

AD-A170 842

CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF RACE RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT
(U) YALE UNIV NEW HAVEN CT SCHOOL OF ORGANIZATION AND
MANAGEMENT C P ALDERFER JUL 86 IR-9-OMR

1/2


UNCLASSIFIED

NO0014-82-K-0715

F/G 5/11

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

1

AD-A170 842

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TR ONR-9	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Changing Perceptions of Race Relations in Management		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Clayton P. Alderfer		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-82-K-0715
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Yale School of Organization and Management Box 1A New Haven, CT 06520		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 170-943
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE July 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 100
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) racial perceptions, race relations improvement, white dominance, upward mobility		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (On reverse side)		

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 12 1986
S D

DTIC FILE COPY

Abstract: This report examines perceptions of race relations in XYZ management by comparing survey results obtained in January 1986 with similar findings obtained in January 1978 and by evaluating the key elements of XYZ's race relations improvement program. Findings also show the consequences of changes in the XYZ business environment on job experiences and attitudes. In addition, the study compares the effects of collecting information about these subjects by questionnaire administered in race alike group meetings with using the same questionnaire distributed individually by mail.

Perceptions of race relations in 1986 reveal more racial tension based on white dominance than in 1978. Whites and blacks both report more racism and more promotion discrimination favoring whites. Blacks report more self protection by blacks and whites. In 1986 compared to 1978, both blacks and whites give more indication that blacks are too demanding and that the company is too zealous in efforts to improve race relations. Comparison over the same period reveals that managers report lower life and work satisfaction, less pride in the company, and less career potential. Investigated by management level, changes in racial tension turn out to be especially pronounced at the first level of management, while differences in job attitudes show most markedly at higher levels.

Evaluations of the Race Relations Advisory Group and the Race Relations Competence Workshop tend to be very favorable by both blacks and whites who say that they have information about these activities. The Upward Mobility Program receives more mixed assessments; blacks who say that they have information about the program give more positive assessments than whites. A substantial proportion of whites recommend against continuing the program. In general, blacks tend to be more favorable than whites about program elements that seem to improve race relations, and whites tend to be more favorable about programs that show fewer signs of effecting change. People who participate in the Race Relations Competence Workshop or the Race Relations Advisory Group perceive more racial tension based on white dominance than those who do not, but in contrast to the overall managerial population, they are less likely to believe that blacks are too demanding and that the company is overzealous in its commitment to improved race relations.

Almost all indicators show that administering the questionnaire in race alike group meetings produces more favorable effects than contacting people by mail. Response rates are higher. Reactions to the questionnaire tend to be more favorable. And some groups tend to provide more frank answers.

On balance, the data suggest that the race relations improvement program provides important counterforces to national and local pressures that work against improved race relations between black and white people. Despite adverse business conditions and signals from the administration in Washington that might have discouraged less committed organizations, XYZ maintained a rigorous series of activities devoted to bettering race relations in management. The strength of the program is demonstrated by its capacity to effect favorable change in the face of such significant opposition.

By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



A

CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF RACE RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT

Report on a Race Relations Improvement Program

by

Clayton P. Alderfer

July 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Introduction. 2

The Mail versus Meeting Study 5

Comparison of Race Relations Perceptions in 1978 and 1986. . . . 9

Evaluation of Race Relations Improvement Program Elements. . . .14

Conclusions.21

Appendices

Introduction

In 1978, the XYZ organization carried out a diagnosis of race relations in management. The results of this study showed a variety of important and meaningful differences in perceptions between black and white managers. After the study report had been thoroughly discussed by senior management, the Black Management Association, and the Race Relations Advisory Group, the corporation began a thorough race relations improvement program based upon nine recommendations that had been developed from the study results.

After eight years of activity, the organization decided to commission a reexamination of managers' perceptions of race relations in order to determine what, if any, changes had occurred during the intervening period. The aims of this study were threefold: (1) to compare the attitudes of XYZ managers about race relations in 1986 with the opinions in 1978; (2) to assess people's reactions to the several programs that XYZ introduced specifically in response to the 1978 diagnosis; and (3) to prepare for incorporating race relations questions into XYZ's annual survey of employee attitudes. The 1986 survey used a variety of procedures to achieve the study objectives.

Working in consultation with the Race Relations Advisory Group, we designed a questionnaire that included both a shortened form of the 1978 questionnaire and a new section for assessing the race relations improvement program. This allows for two kinds of assessment. The first compares answers in 1978 with those in 1986 to determine whether changes occurred in questions

that were asked in both years. We administered the questionnaire during the month of January in both years to be sure that if factors in the calendar year effect race relations, they were the same in both studies. The second basis for comparison utilizes evaluations of the race relations improvement program elements. Here we can see the overall reaction to the various parts of the improvement program and what, if any, differences exist among race gender groups.

When the original questionnaire was administered to XYZ managers, we worked closely with the Race Relations Advisory Group to determine the kind of setting that would give members of both racial groups the greatest sense that they could give their honest opinions. For both groups, this turned out to be race alike groups, and, to the extent possible, also gender and level alike meetings. In addition, the person who administered the questionnaire should also be of the same race and gender as the people taking the instrument. All people who took the questionnaire in 1978 participated in meetings of this kind. In 1986, we added another method of administration to see whether the race relations survey could be conducted by mail as well as by meeting. Managers at levels 1, 2, and 3, were randomly assigned to receive the questionnaire either by mail or by meeting. This provides an experiment which compares data about race relations obtained by the two methods of administration. Managers at level 4 and above received the questionnaire by meeting both years.

In the report, I provide information based on three levels of aggregation. The first and simplest is the individual questionnaire item. An example is the statement, "Race relations within XYZ are good." In reporting results based on such individual questionnaire items, I report the percentage of people in particular groups who agree with the statement by summing those who marked Mildly Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. In some analyses, however, I use mean

(average) values of the answers to the questions by weighing Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Mildly Agree = 3 . . . Strongly Disagree = 6 and then making comparisons among groups. The second most complex method of aggregation is to form a scale of several items and to compare the mean (average) values of scales among groups. A scale can be formed when several items refer to a common theme and when these same items have similar statistical properties. An example of a scale is "Pay Satisfaction," which combines two items: "I feel that my compensation at XYZ is quite satisfactory," and "Right now I feel underpaid for my work." Because these items represent opposite opinions about the same topic (pay), they are combined in a manner that reflects their different orientations. Scale names are carefully chosen by studying the items that compose them and choosing a title that accurately reflects the dominant theme of the scale. There are more than 20 such scales in the study. The third and most complex method of aggregation is to form GRAND SCALES, which are combinations of scales that share common themes and have similar statistical properties. In this report, we have three GRAND SCALES: (1) WHITES HURT BLACKS, (2) BLACKS HURT WHITES, and (3) SATISFACTION. I also compare the mean (average) scale values of GRAND SCALES among groups. Because different kinds of learning are available at each level of aggregation, I shall be using material from each level of aggregation in the report. Appendix 1 contains a listing of the scales and items. Appendix 2 includes the tables referred to throughout the remainder of the report.

The following pages present the results of this study. A separate section covers each study objective. First, we present the results of the mail versus meeting experiment, because the method of administration affects how we interpret all data from the study. Next, we provide a comparison of perceptions in 1978 with reports in 1986. Finally, we present an assessment of the impact of the various parts of the race relations improvement program

(average) values of the answers to the questions by weighing Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Mildly Agree = 3 . . . Strongly Disagree = 6 and then making comparisons among groups. The second most complex method of aggregation is to form a scale of several items and to compare the mean (average) values of scales among groups. A scale can be formed when several items refer to a common theme and when these same items have similar statistical properties. An example of a scale is "Pay Satisfaction," which combines two items: "I feel that my compensation at XYZ is quite satisfactory," and "Right now I feel underpaid for my work." Because these items represent opposite opinions about the same topic (pay), they are combined in a manner that reflects their different orientations. Scale names are carefully chosen by studying the items that compose them and choosing a title that accurately reflects the dominant theme of the scale. There are more than 20 such scales in the study. The third and most complex method of aggregation is to form GRAND SCALES, which are combinations of scales that share common themes and have similar statistical properties. In this report, we have three GRAND SCALES: (1) WHITES HURT BLACKS, (2) BLACKS HURT WHITES, and (3) SATISFACTION. I also compare the mean (average) scale values of GRAND SCALES among groups. Because different kinds of learning are available at each level of aggregation, I shall be using material from each level of aggregation in the report. Appendix 1 contains a listing of the scales and items. Appendix 2 includes the tables referred to throughout the remainder of the report.

The following pages present the results of this study. A separate section covers each study objective. First, we present the results of the mail versus meeting experiment, because the method of administration affects how we interpret all data from the study. Next, we provide a comparison of perceptions in 1978 with reports in 1986. Finally, we present an assessment of the impact of the various parts of the race relations improvement program

action components.

People reading this report should be aware that it is just one in a series of studies designed to assess the XYZ race relations improvement program. Other documents use historical information and provide analyses of the Race Relations Advisory Group, the Race Relations Competence Workshop, the Upward Mobility Program, and the theory on which the activities are based. Copies may be obtained by contacting the author at the Yale School of Organization and Management, Box 1A, New Haven, Connecticut 06520.

The Mail versus Meeting Study

The purpose of the 1986 mail versus meeting experiment was to determine what difference, if any, there was in whether the diagnostic questionnaire was given to people in race alike groups or by mail. In both settings respondents received a letter from the company president encouraging them to participate, a memorandum from the head of management and organization development telling them the method by which they would receive the questionnaire, and one followup letter reminding them of the importance of their participation. In short, we did everything possible to make the conditions surrounding the invitation to participate as similar as possible for people in both mail and the meeting settings.

From a managerial standpoint, having people take the questionnaire by mail seems less expensive than asking them to attend a meeting for the same purpose. People who respond by mail do not have to travel to the meeting site, and they might choose to complete the instrument on their own rather than on company time. The key question is whether we get the same quality of information by both methods. To answer this question, three different kinds of indicators

were used. The first is the proportion of people who completed questionnaires. The second is the reaction of those who completed questionnaires based on their answers to a series of items about the study given on the final page of the instrument. And the third is whether reported perceptions of race relations are different depending on how the questionnaire is taken.

Table 1a shows the response rates for the mail and meeting forms of questionnaire administration in 1986. Significantly more people attended the meetings and completed questionnaires (71%) than responded by mail (58%). Having determined that method of administration affected response rate, we also wished to determine whether the four race-gender groups responded differently to the two forms of administration. Table 1b indicates that there were no significant race-gender group differences in how people responded to the mail versus meeting form of administration.

To test further whether the kinds of people sending back questionnaires were different from those attending meetings, we examined a wide variety of other factors. Included were date of birth, work location, living location, department, seniority date with XYZ, membership in management organizations, job level, Personnel Committees membership, and participation in elements of the race relations improvement program. None of these factors distinguished those who attended meetings from those who mailed back questionnaires. Thus, as far as we can tell, the kinds of people who responded by meeting were not different from those who responded by mail. Simply more people responded to the meeting request than to the mail invitation.

The next step in the process is to compare the questionnaire reactions of the people who responded by each method of administration. Tables 2a-2j show the mean (average) answer to the ten questions for each race-gender group and for the total sample. In reading these tables, recall that people responded on a six-point scale from 1 = Strongly Agree to 6 = Strongly Disagree. On seven

of the ten questions, one or more groups responded significantly more favorably to the questionnaire when it was given by meeting than by mail. In no instance, did any group respond significantly more favorably by mail than by meeting. Compared to mail respondents, the meeting participants reported that they liked the questionnaire better, thought it less biased, had fewer concerns about confidentiality, objected less to being asked so many questions, reported less difficulty in answering the questions, and stated less dislike for the instrument. In terms of respondents' experiences, the meeting form of administration was clearly superior to the mail.

