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Abstract

Two studies were designed to investigate the relations among ethnic group membership, ethnic group identification, group based-appraisals, and group-based emotions in determining behavioral tendencies of support and opposition toward diversity initiatives. The two studies confronted participants with the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based procedure. The first study assessed reactions of whites to the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based or a merit-based policy. The second study compared reactions of white and ethnic minorities to the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based policy. The results of the first study showed that white participants appraised a diversity-based hiring decision as significantly more harmful to the ingroup and unjust which in turn engendered greater feelings of anger toward and shame about the diversity policy rather than the merit based policy, and more stated intentional opposition to the policy. Study 2 revealed that whites’ appraisal of the diversity-based policy as unjust and as harmful to the ingroup lead to stronger intentions to oppose because whites felt angry about it. Minorities’ appraisals of the diversity-based policy as harmful to the ingroup lead to stronger intentional opposition because they felt ashamed about it, and appraisals of the policy as unjust also lead to intention to oppose because they felt low pride about it. In both studies we provide evidence that ethnic group identification acted as a moderator of the predictive effect of emotions on behavioral intentions toward the diversity-based hire. Results are discussed within an intergroup emotion theory framework.
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The identification of a business case for diversity in the mid 90’s clearly positioned diversity management as a strategic issue with important positive consequences for individual, team and organizational outcomes (Cox, 1993). Yet, more than ten years later one of the most pressing concerns for organizations implementing diversity initiatives remains how to deal with negative affective reactions and overall resistance (Wentling & Palmas Rivas, 2000; Soni, 2000; Karp & Sammour, 2000). Accordingly, the managerial and practitioner oriented diversity literature has proposed concrete ways in which organizations can move from a resistance to a learning - and - integration approach to diversity through changes to organizational culture and human resource practices (Dass & Parker, 1999; Thomas & Ely, 1996). Unfortunately, as noted by Dick and Cassell (2002: 972) “resistance, as it is used in the diversity literature, implies that those wishing to change the status quo through diversity initiatives are correct and those who, for whatever reason are opposed or indifferent to such initiatives are wrong”. A potential risk for organizations and researchers that end up equating “resistance to diversity initiatives” with “wrong organizational behavior” is that it may distract them from asking the question of what is being expressed through resistance. In other words, it may lead researchers to neglect important and useful information about differences in interpretations and feelings about diversity initiatives as held by different organizational members.

The psychological antecedents of resistance to diversity initiatives has been of course the focus of much research (for reviews see Crosby, Iyer, Clayton, & Dowing, 2003; Harrison, Kravitz, Mayer, Leslie, & Lev-Arey, 2006; also see publications by the American Psychological Association, 2003, and the Society for Industrial and
Organizational Psychology, 1996; Taylor-Carter, Doverspike & Cook, 1995). However, little is still know about the nature and role of discrete emotions as antecedents of reactions to diversity initiatives (Ashkanasy, Härtel & Daus, 2002; Parker, Baltes, & Christiansen, 1997). The few experimental studies that have examined affective reactions to initiatives like preferential selection and affirmative action have measured general attitudes (Kravitz, 1995) or positive/negative affect (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992) and have rarely measured discrete emotion.

Notable exceptions are the work of Swim and Miller (1999) and Iyer, Leach, and Crosby (2003) investigating the way in which group-based emotion (White guilt) was related to support to affirmative action for African Americans. Swim and Miller (1999) predicted and found that White Americans’ beliefs about discrimination and White privilege lead to support for affirmative action because of White guilt. Iyer et al (2003) found similar results. But more interestingly, they also found that two specific group-based emotions (white guilt and sympathy toward blacks) predicted in turn support for two different forms of affirmative action (support of compensatory affirmative action policies; support of equal opportunity affirmative action policies). More recently, Leach, Iyer and Pedersen (2006, 2007) extended these findings in the Australian context by showing that non-Aborigines appraisals of ingroup-disadvantage compared to Aborigines was strongly associated with anger, which in turn was predictive of opposition to Australian government restitution to Aborigines. Interestingly, non-Aborigines appraisals of ingroup-advantage were also strongly associated with anger, but this time anger was predictive of support to Australian government restitution to Aborigines.
In line with this emerging body of research we report results of two studies that apply Intergroup Emotion Theory (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000) to investigate to what extent individuals’ ethnic group memberships (e.g., whites, minorities) and ethnic/racial group identification affect group-based appraisals (e.g., harm/benefit to ingroup, justice) and emotions (e.g., anger, envy, shame, respect, pride) that in turn produce differentiated behavioral tendencies of opposition and support toward diversity initiatives.

Intergroup Emotion Theory

Intergroup Emotion Theory (IET; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1993; 1999) is based on the assumption that emotion can be an intergroup or group-membership based phenomenon. The major postulates are: 1) that individuals who identify as members of a social group appraise and interpret events as relevant not to the self but to their group membership; 2) that such group-based appraisals generate group-based emotion directed toward both the ingroup and relevant outgroups; and 3) that those group-based emotions in turn act as motivating conditions for ingroup directed or outgroup directed behaviors.

