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ABSTRACT

There has been limited research regarding the impact of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity efforts on people's perceptions of organizational attraction. Attitudes toward affirmative action policies could have adverse consequences on organizations striving to recruit and select the best employees. A review of previous research on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity is described, as are the attitudes and psychological and behavioral effects experienced by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. The following is an investigation of individuals' perceptions toward organizations that implement affirmative action and equal employment opportunity programs. Perceptions of organizational attraction, intentions to pursue a job at such an organization, and intentions to remain at such an organization based on differing levels of affirmative action policies are examined in detail.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I wish to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Mark D. Agars, who has provided me with constant guidance, instruction, and support throughout this entire project. I would like to thank members of my committee, Dr. Janet Kottke and Dr. Gloria Cowan, for sharing their valuable knowledge and for providing direction and insight whenever needed.

I would also like to thank my family, Jim Barrett, Mary Barrett, and Jimmy Barrett for their constant belief in me, for providing ongoing encouragement and understanding, and for having confidence in me through all of life's endeavors. Finally, I thank my loving boyfriend, Gus Tsamoutalidis, for his endless support and for the many sacrifices made in order for this to happen.
To Mam and Pap,

Forever in Mind and Heart
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ........................................................................ iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ....................................................... iv

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................... vii

CHAPTER ONE  
Introduction ................................................................. 1
Attitudes Towards Affirmative Action  
Policies ................................................................. 8
Attitudes Towards Beneficiaries ................................. 16
Knowledge of Affirmative Action .............................. 19
Organizational Attraction ............................................. 22
The Present Study ......................................................... 27

CHAPTER TWO  
Method ................................................................. 32
Design ................................................................. 32
Independent Variables ............................................. 34
Moderator ............................................................. 36
Dependent Variables ............................................... 37
Control Variable ....................................................... 38
Manipulation Check ..................................................... 39
Procedure ............................................................. 39

CHAPTER THREE  
Results ............................................................. 41
CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion ................................................. 50
Hypotheses ................................................. 52
Underlying Relationships ................................. 60
Academic Implications .................................. 64
Applied Implications .................................... 66
Limitations .................................................. 68
Conclusions .................................................. 69

APPENDIX A: HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIOS

Merit Condition ........................................... 71
Preferential Condition .................................. 72
Strong Preferential Condition ......................... 73

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE ............... 74

REFERENCES .................................................. 80
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS OF STUDY VARIABLES ............. 42

TABLE 2. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ........... 45

TABLE 3. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTRACTION IN EACH EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION ......................... 47

TABLE 4. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PURSUIT IN EACH EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION ......................... 48

TABLE 5. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF REMAIN IN EACH EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION ......................... 49
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The implementation of affirmative action programs (AAPs) and equal employment opportunity (EEO) policies have attracted considerable attention from organizations within recent years. Organizations are required to undertake affirmative action (AA) in an effort to reverse the effects of past discrimination (Crosby, 1994). Affirmative action policies usually target African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and women (Konrad & Linnehan, 1998). Political developments and manifestations of such controversial policies have markedly influenced public convictions, both positively and negatively, stimulating either strong endorsement or strong opposition (Ingwerson, 1995). According to the popular business press, AA is clearly under attack, yet many in both academia and business continue to defend it (Konrad & Linnehan, 1998). There are some who see AA as a necessary remedy to widespread discrimination in the workplace, while others see it as creating even more problems than originally intended to solve (Heilman, Battle, Keller, & Lee, 1998). This public debate has involved disagreement concerning the true meaning of affirmative action, (i.e.,
preferential treatment versus assurance of equal opportunity). This general opposition may be due, in part, to the public's poor understanding of the overall principle of AA (Crosby, 1994; Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994).

Pessimistic views have become embedded into the principle of affirmative action, linking it with concepts such as quotas and preferential treatment. Affirmative action policies are often associated with negative attitudes towards beneficiaries. Specifically, there is often a common stigmatization attached to those who benefit from AA policies (Jacobson & Koch, 1977; Heilman, Battle, Keller, & Lee, 1998). This stigmatization has both immediate and long-term effects for beneficiaries. One of the most significant of these consequences is the label of incompetence that becomes attached to target members benefiting from AA policies (Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992; Heilman, Block, & Stathatos, 1997; Summers, 1991). A factor contributing to these unfavorable views may be a general misunderstanding of what affirmative action truly entails or how such programs actually function (Crosby, 1994; Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994; Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993; Kravitz, Stinson, & Mello, 1994). The common themes presented above will be discussed in detail throughout this
Following the review of current literature on attitudes towards affirmative action and attitudes towards beneficiaries will be an investigation of people's attitudes and perceptions towards organizations implementing affirmative action policies.

Affirmative action and equal opportunity are distinct in their definitions in that affirmative action implies an active disposition, whereas equal opportunity implies a more passive one. To further differentiate between the two, equal opportunity, which is sanctioned by the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964 and 1991, refers to the principle that all individuals be offered the same treatment as others. Affirmative action requires federal contractors to take active steps to ensure equal opportunity. Both, however, are aimed at achieving the same objective: the elimination of discriminatory practice. Although AA and EEO policies are considered to be two different concepts, the underlying principles of the two are quite similar. These similarities may lead to confusion and could be an underlying factor contributing to public misunderstanding. It is likely that the public has mistakenly come to treat the two concepts interchangeably.
The history of affirmative action begins with the CRA of 1964. In response to discrimination throughout the United States, the CRA was designed to provide equal opportunity to all individuals, regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In particular, Title VII of the act specifically addresses issues of employment, which later led to the generation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), an agency ratified to issue orders to those affected by the legislation. A further development in 1965 was the edition of Executive Order 11246 (E011246), which, as with Title VII of the CRA of 1964, prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, and carries the weight of the law. It does differ, however, in that it only applies to federal government contractors with 50 or more employees. It also requires employers to take affirmative action to ensure nondiscriminatory treatment in organizational practices and to formulate an affirmative action plan (AAP). The enforcement agency associated with E011246 is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), whose primary mission is to ensure that employers are taking adequate steps to comply with the legislation. Organizations
refusing to take such steps can be withheld from serving as a federal contractor.

Much of the psychological research on affirmative action has focused on individuals' attitudes toward beneficiaries, as well as corresponding psychological and behavioral effects experienced by both beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. Several studies have indicated negative reactions toward beneficiaries of affirmative action (Jacobson & Koch, 1977; Heilman et al., 1992). For example, various studies have asked nontarget group members to evaluate the competence and qualifications of the target group members. Majority members typically reported women and minorities selected through AAPs to be less competent than those selected without affirmative action efforts (Heilman et al., 1998). Furthermore, this effect may generalize to the target group as a whole, rather than taking into consideration individual differences. This finding is especially strong when affirmative action is operationalized as strong preferential treatment, and when it is not defined procedurally, that is, when it is simply mentioned as part of the process (Heilman, McCullough, & Gilbert, 1996). A more detailed review of this literature is presented later in the paper.
A number of studies have focused on the behavioral and psychological effects experienced by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries. Some studies indicate that sex-based selection procedures decrease motivation and interest. In a survey of 70 women in managerial or supervisory positions in a variety of organizations, Chacko (1982) found that women who believed that their selection was based on sex reported decreased motivation and interest, lower job commitment and satisfaction, and greater role ambiguity and conflict than those women who did not believe sex played an important role in their hiring. These adverse effects experienced by beneficiaries seem to be felt more by women than by men. Heilman, Simon, and Repper (1987) reported that preferential selection had a negative effect on self-assessment of leadership competence and the desire to remain a leader for the female students in their experiment, but not for their male student counterparts. In addition, women who were selected on a preferential basis chose a less complex task over a more demanding one, but method of selection (preferential or merit) had no impact on the task choice of men in this same study (Heilman, Rivero, & Brett, 1991). These findings lead to the conclusion that women, but not men, perceive themselves
as being less competent when they are told they were selected on the basis of sex, rather than merit.

Much of the public has come to see affirmative action as preferential selection of women and minorities without regard to qualifications, often in the form of quotas (Holloway, 1989; Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Although affirmative action insinuates that gender or minority group membership is the basis for personnel decisions, it does not necessarily restrict the use of more traditional criteria, such as merit. It is this relative weighting of group membership (or demographic status) versus merit that differentiates between the different strategies for implementing affirmative action in organizational settings (Heilman et al., 1998).

