Is Affirmative Action Still Necessary? Analysis of Minority-Working Adults' Perceptions

Steven Cates

Overton Graduate School of Business, Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia, USA

*Correspondence: Steven Cates, Email: stvncts@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: Over the past three decades, the United States has struggled valiantly to overcome that disgusting legacy as it moves toward to eliminate race, and gender inequality, and the uprooting of prejudice and discrimination. Out of this struggle, came the birth of affirmative action. It has left politicians, social scientists, and economists debating its merits and possible alternatives. From the Supreme Court to the dinner table, the potential effects of this policy on our legal, political and social system have been argued.

This study analyzes the perceptions protected class employees in terms of the affirmative action in employment. Utilizing a sample of 151 protected class working adults, data analysis provided mixed support to the stated hypotheses which suggested that affirmative action had eliminated most discriminatory practices in corporate America. The results of this study answer the question of this study asserting the necessity of the affirmative action.

Keywords: Affirmative Action, Discrimination, Prejudice, Gender, Race

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Author(s): Steven Cates

Received: 19 Feb, 2021; **Accepted:** 08 Mar, 2021; **Published:** 25 Mar, 2021;
e-ISSN: 2347-4696;

Paper Id: BMN-IJBMR-2021-24;

Citation: doi.org/10.37391/IJBMR.090114

Webpage-link:

<https://ijbmr.forexjournal.co.in/archive/volume-9/ijbmr-090114.html>

1. INTRODUCTION

The term "Affirmative Action" as it applies to organizations that operate in the U.S. is commonly understood to include the collective policies and procedures that are taken to address the underutilization of women and minorities and to promote equal opportunity for protected class persons in the application, employment, training and development where minorities have historically been excluded.

The Office of Federal Contract and Compliance Programs (OFCCP) has determined that affirmative action policies should bar preferential treatment in selection in employment, education, and public contracting. In fact, these policies are intended to encourage organizations to improve their diversity efforts so they match standards found in society and to redress the perceived disadvantages practiced before the affirmative action [1]. Historically, discrimination against minorities and women was not only accepted, but the constitution condoned and protected it.

The doctrine of white supremacy was so much part of the American culture that in 1857, the United States government's policy concluded that both the North and the South regarded slaves as being of an inferior order. The Supreme Court concluded that slaves were not suitable to associate with Caucasian society from a social and political position [2]. Throughout the American history, African-Americans, women, and other racial minorities were treated less than

citizens. Both African-American and women were not allowed to run for a political office or to even serve on juries. They also did not have the right to file a lawsuit on their own.

Moreover, women of all ages were not allowed to own property and could not serve as the rightful, legal guardian of their own biological children.

The federal government saw the concept of affirmative action as a process that would correct past discriminatory actions taken against African Americans, women and other disadvantaged ethnic groups that have been subjected to discrimination and socio-economic and political prejudices. The concept of affirmative action has as its purpose the voluntary actions by companies who are governmental contractors to increase the opportunities for employment, development and promotions of protected class groups in schools and in the workplace. African American, women, and other minority groups are proportionately under-represented in an area such as in employment or education.

This is predominantly due the historical discriminatory treatment against protected class people in that particular group. In such case, it is believed that government action giving members of the minority group preferential treatment is necessary to achieve a proportionate distribution. Affirmation action was seen as a transitional strategy, with the intent that over a period of time, the effect of past discrimination would be sufficiently countered. As a result, there would not be a need for affirmative action (U. S. Government, 2004).

This study investigated the perceptions of protected class persons (working adults) in terms of the affirmative action. It was found that the surveyed employees supported the continuity of the affirmative action for employee working in private and public organizations in US organizations.

2. BACKGROUND OF THIS STUDY

2.1 Discrimination and Prejudice Forms

Discrimination exists in various forms in every organization including age, disability, race, religion, national origin, and gender.

Eliminating processes of discrimination is a significant factor of doing business due to the many factors, including legal issues as well as negative publicity that will impact the business factors of success in any organization. This will also result in charges from the EEOC and other governmental agencies. The cost of legal fees and penalties could also result in major fines and monetary settlements. There are multiple policies and procedures that can be implemented to address discrimination in the workplace including implementing zero tolerance practices, diversity and inclusion strategies, role playing exercises for managers along with extensive managerial training programs [1]. The occurrence of prejudice and discrimination has been an unfortunate phenomenon impacting every facet of American life.