IET draws from the social identity approach (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Hogg & Abrams, 1993; Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994) and from appraisal theories of emotion (Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1984; Scherer, 1984a, 1984b, 2001; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985) to propose that when self categorization and social identification occurs, situations are appraised in terms of their consequences for the ingroup rather than in terms of personal consequences. The appraisal processes that generate group-based emotions are thought to be identical to appraisal processes that have been identified as
generating emotion for individuals, with the important difference that group-based appraisals involve the individual’s “social identity” instead of his or her “personal identity” (Smith, 1993; also see Garcia-Prieto & Scherer, 2006). Cognitive appraisal theories of emotion posit that emotions are experienced by individuals because an event has relevance to them as individuals, and similarly IET posits that group-based emotions are experienced by individual group members because an event has relevance to them as members of a social group. Group-based appraisals evaluate the implication of events or situations for the ingroup, rather than for the self. To put it simply, when a social identification is “switched on” it blurs the distinction between ourselves and the ingroup (Smith & Henry, 1996) and emotions are experienced on behalf of the ingroup. Because individuals vary in their level of identification with social groups, IET posits that the more an individual identifies with a group the more easily, frequently, and intensely he/she will experience positive group-based emotions directed toward the ingroup and negative group-based emotions directed toward outgroups (Smith et al., in press).

What are the consequences of experiencing group-based emotion for behavior? Just as the social identity approach argues that social identity made intergroup behavior possible (Turner, 1982), IET argues that group-based emotions regulate behavior directed toward the ingroup and outgroup. Just as emotion theory assumes that emotional responses are adaptive signals that prepare the individual to take action because a relevant event is occurring (Lazarus, 1991; Frijda, 1986), IET argues that group-based emotions are motivators of behavioral tendencies directed toward the ingroup or the outgroup. Particular group-based emotions make particular intergroup behaviors more or less
desirable and likely, and appear to both regulate and be regulated by actual occurrence of such behavior (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2007a and b; Smith et al., in press).

Intergroup Emotion Antecedents of Reactions toward Diversity Initiatives

IET offers a useful framework from which to make propositions about the group-based appraisal and emotion processes underlying reactions toward diversity initiatives. We assume that diversity initiatives can elicit group-based based appraisals and emotions. This assumption is based on past research which has clearly shown that group identifications derived from demographic group memberships like race/ethnicity and gender are important aspects of the self-concept affecting a whole range of work related attitudes and behaviors (for a review see Crosby, Iyer, Clayton, & Dowing, 2003; also see publications by the American Psychological Association, 2003; and Tsui & Gutek, 1999). More specifically, it is based on research suggesting that demographic group memberships affect reactions toward diversity management practices (Beaton & Tougas, 2001, Tougas & Beaton, 1993; Tougas & Veilleux, 1992), and that both the contextual salience of ingroup membership and the level of ingroup identification play major roles in determining when diversity can elicit positive and negative reactions at work (Spataro, 2003).

Building on this research, IET makes the following claims. First, individuals who identify themselves as members of particular demographic groups will appraise and interpret diversity initiatives as events relevant to that salient group membership. Second, the nature of those appraisals will in turn generate group-based emotions directed toward the diversity initiatives. And third, those emotions will in turn act as motivating
conditions for behaviors of support and opposition of those initiatives. Thus IET claims that support for or opposition to diversity measures will be a function of a relevant and salient group membership, moderated by degree of identification with that salient group membership, and mediated by group-relevant appraisals and emotions. In this way, IET holds the promise of greatly advancing our current understanding of why and when different demographic groups experience specific appraisals and emotions toward diversity initiatives in organizations and in what way these emotions lead to specific behavioral responses. Therefore, based on IET we propose that,

Proposition 1: When diversity claims make group membership (e.g., ethnicity) salient, the appraisals of those events for that group membership will determine distinct emotional reactions to those events. That is, group membership determines appraisals of and thus emotional reactions to different diversity initiatives.

Proposition 2: The more an individual identifies with salient group memberships the more likely he/she will appraise diversity initiatives in intergroup terms and thus the more intensely he/she will experience group-relevant emotions about them. That is, group identification moderates the impact of group membership on appraisal and emotion processes.

Proposition 3: Behavioral tendencies indicating support and opposition toward diversity initiatives will be motivated by specific appraisals through specific emotions. That is, effects of group membership on behavioral tendencies related to diversity initiatives will
be mediated by appraisals, and the effect of appraisals on behavior will be mediated by emotion.

Proposition 4: To the extent that individuals vary in their identification to their group memberships, group membership identification will moderate the impact of group membership on appraisal and emotional reactions to different diversity initiatives.

The proposed relationships between group membership, group identification, appraisals, emotion, and behavioral tendencies toward diversity management initiatives are depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1 about here

The most significant implication for organizations and policy makers is the possibility of being able to predict behaviors toward diversity initiatives from emotion reactions. Past emotion research has shown that information about how someone feels is highly suggestive of why people are motivated to act in a particular way (Frijda, Kuipers, & ter Schure, 1989). Past organizational research has also shown that the level of emotion elicited by an issue in an organization can actually have a strong impact on the extent to which individuals and organizations will actually take action on them (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). We want to test whether intergroup emotions toward diversity initiatives can also help us predict behavioral tendencies to oppose or support these initiatives.
Overview of Studies and Hypotheses

Two studies were designed to investigate the relations among ethnic group membership, ethnic group identification, group based-appraisals, and group-based emotions in determining behavioral tendencies of support and opposition toward diversity initiatives. The two studies confronted participants with the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based procedure. The first study assessed reactions of whites to the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based or a merit-based policy. The second study compared reactions of white and ethnic minorities to the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based policy. Thus, the first study focused on the impact of a diversity initiative (which has more direct consequences for the ingroup than a merit initiative), on the appraisals, emotions, and anticipated behavioral reactions of differently identified whites. The second study focused on the impact of whites and minorities’ group membership and group identification on the appraisals, emotions, and anticipated behavioral reactions toward a diversity initiative.

