

Attitudes of search committee members
at ISU toward affirmative action

by

Corey Thomas Miller

A Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Hg Ed)

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions	6
Research Hypotheses	8
Significance of the Study	11
Limitations of the Study	12
Definition of Terms	13
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
A History of Affirmative Action	15
Background of Statutes and Regulations	19
Discrimination in Higher Education	25
The Relationship of Employment and Attitude Toward Affirmative Action	37
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	39
Independent Variables	39
Subjects	39
Development of the Survey Instrument	42
Survey Distribution	44
Analysis of the Data	44

CHAPTER IV	ANALYSIS OF DATA	46
	Respondent Characteristics	46
	Hypothesis Results	47
CHAPTER V	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND	
	RECOMMENDATIONS	53
	Summary	53
	Implications	55
	Recommendations	62
	Conclusion	67
REFERENCES		69
APPENDIX A	SURVEY AND LETTER	74
APPENDIX B	STATEMENT ON HUMAN SUBJECTS	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since its original inception in the Kennedy Administration, affirmative action has been either praised or sharply criticized by nearly every constituency. Labeled by opponents as reverse discrimination (Cohen, 1979; Glazer, 1982), a guise for preferential treatment (Karnes, 1981), and a method of establishing quotas in hiring (Vaughn, 1982), affirmative action was a product of decades of heavy-handed behavior towards those who were different--different skin color, gender, age, religion, or national origin.

To a large extent, the discrimination felt today in the United States may have had some origination in Colonial America. Marshall (1982) points out that at about the same time colonists were detailing their grievances to the King of England and proclaiming that "all men were created equal" with certain rights, including "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness", an early draft of the Declaration of Independence read:

[he] has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him,

captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in transportation tither (Marshall, 1982, p. 214).

In response to a variety of other brands of discriminatory behavior and disparate treatment, early forms of affirmative action were implemented via Executive Orders. Discrimination by federal contractors on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin was outlawed with the issuance of President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 on March 6, 1961 and Executive Order 11246, issued by President Johnson on September 24, 1965 (Weiss, 1987). These Executive Orders applied to government contractors and subcontractors which included business, education, government, and industry operations. In this investigation, the relationship between affirmative action and higher education, specifically, is addressed.

Within higher education, affirmative action applies to various functions dealing with recruiting, selecting, and promoting university personnel in a manner in which merit or job-related skills and abilities are the only criterion. According to the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1975):

Affirmative action does not mean entitlements to proportional representation. It means actions to

eliminate discrimination: creation of more adequate pools of talent, active searches for talent wherever it exists, revision of policies and practices that permitted or abetted discrimination, development of expectations for a staff whose composition does not reflect the impacts of discrimination, provision of judicial processes to hear complaints, and the making of decisions without improper regard for sex, race, or ethnic origin (1975).

Affirmative action policies and guidelines extend from writing an accurate and meaningful job description to promotion, demotion, termination, and transfer of employment, including rate of pay and other forms of compensation; this investigation, though, is narrowed in scope to the initial stages of an employment search up to, and including, the point of making a final selection or recommendation of a candidate. By limiting the focus of this study at this stage, it is not being implied or suggested that other portions of affirmative action are any less important. The reason behind this dissection is to enable the investigator to better analyze a smaller segment related to affirmative action in order to make distinct conclusions about that segment's current status and recommendations for more effective future searches.

The point must be made, too, that even though the investigator is exploring a certain process, the technicalities and mechanics of the process are not of interest here. Although one cannot argue the value of eliminating current discriminatory practices and guarding against future inequitable treatment, it is necessary to gather information concerning individual attitudes toward elimination of those unfair practices and, in this case, affirmative action. Along with beliefs and values, attitudes shape our decision making processes; consequently, attitudes of search committee members may have some impact, either positive or negative, on the effectiveness of affirmative action during the recruiting and selecting of new employees.

Iowa State University empowers committees of current university staff, students, and/or associates to recruit and select certain university personnel. Along with the task of choosing the best candidate for the position, these search committees take on specific institutional responsibilities in terms of safeguarding against discriminatory practices during any of the search steps as stipulated in the Higher Education Guidelines for Executive Order 11246.

Statement of the Problem

It is possible for some people to make early assumptions that committee members have learned and understand the non-discriminatory and pro-active efforts that are affirmative action before their search has started. Where did their knowledge come from? How thorough is their understanding of the concepts involved in affirmative action?

And further, regardless of each committee member's level of knowledge and understanding, what is their disposition towards affirmative action? Do they support the legislative precepts in principle and/or practice? Is it a restriction on the committees' ability to choose the person they feel is the best for the position? What is their attitude toward affirmative action and how might this attitude, favorable or not, influence their involvement, decision making, and impressions of candidates during an employment search? Specifically, the issue at hand is that individuals serving on administrative search committees may have established certain attitudes toward affirmative action that may affect candidates' chances during consideration for employment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research effort is to analyze differences in attitude toward affirmative action among groups of people who served on administrative search committees at Iowa State University. Particularly, the focus is broken into three interest emphases: differences in attitudes toward affirmative action related to gender, ethnicity, and area of employment. Interwoven with this analysis is the pursuit for how these differences in attitude may affect the chances of candidates who are interested in an administrative positions.

Research Questions

After reviewing the related literature, several questions emerge concerning the relationship of search committee members and their attitudes about affirmative action. Specifically, in following the purpose of this study, the questions to be researched include:

- 1) Do women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts than men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?
- 2) Do women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward

affirmative action at Iowa State than men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?

3) Do ethnic minority men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts than white men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?

4) Do ethnic minority men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State than white men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?

5) Do all women and ethnic minority men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts than white men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?

6) Do all women and ethnic minority men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State than white men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU?

7) Do administrators, faculty, and professional and scientific staff who have been members of administrative

search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action?

8) Do faculty who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action among the ISU colleges (excluding the Graduate College)?

9) Do Professional and Scientific staff who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action among the areas of Professional and Scientific employment?

10) Do administrators who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action among the areas of administrator employment?

Research Hypotheses

In response to the above listed research questions, the following research hypotheses have been generated to provide a basis for empirical study. Although they are challenged through statistical application in the Null form, they are shown here in the Alternate Hypothesis form so as to best present the questions posed by the author:

Ha 1) Women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have more positive attitudes toward

general affirmative action concepts than will men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU.

Ha 1A) Women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State than men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU.

Ha2) Ethnic minority men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts than white men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU.

Ha 2A) Ethnic minority men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State than white men and women who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU.

Ha3) Women and ethnic minority men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts than white men who have been members of administrative search committees.

Ha 3A) Women and ethnic minority men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State

than white men who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU.

Ha 4) Administrators, faculty, and Professional and Scientific staff who have been members of administrative search committees will have different attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts.

Ha 4A) Administrators, faculty, and Professional and Scientific staff who have been members of administrative search committees will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State.

Ha 5) Faculty who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts amount the ISU colleges (excluding the Graduate College).

Ha 5A) Faculty who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State among the ISU colleges (excluding the Graduate College).

Ha 6) Professional and Scientific staff who have been members of administrative search committees will have different attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts among the areas of Professional and Scientific employment.

Ha 6A) Professional and Scientific staff who have been members of administrative search committees will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State among the areas of Professional and Scientific employment.

Ha 7) Administrators who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have different attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts among the areas of administrator employment.

Ha 7A) Administrators who have been members of administrative search committees at ISU will have different attitudes toward affirmative action at ISU among the areas of administrator employment.

Significance of the Study

This study will provide insights into the relationships of search committee members' attitudes toward affirmative action, both generally and at Iowa State, and these variables: gender, ethnicity, and area of employment. Since most studies of this kind have dealt with a more general sample population, the exploratory nature of this investigation involving a more direct relationship of affirmative action and people who use it lends special significance.

Results of this study may be especially helpful for people holding different perspectives of affirmative action:

supporters of the affirmative action concept; affirmative action officers; those interested in further research in this area; those involved with current or future personnel searches; and administrators responsible for the general well-being of the institution.

Limitations of the Study

The sensitive nature of affirmative action issues is, to some degree, a limitation in the sense that some search committee members may be reluctant to respond for fear that their reactions may become known. This reluctance may result in a complete or partial non-response to the questionnaire by the search committee member. A different result may occur if the respondent completes the questionnaire with the socially desirable answers different than his/her own; this occurrence may have a significant impact on the statistical analysis and, hence, final conclusions of the investigation. Each of these situations is more likely to occur when the original attitude toward affirmative action is less positive.

Another limitation of this study is the skewed composition of the search committees themselves. Although white males are dominant in frequency among the institution's overall personnel population, the figures for administrative search committees are magnified even greater

for white men. These ratios favoring men to women and ethnic majority to ethnic minority are both comments on the status of women and ethnic minorities in higher education and hardly allow for fair representation in dealing with issues of consideration such as the present study.

