

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-27,115

JOHNSON, Joan Thomasena Jackson, 1948-
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS:
HOW BLACKS EMPLOYED AT MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
SERVICES UNDERSTAND THE PROGRAM AND
PERCEIVE IT AS AFFECTING THEIR CAREERS.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1976
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© Copyright by
JOAN THOMASENA JACKSON JOHNSON

1976

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS: HOW BLACKS
EMPLOYED AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES
UNDERSTAND THE PROGRAM AND PERCEIVE
IT AS AFFECTING THEIR CAREERS

By

Joan Thomasena Jackson Johnson

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1976

ABSTRACT

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS: HOW BLACKS EMPLOYED AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES UNDERSTAND THE PROGRAM AND PERCEIVE IT AS AFFECTING THEIR CAREERS

By

Joan Thomasena Jackson Johnson

The purpose of this project was to study the perceptions and understandings Blacks employed at Michigan State University (MSU) and Michigan's Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VRS) have concerning Affirmative Action Employment Programs (AAEP). The study was designed to determine if the perceptions and understanding of AAEP were different between Black females and Black males, Blacks under 30 years of age and Blacks over 30 years of age, Blacks who hold higher ranks as opposed to those who fill lower ranks at their respective employment sites, Blacks who were employed at their present place of employment in 1972 as opposed to those employed elsewhere and Blacks employed in 1976 by MSU as opposed to those employed by VRS. Only those Blacks who held appointments within the tenure system at MSU and those VRS employees with a Civil Service rating of 9 and above were asked to participate in this study.

Following a decision to use a questionnaire as the research instrument, a series of questions were developed concerning the study's independent variables of age, sex, place of employment in 1972 when AAEP was implemented, current job placement and current rank. These questions were combined with 40 Likert-type items which were designed to measure the study's dependent variables, namely, understanding of AAEP and perception of its impact on individual careers.

The Likert instrument was constructed on the basis of survey research techniques. This instrument was subjected to reliability and validity studies which showed the scales to have a reliability of .8842 and criterion-person validity scores of a dimension to show that reliability and validity were insured.

The Likert portion of the questionnaire was divided into two parts. Scale I measured how much subjects understand about AAEP. This was the study's first dependent variable. Scale II was designed to measure the perception of subjects regarding AAEP's impact on individual careers. This was the study's second dependent variable. Scale I was composed of 12 items and Scale II was composed of 28 items.

The instrument was mailed along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study to 131 persons who met the criteria of the study. A total of 102 questionnaires (77.9%) were returned. All were usable.

Responses were coded and punched onto IBM cards. The cards were fed into MSU's CDC 6500 computer using the Statistical Package

for Social Sciences program. In addition to computing demographic data concerning the independent variables of rank, age, sex, current place of employment and place of employment in 1972, the following analyses were done: mean level of understanding subjects have of AAEP, mean perception of impact of AAEP on individual career levels, ANOVA's between the dependent variables and each independent variable and multiple regression analyses of relationships between dependent and independent variables.

The data analysis, whether by simple comparison of means, analysis of variance or multiple regression analysis, was consistent in indicating the following:

1. Respondents do understand the formal body of laws and communications known as AAEP.

2. Respondents do not perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

3. Persons employed at MSU have a higher level of understanding of AAEP than persons employed at VRS.

4. Persons holding higher ranks at their respective places of employment have a higher level of understanding about AAEP than persons who hold lower faculty or Civil Service ranks.

5. When scores for level of understanding and perception of impact scales are combined, only rank is significant. Persons who hold higher ranks at both employment sites differ significantly from those who hold lower ranks.

6. Almost one-third of the sample offered unsolicited comments about possible negative effects of AAEP.

Explanations for significant differences were offered and suggestions for future research projects were presented.

*I have a dream that my children will one day
live in a nation where they will not be judged
by the color of their skin but by the content
of their character.*

--Martin Luther King, Jr.
August 28, 1963

DEDICATION

To Vern and Kobie,
the sources of my motivation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to those who aided directly and indirectly in this study. Special acknowledgment is due the following:

To my Black brothers and sisters who took their valuable time to participate as research subjects;

To Dr. Philip Cusick who was director of my doctoral program, co-chairman of this research project and provided valuable insight which enabled us to learn and grow from the experience we shared;

To Dr. Joseph McMillan who was co-chairman of this dissertation and, in addition, as Michigan State University's Affirmative Action officer provided valuable insights and continual encouragement;

To Drs. James Costar, Dozier Thornton, and John Suehr who, as members of the dissertation committee, were available to offer assistance, suggestions, and constructive criticism;

To my family--Vern, Kobie, my mother Mildred Tice, my Uncle and Aunt, Emmitt and Evelyn Walker--who have to know how much I appreciate their support and understanding;

To Mary Jane and Wally Keller who always believed in me and, like my friends John and Mary Dojka offered continued encouragement and taught me about brotherhood.

I am grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
Purpose	1
Definitions	3
Federal Government Actions	5
Summary	16
Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Affirmative Action	16
Michigan State University and Affirmative Action	22
Current Economic Factors	28
Exploratory Questions	33
Summary	37
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	38
Purpose	38
Precipitants of Affirmative Action Legislation	39
Educational Opportunities	41
Academic Achievement	42
Economic Precursors and Consequences	43
Sex Discrimination	48
Litigation	53
Research	57
Summary	64
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	66
The Population	66
Selection and Description of the Instrument	68
Construction of the Instrument	71
Pretest of the Instrument	72
Measuring Reliability	72
Questionnaire Validity	75
Administration of the Questionnaire	77
Design	79
Testable Hypotheses	80
Scale I: Understanding	80
Scale II: Perception of AAEP as Having Impact on Careers	82

Chapter	Page
General Hypotheses	84
Analysis	85
Summary	86
IV. DATA ANALYSIS	87
Overview	87
Demographic Data	87
Subscale I: Subjects Do Understand AAEP	88
Exploratory Question I	90
Exploratory Question II	90
Exploratory Question III	91
Exploratory Question IV	96
Subscale II: Subjects Perceive AAEP to Have an	
Impact on Their Careers	100
Exploratory Question I	100
Exploratory Question II	100
Exploratory Question III	101
Exploratory Question IV	102
Exploratory Question V	102
Exploratory Question VI	106
Exploratory Question VII	110
Exploratory Question VIII	112
Exploratory Question IX	116
ANOVA I: Subjects' Understanding of AAEP	120
ANOVA II: Subjects' Perceptions of AAEP	
Impact on Career	122
ANOVA III: Subjects' Understanding and	
Perception Scales Combined	124
Multiple Regression Analyses	126
The Null Hypotheses	128
Scale I: Subjects Do Understand AAEP	128
Scale II: Subjects Perceive AAEP to Affect	
Careers	128
Dependent Variable I	129
Dependent Variable II	129
Additional Data: Comments	130
Summary	130
V. SUMMARY	133
Conclusions	133
Discussion	136
Subtle Forms of Racism Comment	141
Implications for Future Research	144

	Page
APPENDICES	147
A. COVER LETTER	148
B. QUESTIONNAIRE	150
BIBLIOGRAPHY	157

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Nonwhite Representation in Occupations in Which Majority Are Not High School Graduates (Thousands of Males, 25-64, 1960)	45
3.1 Pretest Item Variance	74
3.2 Determination of Test Variance Data	75
3.3 Criterion-Personal Validity Scores	76
4.1 Employment Status in 1972 and 1976	89
4.2 Access to Employer's AAEP Statement Frequency Data .	90
4.3 Correct Identification of AAEP Officer Frequency Data	91
4.4 Knowledge of Hiring of Unqualified Persons Frequency Data	92
4.5 Knowledge of Requirement of Preferential Treatment Frequency Data	92
4.6 Knowledge of Timetables for Hiring Requirement Frequency Data	93
4.7 Knowledge of Sanctions for Noncompliance Frequency Data	94
4.8 Knowledge of Target Population of AAEP Frequency Data	95
4.9 Knowledge of Employer Compliance Frequency Data . .	95
4.10 Knowledge of Minority Ratio Data Accessibility Frequency Data	96
4.11 Knowledge of Part-Time Work Requirement Frequency Data	97
4.12 Knowledge of Provisions for Child Care Frequency Data	98

Table	Page
4.13 Knowledge of Training for Prospective Employees Frequency Data	98
4.14 Understanding of AAEP Frequency Data	99
4.15 AAEP and Job Stability Frequency Data	100
4.16 AAEP and Recruitment and Hiring Frequency Data	101
4.17 AAEP and Promotion Frequency Data	101
4.18 AAEP and Salary Frequency Data	102
4.19 AAEP and Professional Meeting Attendance Frequency Data	103
4.20 AAEP and Advanced Training Frequency Data	103
4.21 AAEP and Leave Benefits Frequency Data	104
4.22 Perception of Nondiscrimination Regarding Job Benefits Frequency Data	105
4.23 Assistance from AAEP Office Frequency Data	105
4.24 Perceived White Beliefs Regarding Recruitment Frequency Data	106
4.25 Perceived White Beliefs Regarding Morale Problems Frequency Data	107
4.26 Perceived Beliefs of Whites Feeling Sacrificed Frequency Data	107
4.27 Perceived White Beliefs of AAEP as Economically Harmful Frequency Data	108
4.28 Perception of Whites' Desire to Discuss Issues Frequency Data	109
4.29 Perception of Whites' Desire to Discuss "Reverse Racism" Frequency Data	109
4.30 Perception of AAEP as Providing Future Oppor- tunities Frequency Data	110
4.31 Perception of AAEP as Providing Personal Enrichment Frequency Data	111

Table	Page
4.32 Perception of AAEP as Causing Whites to Perceive Competency Frequency Data	111
4.33 Perception of AAEP as Enhancing Appreciation of Respondent Frequency Data	112
4.34 Perception of AAEP as Increasing Black Employment Frequency Data	113
4.35 Perception of AAEP as Helping Blacks to Be Treated More Favorably Frequency Data	113
4.36 Perception of AAEP Policy Changes Needed Frequency Data	114
4.37 Perception of AAEP as Requiring Modification of Qualifications Frequency Data	115
4.38 Perception of AAEP as Needing to Usurp Management Prerogatives Frequency Data	116
4.39 Perception of Effects of Forced Implementation Frequency Data	117
4.40 Perception of the Possibility of an Open System Frequency Data	117
4.41 Perception of Being Stigmatized by AAEP Frequency Data	118
4.42 Perception of Support for AAEP Frequency Data	118
4.43 Perception of AAEP Impact on Career Frequency Data	119
4.44 ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variable I	120
4.45 Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variable I	121
4.46 ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variable II	122
4.47 Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variable II	123
4.48 ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variables I and II Combined	124

Table	Page
4.49 Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variables I (Understanding) and II (Perception) Combined	125
4.50 Multiple Regression Correlation Coefficients	127

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to study the perceptions and understanding Blacks employed at Michigan State University (MSU) and Michigan's Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VRS) have concerning Affirmative Action Employment Programs (AAEP). Furthermore, this study is designed to determine if the perceptions and understanding of AAEP is different between Black females and Black males, Blacks under 30 years of age and Blacks over 30 years of age, Blacks who hold higher ranks as opposed to those who fill lower ranks at their respective employment sites, Blacks who were employed at their current place of employment in 1972 as opposed to those employed elsewhere, and Blacks employed in 1976 by MSU as opposed to those employed by VRS. Only those Blacks who hold appointments within the tenure system at MSU and those VRS employees with a Civil Service rating of 9 and above will participate in this study.

The need for this study is predicated on the belief that employment discrimination in this nation based on color, sex, national origin, creed and religion continue to be ubiquitous despite the presence of an arsenal of federal and state laws which unequivocally establish the illegality of employment discrimination in most employment settings. The nation's attention was focused

on this racial and sexual discrimination particularly following World War II because of the efforts of the Civil Rights movement and women's liberation. Although the literature is just beginning to include studies of the federal government's legal bases for ensuring equality of opportunity in employment, there is little empirical data concerning the reactions and beliefs of Blacks who allegedly are to profit from AAEP's action oriented requirements of employers to recruit, train, and promote minority group members. It is the purpose of this study to examine AAEP as it pertains to one sample of Blacks, namely, those employed by two large work units, one a state university and another a state service agency.

The purpose of this chapter is fivefold:

1. To present definitions of terms to which there is frequent reference;
2. To describe and examine the federal and state laws and other governmental actions which led to and include AAEP;
3. To examine the two state employers, Michigan State University and Vocational Rehabilitation Services, in terms of their position and policy statements concerning AAEP;
4. To describe the current pressures engendered by the nation's recession which complicate and ultimately hamper many employers' attempts to implement AAEP as the general rule within the competitive labor force;
5. To present the questions this study was designed to answer.

Definitions

Affirmative Action Employment Program(s) or AAEP: Recruitment, training, and employment programs designed to create fair employment practices on the basis of merit for members of minorities and women.

Equal Employment Opportunity Laws: Laws designed to improve opportunities for employment and promotion of members of minorities and women.

Affirmative Action: The term used to refer to steps employers take to insure that persons previously under-represented in employment are given opportunity for placement.

Minority Group Members: Members of ethnic groups considered to be minorities are Black-Americans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and Orientals.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: The five-member federal commission charged with administration of the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services or VRS: Vocational Rehabilitation Services, one division of the Michigan Department of Education, is a state-wide agency charged with helping adults with physical, emotional, and intellectual disabilities attain the greatest vocational achievement of which they are capable. This goal is achieved through optimal medical restoration followed by job training and placement. VRS is funded by both state and federal money and is given its support and charge through the Smith-Fess Act of 1920, the Barden-LaFollette Act of 1953, Public Law 565 of 1954,

Public Law 333 of 1965, Public Act 90-341 of 1968 and Public Act 93-112 of 1973.¹

Civil Service Commission: The hiring arm of the Michigan state government which has jurisdiction over hiring and promotion of all VRS employees.

Michigan State University: MSU, one of the nation's original land grant colleges, is located in East Lansing, Michigan. The university is comprised of 17 colleges: Agriculture and Natural Resources, Arts and Letters, Business, Communication Arts, Education, Engineering, Human Ecology, Human Medicine, Justin Morrill, James Madison, Lyman Briggs, Natural Science, Osteopathic Medicine, Social Science, University College, Urban Development, and Veterinary Medicine.

Perception: The mental process by which the nature of an object is recognized through the association of a memory of its other qualities with special senses bringing it at the time to consciousness.² In this study, the principal processes which probably have been simultaneously activated to result in a perceptual response are the visual and auditory ones.

Contractors: Those employers who receive federal dollars. For the purpose of this study, both MSU and VRS are contractors.

¹Adam Zawada, ed., Rehabilitation of the Severely Disabled (Charleston, W. Va.: West Virginia University Press, 1973), pp. 56-57.

²L. E. Hinsie and R. J. Campbell, Psychiatric Dictionary (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 553.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS): An integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social sciences data. The experimenter is provided with a large number of statistical techniques commonly used in the social sciences, e.g., descriptive statistics, frequency distribution, cross-tabulations, correlations, analysis of variance and multiple regression.¹

ANOVA: An SPAA program subprogram which provides analyses of variance for factorial designs. It allows for up to five factors in each design.²

Federal Government Actions

It is conceivable that many persons are unaware of the long, often bitter legislative battles waged to guarantee equal rights for all American people. There are, after all, 13 major pieces of legislation enacted since the Civil War which pertain, directly or indirectly, to this study's topic. There also are four actions by the executive branch of the federal government and one from the judicial branch of the federal government which combine to form AAEP. As noted by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, AAEP has engendered "passions, ideologies, strong opinions and established interests surrounding consideration of

¹N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, Jean Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and D. H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 1.

²Jae-On Kim and F. J. Kohout, "Analysis of Variance and Covariance: Subprograms ANOVA and ONEWAY," in N. H. Nie et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), pp. 398-421.

every aspect of it."¹ In agreeing with the astute council on the "explosiveness of the issue," it seems imperative that the federal and state laws leading to and including AAEP be reviewed so that the rational, dispassionate, legal framework and background of the program be available in one resource for examination. No such comprehensive listing of the governmental laws and regulations was found by this writer.

The Civil Rights legislation and judicial act upon which Affirmative Action legislation has been built will be listed and described briefly in the chronological order of passage and enactment. The first series of federal government actions include:

- Civil Rights Acts of 1866
- Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution
- Civil Rights Act of 1870
- Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 1)
- Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 2)
- Civil Rights Act of 1875
- Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution
- Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938
- Brown v. Board of Education (1954)

Civil Rights Act of 1866: This legislation focused on the emancipation of slaves. Citizens of the United States were guaranteed the right to own, buy, sell and trade property and were given the right to inherit, to contract, and the right to sue.¹

Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (1868): By this act all United States citizens were guaranteed the

¹ Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1975), p. xi.

² Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat., 27.

right to life, liberty, and property. Blacks were given the right to vote.¹ (Women were not.)

Civil Rights Act of 1870: This act reaffirms the property and voting rights of all citizens regardless of "race, color or previous condition of servitude."²

Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 1): This act amends the 1870 act pertaining to voting rights by calling for the appointment of officers to guard the polls, prevent fraud, and regulate voting hours.³

Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 2): In an attempt to spell out specifics of the 14th Amendment, this act speaks to the issue of seizure of property, testifying at trials, influencing jurors, preventing persons from voting, and, in general, enforces the 14th Amendment.⁴

Civil Rights Act of 1875: This act calls for the equal use of inns, theaters, and public transportation and equal and exact justice for all citizens regardless of race, color, or religious or political persuasion.⁵

Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (1920): Women are guaranteed the right to vote.⁶

¹United States Constitution, 14th Amendment, 1868.

²Civil Rights Act of 1870, 16 Stat., 140.

³Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 1), 16 Stat., 433.

⁴Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 2), 17 Stat., 13.

⁵Civil Rights Act of 1875, 18 Stat., 335.

⁶United States Constitution, Nineteenth Amendment, 1920.

Fair Standards Act of 1938: This act called for the establishment of fair labor standards in employment, wages, salaries, and interstate commerce.¹

Brown v. Board of Education (1954): This is the landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court which outlaws segregation in public schools of this nation. The principle "separate but equal" was reversed because it deprived Black students of equal protection as guaranteed by the 14th Amendment.²

In noting Brown v. Board of Education, it is instructive to review the history of one comment Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren made in offering the Court's decision to strike down laws calling for school segregation according to race. The statement is:

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Ferguson, this finding (by the Kansas court in Brown that segregation denotes inferiority and diminishes learning motivation) is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in Plessy v. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected.³

Plessy v. Ferguson⁴ was a case concerning the law in Louisiana which required people to occupy segregated railroad cars according to race. As such, it was one of a vast body of laws in existence in the South since the time of the Blacks' release from bondage. In upholding Plessy v. Ferguson, Justice Henry B. Brown wrote the majority opinion

¹Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, Public Law 718, 52 Stat., 1060.

²Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954).

³Richard Kluger, Simple Justice (New York: Knopf, 1976), p. 705.

⁴Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

using words which most Blacks respond to with a plethora of feeling and attitudes ranging from incredulity to revulsion.

We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it.¹

In the one dissenting opinion, Justice John M. Harlan responded to this racist statement with:

The white race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is, in prestige, in achievements, in education, in wealth and power But in the view of the Constitution, in the eyes of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste system here. Our Constitution is color-blind and neither knows nor tolerates classes among its citizens.²

In materials currently being published, this is referred to as the "color-blind clause" in the Constitution. Reference to it is in this sense: the Constitution is supposed to be color-blind but now the federal government has entered into "the most decisive public actions ever taken to overcome subordination and caste systems"³ using "color and group consciousness with a vengeance."⁴

Before continuing with a description of Civil Rights legislation, it is important to note that subsequent federal government actions are the most relevant to the current study. The

¹Kluger, op. cit., p. 30.

²Ibid., p. 82.

³Nathan Glazer, Affirmative Discrimination (New York: Basic Books, 1975), p. 7.

⁴Ibid., p. 31.

aforementioned legislation gradually merged into AAEP, the preparation and enactment of which crested in the 1960s and early 1970s.

They are as follows:

- Executive Order No. 10925 (1961)
- Executive Order No. 11114 (1963)
- Equal Pay Act of 1963
- The Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Executive Order No. 11246 (1965), as amended in Executive Order No. 11375 (1968)
- Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971
- U.S. Department of Labor, Revised Order No. 4 (1971)
- Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972
- Education Amendments of 1972, Title IX

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be considered the key piece of legislation in this matter and the Department of Labor's Revised Order No. 4 is the major compliance order with sanctions for noncompliance clearly articulated. A brief summary of these actions is as follows:

Executive Order No. 10925 (1961): Discrimination because of race, color, creed, and/or national origin was declared by President Kennedy to be contrary to constitutional principles of the United States. Discrimination in all aspects of federal government employment and by government contractors was defined as illegal.¹

Executive Order No. 11114 (1963): President Kennedy issued this order to reinforce principles articulated in Executive Order No. 10925. In addition, sanctions for noncompliance were specified.²

Equal Pay Act of 1963: This is one of the many amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. For the first time, equal

¹Executive Order No. 10925, 26 Fed. Reg. 1977 (1961).

²Executive Order No. 11114, 28 Fed. Reg. 6485 (1963).

pay for equal work for both sexes is specified. Also, for the first time, "teachers on all levels" are granted protection.¹

The Civil Rights Act of 1964: This is the major piece of legislation pertinent to the study of Affirmative Action. In addition to (a) enforcing the constitutional right to vote, (b) providing the United States District Courts authority to provide relief in cases of discrimination in public accommodations, (c) preventing discrimination in federally assisted programs, and (d) authorizing the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public education, a commission of Equal Employment Opportunities was established. This part of the act is referred to as Title VI. Key provisions of Title VI are as follows:

- a. It shall be unlawful employment practice for an employer
 - (1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin or
 - (2) to limit, segregate or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex or national origin.
- b. It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employment agency to fail or refuse to refer for employment or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, or to classify or refer to employment any individual on the basis of his race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
- c. It shall be unlawful employment practice for a labor organization

¹Equal Pay Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-38), 77 Stat. 56 (1963).

- (1) to exclude or to expel from its membership or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
 - (2) to limit, segregate or classify its membership or to fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual of employment opportunities or would limit such employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex or national origin or
 - (3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.
- d. It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs to discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training.¹

A major section to Title VI, namely section 704(b), reads:

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or employment agency to print, or publish or cause to be printed or published any notice or advertisement relating to employment by such employer or membership in or any classification or referral for employment by such a labor organization or relating to any classification or referral for employment by such an employing agency, indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, except that such a notice or advertisement may indicate a preference, limitation, specification, discrimination based on religion, sex, or national origin when religion, sex, and national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification for employment.