Discrimination has existed in various forms involving unfair social, academic, occupational, and residential practices for various different reasons [1].

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission defines discrimination as defined by the 1964 Civil Rights Act and its amendments as unfavorable or unfair treatment of a person or class of persons in comparison to others who are not members of the protected class because of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, physical or mental handicap, sexual harassment [1]. When examined from childhood to later life, the experience of discrimination can be profound, and it can limit opportunities in various areas ranging from occupations to place of residency.

Discrimination in the work environment can be seen as any unfair practices that are perceived or are evident when an employee is treated differently than their peers. This includes treatment that is solely based on gender, ethnic background, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, or sexual orientation.

Additionally, the issue of discrimination carried legal and monetary penalties against the organization [3]. The statistics from the EEOC shows prejudice and discrimination against minority groups have diminished in US work environments and racial segregation has become illegal [4]. Additionally, discrimination based on age, race, sex, disability and religion is much less common than it was during the 1950s and 1960s.

However, modern discrimination is now taking a more covert form of prejudice and discrimination that has emerged [4]. Modern discrimination is evident when people privately harbor negative attitudes towards minority groups, but express them only when they feel that they are justified or that it is safe to do so [4]. Discrimination still exists today as organizations might overtly support the concept of equality but do not actually practice diversity and inclusion.

2.2 History of Affirmative Action

The term "Affirmative Action" was first introduced in a discriminatory context by President John F. Kennedy in 1961 who issued Executive Order 10925 [5]. Although cited as the first reference to affirmative action, Executive Order No. 10925 was important for other reasons. First, it required the incorporation in all federal contracts of an equal employment opportunity clause. Second, it established a mechanism for enforcing the mandated clause [5]. Affirmative Action was created by President Johnson with Executive Order 11246.

The Voting Rights of 1965 was passed to ensure no discrimination and prohibited discrimination in voting, in public education, and in employment. Title VII of the Civil Right Act offered a similar understanding of affirmative action as Executive Order 10925. The purpose of Title VII of the Civil Right Act of 1964, as amended, was to improve the economic and social conditions of women and minorities by providing equality of opportunity in the workplace [5]. Title VII prohibits employers with fifteen or more employees engaged in industry affecting commerce to discriminate against employees on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The explicit ban on discrimination in the Civil Rights Act appears at Title VII section 703 (a) which reads in part: "It shall be an unlawful practice for an employer (1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, condition, or privileges or employment, because such individual's race, color, sex, or national origin; or (2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees or applicants for employment in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin" [5].

Title VII was a merging of the history of employment law and the social change of the civil rights movement. Affirmative action was bought about as a result of an ideological change in employment relations and the role of the government.

2.3 The Creation of Affirmative Action

The changing ideology in relation to the employment relationship and the role of the government created the need for government intervention to ensure protected class persons receive equal and fair treatment to their white counterparts. Although affirmative action is looked at in terms of Title VII or the equal protection clause, neither has played the largest role in bringing it about.

The purpose of affirmative action is to address the discrepancies resulting from historical events such as slavery or social pressures that are not necessarily attributable to an employer's or union's own discrimination. This is done by efforts geared toward increasing the number of minorities in a given workforce [5]. While Title VII prohibits discrimination and attempts to guarantee equal opportunity for individuals

regardless of age, sex, race, etc., it does not command employers to achieve equality of result in an effort to address discrepancies. Instead, the Act created a new federal agency within the U.S.

Department of Labor called the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) which serves to command employers to achieve equality. The EEOC acts as a facilitator between plaintiffs and private employers and also pressures violating employers to provide compensation in the form of back pay or restitution. The EEOC also provides legal support for plaintiffs should the plaintiffs pursue their grievances in court [6].

The President's Committee on EEOC was later replaced by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, in the Fair Labor Standards Act. In fact, it was the Executive Order No. 11246 that created the Office of Federal Contract Compliance in the Department of Labor. Executive Order No. 11246 order was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on September 24, 1965. Much of its language was similar to EO 10925 and parts of Title VII. EO 11246 was later amended in 1970 and again in 1971 to become Revised Order No. 4 [5].