Lastly, caution must be maintained in any generalizations to a larger or significantly different population. For instance, generalizing the results to all administrators or faculty at Iowa State would be a grievous error because the individuals in the search committees most likely have certain characteristics different from their cohorts.

Similarly, applying the results of this study to search committee members elsewhere would be very difficult since a host of variables may impact the search committee members' attitudes toward affirmative action. For instance, an institution of the Eastern seaboard has certain environmental variables and social values different from a Midwestern institution; thus, attitudes toward affirmative action and other issues may vary.

Definition of Terms

Administrative Search Committee refers to a group of faculty, staff, and administrators, and, occasionally, students and university associates, who were or are involved

in an employment search for a Dean, Director, or higher in the Iowa State University administration.

Affirmative Action is the additional effort(s) made by an employer to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded in an attempt to correct the effects of past discrimination.

Area of Employment means a university office or department outside an academic college where one is employed.

Attitudes vary in definition. For this study, Allport's definition will be used: an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experiences, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations to which it is related.

Ethnic Minority Members include those groups used by Iowa State's Affirmative Action Office. These are: Black, not of Hispanic origin; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian or Alaskan Native; and Hispanic.

Gender simply refers to the characteristic of being female or male.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

As noted earlier, affirmative action was created with two serious intentions in mind: (a) to eliminate the effects of past disparate treatment among disadvantaged groups of people, and (b) to make positive efforts to ensure that previously disadvantaged groups have equal opportunities in the future. In both instances, discrimination--either in past, present, or future--is at the heart of the matter; thus, a large portion of this chapter is devoted to reviewing the presence of discrimination in higher education.

A synopsis of affirmative action's history, including a summary of statutes and regulations, will be presented in the first segment. Secondly, a retrospective look at the status of women and ethnic minorities will be taken, along with an examination of how employment may relate to attitudes toward affirmative action.

A History of Affirmative Action

Although the phrase "affirmative action" was popularized in the 1960s, the concept was actually a

culmination of several federal efforts at eliminating discriminatory treatment. President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 differed from earlier anti-discrimination legislation by the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Administrations because it not only called for an end to discrimination in employment, but also required employers with federal contracts to take extra effort to ensure future equal opportunity among people from protected groups.

Shortly after assuming office, President Johnson issued Executive Order 11246 which preserved the nondiscrimination/affirmative action concept but added that federal contractors submit compliance reports (Weatherspoon, 1985). It also entrusted the authority of enforcement with the Office Of Federal Contract Compliance within the Department of Labor. Current contracts could be canceled, future ones could be disallowed, and cases could be recommended to the Justice Department for prosecution in the event of noncompliance (Weiss, 1987).

To this point, the regulations of affirmative action were quite vague. During the later years of the Johnson Administration and into the initial Nixon term, affirmative action was expanded and clarified. Contractors with 50 or more employees and a contract in excess of \$50,000 were forced to develop a written affirmative action program

including goals and timetables for minority hiring (Weiss, 1987). Under President Nixon, the Department of Labor issued Revised Order #4 which did two things: (a) it gave contractors a maximum of 120 days to submit the necessary written affirmative action plans for each of its "establishments", even if only one received federal money; and, (b) it distinguished between goals--"targets reasonably attainable by means of applying every good faith effort" --and "rigid and flexible quotas" (Weiss, 1987, p. 51).

Until this time, the effects of the Executive Orders were largely unknown in higher education because enforcement had mainly taken place in other areas of employment. But in early 1970, the Women's Equity Action League charged the entire academic community with extensive sex discrimination. Since then, federal involvement in enforcing compliance in higher education has been extensive (Carnegie Council, 1975; Sandler, 1974).

Throughout the Ford and Carter Administrations, the basic tenets of affirmative action, as established by Kennedy and expanded by Johnson and Nixon, remained relatively stable.

In June of 1978, though, the U.S. Supreme Court altered the future of affirmative action by ruling in favor of a reverse discrimination suit brought by Allan Bakke against

the University of California-Davis medical school. In effect the Supreme Court said that although race could be considered as a factor in admissions, colleges and universities could not set specific admissions quotas (Gray, 1987).

The end result for affirmative action is still greatly contested between supporters and critics. Michael Olivas, director of the Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance at the University of Houston Law Center stated that:

Under the Bakke decision, colleges continued to have considerable latitude in what they're allowed to do. That latitude has rarely worked to the advantage of minorities. Universities have been underwhelming in their efforts to recruit minority students, and even more derelict in their responsibilities to recruit minority scholars (Fields, 1988, p. A14).

Mary F. Berry, of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, claimed that the Bakke decision gave academe "an excuse to retard growth of affirmative action" (Fields, 1988, p. A15). Opponents, on the other hand, saw this Supreme Court stance as the impetus behind more programs based on race (Fields, 1988).

This landmark case ushered in the Reagan Administration which has taken a narrow view of affirmative action. It has "attacked affirmative action by appointing opponents of this philosophy to federal civil rights agencies" (Weiss, 1987, p. 51) and moving to the courtroom to challenge established plan (Fields, 1988; Jacobs, 1985). Confirming Reagan's conservative perspective, the Supreme Court ruled, in a 1984 case involving Grove City College, that only the specific department(s) which actually received federal aid must not discriminate. Thus, if only the Financial Aid Office received federal dollars, that would be the only office or department required to comply with anti-discriminatory measures; any other office or academic department would not need to comply with the affirmative action stipulations. In March of 1988, however, the U.S. Congress overturned that decision by overruling Reagan's veto of a bill that would attain extend compliance to all parts of a business or educational institution even if only one area received monetary support from the federal government (Leatherman, 1988).

Background of Statutes and Regulations

The Executive Orders

Most sources trace the origins of affirmative action to President Johnson's issuance of Executive Order 11246

(Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1975; Weatherspoon, 1985). However, Weiss (1987) points out that the adoption by the federal government of a policy of affirmative action can be traced to President John F. Kennedy's Executive Order 10925; it outlawed discrimination by federal contractors and required each to "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin" (Hubbard, 1978, p. 111). Nondiscrimination based on gender was added in October 1968 under Executive Order 11375 (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1975).

It is essential to understand that Executive Orders are not laws. They are administrative interpretations of public policy made by the President and implemented in contractual agreement between the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors (Kruger, 1974; Tinsley & Rueban, 1973).

These Executive Orders hold two key thoughts: nondiscrimination and affirmative action. "Nondiscrimination requires the elimination of all existing discriminatory conditions, whether purposeful or inadvertent" (Guidelines..., 1970, p. 421).

Affirmative action requires the contractor to do more than ensure employment neutrality with regard to race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. As the phrase implies, Affirmative Action requires the employer to make additional efforts to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even if that exclusion cannot be traced to particular discriminatory actions on the part of the employer. The premise of the Affirmative Action concept of the Executive Order 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 (Guidelines..., 1970, p. 421).

Regulations concerning requirements of a written affirmative action plan were established with Order No. 4, then detailed and expanded to cover women as well as minorities with Revised Order No. 4. All institutions with 50 or more employees and \$50,000 or more in federal-contract funds must have a written affirmative action plan. The enforcement of these plans is by the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)

(Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1975).

Equal Pay Act of 1963

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibits discriminatory wages between men and women "for equal work on jobs that require equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and that are performed in the same establishment under similar working conditions; (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1975, p. 100). Different wages are permitted when employers have merit pay systems, seniority systems, systems which measure earnings by quality or quantity of production (incentive systems), or any factor other than the employees' gender (Weatherspoon, 1985).

Until June of 1972, executive, administrative, and professional employees weren't covered (Sandler, 1974). In 1978, under President Jimmy Carter's Reorganization Plan No. 1, enforcement of this policy was transferred from the Wage and Hour Division of the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Gordon, 1977; Weatherspoon, 1985).

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 "prohibits discrimination against the beneficiaries, i.e., students in federally assisted programs" (Sandler, 1974, p. 27). With

the passage of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (the Higher Education Act), discrimination on the basis of sex was added to race, color, or national origin as illegal (Sandler, 1974). The Office of Civil Rights has the authority for enforcing the provisions of Title VI.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes discrimination on the basis of gender, race, color, religion, or national origin illegal (Gordon, 1977). Prior to March 1972, educational institutions were not covered by Title VII; this regulation applies to all institutions of higher learning whether or not they receive federal funds (Sandler, 1974).

This policy differs from the Executive Orders because it does not require any affirmative action, only that employers do not discriminate. Enforcement of this legislation was given to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which may conduct a review without any changes being filed (Sandler, 1974).

Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967

Congress established the Age Discrimination in Employment of 1967 (ADEA) to "protect employment applicants and employees between the ages of 40 and 65 from adverse employment action because of their age" (Weatherspoon, 1985,

p. xxix). The protected age range was expanded in 1978 to include the ages between 40 and 70 (Linenberger & Keaveny, 1979). Enforcement rests with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Greenlaw & Kuhl, 1982).

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 specifically prohibits, on the basis of gender, the exclusion of any person from participating in, being denied the benefits of, or being discriminated against under any educational program or activity receiving federal funding (Gordon, 1977; Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1975).

Generally, all institutions must comply with this regulation, except: (a) private and public undergraduate institutions that have "traditionally and continuously from their establishment admitted members of one sex"; (b) institutions whose main interest is providing training for the U.S. military services; and (c) religious institutions.,

A 1977 district court ruling suggested that this legislation should apply only to students and be targeted to specific programs (Gordon, 1977). Much controversy exists today concerning Title IX's relationship to athletics.

Enforcement is with HEW's Office of Civil Rights; should discrimination be found, affirmative action may be required (Kruger, 1974).

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Sections 503 & 504

Both sections prohibit discrimination on the basis of handicap in any federally funded or assisted program. A handicapped individual is defined by the Rehabilitation Act as: (a) an individual who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person's major life activities, and (b) has a record of such an impairment; or if regarded as having such an impairment (Weatherspoon, 1985, p. xxvii).

Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 requires contractors and subcontractors receiving more than \$2,500 in federal funds to have an affirmative action clause in the contract; Section 504 goes further by requiring federal contractors and subcontractors receiving in excess of \$50,000 and employing at least 50 people to develop a written affirmative action program.

Discrimination in Higher Education

The origins of discriminatory attitudes and behavior in academia are squarely rooted in the socialization process that occurs from childhood throughout adulthood. Society's expectation of how particular groups fit into our world

community are entrenched in our young via parents, peers, and the media; as they mature, few young adults will re-evaluate and challenge those roles. Rather, most people accept these characteristics as appropriate and expect others to fit into these roles according to certain attributes they possess.

Referring to the prevalence of sex discrimination in higher education, Alfred and Good (1972) said that:

Clearly...sex discrimination is neither initiated nor terminated in higher education. It is a phenomenon rooted in the effects of early childhood socialization for "appropriate" sex roles; reinforced through differential opportunities accorded females throughout higher education; and finalized in an equilibrium system prevalent in the economy as an institution of American society (p. 18).

Discrimination of any type in the academic arena can be viewed from two perspectives: the institution as an employer and as an educator (Kruger, 1974). Academe has long been accused of discrimination in a variety of areas from both perspectives, such as student admissions, differential rewards for staff based on race or gender, student athletics, and biased attitudes of university personnel, to mention a few (Kruger, 1974). In the present

study, the focus is on the university or college as an agent involved in hiring people and remunerating them for their services; hence, the review of literature concerns itself with the relationship of discrimination and institutions of higher learning as employers.

The Status of Women in Higher Education

In the 1960s and early 1970s colleges and universities recorded tremendous growth. Between 1960 and 1970 resident college enrollment exploded by nearly 265% while the population of faculty staff, and administrators increased almost 185% (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). During this same period of time women faculty lost ground as a percentage of all faculty members in four-year institutions. At all ranks, women stayed relatively even (19%). The professor, associate professor, and assistant professor ranks all registered declines; the instructor rank increased 10.1% (National Education Association, 1972).

According to more recent figures from the National Center for Educational Statistics, the female professorate has made minimal gains in the upper-echelon of faculty ranks and moderate gains in the lower ranks. Specifically, women comprise 10.7% of full professors, 22% of associate professors, 36.1% of assistant professors, and 51.7% of instructors (Sternhell, 1984).

For women who do enter into the academic ranks, they are more likely to be "found in the lower, untenured ranks, where they remain for longer periods than equally qualified men" (Kahn, 1984, p. E18). In one of the earliest comprehensive studies concerning differences in the academic reward system, Astin and Bayer (1972) concluded that gender was a significant predictor of salary, following only rank, type of institution, and productivity from a set of 32 predictor variables. Additionally, they found that gender was a significant predictor of rank; highest degree, productivity as measured by articles published, type of institution, years of employment, and time spent in administrative activities were more significant than gender in predicting rank.

Sandler (1983) substantiated Astin and Bayer's study by finding that women who remain in the higher education environment will continue to earn less than men, even when factors like length of service, year Ph.D. was earned, and academic discipline are controlled. A study by Ahern and Scott (cited in Pfafflin, 1984, p. 1183) explained that "women were less likely to achieve tenure, did so at a later age and had substantially lower average salaries than men of comparable rank and experience. This pattern held

regardless of whether they were married or whether they had children."

Evaluation of average faculty salary levels for 1974-1975 and 1984-1985, based on information systematically gathered by the American Association of University Professors, indicated that male professors earned 109.2% of women professors' salaries in 1974-1975 and 113.5% in 1984-1985. Comparable figures from this project for associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor are 103.8% to 107.7%, 103.8% to 108.8%, and 104.5% to 107.5%, respectively (Kahn, 1985).

At all ranks in 1985-1986, male faculty earned an average annual salary of \$34,300 compared to \$27,600 for women (Association of American Colleges, 1987). This \$6,700 salary gap is slightly larger than the \$6,100 margin that favored male faculty in 1976-1977. The American Association of University Professors report that in 1987 male full professors received an average of \$46,070 compared to \$40,630 for women (Association of American Colleges, 1988).

Tolbert (1986) offers possible sources of differences in higher education relating to organizational characteristics. She found that discrimination of women is more likely to occur in institutions that are larger, wealthier, and/or private. At Harvard, women are only 4.2%

of full professors; at Princeton, 3.2%; at Stanford, 2.6%; and at Yale, 3.9% (Kahn, 1984).

Much literature on women in higher education focuses on faculty women. Robbins and Kahn (1985, p. 3) point out that progress "toward sex equity in all phases of the academic process has been slow." "After more than a decade of effort in affirmative action, the number and distribution of women and minority administrators in American colleges and universities have changed very little" claims Bernstein (1984, p. 77).

According to an all-inclusive report prepared by the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) covering 1,236 institutions, women totaled slightly less than 20% of all college and university administrators in 1979 (Frances & Mensel, 1981). About 63% of these women held administrative positions in white women's colleges, while at predominantly white co-educational institutions slightly less than 19% of the administrators were women.

Within the white co-educational college or university, the researchers found that women were more prevalent among private than public institutions. The smallest margin of representation of women administrators between public and private schools was 1.7% in Student Affairs. Among the private institutions responding, the greatest share of women

administrators were employed in Student Affairs (31.9%) and the smallest share were Chief Executive Officers (5.4%).

Public universities and colleges were slightly different, with the largest portion of women administrators working in External Affairs (22.8%) and the smallest portion as Chief Executive Officers (1.1%).

Nearly one-quarter of the women at public white co-educational institutions in the ACE study held one of four positions: (a) Dean of Nursing, (b) Library Services Director, (c) Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Director, or (d) Registrar. Similarly, Moore (1984) found that, while presidents, provosts, and academic deans are chiefly male, the largest number of women in administrative positions were head librarians, registrars, or directors of financial aid.

Bernstein (1984) concluded that less than 15% of college and university chief academic officers were women. However, the number of women chief executive officers reported by the American Council on Education in 1987 reached 286; this represents about 9% of all colleges and universities, up from the 5% reported in 1975 (Association of American Colleges, 1987).

In 1987-1988, the average yearly salary for Chief Executive Officers at American universities was about \$90,000 (Mooney, 1988). It is likely that many women in

this position earned less than the average figure. Mooney (1988, p. A15) adds, "As they have in the past, women...continued to earn lower salaries than their white counterparts...Women administrators earned an average of 37% less than men."

This current earnings gap between men and women administrators is not unlike earlier years. Women administrators' salaries differed considerably depending on the type of institution they were employed at (Frances & Mensel, 1981). At predominantly white co-educational institutions, women earned between 70% and 80% of the average white male salary. Women's private colleges paid women administrators 78% of the white male's average salary while women at men's private colleges earned only 59% of male administrators' wages (Frances & Mensel, 1981).

The Status of Women at Iowa State University

In the fall of 1984, Iowa State employed just over 3,300 administrators, faculty, and Professional and Scientific (P & S) staff. Of the 196 administrators, 30--or 15.3%--were women. Women also represented 24.2% of all faculty (18.9% of tenure track positions and 42.6% non-tenure track positions) and 36.2% of all Professional and Scientific staff (ISU Self Study, 1984). According to recent figures from the Affirmative Action Progress Report

(1987), women were 25.7% of the Executive/Administrative/Managerial category; 18.4% of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty; 46.6% of Non-Tenure Track Faculty; and 40.3% of Professional Non-Faculty.