Another major section is section 705 which creates an Equal Opportunity Commission to enforce Title VI provisions. The law became effective one year from the enactment date of July 2, 1964.

¹United States Congress, 88th Congress, Public Law 88-352, 7152, 78 Stat. 241, 1964.

Executive Order No. 11246 (1965)¹ and Executive Order No. 11375 (1968)²: These executive orders prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin and sex by all institutions, including higher education, who have contracts with the federal government. All employees are covered by nondiscrimination requirements in regard to hiring, upgrading, salaries, fringe benefits, training, and other conditions of employment. Specifically, institutions which receive at least \$10,000 in federal contracts must not discriminate against any employee or job applicant and private institutions employing more than 50 persons and receiving at least \$50,000 in federal monies must have a written Affirmative Action plan on file. Punishment for noncompliance could lead to suspension or cancellation of contract money and, further, the institution could be assigned a "non-rewardable" status which would deny it access to future government contracts as long as discrimination persisted.

The reader is referred to Nash³ for a comprehensive review of this order's impact on AAEP.

Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971: By this act women were guaranteed equal access to schools of medicine,

¹Executive Order No. 11246, 30 Fed. Reg., 12319 (1965). Quite frequently one reads "Executive Order No. 11246 (as amended)." The amendment reference is to Executive Order No. 11375 which included sex as a basis of discrimination.

²Executive Order No. 11375, 32 Fed. Reg., 14305 (1968).

³Peter Nash, "Affirmative Action Under Executive Order 11246," New York University Law Review 46, 21 (April 19, 1971): 225-261.

osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, public health and other ancillary health training programs.¹

United States Department of Labor, Revised Order No. 4, 1971: This order is considered to be the cornerstone for the compliance efforts of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights in regard to AAEP. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution prohibited employment discrimination by governmental units. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited employment discrimination by private employers, labor unions, and employment agencies but no act provided effective mechanisms for enforcing this prohibition. Revised Order No. 4 dictates the three basic requirements which contracting agencies must comply with under this order.² These requirements are:

- (a) to perform an analysis of minority utilization in all job categories;
- (b) to establish goals and timetables to correct deficiencies, these must be separate for women and minorities;
- (c) to develop data collection systems and reporting plans documenting progress in achieving affirmative action goals.

In addition, this order requires publication of the AAEP policy, development of programs to attain goals, and appointment of an Equal Employment Opportunity Officer at each institution or job site.

¹U.S., Congress, House Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 1971.

²U.S. Department of Labor Revised Order No. 4, 41 Fed. Reg., 60-2 (1971).

Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972: This act amends portions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by forbidding discrimination in hiring, firing, layoff, recall and recruitment, wages, conditions of employment, promotional opportunities, assignment, sick leave, vacation, overtime, insurance, health benefits, or advertising employment preferences on the basis of color, religion, sex, and national origin. This act also expanded the enforcement powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions. In reality, this act pulls together all previous AAEP legislation.¹

The Education Amendments of 1972, Title IX: This act prohibits discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance and includes private and public schools, elementary and secondary schools, vocational schools, colleges and professional schools. The primary statement of this act is: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Parenthetically, major public brouhaha concerning this act involves participation of females in athletics but the coverage is much broader than that.²

¹Equal Employment Opportunity Act, Public Law 92-261, 92nd Congress, 1972.

²Educational Amendments of 1972, Title IX, Sec. 901(a), 373 (June 23, 1972).

Summary

Federal laws and actions culminating in the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 embody two concepts: prohibition of employment discrimination for all persons regardless of sex, color, national origin, race, and religion and more than employment neutrality must be assured by employers. Additional efforts must be made to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded. "The premise of this concept, Affirmative Action, is that unless positive action is undertaken to overcome the effects of systematic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination, a benign neutrality in employment practices will tend to perpetuate the status quo ante indefinitely."¹

The next portion of this presentation of background materials examines how the two target populations of the study, MSU and VRS, have responded to federal government rules and regulations.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Affirmative Action

Vocational Rehabilitation Services is an agency charged with helping disabled individuals return to competitive employment. As a branch of the Michigan Department of Education, VRS is a governmental unit whose hiring and personnel practices are controlled by the Michigan Civil Service Commission. VRS can devise as many policies as it wants in regard to employment practices but nothing changes the fact that Civil Service is the state's hiring arm and,

¹U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246 (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1972), p. 3.

as such, is directly in control of implementation of AAEP. As noted in Van Riper's¹ exhaustive study of the civil service system, this unit was developed to guarantee governmental hiring practices based on merit as opposed to political patronage; merit has been defined as performance on supposedly objective tests developed, administered, and scored by Civil Service.

Because of a variety of problems and even periodic abuses of the system, an attempt was made by Michigan Civil Service to evaluate persons and rank them on other than formal examinations. By way of example, previous experience was evaluated and given a "score" which became part of the applicant's employment file. Michigan Civil Service also created a rule labeled "three plus one" which is an attempt to expand the employer's prerogatives in selecting persons from Civil Service rosters, that is, the employer can select one of the top three on the roster or one other not in the top three.² Such changes have not been accepted freely, and in fact, are probably going to be litigated unless issues are resolved by the newly appointed State Personnel Director, Richard Ross.

At this time, Michigan VRS employes approximately 1,200 persons in its 7 regions and 34 districts. All persons, again, hold Civil Service rank which means that the history of AAEP for VRS begins with instructions from the Governor to the Civil Service

¹P. P. Van Riper, History of the United States Civil Service (New York: Harper and Row, 1958).

²Julie Lehr, "Expanded Certification for Civil Service Urged," Lansing State Journal, November 27, 1974, p. D-4.

Commission followed by a directive from the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, and, ultimately, a position paper from the Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction for VRS.

First of all, there is Executive Order 1971-8 which was presented by Governor William Milliken on September 21, 1971. Briefly, this policy statement carefully defined steps each state agency would take to insure not only recruitment and employment of minority group members but also placement in responsible, decision making, "status" positions. Each department head was to develop and maintain an AAEP plan and the Civil Service Commission was to provide leadership in eradicating "this most critical social problem" by, among other steps:

insure that rules and regulations setting standards and qualifications for employment within the classified service shall not utilize testing procedures which have been high percentage of minorities from job placement and promotion.¹ ~~insure that rules and regulations setting standards and qualifications for employment within the classified service shall not utilize testing procedures which have been high percentage of minorities from job placement and promotion.~~

Secondly, there is Equal Opportunity Rule 1.2a. On September 22, 1971, the Michigan Civil Service Commission adopted an Equal Opportunity Rule as instructed to do so by the Governor. Each department of state was ordered to do as follows:

- A. Designate a person to assume total responsibility for the coordination and implementation of the department's Equal Opportunity components and job categories.

¹W. C. Milliken, "Equal Employment Opportunity in State Government," State of Michigan Executive Directive 8, September, 1971.

- B. Develop goals and objectives for the effective utilization and employment of minorities and women throughout the department's organizational components and job categories.
- C. Establish realistic timetables for achieving goals and objectives set forth in the department's Equal Employment Opportunity Action Plan. Ideally, the timetables should be developed to accomplish goals within three years.
- D. Analyze the problems which serve as impediments to the department's ability to achieve equality of opportunities for minorities and women.
- E. Define specific actions or approaches the department will use as a vehicle for achieving mutually agreed upon goals and objectives.
- F. Develop a system to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of the department's Equal Opportunity Action Plan.
- G. Allocate sufficient resources for the effective administration of the department's Equal Employment Opportunity Action Plan.
- H. Set a target date for completion of development of the Equal Employment Opportunity Action plan by January 1, 1972.¹

Next in chronological order is the State of Michigan, Department of Education AAEP Directive of April 28, 1972. Dr. John Porter, Michigan's Superintendent of Public Instruction, defined in this document how the Department of Education would implement the Governor's program. This directive was addressed to the State Board of Education and in addition to spelling out staffing needs and patterns by years up to 1977, the following plan was described:

- A. Department supervisors and administrators at all levels will personally review and be provided a copy of the equal employment policy and they will be expected to

¹State of Michigan, Department of Civil Service, "Equal Opportunity Rule 1.2a Memorandum," September 22, 1971.

work with diligence and good faith to make the policy an integral part of the overall management philosophy.

- B. Employment at a professional level is prohibited until the Deputy Superintendent has been assured by the Personnel Director that there are no qualified women and/or minority candidates with comparable qualifications available for consideration for the position. This policy will be continued and vigorously enforced.
- C. The Department of Education will review all hiring practices and qualifications/requirements for initial entry and promotion and determine whether such practices and systems contain unrealistic job requirements which tend to eliminate consideration of qualified candidates or make discrimination possible or likely.
- D. The Department of Education will explore all possible means to identify necessary resources to provide special programs for training, education, and support for all staff without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
- E. The Department of Education will communicate to all employees the importance of compliance by incorporation of the AAEP in publications, orientation for all new employees and other programs conducted.
- F. The Department of Education will maximize the distribution of vacancy announcements, including on a regular basis those media and agencies that serve women and minority communications. In addition, special recruitment visits will be scheduled at universities and other appropriate institutions where capable candidates are enrolled.
- G. The Department of Education administrators will be encouraged to maintain systematic contacts with minority and human relations organizations leaders and spokesmen to encourage referral of qualified minority candidates.
- H. The Department of Education will insure that staff make-up will reflect representation of qualified women and minorities at all levels.
- I. The Department of Education will increase its participation in community action programs related to educational practices which will identify the Department of Education as an equal opportunity employer. This includes personal

appearances by department administrative staff as well as the designation of other department personnel who can speak and act effectively in the state community.

- J. The Department of Education is considering the appointment of a full-time Human Relations Officer who will be under the direct supervision of the Assistant Superintendent for School and Community Affairs. In addition to the responsibility of monitoring the Department's AAEP, this appointee will also be responsible for monitoring equal opportunity employment compliance with regard to Federal procedures related to various Federal appropriates to the Department.
- K. The Department of Education will conduct exit interviews to determine whether turnover is due to controllable conditions which may be included in the Affirmative Action Program.¹

Finally, there is the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Affirmative Action Employment Program for Equal Employment Opportunity. In addition to affirming its policy of equal employment, that is, of recruitment, hiring, and promotion without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, or age except where sex or age is a bona fide occupational qualification, this policy statement proposed the following Affirmative Action steps:

- A. Endeavor to achieve greater representation in the professional administrative, and management positions by recruiting at minority colleges and areas where minority applicants are available with the goal of having representation of minority employees in agency offices to the same degree as minorities are represented in the community.
- B. V.R.S. will have a full time Civil Rights Committee which will determine compliance, provide training to agency supervisors, review and analyze pertinent data

¹ J. W. Porter, "Recommended Action Regarding the Department of Education AAEP Plan," April 28, 1972.

on personnel actions, investigate and react to complaints of racial discrimination, propose recommendations for attracting, retaining and upgrading minorities in the agency, and train supervisors to keep abreast of community needs.¹

In summary, the State of Michigan's V.R.S. through directives emanating from the Governor's office has defined how AAEP will be implemented. As opposed to the policies of MSU to be next reviewed, VRS does not have autonomy in its employment practices. It can define policy and philosophy but is subservient to the Civil Service Commission in terms of recruiting, hiring, and promoting. Furthermore, as a state employee with modest administrative duties with VRS, this writer has noted:

1. The State of Michigan does not have an AAEP officer. VRS has an administrative assistant assigned to handle the VRS AAEP along with many other staff responsibilities.
2. The State of Michigan does not publish its AAEP policy in documents readily accessible to state employees.
3. The State of Michigan does not publish AAEP statistics and reports in documents readily accessible to state employees.

Why these factors are true is unknown to the writer.

Michigan State University and Affirmative Action

Michigan State University, as well as other large Michigan universities, recently completed litigation where its autonomy from state regulations was affirmed. It is not, then, compelled to

¹R. F. Peckham, "Department of Education, V.R.S. Affirmative Action Program for Equal Employment Opportunity," Memorandum, July 27, 1972.

follow state directives on issues as is VRS. Specifically, recruitment, hiring, and promotion policies are developed at a university-wide level but implemented uniquely by each department. Because of departmental idiosyncrasies, hiring and promotion issues tend to be far more complex and far less uniform for MSU's 5,000-plus employees than for the VRS staff.

MSU, like VRS, however, is covered by AAEP. The history of its involvement with this programming is as follows: One and a half years before the state of Michigan acted, MSU initiated anti-discrimination policies and Affirmative Action programs. The purpose of these programs as described in Article 1 of the MSU Anti-Discrimination Policy and Procedures reads:

The Board of Trustees of M.S.U. reaffirms its commitment to a policy of no discrimination on the basis of race, creed, ethnic origin, or sex and established the following procedures to prevent such discrimination in accordance with due process within the university community. In doing so, the Board of Trustees recognizes that it is not enough to proclaim that we do not discriminate against minority groups. The University must also strive actively to build a community in which opportunity is equalized and use its facilities and human resources to develop the skills and opportunities of the members of all groups so they may plan responsible and productive roles in society. This policy is relevant to all aspects of the university including the choice of contractors and suppliers of goods and services.

The Board directs the establishment of the Committee Against Discrimination and the Anti-discrimination Judicial Board to carry out this policy in the manner outlined below. The Board also directs all units of the University to take appropriate action immediately to implement this policy and procedures.¹

¹Staff, "M.S.U. Anti-Discrimination and Affirmative Action Policies," Michigan State News, November 21, 1974, p. 12.

This statement is published annually in the MSU Faculty Handbook and in the Student Handbook. The entire text is published as a separate pamphlet available to the entire campus. Furthermore, the University has filed an annual AAEP report with the Chicago Regional Office of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare beginning in September, 1970, and this material is available to the public. The Committee Against Discrimination publishes an annual report of its activities as does the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs. By way of example, 13 articles were published regarding anti-discrimination actions in the MSU State News between 7/01/70 and 7/01/71. Finally, the University periodically compiles statistical data for study by its administrators regarding minority staff members and obeys the laws by publishing in the student newspaper the University's AAEP (at a cost of \$1,008 on November 2, 1974).

The Office of Equal Opportunity Programs was established in 1972 as the campus agency responsible for coordinating equal opportunity activities. Subsequently (1973), the office was titled Department of Human Relations, a division of the Vice President for University Relations' office. This office's establishment was mandated by law and specifically requires:

. . . he or she should be given the necessary top management support and staffing to execute the assignment. This should be a person knowledgeable and sensitive to the problems of women and minority groups . . . and necessary authority and staff should be accorded the position to ensure the proper implementation of the program.¹

¹Executive Order No. 11246 as amended, op. cit., p. 15.

As a part of the reorganization of the Office of Equal Opportunity, the Committee Against Discrimination was given extended powers:

Any person or persons having knowledge of prohibited discrimination but without a personal grievance, shall have the right to file with the CAD reciting facts of such alleged discrimination and requesting corrective action in the same manner as a person aggrieved. Such complainant shall have the same right as an aggrieved person to an appeal in the same manner to the Anti-Discrimination Judicial Board. Such appeals to be entitled to consideration, shall specify the time, the place, and the exact nature of the alleged discrimination; shall identify in specific terms the individual, group, organization or office believed by the complainant to be responsible for the alleged discrimination; and shall specify the remedy being sought by the complainant. Reports on these petitions and actions shall be included in the report to the President and to the Board of Trustees.¹

An Anti-discrimination Judicial Board was established and regular reports are made available including the nature of claims, number of cases, basis for discrimination, administrative unity involved, and disposition of claims.

The MSU Board of Trustees' actions in 1970 were timely as noted by the fact that its sister university, the University of Michigan, was cited in October, 1970, by the Chicago Office for Civil Rights and underwent what has been described as a "traumatic compliance review."² The University was ordered to:

1. Achieve salary equity between males and females.

¹Board of Trustees, MSU Anti-Discrimination Policy, Article II, C-3.

²"Sex Discrimination: Campuses Face Contract Loss Over HEW Demands," Science (November 20, 1970): 834-835.

2. Compensate through payment of back wages, each female employee who lost wages through discrimination at the University of Michigan.
3. Achieve a ratio of female employees in academic positions.
4. Increase the ratio of female admissions to all Ph.D. programs.
5. Increase the participation of women on committees which involve the selection and treatment of employees both academic and nonacademic.
6. Develop and issue a written statement on nepotism which will assure uniform treatment of tandem teams throughout the University.
7. Analyze past effects of nepotism and retroactively compensate (to October 12, 1968) any person who has suffered discrimination.
8. Assure that female applicants for nonacademic employment receive consideration for employment commensurate with their qualifications.
9. Assure that all female employees be given priority consideration for promotions to higher level positions for which they qualify.

Again in 1975 the University of Michigan made headlines when a federal grant of \$485,000 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare was withheld because of continuing alleged noncompliance with AAEP. In this specific instance, the issue involved the failure of the College of Arts and Sciences to hire a Black female, Dr. Jewel Cobb, as Dean of the College. She had been approved for appointment by Michigan's Board of Regents but negotiations with the College and the Department of Zoology failed to result in an appointment satisfactory to Dr. Cobb.¹ MSU was

¹Staff, "Michigan Held on Non-Compliance," Lansing State Journal, May 18, 1975, p. A-3.

warned June, 1975, that funding of three federal contracts might be withheld because AAEP agreements were not in order. HEW delayed action against MSU and 30 universities after a University spokesperson (Robert Perrin of MSU) complained of the abbreviated period given universities (two weeks) to comply with "sweeping new rules."¹

According to the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education,

Affirmative Action is today one of the most important issues before the higher education community. It affects the life changes of many individuals and the degree of independence of higher education from increasing governmental controls. It involves the highest principles of academic and political life, the goals and tactics of important interest groups, and the quality of public administration in an important area of action.²

Review of MSU's involvement with AAEP has shown development of appropriate policies, appointment of an AAEP officer, and publication of pertinent documents. As in the case of VRS, nothing noted in any of the documents reviewed speaks to the "human issue," that is, how do employees feel about AAEP? What impact is it believed to have on their careers? What contribution can an employee make to implementation of the regulations? Neither do the laws take into account the possibility of a severe economic decline which would have widespread implications for all employers and employees and possibly contribute significantly to noncompliance. Discussion of this issue follows.

¹Staff, "H.E.W. Ease Affirmative Action Requirement," MSU News Bulletin, July 3, 1975, p. 4.

²Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1975), p. 3.

Current Economic Factors

In evaluating the impact of AAEP on minorities as well as employers, one cannot ignore the reality of the current economic recession our nation is experiencing. Readers of local and national newspapers can readily find materials addressed to the issue of how layoffs and terminations are to be handled, that is, on the usual "last hired, first fired" seniority basis or on the basis of the requirements of certain AAEP. A spate of such articles appeared in area newspapers beginning in the fall of 1974 and addressed the issue of how industrial and governmental AAEP would be affected by such cutbacks.¹

Historically, the principle followed in times of recession has been "last hired, first fired" but since 1972 AAEP has been in effect with programs which require establishing of different balances of non-Whites and females. Such individuals tend to fall under the "last hired" rubric. Therefore, members of minority groups and women have become pitted against a much hallowed principle of collective bargaining because state and federal laws now protect their jobs as opposed to those of White males employed for longer periods.

¹ Marilyn Bender, "Job Discrimination: 10 Years Later," New York Times, November 10, 1974, pp. E1 and 5; William Chapman, "Last Hired, First Fired Rule Under Fire," Lansing State Journal, November 17, 1974, p. A22; James Kilpatrick, "Dichotomy in Civil Rights," Detroit Free Press, November 19, 1974, p. A9; William Raspberry, "Discrimination v. Seniority," Lansing State Journal, February 14, 1975, p. A6; Albert Shanker, "Affirmative National Leadership Toward Equal Opportunity," New York Times, November 10, 1974, p. E15; Chuck Stone, "Quotas Become an Issue Politically, Economically," Detroit Free Press, December 24, 1974, p. A13; and Philip Hager, "Workers With Seniority Battle Minority Threat," Lansing State Journal, April 27, 1975, p. E11.

Furthermore, companies are caught between two contracts: (1) the contract arrived at through collective bargaining calling for layoffs according to seniority and (2) contracts reached through negotiations with the federal government which require preferential employment of non-Whites and females since 1972.

This latter population is saying their jobs must be protected because they have not been employed long enough to qualify for seniority. White males, on the other hand, say seniority must reign regardless of the upsetting of racial balances.¹ It is obvious non-White males and females will be the first to be discharged if seniority rules are implemented whereas the converse is true if AAEP is not abolished during the current employment crisis. A prophetic warning about just such a crisis related to the tenuous nature of Black employment gains was made by Rogers and Bullock in 1972, that is, before the current recession.²

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled³ that AAEP principles will be upheld in respect to hiring practices but the far-reaching and controversial questions regarding the validity of company and union seniority systems was not a part of this decision.

¹Rone Tempest, "Bias Complaints from Whites Mount," Detroit Free Press, December 15, 1974, p. A3.

²H. R. Rogers and C. S. Bullock, III, "Black Employment: The Last Hired and First Fired," in Law and Social Change (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. 113-137.

³J. P. MacKenzie, "Court Backs Bias Victims' Job Seniority," The Washington Post, March 25, 1976, p. A1.

Although both MSU and VRS currently are coping with budgetary problems by freezing actions, that is, not filling positions vacated by retirements, resignations, or deaths, the possibility of governmental units and universities having to force cutbacks of staff is not to be discounted.¹ In this regard Wicker² has quoted a Harvard Dean's warning to his faculty regarding forced reduction of faculty, and Southern Illinois University had the dubious distinction of being the first university to be discussed in the national media when it did, in fact, release tenured faculty because of economic issues.

There is another aspect of the AAEP controversy. Questions are being raised about implementation of AAEP without regard to the qualifications of newly employed minorities and females. "Reverse discrimination" and "reverse racism" are now prominent terms in the vocabulary of many Americans.³ A recent ruling of the New York State Division of Human Rights went beyond thinking and feeling; namely, an appointment of a female Puerto Rican was overturned and a White male assigned as a principal of a predominantly Puerto Rican school.⁴ Likewise, in Michigan's Ingham County Circuit Court,

¹Staff, "State Hiring Policy Called Too Aggressive," Lansing State Journal, December 11, 1974, p. B1.

²Tom Wicker, "Affirmative Action Needed," New York Times, January 12, 1975, p. E19.

³Tom Wicker, "The Real Reverse of Racism," New York Times, January 19, 1975, p. E19.

