THE IMPACT OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY PROGRAMS ON INTERGROUP BEHAVIOUR : A STUDENT SURVEY

by

Dora C. S. Lau

B. Soc.Sc., University of Hong Kong , 1984.

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS

ADMINISTRATION

in the Faculty

of

Business Administration

© Dora C. S. Lau 1994

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

October 1994

APPROVAL

NAME: Dora C. S. Lau

DEGREE: Master of Business Administration

TITLE OF THESIS: The Impact of Employment Equity Programs
                              on Intergroup Behaviour : A Student Survey

Examining Committee:

      Chair: Dr. Lawrence T. Pinfield

Dr. Stephen J. Havlovic
Senior Supervisor
Faculty of Business Administration
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Carolyn P. Egri
Supervisor
Faculty of Business Administration
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Meredith Kimball
External Examiner
Department of Psychology
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved : Oct. 25, 1994

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

The Impact of Employment Equity Programs
on Intergroup Behaviour: A Student Survey

Author: _____
(signature)

_____
(name)

Oct 27, 1994
(date)

ABSTRACT

Due to the increasing participation rate of female workers and the changing composition of immigrants, there is a growing trend of diversity in the Canadian work force. Since female and non-Caucasian workers were found to be systemically discriminated against in the work place, employment equity programs were designed to remedy discrimination of this nature and provide equal opportunities in employment conditions. Despite the original intention, employment equity programs bring claims of reverse discrimination as well as fear of stigmatization into the gender and racial group relationships. These unintended impacts were hypothesized in this thesis using a theoretical framework based on social identity theory. Logistical regression procedures were used to analyze the results from a student survey.

The findings support the hypothesis that female subjects tend to favour their ingroup members more than male subjects. In addition, perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs is not an issue with the gender groups. This implies that both male and female workers accept such programs. On the other hand, Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity programs as an illegitimate means of advancement tend to favour their ingroup members more. The interaction effect between group status and perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs is significant for this group. This result implies that employment equity programs create an additional source of tension between racial groups, despite its original intentions. Contrary to the a priori hypothesis, group identity is not a significant predictor of intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours. In addition, the a

priori theoretical model does not explain the outgroup differentiating behaviours and the same-gender (or same-race) candidate selection. Applications of the findings, limitations of this study, and suggestions for future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The presence of a diverse Canadian population brings people with different cultures, values and expectations together. However, there may be potential benefits as well as drawbacks to a heterogeneous work force. Stereotypes and misunderstandings of an outgroup often leads to unfair discrimination. In the Report of the Commission on Equality in Employment, Judge Abella (1984) found that systemic discrimination prevailed in Canada. She recommended the implementation of employment equity programs to prevent systemic discrimination and remedy past discrimination in the work place.

This thesis will examine the impact of such programs on the intergroup dynamics between traditional groups and nontraditional groups. In particular, this study will examine whether employment equity programs will create an additional source of tension at the intergroup level despite the original intention of reducing systemic discrimination. Due to the wide range of nontraditional groups, it is difficult to examine all such relationships. This study will focus only on gender and race relationships. In addition, since employment equity programs were recommended to deal with discrimination of a systemic nature, this study will focus on the intergroup behaviours between male and female, as well as Caucasians and non-Caucasians. Finally, this study will survey students to examine their perceptions of employment equity programs and intergroup relationships. As a result, the actual effectiveness of the programs in reducing systemic discrimination will not be examined in this study.

Demographic Trends

Recent statistics show that there are important demographic changes occurring in the Canadian population and work force. (Statistics Canada, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1993d) First, there is the trend of increasing participation in the labour force by women. In 1991, 45% of the labour force consisted of women; while in 1971, only 35% of the labour force were women (Statistics Canada, 1993c).

Second, recent statistics show that almost half (48%) of the immigrants to Canada during the 1981 to 1991 period were born in Asia (Statistics Canada, 1993b). Before 1980 the majority of immigrants were Europeans. Since 1980 the composition of immigrants has evolved from a majority of Europeans to Asians. In addition, with favourable immigration policies, the number of immigrants admitted to Canada per year had doubled during the period between 1983 and 1989. This changing immigration pattern has a significant impact on the cultural composition of the work force.

Third, the Canadian population is aging (Statistics Canada, 1993a). In other words, there are and will be fewer young Canadians to join the work force than before. As a result, there will be a heavier reliance on immigrants to meet the demand for new workers. In other words, the aging population has an indirect effect of increasing diversity in the work force.

Impact Of Demographic Changes

The above demographic changes will impact both labour markets as well as consumer markets.

Labour Markets

The increasing participation of women and non-Caucasian immigrants in the work force shows that the dominance of traditional sources of workers, i.e. Caucasian males, will not prevail. [In order to be competitive, corporations need to recruit and utilize the best human resources available (Kirchmeyer & McLellan, 1991). As the work force becomes more diverse, it will be logical for corporations to recruit from both traditional and nontraditional sources of labour to reflect the population composition. Otherwise, some of the best talents will be excluded. In addition, as stated earlier, an aging population contributes to a shortage of labour and thus, a heavier reliance on immigrants. In order to attract the best talent from nontraditional sources of labour, corporations need to provide a working environment that welcomes these workers.] Female and non-Caucasian workers will prefer to work in corporations that understand their concerns and adopt fair policies in the workplace. Existing corporate policies, including recruitment and promotion, work procedures and organizational culture were established and maintained by Caucasian male workers according to their needs. Needs of female and non-Caucasian workers were not taken into consideration. Without considerable adjustments, misunderstandings and conflicts may follow which result in turnover and dissatisfaction among the female and non-Caucasian workers. For example, a study by Ann Morrison (1992) shows that U.S. corporations have a hard time retaining female and non-Caucasian workers.

Consumer Markets

The changing population composition means that there are large untapped market segments which have different needs and habits from traditional market segments. In the U.S., the spending power of African-Americans and Asian-Americans was estimated to be $424 billion in 1990. By the year 2000, their spending power has been estimated to be $650 billion (Morrison, 1992). These relatively untapped market segments are sources of extra revenues and profits for North American companies. Instead of using resources to open international markets, companies which are capable of tapping these market segments will have competitive advantages. Lacking the ability to understand the characteristics of these unexplored market segments may be detrimental to an organization's survival.

Impact of Diversity in the Work Place

Although diversity in workplace demographics is inevitable, a diverse work force may not be harmonious, productive or effective automatically. A diverse work force can be damaging if there is no advance planning to deal with the potential conflicts and misunderstandings (Mighty, 1991). On the other hand, diversity can be a source of competitive advantage if the work force is managed properly (Mighty, 1991).

Negative Impact

Increased diversity brings workers with different values and beliefs together in a work place. These values are often learned at very early

stages of the socialization process (i.e. childhood) and we may not be aware of them until we encounter people from a different culture (Cushner & Trifonovitch, 1989). One of the common attitudes found in the context of a diverse work place is prejudice. Prejudice involves negative, unfriendly, or suspicious attitudes towards people who are different from the referent groups in terms of gender, skin colour, disabilities, or other characteristics (Morrison, 1992). Prejudice attitudes tend to be relatively stable and they are based on "stereotypic beliefs and biased perceptions". (Fromkin, 1974, p. 1).

Solomon (1989) performed an experiment to identify stereotyping behaviour. Subjects were asked to suggest the content of the conversation between three pairs of employees. The first pair consisted of two Caucasian female employees sitting in front of typewriters. The second pair consisted of two black employees standing in the corridor. The final pair consisted of two Caucasian male employees standing by the elevators. Solomon found that three distinct sets of topics were suggested. The Caucasian female pair talked about family matters, the black male pair talked about sports while the Caucasian male pair talked about business issues. These types of assumptions often prevent identification of individual qualities and talents of nontraditional workers. In Solomon's experiment, typical Caucasian females will be recruited as secretaries and clerical workers without considering their potential managerial abilities. The masking of individual abilities by negative attitudes towards the physical characteristics of workers will undermine opportunities for equal treatment.

When attitudes turn into behaviours, discrimination results. "Discrimination refers to unfriendly behaviour toward a target person

who is selected only by virtue of his membership in an ethnic group" (Fromkin, 1974, p. 9). Fromkin's definition can be expanded to cover gender, sexual orientations, marital status, age and other group identities. Discrimination in recruitment and promotion opportunities will lead to dissatisfied employees. "Glass ceilings" are the major dissatisfiers reported by nontraditional employees (Morrison et al. , 1992). Although nontraditional workers are recruited, the majority of them stay at the lower end of the organizational hierarchy. High turnover leads to increasing recruitment and training costs and decreasing morale.

Positive impact

Heterogeneous groups can bring enormous benefits to organizations if they are managed appropriately (Mighty, 1991). Two aspects will be discussed: the organizational behaviour aspect and the marketing aspect. The organizational behaviour aspect deals with the dynamics of decision making and synergy while the marketing aspect deals with capturing new markets.

A longitudinal study by Michaelsen, Watson and Kumar (1993) found that heterogeneous groups have the potential to make better quality decisions if they are given enough time to work on intra-group dynamics. The diverse background of members allows different perspectives in problem solving and members have a better chance of generating high quality alternatives. This experiment implies that diverse work groups will be effective in solving complex problems by investigating solutions from different angles and subsequently selecting the best solution from a wide range of alternatives]

The second benefit from a diverse work force is the increase in [innovative power]. According to Moscovici, the existence of a stable group of minority members will provide challenges to majority set norms (Kirchmeyer & McLellan, 1991). These challenges can be sources of innovation provided that the minority members are given channels to voice their opinions.

In addition, a diverse work force, if managed appropriately, may achieve a synergy which would not be possible in a homogenous situation. This diversity can be acknowledged and integrated to create a unique culture which is a source for competitive advantages (Mighty, 1991). For example, the Madza Plant at Flat Rock, Michigan demonstrates the synergy formed by a Japanese management group and American workers. The continuous process of making changes to integrate both cultures creates "an organization that can learn" and adapt to the rapidly changing world automobile market (Jackson et al. , 1993).

In order to compete successfully in a market with diverse consumers, organizations need to know the needs of their customers. With the increasing diversity of the domestic consumer market, it will be advantageous to internally mirror the composition of the market reality. Understanding the needs of customers and being responsive to their changes are keys to keeping and gaining market share. A diverse work force is better equipped than the traditional homogenous Caucasian male teams to understand customers and to provide products or services that meet the needs of specific markets.

For example, the Ford Motor Company realized that "[H]alf of all new cars are bought by women" (Reguly, 1993). Acknowledging this

large market, Ford appointed a female car designer, a rarity in the field. She was given the responsibility of reviewing existing designs that were not friendly to female drivers. She designed the 1993 Ford Probe with "non-sexist features such as lightweight trunk doors and handle knobs that don't snap fingernails" (Reguly, 1993). This type of customer-oriented marketing activities are necessary to compete successfully in today's market place.

Besides responding to changes in the present market, a diverse work force is more equipped to discover potential new markets. The spending power of ethnic groups in the U.S. is quite significant(Morrison, 1992). Corporations which are equipped to position themselves in niches of ethnic customers will significantly enlarge their market share.

In addition to the domestic market, North American corporations need to compete with other companies in the international arena. Possessing the ability to understand the culture of the host country is necessary to establish a long term and viable business relationship. For instance, Japanese businessmen rely on trust rather than legal contracts to build business relationships (Morito, Reingold & Shiromura, 1986). Without understanding such differences, North American firms will be reluctant to invest time and energy to build up personal networks and relationships which are essential to doing business in Japan. The ability to understand foreign business practices better than competitors is a comparative advantage. A diverse work force provides more resources in this respect.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will examine the different theories proposed to explain the social interactions between men and women as well as ethnic groups within a diverse population. Theories were selected based upon their ability to describe the systemic nature of discrimination and the resulting dynamics following the installation of a remedial program. In addition, the purpose, coverage, and effectiveness of employment equity programs will be discussed. Lastly, hypotheses based on the selected theoretical framework and the nature of the employment equity programs will then be presented.

Theories of Inter-gender and Inter-ethnicity Contacts

Within the arena of social psychology, there are a spectrum of theories which discuss the intergroup dynamics between inter-gender and inter-ethnicity contacts. Their strengths and weaknesses will be discussed.

Contact Hypothesis

In the 1950s, school segregation was an important racial problem in the United States (Alderfer, 1991). Students from different races seldom attended the same school. Social scientists proposed that by desegregating the students of different races, the relationship between races would be improved. School desegregation was implemented and the results showed that inter-racial relationships improved due to

increased contact opportunities (Comer, 1980). This became the basic paradigm of the contact hypothesis.

Under this hypothesis, intergroup conflict will have a better chance of resolution when both groups are given more contact opportunities. The inherent assumption is that through *personal* interactions, there will be an increased understanding by outgroup members to disconfirm stereotypic beliefs. Group level dislikes or conflicts will therefore subside. Further research shows that this outcome is only valid under the following five conditions (Brewer & Miller, 1984a, p. 2):

1. Contact must occur in circumstances that define the status of the participants from the two social groups as equal.

2. The attributes of the disliked group members with whom the contact occurs must disconfirm the prevailing stereotyped beliefs about them.

3. The contact situation must encourage, or perhaps require, a mutually interdependent relationship, that is, cooperation in the achievement of a joint goal.

4. The contact situation must have high acquaintance potential; that is, it must promote association of a sort that reveals enough detail about the member of the disliked group to encourage seeing him or her as an individual rather than as a person with stereotyped group characteristics.

5. The social norms of the contact situation must favor group equality and egalitarian intergroup association.

Are personal interactions sufficient to resolve intergroup conflicts or dislikes in the work place? Organizations are frequently marked by their hierarchies of status. Studies show that nontraditional employees are often blocked by 'glass ceilings' and are commonly underrepresented in higher ranking jobs within organizations (Morrison et al. , 1992, p. 13). Under such circumstances (condition 1), more personal contact

opportunities cannot improve intergroup relationships (Alderfer, 1991). Though organizations can implement policies that promote intergroup equality in the work place, employees are from a bigger society and company policies cannot stop employees from bringing societal values to the work place. In this case, an equal status condition is very difficult to establish if societal values remain unchanged (Alderfer, 1991). In other words, both condition 1 and 5 cannot be achieved. In addition, conditions 2 and 4 have an underlying assumption that the disliked group members should behave in a certain way to either "disconfirm the prevailing stereotyped beliefs" or "encourage ... seeing him or her as an individual" (Brewer & Miller, 1984a, p. 2). In other words, the disliked group members should be responsible for improving the intergroup relationship. The contact hypothesis put the onus of proof on the shoulder of one group without exploring other alternatives.

In an equal-status corporation, the traditional group should also bear responsibility for improving the relationship, but the contact hypothesis does not examine this alternative. In addition, stereotypes are difficult to remove as employees tend to treat disconfirming evidence as exceptions rather than changing such beliefs (Brewer and Miller, 1984b). As a result, interpersonal contact may not be sufficient. Some nontraditional employees who are promoted to higher ranking jobs may feel responsible for establishing role models in additional to satisfying the requirements of the job description (Miller, 1991). This additional responsibility creates an extra burden and increases work stress which are unique to this group of workers.

The above inadequacies of the contact hypothesis show that the sole reliance on a personal level of contact is insufficient to resolve inter-

group dislikes or conflicts. A theoretical framework that recognizes the inherent unequal status of groups offers a better solution.

Berry's Model of Cultural Relations in Plural Societies

Instead of assuming the possibility of equal status among all groups and putting the onus on nontraditional groups to reveal their individualities, Berry (1984, p. 12) investigated the issue through two questions:

    1. Are cultural identity and customs of value, and to be retained?

    2. Are positive relations with the larger society of value, and to be sought?

Dichotomous answers to these two questions lead to four possibilities:

- Integration: cultural identity is valued and a positive relationship with the larger society is desired. Nontraditional groups maintain their identities while the larger society accepts them as they are.

- Segregation: cultural identity is valued but there is no desire to maintain a positive relationship with the larger society. Nontraditional groups value and maintain their identities but they prefer to remain separated from the larger society.