Study 1

In the US there is extensive evidence of a white backlash against diversity initiatives in organizations, in particular against affirmative action policies (Mobley & Payne, 1992). The strongest opposition seems to come from white men who are most likely to perceive such policies as a threat to the status quo, existing power structure and allocation of resources (Bond & Pyle, 1998; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Sidanius, Devereux, & Pratto, 1992). It also seems that white men might be less likely to perceive the need to have diversity initiatives in organizations. For example, Kossek and Zonia (1993) studied employees’ beliefs regarding university efforts to promote diversity
and found that white men thought women and minorities already had equal access to resources, whereas women and minorities gave more value to these efforts.

From the IET perspective, behavioral reactions to events derived from group-based emotions, which in turn are triggered by appraisals of events in terms of their implications for important ingroups. We thus hypothesized that for whites the hire of an ethnic minority under a diversity-based policy (vs. a merit-based policy) would elicit stronger appraisals of both injustice and harm to the ingroup (H1); stronger negative group-based emotions, such as anger, that follow from such appraisals (H2); and stronger behavioral opposition (H3).

In line with the relations among appraisal, emotion, and behavioral tendencies proposed by the IET model, we also expected that behavioral tendencies to oppose the diversity-based policy would be predicted by appraisals such as harm to the ingroup, and injustice and that the relation between these appraisals and opposition behavior would be mediated by negative emotions such as anger (H4). Moreover, the predicted impact of appraisals and emotions on opposition behavioral tendencies were expected to be moderated by the extent to which individuals identified with the group membership affected by these events (H5).

Because extensive research exists on reactions of white men, and to provide an even stronger test of IET (since women and minorities have been found to value more and react less negatively to efforts to promote diversity, cf. Kossek & Zonia, 1993), we focused on exploring in more depth the psychological experience of white women. To keep the gender effects constant we also decided to focus on reactions to the hiring of only a female minority target.
Method

Participants

Fifty-two white University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) psychology undergraduate females received either partial course credit or $10 for their participation. Individual participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions in which the hiring policy was described as being either merit-based or diversity-based.

Procedure

Identification assessment. Several weeks before the experiment, participants completed racial/ethnic identification measures as part of a larger set of pre-test questionnaires. Participants completed Luthanen and Crocker’s (1992) importance to identity subscale (e.g., the racial/ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am, Cronbach’s alpha= .75) and the private regard subscale (e.g., In general, I’m glad to be a member of my racial/ethnic group, Cronbach’s alpha= .75). The “importance to self” subscale measures the degree to which the particular membership is central to one’s self-concept and the “private regard” subscale measures how positively one views one’s group. These scales have been shown to tap into different elements of identification namely; “explicit importance” which has more to do with the accessibility or salience strength aspects of identification, and “private regard evaluation” which has more to do with the overall valence of a group membership for the self (for a discussion see Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004). We reasoned that whites are likely to vary in the extent to which they attribute importance and positive value to their racial group membership and this variation is likely to predict outcomes. For example, in the US context white racial group membership may be perceived as highly important to one’s
sense of self, but it could also be negatively regarded by the self. Thus, although we did not have specific predictions for the two subscales we wanted to explore the extent to which they may differentially affect appraisals, emotions and behavioral tendencies.

*Presentation of candidate information.* We adapted Heilman et al.’s (1992, 1998) methodology to present information about an individual ostensibly hired by the UCSB Psychology Department. Participants were asked to read the application materials of an individual recently hired for a job as a mentor for first year psychology students, and to give their opinion on the hiring policy used by the psychology department to hire this mentor. The application materials included a description of the selection policy endorsed by the university, a job description, an employment application which included a section with the hiring decision.

*Manipulation of hiring policy.* Following Heilman (Heilman et al. 1992, 1998), participants were provided with the employer’s hiring policy, under the heading “Policies and Procedures” with a subheading “Subject: First year psychology mentoring hiring” prior to being presented with the job description and the employee information. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two hiring policy conditions. In the *merit-based policy condition* the following statement was presented under the “Subject: First year psychology mentoring hiring” subheading: “Excellence employment policy: The department of psychology is committed to promoting excellence in mentoring programs by actively seeking the most competent candidates.” In the *diversity-based policy condition* the following statement was presented under the “Subject: First year psychology mentoring hiring” subheading: “Diversity employment policy: The department of psychology is committed to enhance diversity in mentoring programs by
actively seeking minority candidates.” In both conditions the hiring policy closed by “In accordance with the university’s mentoring programs, whenever a position becomes available for a first year mentor, the department will comply with the Employment Policy Statement.”

The job description then went on to describe the duties of a first year psychology peer mentor, a position that actually exists and is widely advertised for in UCSB’s psychology department, enhancing relevance and realism of the task for participants. The job description started by stating the psychology department’s hiring policy (see above), and included GPA requirements and job duties, and a section describing the potential benefits of the job for the candidate’s success in their psychology studies. The employment application had been filled out by hand by the ostensible candidate, who was described as Rosa Gutierrez, a junior year student at UCSB, of Hispanic ethnicity, majoring in psychology and Chicano studies, with a GPA of 3.2. The bottom section of the application form, marked “For clerical purposes only” had an area for the hiring decision and a start date of employment. With a clearly different handwriting the word “Hire” appeared in this space, accompanied by a starting date.

Dependent Measures

Appraisals. After reading the application materials, participants rated the hiring policy on a number of 7 point scales from 1(=not at all) to 7(=extremely). Specifically we asked participants to what extent they appraised the hiring policy as “beneficial to your racial/ethnic ingroup” and as “harmful to your racial/ethnic ingroup”. In addition they were asked to what extent they appraised the selection policy as “just,” “fair,” and
“right.” These last three items were combined to create an appraisal of justice scale (i.e., just, fair, right, Cronbach’s alpha = .88).