⁴Staff, "Bias Comes Full Circle: Reverse Bias," New York Times, January 12, 1975, p. D15.

the Michigan Employment Security Commission was ordered to promote a White Male who had been by-passed in favor of a Black female in 1972.¹ Finally, in Montgomery, Alabama, the National Education Association just filed suit in a federal district court asking the judge to reopen nine staff positions recently filled by Blacks. The suit alleges that the Blacks were appointed without concern for qualifications and requests that teachers be selected on the basis of competitive tests on a nonracial basis.²

The National Education Association has been, of course, the instigator of numerous suits in the last decade designed to open teaching positions to Blacks. Now it is asking the courts to protect Whites. The conundrum of the NEA is shared by other organizations. In Michigan possibly the best example of this is the position in which the State Police finds itself. It is being sued in the Grand Rapids Federal District Court by a White male who alleges "reverse discrimination" because he was not selected as a recruit while Black males are accused of being accepted with lower qualifications. Simultaneously, the State Police are being sued by a Black male for failure to comply with AAEP.

Probably the most thorough--and scathing--discussion of issues pertinent to this controversy concerning seniority rights, reverse discrimination, and the primacy of the individual versus

¹Staff, "White Aide Wins Bias Suit Against State Job Agency," Detroit Free Press, August 30, 1975, p. 2A.

²Staff, "N.E.A. Sues to Protect Jobs of Whites," New York Times, November 30, 1975, p. B56.

redress of past discriminatory practices involving ethnic and social groups is provided by Glazer. His presentation of the White ethnic political reaction to AAEP is the most penetrating analysis of this issue. It is his conclusion that AAEP has grave political consequences which take, primarily, the form of increasing resentment between groups. He is totally pessimistic about AAEP as an instrument for minimizing and eventually preventing discrimination in American employment.¹

In addition to the issues of how the current depressed economic conditions and judicial conflicts will affect AAEP, there continues to be concern about the failure of employers to reach AAEP hiring goals,² a problem exacerbated in part by past failure of institutions of higher education to accept qualified minority students into graduate programs.³ One must conclude that many Americans are resisting change in employment practices, sometimes overtly, sometimes covertly.

It is the purpose of this research to study the perception and consequences of AAEP on one portion of that AAEP target

¹Glazer, op. cit.

²Staff, "AA Report Mixed," MSU News Bulletin, January 16, 1975, p. 4; Peggy Gossett, "M.S.U. Falls Short of AA Goal," MSU State News, January 8, 1975, p. A1; S. F. Walton, "Black Studies and AA," The Black Scholar VI (1974): 21-31; Staff, "Bias Plays Big Part in Hiring," Lansing State Journal, December 18, 1974, p. D3.

³Anna Jackson, "Tokenism or Total Involvement?" Professional Psychology V, 4 (1974): 429-433; Preston Valien, "The Progressive Role of Blacks in Higher Education," Report of the First National Congress of Black Professionals in Higher Education, 1973.

population, namely, Black employees of two work units, a study which has not been done and which merits examination since it is readily apparent that the stakes are high, namely, modify employment procedures or risk losing federal dollars while being humiliated publicly for being in contempt of the laws of the land. The fundamental questions this study seeks to answer is this: If employers do obey AAEP legislation, does it accomplish in the perception of Blacks what it proposes to do?

The questions designed to provide enlightenment on this point are listed in the next section.

Exploratory Questions

AAEP legislation could be considered as an authoritative communication emanating from a formal organization (United States Government, Department of Health, Education and Welfare) to members of the organization (all agencies and work units which accept federal monies). According to this model presented by Bleecher,¹ there are two types of authority in such a situation, the objective and the subjective. The objective aspect concerns the nature of the communication while the subjective refers to the personal acceptance of the authoritative communication by individuals.

Bleecher's work, based on Barnard's² theorizing, states that an individual's ability to follow authoritative orders will

¹H. Bleecher, "The Authoritativeness of Michigan's Educational Accountability Program" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974).

²C. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 165.

depend on (1) the recipient's understanding of the order, (2) the recipient's belief that the order is consistent with the purposes of the organization, (3) the order is perceived as compatible with his/her personal interests, and (4) he or she is physically and mentally able to follow the order.

It is the purpose of this study to determine how much persons directly affected by AAEP know about the legislation (objective aspect) and how they believe it has influenced their careers (subjective aspect). It is readily apparent, furthermore, that these two aspects of the Bleecher model are the dependent variables in this study.

The questions asked to make the model specific to VRS and MSU Blacks are:

1. How informed are subjects about AAEP as it pertains to their place of employment?
 - (a) Have subjects had difficulty examining their employers' written AAEP statements?
 - (b) Are subjects familiar with the person in charge of AAEP implementation at their place of employment?
 - (c) Are subjects aware of the changes affecting their employers as a result of AAEP?
 - (d) Do subjects recognize that measures suggested as possible methods for employers to utilize to improve minority representation in their work force are not required by AAEP?
2. What are the subjects' perceptions of AAEP's impact on their careers and lives?
 - (a) Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of job security?

- (b) Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of initial recruitment and hiring?
- (c) Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of promotions?
- (d) Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of salary adjustments?
- (e) Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of fringe benefits?
- (f) Do subjects perceive white members of their employment units as believing that AAEP is a positive experience and program for both the employer and employee?
- (g) Do subjects feel that they as well as Blacks in general have been helped by AAEP?
- (h) Do subjects feel that AAEP is being implemented at their place of employment?
- (i) Do subjects themselves accept the principle of AAEP as a positive force in their lives?

To analyze data in terms of the study's five independent variables of sex, rank, present position, position in 1972 when AAEP was in full force, and age, the following questions will be asked:

1. Is there significant difference in the understanding of AAEP by Black females compared to Black males?
2. Is there significant difference in the understanding of AAEP by Blacks who hold higher ranks (Professor or Civil Service 14-plus) versus those in Civil Service 9 and 10 or Instructors?
3. Is there significant difference in the understanding of AAEP by Blacks who are employed at MSU as opposed to those employed by VRS?
4. Is there significant difference in the understanding of AAEP by Blacks employed at their present employment site in 1972 as compared to those employed elsewhere in 1972?

5. Are there significant differences in the understanding of AAEP by Blacks who are older than 30 years of age and those who are younger than 30?
6. Is there significant difference between the perceptions of Black males and Black females in regard to AAEP's impact on individual careers?
7. Is there significant difference in the perception of Blacks who hold higher ranks (Professor or Civil Service 14-plus) versus those in Civil Service 9 or Instructorships in regard to AAEP's impact on individual careers?
8. Is there a significance in the perception of Blacks who are employed at MSU versus those employed at VRS in regard to AAEP's impact on individual careers?
9. Are there significant differences in perceptions between Blacks employed at their present employment site in 1972 as compared to those employed elsewhere in 1972?
10. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of subjects less than 30 years of age and those over 30 years of age in terms of AAEP's impact on individual careers?

These research questions will be translated into testable hypotheses for statistical analysis in Chapter III.

It is important to conduct this study for two major reasons: First, the target population of this legislation is minority people but no empirical data exists to describe how effective it has been from the perception of one part of the target population, namely, Blacks employed in white-collar or professional level jobs. Secondly, there is no empirical data known to exist which indicates if one portion of the target population even understands what the legislation requires. In an indirect fashion, it is also possible that analysis of data will indicate the existence of possible unintended

effects of the legislation, e.g., escalation of more subtle forms of racial discrimination.

The findings have implications for other groups such as women and various ethnic populations. The Blacks studied here, then, can serve as a model for other groups in government employment and, hopefully, can help those of us in administrative positions to better utilize appropriate administrative principles in attempting to eradicate discrimination in public policy and personnel practices.

Summary

This study of how Black faculty members at MSU and Black professional staff at VRS perceive AAEP needs to be done because of the paucity of information found addressed to the issue of how one portion of the target population to which AAEP is addressed understands the legal requirements and how the legislation is perceived as affecting their careers. In this initial chapter, a review of the legislation and other federal governmental actions which comprise AAEP has been presented. Factors related to the economic recession currently being experienced in this nation have been discussed as they relate to compliance and noncompliance with AAEP and as they bring to the general public's attention that jobs for minorities may mean certain sacrifices for White people, especially White males. Finally, the employers of the Blacks studied in this project have been described in terms of the development of their AAEP plans.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Purpose

In order to comprehend why AAEP seemed necessary, a presentation will be made in this chapter of materials showing the factors leading to enactment of AAEP. Court cases based on the legislation also will be presented as will the meager research done thus far on questions pertaining to AAEP. The reader will note that there is no empirical data to speak of concerning how Blacks employed in a governmental agency or university faculty believe AAEP to influence their careers and there is no data at all to indicate exactly what Blacks in such work stations believe AAEP to be. Finally, a key Affirmative Action officer at a major university has spoken of the need for administrators to have data which this project can provide.¹

The purpose of this chapter is threefold:

1. To describe the economic, educational and employment issues which precipitated AAEP.
2. To list examples of litigations, especially those which preceded 1972 AAEP.
3. To examine research generated by AAEP.

¹Personal communication, Dr. Joseph McMillan, December 3, 1974.

Precipitants of Affirmative Action Legislation

Underlying AAEP is the hypothesis that achievement differences between racial, ethnic, religious, and sexual groups can be eradicated if changes are made in the external environment of such groups. This assumption suggests that there is a natural equality of ability which has been fragmented, exploited, and sometimes even destroyed by nefarious forces in the environment, the most glaring example of which is discrimination. For Blacks the reader will recognize that one special stimulus complex pertains, namely, American Blacks were held in slavery in this country for two and one-half centuries where they were, with few exceptions, kept illiterate, propertyless, and without job skills. Families were separated by this peonage system¹ and governmental agencies designed to help, e.g., welfare organizations, were perceived as motivated to crush personal aspiration, the result being the so-called "slum mentality."

There are, of course, seemingly principled persons with academic and occupational status who cannot accept the hypothesis that removing external barriers such as discriminatory practices in employment and education will alter dramatically the well-being of Blacks in particular. Jenson² questions whether Blacks have the

¹C. C. Killingsworth, "Jobs and Incomes for Negroes," in I. Katz and Patricia Gurin (eds.), Race and the Social Sciences (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp. 1974-273.

²A. R. Jensen, Educational Differences (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1974).

same intellectual endowment as Whites whereas Katz and Gurin¹ point to data which suggests that personality attributes, attitudes and values set the Black individual apart from his White counterpart. Moynihan² studied Black families and aroused considerable controversy and animosity within the Black community when he used emotion-laden terms such as a "tangle of pathology" when describing Black families and when he suggested that a majority of Blacks are products of illegitimacy, are reared in fatherless homes and engage in criminal activities, all Blacks are employed as prostitutes, hustlers, entertainers or athletes if employed at all, and so forth. It is because of writings like this that the current generation of Blacks productively employed in the competitive labor market, especially those holding appointments in institutions of higher education, are loathe to participate in research efforts designed to isolate and clarify variables which could lead to a Psychology of Blackness.³ Despite such sampling problems, it is still instructive to examine several of the barriers or factors which seem to have a bearing on the academic and vocational achievements of Blacks.

¹I. Katz and Patricia Gurin (eds.), "Personal Differences," Race and the Social Sciences (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp. 352-387.

²D. P. Moynihan, The Negro Family: A Case for National Action (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1965).

³W. Moore and L. H. Wagstaff, Black Educators in White Colleges (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. 15; W. F. Brazziel, "White Research in Black Communities: When Solutions Becomes a Part of the Problem," Journal of Social Issues 29, 1 (1973): 41-44; D. W. Sue and S. Sue, "Ethnic Minorities: Resistance to Being Researched," Professional Psychology 3, 1 (1972): 11-17.

Educational Opportunities

The classic document describing and analyzing the effects of racial isolation on educational achievement of Blacks is the Coleman report.¹ Attention will be given to this report because many experts believe that there is ". . . no institution more central to the process of inclusion (of Blacks into American society) than public education."² The consequences of this discrimination in terms of vocational parameters has been described by Crain.³

The more salient points of the Coleman report concerning segregation/racial isolation are: Ninety-seven percent of Black first graders in the urban south were attending predominantly Black schools in 1965. Seventy-two percent of Black youths in the urban north were in predominantly Black schools in 1965. Similar figures were found to exist for White children in 1965; namely, 80 percent of White children in both the first and twelfth grades were in 90 to 100 percent White schools.⁴ At that time, Coleman's figures indicated that segregation was increasing as did the figures of the United States Commission on Civil Rights⁵ which

¹J. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

²T. E. Pettigrew, "The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals," in I. Katz and Patricia Gurin (eds.), Race and the Social Sciences (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp. 49-112.

³R. Crain, "School Integration and Occupational Achievement of Negroes," American Journal of Sociology (1970): 593-606.

⁴Coleman, op. cit., pp. 3-7.

⁵United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1 (1967), p. 8.

reported that Black elementary enrollment had doubled over the period of 1950 to 1965 yet the number in predominantly Black schools had tripled.

More current data supporting escalation is available from Chicago. Twenty-two of its high schools are 99 percent Black, one is 99 percent White, and eight are more than 95 percent Black or White. Seventy-two percent of Chicago's students are Black or Spanish speaking. According to King's analysis of this data:

In 1966 its schools were becoming more tightly segregated. Today Chicago's 530,000 pupils are even more tightly segregated as more than 10,000 white students have been leaving the city each year. Both elementary and high school students are falling below the national average in reading and arithmetic skills.¹

Academic Achievement

The Coleman report found achievement differences at all academic levels but particularly in the upper grades. By way of example, in the northeast, Black students in the twelfth grade were found to function 3.3 years below Whites on standardized achievement tests. Blacks in the ninth grade were 2.4 years behind Whites and Blacks in the sixth grade were 1.6 years below the median White scores. Killingsworth commented, "It was reasonable to assume that these achievement differences are not a recent development."²

¹S. S. King, "Chicago Seeking New School Head," New York Times, July 6, 1975, p. 840.

²Killingsworth, op. cit., p. 294.

It was this kind of data which gave impetus to the development of compensatory programs like Head Start and escalated demands by many different people for full scale public school integration.

Economic Precursors and Consequences

Bergman¹ reviewed data and theories concerning employment discrimination. Attention was directed to years well past the emancipation of slaves. Beginning in 1922, for example, theories were presented which attempted to explain lower pay scales for Blacks in this nation. Edgeworth² is quoted as attributing lower pay to the fact that Blacks are crowded into a comparatively small number of low-paying, unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. Taussig³ responded to the issue of why such jobs did not actually pay workmen more since theoretically there should be the principle of supply and demand here, that is, fewer people want this kind of work and those who do accept such positions, accordingly, should be paid more. His response was that certain groups, in this case Blacks, simply are not permitted to compete for more pleasant jobs and, therefore, are crowded into the same jobs Edgeworth described.

¹Barbara Bergman, "The Effects on White Incomes of Discrimination in Employment," Journal of Political Economy 79 (1971): 294-313.

²F. Y. Edgeworth, "Equal Pay to Men and Women," Journal of Economics 32 (1922): 431-57, as reviewed in Bergman, op. cit., p. 294.

³F. W. Taussig, Principles of Economics (New York: Macmillan, 1923), as reviewed in Bergman, op. cit., p. 294.

Bergman had no difficulty substantiating that Blacks continue to be over-represented in the lowest positions of the competitive labor market's hierarchy. She then asked the question: What are the economic consequences of this discrimination and what losses might Whites incur if integration of employment were to occur? There were risks involved in such a study. She weighed them and decided: If losses were not large (for Whites), data with which to allay fears and promote fairer arrangements would be provided. If losses were going to be severe, the knowledge would be used "in planning economic policies which would make transition less painful, including possibly measures to compensate the losers."¹ Her major conclusion was that ending employment discrimination would not have a major effect on rates of pay for Whites. Whites at the lowest end of the education continuum would experience the most deleterious effects. Perhaps Table 1 best depicts those occupations which would be opened to Blacks were total job integration to occur. The reader's attention is drawn to the first listings, Occupations Where Negroes Are Underemployed (see Table 1).²

Other researchers on this topic of occupational and remuneration benefits for Whites at the expense of Blacks include Glenn³ and Krueger.⁴ Killingsworth examined this issue and commented:

¹Bergman, op. cit., p. 295.

²Ibid., p. 296.

³N. D. Glenn, "Occupational Benefits to Whites from the Subordination of Negroes," American Sociology Review 28 (1963): 443-48.

⁴A. O. Krueger, "The Economics of Discrimination," Journal of Political Economy 71 (1963): 481-87.

TABLE 2.1.--Nonwhite Representation in Occupations in Which Majority Are Not High School Graduates
(Thousands of Males, 25-64, 1960).

Occupation	Number of Workers (All Races) ^a	Actual Number Nonwhites ^a	Expected Number Nonwhites	Actual Less Expected Nonwhites
<u>Occupations Where Negroes Are Underrepresented</u>				
Farmers and farm managers	1,818	124	199	-75
Carpenters	775	40	85	-45
Electricians	319	7	26	-19
Foremen (n.e.c.) ^b	1,052	20	88	-68
Locomotive engineers	50	0	5	- 5
Machinists	444	12	40	-28
Mechanics and repairmen	1,926	117	189	-72
Automobile mechanics and repairmen	581	45	61	-16
Painters, construction and maintenance	339	25	38	-13
Plumbers and pipefitters	295	11	29	-18
Toolmakers, diemakers, and setters	167	0	13	-13
Other construction craftsmen	306	17	34	-17
Other metal craftsmen	399	22	40	-18
Other printing craftsmen	108	2	8	- 6
All other craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	957	47	92	-45
Mine operatives and laborers (n.e.c.)	278	16	36	-20
Protective service workers	586	25	50	-25
All other farm laborers and foremen	39	3	4	- 1

TABLE 2.1.--Continued.

Occupation	Number of Workers (All Races) ^a	Actual Number Nonwhites ^a	Expected Number Nonwhites	Actual Less Expected Nonwhites
<u>Occupations Where Negroes Are Within 10% of Expected Employment</u>				
Bus drivers	148	14	15	- 1
Other specified operatives and kindred workers	2,711	283	284	- 1
Operatives and kindred workers (n.e.c.)	2,789	317	320	- 3
Barbers	137	13	14	- 1
<u>Occupations Where Negroes Are Overrepresented</u>				
Shipping and receiving clerks	200	24	19	+ 5
Brickmasons, stonemasons and tile setters	172	23	19	+ 4
Cement and concrete finishers	42	13	5	+ 8
Plasterers	45	7	5	+ 2
Truck and tractor drivers	1,350	201	159	+42
All other service workers including private household	1,298	414	157	+257
Farm laborers, wage workers	632	178	106	+72
Laborers, except farm and mine	2,341	681	324	+357

^aU.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Occupation by Earnings and Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).

^bn.e.c. = not elsewhere classified.

The fact that Negroes in the middle levels of educational attainment, that is, nine to twelve years of schooling, suffer the highest levels of unemployment rates and that Negro college graduates suffer disproportionately high rates relative to whites, are the most disturbing aspects of Negro unemployment patterns When Negroes invest an equal number of years of their lives in formal education, the results are highly unequal in terms of employment security.¹

Williams' study of Black middle and upper level executives updates Killingsworth's material; he refutes the point that the problem is related to their being relatively few properly trained Black administrators: ". . . these individuals, when they are ready to function, really do not have anywhere to go. They are limited in the availability of positions and the mobility of positions."²

Rogers and Bullock also examined Black employment with special attention given to governmental practices at both the state and federal levels. "By 1970 minorities still held few of the better Federal jobs (less than 2%)"³ and "state and local governments have done very little to change employment practices or attract minorities to government services and in many cases are overtly discriminating against minorities."⁴ Dewitt is somewhat more optimistic but still cautious in regard to Black opportunities at all positions on the employment ladder.⁵

¹Killingsworth, op. cit., p. 231.

²C. Williams, "Employing the Black Administrator," Public Personnel Management (March/April, 1975): 76.

³Rogers and Bullock, op. cit., p. 119.

⁴Ibid., p. 124.

⁵Karen Dewitt, "Black Employment: Better But Not Yet Fair," Black Enterprise, March, 1974, pp. 24-25.

Sex Discrimination

Astin and Bayer most effectively describe how women fare in higher education as compared to their male counterparts.¹ In terms of all academic rewards such as rank, tenure, salary, teaching loads, nonteaching responsibilities, advising and academic work setting, the authors had no difficulty pointing to employment discrimination up to 1972. This conclusion was based on empirical data and literature reviews. In addition to documenting the disadvantaged position of the female employed in academe, they describe how sex discrimination begins early in the female's life, as did Rosenkrantz et al. The latter studied sex role stereotypes and self-concepts and their valuation, that is, how behaviors "stereotypically associated with masculinity are socially desirable compared with those associated with femininity."² A more recent review of these issues with special attention to the special problems of Black women and with a broader coverage of the employment stations is provided by Pendergrass et al.³ Proposals for effecting change in other than legal ways are beginning to appear as evidenced by the work of Kotzin.⁴

¹Helen Astin and A. E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe," Educational Record 53 (1972): 101-18.

²R. Rosenkrantz, Susan Vogel, Helen Bee, and Inge Broverman, "Sex Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 32, 3 (1968): 293-99.

³Virginia Pendergrass, Ellen Kimmel, Joan Joesting, Joyce Peterson, and Endilee Bush, "Sex Discrimination Counseling," American Psychologist 31, 1 (1976): 36-46.

⁴Mirian Kotzin, "Women, Like Blacks and Orientals," Media and Methods (March 1972): 18-22.

Most work on the issue of sex discrimination addresses itself to university employment at the faculty level. Universities are being asked to deal with the two-pronged problem of rectifying job discrimination for females while addressing research skills to eradication of institutional sexism which, among other things, "restricts the goals and aspirations of women compared to men and which take place before women accept appointments on academic faculties."¹ This same point has been made by Goodman² and Goldstein.³ More data is available from a 1969 study of college positions by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.⁴ Blacks had 2.2 percent and women 19.1 percent of college and university positions. This kind of data led Barnes to conclude that equal opportunity really does not exist in higher education.⁵

The sexual discrimination issue is complicated by anti-nepotism rules which by 1970 were still being enforced by 55 percent of the 454 institutions of higher education studied by Oltman.⁶

¹Astin and Bayer, op. cit., p. 117.

²L. V. Goodman, "Women's New Found Muscle," American Education, December 1972, inside cover.

³Jinny Goldstein, "Affirmative Action: Equal Employment Rights for Women in Academia," Teachers College Record 74 (1973): 395-422.

⁴United States Commission on Civil Rights, Statement of Affirmative Action for Equal Employment Opportunities by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

⁵F. J. Barnes, "Equal Opportunity in Higher Education," Journal of Negro Education 37 (1968): 310-15.

⁶R. M. Oltman, "Campus--1970--Where Do Women Stand?" American Association of University Women's Journal 64 (1970): 14-15.