The final step in the mail versus meeting comparison was to determine whether differences in perceptions about race relations were caused by the two methods of administration. Tables 3a-3c contain the means of the three GRAND SCALES that pertain to this question. In the first of these tables, we see that black males were much more likely to report that WHITES HURT BLACKS in meetings than by mail. In Table 3c, we see that black females were likely to report less job and organization SATISFACTION by meeting than by mail. Both of these findings are consistent with an interpretation that the meetings provided a more secure setting in which to report one's perceptions--at least for blacks--and as a result people would give less favorable reports by these methods. Table 3c, however, also shows that white women report more SATISFACTION by meeting than by mail--clearly a finding that is inconsistent with our expectations about the effects of the two methods of administration. Moreover, two out of three of the GRAND SCALES show no differences for white respondents, and none of the grand scales shows differences for white men. Perhaps it is only for blacks that the method of administration affects reports of perceptions about race. In reflecting upon these findings, one should recall that people responded as individuals within each meeting. The only conversation that took place was between the questionnaire administrator and

the respondents as a group. There were no opportunities for respondents to discuss or compare answers with one another.

Finding differences between mail and meeting administration in 1986 leads to a further question. Were there differences between 1978, when all questionnaires were administered by meeting, and 1986, when only a portion of the sample received questionnaires by meeting? The relevant comparison is between all 1978 respondents and those in 1986 who took questionnaires by meeting. Tables 4 and 5a-5j provide the relevant information.

Attendance at the questionnaire meetings in 1978 (76%) was slightly higher than in 1986 (71%). Moreover, a number of the questionnaire reaction items also showed significant differences between the two periods. White females and white males, for example, were less likely to say that they liked completing the questionnaire and more likely to say that they disliked completing the questionnaire in 1986 than in 1978. White females and white males were also more likely to say that they did not appreciate being asked so many questions in 1986 than in 1978, and white females were more likely to see the questionnaire as biased in 1986 than in 1978. Thus, we see a general increase in responding negatively toward the questionnaire between 1978 and 1986 from white people with no comparable change from black people. The group as a whole--and especially black females and white males--were less likely in 1986 than in 1978 to say that they found it difficult to answer many of the questions. This finding suggests that the subject of race relations may be somewhat easier for all managers to address now than eight years ago. Finally, the most revealing difference may be in reported frankness between 1978 and 1986. Both black females and black males reported that they were more able to be frank in 1986 than in 1978, while white men report that they were less able to be frank in 1986 than in 1978.

The comparison between reactions to the questionnaire in 1978 and to

bias, because changes occur that correct important sources of inequity.

During the period since the original diagnosis was undertaken, two important changes that might affect perceptions of race relations at XYZ have occurred in addition to the race relations improvement program. At the national level, leading representatives of the national administration have worked strenuously to remove the impact of affirmative action throughout the country. As this report was being prepared, the Supreme Court of the United States decided against the United States Justice Department in a suit aimed at overturning affirmative action in departments of two municipal governments. More locally, the XYZ organization itself has undergone a crucial change by moving from being a regulated monopoly to becoming a holding company of regulated and unregulated businesses. The effect of this change has heightened the stress on most work relationships and might be expected to affect race relations as well. Thus, the XYZ race relations improvement program was hardly operating in a benign environment. Maintaining the program at all in the face of such powerful counterforces is a notable achievement in itself.

The analyses used to compare perceptions between 1978 and 1986 employ measures from all three levels of aggregation--items, scales, and GRAND SCALES. Included in the scales are several pertaining to general work experiences as well as to race relations. Because of the effects of taking the questionnaire by mail versus by meeting, the comparisons are based on 1978 data in relation to 1986 meeting data. For this section of the study, we did not use the 1986 mail data. We examine which measures change, what direction the changes take, and which groups show particular changes.

Table 6a includes comparisons among the race-gender groups for 13 scales and three GRAND SCALES. From the scales on General Racism and Specific Racism, we see that the total sample shows an increase on both measures from 1978 to 1986. White males, however, report perceptions that go counter to the overall

trend; on both scales they report lower scores in 1986 than in 1978. Black females, on the other hand, report more specific racism in 1986 than in 1978. Since black people are the subject of racism and whites are prone to deny these effects, I interpret these changes as evidence of increasing racism in the corporation at large. The trends noted on these two scales go exactly in the opposite direction specified in advance as indicative of overall favorable change.

Further evidence for increased tension between the races based on greater white dominance is found in the observed changes on three scales that pertain to promotions. Comparing 1978 and 1986, one sees that the sample as a whole reports an increase in perceived promotion discrimination, which is coupled with an increase in perceived white promotion advantage and a decrease in perceived black promotion advantage. In addition, blacks perceive more white self protection and more black self protection in 1986 than in 1978. The sample as a whole also believes less that affirmative action hurts white promotions and less that blacks have a hiring advantage in 1986 than in 1978.

On the subject of firing, blacks believe that they are more easily fired, while whites believe that blacks are less easily fired in 1986 than in 1978.

An unanticipated series of changes can be observed from the scales, Blacks Are Too Demanding and The Company is Overzealous. Both black and white managers report an increase on these scales from 1978 to 1986. Thus both racial groups are more likely in 1986 to demand conformity from blacks to the XYZ image and to criticize the corporation for doing too much on behalf of black employees. The sample as a whole also perceives BMA as less racist in 1986 than in 1978.

The overall pattern of increased racial tension over the eight year period is confirmed by the observed changes in the two GRAND SCALES that pertain to

race relations. Black females and white males both report an increase in the tendency to say WHITES HURT BLACKS, and white males report an increase in the tendency to say BLACKS HURT WHITES. In addition, the GRAND SCALE on SATISFACTION shows a decrease from 1978 to 1986.

In Table 6b, the specific scales pertaining to Pay Satisfaction, Life and Work Satisfaction, Company Pride, and Career Potential all show a decrease from 1978 to 1986. Job Satisfaction shows no change. Moreover, the effects on perceived career potential are strong enough that they show independent changes for each race-gender group. The effects we observe regarding race relations at XYZ occur within a context in which the general work experience of managers is less rewarding in 1986 than it was in 1978.

To examine further the increase in racial tension between 1978 and 1986, we performed analyses that separated race and gender groups by level. Table 7 shows the comparisons on the three GRAND SCALES. Only blacks at level 1 show an increase in WHITES HURT BLACKS from 1978 to 1986. White males at levels 1, 2, and 3 show an increase in BLACKS HURT WHITES from 1978 to 1986, while white males at level 4 and above show no such change. White females at level 1 show a similar change from 1978 to 1986 as do blacks. But there is no similar pattern of change for blacks or white females at level 2 or above. From these data, we see that the increase in racial tension among XYZ managers from 1978 to 1986 tends to be most pronounced at level 1. It is also clear that white males at levels 2 and 3 as well are reporting more racial problems for themselves than in 1978.

An interesting comparison occurs on GRAND SCALE 3 about Satisfaction. Here we see changes occurring at level 2 and above. At levels 2, 3, and 4, white males show less satisfaction in 1986 than in 1978. At level 2, white females show less satisfaction in 1986 than in 1978. At no level do blacks show a significant change in satisfaction from 1978 to 1986.

In the original race relations diagnosis, we presented the analysis of racial perceptions in terms of responses to individual questionnaire items. This method of measurement is not as precise as the use of scales and GRAND SCALES, but it has the advantage that a reader receives a clearer picture of exactly what the person answering questions was intending to say. To provide those who read this report with a direct comparison of responses to the items that were used in the 1978 report, I have included in Tables 8-2 to 8-11 the exact items used in the original report. These tables have the same titles as in the original report, and the second digit in each table number corresponds directly to the number of that table in the original report. I shall comment only on those items where change seems significant.

Among white men and white women, we see indications that the overall quality of race relations within XYZ management has improved. But these perceptions are in no way matched by comparable perceptions from blacks. Especially in light of the other data reported above, they might even be interpreted as evidence of some minor increase in denial by whites.

In Table 8-3, across all four race-gender groups, we see more people understanding that black managers do not enjoy racial joking.

In Table 8-4, we see a decided decrease in white males agreeing that blacks have brought low standards into XYZ. In the same table, black females, black males, and white males agree less with the statement that the company hires blacks off the street when whites are taking lower level jobs just to stay employed.

The material in Table 8-10 is directly relevant to the various efforts XYZ has made to remove the barriers that prevent black people from being promoted into middle management. In the period from 1978 to 1984 according to company records, the number of black men at levels 2 and 3 changed from 18 to 29 and of black women from 13 to 22. The data about perceptions indicates that members

of all four race-gender groups observed this movement, and that the difference was perceived as much more of a change by whites than by blacks.

Evaluation of Race Relations Improvement Program Elements

The XYZ Race Relations Improvement Program was based upon nine recommendations derived directly from the results of the original diagnosis. This section presents an evaluation of those efforts in terms of the perceptions of XYZ managers. We do this in two ways. The first findings pertain to the results of a series of questions that asked people specifically to give their assessments of various program elements. The second set of results pertain to how perceptions of race relations compared between those who took part in the programs and those who did not.

Table 9 contains a statement of the original nine recommendations constituting the race relations improvement program. Entries show what percentage of each race-gender group have information about the activity and how they evaluated the outcome of the recommendation, if they had information. On eight of the nine recommendations, the outcome was evaluated significantly differently by the various race-gender groups.

Recommendations differ substantially in the proportion of the overall sample who say that they have information about the activity. The largest proportion of people say that they have no information about the Race Relations Advisory Group (52%) and the Internal Discrimination Complaint Procedure (41%), and the smallest proportion of people say that they have no information about the objective to increase the number of black managers at third level and higher (26%). Generally, lower proportions of black than white

managers indicate that they have no information about the program elements.

Among the people who have information about the recommendations, the predominant evaluations show more improvement than either no change or worsening for: the Race Relations Advisory Group, the OD Group, increasing the number of black managers at third level and above, and providing race relations competence training for key managers. These activities also tend to be more favorably evaluated by black than white managers. The activities that tend to show more no change or worsening are: delivering an employee information program about race relations, preparing Personnel Committees to respond to the career needs of black employees, improving performance and potential appraisals to be more sensitive to race relations issues, and improving the internal discrimination complaint process. These activities tend to be evaluated more favorably by white than black managers.

The pattern of blacks evaluating more favorably the activities that show more indications of improvement and whites evaluating more favorably the activities that show fewer indications of improvement is itself noteworthy. The finding is consistent with the notion that whites in general are more resistant to changing race relations than blacks. Thus, they evaluate favorable change less positively and no change or worsening more favorably than blacks.

The material in Table 10 provides more detailed assessments and recommendations about five of the most important elements in the change program: the Race Relations Advisory Group, the Race Relations Competence Workshop, the Upward Mobility Program, the Composition of Personnel Committees, and the Internal Discrimination Complaint Process. Of these activities, the Race Relations Advisory Group and the Race Relations Competence Workshop get very favorable assessments from almost all people who have information about them. Fewer blacks than whites, however, tend to be without information about

them, and blacks tend to give them more favorable evaluations than whites. The predominant recommendation about both of these programs is to keep and strengthen them.

Reactions to the Upward Mobility Program are more mixed among both black and white respondents. The program gets more favorable assessments by blacks than by whites. More whites say that they have been hurt by the program than say they have been helped by it. Among blacks, more say they have been helped than say that they have been hurt by the program. More than 60% of blacks believe the program helps both the company as a whole and race relations in the corporation. More than 50% of the white males believe the program hurts both race relations and the organization. The assessments of white females fall between those of blacks and white men. Recommendations about the program are decidedly different between blacks and whites. An overwhelming majority of blacks believe that they program should be kept and strengthened, while approximately one quarter of whites hold a similar view.

Reactions about changing the Composition of Personnel Committees to achieve more equitable racial balance show a similar pattern of responses as the questions about the Upward Mobility Program. However, for this activity, black-white differences are not as pronounced and the overall reaction is more positive for both racial groups. Both the Upward Mobility Program and balancing the personnel committees have the effect of intervening into the XYZ promotion system, and thus it is not surprising that blacks and whites would show similar reaction patterns to both interventions. Moreover, so far the effect of changing the composition of personnel committees has not been as marked as developing the Upward-Mobility Program. Thus one might expect differences in black-white reactions to be less pronounced because change has been less notable.