*Emotions.* Next, participants reported their emotional reactions about the hiring policy on 7 point scales from 1 (=not at all), 2 (=very weakly), 3 (=weakly), 4 (=somewhat weakly), 5 (=somewhat strongly), 6 (=strongly) to 7 (=very strongly). They were asked to rate to what the extent to which they felt 6 negative emotions (angry, irritated, resentful, ashamed, regretful, self-loathing) and 6 positive emotions (satisfied, content, compassionate, proud, respectful, or admiring) about the hiring policy. The 12 emotion items were presented in random order.

*Behavioral tendencies.* After this, participants indicated their behavioral intentions regarding the hiring policy on 7 point scales from 1 (=strongly disagree) to 7 (=strongly agree). Two items were used to assess the extent to which participants might want to express opposition to the hiring policy used (want to sign a letter of complaint to department for hiring mentors in this way; want to inform other students to prevent the department from hiring mentors in this way). These two items were combined to create an “opposition” scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .86).

Finally participants were asked to identify the policy used for the hiring decision as a check on the effectiveness of the manipulation and were thanked and debriefed.

*Results and Discussion*

*Checks on Effectiveness of Manipulation*

Participants were asked to rate to what extent the hiring policy focused on preferential treatment of one racial/ethnic group over another. As expected the diversity-
based policy was rated as more focused on preferential treatment (M=4.92, SD=1.47)
than the merit-based policy (M=3.20, SD=1.68) [F(1,49)=15.22, p<.001, eta=.24].

**Appraisals**

To test our first hypothesis we performed a 2 way (merit-based vs diversity-based
policy) MANOVA on the 3 appraisals (appraisals of benefit to racial/ethnic ingroup,
appraisal of harm to racial/ethnic ingroup, and appraisal of justice scale). Figure 2
displays the mean appraisals across the two conditions.

As expected, the appraisal measures were significantly affected by the type of
hiring policy [F(3, 47)=7.06, p<.001, eta²=.31]. Univariate effects confirmed our
hypothesis (H1) that the diversity-based policy would be appraised as less beneficial to
the ingroup (M=2.92, SD=1.38) than the merit-based policy (M=3.96, SD=1.59) [F (1,49)
=6.17, p<.05]; as more harmful to the ingroup (M=3.58, SD=1.72) than the merit-based
policy (M=1.96, SD=.93) [F (1,49) =17.13 p<.001]; and as less just (M=3.88, SD=.97)
than the merit-based policy (M=4.55, SD=1.02) [F (1,49) =5.58 p<.05].

**Emotions**

The 6 negative and the 6 positive emotions were submitted to two separate
principal component analyses with varimax rotation. Two factors emerged from the
analysis on the negative emotions: an “ashamed” factor (regretful, ashamed, self-
loathing=3.60, explained variance= 59.86%, Cronbach’s alpha =.92) and an “angry”
factor (resentful, irritated, angry: eigenvalue=1.54, explained variance=22.77%,
Cronbach’s alpha=.89). Similarly 2 factors emerged from the analysis on the positive
emotions: a “content” factor (satisfaction, content, respectful=3.42, explained variance=
57.06%, Cronbach’s alpha =.86) and an “admiring” factor (compassionate, admiring, proud: eigenvalue=1.07, explained variance=17.80%, Cronbach’s alpha=.78).

A MANOVA revealed that the combined 4 emotion factors were significantly affected by type of hiring policy [F(4,46)=3.08, p<.05, eta²=.21]. Consistent with H2, univariate effects revealed that participants reported feeling significantly more angry about the diversity-based policy (M=2.91, SD=1.40) than about the merit-based policy (M=1.80, SD=1.18) [F(1,49)=9.32, p<.01]. They also reported feeling significantly more ashamed about the diversity-based policy (M=1.81, SD=1.00) than about the merit-based policy (M=1.16, SD=.67) [F(1,49)=7.31, p<.01]. No differences were observed on the reports of contentment and admiration emotions. Figure 3 displays the mean emotions across the two conditions.

Figure 3 about here

Behavioral tendencies

An ANOVA on the opposition scale revealed that as predicted (H3) participants were more likely to want to oppose the diversity-based policy (M=3.56, SD=1.38) than the merit-based policy (M=2.80, SD=1.46) though differences were only marginally significant [F(1,49)=3.47, p<.07, eta²=.07].

Group-based appraisals and emotions as mediators

We next examined the extent to which the predictive effect of the different hiring events on opposition to those events were due to group-based appraisals of the diversity selection policies, and the extent to which those appraisals predicted opposition because of the mediation of group-based emotions (H4). We thus performed multiple regression
analyses following the procedure of mediation analyses proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986).

We first wanted to ascertain that the ability of the different hiring policies to predict opposition (as expected from the results of the ANOVA) was mediated by group-based appraisals. Mediation could not be established for appraisals of benefit and of harm to ingroup, but was established for appraisal of justice. As expected from the ANOVA results, type of hiring policy (dummy coded so that 0=merit-based policy and 1=diversity-based policy) predicted opposition, so that the diversity-based policy was associated with stronger opposition than then merit-based policy ($\beta = .26$, $t=1.87$, $p<.07$). Type of hiring policy also predicted appraisal of justice, indicating that the diversity-based policy was associated with lower justice appraisals ($\beta =-.32$, $t=-2.36$, $p<.05$).