This is a curious finding given the fact that Dolan and Davis's earlier study sample of 285 colleges and universities reported only 26.3 percent having anti-nepotism regulations and 18.2 percent "become restrictive in some situations."¹ In other words, Dolan and Davis found less than 50 percent of their sample having a nepotism barrier whereas ten years later Oltman seems to be reporting just the opposite. A rather strong polemic regarding this and other issues regarding employment of women in colleges and universities was presented by Fley² following College and University Business's outline of what steps would have to be taken if institutions were to make a firm commitment to sexual equality in employment.³

Other data comes from Dullea concerning public school education. She noted that men occupy 80 percent of elementary school principalships in this nation (up from 41 percent in the 1940s and 69 percent in the 1960s⁴) while 98 percent of all secondary school principalships are held by men and 99 percent of all superintendent's positions are occupied by males. One wonders, parenthetically,

¹Eleanor Dolan and Margaret Davis, "Anti-Nepotism Rules in American Colleges and Universities: Their Effect on the Faculty Employment of Women," The Educational Record 41, 2 (1960): 288-294.

²Jo Ann Fley, "The Time to Be Properly Vicious," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (Winter 1974): 53-58.

³"Policies and Practices Should Reflect College Commitment to Equality," College and University Business 48 (1970): 79-81.

⁴Georgia Dullea, "Women in Classrooms, Not the Principal's Office," New York Times, July 13, 1975, p. D9.

what this says to the 26 percent of Columbia University's doctoral students in Educational Administration who are females.¹

Epstein has studied Black females defined as "professionals" in the occupational world.² Although there have been impressive gains in the training and employment of Black females for the professions, e.g., between 1960 and 1970 female architects increased in numbers from 0 to 107, attorneys from 222 to 497, and physicians from 487 to 1,855,³ the author had no difficulty documenting the Black female's unique distinction of facing "double discrimination." The majority of her sample began their employment in "protected work settings," namely, governmental units, public health clinics and the like where salaries are less, status is in question, and advancement possibilities minimal.

Epstein noted that Black females sometimes did relatively better than Black male professionals possibly because Black females historically had had more access to White society. Black females pay a price for this status differential with Black males, namely, fewer Black females marry and those that do have higher divorce

¹National Education Association Research Division, "Status of Public School Teachers, 1965," NEA Research Bulletin 43 (1965): 43.

²Cynthia Epstein, "Black and Female: The Double Whammy," Psychology Today (August 1973): 57-61, 89.

³Epstein, op. cit., p. 57.

rates than the rest of the population.¹ Dynamics causing such male-female distress are articulated by Pendergrass et al.²

Abzug has presented other data about minority females. Her statement demands particular emphasis:

But while our legal protections have grown stronger, we have been greatly remiss in using them. Our failure is reflected in the continuing disproportionate economic status of minorities. The median income of Black families has remained in the range of 55 to 50% of the white family income since World War II. In fact, from 1970 to 1972, the Black median family income dropped from 61 to 59% of that of whites.

The human costs of our failure to end employment discrimination is incalculable. We have no statistical measure for the frustration and anger or loss of self-esteem suffered by those of our citizens who know they have been denied a fair and equal chance to support themselves and their families.

Minority women are at the bottom of the occupational ladder. Twenty-five percent of non-white women are in the lowest paying occupation as private household workers. Non-white women make up half of all women in this occupation. On the other hand, in 1971, only 31% of non-white women held white collar jobs while 60.5% of all women workers held such jobs.

Minority women also earn considerably less and suffer higher unemployment than any other worker. In 1970, median annual incomes for full-time workers were as follows: white males = \$9,373; Black males = \$6,598; white females = \$5,490; Black women = \$4,674. The unemployment rate for men in 1972 was 4.9% compared with 6.6% for all women and 8.7% for minority women. Black teenage women had an unemployment rate of 36%. And those figures have increased very considerably in the recent period of accelerated unemployment.³

¹Cynthia Epstein, "Successful Black Professional Women," American Journal of Sociology 78 (1972): 78-89.

²Pendergrass et al., op. cit., pp. 43-45.

³Bella Abzug, "Women Minorities and Affirmative Action," New York Times, November 7, 1973, p. A27.

Litigation

Passing legislation or issuing executive orders has not provided straightforward, unquestioned solutions to the problems of unemployment discrimination. To begin with, enforcement of the laws has not been widespread. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act contains weak enforcement powers, a situation Executive Order 11246 was to correct. According to Rogers and Bullock, compliance is not being enforced because compliance agencies are understaffed or enforcement machinery is infinitely complex and/or offices entrusted with enforcement dawdle in their attention to the issues.¹ The point of "trying to kill an elephant with a fly swatter" via the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 also was documented in a 1970 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report.²

Nevertheless, one can find a lengthy listing of court rulings concerning various aspects of compliance. Illustrations of legal opinions delivered up to 1971 are as follows:

Bowe et al. v. Colgate-Palmolive Company³: Employer's rights to set, in good faith, employment requirements based on sex was affirmed. In this case, the company had a 35 pound maximum weight lifting restriction for females and a seniority list segregated by sex (so sometimes females with more seniority than men were

¹Rogers and Bullock, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

²U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970).

³Bowe et al. v. Colgate-Palmolive Company, 272 F. Supp., 332 (1967).

laid off first). The judge ruled that it was not practical for a plant executive to assess physical abilities and capabilities for each female on each general laboring job. Furthermore, it was determined that issues related to the seniority system would be negotiated outside the court's jurisdiction.

Clark v. Hayes International Corporation¹: Affirmative Action plans were not to be administered in disregard to the issues of efficiency and ability, an interpretation which is not fully understood to this day since opponents of the program continue to speak of AAEP as ignoring qualifications in the interest of color, sex, religion, national origin, and race.

Georgia Power Company v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission²: This ruling held that companies can be required to preserve statistical data about AAEP utilization up to five years. Another AAEP suit against this company was recently settled for two million dollars.

Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone,⁴ Cheatwood v. South Central Bell Telephone⁵: These decisions called for the hiring of

¹Clark v. Hayes International Corporation, D. C. Ala., 295, F. Supp., 803 (1968).

²Georgia Power Company v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 295, F. Supp., 950 412 F. 2nd 426 (1968).

³Staff, "Court Orders Back Pay for Victims of Job Bias," Detroit Free Press, June 26, 1975, pp. 1-2.

⁴Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone, 70 LRRM 2483, 1 FEP Cases, 656 (1969).

⁵Cheatwood v. Southern Bell Telephone, U.S.D.C.M., Ala., 2 FEP Cases, 33 (1969).

women despite how strenuous the work was, the night hours one had to work, and rural canvassing.

Rosenfield v. Southern Pacific Company¹: The *Bowe et al. v. Colgate-Palmolive* was overturned, that is, a California law regulating weight lifting and hours worked for females was declared illegal.

Jackson v. Veri-Fresh Poultry²: The religious issue--as addressed in this case. A Seventh Day Adventist had been fired for refusing to work on Saturday. The company was declared in violation of AAEP.

Clark v. Bethlehem Steel Corporation³: Racially neutral policies were prohibited since they tend to have discriminatory effects.

Clark v. Dillon⁴: Like *Clark v. Bethlehem Steel*, racially neutral policies were prohibited.

Contractors' Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. U.S. Secretary of Labor⁵: Failure to meet AAEP goals may not be discriminatory if there is a paucity of minorities present in the community.

¹*Rosenfield v. Southern Pacific Company*, C.A. 9, 3 FEP Cases, 604 (1971).

²*Jackson v. Veri-Fresh Poultry, Inc.*, C.A. 6, 2 FEP Cases, 687 (1969).

³*Clark v. Bethlehem Steel Corporation*, D.C. N.Y., 313 F. Supp., 977 (1970).

⁴*Clark v. Dillon Supply Company*, C.A.N.C., 429 F. 2nd 800 (1970).

⁵*Contractors' Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. U.S. Secretary of Labor*, D.C. P.A., 311 F. Supp., 1002 (1970).

Sprogis v. United Airlines¹: Firing of a married stewardess was found to be unlawful since the same requirement was not made for male stewards.

Griggs v. Duke Power Company²: The employer was held to be discriminatory when employment was denied Black males on the basis of performance of vocational aptitude tests which had not been shown to have predictive validity for the jobs the men sought. This ruling has relevance to state employees, the majority of whom are hired and promoted on the basis of test performance. Tests have to show that they are job-related by professionally acceptable methods.

Armstead v. Starkville Municipal School District³: The school board was declared discriminatory against Blacks for tying appointments to possession of an M.A. degree and specific scores on the GRE. Neither criteria could be shown as related to job performance. As pointed out by this decision and various experts, test performance, especially that based on current available general testing instruments, is unlawful as a fixed measure of job capability.⁴

¹Sprogis v. United Airlines, Inc., D.C. Ill., 307 F. Supp., 959 (1970).

²Griggs v. Duke Power Company, U.S. Sup. Ct., 3 FEP Cases, 175 (1971).

³Armstead v. Starkville Municipal School District, 325 F. Supp., 560 (1972).

⁴R. Chalt and A. Ford, "Can Colleges Have Tenure and Affirmative Action, Too?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 1, 1972, p. 16.

In the most recent Supreme Court decision regarding AAEP, the Court ruled that victims of hiring discrimination are entitled to seniority dating from the employer's refusal to hire them because of discrimination based on sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, and/or age. The Court ruled that victims of discrimination were to be advanced over workers hired after the date victims were denied employment even if the result of said hiring would cause "arguably innocent" fellow workers to be bumped. The decision was by a 5 to 3 vote of a Court generally believed to be conservative.¹

Research

AAEP legislation pertinent to this thesis has been in effect only since 1972. With publication lags in combination with the time and effort required to produce research data for publication, it is not surprising that there is little formal research on the topic thus far. The major data available is in the form of unpublished doctoral dissertations. The following are illustrative.

Whitehead²: This work is a descriptive library study of Civil Rights legislation and executive orders, trends in federal laws, and examples of universities which were under review by various regional offices of Civil Rights. Included among his many conclusions were the following:

¹John P. MacKenzie, "Court Backs Bias Victims' Job Seniority," The Washington Post, March 25, 1976, p. A1.

²J. C. Whitehead, "The Development of a Model for Establishing and Maintaining an Affirmative Action Employment Program for Public Institutions of Higher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1972).

1. Public institutions of higher education which do not comply with the laws can expect severe sanctions.

2. There is a need for comprehensive guidelines of policy and procedure.

3. Public institutions of higher education must identify and correct discriminatory policies and procedures. Further, they must take affirmative actions to insure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during their employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

4. The need for public institutions of higher education to comply with the affirmative action obligation is the result of strong national policy to correct the national embarrassment of women and minority exclusion from job opportunities.

5. AAEP requires continual monitoring and evaluation.¹

McClure²: McClure did an empirical study of the attitudes of public school superintendents on one aspect of AAEP, namely, sex discrimination. She found "a rather wide divergence of attitudes and opinions" among her sample and identified a variety of "patterns of resistance to and patterns of endorsement of hypothetical affirmative action guidelines" which she hoped would be of use to regulatory and social agencies which would want to effect change. Various strategies were described which could be used with

¹Whitehead, op. cit., pp. 155-160.

²Gail McClure, "Attitudes of School Superintendents Toward Affirmative Action Guidelines for Eliminating Sex Stereotypes in Schools" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1973).

superintendents based on the degree of resistance to AAEP. One particularly enlightening aspect of this thesis is a lengthy literature review which includes scholarly journals as well as the popular press, e.g., McCall's Magazine.

Gemmell¹: One of Whitehead's recommendations supported the AAEP rule about appointing an Equal Employment Opportunity Officer. Gemmell proceeded to examine career patterns of such officers holding appointments in colleges and universities and to analyze the kinds of skills they used in their work. Of 218 institutions contacted, 38 had no officer, 68 had full-time officers and 65 had part-time officers. Forty-seven colleges and universities did not respond.

Some of the points made in this study include: Efforts have been made to appoint officers who are part of the target group (women or minorities); the mean age of the officers was 39.1 (full-time) and 45.1 (part-time); the largest group (40.6 percent) had M.A. degrees; the largest percentage of degrees were in education with business or economics being the second most frequent degree held; only six officers brought any AAEP experience to the job; 39.7 percent had other administrative experience; salaries were competitive within the institutions although it is of considerable interest and predictable that the lowest salaries were paid to female officers; officers perceived their chairmen, presidents, deans, etc., as being supportive; and faculty and students

¹Suzanne Gemmell, "Affirmative Action Officers in Higher Education" (Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1974).

were rated as supportive only half of the time. "Misunderstanding of affirmative action, fear of loss of jobs on the part of white males and traditional fear of change were the most often reported reasons for lack of support."

Ashmore¹: This writer studied AAEP implementation in the Los Angeles County Public Schools. He found that minorities were not fairly represented in the schools, school administrators were not in full agreement with AAEP, and qualified females and minorities were not being recruited in a vigorous manner and via the media and modalities available.

Kruger²: Attitudes of selected faculty and administrators at the University of Texas were studied by Kruger. Females and minorities in her sample were more positive toward AAEP, they were more convinced that discrimination continues in the employment market, and males, regardless of departmental allegiances and credentials did not differ in their views of AAEP.

It is important to note that Kruger has sampling problems which make interpretation and generalization of data difficult. There were only 10 minority females on campus so that group was lumped with White females. There were 26 minority males, 9 of whom were Black. Kruger, then, is talking about 19 Blacks, 10 of whom

¹W. R. Ashmore, "Affirmative Action Programs: Implementation in School Districts" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974).

²Peggy Kruger, "Attitudes of Faculty and Administrators Toward Affirmative Action in Higher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974).

are categorized with females in general and 9 of whom are included with Orientals, Mexican-Americans and American Indians. It is difficult if the sample is homogenous and especially in light of the fact that minorities other than Blacks are not known to share a history of slavery.

Johnson¹: This dissertation addressed itself to AAEP and VRS. Johnson (no relation to the present writer) found there was an increase in minorities and female personnel within VRS in Michigan, most of them were in the lower Civil Service ranks, there was improved promotional potential for minorities and there were increased complaints of discrimination. The results concerning higher numbers of minorities and females in VRS employment cannot be considered as a major breakthrough in race relations since the changes were miniscule and did not hold up in the year following the increase. Johnson's study does provide a review of the Civil Service system and Michigan's VRS, material not described in other dissertations.

A recent book by Moore and Wagstaff² details in considerable length results of a study of 3,228 Black educators employed in both two-year and four-year colleges. Since the data is not presented in a research report, nowhere can one find copies of either the research instrument, a questionnaire, or systemized responses or

¹Linda C. Johnson, "Affirmative Action in a Governmental Agency: Michigan's Vocational Rehabilitation Services" (Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1974).

²Moore and Wagstaff, op. cit.

methods of statistical analysis upon which the book's many conclusions are based. The work demands attention, however, as it is the only material found which focuses on Blacks' perception of AAEP in regard to university appointments. The material presented is a lucid argument for AAEP, that is, it shows that AAEP does not "strike at the very heart of higher learning,"¹ it does not usurp university prerogatives in regard to personnel policies,² and it shows that Blacks who are entering the academic marketplace are not unqualified and incompetent.³ Points have been made that higher education is not a business to be run like an "automotive plant"⁴ and, therefore, AAEP would lead "inexorably to the hiring of unqualified persons for irrelevant reasons."⁵

According to Moore and Wagstaff, there is no data to support this kind of statement and data to be studied comparatively is not supportive of the point of incompetence. For example, 80 percent of Blacks employed in universities have not written a book. However, 70 percent of non-Blacks also have never published a book. The 10 percent difference (degree of significance unknown) palls considerably when one realizes that the Black sample was composed of

¹M. M. Todorovich, "Total Affirmative Action Would Strike at the Very Heart of Higher Learning," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 15, 1973, p. 11.

²Chalt and Ford, op. cit., p. 75.

³Moore and Wagstaff, op. cit., p. 75.

⁴R. Perrins, "Computing Minorities," Change, September 1972.

⁵E. Goodman, "The Return of the Quota System," New York Times Magazine, September 10, 1974, p. 114.

young persons (55 percent under age 40) and only one-third (n = 593) held Ph.D. degrees, the usual indicator of research expertise and financial support capability.¹

Sowell's² recently published analysis of two surveys produced by the American Council on Education in 1968-69 and 1972-73 represents a rebuttal of sorts to Moore and Wagstaff. He sought to answer two questions: How much discrimination was there in higher education employment before AAEP, and how beneficial has AAEP been? It is important to note that the surveys on which a very elaborate analysis was done by Sowell involve data collected at or before the time of the major impetus of AAEP. Sowell suggests that there was no discrimination in higher education as evidenced by his data which finds that Black and female academicians have fewer doctorate degrees and hold degrees in areas which historically have offered lower salary, namely, education, social sciences and the humanities. He also reports that women hold approximately 10 percent of all Ph.D. degrees and 20 percent of all faculty positions and, therefore, are over-represented in terms of qualifications. Likewise, he states that Blacks hold less than 1 percent of the Ph.D.'s but occupy 2 percent of the faculty positions. His conclusion is that Blacks and women are rejected in academe not because of employer discrimination but because of lack of qualifications. He believes AAEP has not changed the percentages of minorities (including females)

¹ Moore and Wagstaff, op. cit., p. 135.

² Thomas Sowell, "Affirmative Action Reconsidered," The Public Interest, Winter 1976.

employed in colleges and universities (up to 1972) but has cost an exorbitant amount of money for implementation (allegedly the University of Michigan spent \$350,000 for compilation of statistical materials alone) and has resulted in consequences which are "poisonous in the long run. While doing little or nothing to advance the position of minorities and females, it creates the impression that hard-won achievements of these groups are conferred benefits" which perpetuates racism. His is a strong polemic with what appears to have obvious logical deficits but it is representative of what many Blacks have known for decades about the sophistry involved in discrediting plans which are designed to increase one's freedom of choice--if one is Black.

Summary

The economic, vocational, and sexual variables which contributed significantly to the development of a strong federal policy against employment discrimination were reviewed. Several of the recent court actions which were a part of the 1972 AAEP legislation were noted. Finally, research addressed to several aspects of AAEP has been listed. There is only one study which explores how Blacks feel about AAEP and this was done before the 1972 legislation and focused only on Black college-level faculty. Most of the research has been done before the 1974 recession and recessions historically have been the "bane of progress for society's underclasses" since the "white majority can be nudged

toward the notion of special opportunity for those who have been specially victimized when the special opportunity does not cost them anything."¹

¹Raspberry, op. cit., p. A6.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Overview

The purpose of this project is to study the perceptions and understanding Blacks employed at Michigan State University (MSU) and Michigan's Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VRS) have concerning Affirmative Action Employment Programs (AAEP).

This chapter contains descriptions of the population studied, the construction, field testing and administration of the questionnaire used to collect data, the research design, and analysis procedures used.

The Population

To identify the knowledge about and impact of AAEP in Blacks employed on MSU's faculty or the professional staff at VRS, two groups of Black individuals were studied. They were:

1. Full-time faculty members at Michigan State University whose appointments are within the tenure tract.
2. Full-time employees of Michigan's VRS who hold a Civil Service rank of 9 or above.

Names of Black faculty members meeting these criteria at MSU were supplied by Dr. Joseph McMillan, Assistant Vice-President for University Relations and Director of Human Relations at MSU. Names of Black VRS staff with appropriate Civil Service ratings

were supplied by Dr. Donald Galvin, Assistant Superintendent of Education, State of Michigan, and Director of Vocational Rehabilitation Services.

Since there are relatively few Black individuals who have attained faculty rank at MSU or professional Civil Service rank at VRS, the decision was made to include all persons who met the criteria in this research project. The n for MSU was 49 and for VRS, 82. The total sample n was 131.

The writer has no intention of attempting to generalize to all Blacks employed in the competitive labor market or even to all Blacks holding white-collar and professional level positions in government or universities. It would seem that even with the most rigorous sampling techniques and inferential statistics, generalizations based on this project's data would be precarious given the fact that the State of Michigan is generally recognized as a liberal state which gives careful attention to federal laws of a Civil Rights nature. Furthermore, Michigan State University can be considered an institution of higher education with a somewhat rather unique prospective regarding employment of Blacks given the obvious facts of a Black president and a Black college administered by a Black dean. This is in direct contrast to data summarized by Barclay¹ regarding Black males often being in executive positions with few responsibilities and very little actual policy making power.

¹Dolores Barclay, "Black Executives Find Their Positions Lack Real Power," Lansing State Journal, March 10, 1976, p. D6.

Therefore, attention was focused on two work samples in Michigan and the decision was made to use the largest sample possible, that is, all persons who are Black and hold certain ranks at MSU and VRS. By utilizing systematic sampling techniques or stratified samples, fewer subjects would have been needed. However, following Borg and Gall's general rule, ". . . the larger the sample, the less likely is the research to obtain negative results or accept the null hypothesis when it is actually false,"¹ all Blacks were included in the pool of potential subjects.

Selection and Description of the Instrument

The first decision made in regard to a testing instrument was that it would be a questionnaire. Based on other research endeavors, the writer selected a questionnaire because (1) it was considered by her to be the most efficient method of reaching a large statewide group, (2) it permitted the use of both one-item tests for collecting demographic data as well as items which would produce structured responses to allow for more accurate tabulation and analysis of data and, (3) unlike the interview, it would provide anonymity to the respondent. In accepting the questionnaire as the research tool, Borg and Gall's² and Babbie's³ survey research techniques concerning construction, determination of validity and

¹W. R. Borg and Meredith Gall, Educational Research, 2nd ed. (New York: David McKay, 1971), p. 123.

²Borg and Gall, op. cit.

³E. R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973).

reliability, pretesting and analysis of questionnaires provided the framework for the activities to be described in this chapter.

Besides a cover letter requesting participation and describing the writer's commitment to persons cooperating with this study (Appendix A), a questionnaire designed to provide data concerning various demographic matters was constructed. The demographic data relate almost in total to the study's independent variables of age, sex, where employed when AAEP was implemented, current job placement and current rank. Other data solicited concerned marital status and educational credentials with the thought that they might provide additional information which could be useful in analyzing and expanding basic results.

Initially two very different questionnaires were developed to elicit material concerning this study's dependent variables, understanding of AAEP and perception of its impact on each individual's career. The first questionnaire developed employed open-ended questions requiring an essay response. Development of questions for this instrument was based on the writer's knowledge of AAEP as garnered from personal experience, her understanding of the literature, and consultations with a person working as an AAEP officer, Dr. Joseph McMillan.