Affirmative action policies can be thought of as resting upon a continuum and can differ in the degree to which gender and minority group membership is emphasized in selection decisions (Heilman et al., 1998; Nacoste, 1990, 1996; Taylor-Carter, Doverspike, & Cook, 1995). Affirmative action policies can be referred to as ranging from soft to hard on this continuum (Heilman et al., 1998; Seligman, 1973). They have also been referred to as ranging from weak preferential treatment to strong
preferential treatment (Kravitz, 1995). More specifically, policies that use gender and minority group membership as an exclusive criterion for selection are placed on the hard end of the continuum or are referred to as strong preferential treatment. In contrast, practices that use merit as the primary criterion, while still considering gender and minority group membership, but as less exclusive, are placed on the soft end of the continuum or are referred to as weak preferential treatment. Research has demonstrated numerous strategies in which organizations may choose to combine both criteria in their decision-making processes, but to the extent in which group membership is emphasized more than individual merit is considered to be on the harder side of the continuum (Heilman et al., 1998; Seligman, 1973; Nacoste, 1990, 1996; Taylor-Carter, Doverspike, & Cook, 1995).

Attitudes Towards Affirmative Action Policies

The importance of structural features of AAPs (i.e., the specific details of AAPs) has been emphasized in much of the research on affirmative action. Much of this research has been accomplished by manipulating the level of the affirmative action policy (merit-based versus weighting of demographic status), thus assuming that reactions or
attitudes, such as perceptions of fairness, will vary depending upon the specific details of the policy (Tougas & Veilleux, 1988; Brutus & Ryan, 1994; Heilman et al., 1987; Heilman et al., 1991; Singer, 1996; Joly, Pelchat, & Tougas, 1993; Nacoste, 1985, 1987; Nacoste & Lehman, 1987; Matheson, Echenberg, Taylor, Rivers, & Chow, 1994). There are many variants of AAPs and many different forms that affirmative action practices and initiatives can take. Referring back to the continuum, AAPs may be soft by emphasizing merit, or hard by emphasizing demographic status, or may combine both in some manner. The preferential strength of the AAP is dependent upon the weight given to demographic status (i.e., the more weight assigned to demographic status, the stronger the preferential treatment). Distinguishing among these different forms is crucial when determining respondent reactions.

Attitudes may be defined as evaluative judgements about particular objects, issues, persons, or any other identifiable objects of the environment (Baron & Graziano, 1991), and attitudes towards affirmative action have been the focus of much psychological research. However, it is the impact that such attitudes have on individuals’
attitudes and perceptions of the people and organizations involved in the implementation of AAPs that is the focus of the present investigation. Selection situations are a valuable tool for researchers to evaluate respondents' attitudes regarding hiring majority versus minority candidates. For example, Nacoste, (1985, 1987) utilized hypothetical scenarios and found that perceived fairness ratings were higher when the more qualified candidate was selected for a fellowship, rather than the less qualified candidate, disregarding demographic status. In addition, Arthur, Doverspike, and Fuentes (1992) found higher ratings of fairness when the selected minority candidates had equal qualifications, rather than inferior to the qualifications of the nonselected majority candidate. Heilman et al. (1996) found fairness ratings to be higher when qualifications of the selected female candidate were equal or superior to those of the rejected minority candidate than when they were of lesser value. If an individual believes that an AAP gives more weight to demographic status, rather than merit, he or she will perceive it to be unfair, will not support the AAP, and will discredit those selected under the AAP (Nacoste, 1994, 1995).
Respondents tend to express greater support for merit-based selection procedures than any type of preferential treatment. For example, Brutus and Ryan (1994) and Hattrup (1994) found that female undergraduates rated merit-based selection more positively than preferential treatment based on gender. Heilman et al. (1987) surveyed 140 male and female undergraduates and found merit selection to have higher ratings of fairness than strong preferential treatment. Replicating this difference, Heilman et al. (1996) found that this effect was moderated by information about qualifications. It was determined that the difference was not significant if the woman selected in the preferential treatment condition was more qualified and therefore would also have been selected on the basis of merit. Heilman et al. (1991), using male and female undergraduates, found that fairness ratings varied with selection procedure, respondent gender, and the interaction between the two. Men and women responded equally positive to merit selection, but men responded more negatively than women to strong preferential treatment. In a series of three experiments, Matheson et al. (1994) evaluated respondent reactions to four AAPs that varied in the weight given to demographic status. In study 1, participants
reported positive reactions to the elimination of discrimination, negative reactions to weak preferential treatment, and very negative reactions to strong preferential treatment and complete discrimination. In study 2, respondents evaluated the elimination of discrimination positively and three versions of preferential treatment equally negatively. These studies reveal that evaluations of preferential treatment are inversely related to the weighting of demographic status. Summers (1995) asked male and female continuing education students to evaluate three possible AAPs. Evaluations among respondents differed depending on the type of action being described in the policy. For example, positive evaluations were given to special training programs. Slightly negative evaluations were given to quotas. Differential scoring of selection tests (which would result in strong preferential treatment) received negative evaluations. Research conducted by Kravitz and Platania (1992, 1993) concluded that respondents favored equal opportunity, the elimination of discrimination, proportional hiring based on the availability of qualified applicants, training, recruitment, targeting organizations with histories of discrimination, and the provision of
employment information to the federal government. They opposed the hiring of unqualified applicants, proportional hiring that ignored qualifications, and all versions of preferential treatment.

Several studies have compared reactions to strong preferential treatment to a weaker level of preferential treatment where weighting of merit was not specified. In three separate studies (Nacoste, 1985, 1987; Nacoste & Lehman, 1987), undergraduates rated fairness of selection procedures more negatively when the process emphasized strong preferential treatment than when it involved preferential treatment. Another study found that respondents who were in the strong preferential treatment condition rated the process as being less fair than those in the weaker preferential condition (Arthur et al., 1992).

Public opinion polls have demonstrated strong support for equality of opportunity and the elimination of discrimination. Moderate support was found for compensatory action (or extra training for minorities), while disfavor was found for preferential treatment and use of quotas (Lipset & Schneider, 1978).

Research has also shown that race/ethnicity and sex are fairly consistent predictors of attitudes toward AAPs.
(Steeh & Krysan, 1996). In general, Sigelman and Welch (1991) concluded that both Blacks and Whites support equal opportunity and affirmative action, while both groups oppose preferential treatment and quotas. Blacks showed stronger support than Whites in all cases. More specifically, White men seem to be less supportive of AAPs than other demographic groups (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Kluegel & Smith, 1983). In addition, White women report being less supportive of AAPs aimed at eliminating race discrimination than are African Americans. There is little research on the attitudes of Asian or Hispanic Americans, but studies have shown that these groups fall somewhere in between African Americans and White Americans in terms of their level of support (Bell, McLaughlin, & Harrison, 1996; Kravitz & Platania, 1993).

Some of the research on affirmative action has looked at demographic differences and has examined reactions toward AAPs that specifically target people of color. Little research has investigated attitudes towards AAPs targeting females, but some studies have concluded that women support these AA policies more strongly than men do (Tougas & Beaton, 1993). Furthermore, White women support
AAPs targeting females more heavily than programs targeting people of color (Smith & Witt, 1990).

In sum, there is greater support for the principle of equal opportunity than for the principle of affirmative action, though individuals do not easily distinguish between the two. Evaluations are strongly influenced by the actual or presumed structure of the AAP in that people tend to support compensatory (or training) actions and diversity efforts, while limiting affirmative action to the elimination of discrimination. Being able to better understand and predict attitudes and perceptions related to affirmative action will aid organizations with better design and implementation of programs that are more likely to be supported by group members, while still meeting policy objectives, such as increasing diversity, eliminating discrimination, and maintaining organizational attractiveness. As will be examined in the present study, these perceptions of AAPs are likely to have important implications for attitudes towards the organization as well. We can expand on this based on the following research on attitudes towards beneficiaries.
Attitudes Towards Beneficiaries

The research on attitudes towards beneficiaries has direct implications for the present study. It is important to understand how female and minority employees selected through AAPs are perceived by others because negative views could barricade opportunities for target members, as well as prevent good relations between majority and minority groups. Research has demonstrated that negative judgements exist toward those believed to have benefited from affirmative action; in fact, beneficiaries seem tainted with a stigma of incompetence. More specifically, dispraise of the skills and abilities of beneficiaries has been manifested in assessment of qualifications (Garcia, Erskine, Hawn, & Casmay, 1981; Summers, 1991), evaluations of leadership performance (Jacobson & Koch, 1977), and competence judgements (Heilman et al., 1992; Northcraft & Martin, 1982). Furthermore, recent research has suggested that this stigma of incompetence perseveres, even in the face of disconfirming information (Heilman et al., 1997).