Finally, assessment of the Internal Discrimination Complaint Process is

especially noteworthy for the high proportion (63%) of all respondents who say that they have no information. There are few black-white differences in the assessment of the activity. The one slight difference is that blacks are more likely than whites to say that they have benefitted from the activity. The primary recommendation of all groups is to keep and strengthen the program. Blacks hold this view more strongly than whites.

A further question one might ask about the major intervention activities is whether there is a relationship between how much people say they know and how favorably they evaluate each program element. Tables 11a, 11b, and 11c provide data to answer this question. In Table 11a, we see positive correlations between information and evaluation for the Race Relations Advisory Group, the Race Relations Competence Workshop, and the Upward Mobility Program. But there are no significant relationships between information and evaluation for the Composition of Personnel Committees and the Internal Discrimination Complaint Process. Moreover, for the Upward Mobility Program, the correlations are significantly positive only for black women and white women. Table 11b shows how participation in the Race Relations Advisory Group is related to evaluation of the five program elements. Members of the group evaluate all except the Internal Discrimination Complaint Process more favorably than nonmembers. Table 11c shows how participation in the Race Relations Competence Workshop is related to evaluation of the five program elements. Workshop participants evaluate the Advisory Group, the Workshop, and the Upward Mobility Program more favorably than non-participants. The Race Relations Competence Workshop is a three day event designed to convey to a larger body of XYZ people what the Advisory Group people have learned about race relations in the corporation. From these data, therefore, I would conclude that a person's evaluation of the first four interventions becomes more favorable, the more fully involved he or she becomes in understanding race relations in the

corporation. This statement, however, does not hold for the Internal Discrimination Complaint Process, where there seems to be no relationship between information and evaluation.

The second question about evaluation is how participation in the various activities is related to perceptions about race relations. Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15 contain data comparing participants and non-participants for each intervention targets. In general, we expected participants to show greater awareness of racial dynamics than non-participants.

Members of the Race Relations Advisory Group have the most intensive relationship to the race relations improvement program. They meet approximately once every six weeks throughout the year to oversee and recommend actions on virtually all matters affecting the company's race relations policies. Members serve for extended periods, with approximately four new members selected annually. The data in Table 12 indicate that Advisory Group members differ from non-members on every racial perception scale, except one. They see more General Racism, more Specific Racism, more Promotion Discrimination, more White Promotion Advantage, less Black Promotion Advantage, more White Self Protection, more ease of Firing Blacks, less sense that Blacks Are Too Demanding, less sense that the Company is Overzealous about race relations, less Black Hiring Advantage, less tendency for Affirmative Action to Hurt White Promotions, and less inclination to perceive BMA as Racist. Their perception of Black Self Protection is not different from non-members. They have a higher score than non-members on the GRAND SCALE, Whites Hurt Blacks, than non-members, and they have a lower score than non-members on the GRAND SCALE, Blacks Hurt Whites.

Table 13 contains the same series of comparisons for participants and non-participants in the Race Relations Competence Workshop. The pattern of results observed for the Race Relations Advisory Group members is repeated

virtually identically for participants and non-participants in the workshop. Because the workshop was designed to reproduce the learning experiences of the Advisory Group members during their first year, the results might be expected. On the other hand, the workshop lasts for only three work days, and one would not necessarily expect the results to be as powerfully lasting as they appear to be.

Table 14a and 14b compare the perceptions of blacks and whites who have differing degrees of contact with the Upward Mobility Program. Here we see very little effect of this program on racial perceptions for either black or white managers. The one consistent--and hardly surprising--finding is that people from both races who were selected for the program had a more favorable evaluation of the program than those who were not selected. An interesting finding is that the self perceived career potential of whites who were selected for the program was significantly more favorable than for those who were not, while there was no significant difference on this measure between those selected and not selected among blacks. One could infer that being selected into the Upward Mobility program was psychologically more significant for whites than for blacks. Perhaps whites saw the selection as more of a confirmation of their career potential than blacks. This would be true if whites believed that they could have more confidence in the XYZ promotion system than blacks.

From the outset of the race relations improvement program, we were concerned about the racial awareness of personnel committee members. As a result, members of the personnel committee system were invited and encouraged to attend the Race Relations Competence Workshop. Table 15 compares the racial perception scales of committee members in 1978 and 1986. The 1986 members see more Racism, more Specific Racism, more Promotion Discrimination, more White Promotion Advantage, less Black Promotion Advantage, more White Self

Protection, less Black Hiring Advantage, less tendency for Affirmative Action to Hurt White Promotions, and less tendency to view BMA as Racist. The GRAND SCALE, Whites Hurt Blacks, is also higher for personnel committee members in 1986 than in 1978. On the measures of Blacks Are Easily Fired, Blacks Are Too Demanding, Black Self Protection, and the GRAND SCALE that BLACKS HURT WHITES, there are no differences between personnel committee members in 1986 compared to 1978. On the scale about the Company as Overzealous about race relations, the personnel committee members perceive this as more true in 1986 than in 1978. In the original study, members of personnel committees showed patterns of perceptions that placed them "in the middle" between whites and blacks--though clearly much closer to whites than to blacks. This time they once again appear in the middle--this time between those who have developed a commitment to improving race relations and those who have not.

We began this report with an analysis of how respondents reacted to the questionnaire. The results of the mail versus meeting comparison for 1986 led, in turn, to an examination of the reactions between those who took the instrument by meeting in 1986 and in 1978. This showed more favorable reactions in the 1978, and I suggested that the questionnaire itself might be serving as a kind of barometer for people's readiness to deal with racial issues in the corporation. The report now closes in Table 16 with a comparison between the questionnaire reactions of those who participated in the Race Relations Workshop and those who did not. In general, the findings show that people who had participated in the Race Relations Competence Workshop had more favorable reactions to the questionnaire than those who did not. This was especially true for white men. Workshop participants more than non-participants tended to like the questionnaire more, to object less to being asked the questions, to disagree more with the idea that harmful changes would come from the study, to agree more that they were frank in their answers,

to disagree more with the idea that it was difficult to answer many of the questions, to agree more that the questionnaire provided an opportunity to express their most most important opinions about race relations, and to disagree more that they disliked completing the questionnaire. The evidence indicates that the people who attended the workshop developed more expansive perceptions about race relations than those who did not. The data about the questionnaire suggest that respondents' reactions to this instrument are a reflection of their overall readiness to deal with racial issues.

Conclusions

Asking questions about race relations is not a simple matter. We have known this from the beginning of the project and have proceeded with an awareness of the need to create conditions for both blacks and whites to speak frankly about their racial perceptions. Without special attention to the circumstances of data collection, it is likely that the methods used will not give adequate attention to black and white differences. When this occurs in a predominantly white organization, the most likely effect will be to arrange conditions that result in blacks giving less candid views than whites. The results may produce conclusions that are more satisfying to whites but at the expense of a more accurate assessment of the overall state of race relations. In this study, our experiment showed differences in how people--especially black men--responded to the questionnaire by mail versus by meeting. As a result, I conclude that at this time, the corporation would not be wise to substitute mail questionnaires for race alike meetings when it wishes to determine perceptions of race relations.

XYZ managers perceive race relations differently in 1986 than 1978. Both blacks and whites are likely to see more racial tension based on white dominance now than eight years ago. This change is accompanied by another set of differences between the two periods. XYZ managers today also report less life and work satisfaction, company pride, and career potential than they did in 1978. The changes in job attitudes undoubtedly reflect the new business environment faced by the entire XYZ organization. In this same period, the organization undertook a major effort to improve race relations within the management organization. Questions naturally arise as to the connections between the race relations improvement program, the altered corporate conditions, and the changes in racial perceptions.

We observed that the most marked increase in racial tension, as acknowledged by blacks and whites, occurred in the lower regions of management--especially at the first level. The changes in job attitudes, on the other hand, were most marked in the more senior regions of the organization. Higher more than lower ranking managers feel the pressures of the new corporate environment directly, so it is understandable that they would be more likely to report changes in their job experiences.

The race relations improvement program was built on a strategy that combined education and power. The aim of the Race Relations Competence Workshop was primarily educational, while the objective of the Upward Mobility Program and efforts to achieve greater balance in the composition of personnel committees was to increase the number of blacks in middle and upper middle management, and more generally, to achieve a more equitable distribution of influence among blacks and whites in the corporation. From the outset, the educational strategy appealed more to whites, and the power strategy drew more favorable reactions from blacks. After eight years in operation, the race relations improvement program maintains this pattern of racial differences in

perceptions and evaluations. People at the lower levels of management have been the most subject to the power effects of the improvement program and least touched by the educational features. The greatest proportion of black promotions have occurred from this section of the organization, and the smallest proportion of managers at this level have attended the race relations competence workshop. For some people, the question will arise as to whether the improvement program "caused" the heightening of tension between black and white managers that we have observed. To this question, there is, unfortunately, not a simple answer--if one attempts to be aware of the complexity in the change process. People associated with the race relations improvement program--both black and white--do develop perceptions that are more attentive to the forces of racism in the organization, and they are less likely to say that blacks are too demanding or that the company is overzealous in efforts to improve race relations. People with more knowledge of the race relations improvement program--both black and white--tend to give more positive evaluations of the program elements that have had the greatest efforts devoted to them. Nevertheless, interventions that either change or offer the possibility of changing the balance of influence between blacks and whites in the organization do draw significant resistance from whites--especially white men. The bottom line? For those who decide to become open to the nature of race relations in the organization, the improvement program has had a predominantly positive impact. However, those who remain uninformed and uninvolved, whether by choice or by accident, do not benefit by osmosis. It takes active commitment to change race relations--especially in the face of regressive trends locally and nationally.

Racial Perception Scales

Scale Title: General Racism

Race Relations within XYZ are good.
Racism pervades XYZ. [reverse]
Most White managers at XYZ are biased against Blacks.
Whites feel intellectually superior to Blacks at XYZ.
I have to deal with racial bigotry at XYZ.
XYZ is particularly biased against Black males.

Scale Title: Specific Racism

Blacks do not get the recognition they deserve.
Black managers are often given assignments with the expectation that they will fail.
Whites set up situations that justify stereotypes of Blacks.
If a Black fails in a job, all Blacks suffer in the eyes of management.
White managers share vital growth and career related information with Black managers. [reverse]
Whites cannot deal with competent Blacks.
Whites cannot deal with college-educated Blacks.

Scale Title: Management Unsupportive

Blacks are well accepted in XYZ management. [reverse]
XYZ officers do little to protect the legal rights of Black managers.
XYZ officers do little to advance the cause of Black managers.

Scale Title: Promotion Discrimination

Black people have to work harder than Whites to prove themselves.
Blacks are almost never evaluated fairly by White supervisors.
The XYZ target system limits the advancement of Blacks.
The way Personnel committees are set up within XYZ it is almost impossible for Blacks to reach upper management levels.
Despite racial discrimination, competent Blacks will be promoted at XYZ. [reverse]

Scale Title: White Promotion Advantage

Whites are given greater promotional opportunities.
Personnel ... committees view White males as a proven commodity.
Whites get better training than Blacks for assignments.
Qualified Whites are promoted more rapidly than equally qualified Blacks.

Scale Title: White Self Protection

Whites stick together to protect incompetent White managers.
Whites do not protect incompetent White managers. [reverse]

Scale Title: Blacks are easily fired.

The union is less likely to intervene to support Blacks who are fired.
It is easier to fire a Black manager than a White manager.

Scale Title: Affirmative Action is Bad.

Affirmative Action programs are helpful. [reverse]
Reverse discrimination demoralizes XYZ.
Affirmative Action programs are fair. [reverse]

Scale Title: Blacks are too Demanding.

Blacks should be grateful that they have jobs in XYZ and should stop complaining.
Black managers are too "pushy."
Black people at XYZ feel the White world owes them a living.
Blacks expect too much.
Black people should conform more and try to fit the XYZ image.

Scale Title: Company Overzealous

XYZ has not done enough on Black-White issues. [reverse]
The company bends over too far to help Blacks who are unwilling to help themselves.