- Assimilation: cultural identity is not valued and there is a great desire to merge into the larger society. Nontraditional groups prefer to give up their cultural identities in order to gain acceptance into traditional groups.

- Deculturation: there is no desire to retain one's cultural identity and to merge into the larger society.

Berry's model identifies status differences between the larger society and nontraditional groups. The model describes the various alternatives that nontraditional groups can choose from when interacting with a larger society. However, it does not explain or predict when individuals will prefer to keep or give up their cultural identity. The various alternatives reflect both individual methods such as assimilation and deculturation (i.e., when individuals give up their group identities to fit into the larger culture) as well as group methods such as integration and segregation (i.e., when the group act together for a common goal). Berry's model outlines the different alternatives that nontraditional groups can take. However, the model does not explore the conditions which lead to each of the alternatives. In other words, when, or under what conditions, will nontraditional individuals retain their group identities. This research question is important as the focus of this study is on intergroup dynamics rather than outlining a taxonomy.

Brewer and Miller's Model of Differentiation and Personalization

Brewer and Miller's model (1984) attempts to integrate both group and individual perspectives in dealing with the issue of diversity. Social identity theory, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section, forms the basis of this model for understanding the intergroup dynamics between the various groups. Brewer and Miller postulated a number of situations where categorization becomes salient. In other words, when a group, rather than an individual perspective is utilized. First, when "group identities based on many different distinctions ... all coincide" (Brewer & Miller, 1984, p. 283), the convergent boundaries will arouse members' awareness of their group membership. Second, the

mere allocation of individuals into groups with no common goals or conflicts of interest will be sufficient to initiate an ingroup-outgroup distinction (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Brewer & Miller, 1984). According to social identity theory, there is an inherent tendency for ingroup members to discriminate against outgroup members. Third, Brewer and Miller (1984, p. 285) "hypothesize that the salience of particular category distinctions will vary as a function of the ratio of category size to total group size". In other words, the presence of a clear minority will provoke category salience.

All the above conditions will increase group boundary awareness and potential intergroup biases. Brewer and Miller (1984) argue that the only way to decrease intergroup discriminations or conflicts is by decategorization. The inherent assumption is that group processes will only enhance intergroup dislikes and should not be used to resolve intergroup conflicts, or potential conflicts. In addition, positive interpersonal relationships are the most effective way to build intergroup acceptance. Brewer and Miller propose two concepts: differentiation and personalization. Differentiation is the ability to identify the individual characteristics of the members in a particular category. The source of information may be first-hand or through third-person materials, such as newspapers. The process can be rational and involve subcategorization, such as old men among the group of men. Differentiation is insufficient to reduce intergroup tensions as subcategorizations may be treated as exceptions and therefore cannot remove stereotypes. On the other hand, personalization requires that the source of information must be first-hand and the individual can relate

the information to oneself. Differentiation is a necessary but not sufficient condition for personalization (Brewer and Miller, 1984, p. 288).

Though the model initiates with a group perspective, its recommended solutions come from an individual perspective only. This shares the weaknesses of the contact hypothesis by ignoring the possibility of unequal status in the system and putting the onus of proof solely on the nontraditional groups.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory predicts that if individuals are randomly assigned into groups and provided that they can identify with their membership, these individuals will inherently have an ingroup bias and discriminate against outgroup members (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The group members need not share any common interests, goals or characteristics. In addition, the groups may not have any conflict in terms of goals or competition for scarce resources. Social psychologists have studied this "minimal intergroup situation" and the experimental results show that ingroup and outgroup attitudinal differences were based on mere subjective group identity (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Azzi, 1993; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1991).

There are two processes involved in the theory: social categorization and social comparison. Social categorization refers to the process that individuals identify themselves as members of a certain group. As shown in the minimal intergroup experiments, there is an "omnipresent" phenomenon that members will favor their ingroup members and discriminate against outgroup members (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This process leads ingroup members to focus on the membership

of outgroup members rather than their individual characteristics (Miller & Brewer, 1984). One necessary condition is the subjective perception of one's membership. Individuals need to identify with their own membership and external confirmation is of second importance. According to Tajfel and Turner (1986), "social categorization ... segment, classify, and order the social environment, ... they also provide a system of orientation for *self-reference:* they create and define the individual's place in society". In other words, social categorization creates a comparative ranking system in the society and it is the nature of group members to compare themselves against different groups to define their own position. This is the social comparison process. The comparison results lead to the formation of one's social identity which can be defined as "self-image", "self-esteem" or "positive or negative connotations according to the evaluations" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Members compare their group with other groups of choice against some set criteria. The criteria can be a wide range of attributes and often situational. The purpose of the comparison is to improve one's social identity in the society. Positive social identity comes from favourable results when comparing to other groups.

According to the theory, negative impacts on social identity will translate into the following possibilities:

- members decide to leave the group and join groups of higher social identity. This alternative assumes that social mobility is free or with minimal penalty. Identity of a traitor may be used as a form of penalty. In addition, some of the group attributes cannot be changed easily such as gender or colour of skin.

members will try to enhance their group status by either adding or changing comparative criteria, changing the values attached to the criteria or changing the comparison group in order to gain a more positive result. This alternative is more frequently used when social mobility is difficult or costly.

Tajfel and Turner (1986, p. 22) state that "[W]here status relations are perceived as immutable,... , then social identity is secure". At this stage, groups will not compare with other groups because there is no chance for improving their status. Only when the legitimacy of the ordering is questioned will the social comparison process will be 'kick-started'. This phenomenon is common in all kinds of ball games. One team becomes the champion this year but their status will be challenged next year because the status relations are not immutable. The discriminatory behaviour will intensify if the losing teams feel that the winning team illegitimately became the champion. It is expected that the losing teams will challenge the winning team vigorously in the next season to prove their superiority in terms of salient criteria such as skills.

Unlike Brewer and Miller's model, there is no clear-cut solution for resolving intergroup conflict under this theory. A few indicators can be identified as initiating intense intergroup dislike: minimal social mobility, perception that the existing status can be changed and perceived illegitimacy of the present ranking. The theory implies that, unless social mobility is open, individualization will not resolve intergroup conflicts. The reason is that the omnipresent nature of group membership leads to an inherent bias towards ingroup members. Unless this inherent nature is dealt with, intergroup conflict will not subside. Referring back to

Alderfer's arguments on systemic discrimination and putting the onus on subordinate groups to reveal themselves (1991), group mechanisms are necessary to acknowledge and deal with the inherent group dynamics.

Employment Equity Programs

Examining the diverse demography in the work place, Judge Abella (1984) discovered that systemic discrimination towards four groups of workers prevailed in Canada and could not be eliminated through the human rights codes which relied on individual nontraditional workers to report discrimination cases. Through her recommendations, the Canadian Parliament enacted the Employment Equity Act in 1986 which was the first federal legislative action to combat systemic employment discrimination in Canada (Chabursky, 1992). This Act represented the Canadian government's recognition of systemic employment discrimination and its intention to eliminate such discrimination through voluntary systemic programs. The following section will review the purposes of the Employment Equity Act, discuss the details of its enforcement; and evaluate the impact of such programs on discrimination.

Purposes

In 1984, Judge Rosalie Silberman Abella chaired the newly created Royal Commission on Equality in Employment to find the best model to combat systemic discrimination in Canada. Judge Abella (1984) defined systemic discrimination in her *Report of the Commission on Equality in Employment* as follows:

> Rather than approaching discrimination from the perspective of the single perpetrator and the single victim, the systemic approach acknowledges that by and large the systems and practices we customarily and often unwittingly adopt may have an unjustifiably negative effect on certain groups in the society. (p. 9)

Before the implementation of the Employment Equity Act, individual victims relied solely on the complaint processes as set out in various human rights codes. The case-by-case approach through federal and provincial human rights legislation was not effective because it was designed to deal with isolated and occasional sources of discrimination. It was not capable of removing the structural nature of employment discrimination inherent in human resource management practices such as recruitment, promotion and training.

After reviewing the effectiveness of Human Rights Codes in Canada and the experience of affirmative action programs in the United States, Judge Abella recommended that systemic remedies were necessary to eliminate systemic discrimination. Since compulsory affirmative action programs were deemed undesirable by the Commission, she recommended that the legislation should be voluntary so that employers could design their own programs to fit their specific situations (Chabursky, 1992).

The Employment Equity Act was passed in 1986 and its main purpose was to attain equality of employment opportunities and benefits in the work place. Four disadvantaged groups: women, aboriginals, disabled and visible minorities were identified. There are two main aspects in the Act: preventive and remedial. The **preventive** aspect requires employers to identify and eliminate employment practices that create employment barriers, especially for the four disadvantaged groups. In other words, employers are expected to evaluate their human resource

policies and procedures and remove those that have an adverse impact on the four identified groups. On the other hand, the **remedial** aspect requires employers to correct past discrimination by "making reasonable accommodations" to the four groups and to "achieve a degree of representation" based on availability (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1987). Employers are expected to provide support systems for the four groups. For example, daycare for female workers with children and special facilities for disabled employees within 'reasonable' ability of employers. In addition, employers should attempt to achieve statistical parity in the whole work force as well as in different departments and ranks through both recruitment and promotions. This requirement for statistical parity in different sections aims to eliminate job segregation.

Coverage

The Employment Equity Act covers two sets of employers under two different programs: the Federal Compliance Program which includes all federally regulated employers with more than one hundred employees; and the Contractor Compliance Program which includes all employers who want to have a contract, in an amount of at least $200,000 with the federal government (Chabursky, 1992; McDermott, 1992). Federally regulated employers include all federal crown corporations and any public or private employers involved in federal work. Provincial and municipal governments, as well as most private organizations are not covered by the Act.

The Ontario government passed their own Employment Equity laws in 1993. This law requires that "private companies with more than 50 workers and public sector entities with more than 10 workers to

survey their work forces and set plans for hiring members of the target groups" and to "set hiring targets and timetables" (Casella, 1993). In the same newspaper article, Casella reported that the B.C. NDP government is pushing the public sector towards employment equity. The prevailing trend suggests that there is a spreading of employment equity concerns from the federal level to the provincial level.

Designing the Programs

The Employment Equity Act emphasizes flexibility in designing programs and that the onus of program design be placed on employers (Chabursky, 1992). Unlike affirmative action programs in the United States where employers need to set up "significant, measurable and attainable goals" with achievable timetables (Compliance Responsibility for Equal Employment Opportunity, 1978, p. 21), Canadian employers have more flexibility in designing their own programs for removal of employment barriers. Specific quotas or targets for the four disadvantaged groups are not required. However, employers are required to provide extensive and detailed reports annually to the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission on the composition and flow of their work force in terms of the four protected groups, various salary ranges, and occupational categories. Failure to report may result in a fine of $50,000 (Chabursky, 1992). When consulted, the Department of Employment and Immigration will assist employers in creating employment equity plans. However, they have no mandate to investigate whether the plans are effective in eliminating employment discrimination. In addition, they are not responsible for ensuring

compliance. In other words, employers can prepare an employment equity plan without adopting or whole-heartedly implementing the plan.

Enforcement

Enforcement of employment equity is weak. "The Commission's preferred approach to ensuring compliance is a non-confrontational voluntary review of employment systems" (Chabursky, 1992, p. 336). The assumption is that allowing employers to determine their own goals and timetables will encourage cooperation from employers. This is perceived by the Commission as preferable to legal enforcement which may attract minimal compliance. This approach incurs the risk of accepting poorly designed plans from employers who only want to meet the legal requirements.

Representation in the Work Place

Although systemic discrimination is acknowledged by the Commission and the Canadian Parliament, there are difficulties in defining the exact elements involved in systemic discrimination. In the United States, discrimination can be determined by the existence of "adverse impact" in the recruitment process. The four/fifth selection rate is used as a 'rule-of-thumb' and the first step to determine whether there is an adverse impact (Adoption by Four Agencies of Uniform Guidelines on Employment Selection Procedures, 1978). Further investigation will determine whether discrimination actually exists. "The numbers approach came to Canada along with the introduction of the adverse impact doctrine" (Chabursky, 1992, p. 341). Judge Abella (1984) concluded in her report that statistical imbalance serves as a signal of

potential discriminatory practices. On the other hand, reaching statistical parity may not be equal to having a discrimination-free work place. As a result, the Employment Equity Act does not include the use of the four/fifth rule.

However, the Act requires employers to achieve a "degree of representation" in their work force which encourages employers to set numerical goals and quotas (Chabursky, 1992, p. 343). This focus on hiring goals and quotas leads to an increase of nontraditional employees at the lower ends of organizational hierarchies (Morrison, 1992a). Furthermore, the same study indicates that nontraditional employees have a high-than-average turnover rate which implies that systemic discrimination still exists. "A government can legislate conduct to raise the representation of the minority groups; but it cannot legislate attitudes" (Chabursky, 1992, p. 342). Work places with statistical parity may still have other barriers for nontraditional employees. Job segregation and pay inequity are such possibilities.

Impact of the Employment Equity Programs

The Annual Report on the Employment Equity Act prepared by the Department of Employment and Immigration showed that representation of all four disadvantaged groups in the work force increased from 1986 to 1990 as shown in Table 2.1 (Chabursky, 1992).

Table 2.1

Comparison of the Percentages of the Four Disadvantaged
Groups in the work force from 1987 to 1990

	1987	1990
Women	40.9%	43.7%
Visible Minorities	6.68%	7.1%
Aboriginal workers	0.66%	0.9%
Disabled People	1.59%	2.4%

source: Employment Equity Act, 1990 annual report

Despite the improvement in all four groups, three of them are still far from reaching true representation (Benimadhu & Wright, 1992). Only visible minorities have their workplace representation (7.1% in 1990) above their 6.3% population representation (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1990). Besides the gap between the number of people hired and the number of people available, job segregation remains a major problem. Members of these four groups predominate in lower paying part-time jobs (Chabursky, 1992).

Leck and Saunders (1992) studied the effects of Canada's Employment Equity Act on the number of women hired. They found that more formalized, comprehensive and better supported Employment Equity Programs are more likely to create a more representative work force in terms of female participation. However, the variance explained is extremely small (only 2%). Konrad and Linnehan (1992) tried to establish the causal relationship between U.S. affirmative action programs and higher percentages of female and minority managers.

However, their hypothesis was not supported. On the other hand, top managers possessing strong employment equity values are shown to have an impact on the percentage of female and minority managers employed. These two studies indicate the small and limited impact of affirmative action programs on creating a more representative work force.

The impact of employment equity programs on the climate of organizations has seldom been studied. While it is difficult to find out "true" attitudes at the management level due to the political correctness nature of the issue, there remains a vacuum regarding understanding the impact of such programs on rank-and-file employees. It is the purpose of this study to find out how employment equity programs influence intergroup behaviour in the work place.

Evaluation

Has the Employment Equity Act been effective in achieving its goals? While there are indicators of some positive impact, should Canadian society continue its sole reliance on the Act to eliminate systemic discrimination and attain equality in the work place? These questions are worth investigating.

Rutherglen (1992, p. 339) argues that the most important issue is "...how affirmative action affects all employees; thus, the courts should create a remedy that eliminates the effects of past discrimination, whatever its form, and imposes a minimal burden on other employees". The nature of employment equity programs is similar to affirmative actions in using the "disease as cure" (Rutherglen, 1992). Employers are required to stop using gender, race and disability in recruitment and promotion criteria in order to eliminate employment discrimination. On

the other hand, employers need to recruit or promote more applicants from the four disadvantaged groups in order to achieve statistical parity. In other words, gender, race and disability become salient criteria, yet in the opposite sense. This approach creates different impacts on the traditionally advantaged groups who are represented by Caucasians and males compared to the nontraditional disadvantaged groups.

