Abstract

Norton, Gillian Anne. The Effects of an Existing and Eliminated Affirmative Action Policy on Intergroup Tension. (Under the direction of Rupert W. Nacoste.)

The claim has been made that the policy of affirmative action has caused intergroup tension and evaluations of unfairness, therefore, the policy should be eliminated. The present investigation examined how characteristics of an existing affirmative action procedure and the elimination of affirmative action influenced evaluations of the procedure, self, other, team, and behavior of target and nontarget group members.

Based on the theories of procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975, 1978; Lind & Tyler, 1988), interdependence (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), and procedural-interdependence (Nacoste, 1996), the level of procedural voice in an affirmative action policy and the method of policy elimination would have main and interaction effects on evaluations and behavior. Level of voice refers to the amount of input an individual has in a selection decision. Voice was operationalized as either high voice, the majority of the decision-making weight was applied towards one's qualifications and a marginal amount of weight toward membership in a traditionally underrepresented group, or low voice, a disproportionate amount of the decision-making weight was applied towards group membership as compared to the amount of weight applied toward one's qualifications. Method of policy elimination refers to the state of affirmative action. Abrupt elimination was operationalized as immediate policy elimination, whereas gradual elimination involved policy elimination over time. Both

independent variables had control conditions, with no existing and /or eliminated policy information.

Participants included 270 North Carolina State University undergraduates (134 males and 135 females). The laboratory sessions consisted of triads. Participants were informed that a role decision would occur followed by a task of manual dexterity. Affirmative action information was given in the guise of new legislation.

Participants were randomly assigned based on the manipulated condition to the roles of leader, follower, and observer. The leader told the follower to complete the task under timed conditions, whose performance was assessed by the leader and observer. Upon task completion, all participants completed a questionnaire to assess evaluations of the procedure, self, other, team, and demographics. Behavioral measures included task completion time and the number of mistakes made during the task.

All analyses were conducted within an ANOVA framework with post hoc tests. Participants' evaluations of the fairness of a high and low voice affirmative action policy did not differ statistically. However, having no affirmative action information led to negative policy evaluations and lower evaluations of the other participant. The influence of a high versus a low voice policy did emerge in participant behavior. In the face of low voice versus high voice information, participants made almost twice as many mistakes and required more task completion time. In addition, the team was evaluated more positively only when high voice affirmative action was given.

The features of the existing affirmative action policy and the method of elimination did influence ratings of tension in the self and other. Procedural tension for the self was associated with the gradual elimination of a high voice policy due to the loss of one's voice

and a longer period to contemplate the implications. General tension for the other was associated with the abrupt elimination of a low voice policy due to a self-protection need and a lack of time to accommodate. In conclusion the features of an existing policy and the method of elimination influence how people evaluate the policy, self, other, team, and behavior. These findings highlight the practical implications for the method of policy implementation and the future state of the policy.

The Effects of an Existing and Eliminated Affirmative Action Policy on Intergroup Tension

by

Gillian A. Norton

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

North Carolina State University

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

Department of Psychology

Raleigh

December 2003

Approved By:

_____ _____

_____

Chair of Advisory Committee

Biography

First and foremost, Gillian Anne Norton is a product of American society. She has exploited the American myth that we can be anything we want and yet has only the foggiest notion of what that thing of "want" is. She began her educationally journey in the "hard" sciences with a focus on biochemistry. During this time, she realized that her interest lay in understanding the behavior of people, not their molecular structure. In the summer of 1995, she discovered social psychology and found part of what she "wanted." She discovered interdependence, but did not grasp the significance of what this would mean until much later. She received her B.A. in psychology at North Carolina State University in 1996.

The years of 1996-1999 were spent at Dorthea Dix Hospital in the Child and Adolescent unit. The part of this experience that led Gillian to narrow her "wants" related to helping children learn. The children were primarily abuse victims who needed support and structure to grow, mature, become healthy, and hopefully break the cycle of abuse. Gillian realized that she was good at observing the children's behavior, parents' behavior, staff behavior, the physical environment of the hospital and the home. She realized many of the children's problems stemmed from their social environment. She also realized that all of the social factors in the environment and the children themselves worked as a unit – interdependently. The behavior and mental health would not change unless the constellation of social forces was also changed.

In 1998, Gillian decided to attend graduate school in social psychology under the direction of Dr. Rupert Nacoste. She "wanted" to do more than teach, she "wanted" to

understand the constellation of social forces. Graduate school has allowed her to cultivate her teaching skills and has given her a broader (and narrower) understanding of our social world.

In 2002, Gillian tried on a new hat. Working at Measurement Incorporated™, an educational testing company, allowed refinement of her statistical skills. It also opened her eyes to one of the ways she sees the world – policy. Until this time, she knew policy was important, but not how important in American society. We live via the social forces of public policy. No Child Will Be Left Behind.

At the moment, Gillian has set aside her psychometric hat and placed her social psychologist cap squarely on her head. Her career oriented "want" is to complete her education and find the appropriate spot to both understand people and help people. She wants to dance the dance of interdependence in its many forms.

Acknowledgments

The Road Not Taken

Robert Frost

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence;
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I –
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

My journey thus far has taken me on the road not typically taken, which has led me to new horizons and allowed amazing vistas to emerge. Holding my hand throughout this journey has been Dr. Rupert Nacoste, who has opened my eyes to the world of social psychology, and more importantly to the true focus of social psychology – interdependence. During the past 7 years, my mentor has demonstrated immense patience, understanding, and guidance whenever my interdependent journey became too bumpy. I am forever grateful to

Dr. Nacoste for giving me an incredible education, not only pertaining to my academic career, but in terms of enjoying the richness that life entails. And, of course, as Rupert and I know, the answer to the ultimate question of life, the universe, and everything is 42.

Along this journey, two faculty members have given me guidance on two different roads. Dr. Jim Luginbuhl and I strolled through social psychological theories, with special emphasis on attribution theory. Dr. Samuel Pond and I are currently navigating the theories of organizational psychology. These roads have revealed new paths to further my understanding of this interdependent world.

Somehow, my parents always knew that I would end up where I am supposed to be, even though I have often taken roads no one should take. The love and support of my mother and father has given me immense strength to overcome the obstacles thrown in the road. After 31 years, the interdependence with my parents has grown into a close parent-child bond as well as a true friendship. My eternal gratitude to my parents for all of the opportunities they have given me.

Without my friends, this part of the journey would have been unbearable. Searching Deane's cabinets for a snack while she told me to get to work have been some of the most memorable evenings of my life. Witnessing her determination and drive to excel has been a constant source of motivation during my graduate career.

Two introverts in an office together for three years yields the Wegner-Norton Effect. Brandy has walked side by side with me on this road. When I cry, Brandy hands me a tissue.

When I laugh, Brandy is there to share it with me. When I do really stupid things, Brandy is there to tell me it's all going to be just fine. When I want to give up, Brandy is there to listen. Without Brandy, my journey on this bumpy road would not be worthwhile.

Interdependence is a lifelong journey. Once in a while we are fortunate enough to take many strolls with our closest friends on this road. I offer special gratitude to people that I bumped into along my journey and who now share my adventures on roads not taken. Rob, our discussions always take us to new horizons. Dan, our thesis parties have opened my eyes to aspects of interdependence I had not seen; Melissa and Jen, our bond in friendship has given me incredible support. I love you all more than I can express. Thank-you for sharing my journey.

Walking along this road no one takes, I walked right into Bear. We've begun to dance along this road together without stepping on one another's toes. To understand interdependence opens your eyes to the social world. But, to live interdependence is to find someone to share all of the dances, elegantly flowing dances to dances where you may stumble. Bear walks with me as this part of the journey comes to an end. When a fork in the road appears, we will take the one no one else travels. You may find us if you're brave enough to take the road of interdependence.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

The Effects of Existing and Eliminated Affirmative Action Policy on Intergroup Tension

There are various movements within America to end affirmative action. There are some proposals that would end affirmative action abruptly and some that would gradually reduce its use until it is eliminated (O'Sullivan, 2000; Shelton, 2000). The policy of affirmative action has been eliminated in both California and Washington resulting from target groups and nontarget groups' discussion and debate on the voting referendums. However, no empirical investigations were completed before this elimination in order to assess the implications nor has extensive research been conducted in the aftermath to assess the real world implications of the elimination of the policy. Yet policy elimination without a theoretical framework to regulate intergroup relations is a precarious decision (Krieger, 1998; Myers, Jr., 2000). The present investigation is designed to discover if the initial type of affirmative action policy and subsequent elimination of that policy has an influence on intergroup tension, or tension between target members and nontarget members of an affirmative action policy.

Affirmative action can be defined as the requirement of "organizations to ensure that their selection procedures are free of subtle forms of discrimination and that they take 'extra' or 'affirmative' steps to increase the representation of previously underrepresented groups in their applicant pools" (p. 1255, Krieger, 1998). The important aspect of any affirmative action policy is that implementation occurs only when a historical discrimination against a target group has been established. No surprise that the call to end the policy of affirmative action is based on a variety of problems associated with affirmative action implementation

procedures, even when various organizations were attempting to address the historical discrimination. Various cases brought to the United States Supreme Court illustrate the misuse of the policy and these cases contribute to the general misunderstanding of the policy because of inconsistent and incorrect implementation methods (see Hopwood v. Texas, 1995; Reagents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978; City of Richmond v. J. A. Cronson Co., 1989). For example, in the University of California v. Bakke case the issue of policy misuse from quotas was addressed. Allan Bakke was denied admission to the Davis Medical School, even though his qualifications exceeded those of some minority students who were admitted. The university was using a strict quota system that involved admission to a set number of minority individuals regardless of qualification. These mistakes, however, do not mean that affirmative action policies are not necessary. The policy is intended to rectify discrimination and yield target groups equity with nontarget groups. As evidenced by these various court cases, however, many organizations have implemented misapplications of the policy that do not determine a historical discriminatory practice, and instead of yielding equity to groups utilize a preferential treatment approach (Nacoste, 1996). This approach occurs when an individual is selected for a position based more so on characteristics other than qualifications, such as race or gender (Turner & Pratkanis, 1993).

One major flaw in the rationale to eliminate affirmative action without putting in place an alternative approach to ensuring nondiscrimination in selection decisions is unintentional bias (Dovidio, & Gaertner, 1996; Kreiger, 1998). Decision-makers may be unaware of their own tendencies to give preferential treatment to members of the nontarget group. Traditionally,

organizations compiled numerical standards in order to examine resource and selection distribution to understand broad patterns. This technique enabled discrimination to be detected and managed through an affirmative action policy. If no policy exists and these types of data are not collected, then organizations using group characteristics in selection procedures, intentionally or unintentionally, will not be identified. For example, measures of merit are often developed based on nontarget group expectations and thus are culturally biased. This is a subtle form of discrimination that may affect selection of target group members. Research has demonstrated that even when individuals do not believe they are prejudiced against a target group, there may be a more elusive form of discrimination operating. Aversive racism, a subtle and indirect form of prejudice, has increased in America in contrast to the more overt and contemporary forms of prejudice. Thus, individuals who hold egalitarian attitudes and do not believe themselves to be prejudiced may discriminate in subtle, justifiable forms (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1996). Without the policy of affirmative action and the demographic data involved with policy implementation collected, these subtle types of discrimination will not be recognized. Thus, it will make identifying instances of discrimination more difficult and completely the responsibility of the individual who experienced the discrimination (Kreiger, 1998).

Still, support for the ending of affirmative action is bolstered by evidence that indicates negative consequences on target and nontarget group members. The claimed negative impact on target group members includes self-doubt of competence, self-derogation, and disaffection (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Murray, 1984b). Some researchers have argued that

when target group members doubt their abilities and believe that they have been selected for a position based on group membership instead of qualifications, then they may experience stereotype threat (Steele, 1990) and subsequently disidentify with their social group. A negative consequence to the entire target group may involve a loss of social identity that comes from belonging to a social group because members cannot feel positive about their own group (Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979).

There is some evidence of both perceived and actual behavioral negative effects related to the experience of self-doubt. Nacoste (1989) demonstrated that participants who believed that they might have been preferentially selected based on group membership undervalue their performance on a task. Furthermore, researchers have found that actual performance on a task decreased when female participants were preferentially selected based on group membership instead of merit when they believed that the task required ability rather than effort (Brown, Charnsangavej, Keugh, Newman, & Rentfrow, 2000; Turner & Pratkanis, 1993). This indicates that those selected in this manner doubted their ability level. As a consequence, the use of preference-based selection procedures may create internal tension because of self-doubts, which in turn will affect interdependent relations between target and nontarget group members.

In addition, there is evidence for negative consequences for members of the nontarget group who do not directly benefit from an affirmative action policy. If people believe that they were denied a position in favor of target group member who did not have the qualifications for the position, then resentment and hostility may result. This occurs primarily

when nontarget group members believe that an unfair procedure has been implemented (Greenberg, 1990). Attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1971, 1973) also yields insight into negative reactions of nontarget group members toward target group members. The involved parties are motivated to find causes for each other's behavior and in the case of affirmative action, there is motivation to discover the cause of selection for a position. When a target group member receives a position through an affirmative action policy, there is an available situational explanation instead of a dispositional explanation for the selection decision. Thus, nontarget group members may attribute the success to the policy rather than to individual ability or qualification. As a result, nontarget group members may question target group member's competence in the position. Subsequently, these doubts of competence will influence target and nontarget group members, and may lead to negative and hostile group member interactions (Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992).

