analysis of performance criteria. Psychological Bulletin, 99(3), 330-337.

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. In R. D. Braungart (Ed.), Research in political sociology (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Garcia, L. T., Erskine, N., Hawn, K., & Casmay, S. R. (1981). The effect of affirmative action on attributions about minority group members. Journal of Personality, 49(4), 427-437.

Glasser, I. (1988). Affirmative action and the legacy of racial injustice. In P. A. Katz, & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 341-357). New York: Plenum Press.

Glazer, N. (1975). Affirmative discrimination: Ethnic inequality and public policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Glazer, N. (1988). The future of preferential affirmative action. In P. A. Katz, & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 329-339). New York: Plenum Press.

Goldsmith, N., Cordova, D., Dwyer, K., Langlois, B., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Reactions to affirmative action: A case study. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 139-146). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Goldstein, M., & Smith, R. S. (1976). The estimated impact of the antidiscrimination program aimed at federal contractors. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 29, 523-543.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1986). Societal consequences of the g factor in employment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29, 379-410.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1986). Reconsidering fairness: A matter of social and ethical priorities. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33, 293-319.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1990, April). Affirmative action and the merit principle. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Miami Beach, FL.

Graves, L. M., & Powell, G. N. (1994). Effects of sex-based preferential selection and discrimination on job attitudes. Human Relations, 47(2), 133-157.

Hattrup, K. (1994, April). The roles of the self-concept and fairness perceptions in reactions to preferential hiring. In M. A. McDaniel (Chair), Research in Affirmative Action. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.

Heckman, J. J., & Wolpin, K. I. (1976). Does the contract compliance program work? An analysis of Chicago data. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 29, 544-564.

Heilman, M. E. (1979). High school students' occupational interest as a function of projected sex ratios in male-dominated occupations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64(3), 275-279.

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 5, pp. 269-298). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Heilman, M. E. (1994). Affirmative Action: Some unintended consequences for working women. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 16, pp. 125-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Lucas, J. A. (1992). Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77(4), 536-544.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Stathatos, P. (1994). Tenacity of the affirmative action stigma: The effects of performance information on competence evaluations. Unpublished manuscript.

Heilman, M. E., & Guzzo, R. A. (1978). The perceived cause of work success as a mediator of sex discrimination in organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21(3), 346-357.

Heilman, M. E., Kaplow, S. R., Amato, M. A. G., & Stathatos, P. (1993). When similarity is a liability: Effects of sex-based preferential selection on reactions to like-sex and different-sex others. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(6), 917-927.

Heilman, M. E., & Herlihy, J. M. (1984). Affirmative action, negative reaction? Some moderating conditions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33, 204-213.

Heilman, M. E., Lucas, J. A., & Kaplow, S. R. (1990). Self-derogating consequences of sex-based preferential selection: The moderating role of initial self-confidence. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 46, 202-216.

Heilman, M. E., Rivero, J. C., Brett, J. F. (1991). Skirting the competence issue: Effects of sex-based preferential selection on task choices of women and men. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(1), 99-105.

Heilman, M. E., Simon, M. C., & Repper, D. P. (1987). Intentionally harmed? Impact of sex-based preferential selection on self-perceptions and self-evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(1), 62-68.

Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). The Bell Curve. New York: The Free Press.

Hitt, M. A., & Keats, B. W. (1984). Empirical identification of the criteria for effective affirmative action programs. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20(3), 203-222.

Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., & Purdum, S. (1983). Affirmative action effectiveness criteria in institutions of higher education. Research in Higher Education, 18(2), 391-406.

Holloway, F. A. (1989). What is affirmative action? In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 9-19). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Jacobson, C. K. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism? Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29(2), 306-329.

Jackson, S. E. (1991). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing an increasingly diverse workforce. In S. Worchel, W. Wood, & J. Simpson (Eds.), Group process and productivity (pp. 138-173). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Johnson, S. D. (1980). Reverse Discrimination and Aggressive behavior. Journal of Psychology, 104, 11-19.

Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1990). Mimicking political debate with survey questions: The case of white opinion on affirmative action for blacks. Social Cognition, 8(1), 73-103.

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 414-431.