Scale Title: Black Hiring Advantage

XYZ would prefer to hire a Black into management rather than a White.
Black managers are hired on the basis of competence. [reverse]
Unqualified Blacks are hired just to fill racial quotas.

Scale Title: Black Promotion Advantage

Most Blacks are promoted just because they are Black - not because they are qualified.
Qualified Blacks are promoted more rapidly than equally qualified Whites.
Blacks get promoted even if they are doing a mediocre job.
Blacks are given greater promotional opportunities than Whites.

Scale Title: Affirmative Action hurts White Promotion.

White males are unjustly penalized by Affirmative Action.
Despite EEO targets for Blacks, competent Whites will be promoted at XYZ. [reverse]

Scale Title: Black Self-Protection

Blacks stick together to protect incompetent Black managers.
Blacks do not protect incompetent Black managers. [reverse]

Scale Title: BMA is racist.

In terms of member attitudes, the BMA is essentially a racist organization.
The Black Management Association is a cause of racial tension.

Job Attitude Scales

Scale Title: Pay Satisfaction

I feel my compensation at XYZ is quite satisfactory.
Right now I feel underpaid for my work. [reverse]

Scale Title: General Satisfaction

I feel that things are basically going well for me in my life in general
(in...out XYZ).
Right now I feel that things are going poorly for me in my life in general
(in...out XYZ). [reverse]

Scale Title: Job Satisfaction

Right now I am satisfied with the work I am doing at XYZ.
I am unhappy with the work I am doing at XYZ. [reverse]

Scale Title: Company Pride

I am ashamed to tell people I work for XYZ. [reverse]
I am proud to tell people that I work for XYZ.

Scale Title: Career Potential

I feel that my career at XYZ has just about reached its peak. [reverse]
I feel that I have a very promising future at XYZ.

Appendix 2. Tables Showing Item and Scale Comparisons

Table 1a. Response to Mail and Meeting

frequency (percentage)

	Mail	Meeting
Respond	190 (58)	239 (71)
Not Respond	140 (42)	97 (29)

$$\chi^2 = 13.35 \text{ (d.f. = 1), } p < .001$$

Table 1b. Race-Gender Group Responses to Mail and Meeting
frequency (percentage)

Black Females	36 (50)	55 (75)
Black Males	30 (65)	41 (85)
White Females	52 (55)	54 (56)
White Males	72 (61)	89 (75)
Total	190 (58)	239 (71)

χ^2 not significant

Table 2a.¹ Race-Gender Group Responses to "I liked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.28 (32)	2.56 (54)	2.52	.01
Black Males	3.00 (28)	2.31 (44)	2.31	.02
White Females	3.48 (48)	3.19 (53)	1.16	n.s.
White Males	3.28 (68)	2.92 (87)	1.95	.05
Total	3.30 (177)	2.79 (238)	4.18	.0001

Table 2b. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I think improvements will come as a result of the study."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.39 (33)	3.44 (54)	0.19	n.s.
Black Males	3.26 (27)	3.44 (43)	0.59	n.s.
White Females	3.87 (47)	3.33 (52)	2.49	.01
White Males	3.78 (68)	3.55 (87)	1.19	n.s.
Total	3.66 (176)	3.46 (236)	1.72	n.s.

¹For all items in Tables 2-5, 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Mildly Agree, 4 = Mildly Disagree, 5 = Disagree, 6 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 2c. Race-Gender Group Responses to "This questionnaire is biased."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.64 (33)	4.69 (51)	0.22	n.s.
Black Males	4.51 (27)	4.58 (43)	0.32	n.s.
White Females	4.35 (46)	4.41 (51)	0.30	n.s.
White Males	3.86 (66)	4.54 (86)	3.91	.0001
Total	4.23 (173)	4.55 (231)	3.14	.002

Table 2d. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I thought my answers might not be held in confidence."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.18 (34)	4.48 (54)	1.08	n.s.
Black Males	3.96 (27)	4.28 (43)	1.06	n.s.
White Females	4.30 (47)	4.85 (53)	2.25	.03
White Males	4.06 (67)	4.76 (96)	3.68	.0003
Total	4.13 (175)	4.63 (236)	4.08	.0001

Table 2e. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I did not appreciate being asked so many questions."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	4.03 (33)	4.83 (54)	3.19	.002
Black Males	4.33 (27)	4.60 (43)	0.92	n.s.
White Females	3.77 (49)	4.53 (53)	3.10	.002
White Males	3.66 (68)	4.59 (86)	4.91	.0001
Total	3.87 (178)	4.64 (236)	6.50	.001

Table 2f. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I think harmful changes will come as a result of the study."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	5.09 (33)	5.26 (54)	1.09	n.s.
Black Males	5.18 (27)	5.02 (43)	0.70	n.s.
White Females	4.93 (47)	5.02 (53)	0.60	n.s.
White Males	4.75 (67)	4.99 (86)	1.93	n.s.
Total	4.93 (175)	5.06 (236)	1.71	n.s.

Table 2g. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I was able to be very frank in answering the questions."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	1.92 (34)	1.95 (54)	0.18	n.s.
Black Males	1.89 (27)	1.78 (44)	0.50	n.s.
White Females	2.38 (48)	2.17 (53)	0.96	n.s.
White Males	2.10 (68)	2.08 (86)	0.13	n.s.
Total	2.11 (178)	2.01 (237)	0.97	n.s.

Table 2h. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I found it difficult to answer many of the questions."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.84 (33)	4.02 (54)	0.58	n.s.
Black Males	3.82 (28)	4.65 (43)	2.81	.006
White Females	3.42 (48)	3.53 (54)	0.31	n.s.
White Males	3.44 (68)	4.03 (86)	2.67	.008
Total	3.56 (178)	3.98 (237)	3.11	.002

Table 2i. Race-Gender Group Responses to "The questionnaire provided me with an opportunity to express my most important opinions about race relations in management."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	2.64 (33)	2.78 (54)	0.58	n.s.
Black Males	2.61 (28)	2.48 (44)	0.43	n.s.
White Females	3.15 (48)	3.08 (52)	0.27	n.s.
White Males	3.01 (67)	2.92 (86)	0.52	n.s.
Total	3.02 (177)	2.84 (236)	0.60	n.s.

Table 2j. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I disliked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	4.06 (33)	4.67 (54)	2.02	.05
Black Males	4.78 (28)	4.93 (43)	0.61	n.s.
White Females	3.77 (48)	4.29 (52)	1.81	n.s.
White Males	3.79 (68)	4.41 (86)	3.14	.002
Total	3.99 (178)	4.54 (235)	4.29	.0001

Table 3a. Race-Gender Group Responses to G.S. 1, "Whites Hurt Blacks"

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.11 (36)	4.29 (56)	1.10	n.s.
Black Males	3.90 (30)	4.44 (45)	3.00	.004
White Females	2.36 (51)	2.27 (55)	0.74	n.s.
White Males	2.35 (72)	2.26 (89)	0.94	n.s.
Total	2.94 (190)	3.13 (245)	1.67	.09

Table 3b. Race-Gender Group Responses to G.S. 2, "Blacks Hurt Whites"

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	2.29 (36)	2.24 (56)	0.50	n.s.
Black Males	2.13 (30)	2.15 (45)	0.17	n.s.
White Females	3.26 (51)	3.03 (55)	1.57	n.s.
White Males	3.56 (72)	3.54 (89)	0.15	n.s.
Total	3.00 (190)	2.87 (245)	1.55	n.s.

Table 3c. Race-Gender Group Responses on G.S. 3 Satisfaction

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.76 (36)	4.42 (56)	2.14	.04
Black Males	4.66 (30)	4.55 (45)	0.61	n.s.
White Females	4.58 (51)	5.00 (55)	2.57	.01
White Males	4.67 (72)	4.85 (89)	1.52	n.s.
Total	4.66 (190)	4.73 (245)	0.98	n.s.

Table 4. Response to 1978 Sessions and 1986 Meeting Only

	frequency (percentage)	
	1978	1986
	Sessions	Meeting Only
Respond	662 (76)	239 (71)
Not Respond	206 (24)	97 (29)

$$\chi^2 = 3.39 \text{ (d.f. = 1), } .05 < p < .10$$

Table 5a. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I liked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	2.25 (72)	2.56 (54)	1.57	n.s.
Black Males	2.29 (60)	2.36 (44)	0.36	n.s.
White Females	2.72 (172)	3.26 (57)	2.98	.003
White Males	2.60 (341)	2.96 (128)	3.49	.0005
Total	2.57 (653)	2.82 (315)	3.30	.001

Table 5b. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I think improvements will come as a result of the study."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	3.29 (73)	3.44 (54)	0.72	n.s.
Black Males	3.42 (60)	3.44 (43)	0.10	n.s.
White Females	3.22 (169)	3.34 (56)	0.68	n.s.
White Males	3.25 (336)	3.42 (129)	1.57	n.s.
Total	3.27 (646)	3.38 (314)	1.52	n.s.

Table 5c. Race-Gender Group Responses to "This questionnaire is biased."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	4.63 (71)	4.69 (51)	0.30	n.s.
Black Males	4.50 (60)	4.58 (43)	0.40	n.s.
White Females	4.65 (162)	4.36 (55)	1.94	.05
White Males	3.48 (336)	4.46 (127)	0.12	n.s.
Total	4.54 (637)	4.46 (308)	1.30	n.s.

Table 5d. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I thought my answers might not be held in confidence."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	4.60 (72)	4.48 (54)	0.53	n.s.
Black Males	4.61 (60)	4.28 (43)	1.47	n.s.
White Females	4.72 (170)	4.88 (57)	0.80	n.s.
White Males	4.94 (336)	4.72 (127)	2.02	.04
Total	4.81 (646)	4.68 (313)	1.62	n.s.

Table 5e. Race-Gender Responses to "I did not appreciate being asked so many questions."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	5.03 (73)	4.83 (54)	1.16	n.s.
Black Males	4.97 (60)	4.60 (43)	1.73	.09
White Females	4.82 (171)	4.49 (57)	1.96	.05
White Males	4.84 (337)	4.57 (127)	2.57	.01
Total	4.87 (649)	4.64 (313)	3.21	.001

Table 5f. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I think harmful changes will come as a result of the study."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	5.18 (73)	5.26 (54)	0.67	n.s.
Black Males	5.10 (60)	5.02 (43)	0.44	n.s.
White Females	5.08 (171)	5.00 (57)	0.65	n.s.
White Males	5.03 (337)	4.98 (127)	0.77	n.s.
Total	5.07 (649)	5.05 (313)	0.29	n.s.

Table 5g. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I was able to be very frank in answering the questions."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	2.39 (73)	1.95 (54)	2.02	.05
Black Males	2.22 (60)	1.77 (40)	1.97	.05
White Females	2.03 (172)	2.16 (57)	0.86	n.s.
White Males	1.83 (338)	2.04 (129)	2.23	.03
Total	1.98 (651)	1.98 (316)	0.04	n.s.

Table 5h. Race-Gender Group Responses to "I found it difficult to answer many of the questions."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Meeting</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	3.38 (73)	4.02 (54)	2.62	.001
Black Males	4.25 (60)	4.65 (43)	1.61	n.s.
White Females	3.30 (173)	3.40 (173)	0.43	n.s.
White Males	3.89 (337)	4.20 (127)	2.26	.02
Total	3.72 (651)	4.06 (315)	3.62	.0003

Table 5i. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "The questionnaire provided me with an opportunity to express my most important opinions about race relations in management."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986</u> <u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	2.92 (73)	2.78 (54)	0.64	n.s.
Black Males	2.60 (60)	2.48 (44)	0.51	n.s.
White Females	3.01 (168)	3.20 (56)	1.08	n.s.
White Males	2.79 (338)	2.89 (128)	0.95	n.s.
Total	2.84 (647)	2.85 (314)	0.13	n.s.