Research has demonstrated that both target and nontarget group members can experience negative consequences when an affirmative action policy is implemented. Much of this research has been conducted without a complete theoretical orientation that fully explains why these negative reactions occur. The research has focused on only intra-level variables instead of the design of the policy as the source of tension, thus researchers have misunderstood the source of intergroup tension resulting from not clearly defining the procedure or addressing the contextual factors of the process (Krieger, 1998). As a result, situational influences on negative reactions have been overlooked or not fully explored in these intra-level investigations. In order to fully explain reactions to affirmative action

policies and intergroup relations, both the person and the situation (Lewin, 1935) should be addressed. Two influential theories have been combined and developed which describe and explain the social psychology of affirmative action: procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975, 1978) and interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Nacoste (1990, 1992, 1994) extended these theories and formulated procedural-interdependence theory in order to address the complexities of both the person and the situation.

Procedural Justice

Previous research has demonstrated that procedural factors have numerous social psychological effects. The original theory of procedural justice yields several insights into the psychology of conflict management and resolution (Thibaut & Walker, 1975, 1978), consequently producing evidence for the situational factors that are important to understand policy reactions. A distinction is made between distributive and procedural justice, which is relevant to the psychology of affirmative action. Distributive justice refers to individual satisfaction with the outcomes of a decision in conflict resolution. In contrast, procedural justice refers to individual satisfaction with the procedure used to make a decision. Affirmative action can be perceived as unfair if the equity or merit norms are violated with regard to distributive justice. Thus, if distributive justice is perceived of as unfair, then group members are unsatisfied with the outcome of a selection decision. In terms of procedural justice, the policy can be unfair because "affirmative action treats target and nontarget group members inconsistently in that group status is an advantage for some and a disadvantage for

others" (p. 655; Bobocel, Son Hing, Davey, & Zanna, 1998). Furthermore, research has demonstrated that rather than self-interest in personal outcomes, it is the beliefs about the fairness of distributive and procedural justice that predict attitudes about affirmative action (Belliveau, 1996).

The policy of affirmative action is implemented through the procedures an organization decides to use. If features of the procedure lead to the evaluation of the procedure as unfair, then individuals will be unsatisfied with the distribution of outcomes. The original theory of procedure explains that people affected by a policy prefer procedures that provide high voice instead of a low voice procedure. High voice procedures use universalistic criteria more heavily, which pertain to traditional measures of competence and merit in the decision-making process. In contrast, low voice procedures use more particularistic criteria, which refer to uncontrollable membership in an underrepresented group (Kravitz & Plantania, 1993; Nacoste, 1990; Nacoste, 1996; Singer, 1992).

Group members prefer a procedure that gives more voice to universalistic criteria. Such a procedure also results in more perceptions of fairness and satisfaction. When particularistic criteria are more heavily weighted than universalistic criteria, people perceive the selected individual as being less qualified or competent. This procedure mutes the voice of competitors and, thus, the procedure is perceived to be less fair, and people are not as satisfied with the procedure itself (Nacoste, 1985). As a consequence, members of target and nontarget groups are more likely to experience intergroup tension when the procedure is perceived as unfair because unfavorable situational factors, including an unfair procedure,

may actually increase the intergroup tension (Amir, 1969). When the situational factors result in an unpleasant and tension-producing atmosphere, exposure to other groups and introduction of cooperative tasks may not be enough to overcome the intergroup tension.

The original theory of procedure then indicates that it is the procedural implementation of affirmative action that is the most important aspect in managing intergroup relations. This is in sharp contrast to much of the research conducted on intra-level variables that suggests the policy of affirmative action, not necessarily defined in the experimentation, causes negative consequences to the individual target and nontarget group members, as well as the relationships between group members. Rather, derived from procedural justice, it is the features of the policy that influence the negative consequences to the various interest groups.

Interdependence Theory

Interdependence theory yields several insights into when and how individuals will experience and react to conflict in their interpersonal relationships (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Target groups and nontarget groups are linked through interdependence, or mutually linked behaviors. As a consequence, each group's inputs and outcomes to the dynamic relationship affect these links. A repercussion of a misused or misunderstood policy of affirmative action that influences these relationships is response interference, or conflict. All of the interest groups must manage this response interference in some manner. If managed effectively, then intergroup tension will be minimized. However, if target and nontarget group members do not manage this response interference, then intergroup tension will increase.

Interdependence theory outlines two main sources of conflict in interpersonal relationships. First, there are sources of conflict which individual group members will bring to every potential relationship between their own or other group members. Individual differences and personality traits are included in exogenous sources, as well as outside influences on the individual. For example, a target group member may be surrounded by a group of individuals who believe that affirmative action is a necessary and useful policy. Consequently, the members' personal attitudes and how they interact with a nontarget group member who believes that affirmative action should be eliminated will be affected. A potentially negative interaction may result, further sustaining a dynamic of intergroup tension.

The dynamics developed between different individuals constitutes the endogenous portion of potential response interference. In terms of affirmative action, the nature of historical interactions between target and nontarget group members is important to understand. If members have developed a pattern of positive interaction, then management of response interference will be more successful and promote positive intergroup relations. However, in a case where a historical pattern of tension already exists, then management of current response interference will be more difficult. A potential result is an increase in intergroup tension.

The social psychology of affirmative action relates to interdependence because the policy can affect the mutually linked behaviors of target and nontarget group members. A policy is a source of exogenous response interference because the outcome of the policy for members of

the interest group is a factor that is brought into any potential interaction between members, or the endogenous portion of the relationship dynamics.

Procedural-Interdependence

Extending these theories, Nacoste (1987a, 1990, 1992, 1994) developed procedural-interdependence to fully explain how the implementation of a policy involves the interdependent relationships between the organization that will make a decision, the target group, and the nontarget group. Each of these interest groups has mutually linked behaviors so that the groups affect one another, as well as being affected by any policy, which affects any or all of the groups.

This ecological framework of affirmative action leads to the critical analysis of the procedural implementation of affirmative action and its subsequent influence on both the material and subjective links between these groups. Material outcomes deal with factors such as whether the policy of affirmative action has led to an increase in the target group representation in the organization, as well as income of the target group members, for example. These outcomes can indicate whether the policy has achieved at least one of the original goals of affirmative action, which was increasing diversity in the environment. Subjective outcomes are important at the individual level and are different for the different interest groups. Target group members may be affected in terms of one's emotional state and self-evaluation in relation to the method of selection through an affirmative action procedure. Nontarget group members may experience effects such as general affect toward a policy and expectations of target group members as well as their abilities. (Nacoste, 1992).

The material and subjective outcomes can be positive or negative, but the most important aspect of these outcomes is perceptions of procedural fairness. Perceptions of a fair procedure will not result in conflict or tension between the interest groups. However, negative consequences arise for all of the interest groups when the policy is perceived as unfair. As a repercussion of an unfair procedure of affirmative action, intergroup tension between the target and nontarget group is likely to arise because of procedural reverberations. Thus, the mutual links between target and nontarget group members are disrupted and members experience response interference.

"Virtual Models" of Affirmative Action

One final component that affects the interdependence between these groups is whether interest groups have a schema of an actual or imagined policy of affirmative action policy implementation (Nacoste 1992; Nacoste, 1996). A normal cognitive function is to categorize information in terms of a schema in order to reduce and simply the vast amount of information encountered (Fiske & Pavelchak, 1986). Target group members who are affected by an affirmative action policy may fit into a social schema whereby nontarget group members only require "a rapid affective response to an instance of the category, a response that does not require an attribute-by-attribute affective response to the instance" (p. 167, Fiske & Pavelchak, 1986). Subsequently, target group members are classified in a schema as a recipient of an affirmative action policy and examination of qualifications may be overlooked in the process of information simplification. If individuals are aware of and understand the policy and implementation procedure, then the actual policy is used to form a

schematic representation about the components of the interdependent links in the relationships. A high voice procedure should not result in intergroup tension when members of both groups have a realistic model for the policy. However, when members of the groups are aware of a low voice procedure, then intergroup tension is likely to occur.

An imagined policy exists because of a lack of information or understanding and interest group members will develop a "virtual model" of the affirmative action policy (Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Nacoste, 1994). That is, group members will develop a policy schema that includes the components of what they believe constitutes an affirmative action policy. The model may be accurate or inaccurate, and this is unimportant. What is important is the perception of whether or not the procedure is fair. If the "virtual" model is perceived as low voice, then intergroup tension is the probable result. In either case, it is the procedure that is most likely the source of intergroup tension (Nacoste, 1996) rather than individual differences such as attitudes toward affirmative action. Derived from the theory of procedural-interdependence, it is theoretical that the movement to eliminate affirmative action is based on the "virtual" model of an existing low voice procedure. Thus, the movement is based on misconceptions of the current policy and perceptions of unfairness and tension resulting from a low voice procedure.

Related to the development of a "virtual" model of affirmative action and the potential intergroup tension that may result is the manner in which an organization communicates the policy to target and nontarget group members. If the policy is ambiguous and the

organization does not demonstrate a history of discrimination, then more intergroup tension is likely to result

(Doverspike, Taylor, & Arthur, 2000; Nacoste, 1995; Nacoste & Lehman, 1987). Additionally, when a policy is not properly communicated interest group members will base their reactions on their "virtual" model of affirmative action. Miscommunication can lead to increased policy misunderstanding and an inaccurate schema including a low voice procedure.

Method of Policy Change

There are various methods of social policy change, although no pure scientific evidence is available to explain human reactions to specific methods of policy change. Therefore, the researcher intuitively expects different reactions based on how a policy is ended. In the case of affirmative action, some have called for an abrupt elimination of the policy. Others have called for a gradual elimination of the policy. The method of elimination will affect the interdependent links between the target and nontarget group members. In the case of an abrupt elimination, for example, an employee may be hired on a particular day through an affirmative action policy. The next day the policy no longer exists and the potential employee is selected based on some new policy for which group membership is no longer accounted. Personnel management must quickly adapt to an entirely new structure. There is no time to investigate other alternative methods of selection and become proficient in the new policy structure. In contrast, a gradual reduction of affirmative action will allow potential employees and personnel management to accommodate and familiarize them with the changing

structure. In addition, members of the organizational structure can develop the most appropriate new policy for their organizational needs.

Hypotheses

The investigation examined the effects of the existing procedure and the subsequent state of affirmative action on individuals' reactions to factors such as evaluation apprehension and perceptions of fairness. The specific hypotheses were:

1. The existing high voice procedure will be perceived as fair and will result in minimal intergroup tension. The existing low voice procedure will be perceived as unfair and will result in higher levels of intergroup tension.
2. The gradual ending of affirmative action will result in the strongest feelings of fairness, as well as the least amount of intergroup tension. The abrupt ending of affirmative action will result in strong feelings of unfairness and the largest amount of intergroup tension.
3. An interaction between type of existing procedure and the method of eliminating affirmative action is predicted. The existing low voice procedure and abrupt elimination of an affirmative action policy will result in extreme feelings of policy unfairness and strong levels of intergroup tension as compared to a gradual elimination of the policy. The existing high voice procedure and the gradual elimination of the policy will result in the highest perceptions of policy fairness and the least amount of intergroup tension as compared to an abrupt elimination of the policy.

Method

Participants

270 North Carolina State University undergraduate students who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course participated and received credit to partially fulfill a course requirement. 134 participants were male and 135 participants were female. One participant did not complete the demographic information.

Procedure

The experimental design is a 3 (role) x 3 (existing policy) x 3 (method of policy elimination) design. Each experimental condition consisted of a triad, which included at least one male and one female. In order to encourage group cohesion, each member of the triad introduced himself or herself and wore a nametag with his or her first name on it. The researcher assigned each participant a seat, described information about the initial procedure, and the subsequent procedure used to select a group leader.

The researcher read a prepared script, which follows: "The experiment today involves an individual's reaction to completing a task on observed manual dexterity in order to better understand performance on certain types of tasks. Previous research has demonstrated that the game of Operation is a valid indicator of manual dexterity. Experimentation in this area is useful for a wide variety of applications. A selection process with a leadership assessment as a qualification measure will be given first. One of you will be selected leader. This individual will read instructions to a follower and evaluate the follower's performance on the task. One was selected as a follower. The follower will be required to complete the task with as few

errors as possible. Finally, one person will be selected as an observer, who is to watch the interaction between the leader and follower and then evaluate the two people. All three positions are critical to the experiment. We are attempting to further our understanding of manual dexterity performance when an individual is observed."

In conditions that involve information about an affirmative action policy, the following insertion will be added: "Typically, we do not discuss how you are selected for the various roles because it is not relevant to the experiment itself. However, due to recent legislative changes in the way we conduct experiments like this one, we must disclose certain information that relates to informed consent. This is so you know all of the details of the experiment. Thus, we are required by law to disclose the selection procedures used and the changing nature of this procedure in order to legally conduct this experiment."

The existing policy was manipulated to indicate high voice, low voice, or no information given. The insertion into the script for high voice procedure follows: "The current policy of affirmative action requires that 95% of the decision is based on qualifications and 5% on group membership in a traditionally underrepresented group, females in this case." The insertion into the script for low voice procedure follows: "The current policy of affirmative action requires that 45% of the decision is based on group membership in a traditionally underrepresented group, females in this case, and 55% on qualifications." No insertion was required for the no prior information condition.

The final state of the affirmative action policy was the abrupt ending of affirmative action, gradual reduction in affirmative action until elimination, or a control condition of no

information. The insertion into the script for the abrupt condition follows: “The government has abolished the use of affirmative action in selection procedures used in experiments like this one. Now, 100% of the decision is based on qualifications and 0% on gender in a traditionally underrepresented group, females in this case. The score on the leadership assessment will be the qualification criterion.” The insertion into the gradual reduction condition follows: “The government has decided that the use of affirmative action in selection procedures used in experiments like this one will be gradually reduced and eliminated. The process is mostly complete. Now, 99% of the decision is based on qualifications and 1% on gender in a traditionally underrepresented group, females in this case. The score on the leadership assessment will be the qualification criterion.” Finally, no information about the affirmative action policy used in the current selection was given as a control.