2.4 Presidential Executive Order 11246

The main purpose of Executive Order No. 11246, as amended, was to improve the economic and social conditions of minorities by providing equality of opportunity in the workplace. The executive Order itself lays down the general principles of non-construction contractors' agreement. The basic requirements of the executive order are that federal contractors having contracts or subcontracts with the government in excess of \$10,000 must comply with the non-discrimination requirements. One of the requirements is that federal contractors refrain from discriminating against any employee or job applicant on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Secondly, the contractors or subcontractors with a contract of \$50,000 or more and having fifty or more employees must, as well as desisting from discrimination, take the following actions [5]: Prepare an annual written affirmative action program to ensure non-discrimination, to monitor the workforce composition and in the event of the under-utilization of minorities or women, prepare a plan to correct any imbalance, including the setting of goals and time tables. State their equal opportunity commitment in all job advertisements. Inform all labor unions with which they deal with of the commitments under the Order. Include all the obligations under the Order in any subcontract they enter into.

Allow access to all material that might be relevant to establishing whether they are complying. File regular compliance reports with the OFCCP.

2.5 The Pros and Cons to Affirmative Action

Affirmative action policies have sparked debate and raised very important issues amongst, schools, politicians and businesses for over 40 years. Many look at affirmative action

as a way to diversify their companies and schools but have in many cases taken it way out of context. Those that oppose affirmative action have their reasons for doing so, which has raised issues for legislation.

Many argue that those whom the policies were created for are not the primary beneficiaries. While a fight continues for equality, many contend that the uses of affirmative action policies are allowing "certain individuals" to receive something they don't deserve [7]. In the education arena, many that oppose of such policies feel that the policies tend to provide a quick fix for deeper social problems; discriminating against clever, rich people to give thicker, poorer ones a leg-up is unfair and likely to damage higher education without improving society" [8].

Some suggest that recent studies have indicated that affirmative action policies upheld by many colleges and universities have shown that students admitted through affirmative action programs tend to perform lower academically as they are in many cases inadequately prepared to compete in their new academic environment. Furthermore, the ending results of providing racial preferences does more harm than good for blacks because their lack of preparedness causes them to fail to graduate, many feel that these students are cheated the opportunity to reach for success at an institution better equipped with the tools and resources necessary to prepare them for future professional success.

A study of medical students who were admitted under affirmative action policies showed that not only did few of them graduate but "black students were less likely to pass U.S. medical licensing examinations, one-in-four failed the first step of the test compared to two whites out of 81 who failed" [9]. Those who oppose affirmative action also warn advocates that such policies cause reverse discrimination. Affirmative action policies become discriminatory against a whole other group of people; when preference is given to one group or individual, you are automatically discriminating against another group or individual".

Michael Ryan filed a suit against the Federal Aviation Agency, claiming reverse discrimination as a result of him being passed up for a management position as a result of the FAA attempting to comply with affirmative action policies. "The FAA settled the suit with Ryan with remedy being placing Ryan in the management position, plus \$100,000 in retroactive pay, \$380,000 in lawyer's fees, and a pledge to improve its hiring and promotion policies and practices". While there remains mixed feelings about affirmative action policies, advocates seem to have a very different perspective compared to those who oppose of it.

Many believe that affirmative action programs receive more support when respondents believe that the target group has historically experienced discrimination and when affirmative action policies are not clearly defined, there tends to be a greater level of differentiated opinions concerning the need. Furthermore, affirmative action policies tend to enhance organizational diversity which creates competitive advantage

and increases responsiveness to its customers [10]. Today, arguments persist that affirmative action, contrary to the claims of its supporters, is a quota system that leads to unfair preferences for certain groups.

Most people think of quotas as numerical requirements, such as specific and measurable target for employers in hiring acceptable levels of minorities. While the original language of Executive Order 11246 addressed the diversity of applicants only, and not those ultimately chosen, some people argue that efforts to meet the numerical goal tend to override all other considerations, most particularly, qualifications, in the final selection process [11]. They claimed this practice to be “reverse discrimination”.

Examples of “reverse discrimination” are instances in which Caucasian male applicants with superior qualifications are turned away from a job in favor of a minority applicant [11]. “This system erodes the American ideal that anyone who works hard and plays by the book has an equal chance to achieve his or her goals” [11]. Such discrimination fosters divisiveness, resentment, and interracial disharmony. Some people insist that affirmative action does not work and never has, claiming that its policies have harmed the very individual they were designed to help.