Earlier work on evaluations of beneficiaries has demonstrated that association with affirmative action stigmatizes target members by linking them with incompetence. If an individual is seen as being hired
based primarily on group membership, then his/her qualifications are discounted and he/she is not seen as being well-equipped to handle the job (Heilman et al., 1992, 1997). Heilman et al. (1998) conducted a study to examine respondents' reactions toward female beneficiaries. The results indicated that a reputation of incompetence is attached to those who profit from affirmative action practices. Interestingly, this finding occurred whether qualifications were considered to be absent or minimally included during the selection stage and even when there was no information provided regarding the role of qualifications in the decision-making process. Those beneficiaries assumed to be equally qualified (the preferential equivalent condition) were rated as more competent than those in the harder conditions (preferential absolute). The data conclude that even when merit is emphasized in the policy, negative evaluations toward beneficiaries prevail, despite the strength of merit specified in the manipulation. However, the results do demonstrate the importance of the merit criterion in affirmative action decision-making and make clear the significance of distinguishing among AAPs in which qualifications have played different roles. Jacobson and
Koch (1977) paired undergraduates with a female confederate assigned to a leadership position. Participants were told that the confederate was either assigned on the basis of sex (preferential treatment), chance, or superior performance on a test (merit). After engaging in a one-way communication task with the female confederate, the participant was notified of either succeeding or failing at the task. Results indicated that females selected on the basis of gender (preferential treatment) were blamed for poor performance of the group (or failure at the task), but were not given credit if the group was successful. This represents the negative association attached to female beneficiaries of affirmative action practices.

Garcia et al. (1981) examined perceptions of minority applicants' academic qualifications by asking participants to estimate grade point averages. They found that when participants were told that the school had an AA policy, the estimates were lower than when AA was not mentioned. This represents, once again, the idea of individuals underestimating the qualifications of those perceived to benefit from AAPs.

In sum, people's reactions are strongly influenced by the extent to which they believe merit acts as the primary
consideration in the selection process (Heilman et al., 1998). The stigmatization toward beneficiaries may be tempered by providing clear testaments of the female’s or minority group’s competence (Heilman et al., 1992, 1996, 1998; Jacobson & Koch, 1977; Summers, 1991), but it is not likely to be eliminated completely. It is possible, however, that providing such evidence may alter people’s negative perceptions that have become embedded into this stigmatization, later leading to more favorable evaluations of target members as a whole. It is clear that the presence of AAPs impacts attitudes towards those individuals involved in the process. However, what has yet to be investigated is how AAPs impact perceptions of the organization.

Knowledge of Affirmative Action

Although research on knowledge of affirmative action is limited largely to public opinion polls, the data have shown that people’s beliefs about AAPs are often incorrect (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). An individual’s knowledge of what affirmative action entails will influence his or her overall attitudes regarding support or opposition. Therefore, much of the negativity and controversy associated with affirmative action may be partly attributed
to this less than perfect understanding of the principle. In one study, participants were asked to evaluate components of an affirmative action plan and then estimate the likelihood that each component would be incorporated into an AA plan. Anticipation of liked components was generally associated with positive attitudes, and anticipation of disliked components with negative attitudes. Results also indicated that individuals have a poor understanding of what affirmative action fully entails. For example, respondents did not know which organizations were required to have AAPs, and in addition, rated the emphasis of recruitment and elimination of discrimination as being of neutral likelihood, when, in fact, these components are an integral part of AAPs. Furthermore it was reported that 40% of respondents were completely unfamiliar with the concept of affirmative action, while those who did declare familiarity provided obscure definitions (Kravitz & Platania, 1992, 1993; Kravitz et al., 1994).

Research has also demonstrated that people who believe that AA programs lead to positive outcomes have more favorable attitudes toward AAPs (Jacobson, 1983; Tougas & Beaton, 1993). When respondents are provided with specific
information about the actual content of AAPs, their support for the principle increases dramatically (Steeh & Krysan, 1996). In addition, respondents approve of AA programs that function in the manner in which they actually operate. Therefore, educating the public about how AAPs actually operate would help to increase support for the implementation of such policies (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Unfortunately, the large majority of people remains misinformed about AAPs, and it is these misperceptions which influence work-related attitudes.

Based on the research discussed thus far, one can see the relationships that exist between affirmative action and public attitudes, as well as the psychological and behavioral effects experienced by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries of AA policies. The evidence supporting these various relationships has been well documented. There is no research, however, regarding the relationship between affirmative action policies and individuals' perceptions of organizational attraction. This represents a significant gap in AA literature. It is clearly important to determine individuals' perceptions of organizations based on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity efforts because of the adverse
effects it may have on an organization’s recruitment and selection efforts, particularly in their efforts to create a more diverse workforce.

Organizational Attraction

Attracting and selecting the right types of employees has always been a concern for organizations (Schneider, 1976, 1987). Applicant attraction is often the immediate objective of organizational recruitment (Rynes, 1991). Identifying the factors that influence applicant attraction to firms is critical to organizational survival. If a quality individual is not attracted to an organization, not only are top prospective applicants lost, but the overall utility of the selection system is reduced as well (Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Murphy, 1986).

According to the management and organizational behavior literature, one of the most distinct strategies for attracting applicants is through recruitment practices (Rynes, Henrman, & Schwab, 1980; Schwab, 1982; Wanous, 1980). More specifically, one particular dimension of the recruitment process that has been hypothesized to influence applicant attraction is the nature of the message being transmitted to prospective employees (Rynes & Barber, 1990). For example, the nature of the message may include
information about the organization's affirmative action policies and equal employment opportunities. Depending upon the discretion of the applicant, this information may be interpreted negatively and subsequently influence applicant attraction. Nacoste (1987) found that women who read a scenario about a competitively awarded research grant were less likely to report that they would apply for a job at that university when just sex alone was used as the basis of the award than when both sex and qualifications were employed.

Attraction strategies are also influenced by the legal and political climates in which organizations operate (Rynes & Barber, 1990). One of the legal aspects that may be particularly influential is equal employment opportunity legislation (Schwab, 1982). The extent of EEO influence has varied considerably according to changes in legislative, judicial, and executive administrations. For example, former governmental emphasis on class-action prosecutions increased the vulnerability of organizations with large numbers of homogeneous employees. Legal rulings made in the late 1980s (e.g., Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins) have switched the emphasis toward managerial intent, rather than on numbers per se (Rynes & Barber, 1990). Therefore,
legal considerations undoubtedly affect the selection behaviors of organizations, particularly the extent to which affirmative action and equal employment opportunity affect the process. However, many uncertainties exist concerning how they affect organizational attraction.

Research suggests that an organization's reputation is an important part of the recruitment process and appears to influence applicants' attraction to the firm in a complex manner (Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998). Some evidence suggests that an organization's reputation prior to an interview has a direct effect on attraction to the organization. Lawler, Kuleck, Rhode, and Sorenson (1975) found that firm attractiveness ratings obtained before interviews were related to subsequent job choices. Specifically, 80% of participants accepted a job with the highest rating of attractiveness. Likewise, Rynes et al. (1990) found that general company reputation had a positive and direct influence on applicant assessments of firms.

Several researchers have assumed that fairness judgments play a role in initial attraction to an organization. Thus, many studies have assessed perceptions of fairness, rather than direct attitudes towards affirmative action. Results indicate typical arguments
among respondents such as concerns about reverse discrimination. More specifically, some perceive affirmative action as a punishment to young white men who were not responsible for discrimination (Glasser, 1988; Groarke, 1990). Others see it as a method of forcing organizations to change the rules in the middle of the game (Crosby, 1994). Nacoste (1987) reported that one reason for negative reactions to strong affirmative action plans is that they imply that the organization is not committed to fairness. This negativity may have adverse consequences for organizations in terms of attracting the best employees. Applicants who are less attracted to organizations based on negative perceptions of fairness may be influenced to withdraw from the applicant pool.

Nacoste (1985, 1987) has examined effects of perceived fairness on the outcomes of AAPs. His research concluded that the perceived fairness of selection criteria was a significant predictor of the attractiveness of the organization. Furthermore, when an organization's selection criteria for a research grant incorporated both gender and merit, respondents were more willing to work for the organization than when the decision was based solely on the sex of the applicant (Nacoste, 1985). Procedures that
include the consideration of both qualifications and demographics, rather than just the latter, are perceived to be more fair and are less likely to have a negative impact on an organization's reputation (Konrad & Linnehan, 1998).