Each participant completed a leadership assessment (See Appendix A), which the researcher passed out after ensuring confidentiality. The researcher scored the assessment and assigned a leader based on either the abrupt or gradual ending of affirmative action, or with no information given to the participants. All leaders were female, or policy advantaged group members, in order to control for gender effects in the role. All followers were male; members of the policy disadvantaged group. After selection of the leader, the leader was given the task, an instruction sheet (See Appendix B) and instructed to guide the dyad through the completion of the task, while standing next to the follower to establish a leadership position. Additionally, the leader recorded the number of mistakes the follower

made during the task, recorded the time it took to complete the task, and evaluated the follower's performance (See Appendix C).

The observer was instructed to sit quietly and watch the dyad unobtrusively while evaluating both the leader and follower, as well as record the number of mistakes made during the task (See Appendix D). The participants individually completed a battery of questionnaires in corners of the room without facing one another. After all three participants completed the questionnaires; the experimenter thoroughly debriefed the participants and ensured that all instances of deception were explained. Moreover, the experimenter ensured that all participants understood the rationale for the deception before leaving the experiment. Before leaving the experimental setting, all participants agreed not to disclose any information about the experiment.

Apparatus

The game "Operation™" was used as an executing performance task so that the individual is striving to meet a set standard of performance. This type of task requires cooperation between members of the dyad and many of the tasks required in the workforce fall into this category (McGrath, 1984). In addition, the rationale for the use of this game was to add a degree of anxiety and apprehension for the follower. The follower was presented with a child's game and should assume it will be an easy task to complete. However, the follower was being watched and evaluated by the leader, observer, and the experimenter. This should result in evaluation apprehension and cause the follower to make mistakes. When a mistake is made in the game, a buzzing sound results, thus contributing to the general anxiety already

present. Moreover, the follower was timed with a standard kitchen timer, which ticks. These factors were designed to create an environment with tension built in order to simulate a working environment that includes “normal” tension as well as tension resulting from the selection procedure.

Dependent Measures

Several questionnaires were administered (See Appendix E) to the participants who filled the roles of leader and follower. A modified version of these questionnaires was administered to the observer (See Appendix F). Both the leader and observer evaluated the follower during the task on an ambiguous measure of performance. The number of mistakes and time of task completion were also measured by the leader and observer. Evaluations of the fairness and satisfaction with the procedure were measured, as well as the amount of evaluation apprehension and psychological tension during the selection process and the completion of the task. Participants evaluated the team on dimensions such as cooperation, leadership ability, and amount of effort, friendliness, and effectiveness. In addition, participants completed a questionnaire assessing psychological involvement and anxiety associated with completion of the task (See Appendix G).

Results

Manipulation Checks

Responses to five manipulation check items were analyzed with 3 (Existing Policy) x 3 (Method of Policy Elimination) x 3 (Role) ANOVAs. The items dealt with participant evaluations of policy understanding, policy fairness, policy satisfaction, policy elimination fairness in the experiment, and finally, policy elimination in general. Refer to Table 1 for the correlation matrix of manipulation check items. (Refer to Appendix H for 3-way tables of all dependent measures with means and standard deviations.).

Table 1

Correlation Matrix of Manipulation Check Items

	Understanding	Fairness	Satisfaction	Experimental Elimination	General Elimination
Understanding	1.00	.46** (270)	.43** (269)	.19* (270)	.13* (270)
Fairness	-----	1.00	.70** (269)	.36** (270)	.02 (270)
Satisfaction	-----	-----	1.00	.30** (269)	-.03 (269)
Experimental Elimination	-----	-----	-----	1.00	.36** (269)

Note: *p < .05
**p < .0001

The theory of procedural justice predicts that evaluations of policy fairness and satisfaction will be positively correlated (Thibaut & Walker, 1978). In addition, participants evaluated the policy as fairer and more satisfying when they also evaluated the experimental elimination of the policy as fair. Likewise, evaluations of the fairness of the experimental

elimination of the policy and evaluations of the general fairness of policy elimination are significantly correlated.

Policy Understanding

Participants rated how well they understood the policy used in the selection decision with high scores reflecting greater understanding. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. The main effect for participant role on policy understanding was significant, $F(2, 269) = 3.27$, $p < .04$. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that followers ($M = 7.31$, $SD = 3.38$), who are all members of the policy disadvantaged group, rated their policy understanding significantly higher than observers ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 3.35$), who were evenly divided into members of the policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Leaders did not differ from the other groups. Leaders ($M = 6.93$, $SD = 3.21$), who are all members of the policy advantaged group, fell between these two groups.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy ($F(2, 269) = 1.76$, $p < .17$); Method of policy elimination ($F(2, 269) = 1.93$, $p < .15$); Existing policy x Method of elimination ($F(4, 269) = 0.40$); Existing policy x Role ($F(4, 269) = 0.38$); Method of elimination x Role ($F(4, 269) = 1.18$, $p < .32$); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role ($F(8, 269) = 0.48$)]

Policy Fairness

Participants rated the fairness of the policy used in the selection process. Higher scores reflect stronger evaluations of policy fairness. An ANOVA was conducted in order to investigate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for existing policy (F

(2, 269) = 3.61, $p < .03$) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that participants rated both a high voice ($M = 7.76$, $SD = 2.30$) and low voice policy ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 2.62$) as equivalently fair. No information ($M = 6.84$, $SD = 2.48$) about the existing policy was evaluated as significantly less fair than either the high voice or low voice policy.

In addition, a significant interaction between the method of policy elimination and role was obtained, F (4, 269) = 2.80, $p < .03$ (refer to Table 2). Differences in participant responses to policy fairness were analyzed across role within each method of policy elimination. When a policy was eliminated abruptly, leaders (cell mean A), who were all members of the policy advantaged group, rated the policy as more fair than observers (cell mean C), who were members of both policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Followers (cell mean B), who were members of the policy disadvantaged group, did not differ from either leaders (cell mean A) or observers (cell mean C) in their ratings of policy fairness when a policy was eliminated abruptly. No other significant differences were obtained. Regardless of role, participants rated policy fairness equally when the policy was eliminated gradually (cell means D, E, and F). Likewise, when no information was given about the method of policy elimination, the control condition, (cell means G, H, and I), participants rated the policy as equivalently fair despite participant role.

No other effects were significant. [Method of policy elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.27, $p < .28$); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.66, $p < .19$); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.23, $p < .29$); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.62); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.04, $p < .41$)]

Table 2

Method of Elimination x Role Interaction Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Fairness

	Role		
Method of Elimination	Leader	Follower	Observer
Abrupt	8.87 (1.81)*A	7.73 (2.32) B	6.60 (2.47)*C
Gradual	7.40 (2.14) D	6.97 (2.62) E	7.30 (2.14) F
Control	7.07 (2.64) G	7.07 (2.99) H	7.60 (2.75) I

Note: All conditional means have 30 participants.
*A v. C, p<.001

Policy Satisfaction

Participants rated overall satisfaction with the procedure used in the selection process with higher scores reflecting more satisfaction. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. No effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 1.29, p < .28); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 2.43, p < .09); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.09, p < .34); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) =0 .64); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) =0 .85); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.48); Existing policy x Method of elimination Role (F (8, 269) =0 .85)]

Elimination Fairness of Affirmative Action in the Experiment

Participants evaluated how fair the method of elimination of affirmative action in the experiment was, with higher scores reflecting stronger evaluations of elimination fairness. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. The interaction between existing policy and role was significant, F = (4, 269) = 2.72, p < .03 (see to Table 3).

Participant role was analyzed as a function of the existing policy information given. The leader, follower, and observer evaluations of elimination fairness in the experiment were analyzed within each level of the existing policy. First, responses made by each level of participant role that received existing high voice policy information were analyzed. A simple effects test revealed that when existing high voice information was given, followers (cell mean B), members of the policy disadvantaged group, rated the experimental elimination of affirmative action as more fair than observers (cell mean C), members of both the policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Leaders (cell mean A), members of the policy advantaged group, did not significantly differ from followers or observers in evaluations of experimental elimination fairness when an existing policy was high voice.

Secondly, responses made by each level of participant role that received existing low voice policy information were analyzed. All three levels of role evaluated the experimental elimination of affirmative action as equally fair when existing low voice policy information was given (cell means D, E, and F).

Finally, responses made by each level of participant role that received no information about the existing policy, the control condition, were analyzed. All three levels of role evaluated the experimental elimination of affirmative action as equivalently fair when no existing policy information was given (cell means G, H, and I).

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.82); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 2.63, p < .07); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.15, p < .32); Existing policy x

Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.51); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.16, p < .33); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0.83)]

Table 3

Existing Policy x Role Interaction Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental Elimination Fairness

	Role		
Existing Policy	Leader	Follow	Observer
High Voice	7.33 (2.28) A	7.83 (1.74)*B	6.40 (2.01)* C
Low Voice	7.30 (1.58) D	6.70 (2.68) E	7.63 (2.16) F
Control	7.37 (2.03) G	6.63 (1.45) H	6.57 (2.50) I

Note: All conditional means have 30 participants.
*A v. B, p<.01

Elimination of Affirmative Action Fairness in General

Participants rated how fair eliminating the policy of affirmative action would be in general, with higher scores reflecting stronger agreement with elimination. No significant main effects or interactions were obtained with the ANOVA. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.60); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.65, p < .19); Role (F (2, 269) = 2.26, p < .11); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) =0 .42); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.80); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.56); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.08, p < .38).

Manipulation Check Summary

Effectiveness of the manipulation of voice was obtained with regard to policy fairness. Participants evaluated a policy as more fair when either high voice or low voice existing policy information was given in comparison to no information about the existing policy. Likewise, participants differentially evaluated the experimental elimination fairness as a function of both existing policy and role.

Evidence for the effectiveness of the manipulation of method of policy elimination was obtained. Participants responded differentially to the method of elimination in terms of policy fairness dependent upon role.

Importantly, participants did not vary in terms of ratings of policy elimination fairness, in general, as a function of the independent variables. This indicates that the manipulations were effective on evaluations related to the experimental manipulations, but not on evaluations based on preexisting policy attitudes.

Data Organization

Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was completed in order to organize a portion of the dependent measures into nine general factors. Dependent measures related to manipulation checks were not included in the factor analysis. Only factors with an eigenvalue greater than one were retained. Each variable had a factor weight of .40 or greater between the dependent variable and the factor. The dependent variables that formed a factor were averaged. Variables that did not load or were double-loaded on a factor were analyzed separately.

The resulting nine factors were experimental investment, team evaluation, general evaluation apprehension, evaluation apprehension due to the selection process, evaluations of the self, participant self-image, the importance of diversity, evaluations of the other, and job evaluations. Refer to Table 4 for factors, the items that comprise each factor, factor loadings, eigenvalues, and explained variance of each factor.

Experimental Investment

Experimental investment is a factor including an item rating the amount a participant invested in the experiment and how much effort the participant expended in the task. Higher scores reflect higher investment. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A main effect for role (F (2, 269) = 18.44, p < .0001) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test (p<. 05) revealed that followers (M = 9.33, SD = 1.83), members of the policy disadvantaged group, invested the most in the experiment. Leaders (M = 8.62, SD = 1.47), members of the policy advantaged group, invested significantly lower amounts in the experiment as compared to followers. Finally, observers (M = 7.67, SD = 2.17), members of both groups, invested the least amount in the experiment as compared to followers or leaders.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 1.08, p < .34); Method of policy elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.29, p < .28); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F = (4, 269) = 1.29, p < .27); Existing policy x Role (F = (4, 269) = 0.39); Method of elimination x Role (F = (4, 269) = 2.18, p < .07); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0.76)]

Table 4

Factor Loadings, Eigenvalues, and Explained Variance for Data Organization

Factor and Variable	Factor Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance
Team Evaluation	---	8.26	5.00
Team Productivity	.86		
Team Cooperation	.69		
Team Success	.90		
Team Effort	.85		
Teamwork	.77		
Evaluation of the Other	---	3.01	3.58
Confidence of Other's Qualifications	.52		
Cooperation of Other	.67		
Willingness to work with Other	.75		
Leadership Ability of Other	.73		
Hard worker	.62		
Friendly	.67		
Evaluation of the Self	---	2.25	2.38
Confidence of Self Qualifications	.68		
Leadership Ability of Self	.80		
Hard worker	.69		
Friendly	.41		
General Evaluation Apprehension	---	1.76	2.29
Experimenter Belief of Ability	.81		
Other Belief about Ability	.83		
Impact of Observer	.61		
Evaluation Apprehension due to Procedure	---	1.69	1.89
Apprehension due to Assessment	.82		
Apprehension due to Decision	.88		
Self-Cooperation	---	1.41	1.77
Cooperation of the Self	.63		
Belief in Policy Use	.70		
Investment	---	1.22	1.75
Investment	.74		
Effort	.81		
Selection Outcome Review	---	1.10	1.42
Stay in Jobs	.75		
Review Qualifications	.80		
Diversity	---	1.00	1.35
Importance of Diversity	.52		
General Policy Understanding	.72		

Team Evaluations

A factor was formed pertaining to team evaluations. The factor consisted of evaluations based on team productivity, team cooperativeness, team success, team effort, and teamwork. Higher scores represent more positive team evaluations. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A main effect for the existing policy (F (2, 269) = 3.42, $p < .03$) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test ($p<.05$) revealed that the high voice (M = 9.60, SD = 1.26) condition rated the team significantly more positive in their evaluations than either the low voice (M = 9.14, SD = 1.40) or control (M = 9.14, SD = 1.44) condition. The low voice and control groups made statistically equivalent team evaluations.