The critics maintain that affirmative action, by rewarding race or gender rather than merit, cast doubts over the success of its recipient. Also, opponents of affirmative action state that the policy undermines the achievement of women and minorities by creating the perception that their position were given to them rather than earned. Furthermore, affirmative action fosters the idea that African Americans, women, and minority groups are inferior and therefore are incapable of competing successfully if they are held to the same standards as Caucasian counterparts [11].

On the contrary, supporters of affirmative action argue it does work and that it is largely responsible for whatever gains minorities and women have attained in business and in education, since it was introduced [11]. One of the reasons affirmative action works is because affirmative action programs are an effective way to neutralize the biases, stereotypes, and prejudices that often seep into selection processes, consciously or unconsciously. It is stated that affirmative action forces employers to reach out beyond the “old boys’ network” to give a fair consideration to candidates who are qualified but who don’t fit their preconceptions.

In addition, affirmative action benefits society as a whole. Affirmative action programs that increase opportunities for women and minorities are beneficial to society in numerous ways: Affirmative action programs that help women advance in the workplace are helping families to make ends meet. Most women work because of economic need. In many instances, many women are the sole source of support for their families.

Affirmative action programs expand the talent pool for businesses to draw on; many companies report that a diverse workforce has led to enhance performance and productivity.

Communities benefit from affirmative action in countless ways. For example, increase recruitment and training of women police officers, prosecutors, judges and court personnel has led to an improvement in the handling of domestic violence cases, which benefit women, children, and other family members, as well as the community who are affected by violence in the home [11]. Moreover, those who favor affirmative action insist that the need for its programs remains high.

Supporters cite statistics showing that positions of status in society remain a nearly exclusive support of Caucasian males, despite advances implemented through affirmative action policies. It is stated that only six-tenth of one percent of senior management positions are held by African Americans, three tenths of a percent were held by Asians Americans [2]. In 1995, President Clinton announced “White males makes up 43 percent of our workforce but hold 95 percent of these jobs” [2].

According to the National Organization for Women, for every dollar earned by men, women on a whole earn 74 cents, African American women earn 63 cents and Latina women earn 57 cents. According to the Census Bureau, only 25% of all doctors and lawyers are women. Less than 1% of auto mechanics are women. And women are only 8.4% of engineers [12]. Affirmative action has been used as a method of keeping the peace. Affirmative action is not expected to eradicate or solve the economic disadvantages that African-American, women, and other minorities of different racial backgrounds have faced.

However, it has had an opposite effect, whether intended or not, to pacify leaders. Civil Rights activists have become attached to the idea of affirmative action has become a symbol of progress for women and minority issues. When it comes to the debate of affirmative action, supporters can agree with opponent’s complaint that affirmative action has hurt their credibility. The negative stigma of affirmative action can really have a psychological effect on those who benefit from it.

First, affirmative action can create a feeling of inferiority because of the lowering of traditional standards, such as test scores and qualifications that are often accompanied with the policy. Such a practice inevitably sends the message to a person that: “You are not good enough to do it on your own”. Also, when an African American or woman receives a position, whether it is in high demand or not, there is the suspicion in the person’s mind that he or she has received the position as a result of a lowered standards and preferential treatment due to his or race or gender. Clearly, the debate of affirmative action will continue to be an issue in our place of employment, our political legal system, and our schools as long as widespread discrimination exists.

It is up to us to consider the policy’s strengths and weaknesses, its context and alternatives. It is up to us to discuss the issue intelligently and respectfully, considering the

arguments on all sides. Only in doing so will we find a way to create a society of equality and opportunity for all.

3. OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

The objective of this study was to investigate the perceptions of minority-working audits toward the continuity of the affirmative action. The responses of the surveyed minority-working audits were analyzed based on the research questions derived from the items of the in the distributed in the survey questionnaire as presented in Appendix 1.

1. Should the affirmative action continue in the Law?
2. Has the affirmative action eliminated employment discrimination against minorities and women?
3. Has the affirmative action eliminated discrimination in terms of training and development opportunities for minorities and women?
4. Has the affirmative action eliminated discrimination in terms of promotional opportunities for minorities and women?
5. Has the affirmative action eliminated discrimination in terms of disciplinary actions for minorities and women?
6. Has the affirmative action eliminated discrimination in terms of employment terminations for minorities and women?
7. Should the affirmative action be removed from the Law?
8. Will the racism and sexism be removed from the American society?