Table 5j. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I disliked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986</u> <u>Meeting</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	5.01 (72)	4.67 (54)	1.70	.09
Black Males	5.07 (60)	4.93 (43)	0.78	n.s.
White Females	4.66 (170)	4.23 (56)	2.22	.03
White Males	4.78 (337)	4.47 (128)	2.69	.007
Total	4.79 (647)	4.58 (313)	2.75	.006

Table 6a. Race-Gender Group. Race Perception Scale Comparisons between 1978 and 1986

	1978	1986 Meeting	t	p
1. <u>General Racism</u>	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)		
Black Females	3.74 (78)	3.98 (56)	1.50	n.s.
Black Males	3.91 (61)	4.13 (45)	1.26	n.s.
White Females	2.41 (179)	2.40 (60)	0.05	n.s.
White Males	2.45 (349)	2.26 (136)	2.71	.002
Total	2.72 (676)	2.87 (3.30)	2.38	.02
2. <u>Specific Racism</u>				
Black Females	4.18 (77)	4.50 (56)	2.13	.03
Black Males	4.30 (61)	4.56 (45)	1.70	n.s.
White Females	2.31 (179)	2.46 (60)	1.44	n.s.
White Males	2.40 (349)	2.28 (136)	2.16	.03
Total	2.75 (675)	3.06 (329)	4.14	.0001
3. <u>Promotion Discrimination</u>				
Black Females	4.20 (76)	4.21 (56)	0.05	n.s.
Black Males	4.22 (61)	4.38 (45)	0.99	n.s.
White Females	2.26 (179)	2.25 (60)	0.12	n.s.
White Males	2.23 (348)	2.28 (136)	0.84	n.s.
Total	2.65 (673)	2.94 (329)	4.01	.0001
4. <u>White Promotion Advantage</u>				
Black Females	4.46 (76)	4.82 (56)	2.05	.04
Black Males	4.61 (61)	4.96 (45)	2.22	.03
White Females	2.44 (178)	2.51 (60)	0.51	n.s.
White Males	2.40 (347)	2.48 (136)	1.02	n.s.
Total	2.85 (671)	3.26 (329)	4.87	.0001

Table 6a. (continued)

	1978	1986		
	Mean (n)	Mean (n)	t	p
5. <u>Black Promotion Advantage</u>				
Black Females	1.95 (76)	1.97 (56)	0.20	n.s.
Black Males	2.00 (61)	1.79 (45)	1.55	n.s.
White Females	3.49 (178)	3.40 (60)	0.65	n.s.
White Males	3.76 (347)	3.72 (136)	0.53	n.s.
Total	3.32 (671)	3.05 (329)	3.42	.0007
6. <u>White Self Protection</u>				
Black Females	4.49 (76)	4.90 (56)	2.05	.04
Black Males	4.09 (59)	4.94 (45)	3.81	.0002
White Females	2.73 (176)	2.66 (59)	0.42	n.s.
White Males	2.62 (347)	2.60 (136)	0.20	n.s.
Total	3.00 (667)	3.38 (327)	4.16	.0001
7. <u>Blacks Easily Fired</u>				
Black Females	3.19 (77)	3.71 (56)	2.54	.01
Black Males	3.59 (58)	4.11 (45)	2.48	.01
White Females	1.97 (178)	1.69 (60)	2.51	.01
White Males	2.07 (347)	1.78 (136)	4.19	.0001
Total	2.30 (668)	2.46 (329)	2.11	.03
8. <u>Blacks are too Demanding</u>				
Black Females	1.51 (78)	1.91 (56)	4.33	.0001
Black Males	1.54 (61)	1.80 (45)	2.30	.02
White Females	1.99 (179)	2.49 (60)	4.48	.0001
White Males	2.19 (349)	2.66 (136)	6.47	.0001
Total	2.00 (676)	2.37 (330)	7.33	.0001
9. <u>Company Overzealous</u>				
Black Females	1.47 (76)	1.98 (56)	5.18	.0001
Black Males	1.55 (61)	1.98 (45)	3.49	.0007
White Females	2.38 (179)	3.27 (60)	8.62	.0001
White Males	2.64 (349)	3.58 (136)	12.59	.0001
Total	2.34 (674)	3.00 (330)	11.10	.0001

Table 6a (continued)

	1978	1986		
	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)	t	p
10. <u>Black Hiring Advantage</u>				
Black Females	2.54 (77)	2.34 (56)	1.38	n.s.
Black Males	2.35 (61)	2.13 (45)	1.73	.09
White Females	3.29 (178)	3.22 (58)	0.42	n.s.
White Males	3.34 (347)	3.23 (136)	1.11	n.s.
Total	3.14 (672)	2.90 (328)	3.63	.0003
11. <u>Affirmative Action Hurts White Promotions</u>				
Black Females	2.09 (76)	2.01 (56)	0.63	n.s.
Black Males	2.19 (61)	1.96 (45)	1.59	n.s.
White Females	3.22 (179)	3.08 (60)	0.87	n.s.
White Males	3.62 (348)	3.52 (136)	1.01	n.s.
Total	3.20 (673)	2.91 (329)	4.03	.0001
12. <u>Black Self Protection</u>				
Black Females	2.53 (76)	2.82 (56)	1.66	.10
Black Males	2.58 (59)	3.02 (45)	2.35	.02
White Females	3.29 (170)	3.24 (56)	0.29	n.s.
White Males	3.12 (331)	3.16 (136)	0.30	n.s.
Total	3.06 (645)	3.11 (324)	0.75	n.s.
13. <u>BMA is Racist</u>				
Black Females	2.18 (74)	1.97 (56)	1.16	n.s.
Black Males	2.34 (58)	1.75 (44)	2.52	.01
White Females	3.00 (119)	2.74 (48)	1.23	n.s.
White Males	3.07 (263)	3.11 (125)	0.34	n.s.
Total	2.85 (519)	2.62 (303)	2.57	.01

Table 6a. (continued)

GRAND SCALE 1. Whites Hurt Blacks

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986 Mtg.</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.97 (78)	4.29 (56)	2.21	.03
Black Males	4.06 (61)	4.44 (45)	2.67	.009
White Females	2.33 (179)	2.32 (60)	0.16	n.s.
White Males	2.35 (349)	2.26 (136)	1.82	.07
Total	2.69 (676)	2.95 (330)	4.03	.0001

GRAND SCALE 2. Blacks Hurt Whites

Black Females	2.09 (78)	2.24 (56)	2.03	.04
Black Males	2.14 (61)	2.15 (45)	0.09	n.s.
White Females	2.86 (179)	2.99 (60)	1.29	n.s.
White Males	3.08 (349)	3.32 (136)	3.67	.0003
Total	2.82 (676)	2.88 (330)	1.18	n.s.

GRAND SCALE 3. Satisfaction

Black Females	4.60 (78)	4.42 (56)	1.28	n.s.
Black Males	4.56 (61)	4.55 (45)	0.05	n.s.
White Females	5.00 (178)	4.99 (60)	0.12	n.s.
White Males	5.04 (349)	4.91 (136)	1.96	.05
Total	4.93 (675)	4.77 (330)	3.32	.0009

Table 6b. Race-Gender Group Satisfaction Scale Comparisons between 1978 and 1986

	1978	1986 Mtg.	t	p
1. <u>Pay Satisfaction</u>	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)		
Black Females	3.80 (78)	3.96 (56)	0.70	n.s.
Black Males	3.95 (61)	4.09 (45)	0.56	n.s.
White Females	4.88 (177)	4.75 (60)	0.88	n.s.
White Males	4.52 (349)	4.40 (136)	1.05	n.s.
Total	4.78 (674)	4.31 (330)	2.10	.04
2. <u>Life and Work Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	4.33 (78)	4.19 (50)	0.85	n.s.
Black Males	4.43 (61)	4.25 (45)	0.94	n.s.
White Females	4.95 (177)	4.80 (60)	1.16	n.s.
White Males	4.78 (349)	4.61 (136)	2.10	.04
Total	4.73 (674)	4.47 (330)	4.30	.0001
3. <u>Job Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	4.28 (78)	4.12 (56)	0.69	n.s.
Black Males	4.07 (61)	4.12 (45)	0.20	n.s.
White Females	4.73 (177)	4.91 (60)	1.02	n.s.
White Males	4.91 (349)	4.90 (136)	0.07	n.s.
Total	4.71 (674)	4.66 (330)	0.65	n.s.
4. <u>Company Pride</u>				
Black Females	5.18 (78)	4.96 (56)	1.47	n.s.
Black Males	5.18 (61)	5.28 (45)	0.80	n.s.
White Females	5.39 (178)	5.26 (60)	1.14	n.s.
White Males	5.43 (349)	5.23 (136)	2.41	.02
Total	5.36 (675)	5.18 (330)	3.46	.0006

Table 6b. (continued)

	1978	1986		
5. <u>Career Potential</u>	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.96 (77)	3.57 (56)	1.73	.09
Black Males	4.01 (61)	3.29 (45)	2.70	.008
White Females	4.13 (177)	3.67 (60)	2.23	.03
White Males	3.40 (348)	3.11 (136)	2.24	.03
Total	3.72 (672)	3.38 (329)	3.73	.0002

Table 7. Race-Gender Level GRAND SCALE Comparisons between 1978 and 1986.

GRAND SCALE 1. Whites Hurt Blacks

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986</u>		
Level 1	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Blacks	3.99 (113)	4.24 (119)	2.39	.02
White Females	2.29 (90)	2.24 (51)	0.63	n.s.
White Males	2.34 (101)	2.31 (64)	0.39	n.s.
Level 2				
Blacks	4.00 (23)	4.01 (34)	0.02	n.s.
White Females	2.33 (77)	2.32 (39)	0.09	n.s.
White Males	2.31 (103)	2.29 (59)	0.31	n.s.
Level 3				
Blacks	4.69 (3)	4.86 (13)	0.43	n.s.
White Females	2.61 (12)	2.68 (20)	0.24	n.s.
White Males	2.40 (81)	2.30 (35)	0.99	n.s.
Level 4 and Above				
White Males	2.36 (62)	2.78 (47)	1.13	n.s.

GRAND SCALE 2. Blacks Hurt Whites

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986</u>		
Level 1	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Blacks	2.12 (113)	2.27 (119)	2.85	.005
White Females	2.85 (90)	3.24 (51)	2.99	.003
White Males	3.33 (101)	3.64 (64)	2.90	.004
Level 2				
Blacks	2.11 (23)	2.17 (34)	0.39	n.s.
White Females	2.88 (77)	3.13 (39)	1.78	n.s.
White Males	3.15 (103)	3.60 (59)	4.26	.0001
Level 3				
Blacks	2.04 (3)	1.88 (13)	0.75	n.s.
White Females	2.72 (12)	2.69 (20)	0.12	n.s.
White Males	2.94 (81)	3.23 (35)	2.19	.03
Level 4 and Above				
White Males	2.78 (62)	2.91 (47)	1.44	n.s.

GRAND SCALE 3. Satisfaction

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1986</u>		
Level 1	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Blacks	4.52 (113)	4.50 (119)	0.19	n.s.
White Females	4.93 (89)	4.87 (51)	0.41	n.s.
White Males	4.86 (101)	4.78 (64)	0.64	n.s.
Level 2				
Blacks	4.88 (23)	4.73 (34)	0.89	n.s.
White Females	5.03 (77)	4.71 (39)	2.39	.02
White Males	5.02 (103)	4.76 (59)	2.45	.02
Level 3				
Blacks	4.72 (3)	4.78 (13)	0.12	n.s.
White Females	5.40 (12)	4.82 (20)	1.66	n.s.
White Males	5.11 (81)	4.75 (35)	3.27	.001
Level 4				
White Males	5.26 (62)	5.05 (47)	1.96	.05

Table 8-2. Overall Quality of Race Relations

Percent Agreement with: Race relations within XYZ are good.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	56	53	n.s.
Black Males	44	42	n.s.
White Females	87	83	n.s.
White Males	87	94	.02

Percent Agreement with: I am troubled by the quality of relationships between black and white managers at XYZ.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	62	75	n.s.
Black Males	69	73	n.s.
White Females	24	26	n.s.
White Males	25	18	.004

Percent Agreement with: Race Relations at XYZ have improved since I joined the company.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	62	58	.03
Black Males	68	64	n.s.
White Females	79	86	.01
White Males	86	94	n.s.