The main effect for role was significant, F (2, 269) = 7.38, $p < .0008$. The Duncan multiple range test ($p<.05$) revealed that leaders, members of the policy advantaged group, rated the team more positive (M = 9.68, SD = 1.00) than either the observers (M = 9.29, SD = 1.48), members of policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups, or the followers (M = 8.90, SD = 1.50), members of the policy disadvantaged group. Followers and observers did not significantly differ from one another.

No other effects were significant. [Method of elimination (F (2, 269) =0 .45); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.39); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.15); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.29); Existing policy x method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0 .94)]

General Evaluation Apprehension

A factor was formed on the basis of evaluation apprehension due to experimenter beliefs about participant ability level, what the other participants thought about one's ability level, and whether or not the observer made the participant nervous. Higher scores reflect greater levels of evaluation apprehension. An ANOVA did not detect any significant main effects or interactions. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.51); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 2.51, p < .08); Role (F (2, 269) = 0.79); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.78); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.56); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.68); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0.95)]

Evaluation Apprehension Due to the Selection Procedure

A factor was formed on the basis of dependent variables dealing with the selection procedure itself. The items pertained to apprehension while completing the leadership assessment and when the experimenter made the selection decision. Higher scores reflect higher levels of evaluation apprehension due to the selection procedure. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. As predicted, a significant interaction between existing policy and method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 2.39, p < .05) was obtained (refer to Table 5).

The prediction was an interaction between the existing policy and method of elimination such that an existing high voice policy and a gradual elimination of the policy would result in the least amount of intergroup tension as compared to an abrupt elimination. Whereas, an existing low voice policy that is eliminated abruptly will result in more intergroup tension as

compared to a gradual elimination. Following the interaction hypothesis a planned comparison was conducted.

First, the existing high voice policy condition was analyzed as a function of the method of elimination in terms of reported evaluation apprehension due to the selection process. The Duncan multiple range test revealed that participants in the existing high voice condition who received abrupt policy elimination information (cell mean A) reported significantly less evaluation apprehension due to the selection process than participants in the existing high voice condition who received gradual elimination information (cell mean B). Participants who received existing high voice policy information and no information about policy elimination (cell mean C) also reported significantly less evaluation apprehension due to the selection process than participants who received existing high voice information and gradual elimination information (cell mean B). Participants who received existing high voice information and either abrupt elimination information (cell mean A) or no elimination information (cell mean C) did not differ in their reported level of evaluation apprehension due to the selection process.

Secondly, the existing low voice policy condition was analyzed as a function of the method of elimination. Participants in the existing low voice condition (cell means D, E, and F) did not differ in reported evaluation apprehension as a function of method of policy elimination.

Finally, the no existing policy information, or control condition, was analyzed as a function of the method of elimination. Participants who received no information about the

existing policy did not differ in reported evaluation apprehension due to the selection process as a function of the method of policy elimination (cell means G, H, and I).

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 1.09, p < .34); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.30, p < .27); Role (F (2, 269) = 0.83); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.58); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.54); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.10, p < .36)]

Table 5

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination Means and Standard Deviations for Evaluation Apprehension of the Selection Procedure

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt	4.37 (2.39)*A	5.98 (2.74) D	5.38 (2.83) G
Gradual	6.12 (2.91)*B	4.87 (2.75) E	5.77 (2.55) H
Control	4.42 (2.47)*C	4.92 (2.51) F	5.50 (2.54) I

Note: All conditional means have 30 participants.
*A v. B; A v. C, p < .01

Evaluations of the Self

A factor was formed on the basis of items related to the participant rating themselves on the following items: confidence in personal qualifications, reported leadership ability, being a hard worker, and finally, reported friendliness of the self. Higher scores reflect more positive evaluations of the self. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. The ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of existing policy on self-

evaluations, F (2, 269) = 4.19, $p < .02$. A Duncan multiple range test ($p<.05$) revealed that participants in the low voice condition (M = 9.78, SD = 1.07) evaluated themselves significantly higher than either the high voice condition (M = 9.33, SD = 1.44) or the control group (M = 9.30, SD = 1.31), which were statistically equivalent.

The interaction between existing policy, method of elimination, and role was significant, F (8, 269) = 2.48, $p < .01$ (refer to Table 6). First, each level of participant role was analyzed as a function of the method of policy elimination when a high voice existing policy was used. Leaders, all members of the policy advantaged group, evaluated themselves equivalently regardless of the method of policy elimination (cell means A, D, and G). Likewise, observers, members of both the policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups, evaluated themselves equally positive regardless of the method of policy elimination (cell means C, F, and I).

Followers, all members of the policy-disadvantaged group, evaluated themselves differentially based on the method of elimination when an existing high voice policy was used. An existing high voice policy that was eliminated abruptly (cell mean B) resulted in less positive evaluations of the self for followers as compared to a gradual elimination of a high voice policy (cell mean E). Likewise, followers rated themselves less positively when an existing high voice policy was eliminated abruptly (cell mean B) as compared to no information about policy elimination, the control condition (cell mean H). Followers evaluated themselves equally positive when an existing high voice policy was eliminated

gradually (cell mean E) or when no information was given about policy elimination (cell mean H).

Secondly, each level of participant role was analyzed as a function of the method of policy elimination when a low voice existing policy was used. Leaders evaluated themselves equally positive regardless of the method of elimination when an existing low voice policy was used (cell means J, M, and P). Followers also rated themselves equally positive regardless of the method of policy elimination when existing low voice policy information was given (cell means K, N, and Q). Lastly, observers rated themselves positively regardless of the method of elimination when an existing low voice policy was used (cell means L, O, and R).

Finally, each level of participant role was analyzed as a function of the method of policy elimination when no information was given about the existing policy, or the control condition. Leaders evaluated themselves equally positive when no existing policy information was given regardless of the method of elimination (cell means S, V, and Y). Likewise, followers evaluated themselves equally positive regardless of the method of elimination when no existing policy information was given (cell means T, W, and Z).

Observers rated themselves less positively when they received no information about an existing policy and abrupt policy elimination information (cell mean U) as compared to no policy elimination information (cell mean AA). Observers who received no existing policy information and abrupt elimination (cell mean U) information did not differ from those who

received no existing policy information and gradual elimination information (cell mean X). Participants who received no existing policy information and gradual elimination information (cell mean X) did not differ from those who received neither existing policy information nor method of policy elimination information (cell mean AA) in their evaluations of themselves.

No other effects were significant. [Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.26, p < .29); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.78, p < .17); Exiting policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.22, p < .30); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.30, p < .27); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.48, p < .21)].

Table 6

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Evaluations

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	9.500 (0.89) A	9.350 (1.31) J	9.980 (0.92) S
Followers	7.800 (2.47)*B	9.880 (0.90) K	9.630 (1.23) T
Observers	9.380 (1.59) C	9.920 (1.19) L	8.400 (1.80)*U
Gradual			
Leaders	9.480 (1.00) D	9.830 (0.98) M	8.650 (1.83) V
Followers	9.330 (0.73)*E	9.780 (0.95) N	9.250 (1.25) W
Observers	9.580 (1.49) F	10.08 (0.97) O	9.430 (1.14) X
Control			
Leader	10.30 (0.48) G	10.30 (0.60) P	9.500 (0.76) Y
Followers	9.600 (0.91)*H	9.180 (1.46) Q	9.330 (0.96) Z
Observers	8.980 (1.51) I	9.700 (0.99) R	9.580 (1.24) *AA

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.
*B v. E; E v. H, U v. AA p<.05

Tendency toward Policy Cooperation

A factor was formed combining the items pertaining to whether or not a participant perceived themselves to be cooperative and whether or not they thought affirmative action should be used, in general. Higher scores reflect evaluations of a more policy cooperative self. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for role (F (2, 269) = 11.91, $p < .0001$) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that leaders (M = 8.22, SD = 1.16), members of the policy advantaged group, and observers (M = 7.88, SD = 1.86), policy advantaged and disadvantaged group members, did not significantly differ from one another in their evaluations of themselves as cooperative. However, both groups were significantly higher in their evaluations of self-cooperation than followers (M = 7.07, SD = 1.72), members of the policy disadvantaged group.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.34); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0.53); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.50, $p < .20$); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.61); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0 .37); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0 .57)]

Diversity Awareness

A factor was formed on the basis of two items: the importance of diversity to the participant and whether or not they understood affirmative action, in general. Conceptually, these items were retained as a factor because if an individual emphasizes the importance of

diversity, then it is likely that they are more knowledgeable about issues surrounding diversity such as general policy understanding.

The ANOVA revealed no significant main effects or interactions. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 2.41, p < .09); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0.17); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.05, p < .35); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 2.10, p < .08); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.24, p < .30); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0 .66); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0.44)]

Evaluations of the Other

A factor was formed pertaining to participant evaluations of the other participants. Leaders and followers responded so that they were evaluating one another, whereas observers responded so that they were evaluating the leader and follower together. The items include confidence about the other's qualifications, whether or not the other was cooperative, whether or not the participant would like to work with the other in other situations, leadership ability of the other, whether or not the other was a hard worker, and finally whether or not the other was friendly.

An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. No significant main effects or interactions were found. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.63); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0.80); Role (F (2, 269) = 1.27, p <.28); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.21, p < .31); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.78, p < .13); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0 .89); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0 .82)]

Selection Outcome Review

A factor pertaining to job evaluations was formed on the basis of the factor analysis. The items include whether or not a participant believes if affirmative action were eliminated an individual should remain in their job without reevaluation and whether or not the participant believes an individual's qualifications should be reviewed after the elimination of affirmative action, which was reversed scored so that the items would be interpretable.

An ANOVA revealed no significant main effects or interactions. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0 .06); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.03, p < .36); Role (F (2, 269) = 0.07); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.80); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.08, p < .37); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.50, p < .20); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.16, p < .33)]

Unloaded Dependent Measures

Several dependent measures double-loaded or did not load on a factor. These include ratings of the good job of the self, good job of the other, self-tension, tension in the other, effort of the other, whether the procedure should be used in similar selection procedures, and whether the procedure should be used in other types of selection procedures.

Good Job of the Self

Participants rated whether or not they had done a good job during the task. Higher scores reflect stronger agreement with doing a good job. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effect and interactions. The main effect for role was significant, F (2, 269) = 12.73, p < .0001. A Duncan multiple range test (p<.05) revealed that leaders (M = 9.37, SD

= 1.44), members of the policy advantaged group, and observers (M = 9.18, SD = 1.97), members of both policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups, rated themselves higher in terms of doing a good job than followers (M = 7.94, SD = 2.56), members of the policy disadvantaged group.

No other significant effects were obtained. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 2.86, $p < .06$); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0.76); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0 .80); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.33); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.55, $p < .19$); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0 .47)]

Good Job of the Other

Participants rated whether or not they thought the other had done a good job. Leaders and followers rated one another on this item and observers rated both the leader and follower together. Higher scores reflect stronger agreement with the other doing a good job. An ANOVA was conducted in order to evaluate the main effects and interactions. The ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for existing policy, F (2, 269) = 3.05, $p < .05$. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that the high voice (M = 9.86, SD = 1.60) and low voice (M = 9.82, SD = 1.35) groups rated the other as doing a good job significantly higher than the control group (M = 9.34, SD = 1.70).

No other effects were significant. [Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.52, $p < .22$); Role F (2, 269) = 2.70, $p < .07$); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.69, $p < .15$); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.74); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0 .19); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0 .85)]

Tension in the Self

Participants rated how much tension they experienced during the experiment, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of reported tension. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for role (F (2, 269) = 25.76, p < .0001) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test (p<.05) revealed that all three groups significantly differed from one another. Followers, member of the policy disadvantaged group, expressed the highest amount of tension (M = 7.56, SD = 2.84). Leaders, members of the policy advantaged group, rated their tension between followers and observers, M = 5.26 (SD = 3.36). Finally, observers, members of both the policy advantaged and disadvantaged group, expressed the least amount of tension, M = 4.20, SD = 3.26.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.17); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0 .95); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.48); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0 .41); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.36); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.23, p < .28)]

Tension of the Other

Participants rated how much tension the other participant experienced during the experiment. Leaders and followers evaluated one another, whereas the observer evaluated the leader and follower together. Higher scores reflect higher evaluations of tension in the other.

An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for role (F (2, 269) = 61.22, p < .0001) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test (p<.05) revealed that all three levels of role differed significantly from one another.

Leaders (M = 8.27, SD = 2.58), members of the policy advantaged group, reported the most tension in the other. Followers (M = 5.47, SD = 2.56), members of the policy disadvantaged group, reported less tension in the other. The observers (M = 3.71, SD = 3.17), members of both the policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups, reported the least amount of tension in the other.

In addition, the interaction between existing policy and method of elimination on perceived tension of the other was significant, F (4, 269) = 2.99, $p < .02$ (refer to Table 7). An interaction was hypothesized such that an existing high voice procedure that was gradually eliminated would result in less intergroup tension as compared to an abrupt elimination. An existing low voice procedure that was eliminated abruptly would result in more intergroup tension than a gradual elimination.

Having predicted this interaction, the post hoc analysis by way of the planned comparison revealed that participants in the existing high voice policy condition (cell means A, B and C) did not significantly differ in their perceptions of tension in the other participant as a function of method of elimination. Likewise, participants in the existing no information policy condition, or control condition, did not significantly differ in their evaluations of tension in the other as a function of method of elimination (cell means G, H, and I).