Finally, adding appraisal of justice to the prediction made the relation between type of hiring policy and opposition non-significant ($\beta =.09$; $t=.73$; sobel $t=2.05$, $p<.05$) while appraisal of justice continued to predict opposition ($\beta =-.51$; $t=-4.05$ $p<.001$) suggesting that appraisal of justice fully mediated the relation between type of hiring policy and opposition behavior. In other words, the diversity-based hiring policy led to opposition because it was appraised as unjust.

Having ascertained that appraisals of the diversity-based hiring policy as being unjust for the ingroup determines behavioral intentions to oppose that policy, we next

---

1 While this result does not appear to meet the first criteria of mediation as per Baron and Kenny (1986) this aspect of determining mediation has been qualified. Kenny, Kashy and Bolger (1998) established that it was not necessary to show that the independent variable exhibits a main effect on the dependent variable, but rather that the relationships between the independent variable and the mediator, and that the mediator significantly predicts the dependent variable (Kenny et al., 1998).
sought evidence that the relation between appraisals of injustice and opposition behavior was itself mediated by group-based emotions.

We conducted these mediation analyses controlling for type of hiring policy. Appraisal of justice predicted opposition in the expected direction ($\beta =-.46, t=-3.70, p<.001$). Appraisal of justice predicted reported anger, so that lower appraisals of justice were associated with higher levels of anger about the policy ($\beta =-.35, t=-2.65, p<.05$). Finally, adding reported anger to the prediction marginally reduced the relation between justice appraisal and opposition ($\beta =-.35; t=-2.65\ p<.05;\ sobel\ t=1.74,\ p<.08$) while anger continued to predict opposition ($\beta =.33; t=2.30,\ p<.05$). Appraisal of justice also predicted reported contentment, indicating that appraisal of higher justice was associated with higher levels of contentment with the policy ($\beta =.58, t=4.70, p<.001$). Adding contentment to the prediction significantly reduced the relation between justice appraisal and opposition ($\beta =-.32; t=-2.21\ p<.05;\ sobel\ t=2.07,\ p<.05$) while lack of contentment continued to predict opposition ($\beta =-.32; t=-2.31,\ p<.05$). Thus, controlling for type of hiring policy, both anger and content feelings about the diversity based policy partially mediated the relation between appraisal of justice and behavioral intentions to oppose the hiring policy.

*Moderation by racial/ethnic identification*

We then wanted to ascertain the extent to which the predictive effects of the appraisals and emotions on behavior were moderated by racial/group identification as assessed by the importance and the private regard collective self-esteem scales. Thus, we conducted a series of multiple regression analyses using opposition behavior as the criterion, and appraisals, emotions, racial/ethnic identification scales and the interaction
between appraisals and each identification scale, and between emotions and each identification scale as the predictors while controlling for type of hiring policy. Following Aiken and West (1991) we selected data points for estimating the regression lines at +/- 1 standard deviation for predictors of the regression equation.

We found no evidence that racial/ethnic identification moderated the impact of appraisals on opposition behaviors. However, in support of our hypothesis (H5) racial/ethnic identification (specifically, as measured by the importance racial/ethnic identification i.e., the degree to which the particular membership is central to one’s self-concept) moderated the impact of admiration on opposition behavior. Opposition was reliably predicted by the interaction between importance racial/ethnic identification and admiration ($\beta = -.33$, $t=-2.38$, $p<.05$). As displayed in figure 4, for participants with higher levels of identification the lower their levels admiration about the procedure the greater their intention to oppose (simple $\beta = -.47$, $t=-2.50$, $p<.05$) but for participants with low levels of identification there was no link between their level of admiration and the strength of their opposition behaviors (simple $\beta = .34$, $t=1.27$, $p=.21$).

Discussion

The results of the first study showed that white participants appraised a diversity-based hiring decision as significantly more harmful to the ingroup and unjust than a merit-based hiring decision. These appraisals in turn engendered greater feelings of anger toward and shame about the diversity policy rather than the merit based policy, and more stated intentional opposition to the policy. When whites apparently felt threatened by the hiring policy (in the diversity condition where the policy was seen as biased against the
ingroup) the impact of the negative appraisals on opposition to the policy depended, in part, on experienced levels of anger and contentment about the policy. Moreover, identification with the racial/ethnic ingroup assessed through the importance to self-concept scale increased the role that lack of admiration about the policy played in directing opposition behavioral intentions. The more participants perceived “being white” as important to the sense of self, the more strongly their lack of admiration toward the diversity policy translated into behavioral intentions to oppose it. For participants for whom “being white” was low in importance to the sense of self showed lower levels of intentional opposition to the diversity policy, and this behavior was not related to their reports of lack of admiration toward the policy.

These results underline the important role of group-based appraisals and emotions in determining whether diversity initiatives are or are not opposed. They also suggest that group relevant identification acts as a moderator of the predictive effect of emotions on opposition behavior. However, identification did not act as a moderator of appraisals. In the second study, we sought additional evidence for the role of group membership and identification in determining group-based appraisal and emotional reactions and thus behavioral response to diversity initiatives.