Although the main approach of the federal Human Rights Code is "not to punish the discriminator, but rather to provide relief for the victims of discrimination", the discriminator, actual or alleged, have to pay the price (Chabursky, 1992, p. 313). In particular, the traditionally advantaged Caucasian males, as a group, bear the penalties and costs for past discrimination. In order to achieve work place representation, employers will add gender, race or disability criteria into their recruitment or promotion considerations. Ultimately, some Caucasian male applicants suffer. They feel that they are victims under the programs; and fairness and merits are no longer valued (Bresler, 1989). In terms of Rutherglen's criterion (1992), the burden on white males cannot be ignored. The arguments of performance and fairness are essential in the employment equity controversy. Should gender and race be added to the list and should they have priority over performance? Rutherglen (1992) argued that as long as gender and race are perceived to be more important than performance on the list, rumors of inequity will exist and discriminatory attitudes will be prevalent.

On the other hand, the disadvantaged groups, who should benefit from the programs, may not show enthusiasm. Their experiences tell us that they face the risk of being stigmatized as incompetent (Monroe, 1991). A study by Heilman, Block and Lucas (1992) showed that

applicants recruited under an affirmative action program are perceived to be less capable than those who are recruited without such programs. They are also concerned about the use of gender and race as recruitment and promotion criteria. Nontraditional people resist the idea of creating a "tilted playing field" by the employment equity programs because they foresee a larger polarization among groups (Chong, 1994). Others are afraid that such programs will spread the victim mentality across the disadvantaged groups (Hall, 1991). This will lead to the loss of personal direction in creating one's future.

Reginald Dickson (1992) established Inroads Inc. which is an organization for training young black students and preparing them for climbing corporate ladders in the United States. He, at the other extreme, emphasizes that effort is the most important factor in bringing career success to black people. According to Dickson, black students should learn to assimilate themselves into American society in order to be successful. This approach puts the onus on nontraditional people alone and ignores the forces of systemic discrimination. Dickson insists that black people should not assume the victim role and wait for help. The philosophy behind Inroads Inc. indicates Dickson's lack of confidence in affirmative action programs to provide equal employment opportunities and his fear of stigmatization on black people .

A recent Gallup Poll shows that three quarters of Canadians are opposed to the notion of cultural diversity (Jeffs, 1993). In other words, employment equity programs which deal with cultural diversity in the work place are not likely to be welcomed. A study of multiculturalism conducted in 1985 by Marketing Initiatives International Inc. (MII) found that most Canadians are generally sympathetic to minorities, but most

oppose compulsory affirmative action programs (Fleras and Elliott, 1992, p. 116-117). In addition, it seems that the general population lacks patience in dealing with cultural diversity in the midst of economic hardships.

Although employment equity programs bring progress in work place representation, there is no indication that the attitudes between different groups of employees will be improved. Together with the resentment shown by both the advantaged and disadvantaged groups, there are hints that the Employment Equity Act brings the unintended effect of polarizing the work place.

Hypotheses

Social identity theory provides a theoretical framework to examine the impact of employment equity programs on intergroup dynamics between the traditional and nontraditional groups. The introduction of employment equity programs provides collective channels for nontraditional groups to advance from their low group status in the work place. However, not all nontraditional group members are willing to advance through this channel. They may not identify themselves as being a member of a nontraditional group or they may perceive the collective channel as illegitimate. On the other hand, traditional group members may react differently depending on whether they recognize the need for nontraditional members to advance in the work place. In sum, group status, group identity and perceptions of employment equity programs are important concepts in this research study.

The first hypothesis examines the main effect of group status on intergroup discriminating attitudes and behaviours.

Hypothesis 1: *Subjects from low status groups will discriminate more than members from high status groups.*

According to social identity theory, group status is the prestige and esteem which results from comparison with other groups regarding some salient dimensions (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In a stable environment where group status changes are unlikely, high status group members will discriminate more as they have to protect and maintain their high status while low status group members understand that they are inferior in terms of the salient dimensions and they tend to discriminate less. The laboratory study by Sachdev and Bourhis (1991) confirms that high status group members are positively biased towards their ingroup members in order to maintain their positive social identity. However, Mullen at al.'s meta-analysis of 137 studies on ingroup bias (1992) shows that this effect works for artificial groups only. Real groups, such as ethnic groups, show a slight, insignificant and opposite trend. The inconsistent results can be explained in terms of the salient criteria. Mullen et al. found that high status groups discriminate more on relevant attributes while low status groups discriminate more on less relevant attributes. In addition, the laboratory studies manipulated the experimental environment, therefore group status changes were not likely. In such a stable environment, high status groups will discriminate more to protect their status while low status groups tend to internalize their inferiority. However, when changes are possible and likely, low status groups will try to enhance their identity. In Kelly's study (1990) of a political campaign, the minority party was found to discriminate more than the majority party as the opportunity to enhance its status was likely. Similar to this study, Kelly's study (1990) involved

real groups and a change process. Her results confirm that low status group members will discriminate more when changes of status are possible and likely.

The second hypothesis examines the main effect of the group identity variable on intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours. Hypothesis 2: ***Subjects with stronger group identity will discriminate more than those with weak group identity.***

Social identity theory emphasizes that the self-perception of one's group membership is more important than one's objective membership (Turner & Tajfel, 1986). In other words, members need to identify with the group before the group comparison process will become effective with individual members. This aspect of the theory is not examined in the laboratory studies as the 'minimum group paradigm' is often used. In this particular setup, individuals do not know or talk to other group members. They are told that they belong to a particular artificial group. Under the strict manipulations in experiments, group identity is not an issue. However, in real groups such as ethnic and gender groups, the degree of group identity affects members' sense of belongingness. High group identity members feel strongly and proudly about being a member of the group and tend to follow collective actions while low group identity members may deny their group membership. Second, strength of group identity involves a motivational aspect of group comparison. Karasawa (1991, p. 296) argues that group identity has "an interactive effect with members' motivation to seek self-/in-group evaluations as their need for self/in-group enhancement is intensified, w0hereas low identity members may not exhibit the direct relationship between their motivation and group evaluations because in-group evaluations may not

necessarily serve as a basis for these members' self-image". This motivation for enhancement will stimulate more vigorous group comparisons and lead to more intense intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.

Past studies (Karasawa, 1991; Brown et al., 1986; Kelly, 1990; Bornman & Mynhardt 1991) show that there are some positive relationships between group identity and intergroup discrimination. However, most rely on correlational analysis and some are inconsistent and weak. The main reason for the different results can be traced to different operational definitions of the construct. Karasawa (1991) identifies two aspects of the construct: identification with the group and with group members. The study shows that both aspects lead to more intense ingroup bias. The study by Brown et al. (1986) omits the group members' identification aspects and this study shows weak and inconsistent positive predictions. Kelly's study (1990) interprets group identity as identification with the group leader. She finds that there is a positive relationship between the construct and intergroup differentiation. It seems that the group members aspect is important and Karasawa's study (1991) confirms its significance. In this study, Karasawa's definition is used but the questions are modified with reference to the study by Brown et al. (1986) to suit the present field study. There are other studies that use group identity as the dependent variable and examine the impact of group status on this construct (Ellemers et al., 1988; 1992; 1993). They found that group status has a positive impact on intergroup differentiation. However, their interpretation of the construct is different from other studies as they include intergroup experiences and feelings towards outgroup members.

This inclusion makes comparison difficult as they are actually different constructs.

The third hypothesis deals with the interactive effect of group status and perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs on intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.

Hypothesis 3: *Subjects who are of high group status and perceive employment equity programs as an illegitimate means of promoting one's group status will discriminate more.*

Employment equity programs provide collective channels for lower status groups to move ahead in organizational hierarchies. However, there is no unanimous agreement on whether such programs are legitimate means of status promotion. It is the purpose of this study to determine the impact of perceived legitimacy of the change process on discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.

Social identity theory predicts that perceived legitimacy of a status change process will lead to intense discrimination (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When changes are possible and likely, high status group members will try to protect and maintain the status quo while low status members will attempt to move up the status ladder. While lower status groups such as women and visible minorities claim that they are underrepresented in the work place, Caucasian males "say that the diversity programs often make them feel threatened and attacked" (Galen & Palmer, 1994). The Caucasian male backlash shows that they are protecting their present status and it is predicted that they will perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate and discriminate against low status group members. On the other hand, Heilman, Block and Lucas (1992) found that employees recruited under such programs will more

likely be labelled as incompetent. This perceived incompetency is rejected by low status group members as they have the capability to compete on an equal basis. It is predicted that they will perceive employment equity programs as undesirable means of advancement and therefore illegitimate. There are two alternatives available: deprecate one's group membership or propose other collective actions. Karasawa (1991) found that some low status members with low group identity choose to deprecate their group membership. In this scenario, they may choose to compete on an individual level or internalize the inferior status and accept the status quo. For both cases, they will not discriminate against outgroup members on a group basis. On the other hand, if group members, regardless of status, perceive employment equity programs as legitimate means for advancing in the organization, it is predicted that they will discriminate less. According to social identity theory, these group members accept that the present status allocation is not legitimate and some changes are necessary to bring back equity. As a result, these high status group members are ready to accept the collective advancement of low status group members. The comparison process will lead to a new status allocation with minimal disagreement (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

There are relatively few studies on the topic of perceived legitimacy and most of them focus on the perceived legitimacy of assigned status (Ellemers et al., 1992; Ellemers et al., 1993). These laboratory studies show that illegitimate assignment of group status is less acceptable and has a negative impact on ingroup identity. On the other hand, high status groups will try to protect their own status by displaying more ingroup favouritism than members of low status group members

(Ellemers et al., 1992). Caddick's study (1982) shows that illegitimately-assigned low status group members tend to be more ingroup biased and discriminate more than legitimately-assigned low status group members. These results suggest that if group members perceive that their group status is illegitimate, they will discriminate more. This hypothesis focuses on the perceived legitimacy of the change process and whether group members are willing to utilize this channel rather than the aftermath results.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Field Survey

Discrimination is a sensitive topic and socially desirable answers
will distort the true measure of discriminatory attitudes or behaviours. A
field survey is therefore an appropriate research method because the
researcher is not in direct contact with subjects and their responses will
be anonymous. This will enhance the opportunities of getting true
responses compared to other methods such as personal or telephone
interviewing.

Direct questions on discriminatory attitudes or behaviours may
attract politically correct answers. Therefore, hypothetical cases of
employment decision making were used to detach subjects' feelings from
the responses. Field surveys do not pose any pressure on subjects and
allow them enough time to read, think and make decisions about each
scenario.

Prior studies have investigated the organizational impact of EEPs
by interviewing representatives from human resource departments (Leck
& Saunders, 1992; Konrad & Linnehan, 1992). Other departments and
levels are seldom surveyed. Such responses bear a potential bias of
vested interests and political correctness since the respondents are
responsible for the programs. Moreover, using key informants creates
perceptual errors such as "...hindsight bias, attributional bias,
subconscious attempts to maintain self-esteem, or impression

management" (Kumar, Stern & Anderson, 1993, 1634). By surveying students who come from different organizations and have a wide range of work experience, there is a better chance of understanding the concerns of employees who do not have vested interests in employment equity programs. Finally, results from this student survey serve the purpose of increasing the external validity of social identity theory. While social identity theory is well-tested in experimental laboratories, field studies show both confirming and disconfirming results (Mullen et al. , 1992). This study changes the research methodology from studying students in fully-manipulated laboratory experiments to surveying students in the 'real world'. This will help to expand the scope of the theory's applicability and increase our understanding about its limitations.

Survey Design

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed according to the hypotheses stated in the prior chapter. Pre-tests were carried out among business students who were not enrolled in the classes surveyed and minor modifications were made. There are four parts (A, B, C, D). The first section focuses on demographic questions including gender and ethnic origin (Part A). It captures the status of the subject. According to employment equity programs, the male or Caucasian groups are considered to be high status, and female or non-Caucasian groups are considered to be low status. These questions were put in the first section because they are straightforward and do not require much thinking. Subjects were given the easy-to-answer questions first so that they would not become discouraged and decide not to complete the whole

questionnaire (Emory & Cooper, 1991, p. 370). Other questions include length of stay in Canada, age group, and work experiences.

The second section measures the dependent variable: intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours (Part B). This section involved two hypothetical cases. The first case was about a promotion opportunity and the second one was about a training opportunity. In each scenario, subjects were asked to select one candidate from two qualified candidates with different personalities and experiences and to evaluate the future performance potential of both characters.

The third section (Part C) focused on the perceived legitimacy of the employment equity programs while the last section (Part D) focused on the subject's group identity. The hypothetical cases were placed second because I did not want subjects to be aware of the purpose of the study, which would be revealed by the group identity and employment equity questions. In addition, the questionnaire was labelled "Employment Decision Making Survey" so that subjects did not know the objective of this survey. At the end of the survey, subjects were, however, encouraged to write their comments on employment equity programs.

The major independent variable is EEP group status. In order to capture the same categorization as the Employment Equity Act, EEP group status is categorized into high and low. Caucasians and males belong to the high status group since they enjoyed systemic privileges in the past. Female and non-Caucasian subjects are categorized as low status. In this study, the gender status variable (MALE) was dummy coded with male = 1 and female = 0. The race status variable (CAUCASN) was coded in the same manner with Caucasian = 1 and non-caucasian= 0. Although these are demographic and seemingly

objective data, Turner and Tajfel (1986) found that self-perceived membership is more important than objective group membership. As a result, research questions focused on subjects' perceived membership and subjects were asked to identify themselves based on their group membership beliefs (Part A, Question 1 & 2).

The other independent variable is group identity. A person can be labelled as a high status worker but the impact of such labelling depends on how the person identifies with his/her own group membership. This study used a modified construct which was based on the studies by Karasawa (1991) and Brown et al. (1986). There are four sections of group identity questions and each subject was asked to answer two sections according to their gender (female/male) and ethnicity (Caucasian/non-Caucasian). A gender identity variable (GENDERID) was created by combining the response from Part D Sections 1 & 2 (female and male sections of group identity questions). Responses from Section 1 were used for female subjects and those from Section 2 were used for male subjects. The same process was also applied to the race identity questions (Part D, Sections 3 & 4) and the variable was labelled race identity (RACEID). Each of these variables was used as the group identity predictor in the corresponding regression runs.

Perceived legitimacy of the EEPs (EEPPL) is a multifaceted construct. This is a relatively unexplored part of social identity theory. This construct measures subjects' perceptions of whether changing social status due to EEPs are acceptable and legitimate means. First, subjects' beliefs whether discrimination exists in the work place will determine whether there is the need for corrective actions (Part C, Section 2, Questions 1 & 2). If subjects feel that there is no

discrimination, there will be no need for remedial actions and they will probably perceive EEPs as illegitimate. In addition, the reasons for discriminating behaviour are also asked. If subjects believe that discrimination is due to faults of individuals, systemic remedies such as employment equity programs will not be necessary (Part C, Section 2, Question 3). On the other hand, if discriminatory behaviour is due to company policies, then systemic remedies such as employment equity programs may be necessary (Part C, Section 2, Question 4). Third, subjects who believe that systemic discrimination exists may not agree that EEPs are the appropriate cure. Subjects were asked to indicate whether EEPs are effective mechanisms for reducing workplace discrimination and increasing representation of female workers and visible minorities (Part C, Section 3, Question 2, 3, 4). In order to remedy past discrimination and to increase work place representation, employers may include gender, colour of skin and disability status as part of their recruitment or promotion criteria. These criteria may supersede performance as the major basis for recruitment and promotion. Subjects may not agree to having preferential treatment for subordinate groups and therefore reject EEPs as a legitimate tool for improving one's group status (Part C, Section 3, Question 5).

Intergroup discriminatory attitude or behaviour refers to the resultant attitude or behaviour of subjects toward outgroup members. This construct is measured by the two hypothetical cases in the questionnaire (Part B, Sections 1 & 2). Three groups of dependent variables were created to measure different aspects of the intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours. Subjects were asked to select one candidate in the first question (Sections 1& 2, Question 1). The

variable same-gender candidate selection (SGCS) or same-race candidate selection (SRCS) was created. It was coded one when subjects selected the candidate who was of the same gender or race; otherwise it was coded 0. The second group of dependent variables measures gender and race ingroup performance bias (GIPB or RIPB). These were measured by the second and third question in the same sections (Sections 1 & 2, Questions 2 & 3). The performance ratings of the same-gender (or race) candidate were used for this purpose. The third group of dependent variables measures gender and race outgroup performance differentiation (GOPD or ROPD). This was measured by the same questions. However, the performance ratings of the opposite-gender (or race) candidate were used.