However, participants in the existing low voice procedure condition and received abrupt elimination policy information (cell mean D) perceived significantly more tension in the other than when the policy was eliminated gradually (cell mean E). Likewise, participants in the existing low voice condition and received no information about policy elimination, the

control condition, (cell mean F) reported significantly more tension in the other participant than those who received existing low voice information and gradual elimination information (cell mean E). Participants who received existing low voice information and abrupt elimination information (cell mean D) did not significantly differ from those who received low voice existing policy information and no information regarding elimination, the control condition (cell mean F).

Table 7

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Tension of the Other

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt	6.03 (3.34) A	7.00 (3.09)*D	5.37 (3.34) G
Gradual	6.03 (3.76) B	4.50 (2.96)*E	6.00 (3.46) H
Control	5.43 (3.41) C	6.13 (3.42)*F	5.83 (3.21) I

Note: All conditional means have 30 participants.
*D v. E; E v. F, $p < .05$

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0.06); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.12, $p<.33$); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.71); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) =0 .92); Existing policy x Method of elimination Role (F (8, 269) = 0.36)]

Effort of the Other

Participants rated how much effort they perceived the other to be expending during the experiment. Leaders and followers evaluated one another, whereas observers evaluated both the leader and follower together. Higher scores reflect ratings of higher effort on the part of the other. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for role (F (2, 269) = 10.04, p < .0001) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test (p< .05) revealed that leaders (M = 9.62, SD = 1.97), members of the policy advantaged group, perceived significantly more effort on the part of the follower than observers (M = 8.77, SD = 1.84), members of both policy advantaged and disadvantaged groups, or followers (M = 8.29, SD = 2.29), members of the policy disadvantaged group. Observers and followers were statistically equivalent in their ratings of the effort of the other.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2, 269) = 0 .73); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 1.37, p < .25); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 1.17, p < .33); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 2.23, p < .07); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.90, p < .11); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 0.53)]

Similar Selection Procedures

Participants rated whether or not the selection procedure used in the experiment should be used in other similar selection procedures, with higher scores reflecting stronger agreement with subsequent policy use. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. The main effect for existing policy was significant, F (2, 269) = 3.92, p < .02. A

Duncan multiple range post hoc test ($p < .05$) revealed that the high voice ($M = 7.27$, $SD = 2.46$) and low voice ($M = 6.93$, $SD = 2.51$) conditions did not differ, however the no information condition ($M = 6.22$, $SD = 2.69$) yielded lower ratings, indicating less agreement with policy use in similar selection decisions. .

The main effect for participant role was also significant, F (2, 269) = 3.96, $p < .02$. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that leaders ($M = 7.42$, $SD = 2.30$), members of the policy advantaged group, agreed with policy use in similar selection procedures more than either the followers ($M = 6.53$, $SD = 2.67$), members of the policy disadvantaged group, or observers ($M = 6.46$, $SD = 2.68$), members of both advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Followers and observers did not significantly differ from one another.

No other effects were significant. [Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 0.81); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0 .33); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.19); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.15, $p < .33$); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.13, $p < .35$)]

Other Selection Procedures

Participants rated whether or not the procedure should be used in different types of selection procedures, with higher scores reflecting stronger agreement with policy use. An ANOVA was conducted in order to investigate the main effects and interactions. The main effect for role was significant, F (2, 269) = 4.80, $p < .009$. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that leaders ($M = 6.41$, SD 2.33), members of the policy advantaged group, more strongly agreed with policy use in other types of selection procedures than followers

(M = 5.57, SD = 2.74), or policy disadvantaged group members, and observers (M = 5.23, SD = 2.84), or members of both groups. Followers and observers did not significantly differ from one another.

No other effects were significant. [Existing policy (F (2,269) = 0.41); Method of elimination (F (2, 269) = 2.49, p < .09); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 269) = 0.30); Existing policy x Role (F (4, 269) = 1.08, p < .37); Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 269) = 0.75); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (8, 269) = 1.66, p < .11)]

Behavioral Measures

Finally, two behavioral dependent variables, time and mistakes, were analyzed within the ANOVA framework. These variables were not included in the factor analysis due to incompatible scales of measurement.

Time

The amount of time in minutes to complete the task was recorded by the leader for each group. A 3 (Existing Policy) x 3 (Method of Elimination) ANOVA was performed to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A main effect was found for existing policy (F (2, 89) = 4.14, p < .02). A Duncan multiple range test (p < .05) revealed that the low voice condition (M = 6.33, SD = 2.85) averaged significantly more time to complete the task than the high voice condition (M = 5.25, SD = 2.58). The control condition (M = 5.67, SD = 2.27) did not differ significantly from the other two groups.

The ANOVA revealed a main effect for method of policy elimination, F (2, 89) = 4.62, p < .01. A Duncan multiple range test (p < .05) demonstrated that the abrupt (M = 6.08, SD =

2.81) and control (M = 6.08, SD = 2.51) conditions did not significantly differ. However, these groups took significantly more time than the gradual condition (M = 5.08, SD = 2.37).

Finally, a significant interaction between the existing policy and method of elimination was found, F (4, 89) = 5.16, $p < .0005$ (refer to Table 8). The interaction hypothesis that an existing high voice procedure that was eliminated gradually will result in less intergroup tension as compared to an abrupt elimination was examined. Likewise, the hypothesis that an existing low voice procedure that was eliminated gradually will result in less intergroup tension as compared to an abrupt elimination was examined by way of a post hoc planned comparison.

First, the existing high voice procedure was analyzed as a function of the method of policy elimination. The analysis revealed that participants who received information about an existing high voice policy that was abruptly eliminated (cell mean A) took significantly more time to complete the task than participants who received existing high voice policy that was gradually eliminated (cell mean B). Participants who received existing high voice policy information and did not receive policy elimination information, the control condition, (cell mean C) did not significantly differ from the participants who received existing high voice policy information that was abruptly eliminated (cell mean A). Likewise, participants who received existing high voice policy information that was gradually eliminated (cell mean B) did not significantly differ from participants who received existing high voice policy information and no policy elimination information, the control condition (cell mean C).

Secondly, the existing low voice procedure was analyzed as a function of the method of policy information. Participants who received existing low voice policy information that was abruptly eliminated (cell mean D) and participants who received existing low voice policy information that was gradually eliminated (cell mean E) did not significantly differ from one another. Participants who received existing low voice policy information that was abruptly eliminated (cell mean D) took significantly less time to complete the task than participants who received existing low voice policy information and no elimination information, the control condition (cell mean F). Participants who received existing low voice policy information that was gradually eliminated (cell mean E) took significantly less time to complete the task than participants who received existing low voice policy information and no elimination information, the control condition (cell mean F).

Finally, no information of the existing policy, the control condition, was analyzed as a function of the method of elimination. Participants who received no existing policy information, the control condition, and abrupt policy elimination (cell mean G) took significantly longer to complete the task than participants who received no existing policy information and a gradual elimination (cell mean H). Likewise, participants who received no existing policy information, the control condition, and an abrupt policy elimination (cell mean G) took significantly longer to complete the task than participants who received no existing policy or elimination information (cell mean I). Participants who received no existing policy information and gradual elimination information (cell mean H) did not

significantly differ from those who received no existing policy information or elimination information (cell mean I).

Mistakes

The leader and observer recorded the number of mistakes the follower made during the task. A mistake was recorded when a follower touched the sides of the game board and a buzzing noise was heard. Mistakes recorded by the leader were highly correlated with mistakes recorded by the observer, $r = .81$, $p < .0001$. The amount of time for task completion was not significantly correlated with the amount of mistakes recorded by the leader ($r = .12$, $p < .27$) or by the observer ($r = .09$, $p < .39$).

A 3 (Existing Policy) x 3 (Method of Policy Elimination) x 2 (Role) ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the main effects and interactions. A significant main effect for the existing policy (F (2, 179) = 5.07, $p < .007$) was obtained. A Duncan multiple range test ($p < .05$) revealed that the high voice ($M = 12.93$, $SD = 10.10$) and control conditions ($M = 15.83$, $SD = 12.85$) made equivalent mistakes. The low voice condition ($M = 21.07$, $SD = 17.42$), yielded significantly more mistakes than the high voice and control conditions.

No other effects were significant. [Method of elimination (F (2, 179) = 0.74); Role (F (1, 179) = 0.98); Existing policy x Method of elimination (F (4, 179) = 0.44); Existing policy x Role (F (2, 179) = 0.00); Method of elimination x Role (F (2, 179) = 0.25); Existing policy x Method of elimination x Role (F (4, 179) = 0.13)]

Table 8

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination Means and Standard Deviations for Task Completion Time (in minutes)

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt	5.70 (3.12)* A	5.75 (2.31)*D	6.80 (2.91)*G
Gradual	4.40 (1.99)*B	5.45 (2.95)**E	5.40 (1.94)*H
Control	5.65 (2.36) C	7.80 (2.72)**F	4.80 (1.19)*I

Note: All conditional means have 30 participants.
* A v. B; D v. F; G v. H; G v. I, $p<.05$; **E v. F, $p<.001$

Discussion

How will the features of an affirmative action policy influence what we think about the policy, others, and ourselves? Moreover, how will the features of a policy influence our interactions? The data reported suggests that the procedure of a policy intended to rectify a historical pattern of discrimination against target group members seems to have a direct impact on how people evaluate the policy, themselves, others, and also interactions between target and nontarget group members. The strength and direction of this impact is dependent upon both the features of the procedure, that is whether one's voice is heard or not, and the state of the policy, whether it will be eliminated gradually, abruptly, or when no elimination information is given.

In order to fully understand the nature of the intergroup conflicts surrounding the policy of affirmative action, I think it useful to turn to the theory of procedure (Thibaut & Walker, 1978; Thibaut, Walker, LaTour, & Houlden, 1974), which encompasses both situational and psychological reactions to conflict. The present experiment can be conceptualized as an adversarial decision-making situation, whereby the disputing parties were the target and nontarget group members who were competing for various roles. The experimenter served as a third-party unbiased decision-maker. Previous research has demonstrated that people perceive this as the fairest method of conflict resolution when the conflict is material and thus, it is imperative that one's voice is heard. Within this context, a high voice affirmative action policy can be conceptualized as one that yields some process control to the disputant

parties (Nacoste, 1996). Thus, participants had some control over the information that was basic to the conflict resolution process. That information was the score on the leadership assessment in the current experiment. In contrast, participants had no decision-control. Only the experimenter had control over who would be chosen for the three roles within the experiment.

Surprisingly, participants did not differentiate between the features of a high voice and low voice affirmative action policy in terms of policy fairness, as one would expect within the procedural justice framework. The results demonstrate that the difference in policy fairness evaluations between the high voice and low voice conditions were not statistically significant. However, the existing policy condition that gave no specific affirmative action information had significantly lower evaluations of policy fairness.

The theory of procedural-interdependence extends the theory of procedure, such that the features of the decision-making process influence policy and procedural evaluation as well as intergroup relations (Nacoste 1992; Nacoste 1994; Nacoste 1996). The key issue surrounding procedural-interdependence is how actual or imagined affirmative action policies influence the interdependent links between target and nontarget group members. Implicit within the theory are the cognitive effects of the policy features on group members, such as self-evaluations and other evaluations, as well as evaluations such as fairness. With affirmative action information, participants have situational cues on which to base all evaluations (see attribution theory: i.e. Heider, 1958; Kelley 1971, 1973). Thus, followers

with high voice affirmative action information have both the qualification and group membership criteria to evaluate themselves, which leads to a positive evaluation.

Aggregated, participants evaluated themselves highest only when low voice affirmative action information with no method of elimination information was given. Since a low voice affirmative action policy does not yield process control or decision-control for participants, the information available to make self-evaluations is based on both knowledge of the self and the features of the policy. Low voice policy results in an ambiguous decision-making situation whereby people do not know if they were selected based on their qualifications (their voice) or their group membership. Thus, participants may have had a psychological need to inflate their evaluations. That is to say, the low voice policy condition yields information that brings on a motivation to have one's voice heard in some manner, such as inflated self-evaluations.

When no explicit policy information is disseminated, people within an affirmative action context will activate a "virtual model" of the policy (Nacoste 1992; Nacoste 1994; Nacoste 1996). Basically, a "virtual model" of affirmative action is a stereotype of the features of the policy. The condition with no existing affirmative action policy information can be conceptualized in this manner.

An additional conceptualization of how people think about affirmative action relates to interdependence theory (Thibaut and Kelley 1959; Kelley and Thibaut 1978). One's "virtual model" of affirmative action is a comparison level for one's satisfaction with the current policy (Nacoste 1996). In other words, this model serves as a standard of what should be

within one's cognitive schema of affirmative action. If a procedure exceeds one's comparison level, then one is more likely to be satisfied with that procedure. In contrast, if the procedure falls below one's standard then people are more likely to evaluate that procedure as unfair (Nacoste, 1994). Information given within the experimental context gave the participants a standard with which to compare their preexisting "virtual model" of affirmative action. However, those participants who did not receive affirmative action procedural information could only rely on their preexisting stereotypical standard of the policy. This accounts for the finding that high voice and low voice existing policy information are equivalently fair as compared to no information about affirmative action. Participants in the no information condition did not have concrete policy information cues on which to base evaluations, and thus the policy based on a "virtual model" was evaluated as less fair. Participants who received some information, whether it was high or low voice, had concrete procedural information as well as their preexisting stereotype of affirmative action.

An additional finding that is best explained through the "virtual model" lens pertains to evaluations of the other participant. Participants evaluated the other as doing a good job during the task when high voice or low voice affirmative action was given as compared to no information. The policy information provided situation-based cues on which to evaluate the other participant. Even though no statistical difference was detected in policy fairness evaluations, the features of the policy did influence the other evaluations, such that some specific policy information allowed for more fair policy evaluations and more positive evaluations of the other. In contrast, no specific policy information yielded an ambiguous

situation that required the use of a “virtual model”, which had to be based on stereotypes of affirmative action that participants brought into the experimental context.