Based on the above research questions and reviewing the literature on affirmative action, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

H1: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate that the affirmative action should continue in the Law.

H2: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate the affirmative action has eliminated employment discrimination against minorities and women.

H3: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate the affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in training and development opportunities for minorities and women.

H4: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate the affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in promotional opportunities for minorities and women.

H5: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate the affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in disciplinary actions for minorities and women.

H6: The majority of the surveyed minority-working Audits will indicate the affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in employment terminations for minorities and women.

H7: The majority of the surveyed minority-working audits will indicate that the affirmative action should not be removed from the Law.

H8: The majority of the surveyed minority-working audits will indicate that the racism and sexism will be removed from the American society.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Survey Questionnaire

Data was collected from surveys completed by the surveyed minority-working adults who were polled concerning their beliefs about affirmative action. These surveys were completed at local community colleges where working adults take classes in the evening. The data was then analyzed concerning those beliefs to test the hypotheses put forth.

Both correlation and analysis of variance statistical computations were run on the data to obtain the reported results in this paper. Using surveys conducting similar types of research were used in this research study. The survey questionnaire instrument was derived from the literature. The subject matter of the survey questionnaire consisted of 8 questions using a five-point Likert scale where the answers will be arranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questions were selected that would most strongly provide response to the hypotheses derived from the research question and the lack of research found in the literature.

4.2 Sample and Data Collection

The survey questionnaires were handed out in class by the Instructor with the instructions for the student to complete the questionnaire. As an incentive the student received five points on their next test. The surveys were completed individually and then collected by the instructor.

A total of 151 surveys were successfully completed and used for data analysis in this study. A copy of the Survey is in Appendix I.

5. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

All results must be developed according to the above research questions and the developed hypotheses. Based on the outcomes, state the hypothesis and mention if it was supported or not. The results below are NOT acceptable. This paper can NOT be published unless the results can be shown as answers (positive or negative) to the 8-tested hypotheses. The results must referred to in Tables (e.g., Table 1 and the title of the Table below) A total of (n=) 151 surveys were successfully completed and use for this study. There were 124 females and 27 males involved.

			Race	Gender	Age	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8
Spearm an's rho	Race	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.292**	.069	-.292**	.071	.326**	.054	-.154	.108	.069	-.631**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.	.000	.399	.000	.388	.000	.512	.060	.185	.400	.000
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Gender	Correlation Coefficient	-.292**	1.000	-.439**	.188*	.049	-.275**	-. .278**	-.050	-.100	-.339**	.166*
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.	.000	.021	.549	.001	.001	.541	.222	.000	.041
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Age	Correlation Coefficient	.069	-.439**	1.000	.254**	-.327**	-.183*	.034	-.083	-.211**	-.026	-.039
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.399	.000	.	.002	.000	.024	.675	.311	.009	.747	.631
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q1	Correlation Coefficient	-.292**	.188*	.254**	1.000	-.073	-.359**	-. .495**	-. .215**	-.251**	-.464**	.166*
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.021	.002	.	.375	.000	.000	.008	.002	.000	.041
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q2	Correlation Coefficient	.071	.049	-.327**	-.073	1.000	.581**	.587**	.134	.179*	-.419**	-.320**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.388	.549	.000	.375	.	.000	.000	.100	.028	.000	.000
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q3	Correlation Coefficient	.326**	-.275**	-.183*	-.359**	.581**	1.000	.707**	.236**	.418**	.132	-.349**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.001	.024	.000	.000	.	.000	.004	.000	.106	.000
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q4	Correlation Coefficient	.054	-.278**	.034	-.495**	.587**	.707**	1.000	.494**	.435**	.084	-.049
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.512	.001	.675	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.305	.546
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q5	Correlation Coefficient	-.154	-.050	-.083	-.215**	.134	.236**	.494**	1.000	.672**	.181*	.403**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.060	.541	.311	.008	.100	.004	.000	.	.000	.026	.000
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q6	Correlation Coefficient	.108	-.100	-.211**	-.251**	.179*	.418**	.435**	.672**	1.000	.182*	-.130
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.185	.222	.009	.002	.028	.000	.000	.000	.	.026	.111
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q7	Correlation Coefficient	.069	-.339**	-.026	-.464**	-.419**	.132	.084	.181*	.182*	1.000	.286**
		Sig. (2- tailed)	.400	.000	.747	.000	.000	.106	.305	.026	.026	.	.000

		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Q8	Correlation Coefficient	-.631**	.166*	-.039	.166*	-.320**	-.349**	-.049	.403**	-.130	.286**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.041	.631	.041	.000	.000	.546	.000	.111	.000	.
		N	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151

Table 1: Correlations Table.