Better than half of the women faculty were assistant professors or instructors, compared to fewer than 25% of men faculty. Comparatively, 14% of women holding tenure track positions were full professors. Specifically, Iowa State employed only 33 women full professors in 1984-1985, compared to 548 male full professors (ISU Self Study, 1984).

A significant increase of women in the associate professor rank pushed the share of women in the upper two ranks from 28.7% in 1975-1976 to almost 45% in 1984-1985. This happened despite a decrease in women full professors which was largely because of the retirement of some female professors (ISU Self Study, 1984).

The Professional & Scientific system originated in 1976-1977. Since then, the total number of P & S positions grew by 50% but women's representation expanded by 118% to the present level of about 37% (ISU Self-Study, 1984). Within the eight pay grades of the P & S system in 1984, about 19% of the men and only 3% of the women were in the top three pay grades. Conversely, 21% of the women and only 4% of the men were in the bottom two pay grades. By 1986,

21% of men and 3.6% of women were in one of the top three pay grades, while 4.3% of men and 15.3% of women were located in one of the bottom two pay grades (P & S, 1986).

The Status of Ethnic Minorities in Higher Education

The lack of systematic studies concerning the status of ethnic minority personnel in higher education has debilitated researchers' attempts to detail the progress of minority groups in university and college employment (Rickard, 1985). Most investigations in the literature have been regionally based, limited to one institution, or limited to certain types of institutions. In addition, very little attention is given to Alaskan Native/American Indian and Asian/Pacific Islander educators relative to Black and Hispanic educators. Despite the inconsistency in methodology, most people familiar with the state of ethnic minorities in higher education would agree that these groups are underrepresented compared to their white counterparts.

In the early 1970s, minority representation of Chief Student Affairs Officers ranged from 2.0% to 4.6% (Appleton, 1971; Myers & Sandeen, 1973). By 1978, nearly 25% of all administrative positions held by minority men and women at predominantly white public institutions were among just three jobs: (a) Director of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment, (b) Director of Student Financial Aid, or (c)

Chief Student Affairs Officer (Frances & Mensel, 1981). Between 1975 and 1978, minority men made their greatest advancements as Chief Student Affairs Officers, while minority women improved most as Directors of Affirmative Action (Frances & Mensel, 1981). At the end of 1984, minorities were 13% of all college and university administrators (College and University Personnel Association, 1984).

Generally, minority administrators have been better represented at public institutions than private ones (Frances & Mensel, 1981; Rickard, 1985). Among community and junior colleges, Moore (1985) found that less than 20% of all administrators were ethnic minorities.

As with women in higher education, minorities still tend to earn less than non-minorities. At predominantly white public colleges and universities, minority men and women made 90% and 80% of white men's average annual salary, respectively. Furthermore, at minority institutions, minority men and women brought in 89% and 77% of white men's average yearly earnings, respectively (Frances & Mensel, 1981). Interestingly, this study also found evidence that women administrators tended to receive higher salaries at institutions where they were the racial minority.

Ethnic minority faculty haven't fared much better. Snyder (1987) found that ethnic minorities comprised about 10% of all full-time faculty at higher education institutions. Of this, Blacks were 4.1%; Asians/pacific Islanders were 3.6%; Hispanics made up 1.6%; and American Indians/Alaskan Natives were 0.28%. He also concluded that Hispanic and American Indian/Alaskan Native women were similar to white women in their levels of participation at all ranks of full-time faculty within their particular ethnic group. However, Asian/Pacific Islander women participated at a much lower level while Black women were a much larger share of all Black faculty members.

The Status of Ethnic Minorities at Iowa State University

Ethnic minorities represented 4.9% of all administrators, faculty and Professional and Scientific staff employed at Iowa State university in 1984. As a share of the 3,300 administrators, faculty, and P & S staff: Asians/Pacific Islanders were 2.9%, Blacks were 1.3%, Hispanics were 0.6%, and American Indians/Alaskan Natives were 0.06% (ISU Self Study, 1984).

By 1987, the number of administrators, faculty and P & S staff dropped to 3.26%; however, ethnic minority representative rose to 6.9% (Affirmative Action Progress Report, 1987). The largest group increase was

Asians/Pacific Islanders which moved up to 4.3%. Blacks followed with an increase to 1.6%; Hispanics remained the same, while American Indians/Alaskan Natives improved slightly to 0.12% (Affirmative Action Progress Report, 1987).

The portion of administrative jobs held by minorities in 1984 and 1987 were 2.6% and 4.4%, respectively. Comparable figures for tenure track, non-tenure track, and P & S positions are 5.5% and 5.9%, 6.9% and 9.2%, and 4.2% and 7.6%. Despite a decline of 11 minority members since 1986, minorities increased their representation among all three types of positions under study. However, this increase was not large enough to meet the affirmative action goals of 1986-1987; hence, minorities are being underutilized in each category (Affirmative Action Progress Report, 1987).

The Relationship of Employment and Attitude Toward Affirmative Action

Very few studies are present in the literature which have focused on the impact of type or area of employment on individuals' or groups' attitudes toward affirmative action. Developing a clear picture as to how employment might influence attitudes toward affirmative action is difficult because of the unsystematic data available.

Various rationale have been utilized in hypothesizing differences in attitude among groups in the academic labor force. Kruger (1974) hypothesized that faculty in science and technology would be more favorable to affirmative action than humanities faculty, but the opposite was eventually supported.

Roman (1977) found no significant differences between administrators in the humanities and administrators in the sciences and technologies. In the same study, he also found no significant differences in attitude toward affirmative action among: administrators of large, medium, or small institutions; or, central administrators, academic deans, or departmental chairpersons. In general, Roman reports that "university administrators were negative or indifferent in their attitudes toward affirmative action (1977, p. 1928-A).

Lee (1979) concluded that gender was a more influential variable than area of employment when measuring attitude toward affirmative action. He also noted that attitudes and perceptions of "ideal" affirmative action practices were significantly higher than the level of attitudes and perceptions of "real" affirmative action practices.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this study, it was necessary to complete four prior tasks: (a) determine the independent variables to be analyzed, (b) select a sample population, (c) develop a useful tool to measure attitudes toward affirmative action, and (d) choose appropriate statistical analysis to allow for meaningful results and conclusions.

Independent Variables

Three independent variables were selected to be used in the analysis of the data. Two of those variables, ethnicity and gender, were examined separately and in combination with each other. These particular variables take on special interest with this study because ethnic minorities and women are among the protected groups according to affirmative action policies.

The third independent variable, area of employment, was analyzed separately with no combination given to ethnicity or gender. All independent variables were self-reported by the study participants.

Subjects

Members of employment search committees at ISU were recognized as the population for this study. However, a

variety of search committees exist at the present time at ISU, depending on the position that needs to be filled. It was decided that the focus of this study would be with administrative search committees, i.e., those individuals who participated in searches to fill vacancies for the positions of Dean, Director, or higher in the structure of the Iowa State University administration after July 1, 1985.

The principal thought behind selecting members of administrative search committees was that these people will have or have had some amount of influence in the final selection of candidates for integral positions within ISU's administration, and thus, have had some amount of opportunity to learn about and exercise action policies. Also, administrative search committees are comprised of people from several university offices and departments which allowed the investigator to examine subjects with more diverse backgrounds. If a vacancy occurs within the Dean of Students Office, faculty and administrators (aside from the Dean of Students) are unlikely to participate in that search. Consequently, a search for a Vice-President would have a larger search committee, with administrators, faculty, Professional and Scientific staff, and possibly, students and non-ISU personnel participating.

The subjects for this study consisted of 126 administrators, faculty, Professional and Scientific staff, students, and non-ISU personnel. Initially, 128 administrative search committee members were identified through the Affirmative Action Office's records of all searches which had occurred after July 1, 1985; two members left Iowa State University prior to the commencement of this study, thus, they were not included in the sample.

For this study, the sample population was systematically selected. The rationale for the method of selection is as follows:

1. A large enough sample needed to be established for effective and meaningful analysis to be made. On the average, however, search committees typically utilize only about 10-12 people for each search and only a few administrative search committees are formed per year. Hence, the population to select from is small.
2. The investigator felt that recency was an important factor in selecting a sample population. Thus, consideration of administrative search committee members were given to the most recency members and continued until an appropriate sample size was reached.
3. In addition, the investigator was unclear how the sensitive nature of the study's topic would affect the

survey response rate. For effective analysis, a lower return rate would need a higher initial number of participants. All identified administrative search committee members in this sample population were utilized to offset the possibility of a low rate of returned surveys.

Development of the Survey Instrument

Few instruments were found in the literature that measured attitudes toward affirmative action. Each had a slightly different focus and all were developed by the researcher prior to 1980. A newly developed survey best fit the needs of the present researcher for this investigation.