Of theoretical interest, issues surrounding the influence of the method of policy elimination are related to whether one is looking at the self or another person. Originally, it was hypothesized that participants would respond more favorably to a high voice policy that was eliminated gradually versus abruptly. The rationale for a gradual elimination to be preferable involved the time and ability to accommodate to the policy change. In contrast, there would be no time to accommodate to an abrupt elimination. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that a low voice policy eliminated abruptly would result in the most extreme evaluations of unfairness in comparison to a gradual elimination for the same reason. The idea that people would have the strongest reactions to the abrupt elimination of a low voice policy revolves around the theoretical notion that a low voice policy would produce negative responses, which would be exacerbated by the lack of time to accommodate.

The type of existing policy and the method of policy elimination both impact the reports of tension. For the self, a high voice policy that is eliminated gradually, as opposed to abruptly, resulted in more tension due to the selection procedure. One possible explanation for the higher level of self-tension in this situation relates to the type of existing policy. The elimination of a high voice policy means that the participant will lose their voice in the selection procedure. This result, indirectly, indicates the elimination of a high voice policy is unfair. Compounding this reaction is the gradual elimination of the policy. Not only is one’s voice lost, but this loss must be absorbed over a period of time without any possibility of

having one's voice heard in subsequent selection procedures. As a consequence, the selection procedure itself is the source of tension for the self.

The impact of the existing policy and method of policy elimination is also evidenced in the participant reports of tension experienced by the other participant. However, the picture changes to highlight the impact of a low voice policy eliminated abruptly instead of gradually. When a low voice policy was eliminated abruptly, participants reported more general tension in the other participant as compared to a gradual elimination. There are two possible explanations for this finding. Perhaps participants witnessed more behaviors indicative of tension in the other participant in this condition, and subsequently reported more tension. An alternative explanation involves interpreting a low voice policy as having a greater impact on another individual, not the self. In essence, this would be a self-protective strategy to reduce internal tension by attributing the impact of the policy to the other because one's voice is not heard with this policy structure. In addition, the other participant has to immediately react to the policy elimination, which may increase tension due to the lack of time to accommodate to the policy change.

Even in the face of no statistical fairness distinction between an existing high voice and low voice affirmative action policy, some evidence of how the features of a policy influence the interdependent links between group members was detected. The type of existing affirmative action policy given directly influenced team evaluations. Participants evaluated their team more positively in the high voice condition. Teams were evaluated equally when low voice or no affirmative action information was given. This is particularly important in t

terms of understanding the social psychology of affirmative action. Regardless of how we evaluate others and ourselves in an affirmative action context, we must work within a particular environment, and subsequently how we evaluate our teams will influence our interactions.

Practically, the most important aspect of how the features of an affirmative action policy influence people involves their interactions with one another. In the end, how people evaluate the policy itself, themselves, others, as well as their teams are important to understanding the social psychology of affirmative action because interdependence is dynamic. Humans are social animals, which makes it imperative to understand how behavior within a team might be changed by the policy of affirmative action.

There were two behavioral measures in the current experiment: 1) the number of mistakes made in the experimental context, and 2) task completion time. Previous research (Klein & Barnes, 1994; Baradell & Klein, 1993) has demonstrated that these behavioral indicators are reliable measures of tension. Specifically, when an individual is experiencing high levels of tension both the number of mistakes made during a task and task completion time increase. For these measures, it is apparent that even though participants did not differentiate between a high and low voice affirmative action policy in terms of fairness, the features of the policy did impact the actual behavior of participants. The data show that participants made almost twice as many mistakes when low voice affirmative action information was given as compared to high voice or no affirmative action information.

There was also an effect of procedure on task completion time. The amount of time required for task completion depended on both the existing policy information as well as the method of policy elimination. Not only did a low voice affirmative action procedure result in almost twice as many mistakes, participants also took significantly longer to complete the task when they were given low voice policy information with no elimination information. This is a situation that implied that the low voice policy would remain in use.

But, the impact of low voice information was also directly influenced by either an abrupt or gradual elimination. An abrupt elimination of a low voice policy led to less time for task completion than when no elimination information was given. The least amount of time required for task completion involved a low voice policy eliminated gradually. Thus, when people believe an affirmative action policy that allocates a disproportionate amount of weight toward membership to a group that has experienced historical discrimination will remain in place, then more time is required for task completion, followed by an abrupt elimination, and finally a gradual elimination.

The impact of the features of an affirmative action policy is also important in terms of actual behavior when those features are high voice. Here, the task required more time when a high voice policy was eliminated abruptly versus gradually. This finding is possibly a dissonance effect (Festinger, 1957) in that the elimination of a high voice policy is a violation of one's expectations. First, one might question why a high voice policy is being eliminated at all. Then, this reaction is exacerbated by the abrupt elimination. Thus, cognitively, the abrupt elimination of a high voice policy is opposite to the expectation that policies in use

should be fair and allow one's voice to be heard. Supporting one of the original hypotheses, these findings together, indicate that participants were experiencing more tension when given low voice policy information as well as information about an abrupt elimination of the policy.

Limitations

There are two main methodological limitations to the present study that raise cautions about any conclusions to be drawn from the study and require further investigation. The first limitation relates to the participant's role in the experimental context. Due to the exploratory nature of the participant's role, these findings are presented as both methodological limitations and findings of interest for future research. The second main limitation pertains to the lack of manipulation of the historical context of discrimination with the use of affirmative action.

First, the participant roles were intertwined with both participant gender and position in the selection process. The selection procedure clearly defined the leader as an individual in a policy-advantaged position regardless of the level of voice in the policy. Whether the policy was high voice or low voice, membership in a traditionally discriminated against group was made explicit. In the present experiment, that group was comprised of females. Thus, leaders can be conceptualized as policy-advantaged and were all females. In contrast, the position of follower was explicitly the policy-disadvantaged position in the experiment. Not only were followers disadvantaged, but they were also all male. The role of the observer was more

ambiguous because this group was comprised of both the policy-advantaged (females) and the policy-disadvantaged (males).

The implication of the participant's role being intertwined with position in the selection procedure and gender is that the effects of role require further investigation. Many of the responses to the affirmative action procedure, the self and other, the team, and the behavior could be the result of the experimental manipulation of the affirmative action policy or the experience of the role in the experiment itself. Many of the effects were only detected for participants who were followers. For example, followers experienced the most tension and investment in the experiment. It is not absolutely clear if this tension is the result of being a nontarget group member who was policy-disadvantaged or because of their specific role.

Followers were placed in a situation designed to produce high levels of tension. They were required to play a children's game that is difficult, in timed conditions, as well as being instructed in how to play the game by a participant standing next to them. Moreover, both the leader and observer evaluated them on ambiguous criteria. Therefore, the responses of participants based on their experimental role could be due to their role in relation to the affirmative action policy or their physical role in the experimental context.

One finding relevant to this point pertains to how followers evaluated themselves differentially than leaders and observers. For example, regardless of the affirmative action information, followers evaluated their own job performance lower than either leaders or observers. This is of interest given that existing policy information and the method of policy elimination did influence follower's self-evaluations. Follower's evaluated themselves

highest in the high voice affirmative action information condition when no method of elimination information was used as compared to either an abrupt or gradual elimination, an indication of selection based predominantly on one's qualifications instead of group membership. Even though follower's evaluated themselves more positively in this situation, they also evaluated policy elimination within the experimental context as most fair when high voice affirmative action information was given. Due to the methodological limitation of participant role being entwined with gender and target/nontarget group status, these findings suggest that future research should be directed on disentangling the exact factors contributing to differential responses of participants.

The second main limitation of the present study involves the lack of manipulation of the historical context of affirmative action. All participants, except those who received no information pertaining to the existing affirmative action policy, received information that the policy included some weight applied toward group membership in a group that has experienced traditional discrimination. This is a similar confound to a study conducted by Austin, Freedman, Martz, Hooe, & Ball, K. P. (1977), which did not manipulate this variable. Nacoste (1985) investigated participant reactions to the features of an affirmative action policy and included the manipulation of historical discrimination. The results of that study showed that it is possible that participants "view the history information as an indication of either a structural bias of the procedure or as an indication of a naturally occurring bias operating in the (selection) committee itself" (Nacoste, 1985, p. 58). Thus, the results of the

present study is limited due to the lack of manipulation of the historical discrimination of target group members in an affirmative action context.

General Discussion

In the equal opportunity domain, the overriding social psychological force that impacts the interdependent links between target and nontarget group members are the features of an affirmative action policy. Of particular interest is how the features of an affirmative action policy influence the evaluations of the self, the other, and the team. In this study, leaders and observers were more positive in the face of high voice information, whereas followers were more positive in the face of low voice policy information. Moreover, knowledge of the features of the policy directly impacts the evaluations of others. Regardless of the features of an affirmative action policy, others are rated more positively except in the case of the activation of one's "virtual model" of affirmative action.

In terms of the interdependent nature of social forces directly impacting our interactions, the evaluations of the team are important to understand. Even though participants evaluated themselves and others differently based on the features of the policy, they evaluated the team most positively only in a high voice affirmative action selection situation. Ultimately, how we evaluate the groups with whom we work is an extremely important factor to understand in the affirmative action debate. Affirmative action influences the diversity of our groups and, subsequently the features of that policy influence what we think of these groups.

The world is interdependent, where interaction occurs within a diverse society. The features of this world have a direct effect on the stability of the interdependent links between members of target and nontarget group members. The impact of one's role in an affirmative action situation should be further investigated in order to determine the real world implications of how the features of a policy might differentially influence a person's position in the selection decision, either as members of the target group or nontarget group. It is important to further understand the direction and strength of these differential effects of self and other evaluations in relation to one's specific position in an affirmative action context. In order to ensure stable interdependent links between members of all groups in any selection procedure, we must understand how the features of the policy will either produce more or less stable links that lead to more or less intergroup tension.

Not only are there theoretical differences in the evaluations of the self, other, and team in response to the features of an affirmative action policy, there are also practical differences that indicate our behavior is noticeably changed. The essential information in relation to behavior is the features of the affirmative action policy. If the interdependent links between participants in an experimental affirmative action context are this strong, then we must find ways to understand how policies with various features influence interactions in an actual school or business setting.

References

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. Psychological Bulletin, 71(5), 319-341.

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

Austin, W., Friedman, J. S., Martz, R. A., Hooe, G. S., Ball, K. P. (1977). Responses to favorable sex discrimination. Law and Human Behavior, 1, 283 – 298.

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

Baradell, J. G. & Klein, K. (1993). The relationship of life stress and body consciousness to hyper vigilant decision making, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 267 – 273.

Belliveau, M. A. (1996). The paradoxical influence of policy exposure on affirmative action attitudes. Journal of Social Issues, 52(4), 99-104.

Bobocel, D. R., Son Hing, L. S., Davey, L. M., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). Justice-based opposition to social policies: Is it genuine? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75(3), 653-669.

Brown, R. P, Charnssangavej, T., Keough, K. A., Newman, M. L., & Rentfrow, P. J. (2000). Putting the "affirm" into affirmative action: Preferential selection and academic performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(5), 736-747.

Doverspike, D., Taylor, M., & Arthur, W., Jr. (2000). Affirmative action. A psychological perspective. New York: Nova Science.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaerter, S. L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. Journal of Social Issues, 52(4), 51-75.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fiske, S. T., & Pavelchak, M. A. (1986). Category-based versus piecemeal-based affective responses: Developments in schema-triggered affect. In R. M. Sorrentino, & E. T. Higgins (Eds)., Handbook of motivation and cognition. New York: Guilford Press.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16, 399-432.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relationships. New York: Wiley.

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

Kelley, H. H. (1971). Attribution in social interaction. New York: John Wiley.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The process of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 28, 107-128.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence. New York: John Wiley.

Klein, K. & Barnes, D. (1994). The relationship of life stress to problem-solving. Task complexity and individual differences. Social Cognition, 12, 187 – 204.

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

Krieger, L. H. (1998). Civil rights perestroika: Intergroup relations after affirmative action. California Law Review, 86(6), 1251-1333.

Lewin, K. (1935). A dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lind, E. A. & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. New York: Plenum Press.

McGrath, J. E. (1984). Groups: Interaction and performance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Murray, C. (1984b). Affirmative racism: How preferential treatment works against blacks. The New Republic, December, 18-23.

Myers, S. L., Jr. (2000, June). If not affirmative action, then what? Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Nacoste, R. (1985). Selection procedure and responses to affirmative action. The case of favorable treatment. Law and Human Behavior, 9(3), 225-242.

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

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

Nacoste, R. (1992). Toward a psychological ecology of affirmative action. Social Justice Research, 5(3), 296-289.

Nacoste, R. (1994). If empowerment is the goal…: Affirmative action and social interaction. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15(1 & 2), 87-112.

Nacoste, R. W. (1996). How affirmative action can pass constitutional and social psychological muster. Journal of Social Issues, 52(4), 133-144.

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

O'Sullivan, J. (2000). Affirmative action is an ineffective remedy for discrimination. In W. Dudley (Ed.). Opposing viewpoints in social issues. San Diego: Greenhaven.

Shelton, H. O. (2000). Affirmative action counters discrimination. In W. Dudley (Ed.). Opposing viewpoints in social issues. SanDiego: Greenhaven.

Singer, M. S. (1992). The application of relative deprivation theory to justice perception of preferential selection. Current Psychology: Research & Reviews, 11, 128-144.