There were 9 Hispanics, 34 whites and 108 blacks that took part. There were 36 people who were from 19-25 years old; 70 that were between 26-35; 36 that were between 36-45; 9 between the ages of 46-55 and none older that participated. In looking at the correlation results there is a significant level of inverse correlation between age and the awareness of affirmative action. This may be due to the lessening of awareness of such legislature in today's business climate. However there was marked correlations between race and gender as to knowing about affirmative action. In testing H1: Affirmative action has eliminated discrimination against minorities and women; the authors look to the data collected on Question 2.

The data provided little correlation to support this Hypothesis from a race and gender standpoint. However there was a large inverse relationship with age. This would indicate that persons that were older than the norm may remember more discriminate events and this is the reason for these responses. Therefore H1 must be rejected and accept the alternative. In testing H2: Affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in training and development opportunities for minorities and women, data was analyzed from Question 3.

Race had a significant correlation with this issue while we see a large inverse relationship occurring with gender and age. Based on the significant correlations, both positive and negative, H2 has support and will be accepted while the alternative will be rejected. The third hypothesis, H3, wishes to determine if affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in promotional opportunities for minorities and women. We turn to the data collected on Question 4.

In review of the data we find the correlations not significant enough to support the null hypothesis and we will reject it and accept the alternative. Hypothesis 4 wishes to ascertain if there is fair justice for women and minorities by asking if affirmative action has eliminated discrimination in disciplinary

actions for minorities and women. We turn to the data collected on Question 5 for this analysis. There was no significant support for this hypothesis and therefore the null is rejected and the alternative is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 is a continuation of hypothesis 4 in that it asks: do corrective actions end up being greater for women and minorities in the form of termination of their employment due to discriminatory practices? To answer this question we turn to Question 6. There was little to no significant support for this hypothesis although inverse correlation was higher among those older in the sample. Therefore the null cannot be supported and we reject it and support the alternative. Two other questions we asked to further gauge if affirmative action was necessary in today's society.

Question 7 was posed and gender was significantly impacted by the significance of response. Age and race were predicted to have high correlates as well but this was not supported. Question 8 was asked to determine if the issue of racism or sexism outside the issue of affirmative action was still an issue in today's business environment. Race was significantly impacted where gender showed moderate correlation to the question. Age did not seem to be a factor. ANOVA's were then run and their findings support that race and gender show no support for these hypotheses while age had moderate support for several of the hypotheses.

In most instances there was support for the alternative hypotheses which indicates that discrimination is still considered to be a major issue in corporate America today and that affirmative action may be a method to address this issue. One of the problems with this concept may be that most employees do not work for government contractors and have not had the opportunity to be covered under an affirmative action Plan. A copy of the Correlation and ANOVA statistical results can be found in table 2, 3 & 4. The p values for H1 were small and therefore the Null could not be supported.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.922	2	.961	7.024	.001
		Linearity	1.660	1	1.660	12.129	.001
		Deviation from Linearity	.263	1	.263	1.919	.168
	Within Groups		20.250	148	.137		
	Total		22.172	150			
Q2 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	10.792	2	5.396	3.793	.025