Kleiman, L. S., & Faley, R. H. (1988). Voluntary affirmative action and preferential treatment: Legal and research implications. Personnel Psychology, 41, 481-496.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1982). Whites' beliefs about blacks' opportunity. American Sociological Review, 47, 518-532.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1983). Affirmative action attitudes: Effects of self-interest, racial affect, and stratification beliefs on whites' views. Social Forces, 61(3), 797-824.

Kluegel, J. R. (1985). If there isn't a problem, you don't need a solution. American Behavioral Scientist, 28(6), 761-784.

Kravitz, D. A. (1993, May). Effects of plan and individual differences on attitudes toward affirmative action programs. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.

Kravitz, D. A. (1994). Attitudes toward affirmative action plans directed at blacks: Effects of plan and individual differences. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Kravitz, D. A., & Platania, J. (1992, May). Attitudes and beliefs about race-based affirmative action. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Montreal.

Kravitz, D. A., & Platania, J. (1993). Attitudes and beliefs about affirmative action: Effects of target and of respondent sex and ethnicity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(6), 928-938.

Kravitz, D. A., Stinson, V., & Mello E. W. (1994, August). Public reactions to affirmative action. In M. E. Turner (Chair), Affirmative action at work: Towards reducing barriers to the integrated workplace. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, TX.

Kroeck, K. G., Barrett, G. V., & Alexander, R. A. (1983). Imposed quotas and personnel selection: A computer simulation study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68(1), 123-136.

Ledvinka, J., & Hildreth, W. B. (1984). Integrating planned-change intervention and computer simulation technology: The case of affirmative action. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20(2), 125-140.

Leonard, J. S. (1984a). Antidiscrimination or reverse discrimination: The impact of changing demographics, Title VII, and affirmative action on productivity. The Journal of Human Resources, XIX(2), 145-174.

Leonard, J. S. (1984b). The impact of affirmative action on employment. Journal of Labor Economics, 2(4), 439-463.

Leonard, J. S. (1985). What promises are worth: The impact of affirmative action goals. The Journal of Human Resources, XX(1), 3-20.

Leonard, J. S. (1986). What was affirmative action? AEA Papers and Proceedings, 76(2), 359-363.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum.

Loebe, S. A., & Rodriguez, A. (1987). Allocentrism and idiocentrism among Brazilian university students. Interdisciplinaria, 8, 25-40.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). Leadership & Information Processing: Linking perceptions and performance. London: Routledge.

Loury, G. C. (1989). Why should we care about group inequality? In S. Shulman & W. Darity, Jr. (Eds.). The question of discrimination: Racial inequality in the U.S. labor market (pp. 268-292). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Lovrich, N. P., Steel, B. S., Hood, D. (1986). Equity versus productivity: Affirmative action and municipal police services. Public Productivity Review, 39, 61-72.

Marino, K. E. (1980). A preliminary investigation into the behavioral dimensions of affirmative action compliance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65(3), 346-350.

McConahay, J. B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and context on simulated hiring decisions. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9(4), 551-558.

McConahay, J. B., & Hough Jr., J. C. (1976). Symbolic racism. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 23-45.

McEnrue, M. P. (1993). Managing diversity: Los Angeles before and after the riots. Organizational Dynamics, 21(3), 18-29.

Moore, D. P., & Hass, M. (1990). When affirmative action cloaks management bias in selection and promotion decision. Academy of Management Executive, 4(1), 84-90.

Murrell, A. J., Dietz-Uhler, B. L., Gaertner, S. L., Drout, C. (1994). Aversive racism and resistance to affirmative action: Perceptions of justice are not necessarily color blind. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15(1 & 2), 71-86.

Nacoste, R. W. (1985). Selection procedure and responses to affirmative action. Law and Human Behavior, 9(3), 225-242.

Nacoste, R. W. (1987a). But do they care about fairness? The dynamics of preferential treatment and minority interest. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 8(3), 177-191.

Nacoste, R. W. (1987b). Social psychology and affirmative action: The importance of process in policy analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 43(1), 127-132.

Nacoste, R. W. (1989). Affirmative action and self-evaluation. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 103-109). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Nacoste, R. W. (1990). Sources of stigma: Analyzing the psychology of affirmative action. Law & Policy, 12(2), 175-195.

Nacoste, R. W., & Lehman, D. (1987). Procedural stigma. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 17(1), 25-38.