Organizational policies that take into account the needs of a diverse workforce may prove to be a competitive advantage with respect to attracting new employees. More specifically, research indicates that a match between individual values and organizational values is a good predictor of job choice (Judge & Bretz, 1992). It has also been suggested that individuals may be attracted to organizations based on their perceived fit. Person-organization fit has been identified by Chattman (1989) as the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons (p. 339). Empirical research on several occupations has shown that people tend to choose organizations on the basis of the similarity between their own values and the values of the organization they are considering (Betz & Judkins, 1975; Sigelman, 1975; Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970). Judge and Bretz (1992) reported that the congruence between individual work values and organizational values was a
better predictor of job choice than either pay or promotion opportunities.

Job seekers may infer the values of an organization based on their recruiting materials. For example, they may search recruitment material for cues that an organization fits their salient identity (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997). Furthermore, individuals are expected to be most attracted to organizations that offer policies that are compatible with their identities because they will perceive opportunities to perform in terms of that identity (Stryker, 1968).

Perceptions of fairness, organizational fit, and values as a result of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity may affect applicant attraction. Given this and the previous research on attitudes toward AA and EEO, as well as the psychological and behavioral effects experienced by beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries of such policies, it is important to determine if these attitudes affect perceptions of organizational attraction.

The Present Study

The present study seeks to contribute to the research on affirmative action by examining people's perceptions of organizations that implement AA policies. It is important
to understand individual’s attitudes toward organizations utilizing such programs, especially if potential applicants and/or current employees interpret these policies negatively. Furthermore, it is essential to clearly understand how people view AA programs in order to aid organizations with better design and implementation of hiring practices that are both attractive to potential applicants and/or current employees, while simultaneously increasing organizational diversity.

With regards to hiring practices, present-day organizations are faced with conflicting responsibilities, such as encouraging the development of a diverse workforce, while simultaneously engaging in non-preferential decision-making during the selection process. As documented in the literature, attempting to accomplish both of these objectives has created much controversy. Participating in diversity-focused recruitment practices is highly regarded, yet engaging in preferential decision making during selection practices is often seen as unfair and unacceptable.

The research reviewed up to this point has focused on attitudes toward affirmative action and toward those who benefit from such policies. These studies have concluded
that negative consequences exist for both target and non-target members. There has been limited research, however, examining current or prospective employees’ attitudes toward organizations that implement such policies through their recruitment and selection efforts. This represents a significant gap in the AA literature.

Encouraging a diverse workforce is perceived as a worthy goal; however, if such efforts lead to negative perceptions of the organization, this may have serious implications for organizational recruitment and selection efforts. For example, individuals may be less likely to apply to an organization that has a reputation for participating in preferential hiring practices. If applicants perceive an organization to have a reputation for preferential decision-making, this could result in immediate and long-term consequences for both the applicant and the organization. Thus, although organizations are striving to increase diversity in the workplace, their efforts to do so may, in actuality, be reducing it. The purpose of the present study is to directly examine whether these policies do in fact lead to negative attitudes and organizational perceptions. Specifically, there are four hypotheses to be considered:
Hypothesis 1: The stronger an organization's emphasis on demographic status, the less likely it is individuals will be attracted to that organization. Individuals in the preferential selection conditions will report lower ratings of organizational attraction than individuals in the merit condition. Applicants are more likely to be attracted to organizations that are perceived to emphasize merit, rather than demographic status, during the selection process.

Hypothesis 2: The stronger an organization's emphasis on demographic status, the less likely it is that individuals intend to pursue that organization. Individuals in the preferential selection conditions will report lower ratings of intentions to pursue the organization. Applicants are more likely to pursue a job at an organization that emphasizes merit, rather than demographic status, during the selection process.

Hypothesis 3: The stronger an organization's emphasis on demographic status, the less likely it is that individuals will expect to remain at that organization. Individuals in the preferential selection conditions will report lower ratings of intentions to remain.
Applicants are more likely to remain at an organization that is perceived to emphasize merit, rather than demographic status, during the selection process.

The final hypothesis examines the impact of an important individual difference variable, specifically attitudes towards affirmative action. Although it is expected that the presence of AA policies will directly lead to negative perceptions, it is likely that these relationships will be influenced by the valence of someone’s attitudes towards AA. Therefore attitudes towards AA will be examined as a moderator.

**Hypothesis 4:** Attitudes toward affirmative action will moderate the relationship between type of selection process and individuals’ perceptions of organizational attraction, intention to pursue an organization, and intention to remain at an organization.

This will be expressed such that the predicted relationship between AA policy and attitudes will be stronger for those individuals holding more negative (or more positive) attitudes towards affirmative action, than those individuals whose views are simply neutral.
Method

Participants

The sample included 165 students, 117 women and 48 men, enrolled at California State University, San Bernardino. The mean age of participants was 24.62 with a range of 18-51. Of the population, 41% were White, 26% were Hispanic, 14% were African American, 7% were Asian, and 12% rated themselves as other. Participants were recruited from psychology courses during regularly scheduled class sessions and received credit for their participation.

Design

The present study was an investigation of people’s perceptions of organizations that implement affirmative action and equal employment opportunity policies. Using a between-subjects design, stimulus materials included three hypothetical employment scenarios that differed in the emphasis given to demographic status versus merit during an organization’s selection process. Participants reported their perceptions of organizational attraction, intentions to pursue the organization, intentions to remain with the organization, and general attitudes toward affirmative
action. Finally, participants were provided with a list of potential components of an AA program, in which they were instructed to evaluate the likelihood of each component being true. This measure was used to assess their general knowledge of affirmative action (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Each of these variables is explained in further detail in the following section.

An exploratory investigation of individual differences (e.g., gender and ethnicity) was conducted in order to determine if such differences relate to differential perceptions about organizations. Therefore, data were examined as a whole, as well as through various demographic backgrounds. Although no hypotheses were made, supplemental analyses were conducted in order to examine additional variables that may help to explain some underlying processes related to perceptions of affirmative action and organizational attraction. Additional variables included organizational fairness, self-interest, and organizational fit, or how one's values match the values of an organization. Fairness was measured using a 5-item scale ($\alpha = .86$), and self-interest was measured using a 4-item scale ($\alpha = .79$), both adapted from Kravitz (1995).
Organizational fit was assessed using 2 items ($\alpha = .86$) adapted from Cable and Judge (1996). Please refer to Appendix B.

**Independent Variables**

**Type of Affirmative Action Policy**

Types of AA policies was presented in the form of three hypothetical employment scenarios to assess respondents attitudes regarding the use of merit versus demographic status during selection processes. All scenarios described an organization seeking applicants for the position of Administrative Specialist. This position was chosen based on its gender-equal characteristics (Heilman, Kaplow, Amato, & Stathatos, 1993). The name of the organization remained consistent across all three levels and was specifically described as being an equal opportunity employer with an affirmative action policy.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions. The conditions varied depending upon how demographic status versus merit is considered during selection processes. The first level described an organization in which selection decisions are based solely on applicant qualifications (see Appendix A). From this
point on, this condition will be referred to as the merit condition (or control). The merit condition included statements such as, "the organization is committed to fair selection processes by always seeking out the most competent employees." The second level suggested the use of preferential treatment during the selection process, but only when women and minorities have equal qualifications to those of the majority (see Appendix A). This second level is referred to as the preferential condition and included statements such as, "the organization frequently gives preference to women and minorities if their qualifications are equal to those of the majority." The third level suggested a selection process in which demographic status is the primary consideration over merit (see Appendix A). This third level is referred to as the strong preferential condition and includes statements such as, "the organization is known for seeking the demographic status of its applicants..."}

Advertisements do not commonly include how merit and/or demographic status are handled during the selection process. Therefore, to
convey a more realistic employment situation, while still allowing the manipulation, the scenarios stated that a friend, and current employee of the company, has mentioned to the participant how the selection process normally operates at that organization, either by regularly considering merit as the primary determinant, demographic status, or both.

Moderator

Attitudes towards Affirmative Action was used as a moderator for the relationship between Type of AA Policy and Organizational Attraction. Participants reported their attitudes toward affirmative action using a six-item attitude scale (α = .83) developed by Kravitz and Platania (1993; see Appendix B). Responses were based on a 5-point Likert-type response scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The responses conveyed whether they felt that the goals of AA policies are good, whether or not they would like to work at an organization with an AA plan, whether employees should be actively involved in the attempt to improve AA conditions at their place of employment, and whether or not they oppose the use of AA plans in industry. Sample items included, "I would be
willing to work at an organization with an AA plan”, and “All in all, I oppose AA plans in industry for minorities and women.”