Study 2

A general objective of diversity initiatives is to attempt to equilibrate group status and power differences in the structure of the organization; hence it is not surprising that research comparing reactions of members from dominant (e.g., whites) with non-dominant groups has systematically shown that they have very different reactions to such initiatives. Group memberships, and in particular race/ethnicity, has been shown to have a
strong influence on whether diversity initiatives are appraised as fair or unfair and whether people have more positive or negative attitudes (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Ayers, 1992; Doverspike & Arthur, 1995; Heilman, McCullough, & Gilbert, 1996; Konrad & Linneham, 1995; Singer, 1996). From the IET perspective, this differential opposition is expected to be rooted in differential appraisal and emotion processes which combine to translate group membership into behavior tendencies. In Study 2, we intended both to replicate the results of study 1 for the diversity-based hiring policy and to extend the predictive power of IET by comparing the relations among appraisal, emotion, and behavioral tendencies in whites and racial/ethnic minorities when confronted by a diversity-based initiative. Again, to keep the gender effects constant we only had female participants reacting to a female minority target.

Method

Participants

Sixty-four White and 44 racial/ethnic minorities (12 Asians, 1 Black, 24 Hispanics, 7 bi-racial), all UCSB psychology undergraduates females, participated for either partial course credit or a $10 payment.

Procedure

Apart from some minor changes made to the emotion and behavioral tendency measures (as described below) all procedures, materials, experimental manipulations and measures were identical to those of study 1. In this study all participants were confronted with a diversity-based hiring policy.

Identification assessment. In study 2 participants completed the same racial/ethnic identification measures collected in study 1 (i.e., importance to identity scale, Cronbach’s
alpha=.72; and the private regard subscale, Cronbach’s alpha=.74). However, in this study participants completed the measures immediately before they completed the experiment.

*Emotions.* As in study 1, participants were asked to rate how they felt about the hiring policy on 7 point scales (from 1 *not at all* to 7 *very strongly*). They were asked to rate the extent to which they felt 4 positive emotions (admiring, proud, compassionate, and satisfied) and 9 negative emotions (angry, frustrated, irritated, resentful, blameworthy, embarrassed, ashamed, jealous, envious) about the hiring policy. The 13 emotion items were presented in random order.

*Behavioral tendencies.* In addition to the opposition items used in Study 1, we also asked participants the extent to which they wished to express “support” for the hiring policy used (i.e., want to sign a letter of praise to the department for hiring mentors in this way, would like to be assigned to this mentor, would go see this mentor).

After completing the measures participants were thanked and debriefed.

*Results*

*Appraisals*

We performed an MANOVA on the 3 appraisals (appraisals of benefit to racial/ethnic ingroup, appraisal of harm to racial/ethnic ingroup, and appraisal of justice scale, Cronbach’s alpha=.90). Figure 5 displays the mean appraisals.

The combined appraisal measures were significantly affected by race/ethnicity \[F(3, 105)=16.18, p<.001, \text{eta}^2=.31\]. Univariate effects showed that whites appraised the diversity-based policy as less beneficial to their racial/ethnic ingroup (M=2.20, SD=1.38).
than did minorities (M=4.43, SD=1.93) [F (1,106) =49.18, p<.001]; as marginally more harmful to their racial/ethnic group (M=3.70, SD=1.89) than did minorities (M=3.06, SD=1.64) [F (1,106) =3.26 p<.07]; and as less just (M=3.37, SD=1.21) than did minorities (M=3.82, SD=1.06) [F (1,106) =4.06, p<.05].

Emotions

The 9 negative emotions and the 4 positive emotions were submitted to two separate principal component analyses with varimax rotation. Three factors emerged from the analysis on the negative emotions: an “angry” factor (frustrated, angry, irritated=4.53, explained variance= 50.30%, Cronbach’s alpha =.87); an “envious” factor (jealous, envious, blameworthy: eigenvalue=1.47, explained variance=16.32%, Cronbach’s alpha=.84) and an “ashamed” factor (ashamed, embarrassed, eigenvalue=1.10, explained variance=12.25%, Cronbach’s alpha=.96). Two factors emerged from the analysis on the positive emotions: a “proud” factor (proud, satisfied=2.63, explained variance= 65.83%, Cronbach’s alpha =.83) and an “admiring” factor (compassionate, admiring: eigenvalue=.79, explained variance=19.80%, Cronbach’s alpha=.78).

A MANOVA revealed that the combined 5 emotion factors were significantly affected by race/ethnicity [F(5,102)=4.22, p<.01, eta^2=.17]. Univariate effects showed that white participants reported feeling significantly more angry about the diversity-based policy (M=3.65, SD=1.44) than did minorities (M=2.97, SD=1.47) [F(1,106)=12.10, p<.05], as well as more envious about the diversity-based policy (M=2.43, SD=1.22) than did minorities (M=1.96, SD=1.07) [F(1,106)=4.26, p<.05]. In contrast, minorities reported feeling significantly more proud about the diversity-based policy (M=3.75, SD=1.75) than did whites (M=3.17, SD=1.30) [F(1,106)=3.89, p<.05]. There were no
effects of group membership on shame or admiration. Figure 6 displays the mean emotions across the two groups.
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**Behavioral tendencies**

Two factors emerged from the analysis on the behavioral tendency items: an “opposition” factor (i.e., want to sign a letter of complaint to department for hiring mentors in this way; want to inform other students to prevent the department from hiring mentor in this way, want to sign letter of praise to department for hiring mentors in this way, reversed-coded) eigenvalue=2.70, explained variance= 53.93%, Cronbach’s alpha =.80) and a “support” factor (i.e., would like to be assigned to this mentor, would go see this mentor) eigenvalue=1.19, explained variance= 23.71%, Cronbach’s alpha =.84).