Kruger's Affirmative Action Questionnaire (1974) was used as a basis in both format and content for developing the current questionnaire. In her survey, Kruger used 44 questions addressing various general issues of affirmative action and the progress of affirmative action at the sample population's institution. The questions were placed into one of eight scales in order to test the eight hypothesis.

Several questions from Kruger's original questionnaire were added to a list of original questions to form a rough draft of 22 possible questions which were critiqued by Iowa State University's Assistant Affirmative Action Officer along with the investigator's graduate committee. After incorporating this feedback, the revised questionnaire was

again reviewed by the graduate committee; minor adjustments were made, as suggested by the committee; and the final draft of the instrument was approved.

Iowa State University's Human Subjects in Research Committee also reviewed and approved the questionnaire, signifying that the rights and welfare of the administrative search committee members were sufficiently protected and that confidentiality of response data could be assured.

The final draft of the instrument (see Appendix A) included 19 questions. Scale 1 consisted of the first nine items which addressed general affirmative action issues. The final 10 questions, Scale 2, were directed towards affirmative action at Iowa State University.

Although a five-point Likert-type measurement scale and an eleven-point agree/disagree continuum were considered earlier, the seven-point scale was chosen for its simplicity and the possibility that a wider dispersion of responses would occur.

To avoid stereotyped responses about half of the items in the questionnaire were worded so that a positive attitude towards the question would be marked on the right half of the continuum indicating disagreement with the statement.

Survey Distribution

All surveys were mailed to members of the sample population on May 27, 1988, via the university mail service for on-campus addressees and the U.S. Postal Service for addressees off-campus. Each envelope included a blank survey, a cover letter that was jointly written and signed by the principal investigator and his major professor, and an envelope to return the completed survey.

Participants were instructed to return the survey within one week to the Professional Studies in Education departmental office. In the event of a low response rate, follow-up telephone calls were planned for all study participants to thank them if they had completed and returned the survey or remind them to do so if they had not done so.

Analysis of the Data

Each returned survey was given an identification number and all data were coded for analysis by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A one-way Analysis of Variance was computed for each hypothesis and subhypothesis using Iowa State's mainframe computer, NAS/9160.

For the first three hypotheses, specific a priori questions allowed the investigator to utilize statistically

stronger orthogonal contrasts in conjunction with the one-way ANOVA and the Sheffé Multiple Range Test. The remaining hypotheses used only post hoc procedures for finding differences among groups.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Following a summary of characteristics of those people who returned surveys, each hypothesis will be analyzed in turn. At each point, attention will be given to both Scale 1 and Scale 2. It should be pointed out that a lower mean score on either scale signifies a more positive attitude on the part of the respondents.

Respondent Characteristics

Surveys were mailed to 126 administrative search committee members at Iowa State University. A total of 87 surveys were returned to the Professional Studies in Education departmental office, but four of these were unusable. One survey was only partially completed while three were returned indicating that the subjects had left the institution for an extended period of time and would not return in time to complete the survey. The response rate of usable surveys was 65.9%.

From the returned surveys, 52 (62.6%) were men, 30 (36.1%) were women, and 1 (1.2%) did not indicate his or her gender. Ethnic minorities comprised just 3.6% ($n = 3$) of the respondents while ethnic majority subjects were 96.4% ($n = 80$).

Among the 83 surveys which indicated their primary type of employment, 33 (39.8%) were administrators, 38 (45.8%) were faculty, 9 (10.8%) were Professional and Scientific staff, 2 (2.4%) were students, and 1 (1.2%) was a merit employee.

Slightly more than 37% of the respondents marked their age to be between 41 and 50 years; 25% were between 51 and 60 years. Ranging in years from 3 to 41, the average length of service to Iowa State University was 17.3 years.

A majority of the subjects served on just one or two search committees after July 1, 1985. The average number of search committees served on after this date was 2.8.

Hypothesis Results

Hypothesis 1 suggested that women administrative search committee members would have a more positive attitude toward general affirmative action issues than men on these committees. Scale 1 was used to measure these attitudes; scores could range from 9 to 63.

A oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) found the group mean for ethnic minority women ($n = 1$) to be 22.0; white women ($n = 30$), 25.8; ethnic minority men ($n = 2$), 22.5; and white men ($n = 50$), 31.2. The ANOVA indicated a significant difference among the groups, $F(3, 79) = 2.8751, p < .05$. Sheffé's multiple range test found a significant difference

between white women and white men, $p < .10$. Ethnic minority men and women, both of which had lower Scale 1 means than white women, were not considered by the statistical program because of low cell counts.

Because a specific a priori question about differences among these groups had been hypothesized, the investigator was able to implement a planned orthogonal contrast in the testing of the hypothesis. In this case, all women were matched against all men. The observed t -value (79, .532) indicated that women's lower Scale 1 score ($M = 25.7$) was not significantly different than men's Scale 1 score ($M = 30.8$). Thus, although a significant difference was found between white men and white women, a hypothesis favoring all women's attitudes could not be completely supported.

Part A of Hypothesis 1 reasoned that the same groups would differ in their attitudes toward affirmative action efforts at Iowa State University. This sub-hypothesis exercised a oneway ANOVA using Scale 2 to measure subject's attitudes toward affirmative action. It was possible for individuals to range in their responses from 10 to 70 on Scale 2.

The means computed for ethnic minority women ($n = 1$), white women ($n = 30$), ethnic minority men ($n = 2$), and white men ($n = 50$) were 26.0, 32.6, 31.5, and 43.1, respectively.

Using the oneway ANOVA, significant differences among the groups can be suggested, $F(3, 79) = 10.4254, p < .01$. Scheffé's multiple range test located a difference between white women and white men at the .10 level of significance. Again, due to low cell counts, ethnic minority men and women were not considered in the oneway ANOVA.

In comparing scores on Scale 2, the observed t-value was too small to suggest a difference between all men and all women, $t(79) = 1.482, p > .10$. Hence, the investigator was unable to reject the Null Hypothesis of no difference between men and women in their attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State University. However, the oneway ANOVA indicated that a significant difference in Scale 2 scores exists between white women and white men.

Hypothesis 2 stated that ethnic minority subjects would have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action issues than subjects in the ethnic majority. Part 2A suggested that these two groups of administrative search committee members would differ in their attitudes toward Iowa State University's affirmative action efforts. Neither hypothesis was tested due to the low number of responding ethnic minorities ($n = 3$).

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the mean of all women and ethnic minority males, collectively ($n = 33$), would be

significantly less than the mean of white men ($n = 50$) on Scale 1 (indicating a more positive attitude toward general affirmative action issues). A oneway ANOVA was completed along with the planned orthogonal contrast; the mean score on Scale 1 for the combined groups was 25.5 and for white men it was 31.2. This difference was significant, $t(79) = 2.01$, $p. < .05$.

Hypothesis 3A suggested a difference in attitude toward affirmative action efforts at Iowa State University between white men ($n = 50$) and all other subjects ($n = 33$). The observed t-value (79, 3.457) was large enough to make a decision to support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4 advanced the idea that administrators, faculty, and Professional and Scientific staff may have different attitudes regarding general affirmative action issues. A oneway ANOVA was utilized in the search for differences among group means. The mean for administrators ($n = 33$) was 26.9, for faculty ($n = 38$) it was 30.7, and for P & S ($n = 9$) it was 27.3. No significant differences were found among these groups on Scale 1; thus, this hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 4A proposed that the same groups in Hypothesis 4 would differ in their attitudes toward affirmative action at ISU. Scale 2 was used to measure

these groups' attitude. The oneway ANOVA calculated means for the administrators, faculty, and P & S staff; in order, they are 38.8%, 39.5%, and 35.0%. Because an F-test was unable to identify any significant differences [$F(2,77) = .6989, p > .10$], this hypothesis was not accepted.

Hypotheses 5 and 5A intended to measure differences in attitudes of faculty among the academic colleges toward basic affirmative action issues (5) and affirmative action at Iowa State (5A). Using the oneway ANOVA for the main hypothesis, the following means were found for Scale 1: Agriculture ($n = 9$), 38.4; Design ($n = 1$) 27.0; Education ($n = 2$), 28.5; Engineering ($n = 9$), 32.4; Family and Consumer Sciences ($n = 5$), 22.2; Sciences and Humanities ($n = 10$), 28.0; Veterinary Medicine ($n = 2$), 27.0. The College of Business Administration did not have a respondent in this study and the Graduate College does not have a faculty per se. The observed F-value [$(6, 31) = 2.0909$] was large enough to make the differences significant at the .10 level, so the hypothesis was supported. Scheffé's multiple range test reflected the difference between the Colleges of Agriculture and Sciences and Humanities.