Table 8-2 continued

Percent Agreement with: Race relations among XYZ managers could be improved.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	100	97	n.s.
Black Males	97	100	n.s.
White Females	80	68	n.s.
White Males	83	82	n.s.

Table 8-3. Characteristics of Relations Between Black and White Managers at XYZ.

Percent Agreement with: Whites socialize mainly with Whites regardless of job level.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	80	87	n.s.
Black Males	89	96	n.s.
White Females	71	80	n.s.
White Males	85	81	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Blacks socialize mainly with other blacks regardless of job level.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	70	71	n.s.
Black Males	77	66	n.s.
White Females	82	88	n.s.
White Males	84	85	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Good one-to-one black-white relationships are common in XYZ.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	59	50	n.s.
Black Males	40	49	n.s.
White Females	78	85	n.s.
White Males	74	86	.005

Table 8-3 continued

Percent Agreement with: Black managers enjoy participating in racial joking.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	25	2	.0003
Black Males	15	4	.06
White Females	41	25	.08
White Males	28	13	.0001

Percent Agreement with: I talk about race relations with people who are of a different race than mine.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	17	21	n.s.
Black Males	21	16	n.s.
White Females	11	13	n.s.
White Males	7	13	.004

Percent Agreement with: I have serious conversations about racial issues with people of my own racial background.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	51	59	n.s.
Black Males	54	55	n.s.
White Females	6	11	n.s.
White Males	7	9	n.s.

Table 8-4. Hiring Black and White Managers

Percent Agreement with: Blacks should be hired on the basis of their ability rather than their color.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	97	96	n.s.
Black Males	95	96	n.s.
White Females	99	98	n.s.
White Males	96	96	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Whites should be hired on the basis of their ability rather than color.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	99	98	n.s.
Black Males	97	93	n.s.
White Females	97	100	n.s.
White Males	98	98	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Black managers are hired on the basis of competence.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	76	86	n.s.
Black Males	90	85	n.s.
White Females	62	72	n.s.
White Males	64	70	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Unqualified blacks are hired just to fill racial quotas.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	32	41	.05
Black Males	18	20	n.s.
White Females	51	50	n.s.
White Males	50	38	n.s.

Table 8-4, part 2

Percent Agreement with: Blacks have brought low standards into XYZ.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	3	3	n.s.
Black Males	5	0	n.s.
White Females	19	10	n.s.
White Males	38	14	.0001

Percent Agreement with: The company hires blacks off the street when whites are taking lower level jobs just to stay employed.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	22	4	.02
Black Males	24	7	.04
White Females	59	42	n.s.
White Males	55	26	.0001

Table 8-5. Evaluation of Managerial Performance

Percent Agreement with: Black managers are often given assignments with the expectation that they will fail.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	61	79	n.s.
Black Males	70	73	n.s.
White Females	7	7	n.s.
White Males	5	4	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Whites cannot deal with competent blacks.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	79	87	n.s.
Black Males	74	91	n.s.
White Females	10	13	n.s.
White Males	8	4	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: If a black fails at a job, all blacks suffer in the eyes of management.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	65	82	.05
Black Males	79	87	n.s.
White Females	33	34	n.s.
White Males	35	21	.05

Percent Agreement with: If a white fails at a job, it is considered an individual issue.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	94	97	n.s.
Black Males	95	100	n.s.
White Females	93	93	n.s.
White Males	95	98	n.s.

Table 8-5, p. 2

Percent Agreement with: Black people have to work harder than whites to prove themselves.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	97	100	n.s.
Black Males	97	98	n.s.
White Females	44	53	n.s.
White Males	36	41	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Blacks are almost never evaluated fairly by white supervisors.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	58	54	n.s.
Black Males	60	69	n.s.
White Females	6	6	n.s.
White Males	12	12	n.s.

Table 8-6. Getting Information About Promotions

Percent Agreement with: White managers share vital growth and career related information with Black managers.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	40	41	n.s.
Black Males	42	22	.03
White Females	41	42	n.s.
White Males	39	51	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: I have been told what my category rating is on the stacking list for promotion.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	56	63	n.s.
Black Males	62	47	n.s.
White Females	70	74	n.s.
White Males	72	72	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: I have been told that the odds of my being promoted (whether they are high or low) depend on my race.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	22	9	n.s.
Black Males	31	6	.001
White Females	7	10	n.s.
White Males	16	13	n.s.

Table 8-7. Who Has Promotion Advantages?

Percent Agreement with: Whites receive proper training for their assignments.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	67	66	n.s.
Black Males	73	71	n.s.
White Females	54	41	n.s.
White Males	60	58	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Blacks receive proper training for their assignments.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	29	12	.07
Black Males	32	13	.04
White Females	40	52	n.s.
White Males	63	59	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Whites get better training than blacks for assignments.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	62	64	n.s.
Black Males	66	79	n.s.
White Females	1	7	.06
White Males	6	4	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Qualified blacks are promoted more rapidly than equally qualified whites.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	12	7	n.s.
Black Males	13	9	n.s.
White Females	75	78	n.s.
White Males	82	84	n.s.

Table 8-7, p. 2

Percent Agreement with: Qualified whites are promoted more rapidly than equally qualified whites.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	89	93	n.s.
Black Males	95	98	n.s.
White Females	12	18	n.s.
White Males	10	13	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Blacks get promoted even if they are doing a mediocre job.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	4	18	.02
Black Males	5	0	n.s.
White Females	53	62	n.s.
White Males	58	48	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Reverse discrimination demoralizes XYZ management.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	48	60	n.s.
Black Males	45	55	n.s.
White Females	77	77	n.s.
White Males	86	88	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: White males are unjustly penalized by Affirmative Action programs.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	20	16	n.s.
Black Males	29	17	n.s.
White Females	69	60	n.s.
White Males	51	79	.05

Table 8-8. Perceptions of Top Management Position on Race Relations

Percent Agreement with: Top management at XYZ has a serious commitment to improve race relations.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	71	77	n.s.
Black Males	78	67	n.s.
White Females	81	79	n.s.
White Males	84	87	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: XYZ officers do little to protect the legal rights of black managers.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	60	46	n.s.
Black Males	50	44	n.s.
White Females	4	5	n.s.
White Males	4	2	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: XYZ officers do little to advance the cause of black managers.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	82	69	n.s.
Black Males	74	62	n.s.
White Females	7	8	n.s.
White Males	9	4	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: There is a strong commitment among top management toward promoting blacks.

	Meeting		
	1978	1986	p
Black Females	38	36	n.s.
Black Males	48	44	n.s.
White Females	84	87	n.s.
White Males	90	87	n.s.

Table 8-10 . Views of Management Movement Committees

Percent Agreement with: The way management movement committees are set up within XYZ, it is almost impossible for blacks to reach upper management levels.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	73	79	n.s.
Black Males	72	84	n.s.
White Females	9	14	n.s.
White Males	4	5	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: Management movement committees view white males as a proven commodity.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	89	93	.01
Black Males	86	87	n.s.
White Females	49	44	.01
White Males	32	27	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: There are few blacks above level 2.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	100	95	.0001
Black Males	97	91	.01
White Females	96	55	.0007
White Males	95	56	.0001

Table 8-11. Black Managers Association

Percent Agreement with: BMA is an effective support system for black managers.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	72	75	n.s.
Black Males	74	86	n.s.
White Females	89	93	n.s.
White Males	80	74	.03

Percent Agreement with: BMA is a cause of racial tension.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	19	21	n.s.
Black Males	17	12	n.s.
White Females	34	38	n.s.
White Males	31	41	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: In terms of member attitudes, the BMA is essentially a racist organization.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	16	5	n.s.
Black Males	25	7	n.s.
White Females	43	41	n.s.
White Males	50	53	n.s.

Percent Agreement with: BMA works with top management to solve racial problems at XYZ.

	Meeting		p
	1978	1986	
Black Females	69	76	n.s.
Black Males	77	80	n.s.
White Females	78	77	n.s.
White Males	79	68	n.s.

Table 9. Perception of Change from Recommendations by Race Gender Groups
(percentages)

1. Continue and expand Race Relations Advisory Group

	(n)	<u>No Information</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Improved</u>	
Black Females	(87)	31	4	17	48	
Black Males	(72)	38	4	15	43	
White Females	(103)	65	3	8	25	
White Males	(198)	60	2	8	30	
Total	(460)	52	3	11	34	p < .0008

2. Prepare OD Group to Work on Race Relations Improvement

	(n)	<u>No Information</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Improved</u>	
Black Females	(86)	22	5	14	59	
Black Males	(73)	23	5	7	64	
White Females	(103)	44	2	10	44	
White Males	(200)	38	8	10	44	
Total	(462)	34	6	10	50	p < .02

3. Develop and deliver employee information program about race relations

	(n)	<u>No Information</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Improved</u>	
Black Females	(87)	25	6	31	38	
Black Males	(74)	26	12	30	32	
White Females	(102)	40	7	26	27	
White Males	(199)	26	10	23	41	
Total	(462)	29	9	26	36	n.s.

Table 9, continued

4. Increase the number of black managers at third level and higher.

	(n)	No Information	Worsened	No Change	Improved	
Black Females	(87)	7	10	21	62	
Black Males	(73)	12	6	15	67	
White Females	(105)	23	8	13	56	
White Males	(200)	19	15	13	53	
Total	(465)	26	11	15	58	p < .02

5. Prepare Personnel Committees to respond more effectively to career needs of black employees.

	(n)	No Information	Worsened	No Change	Improved	
Black Females	(87)	14	25	40	21	
Black Males	(73)	25	21	25	29	
White Females	(103)	45	5	13	38	
White Males	(200)	34	15	14	37	
Total	(463)	31	16	20	33	p < .0001

6. Develop and deliver training to improve race relations competence of key managers.

	(n)	No Information	Worsened	No Change	Improved	
Black Females	(86)	23	16	30	31	
Black Males	(73)	26	10	23	41	
White Females	(103)	39	6	15	40	
White Males	(199)	30	9	17	44	
Total	(461)	30	9	20	41	p < .01

7. Improve performance appraisal to be more responsive to race relations issues.

	(n)	No Information	Worsened	No Change	Improved	
Black Females	(87)	21	20	47	12	
Black Males	(72)	25	25	35	15	
White Females	(102)	42	6	40	12	
White Males	(198)	30	13	38	19	
Total	(459)	30	15	40	15	p < .001

Table 9, continued

8. Improve potential appraisal to be more responsive to race relations issues.

	(n)	No <u>Information</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	No <u>Change</u>	<u>Improved</u>	
Black Females	(86)	21	21	45	13	
Black Males	(73)	27	25	34	14	
White Females	(101)	50	4	33	13	
White Males	(198)	32	15	31	22	
Total	(458)	33	15	35	17	p < .004

9. Improve internal discrimination complaint process.

	(n)	No <u>Information</u>	<u>Worsened</u>	No <u>Change</u>	<u>Improved</u>	
Black Females	(86)	31	15	35	19	
Black Males	(73)	38	10	30	22	
White Females	(103)	45	4	24	27	
White Males	(198)	44	8	21	27	
Total	(460)	41	8	26	25	p < .04

Table 10. Assessments and Recommendations about Key Program Elements by Race-Gender Groups

1a. Assessments of Race Relations Advisory Group
 (Percentage Agreement)
 (n = 200)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>p</u>
Helps race relations at XYZ	88	87	86	89	88	n.s.
Hurts XYZ organization	2	2	14	13	8	.004
I have benefitted	67	71	36	32	50	.01
Helps XYZ organization	96	96	88	85	91	n.s.
Hurts race relations at XYZ	0	2	11	17	7	.001
I have been hurt	2	11	11	8	9	n.s.
No Information (n = 276)	46	36	68	64	57	.0001

(Table 10)

1b. Recommendations About Race Relations Advisory Group

(percentages)

(n = 206)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep and strengthen	92	91	57	27	62
Keep as is	2	4	29	48	24
Keep but reduce resources	0	2	6	12	6
Review with expectation to eliminate	2	2	9	8	5
Definitely eliminate	2	0	0	0	2

p < .0001

(Table 10)