The formulation of these variables was based on results from previous studies which defined discrimination as the preference for ingroup members over outgroup members. In the study by Sachdev and Bourhis (1991), subjects were given the power to allocate rewards among work pieces produced by both ingroup and outgroup members. These work pieces were rated as having the same quality by external judges. Subjects were found to allocate more rewards to their own group members than outgroup members. Two concepts are involved: ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation. Subjects can allocate more rewards to ingroup members and this behaviour is labelled ingroup bias. On the other hand, subjects may choose to reduce rewards to outgroup members and this behaviour is called outgroup differentiation. In a zero-sum reward scenario, ingroup bias will directly imply outgroup differentiation. For instance, when there is a training opportunity for only one candidate, the choice of same-gender candidate over the

opposite-gender worker will indicate both ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation. On the other hand, in non-zero-sum reward situations, such as performance ratings in this study, favoring ingroup members does not necessarily imply reducing rewards to outgroup members. In this study, both behaviours were examined individually. The dependent variables: ingroup bias, outgroup differentiation and same-gender (or race) candidate selection, were used to test all three hypotheses in both gender and race analyses. It is expected that subjects with low group status (female or non-Caucasian subjects), strong group identities, and subjects with high group status who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate will tend to favour the same-group candidate; give lower ratings to the opposite-group candidate, and select candidates of the same gender or race.

In this study, two hypothetical cases regarding promotion and training opportunities were designed to manipulate the gender and race variables. Each case consisted of either the race or the gender variable which were controlled by the names of the characters. When gender was involved, Peter was used to represent males and Jane was used to represent females. When race was involved, Philip was used to represent Caucasians while Ming-wah was used to represent non-Caucasians. Two hypothetical characters (A & B), each with different work experiences and personalities, were created for each case. In order to control for work experience and personality differences, two versions were created for each case. For instance, version one consisted of the male candidate A and the female candidate B; and version two consisted of the female candidate A and the male candidate B. Similar manipulations applied to

the race variable. A total of four different versions of the questionnaires were created.

Sample

The ideal sample for this study would involve employees of a large organization in which employment equity programs are well-established so that employees have extensive experiences with the program. It is better to study one large organization than several small ones. The reason being that different organizations have different objectives, invest different resources, and have different action plans with their employment equity programs.

After contacting more than 20 organizations in a two month period, none of the organizations showed interests in implementing the survey. Reasons for not participating included: recent surveys administered on other issues; organizations did not want to "disturb" their employees too much; the sensitive nature of the topic and the company was not ready for it; organizational preference for a survey which was processed by employees within the organization; and low priority of the issue. Due to the time constraints associated with this study, using an organization sample was not possible.

Consequently, the sample of this research project was changed to undergraduate students in a business administration program of a western Canadian university. The student population represents future employees in the job market. Although some of them may have limited experience with employment equity programs, their present attitude towards the issue may affect their future work behaviour. Individuals learn about their own culture during early socialization stages. The

resulting set of values and attitudes remain hidden until they encounter a different culture (Cushner & Trifonovitch, 1989). In other words, unless organizations have strong training and socialization programs or students encounter strong disconfirming experiences, these attitudes will persist. As a result, it is important to understand how undergraduate students perceive employment equity programs so that proper training or socialization programs can be designed.

Second, a student population provides a large pool of variance regarding experiences and knowledge with employment equity programs. Some students work part-time and have limited experiences and knowledge of EEPs while others work full-time and study part-time and have extensive understanding of the programs. The different degrees of knowledge and experience with employment equity programs may be potential predictors of intergroup discrimination. These variables are studied in an exploratory manner in this study.

There are limitations with using a student sample. First, employment equity programs are different in different organizations. They may be different in terms of objectives, coverage, degree of effort and budgets. Students may have varied perceptions of employment equity programs due to their prior experiences. As a result, this research study focuses on general attitudes towards such programs, rather than specific details. In addition to their opinions on employment equity programs, students were asked to indicate their opinions as to whether discrimination is a common phenomenon in Canada; and what leads to workplace discrimination (Appendix A, Part C, Section 2).

Second, there may be limitations on the external validity of the results. It may be argued that some students do not have actual

experiences with such programs and their attitudes and behaviour are different from those of experienced workers. Additional independent variables such as self-rated knowledge and experience with employment equity programs are used for control purposes. Moreover, part-time workers may have different work attitudes than full-time workers. The number of hours worked in a typical week in the current job is also measured to check whether it has a significant impact on intergroup discriminatory attitude and behaviour.

Sampling method

Three classes, representing different levels in the business program of a western Canadian university, were selected as the sample for this study. The professors of all three classes indicated that employment equity programs were not discussed in their lectures so that students' attitudes should not be biased. For each of the two bigger classes, I introduced and distributed the questionnaires in one of their lectures and subjects were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. The study was voluntary and students were asked to complete and return the questionnaires on their own time. Two personal reminders were delivered by either the professor or the researcher in the following lecture and subsequent tutorials. On the other hand, students of the smallest class were given class time to complete the questionnaires. No reminder was delivered for this class.

Method of Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was chosen as the method of analysis due to its capability to analyze both categorical and continuous predictors at the same time (Pedhazur, 1982, p. 328). Other methods such as ANOVA required all predictors to be categorical. An arbitrary cutoff point for the continuous predictors might distort the analysis and cause information loss. In this study, there are both categorical variables (e.g. MALE and CAUCASN) as well as continuous variables (e.g. GENDERID, RACEID & EEPPL). Besides the main effect variables, the hypotheses involve a number of interactions between categorical and continuous variables which can be analyzed by using multiple regression analysis. In addition, the criterion variables are either nominal (SGCS & SRCS) or ordinal (GIPB, GOPD, RIPB & ROPD). Logistical regressions procedures were used to analyze the limited dependent variables[1]. Due to the relatively small sample size and exploratory nature of the study, a 90% confidence level (p < .10) was utilized in determining the significance of both regression coefficients and the overall model.

In this study, there are two separate sets of regression runs. The first set involves discriminating attitudes and behaviours with regards to gender while the second set deals with race. There are three hypotheses

---

[1]After reviewing the results of the ordinal dependent variables, I found that there were range restriction problems. Though there were 7 categories for each variable, responses focused on the high end of the scale. The lack of normality of the dependent variables violated one of the assumptions of ordinary least square regressions. As a result, these variables were collapsed into two categories: less effective and more effective. Logistical regression procedures were found to be applicable.

to be tested in this study and all of them will be tested for both groups (gender and race). The regression equations are as follows:

Gender-related regression runs:

Equation 3.1:

$$GIPB = a_{10} + b_{11} MALE + b_{12} GENDERID + b_{13} MALE*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{14} EEPPL + b_{15} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Equation 3.2:

$$GOPD = a_{20} + b_{21} MALE + b_{22} GENDERID + b_{23} MALE*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{24} EEPPL + b_{25} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Equation 3.3

$$SGCS = a_{30} + a_{31} MALE + b_{32} GENDERID + b_{33} MALE*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{34} EEPPL + b_{35} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Race-related regression runs:

Equation 3.4:

$$RIPB = a_{40} + b_{41} CAUCASN + b_{42} RACEID + b_{43} CAUCASN*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{44} EEPPL + b_{45} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Equation 3.5:

$$ROPD = a_{50} + b_{51} CAUCASN + b_{52} RACEID + b_{53} CAUCASN*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{54} EEPPL + b_{55} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Equation 3.6

$$SRCS = a_{60} + b_{61} CAUCASN + b_{62} RACEID + b_{63} CAUCASN*EEPPL$$
$$+ b_{64} EEPPL + b_{65} \text{ Control Variables}$$

Equations 3.1 and 3.4 are used to test Hypothesis 1 that subjects with low group status will discriminate more than those from high status groups. In other words, female (MALE = 0) and non-Caucasian (CAUCASN = 0) subjects are expected to discriminate more. They are expected to be more ingroup biased, less lenient towards outgroup candidates and tend to select the same-gender candidate. The expected direction of the regression coefficients is shown in Table 3.1 .

TABLE 3.1

Hypothesis 1: expected direction of regression coefficients

DEPENDENT VARIABLES	PREDICTORS	
	MALE	CAUCASN
Ingroup Bias	$-b_{11}$	$-b_{41}$
Outgroup Differentiation	$+b_{21}$	$+b_{51}$
Select same-gender /race candidate	$-b_{31}$	$-b_{61}$

Equations 3.2 and 3.5 are used to test Hypothesis 2 which states that subjects with stronger group identification will discriminate more. In other words, subjects with stronger group identification will: be more ingroup bias, be less lenient towards outgroup members; and tend to select candidates with either the same gender or race. The expected direction of the regression coefficients are shown in Table 3.2 .

TABLE 3.2

Hypothesis 2: expected direction of regression coefficients

DEPENDENT	PREDICTORS	
VARIABLES	GENDERID	RACEID
Ingroup Bias	$+ \, b_{11}$	$+ \, b_{41}$
Outgroup Differentiation	$- \, b_{21}$	$- \, b_{51}$
Select same-gender /race candidate	$+ \, b_{31}$	$+ \, b_{61}$

Equations 3.3 and 3.6 are used to test Hypothesis 3 which states that subjects who are of high status and perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate means of promoting one's group status will discriminate more. The interaction effect between group status and perceived legitimacy of EEPs are examined in this hypothesis. The hypothesized impact of the interaction effect on ingroup bias (race and gender) and same gender/race candidate selection are illustrated in Table 3.3 . It is expected that high status subjects who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate will favour candidates of the same race or gender (+) while perceived legitimacy will lead to the opposite behaviours (-).

TABLE 3.3

Impact of Status and Perceived Legitimacy of EEPs on Ingroup Bias (b_{13} & b_{43}) and Candidate Selection (b_{33} & b_{63})

Status	Perceived Legitimacy of EEPs	
	Legitimate	Illegitimate
High	-	+
Low	+	-

On the other hand, the impact of the interaction is expected to be opposite for outgroup differentiation . The expected direction of the regression coefficients are shown in Table 3.4. It is expected that high status subjects who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate will tend to protect their own status by lowering the performance ratings of outgroup candidates (-) as shown in Table 3.4. On the other hand, high status subjects with legitimate perception of employment equity programs will tend to favour outgroup candidates (+).

TABLE 3.4

Impact of Status and Perceived Legitimacy of EEPs on Outgroup Differentiation (b_{23} & b_{53})

Status	Perceived Legitimacy of EEPs	
	Legitimate	Illegitimate
High	+	-
Low	-	+

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested in separate regression runs to avoid multicollinearity problems. Each regression run consisted of two steps. The first step involved the main effect variables such as MALE, CAUCASN, GENDERID AND RACEID and the second step involved the control variables as well. Control variables include age of the subjects (AGE), the self-reported knowledge of employment equity programs (EEPKNOW)[2], the weekly number of hours worked in the current job (NOWJOB). For the race regression runs, there was an additional control variable which measures whether subjects are born in Canada (BORNINC)[3]. This is an exploratory variable and it may have a moderating effect on race status and race group identity.

Hypothesis 3 involves interaction terms and therefore the regression runs involve 3 steps. First the main effect variables were entered, followed by the interaction terms, and finally the control variables. The purpose of this procedure is to examine whether the additional interaction terms explain more variance in the intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours beyond the main effects variables. In addition, since the product terms of group status and perceived legitimacy factors are expected to have high correlation with the main effect predictors, mean centering of the main effect predictors

---

[2] Another control variable which measures the self-rated experience of employment equity programs (EEPEXP) was deleted because of high correlation with EEPKNOW (0.5096).

[3] Another dummy-coded control variable LTIMMIG, which records those subjects who are not born in Canada but have resided in Canada for more than 6 years, was deleted due to high correlation with BORNINC (-.6822).

was utilized to avoid multicollinearity problems (Jaccard et al. , 1990, p. 31). Since the dependent variables are dichotomous, it is difficult to graph the significant interaction effects. In order to examine the interaction effect more closely, additional regression runs on split samples were performed. The sample was split according to the gender and race of the subjects. EEPPL was the predictor in the first step while control variables were added in the second step. Through these runs, we can examine more closely the sources of the interaction effects.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

After collecting all the completed questionnaires, descriptive statistics were processed to gain an initial understanding of the data (Appendix B). Furthermore, correlational analyses of the independent variables were processed to review whether there were multicollinearity problems (Appendix C). Results showed that most of the correlations[1] were less than 0.5 which implied that there was no multicollinearity among predictors.

Survey Responses

The 36% (98/274) survey response rate was acceptable given that completing and returning the questionnaires was voluntary. However, the response rate of the three participating classes differed considerably. The second year business class return rate was 39% (63/160) while the third year class had a lower rate of 19% (19/98). The higher rate of the second year class was due to the availability of tutorial time for students to complete and return their questionnaires to their teaching assistants. This arrangement was not possible in the third year class. The fourth year class students had a 100% return rate as students were given class

---

[1] The correlations between GENDERID and RACEID as well as that between CAUCASN and BORNINC were higher than 0.5. The former correlation did not cause any multicollinearity problem because they were entered into separate regression runs. The latter correlation might have caused multicollinearity problems in the race regression runs where BORNINC was included as one of the control variables. In order to minimize such problems, regression runs on split samples (in terms of ethnic groups) were processed w;hich will allow the researcher to examine the impact of BORNINC on each ethnic group without the multicollinearity concerns.

time to complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed at the beginning of class and discussions did not start until all students had completed the questionnaires.

In terms of gender distribution, 54% of the respondents were female while 46% were male. When compared to the gender distribution in the three classes, more female students completed and returned the questionnaires in both the second and third year classes. This consistent pattern implies that female opinions may be over represented in this study.

In terms of race, 41% of the respondents were Caucasians, 51% were Asians, 4% were of mixed heritage and 4% were of other ethnicity. In other words, 59% of the respondents were non-Caucasians. Although there were more non-Caucasians who returned their completed questionnaires, their response rates were not proportional to the race distribution in their classes. The second year class, which had a population of 160 students, Caucasian students showed a higher response rate. Forty-five percent of the registered Caucasian students, compared to an average of 39% in the whole class, returned their completed questionnaires. On the other hand, non-Caucasian students in the third year showed a higher response rate. Twenty one percent of the registered third year non-Caucasian students, when compared to an average of 19% in the whole class, returned their questionnaires.

The majority of the respondents (over 80%) were between 18 and 25 years of age. There was roughly an equal distribution of male and female respondents among all age groups. However, the non-Caucasian respondents were younger than the Caucasian respondents. About 90% of the non-Caucasian respondents belonged to the 18 to 25 age group

while only 70% of the Caucasian respondents belonged to the same age group. Most of the respondents (98%) had past work experience and 57% of them were currently working. In terms of work experience by race, over 50% of the non-Caucasian respondents were not currently working while only 32.5% of the Caucasian respondents were not currently employed. This may be explained by the presence of international visa students who are not allowed to work in Canada. This can be further illustrated by length of stay in Canada. Eighty percent of the Caucasian respondents have resided in Canada since birth while only 28% of the non-Caucasian respondents were born in Canada. In addition, 24% of the non-Caucasian respondents had lived in Canada for one to three years while only 2.5% of the Caucasian respondents had lived in Canada for less than three years.

Scale Reliability

There are two constructs in this questionnaire that require verification. First, perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs (Appendix A, Part C); and second, group identities (Appendix A, Part D).

Perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs

The perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs construct achieved a marginally satisfactory reliability ($\alpha=.5747$) level. Given that this construct was developed specifically for this study, a factor analysis was performed to determine whether there were different underlying factors. Results revealed that there were three underlying factors in sections B & C which explained 60% of the variance involved. The factor loadings, after varimax rotation, are shown in Table 4.1 (only loadings of

Table 4.1

Factor Loadings for Perceived Legitimacy of EEPs

Q#		EEPs are effective	Discrim-ination is wide-spread	Systemic nature of discrim-ination
2.1	Many workers suffer from discrimination due to their gender and/or ethnic origin in the work place.		0.81848	
2.2	Discrimination in the work place is a common phenomenon in Canada.		0.91285	
2.3	Gender and/or ethnic discrimination in the work place is mainly due to the faults of individuals.			-.59235
2.4	Gender and/or ethnic discrimination in the work place is mainly due to company policies and rules.			0.83259
3.1	An employment equity program has a significant impact on my promotion and/or training opportunities.	0.53261		
3.2	Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for reducing workplace discrimination.	0.80453		
3.3	Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for increasing female representation in the work place.	0.84078		
3.4	Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for increasing the representation of visible minorities in the work place.	0.77811		
3.5	In order to increase female and/or visible minority representation in the work place, it is fair to give them preference for promotion and training opportunities.	0.55217		
	Eigenvalues	2.73	1.61	1.12
	% Variances explained	30.4	17.9	12.4

more than .5 are shown). Factor 1, labelled as "EEPs are effective",

represents the belief that employment equity programs are effective

mechanisms to reduce discrimination and increase representation.

Factor 2, labelled as "discrimination is widespread" represents the belief that discrimination due to gender and/or ethnic origin is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada. Factor 3, labelled as "systemic nature of discrimination", indicates that the major reason for discrimination is due to company policies, but not individuals. The Cronbach's alpha scores for these 3 constructs are 0.6979, 0.7273 and 0.2120 respectively.

Factor 1 (EEPs are effective) and Factor 2 (Discrimination is widespread) achieved satisfactory alpha levels and subsequently summation scales were created to represent these two factors. The Cronbach's alpha level of factor 3 was not satisfactory (0.2120) and, therefore, the individual questions were used in the logistical regression runs. As a result, there are four perceived legitimacy variables: EEPs are effective (EEPEFF), discrimination is widespread (DSCRWIDE), individual nature of discrimination (INDVDL) and systemic nature of discrimination (SYSTEMIC).

Group Identities

The group identity questions in this study are based on the studies by Karasawa (1991) and Brown et al. (1986). Karasawa (1991) did not calculate a coefficient alpha of her construct. Instead she used factor scores to test her hypotheses. As a result, the internal consistency of her construct is not certain. Brown et al. (1986) reported a satisfactory Cronbach alpha (0.71) level for his set of identity questions. Given the different context of this study, modifications were made to the questions in both studies. As a result, the reliability of the group identity construct needed to be verified. The reliability analysis shows that both the

Cronbach alpha value for the gender identity questions (α=.6972) and for the race identity questions (α=.6661) were marginally acceptable to be grouped together to form separate variables. Again, summation scales were used to create a gender group identity variable (GENDERID) and a race group identity variable (RACEID).

Regression Results

Hypothesis 1 : Subjects from low status groups will discriminate more than members from high status groups

The results for Hypothesis 1 are shown in Table 4.2 . The gender status variable (MALE) was a significant predictor of gender ingroup performance bias (GIPB). The negative regression coefficient shows that female subjects discriminate more than male subjects by giving higher performance ratings to the female candidate (Jane). In addition, the model Chi-square was significant which indicated that the model with only the gender status variable was a significant predictor of the gender ingroup performance bias (GIPB). This variable remained significant after the addition of the control variables.

The gender status variable was not, however, significant in predicting the other two gender dependent variables: gender outgroup performance differentiation (GOPD) and same-gender candidate selection (SGCS). The gender status variable remained insignificant after the addition of the control variables. In other words, male and female subjects do not act differently when they evaluate the opposite-gender candidate and select the same-gender candidate.

The other result worth mentioning is that the weekly number of hours worked in the current job (NOWJOB) was a significant predictor of same-gender candidate selection (SGCS). This control variable was not hypothesized to have any explanatory power on SGCS. The negative regression coefficient indicates that subjects who work more hours in a

Table 4.2

Hypothesis 1: Logistical Regression Results

GENDER	GIPB	GIPB	GOPD	GOPD	SGCS	SGCS
MALE	-0.7614*	-0.8124*	-0.2355	-0.2203	-0.5234	-0.6261
AGE		-0.4951		-0.1503		-0.0998
EEPKNOW		0.0656		-0.0577		0.1824
NOWJOB		-0.2786		0.2266		-0.5395**
Model Chi-Square	3.226*	2.227	0.304	0.741	1.511	4.416
# of cases	91	91	92	92	93	93

RACE	RIPB	RIPB	ROPD	ROPD	SRCS	SRCS
CAUCASN	-0.2762	-0.4433	0.3662	0.1164	-0.089	-0.204
AGE		0.7629		0.7417		-0.2581
EEPKNOW		0.122		0.1751		0.2444
NOWJOB		-0.1827		-0.019		0.1404
Model Chi-Square	0.417	2.328	0.731	2.347	0.044	1.108
# of cases	92	92	92	92	93	93

* $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$

week tend to select candidates of the opposite gender. In other words, subjects who work full-time are more likely to favour the opposite-gender candidate than subjects who work part-time or do not currently work. This result will be discussed in the next chapter.

The race status variable (CAUCASN) did not have any explanatory power on all three race dependent variables (RIPB, ROPD & SRCS). The non-significance of the race status variable remained after the addition of the control variables.

Hypothesis 2 : Subjects with stronger group identity will discriminate more than those with weak group identity

The results of Hypothesis 2 are shown in Table 4.3. Both gender and race group identity variables (GENDERID & RACEID) did not explain the variance of any of the dependent variables. After controlling for age, knowledge of employment equity programs, and number of hours worked in the current job during a typical week, both identity variables remained insignificant.

The number of cases included in testing this hypothesis dropped to a range of 76 to 78 subjects. The reason being that many subjects misunderstood the questionnaire instructions (Appendix 1, Part D). Some of the respondents who had past work experience and did not currently work did not complete this section. Taken together with those who had no past work experience, the number of cases decreased by 12 subjects. This change in sample size should not have been enough to reduce the power of the significance tests.

Table 4.3

Hypothesis 2: Logistical Regression Results

GENDER	GIPB	GIPB	GOPD	GOPD	SGCS	SGCS
GENDERID	0.3383	0.29	0.2663	0.2761	0.0036	-0.034
AGE		-0.5474		-0.0626		0.0023
EEPKNOW		0.0716		-0.167		0.2711
NOWJOB		-0.2413		0.0601		-0.4712
Model Chi-Square	1.673	1.783	1.068	0.376	0	3.14
# of cases	76	76	77	77	78	78

RACE	RIPB	RIPB	ROPD	ROPD	SRCS	SRCS
RACEID	0.1201	0.1217	0.1315	0.1504	-0.0023	-0.047
AGE		0.3978		0.7796		-0.5011
EEPKNOW		0.0272		0.0805		0.1459
NOWJOB		-0.0752		-0.2538		0.4021
Model Chi-Square	0.242	0.457	0.286	1.964	0	2.352
# of cases	76	76	76	76	77	77

* p < 0.10   ** p < 0.05

Hypothesis 3 : Subjects who are of high group status and perceive
employment equity programs as an illegitimate means of promoting one's
group status will discriminate more

The results of the gender logistic regression runs regarding Hypothesis 3 are listed in Table 4.4. For each of the criterion variables, there were three blocks of predictors which were entered sequentially to demonstrate the explanatory power of each additional block of variables. None of the interaction terms were significant in any of the equations (GIPB, GOPD, SGCS).

For gender ingroup performance bias (GIPB), the gender status variable (MALE) was the only significant predictor. This result echoed those of Hypothesis 1 . Similar to the results of Hypothesis 1, the gender status variable did not explain the other two gender dependent variables (GOPD & SGCS). In addition, the main effect perceived legitimacy factors were not significant in all equations (GIPB, GOPD & SGCS) except that the factor SYSTEMIC was a significant predictor for selecting the same-gender candidate (SGCS) when the interaction terms and the control variables were added. The negative regression coefficients imply that subjects who believe that discrimination is mainly due to company policies and rules tend to select the opposite-gender candidate. In other words, those subjects who believe that systemic discrimination is prevalent will favour the opposite-gender candidate.

The weekly number of hours worked in the current job (NOWJOB) predicted significantly the variance of SGCS. The negative regression

Table 4.4

Hypothesis 3 : Gender Logistical Regression Results

GENDER	GIPB			GOPD			SGCS		
MALE	-1.0615**	-1.0671**	-1.1482**	-0.2275	-0.23	-0.2308	-0.5801	-0.599	-0.6513
EEPEFF	0.0817	0.0687	0.05	0.0731	0.2038	0.247	0.0834	0.258	-0.0581
DSCRWIDE	-0.1478	-0.0863	-0.0177	0.0328	0.0968	0.0648	0.0279	0.0779	0.1416
INDVDL	-0.0141	0.0298	0.0575	-0.0396	0.0117	0.022	0.1409	0.1144	0.1317
SYSTEMIC	-0.1492	-0.18	-0.2016	0.1276	0.1838	0.1921	-0.2544	-0.3075*	-0.3397*
MALE x EPPEFF		-0.0538	0.0797		0.5409	0.6822		-0.7148	-0.7942
MALE x DSCRWIDE		-0.3398	-0.3643		-0.3225	-0.4102		-0.1946	-0.0079
MALE x INDVDL		-0.2453	-0.3176		0.1286	0.2177		-0.0418	-0.1851
MALE x SYSTEMIC		0.3689	0.5028		0.4488	0.5563		0.0643	0.0113
AGE			-1.0129			-0.5297			-0.0247
EEP_KNOW			0.2859			-0.1663			0.1477
NOWJOB			-0.2403			0.4657			-0.7186**
Model Chi-Square	6.31	2.88	3.876	1.59	3.448	3.026	6.593	2.1	5.662
# of cases	88	88	88	89	89	89	90	90	90

* p < 0.10   ** p < 0.05

62

coefficient implies that subject who work full-time are more likely to select the opposite-gender candidate than subjects who work part-time or do not work currently.

The results of the race regression runs are shown in Table 4.5 . When the block of interaction terms was added to the main effects variables in the race ingroup performance bias (RIPB) regression runs, the model Chi-square became significant. This means that the addition of the interaction terms significantly improves the explanatory power of the model. In particular, the interactions between CAUCASN and EEPEFF as well as CAUCASN and DSCRWIDE were significant both before and after the addition of the control variables. The negative regression coefficient of CAUCASN * EEPEFF implies that Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity-programs as effective mechanisms to reduce systemic discrimination tend to be less ingroup biased. These subjects tend to give lower performance ratings to the same-race candidate (Philip). On the other hand, Caucasian subjects who do not perceive employment equity programs as effective methods tend to bias towards the Caucasian candidate by giving him a higher performance rating.

Non-Caucasian subjects were expected to behave in the opposite manner. Non-Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity programs as effective tend to favour the same-race candidate (Ming-wah) while those who perceive employment equity programs as ineffective will have less ingroup bias.

The same interpretation applies to the interaction effect of CAUCASN * DSCRWIDE. The negative regression coefficient implies that

Table 4.5

Table 4.5

Hypothesis 3: Race Logistical Regression Results

RACE	RIPB			ROPD			SRCS		
CAUCASN	-0.3953	-0.7257	-1.5153*	0.4273	0.1945	-0.455	-0.1869	-0.1971	-0.2428
EEPEFF	-0.1503	-0.4264	-0.3066	0.1121	-0.0402	0.0253	-0.1273	-0.1521	-0.2073
DSCRWIDE	-0.3311	-0.4701*	-0.5611**	0.1029	0.1379	0.1096	-0.3229	-0.4239*	-0.4207*
INDVDL	0.0773	0.0263	0.0364	-0.0909	-0.1066	-0.1201	0.156	0.1439	0.135
SYSTEMIC	0.0438	0.0798	0.1105	0.0551	0.0451	0.0689	-0.0236	-0.0178	0.0269
CAUCASN x EPPEFF		-1.2252*	-1.2205*		-0.6115	-0.6148		-0.5988	-0.5859
CAUCASN x DSCRWIDE		-0.8828*	-0.9476*		0.3374	0.3646		-0.6023	-0.6439
CAUCASN x INDVDL		-0.4657	-0.3653		-0.3811	-0.3408		0.1195	0.0564
CAUCASN x SYSTEMIC		0.2386	0.4135		-0.0753	0.0474		0.6094*	0.6072*
AGE			1.4722*			1.1805*			-0.1353
EEP_KNOW			0.0577			0.1415			0.1496
NOWJOB			-0.12			-0.0361			0.2275
BORNINC			1.12*			0.7511			-0.238
Model Chi-square	4.479	9.070*	6.407	2.156	3.967	4.242	5.341	5.126	1.107
# of cases	89	89	89	89	89	89	90	90	90

* p < 0.10   ** p < 0.05

Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada tend to be less biased towards the same-race candidate while those who believe otherwise tend to be more ingroup biased and give high performance ratings to the Caucasian candidate (Philip). On the other hand, non-Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada tend to be more biased towards their ingroup members by giving higher performance ratings to the non-Caucasian candidate (Ming-wah). Non-Caucasian who believe that discrimination is only incidental and is not widespread in Canada will be less biased towards the same-race candidate. These interaction effects may be caused by behavioural patterns of either one ethnic group or both groups together. The behavioural patterns of each ethnic group will be examined in Tables 4.6 and 4.7 after all the Hypothesis 3 results in Table 4.5 are discussed.

The main effect for the perceived legitimacy factor DSCRWIDE was a significant predictor of racial ingroup performance bias (RIPB). The negative regression coefficient implies that subjects who believe that discrimination is widespread in Canada tend to be give lower performance ratings to the same-race candidate.

Both control variables for AGE and BORNINC were significant predictors of race ingroup performance bias (RIPB). The positive regression coefficient of AGE implies that older subjects tend to give higher performance ratings to the same-race candidate. Similarly, the positive regression coefficient of BORNINC shows that Canadian-born subjects tend to favour the same-race candidate.

As shown in Table 4.5, the block of interaction terms between race group status and the perceived legitimacy factors did not explain the race outgroup performance differentiation variable (ROPD). Similarly the main effects variables were not significant. Only the control variable AGE was significant. The positive regression coefficient shows that older subjects tend to give the opposite-race candidate higher performance ratings.

As for the same-race candidate selection (SRCS) regression run, the block of interaction terms were not significant (shown in Table 4.5). However, the individual interaction between CAUCASN and SYSTEMIC was significant. Contrary to Hypothesis 3, the positive regression coefficient implies that Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is mainly systemic in nature tend to select the same-race candidate (Philip) while those who do not believe in the systemic nature of discrimination tend to select the opposite-race candidate (Ming-wah). Non-Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is mainly systemic in nature tend to select the opposite-race (Philip) candidate while those who believe otherwise tend to select the same-race candidate (Ming-wah).

The main effect for perceived legitimacy DSCRWIDE was significant in predicting the same-race candidate selection variable (SRCS). The negative regression coefficient implies that subjects who believe that discrimination is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada tend to select the opposite-race candidate. Caucasian subjects, categorized as high status, were hypothesized to behave in this manner while the non-Caucasian subjects were not.

In order to better understand the significant interaction effects in the RIPB and SRCS regression runs, the sample was split into two groups: Caucasian and non-Caucasian. Additional logistical regressions were processed on the split samples. The results are shown in Table 4.6 and 4.7 .