Part 5A was measured using Scale 2. Means for the faculty groups are: Agriculture, 43.4; Design, 40.0; Education, 38.0; Engineering, 43.6; Family and Consumer

Sciences, 29.8; Sciences and Humanities, 36.5; and Veterinary Medicine, 43.5. The oneway ANOVA found no significant differences at the .10 level in faculty attitudes toward specific issues of affirmative action at Iowa State University, $F(6, 31) = 1.5503$.

Hypothesis 6 and 6A suggested differences in attitude toward general affirmative action issues (6) and specific issues at Iowa State University (6A) among the areas of employment of Professional & Scientific staff. Due to the low number of P & S staff in the study, the ANOVA procedure was not computed to look for differences in attitude among area of P & S employment. Therefore, no decision was made regarding hypothesis 6 or 6A.

Hypothesis 7 and 7A proposed that the differences in attitudes toward affirmative action would occur among the various areas of administrative employment. Although the collective response from administrators was large enough to make comparisons with faculty and P & S (Hypotheses 4 and 4A), analysis among areas within administrative employment was difficult because the even disbursement of subjects did not create large enough cells for testing. Thus, no action was taken concerning either hypothesis 7 or 7A.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to measure administrative search committee members' attitudes toward affirmative action and locate significant differences among ethnic groups, areas of employment, and between genders.

This chapter includes a summary of the study and research findings, implications of these findings, and recommendations for future research action.

Summary

Subjects' attitudes were measured with an affirmative action questionnaire developed by the investigator utilizing two separate scales. The first scale used nine items to measure attitudes toward general affirmative action issues; scale two measured attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State University by using 10 items that focused on the institution's affirmative action efforts.

Each of the seven hypotheses had two parts that were statistically tested. One part, concentrating on general issues, used scale one in the analysis, while scale two was used for the part which related specifically to affirmative action at Iowa State University.

Women were expected to have significantly more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action issues than men, but this could not be completely supported. Women did have a lower scale one mean score, indicating a more positive attitude for women toward general affirmative action issues than for men. However, the possibility that this difference in scale one mean scores happened by chance is greater than 10 in 100.

A non-directional difference between women's and men's attitudes toward ISU's affirmative action efforts was proposed. Although women had more positive attitudes, the hypothesis was not supported.

Ethnic minority women and men were expected to have more positive attitudes toward general affirmative action issues and different attitudes toward affirmative action at Iowa State University when compared to ethnic majority women and men. Because ethnic minority women and men weren't well represented in the sample population, effective comparisons could not be made.

As expected, white men had significantly less positive attitudes toward general affirmative action issues than white women and ethnic minority men and women, collectively. Also, the attitudes of ethnic minorities and white women were significantly more positive than white men's attitudes

with regard to affirmative action efforts at Iowa State University.

No significant differences were found among administrators, faculty, and P & S staff in their attitudes toward affirmative action, generally or at Iowa State University. As proposed, significant differences in attitudes toward general affirmative action concepts were found among faculty members. Specifically, faculty from Family and Consumer Sciences were significantly more positive toward affirmative action concepts than faculty from the Agriculture and Engineering colleges. In addition, Sciences and Humanities faculty were found to be more positive than faculty from the College of Agriculture.

Professional and Scientific staff and administrators were hypothesized to differ in attitudes toward affirmative action among their respective areas of employment. No action was taken for either hypothesis because cell frequencies were too low for effective statistical analysis.

Implications

First, it is important to make reference to "positiveness" of attitudes presented in this study. Because its focus is unique and few studies are available to make direct comparisons, it is difficult to suggest that one group maintains a negative attitude while another's is

positive. However, as was done by this researcher, it is possible to describe one group's attitude in reference to the attitude of the compared group. Thus, throughout the results of this study, attitudes are described as "less positive" or "more positive" than the other group in the comparison.

The overall results and answering patterns by respondents in protected groups indicate a wide range of positive and negative attitudes. These varying attitudes were focused on two specific issues: excluding certain groups of people in university employment and Affirmative Action as a solution to that exclusion. This implies that it cannot be assumed that all individuals in protected groups have had similar experiences in employment processes and, hence, support affirmative action to the same degree or at all.

Some ethnic minorities and women may disagree with affirmative action because they could be placed in a situation where they question their reason for being hired or being promoted. Were they evaluated and rewarded based on their skills and achievements or because it might enhance the image of the office or department to have ethnic minorities or women on staff? This uncertainty may place

additional pressures on women and ethnic minorities to prove their worth as professionals.

The results and answering patterns of this survey indicate that women and other protected groups may not be organizing into a unified front to recognize or counteract the effects of discrimination in the university workplace.

The results of selected survey items provide an indication that the accuracy of knowledge of affirmative action requirements held by search committee members may be inconsistent.

Item 15 from Scale 2 reads "The requirements of affirmative action may dilute the standards of quality at Iowa State University by forcing the employment of unqualified women and ethnic minorities." Nearly 37% of the sample population agreed, to some extent, even though the guidelines concerning affirmative action program specify that the employer will "make additional efforts to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded" (Guidelines, 1970, p. 421).

Although there was no initial intent on the part of the investigator to empirically analyze the affirmative action knowledge of search committee members, this factor may hold an important connection between search committee members and their attitude toward affirmative action, both generally and

at Iowa State University. Search committee members may be completely or partially misinformed, uninformed, or making assumptions about certain requirements or procedures.

Since women and ethnic minorities are among the groups protected by affirmative action, individually they may have developed a stronger interest in the guidelines and, subsequently, established a more accurate knowledge and better understanding of affirmative action than white men.

The difference in attitude toward general affirmative action issues among selected academic colleges implies that there is a relationship between the traditionally female or male disciplines and attitude toward affirmative action. The faculty of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences was more positive toward affirmative action concepts than the faculty of the colleges of Engineering and Agriculture. Also, faculty from the College of Sciences and Humanities were more positive than faculty of the College of Agriculture.

It may have been expected that differences would exist between Family and Consumer Sciences and the male-dominated disciplines as all respondents from Family and Consumer Sciences were women while Engineering and Agriculture had a total of 24 white male respondents out of their 30 respondents. However, the Sciences and Humanities College

had 13 white male and 5 white female faculty whose attitudes toward general affirmative action were significantly more positive than the 13 white males and the 3 white females from the College of Agriculture.

The attitudinal differences between the faculty of these two colleges may go beyond gender. It may be a product of earlier life and/or career experiences; interaction, support or specific efforts of equality within the particular college; or the type of person attracted to that particular area of study.

The effect of a negative or indifferent attitude lies squarely in the future efforts that faculty, staff, or administrators will extend in creating a more equitable environment for all of its staff. This effort could impact on the search processes for faculty, staff and administrators within a college as well as the university. Also, it may contribute to a climate that, subtly or not, diminishes the work of people from protected groups, thus, maintaining or furthering the discrepancy in rewards, promotion, and hiring.

Based on the results of Item 3 on Scale 1, it may be easy to conclude that white males do not recognize the effect ethnicity and gender have had on the employment process in higher education. In response to Item 3, "If one

works hard in higher education and demonstrates that one is qualified, one will be properly rewarded regardless of one's race or sex," white men agreed while white women and ethnic minorities held no opinion.

If individuals in the sample population are answering solely on their own personal experience rather than what it may be like for others, it is possible that white males aren't necessarily disregarding gender or ethnicity as elements of discrimination. In their particular work environments or employment markets gender and ethnicity may not be considerations because their competition for employment and compensation is mainly from others who are like them (Bernstein, 1984; Moore, 1984).

Schaeff (1985) described this reality in reviewing the White Male System in our society. She points out that "When you are in the middle of [the White Male System], you are usually unaware of it. You eat in it, sleep in it, work, in it, and sooner or later start believing that that is just the way [it] is. You are unaware of the fact that [the White Male system] is not natural until you remove yourself from it and experience [other systems within our culture]."

Thus, hard work may be the primary measure for advancement for white men at this point, especially for senior-level faculty, staff and administrators.

Does this hard-work criterion carry over in evaluating other job applicants, especially women and ethnic minorities? Or does ethnicity and gender, or other characteristics, enter into the evaluation and search process as more important criteria than hard work? Both answers are outside the focus of this study, but both answers would be very helpful in evaluating current employment search processes and making recommendations for future searches and affirmative action efforts.

The results of several comparable survey items indicate that there are differing perceptions toward the recruiting, hiring, and promoting of women, and the recruiting, hiring, and promoting of ethnic minorities. In this case, the implication is that the affirmative action efforts at Iowa State University have been more helpful for women than for ethnic minorities. Specifically, efforts to recruit and hire for administrative positions have been better for women than for ethnic minorities. This is not to imply, however, that the general climate in the workplace is favorable to any one of the protected groups; that conclusion is beyond the scope of this investigation.