		Linearity	.325	1	.325	.228	.634
		Deviation from Linearity	10.467	1	10.467	7.358	.007
	Within Groups		210.559	148	1.423		
	Total		221.351	150			
Q3 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	20.212	2	10.106	4.918	.009
		Linearity	19.301	1	19.301	9.392	.003
		Deviation from Linearity	.911	1	.911	.443	.507
	Within Groups		304.132	148	2.055		
	Total		324.344	150			
Q4 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	10.570	2	5.285	2.650	.074
		Linearity	3.798	1	3.798	1.904	.170
		Deviation from Linearity	6.772	1	6.772	3.395	.067
	Within Groups		295.191	148	1.995		
	Total		305.762	150			
Q5 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	56.880	2	28.440	13.244	.000
		Linearity	14.619	1	14.619	6.808	.010
		Deviation from Linearity	42.261	1	42.261	19.680	.000
	Within Groups		317.809	148	2.147		
	Total		374.689	150			
Q6 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	31.922	2	15.961	5.390	.006
		Linearity	13.687	1	13.687	4.622	.033
		Deviation from Linearity	18.235	1	18.235	6.158	.014
	Within Groups		438.250	148	2.961		
	Total		470.172	150			
Q7 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	12.520	2	6.260	4.767	.010
		Linearity	3.734	1	3.734	2.843	.094
		Deviation from Linearity	8.786	1	8.786	6.690	.011
	Within Groups		194.368	148	1.313		
	Total		206.887	150			
Q8 * Race	Between Groups	(Combined)	8.968	2	4.484	108.484	.000
		Linearity	7.791	1	7.791	188.480	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	1.178	1	1.178	28.488	.000
	Within Groups		6.118	148	.041		
	Total		15.086	150			

Table 2: ANOVA Table for Socio Demographics and Survey Questions.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.051	3	.684	4.994	.003
		Linearity	1.410	1	1.410	10.304	.002
		Deviation from Linearity	.640	2	.320	2.339	.100
	Within Groups		20.121	147	.137		
	Total		22.172	150			
Q2 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	69.408	3	23.136	22.383	.000

		Linearity	.054	1	.054	.052	.820
		Deviation from Linearity	69.354	2	34.677	33.549	.000
	Within Groups		151.943	147	1.034		
	Total		221.351	150			
Q3 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	119.752	3	39.917	28.680	.000
		Linearity	.231	1	.231	.166	.684
		Deviation from Linearity	119.520	2	59.760	42.938	.000
	Within Groups		204.593	147	1.392		
	Total		324.344	150			
Q4 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	129.169	3	43.056	35.841	.000
		Linearity	6.527	1	6.527	5.433	.021
		Deviation from Linearity	122.642	2	61.321	51.045	.000
	Within Groups		176.593	147	1.201		
	Total		305.762	150			
Q5 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	271.389	3	90.463	128.732	.000
		Linearity	.391	1	.391	.557	.457
		Deviation from Linearity	270.997	2	135.499	192.820	.000
	Within Groups		103.300	147	.703		
	Total		374.689	150			
Q6 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	225.122	3	75.041	45.015	.000
		Linearity	5.343	1	5.343	3.205	.075
		Deviation from Linearity	219.779	2	109.890	65.920	.000
	Within Groups		245.050	147	1.667		
	Total		470.172	150			
Q7 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	24.816	3	8.272	6.679	.000
		Linearity	.164	1	.164	.133	.716
		Deviation from Linearity	24.652	2	12.326	9.952	.000
	Within Groups		182.071	147	1.239		
	Total		206.887	150			
Q8 * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.215	3	.738	8.431	.000
		Linearity	.039	1	.039	.443	.507
		Deviation from Linearity	2.176	2	1.088	12.425	.000
	Within Groups		12.871	147	.088		
	Total		15.086	150			

Table 3: ANOVA Table for Age of Sample.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	.785	1	.785	5.470	.021
	Within Groups		21.387	149	.144		
	Total		22.172	150			
Q2 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	.577	1	.577	.389	.534
	Within Groups		220.774	149	1.482		
	Total		221.351	150			

Q3 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	40.377	1	40.377	21.186	.000
	Within Groups		283.968	149	1.906		
	Total		324.344	150			
Q4 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	30.318	1	30.318	16.400	.000
	Within Groups		275.444	149	1.849		
	Total		305.762	150			
Q5 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.205	1	4.205	1.691	.195
	Within Groups		370.484	149	2.486		
	Total		374.689	150			
Q6 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	8.624	1	8.624	2.784	.097
	Within Groups		461.548	149	3.098		
	Total		470.172	150			
Q7 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	26.541	1	26.541	21.928	.000
	Within Groups		180.347	149	1.210		
	Total		206.887	150			
Q8 * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	.417	1	.417	4.233	.041
	Within Groups		14.669	149	.098		
	Total		15.086	150			

Table 4: ANOVA Table for Gender of Sample.

P values for H2 were fairly large and therefore the null was supported and the alternative rejected. In looking at H3 p values were again slightly large and the implications are that the null had enough statistical significance for it to be supported. H4 had rather small p values and the null could not be supported. H5 also had small p values and would lead the readers to reject the null hypothesis.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT

Discriminatory treatment is considered a major issue with minorities and women of all ages in America.