Table 4.6

Hypothesis 3 : Caucasian Group Logistical Regression Results

	RIPB	RIPB	ROPD	ROPD	SRCS	SRCS
EEPEFF	-1.1493*	-0.0293	-0.401	-0.4429	-0.5054	0.1288
DSCRWIDE	-.9910*	-2.6049**	0.3369	0.3836	-.7785*	-1.0311**
INDVDL	-0.2485	-0.1404	-0.3315	-0.3134	0.2144	0.4295
SYSTEMIC	0.2206	0.7121	0.0007	0.0051	0.3774	0.5168
AGE		12.3541		0.2358		1.049
EEPKNOW		0.8091		0.3616		-0.3601
NOWJOB		0.9621		-0.2457		-0.0217
BORNINC		16.7356		-0.0433		2.6129*
Model Chi-Square	10.687**	18.864***	4.501	1.982	7.464	4.686
# of cases	35	35	34	34	35	35

* p <0.10   ** p < 0.05   *** p <0.01

Table 4.7

Hypothesis 3: Non-Caucasian Group Logistical Regression Results

	RIPB	RIPB	ROPD	ROPD	SRCS	SRCS
EEPEFF	0.0759	0.088	0.2105	0.329	0.0933	-0.1221
DSCRWIDE	-0.1082	-0.1057	-0.0005	-0.069	-0.1762	-0.0758
INDVDL	0.2172	0.2046	0.0496	-0.0052	0.0949	0.1696
SYSTEMIC	-0.018	-0.0186	0.076	0.0314	-0.2321	-0.1794
AGE		0.3222		2.3033*		-1.7657
EEPKNOW		0.1836		0.1207		0.4766
NOWJOB		-0.0417		-0.4024		0.6601
BORNINC		0.3292	.	0.9513		-1.2538*
Model Chi-Square	2.333	0.638	0.998	5.895	2.92	6.613
# of cases	54	54	55	55	55	55

* $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$

The factors EEPEFF and DSCRWIDE were significant predictors of RIPB in the Caucasian group. The negative regression coefficients of EEPEFF implies that Caucasian subjects who believe that employment equity programs are effective mechanisms to reduce systemic discrimination tend to be less biased towards the Caucasian candidate (Philip). Similarly, Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada (DSCRWIDE) exhibit the same behavioural pattern. The block of interaction terms was

significant as a model to explain the ingroup biasing behaviour of the Caucasian group. With the addition of the control variables, DSCRWIDE became more significant while EEPEFF lost significance. In addition, the overall model became more significant. On the other hand, the intergroup discriminatory behaviours of non-Caucasian subjects were not differentiated by their perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs. As a result, the significant interaction effects shown in Table 4.5 were mainly due to the behavioural patterns of the Caucasian group alone.

As for the same-race candidate selection regression runs (SRCS), results from Tables 4.6 and 4.7 shows that SYSTEMIC was not significant with either of the race groups. This is contrary to the significant interaction effect reported in Table 4.5. This shows a lack of power when the sample was split into two groups.

The perceived legitimacy factor DSCRWIDE was a significant predictor of same-race candidate selection (SRCS) in the Caucasian group as shown in Table 4.6. The negative regression coefficient implies that Caucasian subjects who believe that discrimination is widespread in Canada tend to select the opposite-race candidate. On the other hand, non-Caucasian subjects (Table 4.7) were not differentiated by their belief of whether discrimination is a common and widespread phenomenon in Canada (DSCRWIDE). The strong and consistent pattern exhibited by Caucasian subjects to select the same-race candidate (Philip) together with the weak and insignificant pattern of non-Caucasian subjects explains why the main effect variable DSCRWIDE was a significant predictor when the sample was not split.

The control variable BORNINC was significant in predicting the same-race candidate selection variable (SRCS) as shown in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. Caucasian subjects who are born in Canada tend to select the same-race candidate (Philip) while Canadian-born non-Caucasians tend to select the opposite-race candidate (Philip). This illustrates a potentially significant interaction effect between the race status variable (CAUCASN) and BORNINC which was not expected nor hypothesized a priori.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, results are discussed with respect to individual hypotheses. Applications of the major findings will be suggested. Finally the limitations of this study will be reviewed and suggestions for future research will be discussed.

Hypothesis 1

Gender

This study shows that female subjects discriminate more than male subjects by giving higher performance ratings to the same-gender candidate. Since females are considered to be of low status according to employment equity programs, Hypothesis 1 is supported. This result confirms the findings of Mullen et al. (1992) that members from high status groups do not discriminate more in a real group scenario. Furthermore, contrary to the second finding of their meta-analysis (Mullen et al., 1992), low status group members showed a weak and inconsistent trend of favouring their ingroup members. The results of this study suggest that when group status advancement is possible and probable through employment equity programs, female subjects (members of a low status group) will discriminate more in a significant and consistent manner. This confirms and adds external validity to the social identity theory model that perception of possible status change is one of the conditions that will lead to intergroup discrimination (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Hypothesis 1 is not supported in terms of outgroup differentiation. The gender status variable did not explain the gender outgroup performance differentiating behaviour. This result shows that status alone cannot determine whether subjects will give lower performance ratings to candidates of the opposite gender. There are two possible reasons. First, status does not explain outgroup differentiating behaviours. Second, status interacts with some other variables before it can explain these behaviours. Results from Hypothesis 3 reject the second possibility. The suitability of using outgroup differentiation as the dependent variable will be discussed in a later section.

Similarly Hypothesis 1 is not supported in terms of same-gender candidate selection. It was expected that in a zero-sum reward scenario when only one opportunity is available, the candidate selecting behaviour should be a combination of ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation. Further discussion of this criterion variable will occur later in this chapter.

Race

Hypothesis 1 is not supported by any of the race regression equations. The race status variable was not a significant predictor of ingroup bias, outgroup differentiation, or same-race candidate selection.

A possible reason why the race status variable is not significant is that the group of non-Caucasians consists of different races and subjects of this category may not identify themselves as the same group. A subject may identify himself as a non-Caucasian, an Asian, a Chinese, a Chinese from mainland China or a Chinese from Beijing in mainland China. The various possibilities of categorizations make it difficult to

correctly define ingroup and outgroup. For instance, in the promotion or training scenario (Appendix A , Part B, Sections 1 and 2), Peter and Ming-wah represent Caucasian and non-Caucasian candidates respectively. However Ming-wah is a Chinese name and whether Africans or East Indians identify themselves as being in the same group as Ming-wah is not clear in this study. This sample included 58 non-Caucasians of whom only 8 were not Asians. The group of Asians included Chinese, Japanese, East Indians and possibly other races. It remains to be verified whether non-Chinese Asians will identify with a Chinese candidate.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 is not supported in either the gender or race regression runs. This lack of significance is not related to poor reliability as both the race and gender group identity variables achieve satisfactory alpha levels.

One possible reason for the insignificant results is its questionable construct validity. Prior studies showed disagreements on the components of the group identity construct (Brown et al., 1986; Karasawa, 1991; Kelly, 1990). The questions used in this study were modified from those used in the studies by Karasawa (1991) and Brown et al. (1986). Karasawa (1991) used factor scores from her study to show the significance of a multi-component approach and the predictive power of various components (cognitive, emotional identification with the group and identification with group members on ingroup biasing behaviour). Brown et al. (1986) studied employees' identity with their departments by examining only cognitive and emotional identification with the group. In

addition, they found that group identity was an inconsistent predictor of intergroup differentiation and the correlation was generally positive but weak. A study using similar questions was conducted to examine the group identity of nurses in different sections (Oaker & Brown, 1986). Results showed that group identification was negatively correlated with intergroup differentiation, i.e., stronger group identity will increase the favouring of outgroup members. There is a lack of agreement on the exact composition of the components.

Given this discussion, a post hoc factor analysis was conducted to examine the underlying constructs of both gender and race identity variables. These results are shown in Table 5.1 (only loadings of more than 0.5 are shown). Two factors were identified with in both gender and race identities. These two factors explained 61% of the variance in the gender identity variable and 64% of race identity variable. Apparently, the factor loadings are different from the results in Karasawa's study (1991). Instead of loading on identity with the group and group members, factor 1 of gender identity and factor 2 of the race identity contain emotional elements of the identity while the other factors contain cognitive elements. Though the design of the survey questions in this study was based on the work of Karasawa's study (1991), results from the factor analysis show a different composition. This result suggests an idiosyncratic nature of the construct and thus difficulties in establishing a universal group identity construct.

Table 5.1

Factor Loading for Gender and Racial Group Identities

Q#		Gender identity		Race identity	
		Emotional	Cognitive	Cognitive	Emotional
1	I am glad to be a m/f/c/nc worker in this organization	-.66201	0.52949	0.69134	-.52260
2	I am a typical m/f/c/nc worker in this organization		0.80104	0.77709	
3	I try to hide my m/f/n/nc identity in this organization	0.85347			0.87492
4	I am proud to be a m/f/c/nc worker in this organization	-.74110			-.68922
5	I am not comfortable to admit that I am a m/f/c/nc worker in this organization	0.80393			0.82191
6	There are many m/f/c/nc workers who influence my thoughts and behaviour		0.77063	0.81828	
7	Most of my best friends are m/f/c/ncs.			0.54059	
	Eigenvalues	2.83	1.45	2.54	1.98
	Variance explained	40.4	20.7	36.3	28.3

Another reason for the insignificant results is that the constructs used in the studies by Brown et al. (1986) and Karasawa (1991) were based on multiple comparison groups. Brown et al. (1986) studied the different departments of an organization while Karasawa (1991) studied students from different schools. Oaker and Brown (1986), using the same construct as Brown et al. (1986), studied two groups of nurses who worked in different departments. This study focused on gender and

ethnic groups. Researchers have suggested that the group identity construct may be unique with the relating group context (Brown et al., 1986; Oaker & Brown, 1986; Hinkle et al., 1989).

Group ideologies influence group members on how to define their own group identity. Oaker & Brown (1986) studied the intergroup relationships between two groups of nurses and found that nurses emphasized the nature of different tasks between the groups, rather than the relationship with other nurses. This suggests that professional groups may identify with the nature of their work while gender and ethnic group members may identify with different values or cultures which define their group boundaries and importance. As a result, group identity questions from other contexts may not be externally valid to measures of gender and race group identity. It is important to determine what the specific components of gender and ethnic identity are and design identity questions specifically for gender and ethnic groups.

Hypothesis 3

Gender

In terms of gender, the interaction terms between status and all the perceived legitimacy factors did not explain the ingroup biasing behaviour. Hypothesis 3 is not supported in terms of gender ingroup performance bias. The results showed that perceived legitimacy of the employment equity programs could not differentiate the behaviours of either the female or male groups. In other words, perceived legitimacy was not an issue between the gender groups. The dominant impact of the gender status variable and the insignificant interaction effects

indicate that employment equity programs do not create a new source of tension between the two gender groups. Both gender groups accept employment equity programs as collective channels for lower status group advancement. The lower status female subject group utilizes this opportunity by favouring the female candidate while the higher status male subject group allows the female candidate to advance by discriminating less.

As for the outgroup performance differentiation variable, neither the gender status variable nor the interaction terms were significant. Similar results were reported for the same-gender candidate selection variable. Neither the gender status variable nor the interaction terms were significant. Hypothesis 3 is not supported in terms of these two gender dependent variables.

The main effect perceived legitimacy (SYSTEMIC) was significant in predicting same-race candidate selection after the addition of the interaction terms. The male subject group behaved according to Hypothesis 3. Male subjects who believe that discrimination in Canada is mainly systemic in nature tend to select the opposite-gender candidate. In other words, those high status male subjects who perceive employment equity programs as legitimate means for lower status groups to improve their status will discriminate less. On the other hand, the female group acted contrary to the what was hypothesized. Results show that those female subjects who perceive employment equity programs as legitimate do not make use of this collective channel to advance their group status. Instead they discriminate less and tend to choose the opposite-gender candidate. This result contradicts with the results from Hypothesis 1 where female subjects discriminate more by favouring their

ingroup members. These two pieces of information together imply that female subjects may change their behaviour and become less discriminating under a zero-sum reward scenario. However, this change of behaviours is not consistent with other perceived legitimacy factors such as the belief that discrimination is widespread in Canada. Further research is required to explore and confirm its validity.

Race

Hypothesis 3 is supported in terms of race ingroup performance bias. The significance of the interaction terms between race status and the perceived legitimacy factors was mainly due to the strong and consistent behavioural patterns of the Caucasian group. The ingroup biasing behaviours of the high status Caucasian subjects could be explained by their perceptions of employment equity programs. Results show that if they perceive such programs as illegitimate, they will protect their status quo by favouring the same-race candidate. For those Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity programs as legitimate tend to discriminate less. This confirms the social identity theory notion that perceived illegitimacy of the status change process will intensify intergroup discriminations (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Together with the mild discriminating behaviour of non-Caucasian subjects after controlling for the interacting terms and control variables, employment equity programs create a new source of tension between the ethnic groups. The high status Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate are highly discriminating while non-Caucasian subjects attempt to improve their group status by favouring their ingroup members.

Hypothesis 3 is not supported in terms of race outgroup performance differentiation. Neither the interaction terms nor the main effect status and perceived legitimacy factors explained the race outgroup performance differentiation variable.

Similarly Hypothesis 3 is not supported in terms of same-race candidate selection. The result was contrary to what was hypothesized. Although the individual interaction term between race status and the perceived legitimacy factor of the systemic nature of employment equity programs was significant, results of both the Caucasian and non-Caucasian groups did not achieve significance. This result, which is similar to the behavioral pattern of female subjects under the zero-sum reward scenario, suggests that behavioural patterns may change in a zero-sum reward scenario. Further research is necessary to determine if the social identity theory framework can explain both types of reward scenarios.

The perceived legitimacy factor - discrimination is a widespread phenomenon in Canada - was a significant predictor of same-race candidate selection. This was mainly due to the consistent behaviour of the Caucasian subject group which confirmed the a priori hypothesis. The reason why the interaction effect between race status and this factor is not significant is the inconsistent behavioural pattern of the non-Caucasian subjects.

Gender vs. Race

Results from Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 3 show that female subjects discriminate more. Perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs is not an issue between the two gender groups. This implies

that the high status male group does not feel threatened by the collective enhancement of the female group and there is no protective behaviours by discrimination against female subjects. They either accept or feel indifferent to employment equity programs and therefore the perceived legitimacy factors can hardly differentiate their behaviours. The female group makes use of the collective channel to enhance their group status by favouring female candidates. Fear of stigmatization is not reflected in this study as there is no sign that female subjects who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate will either lessen their ingroup biasing or increase their outgroup differentiating behaviours. The impact of employment equity programs on the intergroup relationship between male and female groups is mild. Both groups accept the difference of status and the necessity of allowing the low status female group to advance.

The results of the race regression runs show a different picture. Perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs is a significant predictor of intergroup behaviours in the Caucasian group. These results confirm the findings of Ellemers et al. (1992, 1993) and Caddick (1982) that perceived illegitimacy will lead to increase intergroup discrimination. The ingroup biasing behaviours of those Caucasian subjects who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate reflect their status-protecting motivations. The views of these Caucasian subjects can be seen and heard as in the mass media (White, 1994; McLaughlin, 1994). There are claims of "reverse discrimination". On the other hand, the low status non-Caucasian group shows a weak trend of ingroup biasing. Perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs cannot differentiate the intergroup behaviours of non-Caucasian

subjects. However, it cannot be concluded that the non-Caucasian subjects accept the collective channel of advancement due to the multichotomous nature of the non-Caucasian group. Unless the research design enables the non-Caucasians to accurately identify the dynamics of the social categorization and social comparison processes, it is difficult to analyze the behavioural pattern of this group.

These results imply that employment equity programs pose threats to Caucasians and will endanger the intergroup relationship between the two ethnic groups (Caucasian and non-Caucasian). Instead of being perceived as a remedy for systemic discrimination of non-Caucasians, employment equity programs become an additional source of tension between the two groups. Its impact on race ingroup performance bias indicates that high status ethnic groups will favour their ingroup members in order to protect their group status. In other words, if the majority of the decision making groups involve only Caucasian employees who perceive employment equity programs as illegitimate, the organization will perpetually recruit and promote Caucasian workers.