Conceivably, the single most important implication is that differences in attitude toward affirmative action exist. If no significant differences were found, than the

people involved in administrative searches would be in some agreement as to the role affirmative action plays in higher education and the efforts at Iowa State University. As it stands, though, there is some disagreement toward the relationship of affirmative action to higher education, and to Iowa State University.

Recommendations

Based on this study and previous studies identified in the literature the following recommendations are suggested:

- 1) Conduct additional empirical research.

Most studies in the literature which measure attitudes toward affirmative action (Kruger, 1974; Lee, 1979; Roman, 1977) are small in sample size, limited to a few independent variables and have somewhat different intentions. Other independent variables need to be examined to provide a more complete picture of attitudes toward affirmative action in higher education. This includes, but is not limited to, length of service to an institution, size of institution, age, level of employment (full professor vs. instructor, etc.) institution's location, tenure status, and status as a public or private institution.

A sample population which is larger and more national in scope would help to solidify conclusions based on smaller, regionally- or institutionally-based sample

populations. This would allow for comparisons of attitudes from different geographic regions.

Also, more systematic research efforts need to be developed which move into the evaluation of effective affirmative action programs in higher education. Model programs which are identified can be shared with college and university administrators for making modifications to their current program.

2) Critically evaluate the performance of the affirmative action program and staff.

In order to improve the affirmative action program it is essential to understand the strengths, weaknesses and image of the office and staff at Iowa State University. A critical evaluation may help the affirmative action staff and its future efforts by pointing out the need for increased staff and, hence, increased funds. It may also highlight the changes and efforts this office has made in trying to aid in creating an equitable employment environment. However, such an analysis may also pinpoint ways in which the office could serve protected classes more efficiently through procedural and budgetary allocation.

The role and image of affirmative action may bring about several perceptions of university faculty and staff toward the general operation and management of the

affirmative action office. University personnel may or may not be aware of the efforts being made by the office and, therefore, may base their opinion of its effectiveness on hearsay. This may result in a lessened support for the affirmative action office and may contribute to a reluctance to seek assistance from the staff. Both of which would diminish the purpose of providing a trained affirmative action staff.

This evaluation would be best served if administered and monitored by a non-university group so as to limit any partiality. However, since that may not be possible, a university-appointed body should be able to conduct such an endeavor; at the least, the affirmative action office should be able to survey the faculty, staff and administration in order to receive honest feedback regarding its performance.

3) Make stronger efforts to educate the university population concerning all areas of affirmative action.

It's important that affirmative action advocates be well informed at all times. Various university entities, such as the Affirmative Action Office, Committee on Women, Faculty Council, Margaret Sloss Women's Center, Minority Student Affairs, Professional and Scientific Council and others, need to share accurate information about affirmative

action so doubts and concerns, as well as misconceptions, can be eliminated.

Affirmative action proponents need to be identified and provided with accurate information. Affirmative action staff need to develop working relationships with these individual proponents so they can be part of a "satellite network" of affirmative action educators and role models within their respective departments.

Educational programs, discussions, or forums dealing with unclear or controversial affirmative action issues could be apart of nearly any level of regular staff meeting or special session.

4) Increase efforts to gather support from areas of employment dominated by white males.

As documented in the review of literature (Bernstein, 1984; Affirmative Action Progress Report, 1987; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; and Synder, 1987) white men dominate higher levels of employment, such as administrators, faculty, and Professional & Scientific staff, and certain academic disciplines. These decision makers are very influential to the overall success of affirmative action at this university. Extra effort needs to be taken to work with these people in clearing misconceptions, offering suggestions and assistance in any way possible. Within

academic departments, especially traditional male disciplines like agriculture and engineering, educational opportunities need to be extended that speak to the nature of the group.

5) Provide additional educational opportunities focusing specifically on employment search procedures.

For an employment search to operate smoothly, effectively and fairly, those more directly involved should be informed of all affirmative action guidelines. Ideally, this information should be provided in a group presentation or workshop format so questions and concerns could be addressed. This type of workshop would be geared for major search committee chairpersons which, most likely, would include assistant deans or directors and heads of academic departments. In addition publications such as quick-reference manuals, procedural checklists and progress update forms could be developed for search committee chairs.

6) Create opportunities for graduate students to work in the Affirmative Action Office.

Graduate assistantships or internships would be beneficial experiences for all involved. From a graduate student's perspective; she/he would learn valuable skills such as administration in higher education, educational

outreach and correspondence, and contract compliance impacted by university and federal government milieus.

This participation may affect the Affirmative Action Office by addressing concerns with understaffing. Also, participating graduate students may choose to explore career opportunities in affirmative action and, at the least, establish themselves as proponents of the program.

7) Study the perceptions of the various protected groups toward affirmative action and the efforts the Affirmative Action Office at Iowa State University.

This investigation was not intended to be a comprehensive study of attitudes of the individual protected groups. With the groups which were surveyed, however, there was evidence to suggest that a wide range of positive and negative attitudes toward affirmative action exist on the campus.

Given that each group has had a separate history of discrimination, it is essential that the Affirmative Action Office develop a system or process of addressing the separate needs of each group.

Conclusion

Measuring attitudes toward affirmative action in higher education is relatively new at this point. This study served, in part, to confirm earlier research that

differences exist in people's attitude toward affirmative action. Based on the study's findings, the author was able to suggest that specific differences in attitude of search committee members were related to their gender, ethnicity, and academic area of employment.

It is evident from this study and the literature that more research needs to be completed to create a clear understanding of why people differ in their attitudes toward affirmative action. Until that research occurs, it is essential that faculty, staff, administrators, and students be involved in implementing specific strategies to assist in the development and support of affirmative action programs and staff. Furthermore, that action should address the needs of search committee members throughout the search process.

It is unfortunate that affirmative action is necessary and especially so for higher education. In the classroom students are evaluated on performance and achievement, but in university offices faculty, staff and administrators are sometimes evaluated on attributes unrelated to their skills as a professional.

If equal opportunity for everyone is an important goal for higher education and Iowa State University, action and a commitment to move forward must continue.

REFERENCES

- Affirmative action progress report: November 1, 1986 - October 31, 1987. (1987). Ames, IA: Iowa State University Affirmative Action Office.
- Alfred, R. and Good, M. (1972) The status of women in higher education and the professions: Metropolitan junior college. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 070 436).
- Allport, G.W. (1967). Attitudes. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement (pp. 1-14). New York: John Wiley.
- Appleton, J.R. (1971). Survey of minority group persons in student affairs positions at NASPA member institutions. NASPA Journal, 2 (2), 96-105.
- Association of American Colleges. (1987).
- Association of American Colleges. (1988).
- Astin, H. & Bayer, A. (1972). Sex discrimination in academe. In A. Rossi & A. Calderwood (Eds.), Academic women on the move. (pp. 333-356). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bernstein, A. (1984). Foundation support for administrative advancement: A mixed record. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in higher education administration (pp. 77-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brubacher, J., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition: A history of american colleges and universities. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1975). Making affirmative action work in higher education analysis of institutional and federal policies with recommendation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, C. (1979). Why racial preference is illegal and immoral. Commentary, 67, 40-52.

- College and University Personnel Association (1984), The 1984 administrative compensation surveys. Washington, D. C.: Author.
- Fields, C. (1988, June 29). 10 years after Bakke ruling, opinion on affirmative action still polarized. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 14-16.
- Frances, C., & Mensel, R. (1981). Women and minorities in the administration of higher education institutions: Employment patterns and salary comparisons 1978-79 and an analysis of progress toward affirmative action goals 1975-76 to 1978-79. Washington, D.C.: College University Personnel Association.
- Glazer, N. (1982). Is affirmative action reverse discrimination?: Compensation for the past is a dangerous principle. In K. Finsterbush & G. McKenna (Eds.), Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial social issues (pp. 208-213). Guilford, CN: Dushkin.
- Gordon, H. (1977). The effects of affirmative action on the role of the employment screening committee. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 589).
- Gray, M. (1987). The halls of ivy and the halls of justice: Lightening the burden. Academe, 73(3), 61-63.
- Greenlaw, P. & Kuhl, J. (1982). Age discrimination in employment guidelines. Personnel Journal, 61, 224-228.
- Guidelines on discrimination because of national origin. (1970). Federal Register, 35(8), 421.
- Harter, C. (1982). Women and minority professional staff in student personnel: A census and analysis. NASPA Journal, 20(2), 42-50.
- Hubbard, W. (1978). Affirmative action: The law and politics of equality. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- ISU Self Study. (1984). Ames: Iowa State University, Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- Jacobs, D. (1985, May 18). Reagan's war on quotas. Newsday, p. 16-17.