A second questionnaire based on the Likert¹ method of collecting data was constructed. Items selected for this initial

¹R. Likert, "A Method of Constructing an Attitude Scale," in M. Fishbein (ed.), Reading in Attitude Theory and Measurement (New York: John Wiley, 1967), pp. 90-185.

objective questionnaire were primarily modifications of those used by Kruger.¹ There were 45 items on this Likert scale.

Four Blacks, one female and one male each from MSU and VRS, participated in a pilot study which required their completing both questionnaires and responding to an interview with this writer.² As a result of their 100 percent concordant response in favor of the Likert instrument, the decision was made to proceed with the refinement of a Likert questionnaire. This decision was made not only because of the respondents' preference for the Likert questionnaire. The writer observed that the Likert scales were much easier to tabulate and score because Likert scales provide for unambiguous ordinality of response categories and lend themselves to a straightforward method of index construction. The latter is accomplished by assigning a number indicating relative strength of agreement to declarative statements. In this particular study the numbers one to four were assigned. One was assigned to "strongly agree," two to "agree," three to "disagree," and four to "strongly disagree." No neutral category such as "no opinion" was included at the recommendation of the writer's advisory committee. The response categories utilized took into account the direction of

¹Kruger, op. cit., pp. 200-202.

²This first pilot sample group also reviewed each item with the writer with the focus being clarity, pertinence, and interpretation. As a result of this consultation, 23 items were eliminated and 6 were rewritten.

the item and provided a total score for the several responses to individual variables.¹

Likert scales also permit collection of large amounts of data per item, that is, two items are sufficient to constitute a rating scale itself and these scales, in turn, can be combined with other types of items to construct indices.²

Construction of the Instrument

The final questionnaire used in this study was composed of two parts, Scale I and Scale II. Scale I items were adapted in part from Kruger's Likert instrument. Her instrument utilized 44 validated items. All 44 items were adapted for use in the pilot study designed to determine whether an essay or objective instrument would be selected. Twelve of these 44 items were selected for Scale I which was designed to measure the dependent variable: The subjects can and do understand AAEP. Scale I was designed to measure literal, factual, and descriptive understanding of the act especially as learned from publication of the AAEP statement by the employer.

Scale II was designed to measure the second dependent variable: AAEP does have an impact on an individual's career. Twenty-eight items were selected on the basis of their ability to measure if the subjects feel AAEP is needed, it has been useful to them and it has been helpful in terms of recruitment, promotion, salary and other fringe benefits. Nine of the 28 items were adapted from

¹Babbie, op. cit., pp. 269-70.

²Bleecher, op. cit., p. 96.

Kruger's questionnaire. Additional items, again, were devised in accordance with what the writer knows to be true about AAEP and with the advice of psychologists familiar with attitude scale development and a university-based AAEP officer.¹ These additional items were added to Scale II. Scale I was composed of 12 items and Scale II of 28 for the statistical pretesting.

Pretest of the Instrument

This 40-item questionnaire was pretested according to principles articulated by Babbie.² Forty Blacks enrolled in graduate programs at Michigan State University were asked to complete the questionnaire and mail it to the author. Twenty-five (63 percent) did.

Measuring Reliability

The responses of the pilot sample were hand-scored and recorded so that the most widely used technique for computing reliability, the split-half method, could be utilized. For this study, Cronbach's coefficient Alpha (α), a generalization of the Kuder-Richardson KR-20 formula, was used.³

¹Reference is to Drs. A. Kirk, M. Keller and J. McMillan.

²Babbie, op. cit., pp. 206-8.

³William Mehrens and Irvin Lehman, Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 113-16; William Mehrens and Robert Ebel, Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement, Selected Readings (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974), pp. 132-66.

$$\alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum S_i^2}{\sigma^2} \right)$$

where k = number of items

S_i^2 = item variance

σ^2 = test variance

With item $n = 33$ and pilot sample $n = 25$, individual item variance is provided in Table 3.1. The formula for determining item variance was¹:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}}{n}$$

where n = number of people

X_i = score for item i^{th} across all people

The formula for test variance was²:

$$\frac{\sum X_i^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}}{n}$$

where X_i = test score for the i^{th} person,

n = number of people.

¹Mehrens and Lehman, op. cit.

²Ibid.

TABLE 3.1.--Pretest Item Variance.

Item Number	Item Variance	Item Number	Item Variance
1	.6000	18	.4896
2	1.5264	19	.4800
3	.3200	20	.8416
4	.6976	21	.8064
5	.4576	22	.7200
6	3.4944	23	.5856
7	.4096	24	.5856
8	.9424	25	.6656
9	.7504	26	.9824
10	.5344	27	.6976
11	.3200	28	.8000
12	.8416	29	1.2000
13	.6336	30	.4800
14	.7584	31	.6656
15	.8000	32	.4736
16	.8416	33	.9600
17	.9344		

Item Variance $\Sigma = 26.296$

The pretest item variance data is presented in Table 3.1 whereas the data for determination of test variance is provided in Table 3.2.

Reliability of the scale was determined to be .8842, a very high reliability as evidenced by Adorno's statement: ". . . it is

TABLE 3.2.--Determination of Test Variance Data.

Person	Score (X)	X ²	Person	Score (X)	X ²
1	122	14,884	14	106	11,236
2	85	7,225	15	116	13,456
3	85	7,225	16	93	8,649
4	85	7,225	17	88	7,744
5	71	5,041	18	95	9,025
6	90	8,100	19	85	7,225
7	107	11,449	20	122	14,884
8	103	10,609	21	79	6,241
9	108	11,664	22	118	13,924
10	98	9,604	23	91	8,281
11	87	7,569	24	105	11,025
12	109	11,881	25	89	7,921
13	107	11,449			
n = 25		ΣX = 2,444	ΣX ² = 243,536		

doubtful that any scale measuring diverse political-economic ideology could obtain an average reliability of much over .80."¹

Questionnaire Validity

In order to determine if this questionnaire had validity, that is, it measured what it purports to measure, criterion-person

¹T. W. Adorno, Else Frekel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1950), p. 159, as quoted in Bleicher, op. cit., p. 111.

comparisons were done using three persons known to this writer to have disparate views about AAEP.

Person 1 = A Black housewife not involved in Civil Rights activities, not employed in the competitive labor market, and married to an individual who is employed in a placement which is not a target of AAEP.

Person 2 = A Black female employed in a situation where AAEP is not applicable. However, she was active in the Civil Rights movement during her college years (1960s).

Person 3 = A Black male who administers a Civil Rights organization. He is deeply committed to effecting change in the system via legislative and political activities.

If the two scales of the questionnaire have empirical validity, the assumption was made that there should be clear differences in scores received by the three respondents.

The results of the criterion-person study are presented in Table 3.3. High scores indicate a lack of understanding of AAEP or a perception of no appreciable effect of such legislation on one's life. Low scores indicate an understanding of AAEP and a perception that it has an influence on one's career. Middle range scores indicate

TABLE 3.3.--Criterion-Person Validity Scores.

Scale	Possible Low Score	Person 1	Person 2	Person 3	Possible High Score
Scale I (Understanding)	12	39	29	16	48
Scale II (Perception of Effects)	28	98	67	45	112

a partial familiarity with AAEP and a belief that it has moderate influence on one's career. It can be seen from inspection of the scores that scores are disturbed in a predictable way and, therefore, constitute a measure of validity.

Administration of the Questionnaire

The first pilot sample assembled to assist the writer in determining what type of instrument to be used was composed to Black friends employed in a professional capacity at either MSU or VRS. The second pilot sample consisted of graduate students in seminars taught by a member of the writer's committee. This group of Blacks completed the questionnaire for reliability studies. The three-pilot sample consisted of Black friends of the writer known to have disparate opinions about AAEP. These individuals provided responses to the questionnaire which were used in validity studies.

The population selected for final examination on an instrument determined to be reliable and valid consisted of all Black faculty at Michigan State University who hold appointments within the tenure system. Included in this faculty group were several high level administrators who, although not involved currently in active classroom assignments, do hold faculty rank. Examples of such individuals would be the president of the university and one college dean. The university n was 49.

All Black VRS employees holding a Civil Service rank of 9 and above were included in this sample. Unlike the university sample which resides within the Greater Lansing area, the VRS

sample resides in the lower peninsula of Michigan with the greatest concentration of individuals living in the Detroit area. The total VRS sample was 82.

Materials were mailed to each member of the population after receipt of a listing of names from appropriate officers in their place of employment. For Michigan State University, names could not be submitted until the writer had sought and received approval of the study from Dr. Paul L. Dressel, Assistant Provost for Institutional Research. With the questionnaire was the cover letter requesting participation (Appendix A).

Within one week 63 questionnaires out of 131 had been returned by mail. Within two weeks 18 more had been submitted. Within three weeks 21 more were mailed to the experimenter for a return of 102 or 78 percent. Seven phone calls were received at the writer's home regarding reasons why the questionnaire was not being returned. Two letters were received from high university officials indicating that the demand on them for participation in such studies was such that they followed an inflexible policy of not completing any form for any person for any reason. Two meetings were held with spokespersons from regional officers of VRS who wanted to discuss AAEP as it pertained to them and who wanted the writer to provide documents spelling out their rights and responsibilities under the legislation. Of the 131 persons asked to participate in this study, 102 persons returned completed questionnaires, two wrote letters of refusal, seven phoned to explain noncompliance, and 18 others expressed their inability to participate

through spokespersons at their VRS offices. A total of 120 responded in some fashion to the questionnaire, then, with only 11 nonrespondents. No attempt was made to solicit a response from these 11 not only because questionnaires had not been coded so as to afford confidentiality, but also because sample size statistics indicated that the number of returned questionnaires was more than adequate for sampling purposes.¹

Design

This project is a descriptive questionnaire study designed to investigate the perceptions and understanding Blacks employed at MSU and VRS have concerning AAEP. As listed in Exploratory Questions, Chapter I, the specific questions asked were: Does this sample understand in an objective, factual manner what AAEP requires? Do the subjects believe AAEP has an impact on their careers? These are the study's two dependent variables. They are examined in terms of the study's five independent variables:

1. Sex with two levels, female and male;
2. Age with two levels, under 30 and over 30 years of age;
3. Rank in 1976 with two levels, low and high;
4. Place of employment in 1972 with two levels, same employment site or employment elsewhere;
5. Place of employment in 1976 with two levels, VRS and MSU.

¹Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: Wiley, 1965).

Respondents' understanding of AAEP is measured by Scale I of the questionnaire while Scale II measures perception of impact on one's career. Understanding was demonstrated if over half of the sample responded correctly to 75 percent of the items on Scale I. Scale II was accepted as indicating perception of impact on one's career if over 50 percent of the sample responded correctly to 75 percent of that scale's items. Omission of items, had they occurred, would have been scored as incorrect.

Statistical analyses will indicate how levels of independent variables are related to each other and to the dependent variables.

Testable Hypotheses

Scale I: Understanding

The hypothesis tested for the independent variable "sex" is:

$$H_0 : M_f = M_m$$

The number of female subjects who understand AAEP is the same as the number of males who understand AAEP,

against:

$$H_1 : M_f \neq M_m$$

The number of female subjects who understand AAEP is not the same as the number of males who understand AAEP.

The hypothesis tested for the independent variable "age" is:

$$H_0 : M_{-30} = M_{+30}$$

The number of persons under 30 who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons over 30 who understand AAEP,

against:

$$H_1 : M_{-30} \neq M_{+30}$$

The number of persons under 30 who understand AAEP is not the same as the number of persons over 30 who understand AAEP.

The hypothesis tested for the independent variable "rank"

is:

$$H_0 : M_{lo} = M_{hi}$$

The number of persons holding low ranks who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons holding higher ranks who understand AAEP,

against:

$$H_1 : M_{lo} \neq M_{hi}$$

The number of persons holding low ranks who understand AAEP is not the same as the number of persons holding higher ranks who understand AAEP.

The hypothesis for the independent variable "place of employment in 1972" is:

$$H_0 : M_{cu} = M_{el}$$

The number of persons employed in their current employment site who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons who were employed elsewhere in 1972,

against:

$$H_1 : M_{eu} \neq M_{el}$$

The number of persons employed in their current employment who understand AAEP is not the same as the number of persons who were employed elsewhere in 1972.

The hypothesis for the independent variable "current place of employment" is:

$$H_0 : M_m = M_v$$

The number of persons employed at VRS who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons employed at MSU who understand AAEP,

against:

$$H_1 : M_m \neq M_v$$

The number of persons employed at VRS who understand AAEP is not the same as the number of persons employed at MSU who understand AAEP.

Scale II: Perception of AAEP as Having Impact on Careers

The hypothesis for the independent variable "sex" is:

$$H_0 : M_f = M_m$$

The number of females who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of males who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers,

against:

$$H_0 : M_f \neq M_m$$

The number of females who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is not the same as the number of males who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

The hypothesis for the independent variable "age" is:

$$H_0 : M_{-30} = M_{+30}$$

The number of persons under 30 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of persons over 30 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers,

against:

$$H_1 : M_{-30} \neq M_{+30}$$

The number of persons under 30 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is not the same as the number of persons over 30 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

The hypothesis for the independent variable "rank" is:

$$H_0 : M_{lo} = M_{hi}$$

The number of persons holding low ranks who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of persons holding high ranks who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

against:

$$H_1 : M_{lo} \neq M_{hi}$$

The number of persons holding low ranks who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is not the same as the number of persons holding high ranks who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

The hypothesis tested for the independent variable "place of employment in 1972" is:

$$H_0 : M_{cu} = M_{el}$$

The number of persons employed at their current employment site who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of people employed elsewhere in 1972 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

against:

$$H_1 : M_{cu} \neq M_{el}$$

The number of persons employed at their current employment site who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is not the same as the number of people employed elsewhere in 1972 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

The hypothesis tested for the independent variable "current place of employment" is:

$$H_0 : M_m = M_v$$

The number of people employed at VRS who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of people employed at MSU who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers,

against:

$$H_1 : M_m \neq M_v$$

The number of people employed at VRS who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is not the same as the number of people employed at MSU who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

General Hypotheses

The general hypotheses tested were:

$$H_0 : M_u = M_{du}$$

Black employees holding professional level or white-collar positions at MSU or VRS understand AAEP,

against:

$$H_1 : M_u \neq M_{eu}$$

Black employees holding professional level or white-collar positions at MSU or VRS do not understand AAEP;

and

$$H_0 : M_p = M_{np}$$

Black employees holding professional level or white-collar positions at MSU or VRS perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers,

against:

$$H_1 : M_p \neq M_{np}$$

Black employees holding professional level or white-collar positions at MSU or VRS do not perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

All hypotheses involve a two-tailed test $p < .05$; that is, the null hypothesis will be supported if there is no difference in the populations at a probability level of less than .05.

Analysis

With the initial assistance of Mr. Eric Gordon, Research Consultant, College of Education, Michigan State University, the writer learned how to use IBM keypunch technique whereby all responses to the questionnaire were coded in numerical form and punched onto IBM cards. The cards then were fed into MSU's CDC 6500 computer using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The computer was asked to compute:

1. Demographic data concerning the independent variables of rank, age, sex, current place of employment and place of employment in 1972.
2. Subjects' understanding of AAEP as measured by questionnaire items 1 through 12.
3. Subjects' perception of AAEP's impact on individual careers as measured by questionnaire items 13 through 40.

(For 1, 2, and 3 the following were provided: mean, median, variance, standard deviation, mode, frequency data, and standard errors. Actually, much more data was provided but not found useful, e.g., skewness, kurtosis, and various percentages.)

4. An ANOVA on (a) understanding of AAEP; (b) perception of AAEP's effects on careers, and (c) a combination of scores on the understanding and perception scales by sex, rank, age, current place of employment and place of employment in 1972.

5. Multiple regression analyses of relationships between dependent and independent variables. Although multiple regression analyses are done for a variety of reasons,¹ the purpose of this particular series of analyses was to evaluate the contributions of a specific variable or set of variables.

Summary

In this chapter presentation has been made of the population studied, how a testing instrument was selected, how the testing instrument was constructed and field tested for validity and reliability purposes, how the instrument was administered, how the study was designed, and how the data produced from the instrument was analyzed.

In the chapter to follow there will be a presentation of the results of this study and an analysis and interpretation of the results.

¹Jae-On Kim and Frank J. Kohout, "Multiple Regression Analysis: Subprogram Regression," in N. H. Nie et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 321.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Overview

In this chapter data will be presented and analyzed in terms of (1) demographic materials concerning the independent variables of rank, sex, age, current place of employment and place of employment in 1972; (2) subjects' understanding of AAEP as measured by questionnaire items 1 through 12; (3) subjects' perceptions of AAEP's impact on individual careers as measured by questionnaire items 13 through 40, and (4) the ANOVA on understanding of and perception of impact of AAEP by sex, rank, age, place of employment in 1972 and current place of employment. Levels of significance regarding the dependent variable of understanding AAEP and perception of its impact on one's career will be presented. Unintended effects, if any, will be identified.

Demographic Data

The material of a demographic nature, that is, that which describes the respondents to the questionnaire, is as follows:

Sex: Sixty-two of the respondents were males and 40 were females.

Place of Employment in 1972: Thirty-one of the subjects were employed at MSU, 34 were employed at VRS, 11 were in training programs and 26 were employed at other places besides MSU or VRS.

Current Employment Site: Thirty-nine of the respondents work at MSU and 63 are employed at VRS.

Educational Credentials: Twenty-three individuals hold bachelor's degrees, 35 have master's degrees, 21 have master's degrees plus doctorate coursework, 31 have doctorates, 1 has an educational specialist degree and 1 person chose not to respond regarding what educational degree, if any, had been attained.

Age of Respondents: Thirty-three of the respondents are between the ages of 20-29, 39 are between the ages of 30-39, 24 are between the ages of 40-59, and 6 are between the ages of 50-59.

Marital Status: Nineteen currently are single, 66 are married, 4 have lost their spouses by death and 13 are currently divorced or separated.

Employment Rank: This data is best presented in tabular form (Table 4.1). In Table 4.1, the category Other holds an n which is different from data categorized under Place of Employment in 1972. Eleven persons indicated placement in training programs and 26 stated that they were employed at a variety of other places for an n of 37. The difference of 12 is accounted for by the fact that eight of the subjects were employed at VRS but below a Civil Service rank of 9. Likewise, four were employed at MSU but were not in the tenure stream.

Subscale I: Subjects Do Understand AAEP

This subscale is designed to measure the factual understanding of Barnard's principle: Black employees can and do understand AAEP.

TABLE 4.1.--Employment Status in 1972 and 1976.

Rank		1972	1976
Instructor		2	1
Assistant Professor		16	20
Associate Professor		11	13
Professor		2	6
Civil Service 9		14	30
Civil Service 10		5	18
Civil Service 11		2	6
Civil Service 12		1	4
Civil Service 13		0	3
Civil Service 15+		0	1
Other:		49	0
Training	11		
Employment elsewhere	26		
MSU but not in tenure tract	4		
VRS but C.S. rank < 9	8		
		102	102

In presenting the computer data supporting the fact that Blacks who participated in this study do understand AAEP, there first will be an analysis of the subjects' responses to each item of Scale I. The exploratory question will be listed with Roman numerals. Under each exploratory question will be the questionnaire items relating to the exploratory question. They will be listed with Arabic numerals.

Exploratory Question I

Have subjects had difficulty in examining their employer's written AAEP statement? As noted in Table 4.2, the majority of respondents had access to the statement (66.7 percent).

TABLE 4.2.--Access to Employer's AAEP Statement Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	24	23.5	23.5
Agree	44	43.1	66.7
Disagree	22	21.6	88.2
Strongly disagree	<u>12</u>	<u>11.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.216	Std. Err.	.093
Median	2.114	Std. Dev.	.940
Mode	2.000	Variance	.884

Exploratory Question II

Are subjects familiar with the person in charge of AAEP implementation at their place of employment? According to data in Table 4.3, fewer than half of the sample knew the AAEP officer at their place of employment. This table, however, needs comment. Of the persons indicating that they knew the individual, 43 percent offered the incorrect name. Only four individuals at VRS knew the correct name whereas 21 of the university sample listed the correct officer.

TABLE 4.3.--Correct Identification of AAEP Officer Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	26	25.5	25.5
Agree	18	17.6	43.1
Disagree	31	30.4	73.5
Strongly disagree	<u>27</u>	<u>26.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.578	Std. Err.	.113
Median	2.326	Std. Dev.	1.138
Mode	3.000	Variance	1.290

Exploratory Question III

Are subjects aware of the changes affecting their employer as a result of AAEP? Several of the items pertain to this question and will be tabulated in order of their appearance on the questionnaire.

1. AAEP requires the hiring of minority people to meet quotas even if the prospective employees are not qualified. AAEP does not require the hiring of unqualified persons so a response indicating disagree or strongly disagree indicates that the employee understands this part of AAEP. According to Table 4.4, the vast majority of respondents have the correct information about quotas (89.2 percent).

2. If there are several applicants for a position and one applicant is a member of a minority group or a woman, this person must be given preferential treatment. Table 4.5 shows that

TABLE 4.4.--Knowledge of Hiring of Unqualified Persons Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	60	58.8	58.8
Disagree	31	30.4	89.2
Agree	8	7.8	97.1
Strongly agree	<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	1.549	Std. Err.	.076
Median	1.350	Std. Dev.	.766
Mode	1.000	Variance	.587

TABLE 4.5.--Knowledge of Requirement of Preferential Treatment Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	13	12.7	12.7
Agree	38	37.3	50.0
Disagree	35	34.3	84.3
Strongly disagree	<u>16</u>	<u>15.7</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.529	Std. Err.	.090
Median	2.500	Std. Dev.	.909
Mode	2.000	Variance	.826

the sample was split in its understanding of this requirement, that is, 50 percent recognized it to be true and 50 percent rejected it as false.

3. Timetables for completion of hiring goals and objectives are not required by AAEP. The correct response to this question is a negative one of either disagree or strongly disagree. From Table 4.6 the majority of respondents indicate that they understand this part of the programming (75.5 percent).

TABLE 4.6.--Knowledge of Timetables for Hiring Requirement Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	43	42.2	42.2
Disagree	34	33.3	75.5
Agree	19	18.6	94.1
Strongly Agree	<u>6</u>	<u>5.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	1.882	Std. Err.	.091
Median	1.735	Std. Dev.	.915
Mode	1.000	Variance	.838

4. At this point there are no sanctions for noncompliance if my employer does not meet AAEP requirements. A sample response of 61.8 percent to strongly disagree and disagree indicates understanding of this facet of AAEP, as shown in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7.--Knowledge of Sanctions for Noncompliance Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	30	29.4	29.4
Disagree	33	32.4	61.8
Agree	28	27.5	89.2
Strongly Agree	<u>11</u>	<u>10.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.196	Std. Err.	.098
Median	2.136	Std. Dev.	.985
Mode	2.000	Variance	.971

5. AAEP focuses primarily on helping members of the female sex find employment with members of racial groups receiving secondary consideration. This was recognized as a false statement by 74.5% of the sample, as shown in Table 4.8.