Dependent Variables

Organizational Attraction

Participants were asked to report their level of attraction to the organization based on characteristics described in the scenario. Attraction to the organization was assessed using a 4-item scale (α = .95) adapted from Aimen-Smith et al. (1999; see Appendix B). Sample items included, “I would like to work for this company”, and “I find this a very attractive company.” Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Job Pursuit Intentions

Participants were asked to evaluate the likelihood of pursuing a job at the organization based on characteristics perceived from the employment scenario. Job pursuit intentions was assessed using a 5-item scale (α = .89) adopted from Aimen-Smith et al. (1999; see Appendix B). Sample items included, “I would accept a job offer from this company”, and “I would actively pursue obtaining a position
with this company.” Items were rated on a 5-point-Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Intentions to Remain

Participants reported their intention to remain with the organization based on the characteristics described in the scenario. Intentions to remain was measured using a 3-item scale (α = .73) adopted from Casper (1999; see Appendix B). Sample items included, “If I took a job with this organization I would expect to work there for at least two years”, and “If I took a job at this company, I would be likely to keep looking for a different job.” Items were based on a 5-point-Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Control Variable

Knowledge of Affirmative Action Plans

Knowledge of Affirmative Action Plans (AAPs) was used as a control variable to assess respondents’ overall understanding of affirmative action. Participants were asked to evaluate the likelihood of 10 potential components (see Appendix B) being true of a typical AA policy (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). A 5-point-Likert scale was employed,
ranging from very unlikely (1) to very likely (5). The scale included components such as, “An affirmative action plan would involve quotas for women and minorities” and “An affirmative action plan would require businesses to hire and promote a certain number of women and minorities.” The original scale consisted of 10 items, but due to low reliability estimates ($\alpha = .62$) two items were deleted, increasing reliability to $\alpha = .73$.

**Manipulation Check**

In order to determine the effectiveness of the manipulation of condition, participants were asked to indicate their level of certainty that demographic status was being used as part of the hiring process in the given scenario. More specifically, participants were asked, “How certain are you that the hiring decisions of this organization are based on demographic characteristics, (i.e., gender and race)?” Responses were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from very uncertain (1) to very certain (5).

**Procedure**

Participants completed informed consents and were told that the study was being conducted to examine factors that
may influence applicant attraction to organizations. Upon agreeing to take part in the study, participants were presented with a packet containing the following: a randomly assigned employment scenario, Attraction scale (including measures of Intentions to Pursue and Intention to Remain), AA Attitudes scale, and Knowledge of Affirmative Action scale. The entire survey took approximately 30 minutes to complete, after which respondents were presented with a debriefing form.
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Results

Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining differences on the measured manipulation of affirmative action programs revealed a significant effect of condition $F(2,161) = 7.92, p < .001$. Post-hoc comparisons using Fisher's LSD, with an alpha level of $p < .05$, indicated significant differences between the merit and preferential conditions and between the merit and strong preferential conditions. Differences between preferential and strong preferential conditions, though in the expected direction, were not significant. Taken together, these findings demonstrate a fairly successful manipulation of affirmative action policy in each of the scenarios.

Cell means, standard deviations, and correlations of all study variables are presented in Table 1. Preliminary analyses revealed no differences in ratings as a function of ethnicity, so data from all participants were combined for subsequent analyses. No sex differences were revealed, with mean ratings of attraction, intentions of pursuit, and intentions to remain for males being $X = 3.48$, $S.D. = .92$; $X = 3.77$, $S.D. = .82$; and $X = 2.94$, $S.D. = .91$ respectively, while for females being $X = 3.54$, $S.D. = .93$;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Org Attraction</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intention to Pursue</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intention to Remain</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational. Fit</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fairness</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Interest</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Condition</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Attitudes toward AA</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge of AA</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gender</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnicity</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Age</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Year in School</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 165

Coefficient alphas indicating scale reliabilities (where appropriate) are in bold.

** P < .01
X = 3.81, S.D. = .75; and X = 3.08, S.D. = .84 respectively. No univariate outliers were observed. Use of Mahalanobis distance revealed no multivariate outliers as well (p < .001). Evaluation of assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance also demonstrated satisfactory results.

Initially, it was intended to test the fourth hypothesis by entering attitudes towards affirmative action as an interaction term, and subsequently, using multiple regression to test the effect. However, due to nonsignificance to attraction [t(1, 148) = 1.79, p = .08], intentions of pursuit [t(1, 148) = 1.04, p = .30], and intentions to remain [t(1, 148) = 1.05, p = .29], Attitudes towards AA was dropped from analyses. Therefore, to test the three hypotheses, a between-subjects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted. High and positive bivariate correlations between pairs of the three dependent variables (attraction, intention to pursue, intention to remain) led to the decision to use MANCOVA followed by multiple ANCOVAS, rather than examining three independent ANCOVA techniques. The omnibus MANCOVA was significant using Wilks’ Lambda criterion, F (6, 316) = 11.80, p < .001. The combined dependent variable was
significantly related to the covariate, $F (3,158) = 3.85, p < .05$. A small association was found between the covariate, knowledge of affirmative action, and the combined DV ($\eta^2 = .07$). Results of MANCOVA are displayed in Table 2.

To examine each hypothesis independently for the impact on attraction, intention to pursue, and intention to remain, follow up univariate analysis was conducted for each of the three dependent variables. Significant results were found for attraction, $F (2,160) = 31.91, p < .001$, intentions of pursuit, $F (2,160) = 19.59, p < .001$, and intentions to remain, $F (2,160) = 8.05, p < .001$. Effect size estimates ($\eta^2$) for each outcome were .29, .20, and .09 respectively.

Intercell contrasts indicate significant differences between the merit condition and each preferential condition for all three outcomes ($p < .05$). Although not significant, variance in the strong preferential condition was larger for the three outcome measures, suggesting that there is a greater divergence of opinion regarding AA that incorporates strong preferential treatment. Contrasts for attraction, intention to pursue, and intention to remain
### TABLE 2. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df₂</th>
<th>Multivariate F</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>94.27**</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of AA (Covariate)</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>11.80**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01  
** p < .001
are displayed separately in Tables 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

Correlational analyses were conducted to examine potential processes underlying the aforementioned relationships. Specifically, perceptions of fairness, organizational fit, and self-interest were each examined for their relationships to the study variables. Organizational fairness was negatively related to condition \( (r = -0.49) \), and positively related to attraction \( (r = 0.74) \), intentions to pursue \( (r = 0.71) \), and intentions to remain \( (r = 0.68) \). Correlational results demonstrated similar relationships between perceptions of organizational fit and condition \( (r = -0.35) \) and between fit and attraction \( (r = 0.60) \), intention to pursue \( (r = 0.52) \) and intention to remain \( (r = 0.63) \). Comparable relationships were also found with self-interest. Positive correlations were found between self-interest and attraction \( (r = 0.28) \), intention to pursue \( (r = 0.37) \), and intention to remain \( (r = 0.29) \). The implications of these relationships on the hypothesized relationships are expanded upon below.
TABLE 3. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTRACTION IN EACH EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Preferential</th>
<th>Strong Preferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.06&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.66&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.90&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Different subscripts within a row indicate significant differences at the p < .05 level using the Fisher least square difference procedure. Reported means are unadjusted.
### TABLE 4. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF PURSUIT IN EACH EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION

**Affirmative Action Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pursuit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Preferential</th>
<th>Strong Preferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.12\textsubscript{a}</td>
<td>3.97\textsubscript{a}</td>
<td>3.33\textsubscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Different subscripts within a row indicate significant differences at the p < .05 level using the Fisher least square difference procedure. Reported means are unadjusted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Preferential</th>
<th>Strong Preferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.25&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Different subscripts within a row indicate significant differences at the p < .05 level using the Fisher least square difference procedure. Reported means are unadjusted.
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Discussion

Researchers and practitioners alike have called for a greater emphasis on the recruitment, selection, and development of women and minorities (Catalyst, 1998). The results of the present study reveal important implications for organizations attempting to increase workplace diversity through recruitment and selection efforts. The success of such efforts requires the careful implementation of selection policies that include well-developed, fair affirmative action plans, while ensuring equal opportunity employment for all individuals. Unfortunately, the present study supports a disappointing verity for organizations utilizing such efforts. Similar to conclusions of previous research investigating consequences of affirmative action (c.f., Heilman), the present results suggest that negative perceptions, often associated with AAP beneficiaries, are also formed towards organizations in which the AA policies are being implemented. Therefore, although organizations are striving to increase the number of women and minorities throughout the workplace, this study suggests that their efforts to do so may actually be hurting attempts to enhance diversity if turning away certain populations by
using affirmative action practices that are perceived to be unfair.