Criterion Variables

Initially three criterion variables were established to measure the different aspects of intergroup discriminatory behaviour: ingroup bias, outgroup differentiation and same-gender or same-race candidate selection. Results of this study show that the a priori model explains the ingroup biasing behaviour of both the gender and ethnic groups better than the outgroup differentiating behaviour. Tajfel and Turner (1986) initially defined intergroup discrimination as ingroup bias which is an "omnipresent feature of intergroup relations" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986,

p. 13). They expanded their definition to: "ad hoc intergroup categorization leads to in-group favoritism and discrimination against the out-group" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, p. 14) without explaining the sufficient and necessary conditions for outgroup discrimination. Other studies used intergroup differentiation which measures the difference of rewards allocated to outgroup and ingroup members (Brown et al., 1986; Kelly, 1990). Intergroup differentiation consists of two actions: ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation. Outgroup differentiation is relatively unexplored in the literature. Results of this study show that outgroup differentiation is not determined by group status and perceived legitimacy of the change process. More research is necessary to determine what conditions will lead to outgroup differentiating behaviour. Further research on the relationship between outgroup differentiation and group status is also warranted.

The correlations among the dependent variables are shown in Tables 5.2 & 5.3 . There is not a significant correlation between ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation in the non-zero sum reward situation among the gender or race dependent variables. However, same-gender or same-race candidate selection was positively correlated with ingroup bias and negatively correlated with outgroup differentiation. This implies that same-gender or same-race candidate selection consists of both ingroup bias and outgroup differentiation. Since outgroup differentiation was not explained satisfactorily by the a priori model, the predictive power of the a priori hypotheses on the candidate selection variables was affected.

Table 5.2

Correlations among gender dependent variables (2-tailed test)

	GIPB	GOPD	SGCS
GIPB	1.0000		
GOPD	-0.0943	1.0000	
SGCS	0.5481***	-0.3961***	1.0000

* p < 0.10   ** p < 0.05   *** p < 0.01

GIPB = gender ingroup performance bias

GOPD = gender outgroup differentiation

SGCS = same-gender candidate selection

Table 5.3

Correlations among race dependent variables (2-tailed test)

	RIPB	ROPD	SRCS
RIPB	1.0000		
ROPD	-0.1213	1.0000	
SRCS	0.5208***	-0.5640***	1.0000

* p < 0.10   ** p < 0.05   *** p < 0.01

RIPB = race ingroup performance bias

ROPD = race outgroup performance differentiation

SRCS = same-race candidate selection

Control Variables

A number of regression control variables were found to be significant. There were no a priori hypotheses for these variables since some of them were exploratory. The significant ones are discussed in this section.

Work Status

The weekly number of hours worked in the current job was a significant predictor in a number of the regression runs. A large number of hours worked in a week implies that the subject is a full-time worker and a part-time student while a low number implies that the subject is a part-time worker and a full-time student. This variable was significant in predicting the same-gender candidate selection variable. The results indicate that full-time workers tend to discriminate less. One argument is that full-time workers may have more intergroup experiences so that they understand more about intergroup discrimination. However, the full-time workers in this sample may not be representative of the work force. These full-time workers who are also part-time students represent a section of the work force which is self-motivated and enthusiastic about learning. As a result, the argument that full-time workers are different from full-time students remains to be verified.

Age

Age was a significant predictor when Hypothesis 3 was tested. Since older subjects gave higher performance ratings to both the same-race and opposite-race candidates, it can only be concluded that older

subjects are more lenient in ratings of all the candidates. There is no evidence a subject's age can predict intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours.

Place of Birth

There are potential interaction effects between the race status variable and whether subjects were born in Canada as shown by both the Caucasian and non-Caucasian subjects in selecting the same-race candidate. Results show that Caucasian subjects who were born in Canada as well as non-Caucasian subjects who are not born in Canada discriminate more by selecting same-race candidates. In other words, Caucasians who were not born in Canada are less discriminating. This result is supported by the comments of a Caucasian subject who was a new immigrant from Eastern Europe. He stated that he faced the same language barrier as other visible minorities. He did not identify himself as a high status Caucasian. These "invisible minorities" are often overlooked and not mentioned in employment equity programs. On the other hand, non-Caucasians who are born in Canada are less discriminating. These subjects tend to have identity problems as their colour of skin shows their ethnicity but they may not identify themselves with their ethnic group. In other words, they do not categorize themselves as members of a low status group. Apparently this conflict between self-perceived and objective group membership lowers their discriminating tendency. More research is necessary to examine the dynamics of social categorizations for this group. In terms of future

research, it may be more meaningful to explore the interaction between the race status variable and place of birth[1].

Applications

The impact of gender or race status variables on the ingroup biasing behaviour implies that there is an inherent nature for people to favour their ingroup members. In particular, members from lower status groups exhibit stronger tendencies when collective channels of advancement are probable. This result indicates that it will be desirable to have members of different gender and race in decision making groups to break this inherent nature. Although the low status group members are more ingroup biased, high status groups share the same behaviour but to a lesser extent. In an organizational context where a "glass ceiling" exists, it is important to have a well-balanced top management decision making group so that there will not be a perpetual dominance of one group. Legislated actions such as employment equity programs help to break this pattern.

The second interesting finding is that the discriminatory attitudes and behaviours of members, in particular the high status Caucasian group, are affected by the interaction between status and perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs. As predicted by Hypothesis 3, when high status group members feel threatened by employment

---

[1] Another possibility is to explore the interaction between group status and the length of residency which is not included in this study due to its high correlation with the place of birth variable.

equity programs, they try to protect their status quo by favouring their ingroup members. On the other hand, the low status groups do not show consistent patterns of behaviour regarding perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs. Apparently the fear of stigmatization is not a major concern for this sample group. In order to reduce intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours, organizations should inform, educate and train the high status workers about the legitimacy of employment equity programs. The following items should be included in the discussion:

- the purpose of employment equity programs is to remove systemic discrimination which is due to company policies but not individual employees who are at the top of the hierarchy

- the reality that the designated four groups are still under-employed when compared to their availability and population percentages

- performance is still a valid criterion in recruitment, promotion and training opportunities

Limitations of this Study

Student Population

In this study, students were used as the sample population. It can be argued that students may not be representative of the work force. Most of their past work experience is part-time and therefore they do not have extensive experience with employment equity programs. In this study, additional variables such as the number of hours worked in a typical week and the self-rated knowledge of employment equity programs were added to control for work and program variance among

the students sampled. This was particularly important given that results showed that work status was significant in predicting same-gender candidate selection. Full-time workers tended to discriminate less by selecting the opposite-gender candidate. However, it is not certain whether this result can be extended to the general work force as full-time workers who study part time may not be a representative sample. They may represent only the high achievers in the work force who have chosen to strengthen their academic knowledge.

Second, the composition of the student population is different from that of the general work force. There were a number of international visa students who come to Canada to study and this cannot be found in the actual work force. After graduation, these students will return to their home country to work. These visa students do not have a direct need to understand the intergroup relationships in the work place in Canada, and may not have the urge to understand employment equity programs. A faculty administrator estimated that international visa students make up less than 10% of the student population in business administration (Hamblin, 1994). As a result, their impact is limited.

On the other hand, it can be argued that basic values and attitudes are formed early in the socialization process. Education can also alter these basic values and attitudes. Opinions formed during the university years will remain unless there are strong disconfirming experiences or re-education at the work place (Cushner & Trifonovitch, 1989). As a result, the student population can be representative in terms of attitudes and opinions towards employment equity programs. In this study, the analysis focused on general attitudes about employment equity programs as well as beliefs on the nature and spread

of discrimination in Canada. These attitudes have an important impact on perceptions of employment equity programs. When interacting with the status variables, perceived legitimacy factors such as "discrimination is widespread in Canada" and "the systemic nature of discrimination" were stronger predictors of the discriminatory attitudes and behaviours than the "employment equity programs are effective" variable.

As a result, I would argue that a student population may be weak in the actual experiences of employment equity programs, but students are representative in terms of their general attitude and opinions on discrimination issues. A replication of this study using an organization sample would verify this argument.

Survey Response

The response rate of over 30% is acceptable. However, the sample size of 98 was barely acceptable to test Hypothesis 3 when 13 independent variables, including interaction terms, were used. The power of the model is therefore somewhat limited.

Political Correctness

The political correctness of systemic discrimination remains an issue. Some subjects were able to recognize the purpose of the study even though I labelled it as "Employment Decision Making Survey". The students might have given socially desirable answers.

In this study, I used several methods to minimize the potential political correctness bias. Hypothetical cases (Appendix A, Part B) and attitude rating questions (Appendix A, Part C & D) were used to avoid directly mentioning discrimination as the construct. In addition, strict

confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed so that no individual subject could be identified.

Future Research

Constructs

There are a few areas that can be improved upon in order to further disentangle the relationship between status, group identity, perceived legitimacy of employment equity programs, ingroup bias, outgroup differentiation and same-gender or same-race candidate selection.

First, the constructs of group identity and perceived legitimacy need to be further reviewed and tested. The components of gender and ethnic group identity are not certain at this point. An examination of their group ideologies is one possible direction. More research is necessary to determine whether group identity is unique to each group context. The essential elements of this construct also remain to be determined.

Second, the perceived legitimacy variable needs to be studied further to verify its external validity. The perceived legitimacy construct is a new variable designed for the purpose of this study. Although the reliability test (Cronbach's alpha) indicated acceptable internal consistency, further validation is necessary.

Third, alternative dependent variables should be considered. Hypothetical cases were created for the purpose of this study to measure intergroup discriminatory attitudes and behaviours (Appendix A , Part B). Range restriction problems in the dependent variables occurred in this

study from making the two characters in each case comparable in terms of their performances. Since these limited dependent variables were based on one single question to determine its value, a range restriction problem led to unstable results when ordinary least square regression procedures were used (i.e., violation of the normality requirement of the dependent variables). In order to remedy the range restriction situation, the seven categories were collapsed into two categories and logistical regression procedures were used. This approach may contributed to a loss of variance in the dependent variables.

Range restriction problems may be reduced by using the Heilman, Block and Lucas (1992) approach which involves adjectives with semantic differential scales. They asked subjects to select a representative candidate and to describe the candidate in terms of specific adjectives. In this way, a scale is created which avoids the limited dependent variable problem and ordinary least square regression procedures can be used.

Organization Sample

A replication of this study using an organization sample will serve at least two purposes. First whether the validity of the constructs can be examined. Second, whether the student population is a valid sample for studying social identity theory.

Race Status

The race variable needs closer examination. The multi-chotomous nature of ethnicity required further development of the ingroup and outgroup constructs. Future research should provide a more

comprehensive choice of ethnicity and subjects should be asked to indicate their identity with their specified ethnic group, not only Caucasians or non-Caucasians. This arrangement will facilitate a better measure of group identities. For instance, a Japanese person may be proud of his or her ethnicity but may not identify with the non-Caucasian group as a whole.

The interaction between race and place of birth is an interesting finding in this study that requires further testing. This interaction relates to the dynamics of the self-identification process. A person may feel that he or she belongs to an ethnic group because of his or her place of birth, place of upbringing, colour of skin, location of residence, the length of stay in the above places or an interaction or even a mixture of the above. The actual process requires further examination. This issue is related to the group identity construct as there are unique contextual factors in ethnic groups that make them different from other work groups, such as occupational groups or departments, in the work place.

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYMENT DECISION MAKING SURVEY

Please read the information sheet before completing this questionnaire

Return this questionnaire by **June 30** to :

Dora Lau

Faculty of Business Administration

WMX 3349 (Mailroom)

Simon Fraser University

Burnaby, B.C.

V5A 1S6

INFORMATION SHEET

The purpose of this survey is to discover how organizations' employment decision policies influence students' attitudes and behaviours. You are asked to fill out a questionnaire that will help me better understand these relationships. This information will help organizations better understand and modify their policies. The findings of this study will be used as part of my MBA thesis and they will be available upon request.

The questionnaire is brief, and will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Since some questions deal with your thoughts, feelings and emotions, there may be some questions that you may feel uncomfortable answering. You may choose not to answer these questions, and you may withdraw from the survey at any time. Unanswered questions or withdrawal from the survey will not count against you. **Completing the questionnaires is strictly voluntary and is not related to your performance in this course.**

All information provided will remain confidential. All survey results will be reported in an aggregate form to ensure that personal information will not be associated with your answers. Safe destruction of the survey data is assured after the research project is completed. Should you have a question about the survey, feel free to contact Dora Lau at 291-4728 or through email (doral@sfu.ca). If you have any concerns about the survey, please advise me or register your complaint with Stanley Shapiro, Dean of the Faculty of Business Administration .

PART A

Please check the appropriate answer:

1. Your Gender :   _____ Female   _____ Male

2. Your Ethnic Origin :   _____ Aboriginal   _____ African   _____ Asian

    _____ Caucasian   _____ Mixed Heritage   _____ Other

3. How long have you been living in Canada?

    _____ since birth   _____ 4 - 6 years

    _____ less than 1 year   _____ more than 6 years

    _____ 1 - 3 years

4. What is your age group?

    _____ 17 years or less   _____ 36-45 years

    _____ 18-25 years   _____ 46 or more years

    _____ 26-35 years

5. From which course did you receive this questionnaire?

    BUS _____

6. Do you have current or past work experience (excluding voluntary services) ?

    _____ Yes   _____ No

    [If your answer is "No", please go to Part B on page 4]

7. Are you currently employed?

    _____ Yes   _____ No

    [If your answer is "No", please go to Part B on page 4]

8. How many hours do you work in your current job in a typical week?

    _____ 0 - 10 hours   _____ 31 - 40 hours

    _____ 11 - 20 hours   _____ 41 - 50 hours

    _____ 21 - 30 hours   _____ more than 50 hours

PART B

The following two cases are based on typical employment decision making situations in a Canadian department store called ABC Limited. After reading each case carefully, please mark the appropriate answer for each question.

CASE #1

There is an opening for a Store Manager position. The Store Manager is responsible for the entire ABC department store in the Paradise shopping mall. This mid-size store employs 400-500 employees and is very profitable due to its central location and wealthy neighbourhood. Two employees from different stores have applied for the job. Both employees are fully qualified for the position and have excellent performance ratings on their performance appraisals.

The first candidate Peter has 2 years work experience in the Paradise Shopping Mall store. He is currently the manager of the toys section which contributes significantly to the store's profitability. Before joining ABC Limited 2 years ago, Peter worked as a sales manager in a national retail toy store where he was recognized as a successful manager as his store had the highest sales volume among other comparable toy stores in the province.

The second candidate Jane has worked at ABC Limited for 10 years. She is currently the manager of the sportswear section at the Hillside Shopping Mall. This store is relatively small and employs around 200 employees. Although the store clientele is not as wealthy as those of the Paradise Shopping Mall, its profitability is very good due to its successful marketing strategies. She started as a salesperson and was promoted through the ranks. During her years at ABC Limited, Jane has worked through different sections including apparels, shoes, toys, and gifts as well as stores of various sizes before reaching her current position.

1. Who would you select for the position? _____ Peter _____ Jane
   Please explain briefly for your choice : _____

2. How would you rate Peter's future performance as a Store Manager?
   Ineffective   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Effective

3. How would you rate Jane's future performance as a Store Manager?
   Ineffective   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Effective

PART B (continued)

CASE #2

There is a training opportunity for one salesperson in the ABC store at the University Shopping Mall. This off-site seminar trains salespersons who have potential for advancing to a supervisory position in the store. The content of the seminar includes sales techniques, inventory management and work ethics. There are two salespersons, Ming-wah and Philip, who are eligible to participate in this training seminar. Their performance appraisals revealed that both of them have similar performance records.

The first candidate Ming-wah is a quiet, hardworking and responsible worker. However, he is explicit about his preference not to participate in social activities which are not part of his work duties. The second candidate Philip is friendly, outgoing and sociable. Most of his co-workers like him. However, Philip is occasionally late for work and sometimes careless.