6. My employer is in full compliance with AAEP as evidenced by no complaints having been forthcoming from the federal government about employment practices. Respondents disagree with this statement (82.4 percent cumulative frequency; Table 4.9).

7. The ratio of minorities at my place of employment as determined by minority utilization studies is known to me. An assumption has to be made in interpreting responses to this item. The sample indicating knowledge of such data was relatively small (2.16 percent). Furthermore, of this percentage, only 7 (32.8 percent)

TABLE 4.8.--Knowledge of Target Population of AAEP Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	28	27.5	27.5
Disagree	48	47.1	74.5
Agree	18	17.6	92.2
Strongly agree	<u>8</u>	<u>7.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.059	Std. Err.	.087
Median	1.979	Std. Dev.	.877
Mode	2.000	Variance	.769

TABLE 4.9.--Knowledge of Employer Compliance Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	38	37.3	37.3
Disagree	46	45.1	82.4
Agree	14	13.7	96.1
Strongly agree	<u>4</u>	<u>3.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	1.843	Std. Err.	.080
Median	1.783	Std. Dev.	.805
Mode	2.000	Variance	.648

knew the correct statistics, as can be seen in Table 4.10. The assumption which seems reasonable to make is that this data is not readily available to employees.

TABLE 4.10.--Knowledge of Minority Ratio Data Accessibility Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	5	4.9	4.9
Agree	17	16.7	21.6
Disagree	37	36.3	57.8
Strongly disagree	<u>43</u>	<u>42.2</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.157	Std. Err.	.087
Median	3.284	Std. Dev.	.876
Mode	4.000	Variance	.767

Exploratory Question IV

Do subjects recognize that measures suggested as possible measures for employers to improve minority representation in their work force are not required by law? Three questionnaire items refer to this question.

1. My employer is required to offer part-time employment opportunities to members of minority groups if this is the only way to increase minority representation in the work force. Respondents recognized this as incorrect (88.2 percent).

TABLE 4.11.--Knowledge of Part-Time Work Requirement Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	41	40.2	40.2
Disagree	49	48.0	88.2
Agree	10	9.8	98.0
Strongly agree	<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean 1.735
Median 1.704
Mode 2.000

Std. Err. .071
Std. Dev. .717
Variance .513

2. My employer is required to provide child-care facilities for children of minority individuals if this is the only way to increase minority representation in the work force. This was recognized as being untrue by 94.1 percent of the sample (see Table 4.12).

3. The federal government is required to provide training programs at my place of employment for upgrading credentials of prospective Black employees. Table 4.13 shows that the respondents know that their employers are not required to provide training for prospective employees, as indicated by a strongly disagree/agree response level of 82.4 percent.

TABLE 4.12.--Knowledge of Provisions for Child Care Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	54	52.9	52.9
Disagree	42	41.2	94.1
Agree	4	3.9	98.0
Strongly agree	<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	1.549	Std. Err.	.066
Median	1.444	Std. Dev.	.669
Mode	1.000	Variance	.448

TABLE 4.13.--Knowledge of Training for Prospective Employees Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	40	39.2	39.2
Disagree	44	43.1	82.4
Agree	14	13.7	96.1
Strongly agree	<u>4</u>	<u>3.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	1.824	Std. Err.	.081
Median	1.750	Std. Dev.	.813
Mode	2.000	Variance	.662

In terms of Dependent Variable I, Black employees at MSU and VRS do understand AAEP, the data is clear. As can be noted in Table 4.14, 75 percent (read as 74.5 percent) achieved a score of 27 or less. The criterion initially is accepted as indicating that respondents did, in fact, understand AAEP was that 50 percent of the sample would achieve a score of 75 percent "correct." In this study 75 percent achieved such a rating.

TABLE 4.14.--Understanding of AAEP Frequency Data.

Total Score	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
12-15	0	0.0	0.0
16	1	1.0	1.0
17	0	0.0	1.0
18	1	1.0	2.0
19	2	2.0	3.9
20	2	2.0	5.9
21	6	5.9	11.8
22	16	15.7	27.5
23	7	6.9	34.3
24	11	10.8	45.1
25	9	8.8	53.9
26	9	8.8	62.7
<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>74.5</u>
28	12	11.8	86.3
29	4	3.9	90.2
30	4	3.9	94.1
31	2	2.0	96.1
32	2	2.0	98.0
33	2	2.0	100.0
34-48	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Subscale II: Subjects Perceive AAEP to Have
an Impact on Their Careers

Has AAEP had an impact on the careers of the sample studied? Nine specific questions and the questionnaire items which are responsive to them are presented in the tables to follow.

Exploratory Question I

Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of job stability, one example of which would be favorable tenure action? A minority of subjects agreed with the questionnaire item dealing with this point (29.4 percent).

TABLE 4.15.--AAEP and Job Stability Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	1	1.0	1.0
Agree	29	28.4	29.4
Disagree	31	30.4	59.8
Strongly disagree	<u>41</u>	<u>40.2</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.098	Std. Err.	.084
Median	3.177	Std. Dev.	.850
Mode	4.000	Variance	.723

Exploratory Question II

Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of initial recruitment and hiring? Only 37.3 percent of the sample believed AAEP to be helpful in regard to initial employment procurement.

TABLE 4.16.--AAEP and Recruitment and Hiring Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	9	8.8	8.8
Agree	29	28.4	37.3
Disagree	24	23.5	60.8
Strongly disagree	<u>40</u>	<u>39.2</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.931	Std. Err.	.101
Median	3.042	Std. Dev.	1.017
Mode	4.000	Variance	1.035

Exploratory Question III

Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of promotions? Only a total of 14.7 percent of the entire sample felt promotion was influenced by AAEP.

TABLE 4.17.--AAEP and Promotion Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	5	4.9	4.9
Agree	10	9.8	14.7
Disagree	33	32.4	47.1
Strongly disagree	<u>54</u>	<u>52.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.333	Std. Err.	.084
Median	3.556	Std. Dev.	.848
Mode	4.000	Variance	.719

Exploratory Question IV

Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of salary adjustments?

Only six persons or 5.9 percent of the sample felt AAEP was instrumental in salary matters.

TABLE 4.18.--AAEP and Salary Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	0	0.0	0.0
Agree	6	5.9	5.9
Disagree	26	25.5	31.4
Strongly disagree	<u>70</u>	<u>68.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.627	Std. Err.	.059
Median	3.771	Std. Dev.	.590
Mode	4.000	Variance	.355

Exploratory Question V

Were subjects helped by AAEP in terms of fringe benefits?

Four questionnaire items pertain directly to this question and one is indirectly related to it.

1. AAEP has made it possible for me to attend more professional meetings--at no personal expense--than I did before AAEP was in progress. Respondents could not agree with this statement.

TABLE 4.19.--AAEP and Professional Meeting Attendance Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	0	0.0	0.0
Agree	7	6.9	6.9
Disagree	34	33.3	40.2
Strongly disagree	<u>61</u>	<u>59.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.529	Std. Err.	.062
Median	3.664	Std. Dev.	.625
Mode	4.00	Variance	.390

2. AAEP has made it possible for me to take advance training, e.g., university coursework, during work hours. Subjects did not find this to be true for the most part.

TABLE 4.20.--AAEP and Advanced Training Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	2	2.0	2.0
Agree	15	14.7	16.7
Disagree	25	24.5	41.2
Strongly disagree	<u>60</u>	<u>58.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.402	Std. Err.	.080
Median	3.650	Std. Dev.	.812
Mode	4.000	Variance	.659

3. AAEP has offered me more liberal vacation or leave time than my colleagues have. Respondents were almost unanimous ($n = 99$) in their rejection of this statement.

TABLE 4.21.--AAEP and Leave Benefits Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	0	0.0	0.0
Agree	3	2.9	2.9
Disagree	26	25.5	28.4
Strongly disagree	<u>73</u>	<u>71.6</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.686	Std. Err.	.052
Median	3.804	Std. Dev.	.526
Mode	4.000	Variance	.277

4. I have not been discriminated against at my current place of employment in terms of salary, tenure, promotions, and other fringe benefits. Table 4.22 shows that the majority of respondents agree with this statement (67.6 percent).

5. The AAEP Office at my place of employment has been helpful to me when I requested aid. The majority of respondents have not requested aid ($n = 72$) and, therefore, respond to this item with disagreement (Table 4.23).

TABLE 4.22.--Perception of Nondiscrimination Regarding Job Benefits
Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	11	10.8	10.8
Agree	58	56.9	67.6
Disagree	10	9.8	77.5
Strongly disagree	<u>23</u>	<u>22.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.627	Std. Err.	.059
Median	3.771	Std. Dev.	.596
Mode	4.000	Variance	.355

TABLE 4.23.--Assistance from AAEP Office Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	5	4.9	4.9
Agree	25	24.5	29.4
Disagree	28	27.5	56.9
Strongly disagree	<u>44</u>	<u>43.1</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	3.088	Std. Err.	.093
Median	3.250	Std. Dev.	.935
Mode	4.000	Variance	.873

Exploratory Question VI

Do subjects perceive White members of their employment units as believing that AAEP is a positive experience and program for the future employer and employees? Four questionnaire items are directly responsive to this exploratory question and two are indirectly related to it.

1. White employees at my place of employment feel that AAEP is creating serious recruitment problems for our department and, directly or indirectly, for them. A total of 67.6 percent of the sample believe this to be true.

TABLE 4.24.--Perceived White Beliefs Regarding Recruitment Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	19	18.6	18.6
Agree	50	49.0	67.6
Disagree	29	28.4	96.1
Strongly disagree	<u>4</u>	<u>3.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.176	Std. Err.	.077
Median	2.140	Std. Dev.	.776
Mode	2.000	Variance	.602

2. White employees in my place of employment feel that AAEP is creating morale problems for our employer and, directly or indirectly, for them. Table 4.25 contains the results for this item.

TABLE 4.25.--Perceived White Beliefs Regarding Morale Problems
Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	11	10.8	10.8
Agree	58	56.9	67.6
Disagree	33	32.4	100.0
Strongly disagree	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.216	Std. Err.	.062
Median	2.190	Std. Dev.	.623
Mode	2.000	Variance	.389

3. White employees at my place of employment feel that White males are being sacrificed in the labor market in the interest of improving the marketability of Blacks. A majority of respondents believes that White employees do have this feeling.

TABLE 4.26.--Perceived Beliefs of Whites Feeling Sacrificed Fre-
quency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	25	24.5	24.5
Agree	49	48.0	72.5
Disagree	23	22.5	95.1
Strongly disagree	<u>5</u>	<u>4.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.078	Std. Err.	.081
Median	2.031	Std. Dev.	.871
Mode	2.000	Variance	.667

4. White employees at my place of employment feel that AAEP is economically harmful to our employer and, directly and indirectly, to them. A total of 76.5 percent of the sample was in agreement with this statement.

TABLE 4.27.--Perceived White Beliefs of AAEP as Economically Harmful
Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	19	18.6	18.6
Agree	59	57.8	76.5
Disagree	23	22.5	99.0
Strongly disagree	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.059	Std. Err.	.067
Median	2.042	Std. Dev.	.672
Mode	2.000	Variance	.452

5. White colleagues are comfortable in discussing AAEP with me or in my presence. Only a total of 28.4 percent of the sample feels that this statement is accurate, as shown in Table 4.28.

6. White colleagues are comfortable in discussing the notion of "reverse racism" in my presence or with me. Table 4.29 reveals that the vast majority of respondents find this not to be true.

TABLE 4.28.--Perception of Whites' Desire to Discuss Issues Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	3	2.9	2.9
Agree	26	25.5	28.4
Disagree	43	42.2	70.6
Strongly disagree	<u>30</u>	<u>29.4</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.980	Std. Err.	.081
Median	3.012	Std. Dev.	.820
Mode	3.000	Variance	.673

TABLE 4.29.--Perception of Whites' Desire to Discuss "Reverse Racism" Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	9	8.8	8.8
Agree	18	17.6	26.5
Disagree	37	36.3	62.7
Strongly disagree	<u>38</u>	<u>37.3</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.020	Std. Err.	.094
Median	3.149	Std. Dev.	.954
Mode	4.000	Variance	.911

Exploratory Question VII

Do subjects feel that they as well as Blacks in general have been helped by AAEP? There are five questionnaire items pertinent to this exploratory question.

1. AAEP will provide greater employment opportunities for members of my race who have yet to enter the job market. The majority of respondents agree with this statement (69.6 percent).

TABLE 4.30.--Perception of AAEP as Providing Future Opportunities
Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	6	5.9	5.9
Agree	65	63.7	69.6
Disagree	16	15.7	85.3
Strongly disagree	<u>15</u>	<u>14.7</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.392	Std. Err.	.080
Median	2.192	Std. Dev.	.810
Mode	2.000	Variance	.657

2. AAEP has contributed positively to the personal enrichment of my life. As seen in Table 4.31, only a total of 27.5 percent of the sample can agree with that statement.

3. AAEP has helped my colleagues to perceive me as a competent employee. Table 4.32 shows that only 91.2 percent of the sample was in disagreement with that statement.

TABLE 4.31.--Perception of AAEP as Providing Personal Enrichment
Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	2	2.0	2.0
Agree	26	25.5	27.5
Disagree	39	38.2	65.7
Strongly disagree	<u>35</u>	<u>34.3</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.049	Std. Err.	.082
Median	3.090	Std. Dev.	.825
Mode	3.000	Variance	.681

TABLE 4.32.--Perception of AAEP as Causing Whites to Perceive
Competency Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	0	0.0	0.0
Agree	9	8.8	8.8
Disagree	48	47.1	55.9
Strongly disagree	<u>45</u>	<u>44.1</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.353	Std. Err.	.063
Median	3.375	Std. Dev.	.639
Mode	3.000	Variance	.409

4. AAEP has helped my colleagues to appreciate me more as a person. Disagreement with this statement totaled 92.8 percent of the sample.

TABLE 4.33.--Perception of AAEP as Enhancing Appreciation of Respondent Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	0	0.0	0.0
Agree	8	7.8	7.8
Disagree	45	44.1	52.0
Strongly disagree	<u>49</u>	<u>48.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	3.402	Std. Err.	.063
Median	3.456	Std. Dev.	.633
Mode	4.000	Variance	.401

Exploratory Question VIII

Do subjects feel that AAEP is being implemented in their place of employment? Five questionnaire items provide answers to that question.

1. AAEP has meant more jobs for Blacks at my place of employment. Table 4.34 shows that almost half of the sample agreed with this item (46.1 percent).

2. Blacks in general at my place of employment have been treated more favorably since 1972. Although there is partial agreement about more job opportunities, Table 4.35 indicates that

TABLE 4.34.--Perception of AAEP as Increasing Black Employment Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	9	8.8	8.8
Agree	38	37.3	46.1
Disagree	28	27.5	73.5
Strongly disagree	<u>27</u>	<u>26.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.716	Std. Err.	.095
Median	2.643	Std. Dev.	.958
Mode	2.000	Variance	.918

TABLE 4.35.--Perception of AAEP as Helping Blacks to Be Treated More Favorably Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	3	2.9	2.9
Agree	29	28.4	31.4
Disagree	38	37.3	68.6
Strongly disagree	<u>32</u>	<u>31.4</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.971	Std. Err.	.084
Median	3.000	Std. Dev.	.850
Mode	3.000	Variance	.722

the respondents do not feel that Blacks have been treated more favorably with a sample response of but 31.4 percent in concordance with that statement.

3. Procedures and policies which interfere with AAEP implementation at MSU, e.g., nepotism, should be prohibited. Procedures and policies which interfere with AAEP implementation at VRS, e.g., performance on Civil Service tests, should be prohibited. Responses to these two statements were combined to show that the majority of respondents agree with that change.

TABLE 4.36.--Perception of AAEP Policy Changes Needed Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	4	3.9	3.9
Disagree	38	37.3	41.2
Agree	36	35.3	76.5
Strongly agree	<u>24</u>	<u>23.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.784	Std. Err.	.084
Median	2.750	Std. Dev.	.852
Mode	2.000	Variance	.725

4. Statements having to do with modification of qualifications also were combined for analysis, namely: In an effort to increase possibility for employment among Blacks, university departments should hire ABD's or their own doctorate graduates before hiring nonminorities with doctorates completed at other

universities and VRS should hire Blacks without professional training, place them on OJT programs sponsored by district managers, and eventually place them in positions now reserved for persons with certain types of university training. Disagreement with such proposals totaled 63.7 percent of the sample.

TABLE 4.37.--Perception of AAEP as Requiring Modification of Qualifications Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	12	11.8	11.8
Disagree	53	52.0	63.7
Agree	22	21.6	85.3
Strongly agree	<u>15</u>	<u>14.7</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	
Mean	2.392	Std. Err.	.087
Median	2.236	Std. Dev.	.881
Mode	2.000	Variance	.775

5. In terms of certain forms of punishment for not implementing AAEP, two more questions were combined, namely: Departments which historically have not hired Blacks should have recruiting and hiring prerogatives withdrawn and District managers who have refused to hire Blacks for professional staff positions should be forced to accept transfer of Black VRS employees from other districts. The majority of the sample (68.6 percent) accepted these statements.

TABLE 4.38.--Perception of AAEP as Needing to Usurp Management Prerogatives Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	30	29.4	29.4
Agree	40	39.2	68.6
Disagree	29	28.4	97.1
Strongly disagree	3	2.9	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.049	Std. Err.	.083
Median	2.025	Std. Dev.	.837
Mode	2.000	Variance	.701

Exploratory Question IX

Do subjects themselves accept the principle of AAEP as a positive force in their lives? The last four questionnaire items pertain to this question.

1. Although the goal of including minorities in the system is desirable, the forced implementation of AAEP is detrimental to the reaching of this goal. Only 14 of the sample agreed with that statement, as indicated in Table 4.39.

2. Without AAEP the system would naturally open up to include and reward more members of minority groups. Table 4.40 shows that only 12 subjects agreed with that statement.

TABLE 4.39.--Perception of Effects of Forced Implementation Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	41	40.2	40.2
Disagree	47	46.1	86.3
Agree	12	11.8	98.0
Strongly agree	<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	1.755	Std. Err.	.073
Median	1.713	Std. Dev.	.737
Mode	2.000	Variance	.543

TABLE 4.40.--Perception of the Possibility of an Open System Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly disagree	55	53.9	53.9
Disagree	35	34.3	88.2
Agree	5	4.9	93.1
Strongly agree	<u>7</u>	<u>6.9</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	1.647	Std. Err.	.085
Median	1.427	Std. Dev.	.863
Mode	1.000	Variance	.745

3. AAEP has hurt me professionally as I am now believed to be a statistic for governmental purposes instead of a competent professional. Almost one-quarter of the sample believes this to be true.

TABLE 4.41.--Perception of Being Stigmatized by AAEP Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	7	6.9	6.9
Agree	16	15.7	22.5
Disagree	53	52.0	74.5
Strongly disagree	<u>26</u>	<u>25.5</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.961	Std. Err.	.082
Median	3.028	Std. Dev.	.832
Mode	3.000	Variance	.692

4. I support AAEP unequivocally. Three-quarters of the sample agreed with this strong statement (73.5 percent).

TABLE 4.42.--Perception of Support for AAEP Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly agree	33	32.4	32.4
Agree	42	41.2	73.5
Disagree	18	17.6	91.2
Strongly disagree	<u>9</u>	<u>8.8</u>	100.0
	102	100.0	

Mean	2.029	Std. Err.	.092
Median	1.929	Std. Dev.	.928
Mode	2.000	Variance	.861

In terms of Dependent Variable II, AAEP is perceived as having an impact on individual careers, materials presented in

Table 4.43 show this not to be the case. According to the study's design, 50 percent of the subjects had to achieve a score of 75 percent of the "correct" responses. Seventy-five percent achieved such a rating in the direction of indicating that they did not as a group perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers.

TABLE 4.43.--Perception of AEEP Impact on Career Frequency Data.

Category Label	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
28-63	0	0.0	0.0
64	2	2.0	2.0
65	2	2.0	3.9
66	1	1.0	4.9
67	3	2.9	7.8
68	1	1.0	8.8
69	2	2.0	10.8
70	2	2.0	12.7
71	8	7.8	20.6
72	6	5.9	26.5
73	5	4.9	31.4
74	5	4.9	36.3
75	4	3.9	40.2
76	8	7.8	48.0
77	10	9.8	57.8
78	5	4.9	62.7
79	4	3.9	66.7
80	3	2.9	69.6
81	5	4.9	74.5
82	3	2.9	77.5
83	5	4.9	82.4
84	2	2.0	84.3
85	4	3.9	88.2
86	5	4.9	93.1
87	0	0.0	93.1
88	0	0.0	93.1
89	2	2.0	95.1
90	3	2.9	98.0
91	0	0.0	98.0
92	0	0.0	98.0
93	0	0.0	98.0
94	1	1.0	99.0
95	1	1.0	100.0
96-112	0	0.0	100.0
	102	100.0	

ANOVA I: Subjects' Understanding of AAEP

The purpose of this analysis of variance is to determine if there is a relationship between the dependent variable of understanding AAEP and the independent variables of age, sex, rank, current place of employment, and place of employment in 1972. The data is presented in Table 4.44. As indicated by this table, there are only two differences in regard to the independent vis-à-vis the dependent variable of understanding AAEP, namely, place of employment and current rank. The significances are .017 and .001. Table 4.45 to follow shows the direction of these differences, namely, persons who

TABLE 4.44.--ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variable I.

Source of Variation	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
<u>Main Effects</u>	61.373	6.781	.001
Sex	2.333	.258	.999
Place of employment	52.497	5.800	.017
1972 place of employment	2.794	.309	.999
Rank	129.960	14.358	.001
Age	.724	.080	.999
<u>2-Way Interactions</u>	7.131	.788	.999
Sex-Place (1976)	3.436	.380	.999
Sex-Rank	4.308	.476	.999
Sex-Place (1972)	5.659	.625	.999
Sex-Age	6.390	.706	.999
Place-Rank	7.316	.808	.999
Place-Place (1972)	.083	.009	.999
Place-Age	.075	.008	.999
Rank-Place (1972)	33.470	3.698	.055
Rank-Age	1.512	.167	.999
Place (1972)-Age	2.159	.239	.999
Residual (error)	9.051		

TABLE 4.45.--Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variable I.*

Variable and Category	Unadjusted DEV and ETA		Adjusted DEV and ETA	
<u>Sex</u>				
Female	.83		.21	
Male	- .54		- .13	
		.20		.05
<u>Place of Employment</u>				
MSU	-1.58		-1.17	
VRS	.98		.73	
		.37		.27
<u>Rank</u>				
Low	1.00		.86	
High	-2.09		-1.80	
		.43		.37
<u>Place of Employment (1972)</u>				
Same placement	.76		- .21	
Different placement	- .70		.19	
		.22		.06
<u>Age</u>				
Less than 30	1.34		.15	
Over 30	- .64		- .07	
		.27		.03
Multiple R ²	.265			
Multiple R	.515			
Grand Mean	25.12			

*Negative scores are the ones to attend to in interpreting Table 4.45. The significant ones are < -1.25 or, specifically, -1.58 for MSU (Place of Employment) and -2.09 for High (Rank).

work at Michigan State University have a better understanding than those who are employed by VRS and persons holding higher ranks at both places of employment have a better understanding of the program than those who hold lower ranks.