It was predicted that attitudes towards affirmative action would moderate the relationship between condition and the three outcome measures of organizational attraction, intentions to pursue, and intentions to remain. More specifically, it was thought that individuals holding negative attitudes towards AA would report even lower ratings of general attraction than those individuals whose overall attitudes towards AA were either positive or neutral. Interestingly, results indicated that attitudes towards AA was not related to any of the three outcome measures, a surprising finding when considering past research on individual attitudes (c.f., Nacoste; Brutus & Ryan, 1994; Hattrup, 1994; Matheson et al., 1994). This variable was therefore removed from subsequent analyses. Future studies may want to reexamine this relationship.

Taken both collectively and independently, the hypotheses testing the three outcome measures of attraction, intentions to pursue, and intentions to remain reveal that individuals are less attracted to organizations implementing AA policies. Participants in the strong preferential conditions reported lower levels of general
attraction to the organization, lower intentions to pursue a job with the organization, and lower intentions to remain with the organization than those in the merit condition. Although not all conditions resulted in significant differences of general attraction, the overall trend suggests that individuals' attitudes grow increasingly negative as the policy drifts further away from merit based decisions. Implications of each relationship are discussed below.

Hypotheses

In support of the anticipated relationship, individuals' ratings of organizational attraction were significantly different across all three conditions. Participants in the strong preferential condition reported lower ratings of attraction than those participants in the preferential condition, as well as those in the merit condition. These results are consistent with previous research on attitudes towards AA suggesting that individuals' reactions will vary depending upon the specific details of the policy (Brutus & Ryan, 1994; Heilman et al., 1991; Singer, 1996; Joly, Pelchat, & Tougas, 1993; Matheson, Echenberg, Taylor, Rivers, & Chow, 1994). More specifically, individuals generally expressed
greater support for softer policies, or those that strongly emphasize merit. In addition, the results of the present study compliment past research related to perceptions of beneficiaries of AA, which states that applicants do not want to be hired based on demographic characteristics because they risk having their qualifications and overall competence discounted by other members of the organization (Heilman, et al., 1992; Northcraft & Martin, 1982). With the present study adding to our understanding of these conclusions, not only do applicants prefer not to be hired based on demographics, but may not even apply to the organization due to perceptions of unattractive AA policies. Furthermore, the present results imply that the mere presence of AA influences perceptions of organizational attraction.

The aforementioned conclusions have both immediate and long-term implications for organizations attempting to implement diversity-focused selection practices. As suggested by the present results, individuals are more attracted to organizations that hire applicants based on merit or qualifications, rather than on demographic characteristics. Therefore, if organizational leaders are implementing poorly developed selection policies that do
not emphasize merit-based decisions, they may, unintentionally, be pushing away quality applicants. Adding to earlier research on attraction, (Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Murphy, 1986) the careful development and implementation of diversity-focused selection practices may be critical to organizational survival in order to attract and retain top employees. Organizational leaders should be aware of and sensitive to these perceptions held by potential applicants when developing and implementing selection practices that incorporate AA. If an individual perceives the AA policy to be unjust, he or she may see the organization as an unattractive alternative to employment, and as a result, may seek out other organizations in which they perceive to be more attractive. Consequently, the organization risks losing qualified job applicants, whom, otherwise, may have been successful candidates for employment.

Not only do organizations risk losing prospective quality applicants, they may also be subjected to long-term consequences that could seriously affect ongoing recruitment and selection efforts. More specifically, an organization may develop a reputation for using preferential hiring practices, a label imposing even more
negativity when attempting to attract and retain quality employees. It was discussed earlier that an organization's reputation is an important part of the recruitment process (Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998), and some evidence suggests that, prior to an interview, it has a direct effect on overall attraction (Lawler, Kuleck, Rhode, & Sorenson, 1975). An organization known for its poor reputation of mishandling AA policies may have trouble discarding this label to potential applicants or current employees, even in the face of disconfirming evidence. Once a negative reputation is developed, the consequences that follow often become irreversible. This should encourage leaders of organizations to reexamine the utility of their AA programs to ensure that applicants perceive a reputation of quality and fairness, thus increasing applicant attraction. It would be a discouraging reality for an organization aiming towards a reputable goal of increasing the number of women and minorities in the workplace to develop a poor reputation due to public perceptions of unjust AA programs.

Regarding the relationship between condition and intentions to pursue a job with the organization, results supported the predictions and are similar to the findings
of attraction. Individuals in the preferential conditions reported that they would be less likely to pursue the organization than those in the merit condition. Differences in participant's ratings were significant between the merit condition and the strong preferential condition and between the preferential condition and the strong preferential condition. However, differences were not significant between the merit and preferential condition. Although the latter was not significant, the linear trend still supports the idea that when individuals perceive the presence of AA, their attitudes towards the organization, once again, become increasingly negative. This lends further support to the importance for organizational leaders to use merit based selection decisions, rather than demographic based policies, when attempting to influence applicants to pursue opportunities at their organization. An individual may have second thoughts about pursuing the organization if he or she perceives the AA policies to be unfair, thus leading to harmful consequences for organizations. Attracting and selecting the right applicants is already a concern for most organizations, and the results of the present study should encourage leaders who are developing AA selection
policies to become more attentive to these issues. Failing to recognize the importance of using fair AA programs can put a serious strain on managers who are striving to hire top quality employees.

As mentioned previously, applicant attraction is often the immediate objective of organizational recruitment (Rynes, 1991), and one of the most distinct strategies of attracting particular applicants is through recruitment practices. There is evidence that the recruitment process is an early, yet important, dimension that applicants rely on when seeking employment (Rynes, Henrman, & Schwab, 1980; Schwab, 1982; Wanous, 1980). As discussed earlier, a particular dimension of the recruitment process that has been predicted to influence applicant attraction is the nature of the message being transmitted to prospective employees (Rynes & Barber, 1991). These messages, commonly portrayed through employment advertisements, often contain information describing AA programs and frequently represent an organization’s “first impression” to potential applicants. Based on findings, the present study suggests that such messages may play a primary role for applicants when deciding whether or not to pursue an organization. If
they perceive these messages to have negative connotations, they may choose to continue their search for employment at other organizations deemed to be fairer during selection processes. Organizations that participate in diversity-focused recruitment practices may be seen as highly regarded; yet, engaging in preferential decision making is seen as unacceptable, thus reducing the likelihood of prospective applicants pursuing the organization. Therefore, in an effort to retain, or even increase, the pursuit of women and minorities it is important for organizations to adhere to well-developed AA programs that emphasize the use of merit, thus indirectly communicating fair, non-preferential treatment to all potential applicants.

Intentions to remain with the organization was included in the present study in order to examine the potential effects that an AA policy may have on individuals' intentions of staying with the organization over a period of time. Although difficult to predict such future plans of any individual, it was thought that participants in the preferential conditions would see themselves as less likely to remain at that organization than those in the merit condition. Differences were
significant between the merit and strong preferential conditions, as well as between the preferential and strong preferential conditions, once again illustrating that individuals are aware of and can differentiate between merit versus preferential hiring practices. Surprisingly, although not significant, participants, overall, reported slightly higher ratings in the preferential condition than the other two conditions. One possible explanation for this nonlinear trend may be related, in part, to the fact that intentions to remain with the organization is tapping into future behaviors of individuals. For example, participants were asked to report their likelihood of remaining with the organization for two years or more. Predicting such future behavior is difficult to accomplish for any of us, especially since many factors may play a role when deciding such behavioral outcomes. It would be interesting for future research to better isolate this outcome and perhaps investigate such behaviors using a longitudinal study. Importantly however, the differences between conditions once again illustrate that individuals are sensitive to the presence of AA. Furthermore, although slightly higher ratings resulted in the preferential condition, the general conclusions still suggest that
individuals are more favorable towards AA programs that incorporate the merit criterion, rather than those based primarily on demographic characteristics. Individuals currently employed at organizations who believe that the selection practices are based on preferential treatment may have little or no intention of remaining there long-term. This, once again, implies serious consequences for organizations in terms of employee retention. Retaining employees is already difficult for most organizations to accomplish, especially with today's competitive and transient workforce. Losing quality employees due to poorly implemented AA policies not only reduces the utility of the program, but also increases turnover rates, as well as organizational recruitment costs. These losses can be avoided with better design and implementation of diversity-focused policies.