1. Who would you select to go to the training seminar?

   _____ Ming-wah   _____ Philip   ·

   Please explain briefly for you choice: _____

   _____

2. If Ming-wah is promoted to the supervisory position, how would you rate his future performance?

   Ineffective   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Effective

3. If Philip is promoted to the supervisory position, what would you rate his future performance?

   Ineffective   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Effective

PART C

Section 1

1. Have you heard about Employment Equity Programs ?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

2. How would you rate your knowledge with employment equity programs?

1	2	3	4	5
No Knowledge	Limited Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Extensive Knowledge	Very Extensive Knowledge

3. How would you rate your experience with employment equity programs?

1	2	3	4	5
No Experience	Limited Experience	Some Experience	Extensive Experience	Very Extensive Experience

4. Do you belong to one of the four groups who are eligible for coverage under the Employment Equity Program?
   _____ Yes   _____ No   _____ Do Not Know

5. Are there any employment equity programs at the organization that you currently or have recently worked?
   _____ Yes   _____ No   _____ Do Not Know

PART C (continued)

Section 2

Using the following scale, please *circle* the appropriate number beside each of the statements to indicate your preference.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Completely	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Slightly	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree Slightly	Agree Strongly	Agree Completely

	Disagree completely				Agree completely		
1. Many workers suffer from discrimination due to their gender and/or ethnic origin in the work place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Discrimination in the work place is a common phenomenon in Canada.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Gender and/or ethnic discrimination in the work place is mainly due to faults of individuals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Gender and/or ethnic discrimination in the work place is mainly due to company policies and rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section 3

Using the following scale, please *circle* the appropriate number beside each of the statements to indicate your preference. *If you do not know the answer, please circle '0'.*

	Disagree completely				Agree completely			Do not know
1. An employment equity program has a significant impact on my promotion and/or training opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
2. Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for reducing workplace discrimination.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
3. Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for increasing female representation in the work place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
4. Employment equity programs are effective mechanisms for increasing the representation of visible minorities in the work place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
5. In order to increase female and/or visible minority representation in the work place, it is fair to give them preference for promotion and training opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0

PART D

*If you are not currently employed and have no past work experience, please go to page #
10.*

Otherwise, for **FEMALE** *students, please complete Section 1 on this page; and for*
MALE *students, please complete Section 2 on this page.* Refer to your most recent work
experience when answering these questions. Please *circle* a number provided beside each
of the statements below using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Completely	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Slightly	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree Slightly	Agree Strongly	Agree Completely

Section 1 (for female students only)   Disagree   Agree
                                                  completely   completely

1. I am glad to be a female worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I am a typical female worker in this organization.˙   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I try to hide my female identity in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I am proud to be a female worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I am not comfortable to admit that I am a female
   worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. There are many female workers who influence
   my thoughts and behaviour.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Most of my best friends are females.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Section 2 (for male students only)   Disagree   Agree
                                                 completely   completely

1. I am glad to be a male worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I am a typical male worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I try to hide my male identity in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I am proud to be a male worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I am not comfortable to admit that I am a male
   worker in this organization.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. There are many male workers who influence
   my thoughts and behaviour.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Most of my best friends are males.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PART D (continued)

For **_CAUCASIAN_** students, please complete Section 3 on this page; and for **_NON-_**
CAUCASIAN students, please complete Section 4 on this page. Refer to your most
recent work experience when answering these questions. Please *circle* a number provided
beside each of the statements below using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Agree	Agree
Completely	Strongly	Slightly	Agree nor	Slightly	Strongly	Completely
			Disagree			

Section 3 (for Caucasian students only)	Disagree completely					Agree completely	
1. I am glad to be a Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am a typical Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I try to hide my Caucasian identity in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am proud to be a Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I am not comfortable to admit that I am a Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. There are many Caucasian workers who influence my thoughts and behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Most of my best friends are Caucasians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section 4 (for Non-Caucasian students only)	Disagree completely					Agree completely	
1. I am glad to be a Non-Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am a typical Non-Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I try to hide my Non-Caucasian identity in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am proud to be a Non-Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I am not comfortable to admit that I am a Non-Caucasian worker in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. There are many Non-Caucasian workers who influence my thoughts and behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Most of my best friends are Non-Caucasians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Thank you. You have completed the questionnaire.

If you have any comments that you would like to make concerning the questionnaire, please use this page for that purpose or you may send a separate letter. Also, any other ideas that you think may help us to understand how you perceive employment equity programs and their impact will be appreciated.

Your contribution to this research study is greatly appreciated.

COMMENTS:

FORM 1A2A

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF ALL VARIABLES

Variables	Acronyms	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Gender status	MALE	0.46	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Race status	CAUCASN	0.41	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Gender identity	GENDERID	5.02	0.89	2.71 - 7.00
Race identity	RACEID	4.90	0.93	2.43 - 6.86
Employment equity programs are effective	EEPEFF	4.25	0.95	1.60 - 7.00
Discrimination is widespread	DSCRWIDE	4.90	1.18	1.50 - 7.00
Individual nature of discrimination	INDIVDL	3.51	1.81	1.00 - 7.00
Systemic nature of discrimination	SYSTEMIC	3.61	1.48	1.00 - 7.00
Age	AGE	1.23	.055	1.00 - 4.00
Knowledge of employment equity programs	EEPKNOW	2.41	0.98	1.00 - 5.00
Work Status	NOWJOB	1.57	1.79	0.00 - 6.00
Place of Birth	BORNINC	0.49	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Gender ingroup performance bias	GIPB	0.51	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Gender outgroup performance differentiation	GOPD	0.42	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Same-gender candidate selection	SGCS	0.60	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Race ingroup performance bias	RIPB	0.57	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Race outgroup performance differentiation	ROPD	0.51	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Same-race candidate selection	SRCS	0.53	0.50	0.00 - 1.00

Value Labels

MALE :   1 = male subjects
                    0 = female subjects

CAUCASN :   1 = Caucasian subjects
                    0 = non-Caucasian subjects

AGE :   4 = 46 or more years
                    3 = 36 - 45 years
                    2 = 26 - 35 years
                    1 = 18 - 25 years
                    0 = 17 years or less

EEPKNOW :   5 = very extensive knowledge
                    4 = extensive knowledge
                    3 = some knowledge
                    2 = limited knowledge
                    1 = no knowledge

NOWJOB :   6 = work more than 50 hours in current job per week
                   5 = work 41 - 50 hours in current job per week
                   4 = work 31 - 40 hours in current job per week
                   3 = work 21 - 30 hours in current job per week
                   2 = work 11 - 20 hours in current job per week
                   1 = work 0 - 10 hours in current job per week
                   0 = do not work currently

BORNINC :   1 = born in Canada
                    0 = not born in Canada

GIPB, GOPD, RIPB, ROPD :   1 = more effective performance
                            0 = less effective performance

SGCS :   1 = select same-gender candidate
                    0 = select opposite gender candidate

SRCS :   1 = select same-race candidate
                    0 = select opposite-race candidate

APPENDIX C

Correlations among Independent Variables (2-tailed test)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. MALE											
2. CAUCASN	.068										
3. GENDERID	-.070	.052									
4. RACEID	.053	.267*	.528**								
5. EEPEFF	-.118	-.387**	-.065	-.164							
6. DSCRWIDE	-.343**	.072	-.060	.024	.128						
7. INDIVDL	-.011	-.040	.048	.013	.051	-.132					
8. SYSTEMIC	-.005	-.033	.116	-.074	.135	.151	-.121				
9. AGE	-.014	.250*	-.123	.039	-.052	.075	.042	-.053			
10. EEPKNOW	.134	.320*	.003	.070	-.061	-.021	.062	-.033	.261*		
11. NOWJOB	-.036	.200	-.097	.120	-.047	.104	-.023	-.029	.213*	.125	
12. BORNINC	.039	.515**	.103	.448**	-.366**	.138	-.110	.053	-.096	.118	.075

* p < .05   ** p < .01

List of References

Abella, R. S. (1984). <u>Report of the Commission on Equality in Employment</u>, Ottawa: Supply & Services Canada.

<u>Adoption by Four Agencies of Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures</u> (1978). Volume 43 Federal Register 166, Section II (August 25). Washington, D.C.: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labour, and Department of Justice.

Alderfer, C. P. (1991). Changing race relations in organizations: a critique of the contact hypothesis, <u>Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences,</u> 8(2), 80-89.

Azzi, A. E. (1993). Implicit and category-based allocations of decision-making power in majority-minority relations. <u>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,</u> 29, 203-228.

Benimadhu, P and Wright, R. (1992). <u>Implementing Employment Equity: A Canadian Experience</u>. Ottawa: The Conference Board of Canada Report 94-92, .

Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller and M.B. Brewer (Ed.), <u>Groups in Contact: the Psychology of Desegregation</u>. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc.

Bornman, E. and Mynhardt, J. C. (1991). Social identity and intergroup contact in South Africa with specific reference to the work situation. <u>Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs,</u> 117(4), 437-462.

Bourhis, R. Y. and Hill, P. (1982). Intergroup perceptions in British higher education: a field study. In H. Tajfel (Ed.) <u>Social Identity and Intergroup Relatons</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bresler, J. B. (1989). The complexities of Affirmative Action. <u>USA Today, September</u>, 7.

Brewer, M. B. and Miller, N. (1984a). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller and M.B. Brewer (Ed.), <u>Groups in Contact: the Psychology of Desegregation</u>. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc.

Brewer, M.B. and Miller, N. (1984b). The social psychology of desegregation: an introduction. In N. Miller and M.B. Brewer (Ed.), <u>Groups in Contact: the Psychology of Desegregation</u>. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc.

Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews A., Wade, G. and Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59(4), 273-286.

Caddick, B. (1982). Perceived illegitimacy and intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), Social Identity and Intergroup Relations. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Casella, E. (1993). Ontario passes employment equity law. The Vancouver Sun, December 10, A1.

Chabursky, L. (1992). The Employment Equity Act: an examination of its development and direction. Ottawa Law Review, 24(2), 305-362.

Chong, G. J. (1994). Employment equity poisons relationships. The Financial Post, January 1, S4.

Comer, J. P. (1980). School Power: Implications of an Intervention Project. New York: The Free Press, .

Compliance Responsibility for Equal Employment Opportunity: Consolidation of Functions Pursuant to Executive Order 12086 (1978). Volume 43 Federal Register 204, 60-2.12 (October 20). Washington, D.C. : Department of Labour, and Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program.

Cushner, K. and Trifonovitch, G. (1989). Understanding misunderstanding: barriers to dealing with diversity. Social Education, September, 318-322.

Dickson, R. D. (1992). The Business of Equal Opportunity. Harvard Business Review, January - February, 46-53.

Ellemers, N., Jan Doosje, B., Van Knippenberg, A. and Wilke, H. (1992). Status protection in high status minority groups. European Journal of Social Psychology, 22(2), 123-140.

Ellemers, N., Wilke, H. and Van Knippenberg A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective status-enhancement strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64(5), 766-778.

Ellemers, N., Van Knippenberg, A., Devries, N. and Wilke, H. (1988). Social identification and permeability of group boundaries. European Journal of Social Psychology, 18(6), 497-513.

Emory, C. W. and Cooper, D. R. (1991). Business Research Methods. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 4th edition.

Employment and Immigration Canada (1987). Employment Equity Act, Regulations and Schedules. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Employment and Immigration Canada (1990). Employment Equity Act: 1990 Annual Report. Ottawa: Supply & Services Canada.

Fleras, A. and Elliott, J. L. (1992). Multuralism in Canada: The Challenge of Diversity. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

Fromkin, H. L. and Sherwood, J. J. (Ed.) (1974). Integrating the Organization: a Social Psychological Analysis. New York: The Free Press.

Galen, M. and Palmer, A. T. (1994). White, male, and worried. Business Week, January 31, 50-55.

Hall, P. A. (1991). Against our best interests: an ambivalent view of affirmative action. American Libraries, October, 898-902.

Hamblin, C., Administrator of the undergraduate program of the Faculty of Business Administration at Simon Fraser University (1994). Telephone interview by author, October 11, Vancouver.

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

Hinkle, S., Taylor, L.A., and Fox-Cardamone D. L. (1989). Intragroup identification and intergroup differentiation: A multicomponent approach. British Journal of Social Psychology, 28(4), 305-317.

Islam, M. R. and Hewstone, M. (1993). Intergroup attributions and affective consequences in majority and minority groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64(6), 936-950.

Jaccard, J., Turrisi, R. and Wan, C. K. (1990). Interaction effects in multiple regression. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Jackson, B.W., LaFasto, F., Schultz, H. G. and Kelly, D. (1993). Diversity. Human Resource Management, 31(1&2), 21-34.

Jeffs, A. (1993). Notion of cultural diversity rejected by most Canadians. The Vancouver Sun, December 14, A5.

Karasawa, M. (1991). Toward an assessment of social identity: the structure of group identification and its effects on in-group evaluations. British Journal of Social Psychology, 30(4), 293-307.

Kelly, C. (1990). Social identity and intergroup perceptions in minority-majority contexts. Human Relations, 43(6), 583-599.

Kirchmeyer, C. and McLellan, J. (1991). Capitalizing on ethnic diversity: an approach to managing the diverse workgroups of the 1990s. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 8(2), 72-79.

Konrad, A.M. and Linnehan, F. (1992). The implementation and effectiveness of Equal Opportunity Employment. Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings, Las Vegas: Academy of Management, 380-389.

Kumar, N., Stern, L. W. and Anderson, J. C. (1993). Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. Academy of Management Journal, 36(6), 1633-1651.

Leck, J. D. and Saunders, D. M. (1992). Hiring women: the effects of Canada's Employment Equity Act. Canadian Public Policy, 18(2), 203-220.

Marr, W. L. (1992). Post-war Canadian immigration patterns. In S. Globerman (Ed.) The Immigration Dilemma. Vancouver, Canada: The Fraser Institute.

McDermott, P. (1992). Employment equity and pay equity. Canadian Woman Studies, 12(3), 24-27.

McLaughlin, G. (1994) Cashing in on the Equity Boom. The Financial Post Magazine, September, 20-25.

Michaelsen, L. K., Watson, W. E. and Kumer, K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: comparing homogenous and diverse task groups. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 590-602.

Mighty, E. J. (1991). Valuing workforce diversity: A model of organizational change. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 8(2), 64-70.

Miller, F. A. (1991). Moving a team to multiculturalism. Revision of an article printed in Team Building: Blueprints for Productivity and Satisfaction. NTL Institute for Applied Behavioural Science and University Associates, Inc. 1988.

Monroe, S. (1991). Does affirmative action help or hurt? Time, May 27, 22-23.

Morito, A., Reingold, M. and Shiromura, M. (1986). Akio Morita and Sony. New Yori: Dutton.

Morrison, A. M. (1992). The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., Van Velsor, E., and the Center for Creative Leadership (1992). Breaking Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations? Reading, Mass.:Addison-Wesley Publishing Company (updated edition).

Mullen, B., Brown, R. and Smith, C. (1991). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance and status: an integration. European Journal of Social Psychology, 22(2), 103-122.

Oaker G., and Brown, R. (1986). Intergroup relations in a hospital setting: A further test of social identity theory. Human Relations, 39(8), 767-778.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research: explanation and prediction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (2nd edition).

Reguly, E. (1993). Ford opens doors to women. The Financial Post, July 10, 1993, 8.

Rutherglen, G. (1992). After affirmation action: Conditions and consequences of ending preferences in employment. University of Illinois Law Review, 2, 339-366.

Sachdev, I. and Bourhis, R. Y. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. European Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 1-24.

Solomon, C. M. (1989). The coporate response to work force diversity. Personnel Journal, 68(8), 43-53.

Statistics Canada (1993a). Age, Sex & Marital Status - The Nation. 91 Census: 93-310. Ontario: Minister of the Industry, Science and Technology.

Statistics Canada (1993b). Immigration & Citizenship - The Nation. 91 Census: 93-316. Ontario: Minister of the Industry, Science and Technology.

Statistics Canada (1993c). Labour Force Activity - The Nation. 91 Census: 93-324. Ontario: Minister of the Industry, Science and Technology.

Statistics Canada (1993d). Occupation - The Nation. 91 Census: 93-327. Ontario: Minister of the Industry, Science and Technology.

Taifel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (Ed.) Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Tsui, A.S. and Ashford, S. J. (1991). Reactions to demographic diversity: similarity-attraction or self-regulation. Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings. Miami: Academy of Management.

White, J. (1994). Employment equity may increase ethnic strife. Financial Post, September 3, S4.