2a. Assessments of Race Relations Competence Workshop
(Percentage Agreement)
(n = 238)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>p</u>
Helps race relations at XYZ	91	98	85	74	89	.07
Hurts XYZ organization	2	6	14	7	8	.03
I have benefitted	88	82	63	60	73	.006
Helps XYZ organization	98	98	87	87	92	n.s.
Hurts race relations at XYZ	0	8	9	18	10	.001
I have been hurt	4	0	2	5	3	n.s.
No Information (n = 233)	36	28	56	58	49	.0001

(Table 10)

2b. Recommendations About Race Relations Competence Workshop

(Percentage Agreement)

(n = 236)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep and strengthen	96	90	62	41	69
Keep as is	4	8	20	35	19
Keep but reduce resources	0	0	2	7	3
Review with expectation to eliminate	0	2	16	13	8
Definitely eliminate	0	0	0	4	1

p < .0001

(Table 10)

3a. Assessment of Upward Mobility Program
(Percentage Agreement)
(n = 276)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>p</u>
Helps race relations at XYZ	62	70	40	41	49	.04
Hurts XYZ organization	30	9	39	52	38	.0001
I have benefitted	48	37	14	20	24	.001
Helps XYZ organization	82	88	67	48	64	.0001
Hurts race relations at XYZ	30	19	45	57	44	.0001
I have been hurt	30	23	29	31	28	n.s.
No Information (n = 186)	53	31	45	35	39	.07

(Table 10)

3b. Recommendations About Upward Mobility Program

(Percentages)

(n = 276)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep and strengthen	65	90	26	25	42
Keep as is	5	6	24	21	17
Keep but reduce resources	8	0	12	7	7
Review with expectation to eliminate	18	2	21	22	18
Definitely eliminate	3	2	17	25	16

p < .0001

(Table 10)

4a. Assessments of Personnel Committee Composition

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>p</u>
Helps race relations at XYZ	94	83	78	84	85	.02
Hurts XYZ organization	0	7	18	17	12	.0001
I have benefitted	67	58	30	18	40	.0001
Helps XYZ organization	98	93	82	82	87	.0001
Hurts race relations at XYZ	7	10	18	16	14	.0001
I have been hurt	12	7	10	15	11	n.s.
No Information (n = 251)	53	42	62	51	53	.06

(Table 10)

4b. Recommendations About Personnel Committee Composition
(percentages)

(n = 225)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep and strengthen	93	95	50	36	60
Keep as is	2	0	42	47	29
Keep but reduce resources	0	0	2	0	5
Review with expectation to eliminate	0	5	2	4	3
Definitely eliminate	5	0	2	3	3

p < .0001

(Table 10)

5a. Assessments of Discrimination Complaint Procedure
(Percentage Agreement)
(n = 170)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Males</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>p</u>
Helps race relations at XYZ	76	68	72	76	74	n.s.
Hurts XYZ organization	14	4	14	20	15	n.s.
I have benefitted	41	21	9	19	22	.09
Helps XYZ organization	85	78	83	82	82	n.s.
Hurts race relations at XYZ	6	14	21	14	15	.01
I have been hurt	9	0	7	6	7	n.s.
No information (n = 302)	61	60	66	65	63	.05

(Table 10)

5b. Recommendations About Discrimination Complaint Procedure

(percentages)

(n = 171)

	<u>Black Females</u>	<u>Black Males</u>	<u>White Females</u>	<u>White Male</u>	<u>Total</u>
Keep and strengthen	78	86	57	58	58
Keep as is	11	3	31	48	29
Keep but reduce resources	3	3	3	4	3
Review with expectation to eliminate	6	3	9	10	8
Definitely eliminate	3	3	0	0	1

p < .001

Table 11a. Correlations Between Information and Evaluation for Specific Interventions

	<u>Advisory Group</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Upward Mobility</u>	<u>PPCN</u>	<u>Discrim. Complaint</u>
Black Females	.34 (p<.02)	.50 (p<.0001)	.51 (p<.001)	.19 (n.s.)	-.31 (p<.07)
Black Males	.31 (p<.04)	.29 (p<.04)	.19 (n.s.)	-.02 (n.s.)	-.12 (n.s.)
White Females	.51 (p<.002)	.48 (p<.0006)	.25 (p<.03)	.06 (n.s.)	.02 (n.s.)
White Males	.43 (p<.0001)	.33 (p<.002)	-.04 (n.s.)	-.05 (n.s.)	-.11 (n.s.)
Total	.37 (p<.0001)	.43 (p<.0001)	.13 (p<.02)	.05 (n.s.)	-.11 (n.s.)

Table 11b. Relations Advisory Group Members and Non Members on Major Intervention Scale Evaluations

	NonMember RRAG <u>mean</u> (n)	Member RRAG <u>mean</u> (n)	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Advisory Group Evaluation	5.05 (184)	6.13 (24)	4.58	.0001
Workshop Evaluation	5.55 (215)	6.12 (25)	2.55	.01
AMD Evaluation	4.22 (257)	5.11 (24)	3.05	.002
PC Evaluation	5.12 (201)	5.88 (23)	3.05	.003
Dis. Complaint Evaluation	4.83 (151)	4.77 (20)	0.25	n.s.

Table 11c. Major Intervention Evaluations for Race Relations Workshop
Participants and NonParticipants

	<u>Non Participant Mean</u> (n)	<u>Participant Mean</u> (n)	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Advisory Group Evaluation	4.81 (50)	5.29 (158)	2.62	.01
Workshop Evaluation	4.93 (52)	5.79 (188)	5.42	.0001
AMDP Evaluation	4.03 (119)	4.50 (162)	2.81	.005
Personnel Committee Composition Evaluation	4.60 (74)	4.49 (150)	1.40	n.s.
Dis. Complaint Evaluation	4.77 (53)	4.83 (118)	0.47	n.s.

Table 12. Race Relations Advisory Group Members and NonMember Comparisons on Race Perception Scales

	NonMember RRAG		Member RRAG		t	p
	mean	(n)	mean	(n)		
General Racism	2.84	(462)	3.91	(25)	5.08	.0001
Specific Racism	3.00	(462)	4.08	(25)	4.42	.0001
Promotion Discrimination	2.90	(462)	3.80	(25)	3.93	.0001
White Promotion Advantage	3.23	(462)	4.47	(25)	4.43	.0001
Black Promotion Advantage	3.16	(462)	2.42	(25)	2.96	.003
White Self Protection	3.33	(457)	4.46	(25)	3.80	.0002
Blacks Easily Fired	2.47	(456)	3.70	(25)	4.69	.0001
Blacks Are Too Demanding	2.41	(462)	1.87	(25)	3.22	.001
Company Overzealous	3.06	(462)	2.25	(25)	3.53	.0005
Black Hiring Advantage	3.00	(459)	2.09	(25)	4.23	.0001
Affirmative Action Hurts White Promotions	3.03	(462)	1.96	(25)	4.43	.0001
Black Self Protection	3.14	(452)	3.04	(25)	0.44	n.s.
BMA is Racist	2.67	(426)	1.96	(25)	2.76	.006
G.S. 1 Whites Hurt Blacks	2.92	(462)	4.03	(25)	4.96	.0001
G.S. 2 Blacks Hurt Whites	2.96	(462)	2.29	(25)	3.87	.0001

Table 13. Race-Gender Group Race Perceptions Scale Comparisons between Participants and NonParticipants in the Race Relations Competence Workshop

	Non Participants	Participants	t	p
1. <u>General Racism</u>	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)		
Black Females	3.70 (20)	4.00 (72)	2.16	.04
Black Males	3.67 (23)	4.02 (52)	1.60	n.s.
White Females	2.24 (72)	2.74 (39)	3.49	.001
White Males	2.24 (130)	2.41 (78)	1.76	n.s.
Total	2.49 (245)	3.29 (242)	8.98	.0001
2. <u>Specific Racism</u>				
Black Females	4.14 (20)	4.47 (72)	2.26	.03
Black Males	4.09 (23)	4.49 (52)	1.72	.09
White Females	2.25 (72)	2.75 (39)	3.53	.0006
White Males	2.25 (130)	2.42 (78)	2.00	.05
Total	2.58 (245)	3.54 (242)	9.48	.0001
3. <u>Promotion Discrimination</u>				
Black Females	3.95 (20)	4.14 (72)	0.90	n.s.
Black Males	3.91 (23)	4.27 (52)	1.60	n.s.
White Females	2.21 (72)	2.50 (39)	2.07	.04
White Males	2.27 (130)	2.45 (78)	2.03	.04
Total	2.54 (245)	3.36 (242)	8.56	.0001
4. <u>White Promotion Advantage</u>				
Black Females	4.35 (20)	4.92 (72)	2.53	.01
Black Males	4.35 (23)	4.95 (52)	2.70	.009
White Females	2.38 (72)	2.96 (39)	3.06	.003
White Males	2.39 (130)	2.60 (78)	1.88	.06
Total	2.73 (245)	3.86 (242)	9.79	.0001

(Table 13 continued)

	NonP.	Part.	t	p
	Mean (n)	Mean (n)		
5. <u>Black Promotion Advantage</u>				
Black Females	2.06 (20)	2.07 (72)	0.04	n.s.
Black Males	2.18 (23)	1.70 (52)	3.66	.0005
White Females	3.55 (72)	3.62 (39)	0.32	n.s.
White Males	3.91 (130)	3.65 (78)	1.97	.05
Total	3.49 (245)	2.74 (242)	7.02	.0001
6. <u>White Self Protection</u>				
Black Females	4.38 (20)	4.89 (72)	2.12	.04
Black Males	4.26 (23)	5.08 (51)	3.35	.001
White Females	2.50 (71)	2.89 (38)	1.78	.08
White Males	2.64 (129)	2.64 (77)	0.0	n.s.
Total	2.90 (243)	3.89 (239)	7.86	.0001
7. <u>Blacks Easily Fired</u>				
Black Females	3.45 (20)	3.84 (71)	1.39	n.s.
Black Males	3.57 (22)	4.21 (51)	2.45	.02
White Females	1.68 (72)	1.99 (39)	1.93	.06
White Males	1.80 (128)	1.92 (77)	1.20	n.s.
Total	2.06 (242)	3.00 (239)	8.42	.0001
8. <u>Blacks are too Demanding</u>				
Black Females	2.01 (20)	1.84 (72)	1.28	n.s.
Black Males	1.87 (23)	1.75 (52)	0.89	n.s.
White Females	2.61 (72)	2.46 (39)	0.90	n.s.
White Males	2.80 (130)	2.65 (78)	1.31	n.s.
Total	2.59 (245)	2.18 (242)	5.64	.0001

(Table 13 continued)

	NonP.	Part.		
	Mean (n)	Mean (n)	t	p
9. <u>Company Overzealous</u>				
Black Females	2.23 (20)	1.99 (72)	1.32	n.s.
Black Males	1.96 (23)	1.98 (52)	0.15	n.s.
White Females	3.51 (72)	3.05 (39)	2.48	.01
White Males	3.81 (130)	3.40 (78)	3.10	.002
Total	3.42 (245)	2.62 (242)	8.36	.001
10. <u>Black Hiring Advantage</u>				
Black Females	2.37 (20)	2.41 (72)	0.22	n.s.
Black Males	2.24 (22)	2.00 (52)	1.48	n.s.
White Females	3.32 (70)	3.15 (39)	0.77	n.s.
White Males	3.54 (130)	3.03 (78)	3.89	.0001
Total	3.26 (242)	2.64 (242)	6.83	.0001
11. <u>Affirmative Action Hurts White Promotions</u>				
Black Females	2.05 (20)	2.02 (72)	0.16	n.s.
Black Males	2.06 (23)	1.99 (52)	0.39	n.s.
White Females	3.38 (72)	2.82 (39)	2.58	.01
White Males	3.83 (130)	3.29 (78)	3.93	.0001
Total	3.39 (245)	2.55 (242)	8.26	.0001
12. <u>Black Self Protection</u>				
Black Females	2.65 (20)	2.90 (72)	1.01	n.s.
Black Males	3.28 (23)	2.94 (51)	1.30	n.s.
White Females	3.26 (69)	3.51 (36)	1.02	n.s.
White Males	3.23 (128)	3.14 (77)	0.53	n.s.
Total	3.19 (240)	3.08 (237)	1.06	n.s.