Underlying Relationships

It was of interest to examine potential underlying processes with relation to the study variables in order to further explain why certain individuals may respond differently in terms of lower versus higher levels of attraction. Specifically, it was anticipated that perceptions of fairness, self-interest, and organizational
fit would play a role with individuals' attitudes. Negative relationships were found between condition and fairness, as well as between condition and organizational fit. These findings suggest that organizations that utilize affirmative action polices are perceived as less fair, as well as a poorer fit for potential applicants. Given public opinion of AAPs, the perceptions of fairness are not surprising. Our findings are similar to previous research, which suggests that individuals' perceptions of fairness are a significant predictor of the attractiveness of the organization (Nacoste, 1985, 1987). These perceptions may be due, in part, to individuals' concerns of reverse discrimination. More specifically, some view AA as a punishment to young white men who are not responsible for discrimination (Glasser, 1988; Groakre, 1990), while others see it as a method of forcing organizations to change their rules (Crosby, 1994). Either way, this adds to the growing body of evidence that fair selection practices are essential when attempting to attract potential candidates. Applicants who are less attracted to organizations based on unfair messages may choose to withdraw from the applicant pool, which leads to serious
consequences for organizational leaders attempting to hire
the best employees.

The relationship between condition and organizational
fit is one that has not yet been explored and introduces a
unique area to investigate in future studies. Organizational fit has been discussed as particularly
important to the successful attraction and retention of
employees (Schneider, 1991). Research indicates that a
match between individual values and organizational values
is a good predictor of job choice (Judge & Bretz, 1992),
and that people tend to seek out organizations on the basis
of value similarity (Betz & Judkins, 1975; Sigelman, 1975;
Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970). Individuals may often
infer the values of an organization based on recruiting
materials, and if the presence of AAPs reduces perceptions
of fit within targeted populations, it may be that they are
doing more harm than good. When considering a lack of fit
in combination with the creation of a poor reputation for
the organization in terms of unfair AA policies, there is
much to be concerned about. It is likely that individuals
are attracted to organizations that are compatible with
their identity; therefore, it is important for
organizational leaders to convey values that would be
congruent with the average job seeker and to express these values through the recruitment process in order to increase organizational attraction. Affirmative action programs that communicate organizational fit will aid leaders with attracting highly desirable candidates, rather than turning them away due to perceptions of value incongruence.

An additional underlying process examined in the present study was self-interest. Self-interest is the feeling of fair or unfair competition due to minority gains (Jacobson, 1985). A positive relationship was found between self-interest and attitudes towards affirmative action. This is consistent with previous research (c.f. Kravitz) revealing more positive attitudes towards affirmative action among minorities and women who perceive that their personal self-interests are being attained through AA policies. Tougas and Beaton (1993) concluded similar results when male participants were highly critical of AA programs because of believing that women were compensated at their own expense. With this in mind, one would then expect to find a significant relationship between self-interest and condition. In other words, if participants believed that the AA policy would contribute to their own personal gains, ratings of general attraction
would be higher. However, no significant relationship was found, which suggests that although self-interest plays a role with attitudes, individuals still favor merit based decisions, even if the AA policy is perceived as having one's own interest in mind. Once again, this contributes to previous research by suggesting that individuals prefer fair AA selection processes that emphasize merit. One's gender or ethnic background does not seem to be a factor when deciding what is acceptable or unacceptable during selection practices. In a sense, this protects women and minorities from becoming exposed to the likelihood of having their qualifications and competence discounted by other members of the organization if had been hired through preferential treatment.

It is likely that the underlying constructs mentioned above operate both directly and indirectly to influence the attraction outcomes discussed in the present study. Their inclusion in future research is well warranted.

Academic Implications

The present study is the first to investigate perceptions of organizations associated with the implementation of AAPs. The anticipated relationships were supported, and these findings offer a pathway to several
directions for future research on the relationship between affirmative action and perceptions of organizations. A particular area briefly explored in the present study, and one that merits future interest, is organizational fit. If individuals are concerned about a proper fit when weighing other factors such as overall attraction and fairness of AA programs, what does this mean for organizations? What can organizations do to better attract quality candidates, portray congruence between their values and the values of quality applicants, while still ensuring fair AA programs? These unanswered questions donate unique areas to examine and would further add to our understanding of organizational perceptions.

Although the present research contributes to the growing body of evidence revealing unintended negative consequences of affirmative action practices, additional research, along with replication, is necessary in order to expand our understanding. A reexamination of attitudes towards affirmative action and its relationship to perceptions of organizations may be a useful construct for future researchers to investigate, being that the present study yielded unexpected results. Perhaps our findings were a result of a sample issue or a measurement issue, but
undoubtedly, attitudes towards AA merits further exploration in order to better understand its relationship to individuals’ perceptions.

**Applied Implications**

Based on the conclusions of the present study, it may be necessary for organizations to reexamine current policies, especially if any concerns exist regarding the fairness of their AA programs. As already discussed, if messages of unfairness are being transmitted to potential applicants, serious consequences may result in more areas than one, including initial attraction, pursuit, and retention. Ultimately, poorly implemented AA programs could lead to the downfall of an organization. If organizational leaders perceive their practices to be causing such harm, then perhaps they should consider alternatives to AAPs. However, with these alternatives in mind, organizations are often limited in terms of what they are able to do, considering the laws governing affirmative action. As stated in current laws, organizations cannot simply eliminate such policies; therefore, it is of great importance for leaders to focus on ways to improve the design and communication of such programs, thus leading to
greater understanding and increased support from all populations.

Greater acceptance of AAPs requires more careful, well-developed implementation of AA policies, along with a better understanding from the public (c.f. Kravitz). This calls for greater education on the concept of affirmative action. Conceivably, if the public had a better understanding of the true meaning of AA, then perhaps a more positive view of the concept would follow. There is evidence that an individual's knowledge of what affirmative action entails influences his or her attitudes regarding support or opposition of the concept (c.f. Kravitz and Platania). Research has also demonstrated that those who perceive AA in a positive manner have more favorable attitudes towards AAPs (Jacobson, 1983; Tougas & Beaton, 1993). Unfortunately, pessimistic views have become embedded into the minds of the general public and the majority of people remains misinformed about AA. It may be these misperceptions that influence general attraction or dislike towards organizations. Therefore, it is up to organizational leaders to take on this challenge of changing the views of the public by ensuring fair AA programs and recruitment practices on all levels, thus
changing public perceptions one by one, as potential applicants walk through their doors in seek of employment.

This study adds to previous research on AA and lends support that applicants prefer to be hired based on merit and qualifications. It is critical for organizations striving to increase diversity in the workplace to ensure that merit is the primary criterion during recruitment processes. The attraction and retention of top prospective minority applicants begins with the recruitment process, thus more attention should be paid to the design and utility of such practices.

Limitations

A potential limitation of the present study is related to the sample. Participants were comprised of university students, and it may be argued that many undergraduates lack the real-world experiences desired in empirical research on applied topics. However, the majority of the sample used for this particular study was comprised of upper-level students (72%) and have been, or are soon to be, on the job market. Therefore, this limitation is somewhat mitigated. Furthermore, our sample is representative of the population used in similar research (c.f. Heilman) investigating affirmative action.
An additional limitation is the use of scenario-based research. Using scenarios to convey proper manipulation is always an argumentative approach, however, the present study followed previous research efforts (c.f. Heilman) and attempted to overcome this limitation as much as possible. Specifically, employment advertisements do not commonly include descriptive information regarding the AA hiring practices of an organization. Based on this, we attempted to manipulate conditions by using word-of-mouth from a current employee of that specific company, rather than including that information as part of a written employment advertisement. It would be useful to conduct future studies on perceptions of organizations without relying on a scenario-based approach in order to investigate whether a more realistic methodology would influence responses.