A MANOVA revealed that the combined behavioral tendency factors were significantly affected by race/ethnicity [F(2,105)=3.02, p<.05, eta^2=.05]. Univariate effects revealed that whites were more likely to want to oppose the diversity-based policy (M=4.59, SD=1.44) than were minorities (M=4.32, SD=1.38) [F(1,105)=4.18, p<.05, eta^2=.04] and minorities were more likely to want to support the diversity-based policy (M=4.07, SD=1.43) than were whites (M=3.49, SD=1.47) [F(1,105)=4.12, p<.05, eta^2=.04].

**Group-based appraisals and emotions as mediators**

We next examined the extent to which whites and minorities’ appraisals predicted behavioral intentions toward the diversity-based procedure because of the mediation of group-based appraisals and emotions (H4). We thus performed multiple regression
analyses following the procedure of mediation analyses proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986), separately for whites and minorities.

For whites, appraisal of harm to the ingroup significantly predicted opposition ($\beta = .35$, $t= 2.99$, $p<.01$). This appraisal also predicted how angry they felt about the diversity-based policy ($\beta = .48$, $t=4.29$, $p<.001$). Adding reported anger as a predictor made the relation between appraisal of harm and opposition non significant ($\beta = .08$, $t= .74$ $p=.46$; sobel $t=3.22$, $p<.01$), and anger continued to predict opposition ($\beta = .56$, $t=4.88$, $p<.001$). Thus, whites’ appraisal of the diversity-based policy as harming the ingroup predicted their intentional opposition to it, and this was fully mediated by how angry they felt about it.

Again for whites, justice appraisal significantly predicted opposition ($\beta = -.60$, $t= -5.89$, $p<.001$). This appraisal also predicted anger ($\beta = -.67$, $t= -7.10$, $p<.001$). Adding anger to the prediction significantly reduced the relations between appraisal of justice and opposition ($\beta = -.35$, $t= -2.71$ $p<.01$; sobel $t=2.64$, $p<.01$) and anger was still positively related to opposition behavioral tendencies ($\beta = .37$, $t=2.85$, $p<.001$). Thus, whites’ appraisals of the diversity-based policy as unjust predicted their intentional opposition to it, and this was partially mediated by how angry they felt about it.

For minorities, appraisal of harm to ingroup predicted opposition ($\beta = .43$, $t= 2.99$, $p<.01$). The more the hiring initiative was seen as harming the ingroup, the more it was opposed. The appraisal of harm to the ingroup also positively predicted how ashamed they felt about the diversity-based policy ($\beta = .46$, $t=3.40$, $p<.01$). The relations between appraisal of harm to ingroup and opposition became non-significant when reported shame was added as a predictor ($\beta = .25$, $t=1.70$, $p=.10$, sobel $t=2.02$ $p<.05$) and shame continued
to predict opposition ($\beta = .37, t=-2.52, p<.05$). Thus, minorities’ appraisal of the diversity-based policy as harming the ingroup predicted opposition, and this was fully mediated by how ashamed they felt about it.

In addition, justice appraisals negatively predicted opposition ($\beta = -.57, t=-4.46, p<.001$), so that the more the hiring practice was perceived as just, the less opposition there was to it. At the same time, justice appraisals positively predicted how proud they felt about the diversity-based policy ($\beta = .49, t=3.61, p<.001$). Adding pride as a predictor significantly reduced the relation between justice appraisal and opposition ($\beta = -.33, t=-2.61, p<.05$; sobel $t=2.65, p<.01$) and pride continued to predict opposition ($\beta = -.49, t=-3.92, p<.001$). Thus, minorities’ appraisal of the diversity-based policy as unjust predicted opposition, and this was partially explained by whether they felt proud about this policy.

*Moderation by racial/ethnic identification*

We conducted a series of multiple regression analyses, separately for whites and minorities, using opposition and support behaviors as the criterion, and appraisals, emotions racial/ethnic identification and the interaction between appraisals and identification, and between emotions and identification as the predictors. Following Aiken and West (1991) we selected data points for estimating the regression lines at +/- 1 standard deviation for predictors of the regression equation.

In line with findings for whites in study 1, we found no evidence that racial/ethnic identification moderated the impact of their appraisals on behaviors toward the diversity-based procedure. Again, similar to findings for whites in study 1, racial/ethnic identification (though this time as assessed by the private regard scale) acted
as a moderator of the link between feelings of admiration toward the diversity-based policy and behavior, but in this case it was behavioral intentions to support it. Support was marginally predicted by the interaction between importance racial/ethnic identification and admiration ($\beta=-1.77$, $t=4.05$, $p<.08$). As displayed in figure 7, whites with higher levels of private regard identification seemed generally more supportive of the diversity-based policy, and this support was not linked to the extent to which they felt admiration about it (simple $\beta=.01$, $t=.03$, $p=.97$). But for whites with lower levels of private regard identification, support toward the policy was predicted by the extent to which they felt admiration about it (simple $\beta=.45$, $t=2.39$, $p<.05$).

Insert figure 7 about here

Similar to whites, minorities’ racial/ethnic identification did not moderate the impact of their appraisals on behaviors, but it did moderate the impact of their emotions on behaviors. Like for whites, minorities’ racial/ethnic identification (as assessed by the private regard scale) acted as a moderator of the link between feelings of admiration toward the diversity-based policy and intentions to support. Support was reliably predicted by the interaction between private racial/ethnic identification and admiration ($\beta=-.58 =-2.31 p<.05$). As displayed in figure 8 and similar to findings for whites, for minorities with lower levels of identification support toward the policy was predicted by the extent to which they felt admiration about it (simple $\beta=.69$, $t=2.44$, $p<.05$). Again, in line with findings for whites, minorities with higher levels of identification seemed generally more supportive of the diversity-based policy, and this support was not linked to the extent to which they felt admiration about it ($B=-.26 t=-1.13 p=.26$).