(Table 13 continued)

	NonP. Mean (n)	Part. Mean (n)	t	p
13. <u>BMA is Racist</u>				
Black Females	1.78 (20)	1.99 (72)	0.99	n.s.
Black Males	1.83 (21)	1.75 (51)	0.41	n.s.
White Females	2.98 (54)	2.76 (38)	0.81	n.s.
White Males	3.24 (118)	3.06 (76)	1.05	n.s.
Total	2.89 (213)	2.40 (238)	4.28	.0001
14. <u>Pay Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	4.50 (20)	4.15 (72)	1.15	n.s.
Black Males	4.37 (23)	4.02 (52)	1.16	n.s.
White Females	4.60 (72)	4.69 (39)	0.42	n.s.
White Males	4.23 (130)	4.20 (78)	0.78	n.s.
Total	4.42 (245)	4.23 (242)	1.81	.07
15. <u>General Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	4.42 (20)	4.32 (72)	0.51	n.s.
Black Males	4.43 (23)	4.25 (52)	0.82	n.s.
White Females	4.70 (79)	4.67 (32)	0.19	n.s.
White Males	4.56 (130)	4.41 (78)	1.35	n.s.
Total	4.58 (245)	4.39 (242)	2.42	.02
16. <u>Job Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	3.70 (20)	4.35 (72)	1.96	.06
Black Males	4.19 (23)	4.22 (52)	0.09	n.s.
White Females	4.70 (72)	4.74 (39)	0.18	n.s.
White Males	4.78 (130)	4.90 (78)	0.82	n.s.
Total	4.61 (245)	4.55 (242)	0.59	n.s.

(Table 13 continued)

	NonP.	Part.	t	p
	<u>Mean</u> (n)	<u>Mean</u> (n)		
17. <u>Company Pride</u>				
Black Females	5.08 (20)	5.13 (72)	0.33	n.s.
Black Males	5.19 (23)	5.31 (52)	0.57	n.s.
White Females	5.12 (72)	4.98 (39)	0.67	n.s.
White Males	5.14 (130)	5.17 (78)	0.22	n.s.
Total	5.13 (245)	5.15 (242)	0.23	n.s.
18. <u>Career Potential</u>				
Black Females	3.32 (20)	3.64 (72)	0.87	n.s.
Black Males	3.76 (23)	3.31 (52)	1.23	n.s.
White Females	3.52 (72)	3.28 (39)	0.88	n.s.
White Males	3.11 (130)	2.88 (78)	1.24	n.s.
Total	3.31 (245)	3.27 (242)	0.38	n.s.

(Table 13 continued)

GRAND SCALE 1.	NonP. <u>Mean</u> (n)	Part. <u>Mean</u> (n)	t	p
<u>Whites Hurt Blacks</u>				
Black Females	3.92 (20)	4.31 (72)	2.97	.004
Black Males	3.89 (23)	4.37 (52)	2.48	.02
White Females	2.19 (72)	2.63 (39)	3.78	.0003
White Males	2.24 (130)	2.37 (78)	1.70	.09
Total	2.52 (245)	3.43 (242)	9.85	.0001
GRAND SCALE 2.				
<u>Blacks Hurt Whites</u>				
Black Females	2.26 (20)	2.26 (72)	0.02	n.s.
Black Males	2.28 (23)	2.08 (52)	2.03	.05
White Females	3.14 (72)	3.05 (39)	1.09	n.s.
White Males	3.51 (130)	3.22 (78)	2.73	.007
Total	3.19 (245)	2.66 (242)	7.18	.0001
GRAND SCALE 3				
<u>Satisfaction</u>				
Black Females	4.40 (20)	4.60 (72)	1.06	n.s.
Black Males	4.61 (23)	4.59 (52)	.08	n.s.
White Females	4.84 (72)	4.79 (39)	0.27	n.s.
White Males	4.83 (130)	4.83 (78)	0.02	n.s.
Total	4.78 (245)	4.69 (242)	1.13	n.s.

Table 14a. Upward Mobility Effects for Blacks

	<u>No Contact</u>	<u>Interviewed Not Selected</u>	<u>Selected</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
General Racism	3.91	3.97	3.98	0.13	n.s.
Specific Racism	4.35	4.51	4.44	0.45	n.s.
White Promotion Advantage	4.77	4.72	4.86	0.16	n.s.
Black Promotion Advantage	2.01	2.01	1.89	0.20	n.s.
Blacks Too Demanding	1.90	1.92	1.50	6.69	.002
BMA Racist	1.88	1.94	1.73	0.39	n.s.
Job Satisfaction	4.25	3.69	4.41	2.67	.07
Company Pride	5.21	5.13	5.11	0.24	n.s.
Career	3.55	3.08	3.77	1.69	n.s.
Upward Mobility Evaluation	4.76	4.45	5.89	9.76	.0002

Table 14b. Upward Mobility Effects for Whites

	<u>No Contact</u>	<u>Interviewed Not Selected</u>	<u>Selected</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
General Racism	2.31	2.93	2.38	4.50	.01
Specific Racism	2.33	2.69	2.53	2.40	.09
White Promotion Advantage	2.50	2.83	2.44	0.91	n.s.
Black Promotion Advantage	3.71	3.83	3.85	0.24	n.s.
Blacks Too Demanding	2.69	2.48	2.67	0.37	n.s.
BMA Racist	3.08	3.08	3.00	0.06	n.s.
Job Satisfaction	4.78	4.54	5.02	0.74	n.s.
Company Pride	5.14	4.62	5.26	1.63	n.s.
Career	3.13	2.71	4.29	7.01	.001
Upward Mobility Evaluation	3.89	3.31	5.20	10.23	.0001

Table 15. Comparison of PPCN Members in 1978 and 1986 on Race Perception Scales

	1978 PPCN Members	1986 PPCN Members	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
General Racism	2.58 (79)	2.89 (43)	1.88	.06
Specific Racism	2.43 (79)	2.97 (43)	3.31	.001
Promotion Discrimination	2.25 (79)	2.89 (43)	3.96	.0001
White Promotion Advantage	2.39 (79)	3.28 (43)	4.51	.0001
Black Promotion Advantage	3.57 (79)	3.10 (43)	2.22	.03
White Self Protection	2.62 (79)	3.38 (42)	3.18	.002
Blacks Easily Fired	2.12 (79)	2.44 (42)	1.69	n.s.
Blacks are too Demanding	2.07 (79)	2.28 (43)	1.58	n.s.
Company Overzealous	2.44 (79)	2.89 (43)	2.84	.005
Black Hiring Advantage	3.21 (79)	2.63 (43)	2.93	.004
Affirmative Action Hurts White Promotions	3.35 (79)	2.55 (43)	4.20	.0001
Black Self Protection	3.08 (79)	3.08 (43)	0.01	n.s.
BMA is Racist	3.08 (60)	2.51 (40)	2.35	.02
G.S. 1 Whites Hurt Blacks	2.40 (79)	2.93 (43)	3.33	.001
G.S. 2 Blacks Hurt Whites	2.96 (79)	2.73 (43)	1.37	n.s.

Table 16. Reactions to Questionnaire for Participants and Non Participants in Race Relations Workshop

1. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I liked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>No</u> <u>Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	2.78 (18)	2.84 (68)	0.17	n.s.
Black Males	2.81 (21)	2.53 (51)	0.92	n.s.
White Females	3.35 (69)	3.17 (36)	1.02	n.s.
White Males	3.21 (125)	2.83 (71)	2.32	.02
Total	3.21 (233)	2.83 (227)	3.35	.0009

2. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I think improvements will come as a result of the study."

	<u>No</u> <u>Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	3.37 (19)	3.44 (68)	0.24	n.s.
Black Males	3.43 (21)	3.35 (49)	0.25	n.s.
White Females	3.45 (67)	3.83 (36)	1.66	.10
White Males	3.72 (125)	3.24 (72)	2.89	.004
Total	3.59 (232)	3.42 (226)	1.48	n.s.

3. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "This questionnaire is biased."

	<u>No</u> <u>Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>		
	mean (n)	mean (n)	t	p
Black Females	4.79 (19)	4.63 (65)	0.62	n.s.
Black Males	4.43 (21)	4.61 (49)	0.89	n.s.
White Females	4.40 (65)	4.30 (36)	0.42	n.s.
White Males	4.25 (122)	4.28 (71)	0.22	n.s.
Total	4.35 (227)	4.45 (222)	0.99	n.s.

AD-A170 842

CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF RACE RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT
(U) YALE UNIV NEW HAVEN CT SCHOOL OF ORGANIZATION AND
MANAGEMENT C P ALDERFER JUL 86 TR-9-ONR

2/2


UNCLASSIFIED

NO0014-82-K-0715

F/G 5/11

ML

END
DATE
FORW. 9/96



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

(Table 16 continued)

4. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I thought my answers might not be held in confidence."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.37 (19)	4.36 (69)	0.02	n.s.
Black Males	4.52 (21)	4.00 (49)	1.68	.10
White Females	4.84 (69)	4.23 (35)	2.44	.02
White Males	4.43 (124)	4.61 (70)	1.05	n.s.
Total	4.55 (233)	4.34 (223)	1.85	.06

5. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I did not appreciate being asked so many questions."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.47 (19)	4.54 (68)	0.23	n.s.
Black Males	4.38 (21)	4.55 (49)	0.55	n.s.
White Females	4.13 (69)	4.24 (37)	0.43	n.s.
White Males	4.18 (124)	4.39 (71)	1.18	n.s.
Total	4.21 (233)	4.45 (226)	2.13	.03

6. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I think harmful changes will come as a result of the study."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	5.26 (19)	5.18 (68)	0.48	n.s.
Black Males	5.05 (21)	5.10 (49)	0.22	n.s.
White Females	4.97 (68)	5.00 (36)	0.20	n.s.
White Males	4.79 (124)	5.08 (70)	2.44	.02
Total	4.90 (232)	5.10 (224)	2.66	.008

(Table 16 continued)

7. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I was able to be very frank in answering the questions."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	1.95 (19)	1.97 (69)	0.10	n.s.
Black Males	2.20 (21)	1.66 (50)	2.22	.03
White Females	2.29 (69)	2.14 (36)	0.68	n.s.
White Males	2.08 (124)	2.01 (73)	0.47	n.s.
Total	2.15 (233)	1.93 (229)	2.36	.02

8. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I found it difficult to answer many of the questions."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	3.79 (19)	4.00 (68)	0.62	n.s.
Black Males	4.09 (21)	4.42 (50)	0.98	n.s.
White Females	3.09 (70)	4.08 (36)	3.85	.0002
White Males	3.76 (124)	4.24 (71)	2.38	.02
Total	3.59 (234)	4.17 (226)	4.67	.0001

9. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "The questionnaire provided me with an opportunity to express my most important opinions about race relations in management."

	<u>No Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	3.00 (19)	2.65 (68)	1.23	n.s.
Black Males	2.81 (21)	2.41 (51)	1.26	n.s.
White Females	3.18 (68)	3.17 (36)	0.04	n.s.
White Males	3.10 (124)	2.65 (71)	2.81	.006
Total	3.09 (232)	2.68 (227)	3.81	.0002

(Table 16 continued)

10. Race-Gender Group Responses to, "I disliked completing the questionnaire."

	<u>No</u> <u>Workshop</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	t	p
	mean (n)	mean (n)		
Black Females	4.53 (19)	4.41 (68)	0.32	n.s.
Black Males	4.76 (21)	4.92 (50)	0.62	n.s.
White Females	4.09 (67)	3.94 (37)	0.49	n.s.
White Males	4.11 (124)	4.44 (124)	1.84	.07
Total	4.20 (231)	4.45 (228)	2.10	.04

DATE
FILMED
— 8