ANOVA II: Subjects' Perceptions of
AAEP Impact on Career

The purpose of this analysis of variance is to determine if there is a relationship between the dependent variable, perception of impact of AAEP on individual careers, and the independent variables of age, sex, rank, current place of employment and place of employment in 1972. There are no significant differences when the level of significance is .05.

TABLE 4.46.--ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variable II.

Source of Variation	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
<u>Main Effects</u>	28.696	.612	.999
Sex	.057	.001	.999
Place (1976)	23.743	.506	.999
Rank	53.910	1.150	.287
Place (1972)	.347	.007	.999
Age	34.149	.728	.999
<u>2-Way Interactions</u>	31.147	.664	.999
Sex-Place (1976)	69.520	1.482	.225
Sex-Rank	54.532	1.163	.287
Sex-Place (1972)	64.144	1.368	.244
Sex-Age	60.506	1.290	.258
Place (1976)-Rank	15.999	.341	.999
Place (1976)-Place (1972)	10.874	.232	.999
Place-Age	5.418	.116	.999
Rank-Place (1972)	1.498	.032	.999
Rank-Age	4.080	.087	.999
Place (1972)-Age	27.790	.593	.999
Residual (error)	46.898		
Total	44.437		

Table 4.47 provides a multiple classification analysis of Dependent Variable II. There are no significant differences as illustrated below.

TABLE 4.47.--Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variable II.

Variable and Category		Unadjusted DEV and ETA		Adjusted DEV and ETA	
<u>Sex</u>					
Female		- .27		.03	
Male		.17		- .02	
			.03		.00
<u>Place of Employment (1976)</u>					
MSU		1.04		.79	
VRS		- .64		- .49	
			.12		.09
<u>Rank</u>					
Low		.27		.56	
High		- .56		-1.16	
			.06		.12
<u>Place (1972)</u>					
Same employment		- .39		- .07	
Different placement		.36		.07	
			.06		.01
<u>Age</u>					
Less than 30		-1.14		-1.04	
Over 30		.54		.50	
			.12		.11
Multiple R ²	.032				
Multiple R	.179				
Grand Mean	77.17				

ANOVA III: Subjects' Understanding and
Perception Scales Combined

When Dependent Variables I and II are combined, there is one significant difference, namely, rank as shown in Table 4.48. This indicates that persons holding higher ranks at both MSU and VRS have a greater understanding of AAEP and also perceive it as having an impact on their careers.

TABLE 4.48.--ANOVA Analysis of Dependent Variables I and II Combined.

Source of Variation	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
<u>Main Effects</u>	90.409	1.887	.104
Sex	9.052	.189	.999
Place (1976)	10.095	.211	.999
Rank	399.034	8.329	.005
Place (1972)	11.168	.233	.999
Age	31.219	.652	.999
<u>2-Way Interactions</u>	27.630	.577	.999
Sex-Place (1976)	74.240	1.550	.214
Sex-Rank	95.259	1.988	.159
Sex-Place (1972)	17.982	.375	.999
Sex-Age	82.749	1.727	.189
Place (1976)-Rank	69.647	1.454	.229
Place (1976)-Place (1972)	6.004	.125	.999
Place (1976)-Age	8.477	.177	.999
Rank-Place (1972)	15.177	.317	.999
Rank-Age	.001	.000	.999
Place (1972)-Age	7.443	.155	.999
Residual (error)	47.909		
Total	48.005		

According to data shown in Table 4.49, persons employed in the higher ranks at both VRS and MSU have a better understanding of AAEP and perceive it as having an impact on their careers.

TABLE 4.49.--Multiple Classification Analysis: Dependent Variables I (Understanding) and II (Perception) Combined.

Variable and Category		Unadjusted DEV and ETA		Adjusted DEV and ETA	
<u>Sex</u>					
Female		.77		.40	
Male		- .50		- .26	
		.09		.05	
<u>Placement (1976)</u>					
VRS		- .66		- .52	
MSU		.41		.32	
		.08		.06	
<u>Rank</u>					
Low		1.34		1.51	
High		-2.80		-3.16	
		.28		.32	
<u>Placement (1972)</u>					
Same placement		.31		- .42	
Different placement		- .29		.39	
		.04		.06	
<u>Age</u>					
Less than 30		.17		-1.00	
Over 30		- .08		- .48	
		.02		.10	
Multiple R ²		.093			
Multiple R		.305			

The multiple classification analysis and ANOVA III, then, both show rank as the only independent variable related to the dependent variables of understanding AAEP and perceiving it as having an impact on careers.

Multiple Regression Analyses

Table 4.50 presents regression correlation coefficients which are most pertinent to this study.

Comparison of the ANOVA data and the multiple regression correlation coefficients indicates that place of employment in 1976 and rank are the two independent variables which are correlated significantly with Dependent Variable I (understanding) and rank is the only independent variable to correlate significantly with a combination of the two dependent variables (understanding and perception). There are no significant correlations in regard to the perception scale just as there were no significant differences in all the statistic studies done on that scale. There is a question in this regard about the fact that Scale I and II had different numbers of items (12 and 28). It is possible that refinement of the scales in terms of numbers alone would produce different results.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that the variable "degree" was included in the multiple regression data and analysis. Information about degree level was elicited but was not either a dependent or independent variable in this particular study.

TABLE 4.50.--Multiple Regression Correlation Coefficients.

Place	.38404								
Rank	.12624	.23211							
Degree	.25172	.70636	.40959						
Employment (1972)	.21656	.44096	.26053	.50036					
Employment (1976)	.11191	.43349	.37134	.49957	-.74151				
Age	.13129	.50100	.34387	.52351	-.33847	.46757			
Total	-.09006	-.07513	-.28045	-.06871	-.09590	-.04356	-.01743		
Understanding	-.19854	-.36898	-.42868	-.41869	-.17459	-.21698	-.27456	.34339	
Perception	.03229	.12317	-.05845	.15873	-.19117	.05670	.11847	.85065	-.17513

The Null Hypotheses

Scale I: Subjects Do Understand AAEP

1. The number of female subjects who understand AAEP is the same as the number of male subjects who understand AAEP.

Supported (p .999).

2. The number of subjects under 30 who understand AAEP is the same as the number of subjects over 30 who understand AAEP.

Supported (p. 999).

3. The number of subjects holding low ranks who understand AAEP is the same as the number of subjects holding higher ranks who understand AAEP. Rejected (p .001).

4. The number of persons employed in their current employment site who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons who were employed elsewhere in 1972. Supported (p .999).

5. The number of persons who are employed at VRS who understand AAEP is the same as the number of persons employed at MSU who understand AAEP. Rejected (p .017).

Scale II: Subjects Perceive AAEP to Affect Careers

1. The number of female subjects who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers is the same as the number of males who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers. Supported (p .999).

2. The number of persons under 30 who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers is the same as the number of

persons over 30 who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers. Supported (p .999).

3. The number of persons holding low ranks who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers is the same as the number of persons holding higher ranks who perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers. Supported (p .287).

4. The number of persons employed in their current employment site who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of persons employed elsewhere in 1972 who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers. Supported (p .999).

5. The number of persons employed at VRS who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers is the same as the number of persons employed at MSU who perceive AAEP as having an impact on their careers. Supported (p .999).

Dependent Variable I

Black employees who hold white-collar or professional level positions at Michigan State University and Vocational Rehabilitation Services understand AAEP. Supported (p .999).

Dependent Variable II

Black employees who hold white-collar or professional level positions at Michigan State University and Vocational Rehabilitation Services perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers. Rejected (p .005).

Additional Data: Comments

There were less than 30 additional comments to the questionnaire. Most involved strong negative statements about perceived resistance of employers to AAEP ($n = 7$). A typical comment involved the belief that MSU's power structure had developed a "Black college" (College of Urban Development) to assuage its collective conscience. Two other persons commented on the belief that AAEP is a sham in the sense of not enforcing the legislation. The comments indicated that the respondents perceived the legislation as providing for punitive actions in the face of noncompliance but not providing a strong enough federal police force to do other than periodically make inadequate efforts at enforcement.

In addition, 19 persons commented in what appeared to be strong language about AAEP having an effect of escalating racism but in subtle form. Examples of such commentary would be: "I have a job and tenure but graduate students are encouraged not to select me as director of their programs." "I am appointed with depressing regularity to every . . . committee at this university." "I am switched from caseload to caseload depending on which requires the most effort or is the least rewarding." "I am expected to handle a caseload with mostly Black clients."

Summary

In this chapter a presentation has been made of the data derived from a questionnaire which was designed to determine how much Black white-collar and professional level employees at MSU and

VRS know about AAEP and if they believe AAEP to have an impact on individual careers. Data was analyzed by Michigan State University's CDC 6500 computer. Analyses provided included frequency of responses to each response, three ANOVA studies, and a multiple regression analysis. In addition, additional comments made by subjects were summarized.

The data analysis whether by simple comparison of mean responses, analysis of variance or multiple regression analysis was consistent in indicating the following:

1. Respondents do understand this formal body of laws and communications known as AAEP.

2. Respondents do not perceive AAEP as having an impact on their current careers.

3. Persons employed at Michigan State University have a higher level of understanding of AAEP than persons employed at Vocational Rehabilitation Services.

4. Persons holding higher ranks at their respective places of employment have a higher level of understanding about AAEP than persons who hold the lower faculty or Civil Service ranks.

5. When scores for Scale I and II are combined, the only independent variable which has significance ($p < .05$) is rank.

6. Of the respondents, 28.5 percent commented on negative perceptions about aspects of AAEP which were not included as response items in this study's questionnaire. Reference is to

comments about employer resistance, poor enforcement of the laws by appropriate governmental units and an escalation of more subtle forms of racism.

Chapter V will include conclusions of this study, a discussion of various issues, and suggestions for future research projects.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Conclusions

After the writer had developed a preliminary aim of studying Affirmative Action, a comprehensive review of relevant literature and court cases was done so as to determine the historical background of present laws governing fair employment. The precipitants of these laws were also researched. Denial of educational opportunities, discrepancies in levels of educational achievement between races, economic factors involving lack of opportunity for gainful employment in other than unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, and job discrimination because of sex were defined and examined as the major precursors of AAEP.

Doctoral theses devoted to various aspects of AAEP were examined as were the few empirical research studies which have studied this program. Gradually, patterns of consensus, patterns of resistance, and patterns of relationship emerged.

From this library research came the observation that no previous investigator had questioned one portion of the target population to which AAEP is directed, namely, Blacks. Because the writer is employed in a situation where job counseling and placement of persons with various physical, emotional, and intellectual problems are the major goals and because she serves a caseload

which includes a high number of Blacks, the decision was made to study AAEP as it related to Blacks. The specific purpose of this study was to investigate how Blacks employed in white-collar and professional level positions at MSU and VRS understand Affirmative Action laws and to determine if they perceive AAEP to have an impact on their careers.

In order to explore views and response patterns of the subjects through utilization of the descriptive method of research, a panel of Blacks was assembled to help select the most effective research tool to use in measuring attitudes and understanding. A Likert questionnaire was determined to be the most efficient and informative type of instrument and 40 items determined to meet reliability and validity criteria were developed, field tested and administered to all Blacks employed within the tenure stream at Michigan State University and all Blacks employed by Vocational Rehabilitation who hold Civil Service ranks of 9 or above. A total of 131 questionnaires were mailed to this pool of subjects and 102 (77.9 percent) were returned. All were completed appropriately and were used in the study.

The questionnaire was divided into two scales. Scale I contained 12 items designed to measure factual understanding of AAEP. Scale I, then, was devised to measure Dependent Variable I: Subjects do understand AAEP. Scale II contained 28 items and was designed to provide data for Dependent Variable II: Subjects perceive AAEP as having an impact on individual careers.

The independent variables in this study were age, sex, rank, place of employment in 1972, and current place of employment. Three ANOVA's were run by the Michigan State University CDC 6500 computer to determine what relationships, if any, there were between the dependent variables of understanding AAEP and perception of its impact on careers and these five independent variables. The computer also provided a multiple regression correlation chart involving these same independent and dependent variables.

In addition to the analyses of variance and correlations, the computer provided a wide variety of demographic information about the sample as well as an item analysis of the samples' responses to each questionnaire item.

Regardless of the type of statistical analysis done on the questionnaire data, the results were consistent in indicating at a significance level of $p < .05$ that:

1. Respondents do understand AAEP.
2. Respondents, while believing in AAEP, do not perceive it as influencing their careers in either a negative or positive degree.
3. Respondents employed at MSU have a higher level of understanding of AAEP than respondents who are employed by VRS.
4. Respondents employed at both VRS and MSU who hold the higher employment ranks know more about AAEP than respondents working at both sites who hold lower faculty or Civil Service ranks.

5. If Scales I and II are combined, the only independent variable which has significance is rank, that is, persons employed at either VRS or MSU know more about AAEP and perceive it as having a greater impact on their careers if they hold higher as opposed to lower rank.

Discussion

Barnard believes that communications are likely to be implemented if (1) the communication is understood; (2) the communication is not inconsistent with the purposes of the organization to which the recipient of the communication belongs; (3) the communication is consistent with what the recipient believes to be his/her interests; and (4) the recipient is able from both the physical and mental standpoints to comply.¹ In this study AAEP is a kind of communication and the question was asked about how well it is understood by persons whom it is intended to assist in the form of increased marketability of skills in the competitive labor market. Understanding from Barnard's point of view includes an objective aspect and a subjective aspect. Objective understanding was measured by Scale I of this study whereas subjective understanding was measured by Scale II. Results indicate that objectively recipients do understand the communication but, subjectively, they need to reject it as the major force in their particular job placement. Closer examination of the variables involved in this

¹C. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).

understanding and perception, the study's independent variables, show that those who hold higher ranks at either VRS or MSU have a better understanding of AAEP than those who hold the lower faculty ranks and Civil Service positions. Further, those employed at MSU have a better understanding than respondents who work for VRS.

In studying these significant differences, it appears that one could have predicted that MSU respondents would be better informed. As carefully noted in Chapter I, the University has been conscientious in printing its AAEP policies and studies in a variety of forms including the student newspaper. Faculty all have access to various handbooks and handouts which also outline in careful terms exactly what the law of the United States, Michigan, and Michigan State University is in terms of AAEP. Finally, all positions at MSU have to be advertised in the faculty newspaper. Very clearly it is stated that "Michigan State University Is An Equal Opportunity Employer." To not be informed, then, would seem to represent an act of almost deliberate negligence if one is a member of the Michigan State University faculty.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services represents a different approach to dissemination about AAEP. As an employee of VRS, this writer has never seen an AAEP policy statement, only reference to policies and documents disseminated among the professional staff who do not hold managerial posts. This governmental unit does hold AAEP briefings for district supervisors and district supervisors may, in turn, review policies and statements in staff meetings. To be

informed if one is not an executive at VRS is difficult at best. The reasons for this are not known to the writer.

There is another reason why VRS staff may not be as informed as MSU faculty. All hiring in state government is done by the Civil Service Department. Staff at VRS who do not hold managerial positions are not involved in any concrete way with recruitment and hiring. On the other hand, university faculty, depending on departmental policy often do participate in personnel selection matters including interviewing and voting on appointment matters. To not be aware of personnel regulations like AAEP in the face of an appointment in a department where one has such duties is difficult to comprehend.

In considering the very clear differences in communication about legal authority, the work of Weber becomes pertinent. He is an authority on organizational structures who believes bureaucratic organizations are dominant because of their efficiency in technological ways. He also states, "Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge."¹ It seems to this writer that his theories and analysis can be expanded appreciably to state agencies: "Bureaucracies means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge of its executives and employees alike." Otherwise, there are many possibilities for communication to be fragmented and ill-understood, for morale problems to develop, and for people at both the executive and employee

¹M. Weber, "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy," in D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971), p. 27.

level to be confused. In this research effort it is clear that one of the bureaucracies is not able to communicate effectively about one body of legal materials which constitutes AAEP. Possibly there would be a difference in a number of parameters associated with this study's independent variables if the VRS sample knew more about AAEP.

Understanding of AAEP was related to place of employment in 1976 and also to rank. Persons holding higher ranks at both VRS and MSU had a higher level of understanding than persons employed at lower ranks. It is difficult to analyze this significant difference except through construction of further hypotheses. One wonders, by way of example, if persons holding higher ranks have had a much more obvious struggle to attain their positions. Introspection would lead us to believe that being hired at any employment site from the lowest of the manual laboring slots to the highest executive position involves a certain amount of job tenacity. Undoubtedly inspection of employment records at both MSU and VRS would indicate that there is, however, a higher attrition rate in the lower ranks than in the higher ranks and, therefore, those who have attained these higher ranks may have had to familiarize themselves with all aspects of Civil Rights including AAEP at one point or another.

One also might hypothesize that persons holding the higher ranks have more understanding of the laws because they are involved in implementing it, that is, higher ranked VRS employees are involved in personnel matters whereas, as just noted, lower ranked

professional staff are not. Likewise, many of the higher ranked MSU respondents are involved in recruitment activities and at least one respondent is the MSU Affirmative Action officer.

Hypotheses about higher ranked individuals having been involved in the Civil Rights activities of the 1960s might be made but it would seem that the independent variables of both "age" and "place of employment in 1972" would have reflected this factor were it the crucial determinant of the rank differential.

Barnard, in another context, has discussed the need for executives to be, above all else, loyal and dominated by the "organizational personality."¹ If those holding higher ranks at MSU and VRS include a significant number of individuals who are "executives," possibly at least a portion of the rank differential would be explained on the basis of those individuals reflecting their domination by the "organizational personality" which must by law enforce AAEP. This is a matter which would need empirical study.

As discussed by Perrow,² there are many other factors studied by management authorities, sociologists, and industrial psychologists which might explain this rank differential. All require a kind of deductive reasoning or considerable generalization. An example would be the belief that those who perform better on the

¹Chester Barnard, "The Executive Functions," in D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971), p. 170.

²Charles Perrow, Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1972).

job (and thus attain higher rank) have stronger positive attitudes about the organization and identify more intensely with it. Again, the organizations' requirement of adherence to AAEP would lead one to suspect that the employees who hold such strong attitudes and identification have (1) attained higher rank in the organization and (2) more closely reflect the organizations' ideology. Evidence for such reasoning needs to be collected in future research.

Subtle Forms of Racism Comment

Over one-quarter of the sample appears to be concerned with AAEP as not being enforced or implemented and/or have the notion that legislation prohibiting overt acts of employment discrimination will lead only to escalation of subtle forms of acts, attitudes, and beliefs designed to show prejudice against and segregate people on the basis of skin color. This writer has no way of knowing on an objective level what credence to give to such statements. To begin with, most of the comments were of a predictive nature. Those which were stated as fact offered no evidence for rational examination.

Possibly the best response one can offer to anxiety about AAEP having, in many respects, the opposite effects of what its designers intended is to look at the first book published on the topic. Reference is to Nathan Glazer's Affirmative Discrimination.¹ The title is suggestive of the author's major thesis, namely, AAEP is discrimination. Before presenting documentation of the book's

¹Glazer, op. cit.

thesis, it might be instructive for the reader to know that Nathan Glazer is a Professor of Education and Social Structure at one of our nation's most prestigious universities, namely, Harvard. Persons holding faculty rank at such institutions of higher learning tend to command attention to a degree usually not afforded scholars at other colleges and universities; e.g., this book has been reviewed in the New York Times and for several weeks reposed on the list of "highly recommended" books in the book review section of that newspaper.

Glazer uses what seems to be highly inflammatory language in his critique of AAEP. AAEP is a "scheme" based on "estimates" of underutilization. AAEP uses "strange" definitions of discrimination.¹ The following possibly is the most telling paragraph:

If more Blacks were given these jobs, perhaps less would be on the streets, or drug addicts, or killing unoffending shopkeepers. It is one thing to be asked to fight discrimination against the competent, hard working and law-abiding; it is quite another to be asked to fight discrimination against the less competent or incompetent and criminally inclined. The statistical emphasis (of AAEP) leads to the latter. Undoubtedly even those of lesser competence and criminal inclination must be incorporated into society but one wonders whether this burden should be placed on laws against discrimination² on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

It seems clear that Blacks seeking entry to a job market they once were excluded from for reasons too numerous and complex to delineate are--in Glazer's thinking--all (1) incompetent and/or (2) criminally inclined. No objective evidence supporting such

¹ Ibid., p. 67.

² Ibid.

rhetoric is presented. Furthermore, there is nothing in any AAEP legislation even suggesting that unqualified people be given any status, let alone priority status.

This kind of publication from people assumed by the public to be credible involves a kind of infectious process. Glazer, by way of example, is an editor of The Public Interest. In the literature review presented in this thesis, a scathing study of AAEP by Sowell was presented (see page 63). This is a new article printed by The Public Interest.

AAEP, like the 1960's controversy over the inheritability of IQ, may have spawned a new assault on Blacks. In 1960 they are believed to have a genetic contribution to give to their children which is less than the White man's gift to his children. In the 1970s Blacks have jobs because the law requires employers to hire them and people like Glazer seem to think the doors are being opened only to the incompetent and criminally inclined. Hopefully, objective research to follow will offer a more positive and dispassionate analysis of AAEP.

In undertaking a research project on AAEP, this writer has learned that one portion of the target population of AAEP is eager to participate in a study of the topic. Evidence supporting this point is the fact that over 75 percent of the sample completed the questionnaire without any follow-up letters of encouragement and many persons directly communicated by telephone or letters to the writer about various aspects of the study and the topic being examined. As noted, approximately one-quarter of the sample has

strong feelings of concern about the legislation in terms of issues like poor enforcement, minimal effort to implement the law, and escalation in acts perceived as subtle forms of racism.