Managers would do well to ensure they have human resource systems that are in place to determine if treatment of all employees is considered fair and equal. This can be accomplished with assessing if internal and external recruitment systems ensure equal opportunity. Managers can determine if their training and development programs provide same opportunity for all. The Human Resources department can ensure that corrective actions and terminations are reviewed by qualified professionals outside the firm to ensure procedural justice is in place.

Diversity training can also assist in having issues discussed in open forums so employees can gain insight into other cultures, social norms, and sexual orientations. Affirmative action is the result of a lack of equal opportunity for all. If management does not ensure opportunities are made available based on qualifications and not stereotypical, then they can get high turnover, poor morale, poor performance and an overall decline in the working environment in their organizations.

Having an affirmative action Plan or similar model would ensure that all employees receive equal treatment and eliminate bias; third part complaints through local, state or federal agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This could also lead to potential law suits from employees. For those who manage organizations that have governmental contracts, it is imperative that you monitor your affirmative action plans and ensure they are strictly adhered to. This will result in both internal and external equity for all employees.

7. CONCLUSION

Affirmative action has brought about a major change in relation to the employment relationship and the role of the government. The need for government intervention to ensure protected class persons received equal and fair treatment to their white counterparts was created by Executive Order.

Although affirmative action is looked at in terms of Title VII or the equal protection clause, neither has played the largest role in bringing it about. The purpose of affirmative action is to address the discrepancies resulting from historical events such as slavery or social pressures that are not necessarily attributable to an employer's or union's own discrimination. This is done by efforts geared toward increasing the number of minorities in a given workforce [5]. Affirmative action is not perceived to be the necessary governmental checks and balance that it was in the 1960's when it first became law.

Today, employees are much more in tune with equal opportunity, as a means to address discriminatory treatment. This study has provided insight on determining the need for

affirmative action. It would appear that young employees don't see the vital need of such legislation where older workers, especially minorities and women see this as a continuing critical piece of legislation that allows them equal opportunity with their white male co-workers.

APPENDIX I

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE:

Please read the following questions. Once you have read the question please circle that response that most closely approximates your true beliefs about that statement. Once you have completed the Survey please return it to your instructor. Thank you for taking the time to provide this information.

1. I know what affirmative action is.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

2. Affirmative Action has eliminated discrimination against minorities and women.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

3. Affirmative Action has eliminated discrimination in training and development opportunities for minorities and women.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

4. Affirmative Action has eliminated discrimination in promotional opportunities for minorities and women.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

5. Affirmative Action has eliminated discrimination in disciplinary actions for minorities and women.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

6. Affirmative Action has eliminated discrimination in terminations for minorities and women.

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

7. Should affirmative action legislation be removed from the Law?

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

8. Will racism or sexism ever be removed from American society?

No	Not Sure	Don't Care	Think So	Yes
1	2	3	4	5

9. Your Age?

18-25 __ 26-35 __ 36-45 __ 46-55 __ 56-66 __ 66 and older __

10. Your ethnicity

White __ Black __ Hispanic __ Asian __ Indian-American __

REFERENCES

- [1] U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (2009) About the commission.
- [2] Curry, George E. (1996) The Affirmative Action Debate. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Company Inc. pp: 1-368.
- [3] Aiello, J.R. (2004) Leading in a Diverse Workplace: Lessons from Diversity Competent Managers.
- [4] Dovidio, J. F., & Hebl, M. R. (2005) Discrimination at the level of the individual: Cognitive and affective factors. In: R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. pp: 11-35.
- [5] Edwards, John. (1995) When Race Counts. New York: Routledge. pp: 1-260.
- [6] <http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/vii.html>
- [7] Affirmative action: What do black conservatives think? (1995) National Minority Politics.
- [8] Affirmative action, negative reaction. (2003) Economist.
- [9] Chavez, L. (2001) In the end, racial preferences hurt even the intended beneficiaries. Enterprise/Salt Lake City, 30 (39): 28.
- [10] Ascribe Newswire: Health. (2001) Study looks at What Matters about Affirmative Action Programs.
- [11] Sadler, A. E. (1996) Affirmative Action-At Issues. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven. pp: 6-92.
- [12] <http://www.now.org/issues/affirm/talking.html>

© 2021 by the Steven Cates. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).