Conclusions

The present study was an examination of individuals' perceptions of organizations that implement AA policies. Although this is an initial investigation, results indicate discouraging conclusions for organizations attempting to increase workplace diversity using such efforts. It can be concluded that individuals perceive organizations implementing AA policies as less attractive in their search
for employment. This presents serious consequences for organizational leaders attempting to attract and retain qualified minority employees, especially if negative attitudes lead applicants to seek employment elsewhere. If AAPs are to represent effective tools to improve the presence of women and minorities in organizations, then significant efforts must first be made to eliminate the negative impact they have on the organizations themselves. Taking an active disposition to increase the presence of women and minorities in the workplace is a worthy goal, but at the same time, one that warrants careful assessment, development, and implementation in order for the achievement and success of such a goal.
APPENDIX A: HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIOS

Merit Condition

Instructions: As you participate in this exercise imagine that you have already graduated from college and are on the job market. You have recently come across a job advertisement that caught your attention. The advertised position appears to be in line with what you’ve been looking for. It fits into your college major and matches your interests. You also know of a friend who is presently working for the same company, so you contacted that person for more information about the organization. Please read the following information about the organization and answer the questions that follow based on the information that you have read.

You are currently in search of a new job and recently came across an advertisement for the position of “Administrative Specialist” at Corporate Telecom Services (CTS). This position seems to fit what you’ve been looking for and is in line with your skills and abilities. It was stated in the advertisement that CTS is an equal opportunity employer with an affirmative action employment policy. It was also stated that CTS is committed to broaden the talent pool by actively seeking the most competent employees. In order to learn more about this organization and their hiring practices, you contacted your friend who currently works for the company. You were told that CTS is known for its commitment to fair selection processes by always giving primary consideration to hiring applicants based on merit, (i.e., those with the strongest qualifications).
Preferential Condition

Instructions: As you participate in this exercise imagine that you have already graduated from college and are on the job market. You have recently come across a job advertisement that caught your attention. The advertised position appears to be in line with what you’ve been looking for. It fits into your college major and matches your interests. You also know of a friend who is presently working for the same company, so you contacted that person for more information about the organization. Please read the following information about the organization and answer the questions that follow based on the information that you have read.

You are currently in search of a new job and recently came across an advertisement for the position of “Administrative Specialist” at Corporate Telecom Services (CTS). This position seems to fit what you’ve been looking for and is in line with your skills and abilities. It was stated in the advertisement that CTS is an equal opportunity employer with an affirmative action employment policy. It was also stated that CTS is committed to promote a fair distribution of employment opportunities as well as to broaden the talent pool by recruiting women and minorities to fill this position. In order to learn more about this organization and their hiring practices, you contacted your friend who currently works for the company. You were told that CTS frequently gives primary consideration to hiring women and members of minority groups, but only if their qualifications are determined to be equivalent to those of other candidates.
Strong Preferential Condition

Instructions: As you participate in this exercise imagine that you have already graduated from college and are on the job market. You have recently come across a job advertisement that caught your attention. The advertised position appears to be in line with what you have been looking for. It fits into your college major and matches your interests. You also know of a friend who is presently working for the same company, so you contacted that person for more information about the organization. Please read the following information about the organization and answer the questions that follow based on the information that you have read.

You are currently in search of a new job and recently came across an advertisement for the position of “Administrative Specialist” at Corporate Telecom Services (CTS). This position seems to fit what you’ve been looking for and is in line with your skills and abilities. It was stated in the job advertisement that CTS is an equal opportunity employer with an affirmative action employment policy. You are aware that CTS is an organization that takes an active approach with their affirmative action policy by putting forth an effort to hire women and minorities. In order to learn more about this organization and their hiring practices, you contacted your friend who currently works for the company. You were told that CTS has a history of providing preferential treatment to women and minorities during the selection process. Your friend has also mentioned that CTS is known for strongly weighting the demographic status of its applicants, instead of their qualifications, when making selection decisions.
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Informed Consent

The researchers for this study are Christine Barrett and Dr. Mark Agars. The purpose of this study is to determine factors that may influence applicant attraction to organizations. You will not be asked to provide your names or any other identifiable records; therefore, your anonymity will be assured. You will be engaging in no potential risks by participating in the present study. You have the right to withdraw your participation and your data from the study at any time without penalty. Your participation in this study may be useful in helping organizations increase their attraction efforts in order to recruit and select the best possible employees. Please feel free to contact Dr. Mark Agars, Department of Psychology, at (909)-880-5433 regarding any questions or concerns you may have. This research has been approved by the Department of Psychology Review Board. Thank you for your time and participation.

I have read and understand the above statement. Please place an "X" below if you are over the age of 18 and consent to participate in this research.

_________  _________
(Place an "X")  Date
Instructions: Please respond to the following statements about the organization based on the information you have just read. Please note that there are different scales for some of the statements.

Please use the following scale to respond to statements 1 - 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This would be a good company to work for.  
2. I would want a company like this in my community.  
3. I would like to work for this company.  
4. I find this a very attractive company.  
5. I would accept a job offer from this company.  
6. I would request more information about this company.  
7. I would attempt to gain an interview with this company.  
8. I would actively pursue obtaining a position with this company.  
9. If this company was at a job fair I would seek out their booth.  
10. If I took a job at this organization I would expect to work there for at least two years.  
11. If I took a job with this company, I would be likely to keep looking for a different job.

Please use the following scale to answer questions 12 to 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = very uncertain</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = very certain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How certain are you that you would continue working for this company five years?  
13. How certain are you that your values “match” this organization and its employees?  
14. How certain are you that the personality of this organization reflects your personality?  
15. How certain are you that the hiring decisions of this organization are based on demographic characteristics (e.g., gender and race)?
Instructions: Please respond to the following statements about the organization based on the information you have just read. Use the scales provided below.

Please use the following scale to respond to statements 1 - 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = disagree</td>
<td>4 = agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I cannot imagine a more just affirmative action plan.  
   1  2  3  4  5

2. This organization treats all potential applicants fairly.  
   1  2  3  4  5

3. This affirmative action plan is fair.  
   1  2  3  4  5

4. This affirmative action plan does not treat all concerned parties fairly.  
   1  2  3  4  5

5. This organization is unjust.  
   1  2  3  4  5

6. This affirmative action plan would help my chances of being hired.  
   1  2  3  4  5

7. This affirmative action plan would hurt my chances of being promoted.  
   1  2  3  4  5

8. This affirmative action plan would probably help my future career.  
   1  2  3  4  5

9. This affirmative action plan would probably help my salary.  
   1  2  3  4  5

Instructions: The following section is comprised of statements regarding your attitudes towards affirmative action. Read each statement carefully. Use the scale provided below to respond to each statement.

Please use the following scale to respond to statements 1 - 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = disagree</td>
<td>4 = agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Affirmative action is a good policy.  
   1  2  3  4  5

2. I would not like to work at an organization with an affirmative action plan.  
   1  2  3  4  5

3. The goals of affirmative action are good.  
   1  2  3  4  5

4. Employees should be actively involved in attempts to improve the affirmative action conditions at their place of employment.  
   1  2  3  4  5

5. I would be willing to work at an organization with an affirmative action plan.  
   1  2  3  4  5

6. All in all, I oppose affirmative action plans in industry for women and minorities.  
   1  2  3  4  5
**Instructions:** The final section is comprised of statements regarding potential components of affirmative action plans. Read each statement carefully. Indicate how likely it is that the statement would be true of an affirmative action plan.

Please use the following scale to respond to statements 1 - 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = very unlikely</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = unlikely</td>
<td>4 = likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: The final section includes some demographic questions. All of the information you provide is anonymous and confidential. It will not be tied to you personally.

1. Sex (please circle): A. Male B. Female

2. Ethnicity (please circle): A. African American D. Latin American/Hispanic
   B. Asian E. Native American
   C. Caucasian F. Other: _____________

3. Age: ________

4. Year in School (please circle): A. Freshman C. Junior E. Other _____________
   B. Sophomore D. Senior
Debriefing Statement

Thank you for taking part in this study. The surveys you completed include a measure of knowledge of affirmative action, a measure of attitudes toward affirmative action, and a measure of perceptions of organizational attraction that implement such policies. The purpose of the study was to examine if affirmative action and equal employment opportunity policies influence overall attraction to organizations. Specifically, we wanted to assess individuals’ intentions to apply for a job at such an organization, intentions to remain at such an organization, and perceived fairness of organizations that make use of such policies. Knowledge of affirmative action was assessed in order to determine a relationship between knowledge and attitudes toward affirmative action. Results of this research will be available in fall 2000. For research results or additional questions, please direct inquiries to Dr. Mark Agars at (909)-880-5433. Once again, we thank you for your time and participation in this study.
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