The writer also learned that Blacks with education have come to an understanding of AAEP and they do support it. However, it is clear that the respondents to this study cannot say that AAEP has had an impact on their careers. In reading statements such as those of Glazer and Sowell, one is better able to appreciate the resistance to AAEP as an important factor in one's own life.

Implications for Future Research

One suspects that the major populations which profit from preferential hiring are those (1) better qualified and (2) seeking positions with either institutions of higher education or the government where AAEP is more likely to be implemented. Therefore, it would be of considerable interest to expand this study by making inquiry of Blacks at both lower levels of employment and those who are employed in industry, especially the highly technical industries and institutions dealing with finance, the latter being placements notorious for racist practices.

It also would be of interest to do more intensive explorations with Blacks who responded to this research project in regard to the rather puzzling point of supporting AAEP unequivocally while not believing it has been helpful to them. This would seem to call for clinical studies to determine at what point pride demands that one disavow assistance from a governmental program as a factor

in one's success as opposed to one's individual efforts and abilities being the sole determinants of one's achievements.

AAEP is a response to pervasive discrimination in American life which appears to be deeply embedded in both American individuals' behavior and America's institutions. Accordingly, the most direct, extensive, and obligatory remedies have been formed into law. No law, however, will effect change in people and institutions who are resolutely opposed to every advance by minorities unless those persons who administer the programs are committed individuals who (1) have the power to attack discriminatory practices and (2) do not shirk from so doing. Studies of those who administer AAEP seem called for and this would include not just AAEP officers but all persons in personnel positions.

There is a need to identify under what conditions personnel staffs will accept the authoritativeness of AAEP and implement it as a matter of course in their daily activities. One thinks of Blecher's work regarding teachers' acceptance of orders from supervisors to act on various matters such as assessment and accountability.¹ This would be a study of administrative procedures which make it possible for people to do what they are asked or required to do efficiently and effectively. In regard to AAEP, there is evidence that personnel managers do understand the dictates of the law but from the point of understanding on there is considerable diversity of opinion and action.

¹Blecher, op. cit.

Finally, in terms of this specific study herein being reported, the questionnaire items could be refined and probably should be expanded if further studies of AAEP are to be done with questionnaires as the major research tool. The first step would be to do inter-item correlations to determine if there are items which consistently measure the same piece of information. The Alpha for Scale I in this study was .21370, .60585 for Scale II and .43394 for combined scales. The rather appreciable differences between the two scales probably is due to differences in item size and this could be a subject of further inquiry.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

2211 Barritt Street
Lansing, Michigan 48812

Dear :

In 1972 the United States Government passed legislation mandating the development of Affirmative Action Employment Programs (AAEP) for any employer who receives federal dollars. This legislation requires that employers do more than ensure employment neutrality with regard to race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. AAEP requires that additional efforts be made to recruit, hire, and promote members of groups excluded previously from employment for reasons of discrimination.

We Blacks are one portion of the target population covered by AAEP. No studies of an empirical nature have been done to explore how we feel about this legislation. As part of my doctoral program at Michigan State University, I am desirous of doing this study but need your help.

I need you to complete the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest possible convenience. Please return it completed in the envelope enclosed for your use.

My commitment to you is as follows: All responses will be considered confidential and privileged. You need not use your name if you so desire but, if you do, you can trust that you will not be quoted in the thesis or elsewhere. Furthermore, upon completion of the study, results are available to you. Please indicate on the questionnaire if you want feedback and it will be forthcoming.

If you have any questions about the study, my motivation, the use to which your responses will be made, please call me at 517:489-6333 any weekday evening after 6:00 P.M. or any weekend from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

Thank you very much for helping me in this effort to understand how selected Blacks feel about Affirmative Action Employment Programs.

Yours truly,

Joan T. Johnson

APPENDIX 8
QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Identifying Data:

1. Name (Optional) _____
2. Female _____ Male _____
3. Place of Employment: M.S.U. _____ V.R.S. _____
4. City of Residence _____
5. Faculty Rank: Instructor _____ Assistant Professor _____
Assoc. Professor _____ Professor _____
6. V.R.S. Civil Service Rank: 9 _____ 10 _____ 11 _____ 12 _____
13 _____ 14 _____ 15+ _____
7. What is the highest college degree you have obtained:
Bachelor _____ Masters _____ Masters Plus _____ Doctorate _____
Educational Specialist _____
8. Where were you employed in 1972: M.S.U. _____ V.R.S. _____
Not employed _____ Other (Please specify) _____
9. If employed in 1972, what was your rank or Civil Service
rating: _____
10. Age: 20-29 _____ 30-39 _____ 40-49 _____ 50-59 _____
60-69 _____ 70+ _____
11. Marital Status: Single _____ Married _____ Widow/Widower _____
Divorced or Separated _____

DIRECTIONS: You are given four possible choices indicating whether you Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree with the following statements about Affirmative Action Employment Programs (AAEP). Please mark the category which best represents your opinion.

B. General Information:

SA A D SD

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. It is not difficult to examine my employer's AAEP and written policies. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. I know who the Director of Affirmative Action is at my place of employment. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| The name is _____. | | | | |
| 3. AAEP requires the hiring of minority peoples to meet quotas even if the prospective employees are not qualified. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. If there are several applicants for a position and one applicant is a member of a minority group or a woman, this person must be given preferential treatment. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. My employer is in full compliance with AAEP as evidenced by no complaints having been forthcoming from the federal government about employment practices. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. My employer is required to offer part-time employment opportunities to members of minority groups if this is the only way to increase minority representation in the work force. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. My employer is required to provide child-care facilities for children of minority individuals if this is the only way to increase minority representation in the work force. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Timetables for completion of hiring goals and objectives are not required by AAEP. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. The federal government is required to provide training programs at my place of employment for upgrading credentials of prospective Black employees. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

	SA	A	D	SD
10. At this point there are no sanctions for non-compliance if my employer does not meet AAEP requirements.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. AAEP focuses primarily on helping members of the female sex find employment with members of racial groups receiving secondary consideration.	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. The ratio of minorities at my place of employment as determined by minority utilization studies is known to me.	_____	_____	_____	_____
The ratio is _____.				
<u>C. Personal Implications:</u>				
13. AAEP has helped my career in terms of job stability, e.g., favorable tenure action.	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. AAEP has helped my career in terms of my being recruited and hired because of the program.	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. AAEP has helped my career in terms of my being promoted.	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. AAEP has made it possible for me to attend more professional meetings--at no personal expense--than I did before AAEP was in progress.	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. AAEP has made it possible for me to take advanced training, e.g., university coursework, during work hours.	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. AAEP has offered me more liberal vacation or leave time than my colleagues have.	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. AAEP has provided me with more positive salary adjustments than my colleagues received.	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. The AAEP office at my place of employment has been helpful to me when I requested aid.	_____	_____	_____	_____
I requested aid because _____				
I have never requested aid _____				

SA A D SD

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 21. | I have not been discriminated against at my current place of employment in terms of salary, tenure, promotions and other fringe benefits. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 22. | AAEP has contributed positively to the personal enrichment of my life. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 23. | AAEP has helped my colleagues to perceive me as a competent employee. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 24. | AAEP has helped my colleagues to appreciate me more as a person. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 25. | AAEP has meant more jobs for Blacks at my place of employment. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 26. | Blacks in general at my place of employment have been treated more favorably since 1972. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 27. | AAEP will provide greater employment opportunities for members of my race who have yet to enter the job market. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 28. | White colleagues are comfortable in discussing AAEP with me or in my presence. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 29. | White colleagues are comfortable in discussing the notion of "reverse racism" in my presence or with me. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 30. | White employees at my place of employment feel that AAEP is economically harmful to our employer and, directly or indirectly, to them. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 31. | White employees at my place of employment feel that AAEP is creating serious recruitment problems for our department and, directly or indirectly, for them. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 32. | White employees at my place of employment feel that AAEP is creating morale problems for our employer and, directly or indirectly, for them. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 33. | White employees at my place of employment feel that White males are being sacrificed in the labor market in the interest of improving the marketability of Blacks. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

SA A D SD

FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY ONLY:

34. Procedures and policies which interfere with AAEP implementation at M.S.U., e.g., nepotism, should be prohibited.

35. In an effort to increase possibilities for employment among Blacks, university departments should hire ABD's or their own doctorate graduates before hiring non-minorities with doctorates completed at other universities.

36. Departments which historically have not hired Blacks should have recruiting and hiring prerogatives withdrawn.

FOR V.R.S. STAFF ONLY:

34. Procedures and policies which interfere with AAEP implementation at V.R.S., e.g., performance on Civil Service tests, should be prohibited.

35. V.R.S. should hire Blacks without professional training, place them on OJT programs sponsored by District managers, and eventually place them in positions now reserved for persons with certain types of university training.

36. District managers who have refused to hire Blacks for professional staff positions should be forced to accept transfer of Black V.R.S. employees from other districts.

FOR M.S.U. AND V.R.S. STAFF:

37. Although the goal of including minorities in the system is desirable, the forced implementation of AAEP is detrimental to the reaching of this goal.

38. Without AAEP the system would naturally open up to include and reward more members of minority groups.

	SA	A	D	SD
--	----	---	---	----

39. AAEP has hurt me professionally as I now am believed to be a statistic for governmental purposes instead of a competent professional.	_____	_____	_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------	-------

40. I support AAEP unequivocally.	_____	_____	_____	_____
-----------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adorno, T. W.; Frekel-Brunswik, Else; Levinson, D. J.; and Sanford, R. N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Babbie, E. R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.
- Barnard, C. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Borg, W. R., and Gall, M. D. Educational Research. 2nd ed. New York: David McKay, 1971.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1975.
- Coleman, J. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Glazer, Nathan. Affirmative Discrimination. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- Hinsie, L. E., and Campbell, R. J. Psychiatric Dictionary. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Jensen, A. R. Educational Differences. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1974.
- Katz, I., and Gurin, Patricia, eds. "Personality Differences." In Race and the Social Sciences. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Killingsworth, C. C. "Jobs and Incomes for Negroes." In Race and the Social Sciences. Edited by K. Katz and Patricia Gurin. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Kim, Jae-On, and Kohout, F. J. "Analysis of Variance and Covariance: Subprograms ANOVA and ONEWAY." In N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, Jean Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and D. H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

- Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Kluger, Richard. Simple Justice. New York: Knopf, 1976.
- Likert, R. "A Method of Constructing an Attitude Scale." In Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Edited by M. Fishbein. New York: John Wiley, 1967.
- Mehrens, W., and Ebel, R. Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement (Selected Readings). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston,
- Mehrens, W., and Lehman, Irvin. Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology
- Moore, W., and Wagstaff, L. H. Black Educators in White Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Moynihan, D. P. The Negro Family: A Case for National Action. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor, 1965.
- Nie, N. H.; Hull, C. H.; Jenkins, Jean; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Pettigrew, T. E. "The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals." In Race and the Social Sciences. Edited by I. Katz and Patricia Gurin. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Pugh, D. S., ed. Organization Theory. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Taussig, F. W. Principles of Economics. New York: Macmillan, 1923.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population, 1960: Occupation by Earnings and Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- _____. Statement of Affirmative Action for Equal Employment Opportunities by the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Van Riper, P. R. History of the United States Civil Service. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Zawada, Adam, ed. Rehabilitation of the Severely Disabled. Charleston, W. Va.: West Virginia University Press, 1973.

Journals

Astin, Helen, and Bayer, A. E. "Sex Discrimination in Academe." The Educational Record 53 (1972): 101-8.

Barnes, F. J. "Equal Opportunity in Higher Education." Journal of Negro Education 37 (1968): 310-15.

Bergman, Barbara. "The Effects on White Incomes of Discrimination in Employment." Journal of Political Economy 79 (1971): 294-313.

Brazziel, W. F. "White Research in Black Communities: When Solutions Become a Part of the Problem." Journal of Social Issues 29, 1 (1973): 41-44.

Chalt, R., and Ford, A. "Can Colleges Have Tenure and Affirmative Action, Too?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 1, 1973, p. 16.

Crain, R. "School Integration and Occupational Achievement by Negroes." American Journal of Sociology (1970): 593-606.

Dewitt, Karen. "Black Employment: Better But Not Yet Fair." Black Enterprise (1974): 24-25.

Dolan, Eleanor, and Davis, Margaret. "Anti-Nepotism Rules in American Colleges and Universities: Their Effect on the Faculty Employment of Women." The Educational Record 41, 2 (1960): 288-94.

Editorial. "Policies and Practices Should Reflect College Commitment to Equality." College and University Business 48 (1970): 79-81.

Edgeworth, F. Y. "Equal Pay to Men and Women." Journal of Economics 32 (1922): 431-57.

Epstein, Cynthia. "Black and Female: The Double Whammy." Psychology Today, August 1973, pp. 57-61, 89.

_____. "Successful Black Professional Women." American Journal of Sociology 78 (1972): 78-89.

- Fley, JoAnn. "The Time to Be Properly Vicious." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (Winter 1974): 53-58.
- Glenn, N. D. "Occupational Benefits to Whites From the Subordination of Negroes." American Sociology Review 28 (1963): 443-48.
- Goldstein, Jinny. "Affirmative Action: Equal Employment Rights for Women in Academe." Teachers College Record 74 (1973): 395-422.
- Goodman, L. V. "Women's New Found Muscle." American Education, December 1972, inside cover.
- Jackson, Anna. "Tokenism or Total Involvement." Professional Psychology 5 (1974): 429-33.
- Kotzin, Miriam. "Women, Like Blacks and Orientals." Media and Methods, March 1972, pp. 18-22.
- Krueger, A. O. "The Economics in Discrimination." Journal of Political Economy 71 (1963): 481-87.
- Nash, Peter. "Affirmative Action Under Executive Order 11246." New York University Law Review 46, 21 (April 19, 1971): 225-61.
- National Education Association Research Division. "Status of Public School Teachers, 1965." NEA Research Bulletin 43 (1965): 43.
- Oltman, R. M. "Campus--1970--Where Do Women Stand?" American Association of University Women's Journal 64 (1970): 14-15.
- Pendergrass, Virginia; Kimmel, Ellen; Joesting, Joan; Peterson, Joyce; and Bush, Endilee. "Sex Discrimination Counseling." American Psychologist 31, 1 (1976): 36-46.
- Perrins, R. "Computing Minorities." Change, September 1972.
- Rogers, H. R., and Bullock, C. S., III. "Black Employment: The Last Hired and First Fired." Law and Social Change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972, pp. 113-137.
- Rosenkrantz, R.; Vogel, Susan; Bee, Helen; and Broverman, Inge. "Sex Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 32, 3 (1968): 293-99.

- Sowell, T. "Affirmative Action Reconsidered." The Public Interest, Winter 1976.
- Staff. "Sex Discrimination: Campuses Face Contract Loss Over HEW Demands." Science, November 20, 1970, pp. 834-35.
- Sue, D. W., and Sue, S. "Ethnic Minorities: Resistance to Being Researched." Professional Psychology 3, 1 (1972): 11-17.
- Todorovich, M. M. "Total Affirmative Action Would Strike at the Very Heart of Higher Learning." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 15, 1973, p. 11.
- Valien, Preston. "The Progressive Role of Blacks in Higher Education." Report of the First National Congress of Black Professionals in Higher Education. New York, 1973.
- Walton, S. F. "Black Studies and AAEP." The Black Scholar 6 (1974): 21-31.
- Williams, C. "Employing the Black Administrator." Public Personnel Management, March/April, 1975, p. 76.

Litigation

- Armstead v. Starkville Municipal School District, 325 F. Supp., 560, 1972.
- Bowe et al. v. Colgate-Palmolive Company, 272 F. Supp., 332, 1967.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686, 1954.
- Cheatwood v. Southern Bell Telephone, U.S.D.C.M., Ala., 2 FEP Cases, 33, 1969.
- Clark v. Bethlehem Steel Corporation, D.C.N.Y., 312 F. Supp., 977, 1970.
- Clark v. Dillon Supply Company, C.A.N.C., 429 F. 2nd 800, 1970.
- Clark v. Hayes International Corporation, D.C. Ala., 295 F. Supp., 803, 1968.
- Contractors' Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. U.S. Secretary of Labor, D.C.P.A., 311 F. Supp., 1002, 1970.
- Georgia Power Company v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 295, F. Supp., 950, 412 F. 2nd 426, 1968.

Griggs v. Duke Power Company, U.S. S. Ct., 3 FEP Cases 175, 1971.
 Jackson v. Veri-Fresh Poultry, Inc., CA 6, 2 FEP Cases, 687, 1969.
 Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537, 1896.
 Rosenfield v. Southern Pacific Company, C.A. 9, 3 FEP Cases, 604, 1971.
 Sprogis v. United Airlines, Inc., D.C. 111, 308 F. Supp., 959, 1970.
 Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone, 70 LRRM 2483, 1 FEP Cases, 33, 1969.

Newspapers

Abzug, Bella. "Minorities and Affirmative Action." New York Times, November 7, 1973, p. A27.
 Barclay, Dolores. "Black Executives Find Their Positions Lack Real Power." Lansing State Journal, March 10, 1976, p. D6.
 Bender, Marilyn. "Job Discrimination: Ten Years Later." New York Times, November 10, 1974, pp. E1-E5.
 Chapman, William. "Last Hired, First Fired Rule Under Fire." Lansing State Journal, November 17, 1974, p. A22.
 Dullea, Georgia. "Women in Classroom,s Not the Principal's Office." New York Times, July 13, 1975, p. D9.
 Goodman, E. "The Return of the Quota System." New York Times Magazine, September 10, 1974, p. 114.
 Gossett, Peggy. "M.S.U. Falls Short of AA Goal." MSU State News, January 8, 1975, p. A8.
 Hager, Philip. "Workers With Seniority Battle Minority Threat." Lansing State Journal, April 27, 1975, p. E11.
 Kilpatrick, James. "Dichotomy in Civil Rights." Detroit Free Press, November 19, 1974, p. A9.
 King, S. S. "Chicago Seeking New School Head." New York Times, July 26, 1975, p. B40.
 Lehr, Julie. "Expanded Certification for Civil Service Urged." Lansing State Journal, November 27, 1974, p. D4.

- Mackenzie, J. P. "Court Backs Bias Victim's Job Seniority." Washington Post, March 25, 1976, p. A1.
- Raspberry, William. "Discrimination v. Seniority." Lansing State Journal, February 14, 1975, p. A6.
- Shaker, A. "Affirmative National Leadership Toward Equal Opportunity." New York Times, November 10, 1974, p. E10.
- Staff. "AA Report Mixed." MSU News Bulletin, January 16, 1975, p. 4.
- Staff. "Bias Comes Full Circle: Reverse Bias." New York Times, January 12, 1975, p. D15.
- Staff. "Bias Plays Big Part in Hiring." Lansing State Journal, December 18, 1974, p. D3.
- Staff. "Court Orders Back Pay for Victims of Job Bias." Detroit Free Press, June 26, 1975, pp. A1-A2.
- Staff. "H.E.W. Eases Affirmative Action Requirement." MSU News Bulletin, July 3, 1975, p. 4.
- Staff. "Michigan Held on Noncompliance." Lansing State Journal, May 18, 1975, p. A3.
- Staff. "M.S.U. Anti-Discrimination and Affirmative Action Policies." MSU State News, November 21, 1974, p. 12.
- Staff. "NEA Sues to Protect Jobs of Whites." New York Times, November 30, 1975, p. B56.
- Staff. "State Hiring Policy Called Too Aggressive." Lansing State Journal, December 11, 1974, p. B1.
- Staff. "White Aide Wins Bias Suit Against Job Agency." Detroit Free Press, August 30, 1975, p. A2.
- Stone, Chuck. "A Sticky Question: Job Security v. Minority Jobs." Detroit Free Press, December 24, 1974, p. A13.
- Stone, Chuck. "Quotas Become an Issue Politically, Economically." Detroit Free Press, November 23, 1974, p. A15.
- Tempest, Rone. "Bias Complaints from Whites Mount." Detroit Free Press, December 15, 1974, p. A3.
- Wicker, Tom. "Affirmative Action Needed." New York Times, January 12, 1975, p. E19.

Wicker, Tom. "The Real Reverse of Racism." New York Times,
January 19, 1975, p. E19.

Public Documents

Board of Trustees, Michigan State University. Anti-Discrimination
Policy, Article III, C-3.

Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat., 27.

Civil Rights Act of 1875, 18 Stat., 335.

Civil Rights Act of 1871 (1), 16 Stat., 433.

Civil Rights Act of 1871 (No. 2), 17 Stat., 13.

Civil Rights Act of 1970, 16 Stat., 140.

Educational Amendments of 1972, Title IX, Sec. 901 (a), 373,
June 23, 1972.

Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Public Law 92-261, 92 Congress,
1972.

Equal Pay Act of 1963, 77 Stat. 56, Public Law 88-38, 1963.

Executive Order No. 10925, 26 Fed. Reg. 1977, 1961.

Executive Order No. 11114, 28 Fed. Reg. 6485, 1963.

Executive Order No. 11246, 30 Fed. Reg., 12319, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11375, 32 Fed. Reg., 14305, 1968.

Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, Public Law 718, 52 Stat., 1060,
1938.

Milliken, W. C. "Equal Employment Opportunity in State Government."
State of Michigan Executive Directive 8, September 1971.

Peckham, R. F. "Department of Education's V.R.S. Affirmative
Action Program for Equal Employment Opportunity." Memo-
randum, July 27, 1972.

J. W. Porter. "Recommended Action Regarding the Department of
Education's AAEP Plan." April 28, 1972.

State of Michigan, Department of Civil Service. "Equal Opportunity
Rule 1.2a Memorandum." September 22, 1971.

United States Congress, 92nd Congress, House. Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971.

United States Congress, 88th Congress. Public Law 880352, 7152, 78 Stat. 241, 1964.

United States Constitution, 14th Amendment, 1868.

United States Constitution, 19th Amendment, 1920.

United States Department of Labor Revised Order No. 4, 41 Fed. Reg., 60-2, 1971.

Dissertations

Ashmore, W. R. "Affirmative Action Programs: Implementation in School Districts." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974.

Bleecher, H. "The Authoritativeness of Michigan's Educational Accountability Program." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975.

Gemmell, Suzanne. "Affirmative Action Officers in Higher Education." Ed.d. dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.

Johnson, Linda. "Affirmative Action in a Governmental Agency: Michigan's Vocational Rehabilitation Services." Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1974.

Kruger, Peggy. "Attitudes of Faculty and Administrators Toward Affirmative Action in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

McClure, Gail. "Attitudes of School Superintendents Toward Affirmative Action Guidelines for Eliminating Sex Stereotypes in Schools." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1973.

Whitehead, J. C. "The Development of a Model for Establishing and Maintaining an Affirmative Action Employment Program for Public Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.