O'Farrell, B., & Harlan, S. L. (1984). Job integration strategies: Today's programs and tomorrow's needs. In B. F. Reskin (Ed.) Sex segregation in the workplace: Trends, explanations, remedies (pp. 267-291). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Outtz, J. l. (1990, April). Affirmative action in the 1990's. Unpublished manuscript, Washington, DC.

Pazy, A. (1986). The persistence of pro-male bias despite identical information regarding causes of success. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 38, 366-377.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Martin, J. (1987). Shaping the organizational context for black american inclusion. Journal of Social Issues, 43(1), 41-78.

Romero, M. (1986). Twice protected? Assessing the impact of affirmative action on Mexican-American women. In W. A. Home (Ed.) Ethnicity and women (pp. 135-156). Madison: University of Wisconsin System.

Rosenbloom, D. H. (1984). What have policy studies told us about affirmative action and where can we go from here? Policy Studies Review, 4, 43-48.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Defining organizational culture. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.) Classics of organizational theory (2nd ed., pp. 381-395). Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.

Sidanius, J., Devereux, E., Pratto, F. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. The Journal of Social Psychology, 132(3), 377-395.

Singer, M. (1990). Individual differences in category width and fairness perception of selection decisions. Social Behavior and Personality, 18(1), 87-94.

Sniderman, P. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (1986a). Reflections on American Racism. Journal of Social Issues, 42(2), 173-187.

Sniderman, P. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (1986b). Symbolic racism: Problems of motive attribution in political analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 42(2), 129-150.

Sowell, T. (1990). Preferential policies. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy-incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. Psychological Bulletin, 111(1), 42-61.

Steel, B. S., & Lovrich, J. R. (1987). Equality and efficiency tradeoffs in affirmative action - real or imagined? The case of women in policing. Social Science Journal, 24, 53-70.

Summers, R. J., (1991). The Influence of Affirmative Action on Perceptions of a Beneficiary's Qualifications. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21(15), 1265-1276.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Differenciation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. London: Academic Press, Inc.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup behavior. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Taylor, D. A. (1989). Affirmative action and presidential executive orders. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 21-29). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Taylor, M. A., & Doverspike, D. (1991). The psychological environment for affirmative action. Unpublished manuscript.

Taylor, M. C. (1994). Impact of affirmative action on beneficiary groups: Evidence from the 1990 General Social Survey. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15, 143-178.

Taylor, M. A., Doverspike, D., & Alexander, R. (1991). Examining fairness perceptions of gender-based preferential treatment: A cognitive response analysis. Unpublished manuscript.

Taylor, D. M., & Dubé, L. (1986). Two faces of identity: The "I" and the "We." Journal of Social Issues, 42(2), 81-98.

Tickamyer, A., Scollay, S., Bokemeier, J., & Wood, T. (1989). Administrators' perceptions of affirmative action in higher education. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 125-138). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1988). The influence of identification, collective relative deprivation and procedure of implementation on women's responses to affirmative action: A causal modeling approach. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 20(1), 16-29.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1989). Who likes affirmative action: Attitudinal processes among men and women. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 110-124). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1990). The response of men to affirmative action strategies for women: The study of a predictive model. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 22(4), 424-432.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 323-338.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 37, 549-579.

Tsui, A. S., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in supervisor-subordinate dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 402-423.

Turner, J. C. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, M. E., & Pratkanis, A. R. (1993). Effects of preferential and meritorious selection on performance: An examination of intuitive and self-handicapping perspectives. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 47-58.

Turner, M. E., & Pratkanis, A. R. (1994). Affirmative action as help: A review of recipient reactions to preferential selection and affirmative action. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15(1 & 2), 43-69.

Turner, M. E., Pratkanis, A. R., & Hardaway, T. (1991). Gender differences in responses to preferential selection: Towards a model of preferential selection as help. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6, 797-820.

Turner, R. (1990). The past and future of affirmative action. New York: Quorum Books.

Twiss, C., Tabb, S., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Affirmative action and aggregate data: The importance of patterns in the perception of discrimination. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 155-167). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Veilleux, F., & Tougas, F. (1989). Male acceptance of affirmative action programs for women: The results of altruistic or egoistical motives? International Journal of Psychology, 24, 485-496.