Insert figure 8 about here
Support was also predicted by the interaction between racial/ethnic identification (assessed by the importance scale) and anger ($\beta=.22 \, t=2.03, \, p<.05$). As displayed in figure 9, minorities with lower levels of identification seemed generally less supportive of the diversity-based procedure, and their lack of support was predicted by the extent to which they felt angry about the diversity-based procedure (simple $\beta=-.38, \, t=-1.84, \, p<.07$). In contrast, minorities with higher levels of identification appeared more supportive of the diversity-based policy, and this support was not determined by the extent to which they reported feeling angry about it (simple $\beta=.13, \, t=.73, \, p=.47$).

Discussion

In replication of findings for study 1, whites’ appraisal of the diversity-based policy as unjust and as harmful to the ingroup lead to stronger intentions to oppose because whites felt angry about it. Minorities’ appraisals of the diversity-based policy as harmful to the ingroup lead to stronger intentional opposition because they felt ashamed about it, and appraisals of the policy as unjust also lead to intention to oppose because they felt low pride about it. This provides evidence that specific groups-appraisals of the diversity-based policy can translate into specific behaviors intentions through specific group-emotions, but in different way for whites and minorities who are the target of these initiatives.

In line with findings for study 1, these results suggest that group relevant identification acts as a moderator of the predictive effect of emotions on supportive behavior. Taken together these results are consistent with IET derived propositions that individuals will appraise and interpret diversity initiatives as events relevant to salient
group memberships, and that the nature of those appraisals generate group-based
emotions which act as motivating conditions for behaviors of support and opposition of
those initiatives.

*General discussion*

Whites opposed a diversity-based policy when they appraised it as harmful to ingroup and unjust *and* they felt angry about it. Minorities opposed a diversity-based policy when they appraised it as harmful to the ingroup and unjust *and* they felt ashamed and little pride about it. This finding has significant practical implication for how we generally conceive and deal with opposition or “resistance” toward diversity initiatives in organizations. Our results suggest that opposition to diversity initiatives from whites and minorities should not be dealt with in the same way as it can stem from quite distinct intergroup emotional antecedents. On the one hand, white and minorities may report the intention to oppose diversity management initiatives as they share the appraisal of this policy as being harmful to the ingroup and unjust. On the other, these appraisals direct behavioral intentions to oppose through very distinct emotions for each group: anger for whites and low pride and shame feelings for minorities. Therefore, it is highly likely that when whites’ and minorities’ stated behavioral intentions to oppose diversity initiatives translate into actual behaviors clearer differences may become apparent between the different types of opposition. Whites’ opposition motivated by anger (a high energy, high status emotion, see Tiedens, 2001a, 2001b) is much more likely to lead to aggressive behaviors (e.g. complaining to HR about these initiatives, refusing to work with a person hired under such an initiative), whereas minorities’ opposition motivated by shame and lack of pride (low energy, lower status emotions) is much more likely to lead to
avoidance behaviors (e.g., not signing up for a diversity mentoring program, not applying for a program to help the career advancement of women).

It is interesting to note that the importance to self and private regard identification scales had quite different moderating effects on the relation between emotions and behaviors toward the diversity-based policy. In study 1, whites’ racial/ethnic identification as assessed through the importance scale increased the role that admiration about the policy played in predicting opposition behavioral intentions. Remember it was only for those whites’ for whom “being white” was important to their sense of self, that feeling lack of admiration about the diversity policy translated into behavioral opposition. In study 2, whites’ racial/ethnic identification as assessed through the private regard scale decreased the role that admiration about the policy played in directing support behavioral intentions. Specifically, whites who perceived “being white” positively (who may feel more at ease with their racial membership) where generally more supportive of the diversity-based policy and their support was not a function of the extent to which they felt admiration about the policy. But for whites who perceived “being white” negatively (who may feel more uneasy about their racial membership) their intention to support the diversity-based policy was a function of the extent to which they felt admiration about it. Clearly, because the importance to self and the private regard scales carry different dimensions of ethnic/racial identification; they affect the link between emotions and behavior differently. Taken together results for whites are suggestive that opposition (or lack of support) toward diversity-based policies may be a more characteristic reaction of those whites for who “being white” is important to their sense of self but who may not feel at ease with “being white”. Based on IET we predicted that racial/ethnic group
membership may have little effect on appraisals, emotions and behavioral intention responses to diversity initiatives, unless race/ethnic identification was strong. But the results of these studies suggest that it is not only the strength of group identification that is important, but also the meaning that different dimensions of group identification may have for different groups. In particular, members from demographic groups enjoying different status or dominance in society are likely to show great variation in the extent to which they identify with their demographic group memberships along the different dimensions, and this variation may predict important differences in reactions to diversity.

In conclusion these results provide support for intergroup emotion theory’s predictions that group membership and group identification are strong determinants of group-based emotional experience and behavioral intentions. More important, it shows that the intergroup approach to emotions holds the promise of helping us better understand the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes underlying reactions of support or opposition to diversity management initiatives in the workplace. In this view, specific intergroup emotion responses felt about specific diversity management practices (e.g., affirmative action, diversity training, etc.) as reported by members of beneficiary (e.g., women, ethnic minorities) and non-beneficiary groups (e.g., men) can be linked to specific appraisal profiles. Also, knowledge about what specific emotions lead to support or opposition of different types of diversity management initiatives give us important information about differences in the way people appraise these practices. In this way we may be able to better identify the structural and psychological conditions under which diversity management practices are most effective.
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