Steele, C. M. (1990). A threat in the air. How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. American Psychologist, 52(4), 613-629.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups, NewYork: John Wiley.

Thibaut, J. W., Walker, L., LaTour, S., & Houlden, P. (1974). Procedural justice as fairness. Stanford Law Review, 26, 1271-1289.

Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1978). A theory of procedure. California Law Review, 66, 541-566.

Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. European Journal of Social Psychology, 9(2), 181-204.

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

Appendix A

Leadership Assessment:

Please write true or false in the blank indicating whether or not the statement is accurate or not of you personally for the following questions.

1. _____I find it hard to imitate the behavior of others.
2. _____I can only argue for ideas, which I already believe.
3. _____I would and/or have put on a show to impress or entertain people.
4. _____In a group of people, I am rarely the center of attention.
5. _____I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
6. _____I am not always the person I appear to be.
7. _____I have considered being an entertainer.
8. _____I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
9. _____At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
10. _____I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.
11. _____I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for the right end).
12. _____I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
13. _____ Please estimate the number of mistakes (times the buzzer will sound) you would make during the task.
14. _____Please estimate the number of mistakes (times the buzzer will sound) that males would make during the task.
15. _____Please estimate the number of mistakes (times the buzzer will sound) that females would make during the task.

Appendix B

Instructions for the Leader

Please read through the instructions before beginning the task with the follower. You will instruct the follower in the removal of each of the 12 pieces on the game board. After the follower removes a piece, please rate them as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or outstanding in your own opinion. Record the number of mistakes the follower makes indicated by the number of times a buzzing noise occurs. **Stand next to the follower while holding the clipboard and making your evaluations.** Take your role seriously and do not laugh. If either the follower or observer laughs, then tell them not to do so. At any time the follower is not completing the task correctly, it is your responsibility to correct that individual.

Read to the follower:

You are to remove each of the 12 pieces only in the order I instruct you. If you miss the piece and touch the sides of the "cavity" where the piece is located, a buzzing noise will be heard. You are to remove the pieces quickly after I ask you to do so with as few errors as possible. Both the observer and I will be evaluating your progress as you complete the task. You are not allowed to laugh, stand, or move the game board during the task. Not following instructions will affect your rating. There is no time limit. However, I will start a kitchen timer when we begin in order to determine the time it takes us to complete the task.

Appendix C

Leader Evaluation Form

Circle the response that indicates how well the follower performed.

1. Remove the Wishbone now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

2. Remove the Wrenched Ankle now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

3. Remove the Funny Bone now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

4. Remove the Charlie Horse now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

5. Remove the Adam's apple now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

6. Remove the Spare Ribs now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

7. Remove the Writer's Cramp pencil now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

8. Remove the Butterflies in the Stomach now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

9. Remove the Water on the Knee bucket now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

10. Remove the Broken Heart now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

11. Remove the Bread Basket now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes

12. Remove the Rubber band now and place the piece to the side.
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding _____ mistakes
Overall Evaluation: Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Outstanding

Total number of mistakes ____

Time for task _____

Appendix D

Observer Evaluation Form				
Please watch the leader and follower closely. Give an evaluation of unsatisfactory (U), satisfactory (S), or outstanding (O) for both The leader and follower after each piece is removed. Record the number of mistakes for each piece. At the end, give an overall evaluation for each person and the total number of mistakes.				
U = Unsatisfactory S = Satisfactory O = Outstanding				
	Leader	Follower	Mistakes	
Wishbone				
Wrenched Ankle				
Funny Bone				
Charlie Horse				
Adam's Apple				
Spare Ribs				
Writer's Cramp				
Butterflies				
Water Bucket				
Broken Heart				
Bread Basket				
Rubber Band				
Overall Evaluation				
Total Mistakes				

Appendix E

Leader & Follower Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions honestly. All responses are confidential. Circle the number that most closely matches your opinion for each question

1. How invested were you in the experiment?

Not at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very invested

2. How well did you understand the procedure used to select a leader?

Not at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very well

3. How fair was the procedure used to select a leader?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

4. How satisfied were you with the procedure used to select a leader?

Not satisfied at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfied

5. Should the procedure be used in other similar selection decisions?

Strongly Disagree –5 – 4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

6. Should the selection procedure be used in all different types of selection decisions?

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

7. What group would most likely be discriminated against by organizations that used this procedure?

Circle one: White males/ White females/ Black males/ Black females/ Other minority males/ Other minority females

8. I felt apprehensive when completing the leadership assessment.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

9. I felt apprehensive when the experimenter made the selection decision.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

10. I worried about what decisions the experimenter made about my ability level.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

11. I worried about what the two other participants thought about my ability level.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

12. I felt confident about my qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

13. I felt confident about my partner's qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

14. The observer made me nervous.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

15. I am a cooperative person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

16. My partner is a cooperative person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

17. I would like to work with my partner in other situations.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

18. I have good leadership abilities.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

19. My partner has good leadership abilities.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

20. I put a lot of effort into the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

21. My partner put a lot of effort into the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

22. I am a hard worker.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

23. My partner is a hard worker.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

24. I am a friendly person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

25. My partner is a friendly person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

26. I did a good job on the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

27. My partner did a good job on the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

28. I would characterize myself and my partner together as

Not productive at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very productive

29. I would characterize myself and my partner together as

Not cooperative at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very cooperative

30. I would characterize myself and my partner together as

Not successful at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very successful

31. I would characterize myself and my partner together as

Not a good team at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 A very good team

32. My partner and I worked well together.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

33. I experienced tension during the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

34. My partner experienced tension during the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

35. How important is it to you to work/learn in a diverse environment?

Not important at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very important

36. My understanding of how Affirmative Action policies work is

Very incomplete –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very complete

37. How fair do you think ending Affirmative Action would be?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

38. How fair was the way affirmative action was ended in the experiment?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

39. I believe that the policy of Affirmative Action should be used in selection making procedures.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

40. If the policy of Affirmative Action was ended today, people currently in schools or the work force selected through Affirmative Action procedures should remain in their current position.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

41. If the policy of Affirmative Action was ended today, people currently in schools or the work force selected through Affirmative Action procedures should be reevaluated and remain only if they meet certain qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

42. I have been selected either in school admissions or a job through an Affirmative Action policy.

Yes No Unsure

43. Circle one:

The group most affected by the Affirmative Action policy is

White males/ White Females/ Black males/ Black females/ Other minority males /Other minority females

Answer the following questions about yourself:

44. Sex:_____

45. Age:_____

46. Race/Ethnicity:_____

47. Circle the best response: Single Dating Married Divorced Widowed

48. Status: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

49. Major: _____

Appendix F

Observer Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions honestly. All responses are confidential. Circle the number that most closely matches your opinion for each question

1. How invested were you in the experiment?

Not at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very invested

2. How well did you understand the procedure used to select a leader?

Not at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very well

3. How fair was the procedure used to select a leader?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

4. How satisfied were you with the procedure used to select a leader?

Not satisfied at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfied

5. Should the procedure be used in other similar selection decisions?

Strongly Disagree –5 – 4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

6. Should the selection procedure be used in all different types of selection decisions?

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

7. What group would most likely be discriminated against by organizations that used this procedure?

Circle one: White males/ White females/ Black males/ Black females/ Other minority males/ Other minority females

8. I felt apprehensive when completing the leadership assessment.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

9. I felt apprehensive when the experimenter made the selection decision.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

10. I worried about what decisions the experimenter made about my ability level.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

11. I worried about what the two other participants thought about my ability level.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

12. I felt confident about my qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

13. I felt confident about the other participant's qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

14. Being the observer made me nervous.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

15. I am a cooperative person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

16. The other participants are cooperative people.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

17. I would like to work with the participants in other situations.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

18. I have good leadership abilities.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

19. The other participants have good leadership abilities.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

20. I put a lot of effort into the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

21. The other participants put a lot of effort into the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

22. I am a hard worker.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

23. The other participants are hard workers.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

24. I am a friendly person.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

25. The other participants are friendly people.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

26. I did a good job on the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

27. The other participants did a good job on the task.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

28. I would characterize the leader and follower together as

Not productive at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very productive

29. I would characterize the leader and follower together as

Not cooperative at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very cooperative

30. I would characterize the leader and follower together as

Not successful at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very successful

31. I would characterize the leader and follower together as

Not a good team at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 A very good team

32. The leader and follower worked well together.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

33. The leader and follower experienced tension while working together.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

34. I experienced tension during the experiment.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

35. How important is it to you to work/learn in a diverse environment?

Not important at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very important

36. My understanding of how Affirmative Action policies work is

Very incomplete –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very complete

37. How fair do you think ending Affirmative Action would be?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

38. How fair was the way Affirmative Action was ended in the experiment?

Not fair at all –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very fair

39. I believe that the policy of Affirmative Action should be used in selection making procedures.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

40. If the policy of Affirmative Action was ended today, people currently in schools or the work force selected through Affirmative Action procedures should remain in their current position.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

41. If the policy of Affirmative Action was ended today, people currently in schools or the work force selected through Affirmative Action procedures should be reevaluated and remain only if they meet certain qualifications.

Strongly Disagree –5 –4 –3 –2 –1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

42. I have been selected either in school admissions or a job through an Affirmative Action policy.

Yes No Unsure

43. Circle one:

The group most affected by the Affirmative Action policy is

White males/ White Females/ Black males/ Black females/ Other minority males/ Other minority females

Answer the following questions about yourself:

44. Sex:_____

45. Age:_____

46. Race/Ethnicity:_____

47. Circle the best response: Single Dating Married Divorced Widowed

48. Status: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

49. Major: _____

Appendix G

Cognitive Activity

Please indicate how often each thought occurred to you while you were working on the task by placing the appropriate number in the blank provided to the left of each question.

1 = never 2 = once 3 = a few times 4 = often 5 = very often

_____I thought about how poorly I was doing.

_____I thought about what the experimenter would think of me.

_____I thought about how I should work more carefully.

_____I thought about how much time I had left.

_____I thought about how others have done on this task.

_____I thought about the difficulty of the problems.

_____I though about my level of ability.

_____I thought about the purpose of the experiment.

_____I thought about how I would feel if I were told how I performed.

_____I thought about how often I got confused.

_____I thought about other activities (for example, assignments, work).

Please circle the number on the following scale, which best represents the degree to which you felt your mind wandered during the task you just completed.

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Very

Appendix H

Table 9

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Participant Investment

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	9.05 (1.55)	8.30 (1.83)	9.00 (1.56)
Followers	8.60 (2.82)	9.50 (1.51)	9.30 (1.57)
Observers	7.95 (2.70)	8.67 (1.56)	8.10 (2.01)
Gradual			
Leaders	7.70 (1.77)	9.00 (1.00)	7.95 (1.38)
Followers	8.80 (1.67)	8.90 (2.26)	9.35 (1.67)
Observers	8.10 (2.78)	7.60 (1.87)	7.25 (1.77)
Control			
Leader	9.35 (0.67)	9.25 (0.49)	8.00 (2.00)
Followers	10.45 (0.83)	9.60 (1.41)	9.45 (2.15)
Observers	7.55 (2.41)	7.40 (1.94)	6.40 (2.83)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 10

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Understanding

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	7.50 (3.78)	7.00 (3.89)	7.30 (3.53)
Followers	6.70 (3.23)	6.80 (3.01)	6.60 (4.06)
Observers	4.30 (3.40)	5.80 (3.65)	5.00 (4.12)
Gradual			
Leaders	5.80 (2.94)	7.80 (2.04)	6.40 (3.81)
Followers	7.30 (3.65)	7.70 (3.53)	6.00 (3.83)
Observers	6.70 (3.33)	6.40 (3.63)	6.00 (2.71)
Control			
Leader	7.50 (3.27)	7.60 (2.46)	5.50 (3.14)
Followers	8.90 (2.18)	9.10 (3.07)	6.70 (3.47)
Observers	6.50 (2.92)	6.80 (3.33)	7.10 (3.28)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 11

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Fairness

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	9.10 (1.73)	8.60 (2.22)	8.80 (1.62)
Followers	8.10 (3.07)	8.60 (1.35)	7.50 (2.46)
Observers	7.80 (2.74)	7.30 (2.91)	8.60 (2.63)
Gradual			
Leaders	6.90 (1.60)	8.10 (2.51)	7.30 (2.67)
Followers	8.30 (2.41)	7.20 (3.39)	7.30 (2.06)
Observers	7.50 (2.22)	8.00 (2.94)	7.00 (2.45)
Control			
Leader	8.40 (1.51)	9.10 (1.97)	6.40 (1.65)
Followers	8.60 (2.55)	7.60 (2.72)	7.20 (2.70)
Observers	7.70 (2.45)	6.70 (2.58)	7.30 (2.94)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 12

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Satisfaction

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	9.10 (1.73)	8.60 (2.22)	8.80 (1.62)
Followers	8.10 (3.07)	8.60 (1.35)	7.50 (2.46)
Observers	7.80 (2.74)	7.30 (2.91)	8.60 (2.63)
Gradual			
Leaders	6.90 (1.60)	8.10 (2.51)	7.30 (2.67)
Followers	8.30 (2.41)	7.20 (3.39)	7.30 (2.06)
Observers	7.50 (2.22)	8.00 (2.94)	7.00 (2.45)
Control			
Leader	8.40 (1.51)	9.10 (1.97)	6.40 (1.65)
Followers	8.60 (2.55)	7.60 (2.72)	7.20 (2.70)
Observers	7.70 (2.45)	6.70 (2.58)	7.30 (2.95)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 13