- Kahn, E. (1984, February). Women in academe haven't made it yet [Letter to the editor]. The New York Times, p. E18.
- Kahn, E. (1985, May). A study of faculty women. Paper presented at the Third Annual New Jersey Research Conference on Women. Douglass College, New Brunswick.
- Karnes, D. (1981). The legality of preferential treatment after Weber. In D. Corpus & L. Rosenzweig (Eds.), OFCCP and federal contract compliance (pp. 169-196). New York: Practising Law Institute.
- Kruger, P. (1974). Attitudes of faculty and administrators toward affirmative action in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Leatherman, C. (1988, March 9). House votes 315-98 to widen scope of anti-bias laws at institutions that receive federal funds. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1, A26.
- Lee, C.F. (1979). Attitudes and perceptions of administrations and faculty members concerning the implementation of affirmative action goals for women in selected two-year colleges in New Jersey and the southeastern counties of Pennsylvania. Dissertation Abstracts International.
- Linenberger, P. & Keaveny, T. (1979). Age discrimination in employment: A guide for employers. The Personnel Administrator, 24, 87-98.
- Moore, K.M. (1984). Careers in college and university administration: How are women affected. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in higher education administration (pp. 5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, K.M. (1985). Today's academic leaders: A national study of administrators in community and junior colleges. University Park. Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 246 922).
- Myers, E.M. & Sandeen, A. (1973). Survey of minority and women student affairs staff members employed in NASPA member institutions. NASPA Journal, 11(1), 2-20.

- National Education Association Research. (1972). Salaries paid and salary-related practices in higher education, 1971-72. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Pfafflin, S.M. (1984). Women, science, and technology. American Psychologist, 39, 1183-1186.
- Professional and Scientific Salary Report. (1986). Ames: Iowa State University, Professional and Scientific Council.
- Rickard, S.T. (1985). The chief student affairs officer: Progress toward equity. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(1), 5-10.
- Robbins, L. and Kahn, E. (1985). Sex discrimination and sex equity for faculty women in the 1980s. Journal of Social Issues, 41(4), 1-16.
- Roman, G.D. (1977). A study of attitudes of university administrators toward affirmative action in federal region VIII. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1928A-1929A.
- Sandler, B.R. (1974). Discrimination is immoral, illegal and, offenders find, costly. College and University Business, 6, 27-30.
- Sandler, B.R. (1983). Women in higher education, where we have been and where we are going; these are times that try men's souls. (Available from Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Washington, D.C.)
- Schaef, A. (1985). Women's reality: An emerging female system in a white male system. New York: Harper & Row.
- Synder, T. (1987). Digest of education statistics. Washington D.C.: Center for Education Statistics.
- Sternhill, C. (1984). The tenure battle: The women who won't disappear. Ms., October, 94-98.
- Tinsley, A. & Rueban, E. (1973). Academic women, sex discrimination and the law. (Available form MCA Commission on the Status of Women.)

- Tolbert, P.S. (1986). Organizations and inequality: Sources of earnings differences between male and female faculty. Sociology of Education, 59, 227-235.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1987). Higher Education Staff Information. In T.D. Snyder (Ed.) Digest of Educational Statistics (p. 158) Washington, D.C.: Center for Educational Statistics.
- Vaughn, D.H. (1982). Employment quotas--discrimination or affirmative action? Employee Relations Law Journal, 7, p. 552-566.
- Weatherspoon, F.D. (1985). Equal employment opportunity and affirmative action: A sourcebook. New York: Garland.
- Weiss, R.J. (1987). Affirmative action: A brief history. The Journal of Intergroup Relations, 15(2), 40-54.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY AND LETTER

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

College of Education
Professional Studies
N243 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011

Telephone 515-294-4143

May 26, 1988

Dear ISU Colleague:

We are conducting a study of Affirmative Action in higher education; the enclosed questionnaire is part of this study. Since you have served on an ISU search committee within the past three years, we are asking your participation in completing the survey and returning it to us at the Department of Professional Studies, N243 Lagomarcino Hall by June 6, 1988.

This study is entirely independent of the Affirmative Action Office at ISU. Your responses to this survey will form the base for Mr. Corey Miller's thesis. Mr. Miller is presently a Master of Science candidate in Education (Higher Education) at Iowa State University.

We would be most grateful if you would assist us in collecting the necessary data to conclude this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to us. Complete anonymity of individual responses is assured.

Your cooperation in this effort is greatly valued.

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers
Professor and Chair
Professional Studies

Corey Miller
Master of Science Candidate

(Please return before June 6, 1988)

Return to: Corey T. Miller Professional Studies N243 Logomarcino Hall
--

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Personal Information. Please check the appropriate response.

1. Gender: Female____ Male____
2. Age: 25 or under____ 26-30____ 31-40____ 41-50____
51-60____ 61 or over____
3. Race/Ethnicity: American Indian or Alaskan Native____
Asian or Pacific Islander____
Black, not of Hispanic origin____
Hispanic____
White, not of Hispanic origin____
4. Number of Years at ISU:_____
5. Number of ISU Search Committees on which you served from July 1, 1985 to the present:_____
6. Primary type of employment at Iowa State University:
Administrator____ (more than 50% of time devoted to administration)
Faculty____
Professional & Scientific____
Student____
Non-ISU Personnel____
7. ISU College Affiliation:
Agriculture____ Business Administration____
Design____ Education____ Engineering____
Family and Consumer Sciences____
Sciences and Humanities____ Veterinary Medicine____
Not assigned to a college____
8. ISU Employment Affiliation (nonfaculty only):
Business and Finance____ Extension____
Planning and Development____ Research____
Student Affairs____ Other____

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL THREE PAGES

II. QUESTIONS. You are given the choice of seven responses for each numbered item: Strongly Agree, Agree, Slightly Agree, No Opinion, Slightly Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Please indicate your response to each item by marking the answer which most nearly represents your reaction.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION is defined as the additional efforts made by an employer to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded in an attempt to correct the effects of past discrimination.

Please begin by marking your personal reaction to the following general Affirmative Action items.

1) It is only just and fair that universities make the additional efforts of Affirmative Action.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Slightly Agree
No Opinion
Slightly Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2) The creation and implementation of Affirmative Action Programs in higher education is necessary.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3) If one works hard in higher education and demonstrates that one is qualified, one will be properly rewarded regardless of one's race or sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4) With Affirmative Action, people who make decisions regarding university employment will discriminate against white males.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5) If higher education were left alone, the system would naturally open up to include more women.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6) If higher education were left alone, the system would naturally open up to include more ethnic minorities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7) Women and ethnic minorities hired under the requirements of Affirmative Action would be resented by their colleagues more than if employed without such a plan.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8) Although the goal of including minorities and women in the system is a desirable one, the forced implementation of Affirmative Action in higher education will be detrimental to the reaching of this goal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9) The future role of Affirmative Action will be minimal in the hiring practices of higher education.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please continue by responding to these items about Affirmative Action at ISU.

10) The Affirmative Action Office at Iowa State University should be given more support in terms of resources and cooperation by the administration of the university.

11) ISU should refuse federal contracts, thus not be required to comply with Affirmative Action regulations.

12) The federal government should not impose its requirements on the administrative recruitment process of Iowa State University.

13) Regarding Affirmative Action, a positive change in the number of ethnic minorities hired in administrative positions has been made at ISU.

14) Regarding Affirmative Action, a positive change in the number of women hired in administrative positions has been made at ISU.

15) The requirements of Affirmative Action may dilute the standards of quality at Iowa State University by forcing the employment of unqualified women and ethnic minorities.

16) Iowa State University is "dragging its feet" with regard to the Affirmative Action Programs.

17) Iowa State University is making good faith efforts to recruit women for administrative positions.

18) Iowa State University is making good faith efforts to recruit ethnic minorities for administrative positions.

19) Iowa State University is committed to fulfilling the spirit as well as the laws pertaining to Affirmative Action requirements.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Slightly Agree
 No Opinion
 Slightly Disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PLEASE RETURN BEFORE JUNE 6, 1988

to: Corey T. Miller
 Professional Studies
 N243 Lagomarcino Hall

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT ON HUMAN SUBJECTS

INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Attitudes of Search Committee Members
Toward Affirmative Action in Higher Education

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Corey T. Miller 4-15-88
Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date Signature of Principal Investigator
407 Welch Ave., Ames, IA 292-4993
Campus Address Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator
 Major Professor

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

- Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- Deception of subjects
- Subjects under 14 years of age and (or) Subjects 14-17 years of age
- Subjects in Institutions
- Research must be approved by another institution or agency



5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

- Signed informed consent will be obtained.
- Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: 04 25 88
Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: 05 16 88

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and (or) identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

Month Day Year

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit
 4-15-88 Professional Studies

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:
 Project Approved Project not approved No action required
George G. Karas 5/5/88
Name of Committee Chairperson Date Signature of Committee Chairperson