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Use in Similar Situations

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	6.80 (2.10)	6.20 (2.04)	7.60 (1.71)
Followers	6.10 (3.00)	6.60 (2.63)	5.80 (1.99)
Observers	6.50 (2.55)	5.40 (2.67)	4.20 (2.35)
Gradual			
Leaders	7.00 (2.45)	5.90 (2.33)	6.10 (1.97)
Followers	4.40 (2.59)	5.50 (2.84)	5.50 (2.17)
Observers	5.50 (2.72)	6.00 (3.43)	5.70 (2.67)
Control			
Leader	7.50 (2.95)	4.80 (2.53)	6.00 (1.76)
Followers	6.30 (3.27)	5.40 (2.99)	4.14 (2.78)
Observers	3.50 (2.59)	4.50 (2.42)	5.80 (3.36)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 14

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Policy Use in Other Selection Situations

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	6.80 (2.10)	6.20 (2.04)	7.60 (1.71)
Followers	6.10 (3.00)	6.60 (2.63)	6.20 (2.15)
Observers	6.50 (2.55)	5.40 (2.67)	4.20 (2.35)
Gradual			
Leaders	7.00 (2.45)	5.90 (2.33)	6.10 (1.97)
Followers	4.40 (2.59)	5.50 (2.84)	5.50 (2.17)
Observers	5.50 (2.72)	6.00 (3.43)	5.70 (2.67)
Control			
Leader	7.30 (3.27)	4.80 (2.53)	6.00 (1.76)
Followers	6.30 (3.37)	5.40 (2.99)	4.14 (2.78)
Observers	3.50 (2.95)	4.50 (2.42)	5.80 (3.36)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 15

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Method of Policy Elimination in the Experiment

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	7.50 (1.78)	7.60 (1.96)	7.70 (1.49)
Followers	8.40 (1.58)	7.70 (2.36)	7.00 (1.94)
Observers	6.90 (2.08)	7.30 (2.11)	5.90 (3.51)
Gradual			
Leaders	6.80 (1.55)	7.50 (1.51)	7.50 (2.68)
Followers	7.80 (2.04)	7.10 (2.85)	6.20 (1.14)
Observers	6.90 (1.79)	8.10 (1.97)	7.30 (1.49)
Control			
Leaders	7.70 (3.27)	6.80 (1.23)	6.90 (1.85)
Followers	7.30 (1.57)	5.30 (2.45)	6.70 (1.16)
Observers	5.40 (1.96)	7.50 (2.51)	6.50 (2.12)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 16

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for General Evaluations of Policy Elimination

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	5.70 (2.91)	6.00 (2.98)	6.00 (2.79)
Followers	6.60 (2.76)	6.70 (2.58)	7.40 (2.01)
Observers	5.80 (2.04)	6.70 (2.83)	6.30 (3.80)
Gradual			
Leaders	6.50 (2.72)	7.70 (2.41)	6.50 (2.92)
Followers	7.90 (3.18)	7.50 (3.17)	6.70 (3.20)
Observers	7.00 (3.62)	7.40 (3.75)	6.80 (2.49)
Control			
Leaders	8.20 (2.44)	5.30 (2.87)	6.50 (3.37)
Followers	7.60 (1.34)	8.20 (2.44)	6.30 (3.09)
Observers	4.60 (2.55)	7.00 (1.56)	5.90 (2.96)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 17

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Dyadic Evaluations

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	10.30 (0.65)	8.96 (1.38)	9.92 (1.04)
Followers	8.84 (1.32)	9.12 (1.37)	8.76 (2.12)
Observers	9.34 (1.75)	9.44 (1.04)	9.44 (1.14)
Gradual			
Leaders	9.90 (1.12)	9.82 (0.69)	8.98 (1.41)
Followers	9.30 (0.96)	8.36 (2.04)	8.40 (1.21)
Observers	9.48 (1.51)	9.08 (1.91)	9.28 (0.92)
Control			
Leaders	10.04 (0.56)	9.66 (0.38)	9.52 (0.65)
Followers	9.32 (1.66)	9.02 (1.43)	8.96 (1.35)
Observers	9.84 (1.04)	8.76 (1.47)	2.33 (8.96)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 18

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for General Evaluation Apprehension

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	3.93 (1.99)	4.47 (2.92)	4.47 (1.77)
Followers	5.40 (2.02)	4.93 (2.33)	5.17 (2.36)
Observers	3.80 (2.65)	4.61 (2.90)	7.10 (2.64)
Gradual			
Leaders	4.23 (2.64)	6.15 (2.31)	4.33 (2.35)
Followers	5.17 (2.78)	4.65 (2.93)	4.70 (2.31)
Observers	4.40 (2.67)	3.60 (2.71)	3.63 (3.00)
Control			
Leaders	4.40 (2.02)	3.10 (2.97)	4.17 (2.75)
Followers	4.20 (2.61)	4.07 (2.24)	4.17 (1.74)
Observers	3.37 (2.81)	4.77 (2.60)	4.03 (3.14)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 19

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Evaluation Apprehension Due to the Selection Procedure

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	4.40 (2.41)	6.60 (2.59)	5.90 (3.27)
Followers	5.00 (2.44)	6.15 (2.22)	5.05 (2.88)
Observers	3.70 (2.39)	5.20 (3.38)	5.20 (2.52)
Gradual			
Leaders	6.40 (3.13)	6.15 (2.31)	5.45 (2.85)
Followers	4.65 (2.61)	4.65 (2.93)	6.00 (2.20)
Observers	7.30 (2.58)	3.80 (2.71)	5.85 (2.80)
Control			
Leaders	5.00 (2.59)	4.55 (3.55)	5.50 (3.06)
Followers	4.40 (2.73)	5.35 (1.72)	4.95 (1.88)
Observers	3.85 (2.19)	4.85 (2.08)	6.05 (2.69)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 20

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the Self Doing a Good Job

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	9.70 (1.06)	9.10 (1.66)	10.00 (1.33)
Followers	7.20 (2.97)	7.30 (3.16)	7.00 (3.43)
Observers	9.60 (2.41)	9.30 (1.34)	8.50 (2.99)
Gradual			
Leaders	8.90 (1.45)	9.80 (0.63)	8.80 (1.87)
Followers	8.50 (1.72)	8.50 (2.32)	7.40 (2.67)
Observers	8.70 (2.41)	9.80 (1.32)	9.20 (1.40)
Control			
Leaders	9.80 (1.23)	9.50 (1.27)	8.70 (1.89)
Followers	8.60 (2.37)	9.00 (1.63)	8.00 (2.40)
Observers	9.10 (1.66)	10.10 (0.88)	8.30 (2.41)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 21

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Tension of the Self

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	4.20 (2.82)	6.00 (3.74)	5.58 (3.44)
Followers	7.90 (2.88)	8.80 (2.30)	7.80 (2.57)
Observers	4.70 (3.80)	5.10 (3.48)	3.70 (3.16)
Gradual			
Leaders	4.60 (4.20)	5.60 (3.00)	5.60 (3.37)
Followers	7.70 (3.16)	6.20 (2.97)	7.40 (2.41)
Observers	4.40 (3.41)	3.90 (3.75)	2.50 (2.32)
Control			
Leaders	6.90 (2.51)	4.20 (4.02)	4.70 (3.20)
Followers	6.30 (4.16)	7.70 (2.58)	8.20 (2.20)
Observers	3.80 (3.26)	5.00 (2.75)	4.70 (3.65)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 22

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Participant Self-Image

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	8.70 (1.40)	8.20 (0.89)	8.60 (0.39)
Followers	7.45 (1.57)	6.90 (1.45)	6.90 (1.54)
Observers	8.30 (2.16)	7.74 (1.53)	8.00 (1.72)
Gradual			
Leaders	8.10 (1.60)	8.20 (0.92)	8.50 (1.31)
Followers	7.00 (1.60)	6.75 (2.34)	7.15 (1.47)
Observers	8.30 (1.83)	6.90 (2.48)	8.20 (1.46)
Control			
Leaders	8.05 (1.04)	8.60 (0.94)	7.05 (1.07)
Followers	7.20 (1.51)	7.40 (1.78)	6.85 (2.45)
Observers	7.35 (1.97)	7.95 (1.44)	8.20 (2.18)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 23

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Importance of Diversity

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	8.00 (1.03)	8.45 (1.66)	9.40 (1.70)
Followers	7.75 (1.21)	8.80 (1.83)	7.75 (2.08)
Observers	7.55 (2.53)	8.30 (2.15)	8.65 (2.38)
Gradual			
Leaders	8.50 (1.55)	7.95 (1.80)	8.00 (1.53)
Followers	8.00 (1.53)	8.50 (1.70)	7.90 (1.82)
Observers	8.80 (2.02)	7.70 (1.84)	8.20 (1.75)
Control			
Leaders	7.25 (1.93)	8.35 (1.06)	9.85 (1.29)
Followers	8.00 (1.87)	8.30 (1.99)	8.60 (1.85)
Observers	7.30 (2.76)	7.25 (2.79)	8.35 (1.99)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 24

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Participant Evaluation of the Other

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	11.32 (0.81)	9.74 (1.58)	10.76 (1.67)
Followers	9.94 (1.83)	10.82 (1.70)	10.90 (2.19)
Observers	10.96 (1.31)	11.60 (1.31)	11.28 (1.16)
Gradual			
Leaders	11.24 (0.76)	10.84 (1.37)	9.94 (1.36)
Followers	11.00 (1.03)	9.88 (2.68)	9.74 (1.45)
Observers	10.74 (1.34)	11.02 (1.69)	10.48 (1.45)
Control			
Leaders	11.30 (1.69)	10.52 (1.30)	10.76 (1.84)
Followers	10.80 (2.05)	11.22 (1.74)	10.44 (1.52)
Observers	10.22 (1.53)	11.00 (0.75)	10.84 (2.16)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 25

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Effort of the Other

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	10.40 (1.07)	9.20 (1.75)	10.00 (1.49)
Followers	7.40 (3.66)	8.60 (1.71)	8.30 (2.11)
Observers	9.10 (0.88)	9.60 (0.84)	9.70 (1.34)
Gradual			
Leaders	10.70 (0.48)	8.90 (2.56)	9.30 (2.06)
Followers	8.30 (1.57)	8.20 (2.90)	8.00 (1.83)
Observers	9.60 (1.07)	8.50 (2.07)	8.50 (1.51)
Control			
Leaders	10.10 (1.29)	9.40 (1.51)	8.60 (3.57)
Followers	8.40 (1.96)	9.60 (1.65)	7.80 (2.66)
Observers	7.90 (2.69)	7.40 (2.46)	8.60 (1.90)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 26

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Good Job of the Other

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	10.40 (0.52)	9.40 (1.43)	9.60 (1.58)
Followers	9.00 (2.00)	9.50 (1.43)	9.30 (2.31)
Observers	9.40 (3.03)	9.90 (0.99)	10.30 (1.06)
Gradual			
Leaders	10.10 (1.20)	9.90 (1.10)	8.80 (2.20)
Followers	10.00 (0.94)	9.70 (1.83)	8.20 (1.32)
Observers	9.90(1.10)	9.40 (2.01)	9.40 (1.51)
Control			
Leaders	10.50 (0.71)	10.20 (0.79)	9.90 (1.79)
Followers	9.50 (2.07)	9.70 (1.42)	9.40 (1.51)
Observers	9.90 (1.20)	10.70 (0.48)	9.20 (1.48)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 27

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Tension of the Other

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	7.70 (2.75)	8.30 (2.58)	8.10 (3.03)
Followers	6.10 (2.92)	7.00 (1.89)	5.50 (1.84)
Observers	4.30 (3.65)	5.70 (4.08)	2.50 (2.42)
Gradual			
Leaders	9.40 (2.17)	6.70 (2.83)	8.50 (3.27)
Followers	5.30 (2.87)	4.20 (2.53)	6.10 (1.20)
Observers	3.40 (3.44)	2.60 (2.07)	3.40 (3.47)
Control			
Leaders	8.70 (1.25)	8.60 (2.72)	8.40 (2.27)
Followers	4.50 (2.95)	5.40 (3.37)	5.10 (2.56)
Observers	3.10 (2.88)	4.40 (2.88)	4.00 (3.13)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 28

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Job Evaluations

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	7.60 (1.68)	6.60 (1.87)	8.40 (1.26)
Followers	7.95 (1.74)	7.80 (1.40)	7.65 (1.16)
Observers	7.95 (1.83)	8.15 (1.43)	8.30 (2.86)
Gradual			
Leaders	7.70 (1.64)	7.95 (1.92)	8.00 (1.41)
Followers	7.65 (1.11)	7.45 (2.40)	7.15 (1.16)
Observers	7.40 (1.70)	7.55 (1.94)	6.35 (1.86)
Control			
Leaders	7.15 (1.16)	8.05 (1.52)	7.15 (2.14)
Followers	8.80 (1.70)	7.30 (1.70)	7.50 (1.51)
Observers	7.35 (1.84)	8.10 (1.68)	8.25 (2.06)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.

Table 29

Existing Policy x Method of Elimination x Role Means and Standard Deviations for Mistakes

	Exiting Policy		
Method of Elimination	High Voice	Low Voice	Control
Abrupt			
Leaders	12.40 (12.56)	25.80 (16.37)	16.40 (14.21)
Observers	11.40 (10.18)	23.90 (17.17)	17.40 (15.40)
Gradual			
Leaders	16.10 (13.96)	23.40 (19.09)	18.00 (14.97)
Observers	13.30 (7.41)	17.60 (12.83)	14.20 (13.09)
Control			
Leaders	13.40 (10.04)	17.20 (15.70)	16.20 (11.94)
Observers	11.00 (6.13)	18.50 (23.97)	12.80 (9.10)

Note: All conditional means have 10 participants.