



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2018

Attitudes and General Knowledge of Affirmative Action in Higher Education Admissions At One Historically Black University in Tennessee

James E. Peters

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peters, James E., "Attitudes and General Knowledge of Affirmative Action in Higher Education Admissions At One Historically Black University in Tennessee" (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3362. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3362>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Attitudes and General Knowledge of Affirmative Action in Higher Education Admissions
at One Historically Black University in Tennessee

A dissertation
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

by
James Eugene Peters
May 2018

Dr. Hal Knight, Chair
Dr. William Flora
Dr. James Lampley
Dr. D. Lee McGahey

Keywords: Affirmative Action, Race, Discrimination, HBCU

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and General Knowledge of Affirmative Action in Higher Education Admissions
at One Historically Black College in Tennessee

by

James Eugene Peters

The purpose of this study was to examine attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee. The researcher used a modified version of the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) to assess attitudes and general knowledge of all administrators, faculty, staff, and students at this institution. At the conclusion of the collection period, 269 surveys were deemed usable. Of these, 31 surveys were completed by administrators, faculty completed 62 surveys, 55 surveys were completed by staff, and 121 surveys were completed by students. The dependent variables for the study were individual survey questions (1-9) and three dimensions created by transforming the data from sets of survey questions. The independent variables were participant group (administrators, faculty, staff, and students), gender, race, and academic discipline. Two-way contingency tables and χ^2 were used to examine the associations between each independent variable and the dependent variable for each of the individual survey questions. Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the mean differences between the dimensions and pairs of independent variables.

The quantitative findings indicated that the independent variable, participant group, was found to differ in five of the 11 research questions significantly. Administrators hold positive attitudes and exhibit greater general knowledge on the topic of Affirmative Action compared to faculty, staff, or students. Of the other independent variables, only race and academic discipline resulted in significant differences. Respondents who identified as Non-White exhibited positive attitudes

towards the dimension that assessed whether Affirmative Action was moral and ethical over respondents who identified as White. Respondents who were classified as belonging to the humanities (academic discipline) were more likely to exhibit positive attitudes toward support of Affirmative Action over respondents who were classified as belonging to business.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my family. My wife, Anne, encouraged me through the process. She flew solo on many nights and weekends while I researched, planned, and wrote this dissertation. Without her support I would surely not have been able to complete this study. Next, to our children, Lucas, Katelyn, Holden, and Ainsley: I started this program shortly after the birth of our first (twins), and now, five years later, we are a family of six. I hope that you find this dedication at some point in the future and you realize the sacrifices that were made and how important it was for me to complete this program. My hope for you is that you learn to value education as I have and are able to push through the obstacles that you encounter.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Hal Knight, my dissertation chair, I have appreciated your insight and professionalism both in and out of the classroom. Your leadership has guided this research and improved my study. Your dedication to this program and institution is best exemplified by your patience, communication style, and thoroughness. I thank you, Sir.

Dr. James Lampley, you recruited me into this program and talked me through the statistical analyses of my study at times when most were celebrating Christmas and the Superbowl. You allowed me to call you in the office and at home until I understood my data. I appreciate the time you spent with me and your willingness to repeat yourself when I failed to grasp it the first time.

Dr. William Flora, I have appreciated your perspective and candor. The questions you posed at my proposal defense made me reconsider aspects of my study that resulted, in my view, in a richer study. You have improved my project.

Dr. Trinetia Respress, you were a beacon of light when all hope was lost. Please accept my sincere thanks for your willingness to serve as my institutional support liaison and for personally overseeing the distribution of my survey. You came onto the scene at my lowest moment.

Finally, Dr. D. Lee McGahey, your work jumpstarted this study. Before stumbling upon your dissertation, I was a 2nd-year student struggling to find a topic that was both relevant and personally satisfying. I selected your dissertation for a review assignment and knew that I had found my topic. Our study topic is rooted in suffrage and controversy. It was rewarding to be able to share this project with someone who had tackled the topic. Thank you, Sir, for your time and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
LIST OF TABLES	9
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	10
Statement of Problem.....	13
Research Questions.....	14
Study Significance	16
Definitions of Terms.....	16
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study	17
Summary.....	18
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	19
Introduction.....	19
Overview of Discrimination in the United States 1850-1900.....	20
Overview of Affirmative Action in Higher Education 1900-Present.....	21
Challenging Affirmative Action in Higher Education.....	25
The Controversy.....	30
Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education	30
Fairness	35
Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action.....	36
Race/Ethnicity and Gender	36
Socio-Economic Status	39
Political Ideology	40
Educational Sophistication	42

Chapter	Page
General Knowledge of Affirmative Action	42
3. RESEARCH METHODS	45
Introduction	45
Research Questions and Null Hypotheses	46
Instrumentation	49
Instrument Development	49
Instrument Modification & Testing	52
Sample	53
Data Collection	54
Data Analysis	55
Summary	56
4. RESULTS	57
Research Question 1	60
Research Question 2	66
Research Question 3	68
Research Question 4	70
Research Question 5	72
Research Question 6	75
Research Question 7	77
Research Question 8	79
Research Question 9	81
Research Question 10	83
Research Question 11	86
Chapter Summary	88

Chapter	Page
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
Summary of the Study	89
Summary of the Findings	90
Research Questions Addressing General Knowledge Dimension	90
Research Questions Addressing Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension	93
Research Questions Addressing Attitudes Toward Support Dimension	94
Research Questions Addressing Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension....	96
Conclusions	97
Recommendations for Further Research	98
REFERENCES	100
APPENDICES	111
Appendix A: Peters’s Proposed Modified Version of the EAAI	111
Appendix B: Carr’s (2007) Modified Version of the EAAI	113
Appendix C: McGahey’s (2007) Modified Version of the EAAI	116
VITA	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Participant Groups	57
2. Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Gender	58
3. Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Race	59
4. Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Academic Disciplines	60
5. Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 1 ₄	63
6. Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 1 ₈	65
7. Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 1 ₉	66
8. Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension of the EAAI	68
9. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI	70
10. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI	72
11. Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension of the EAAI	77
12. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI	79
13. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI	81
14. Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension of the EAAI	83
15. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI	85
16. Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI	87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Affirmative Action has been the most volatile and divisive of issues in higher education that arose from the civil rights movements of the 1960s (Echols, 1997; Kellough, 2006) and is one of the most contested areas of Affirmative Action policy in the United States (Glazer, 1998). According to Epps (2006), Affirmative Action, as it relates to higher education admission practices, was conceived in an attempt to correct acts of discrimination against minorities, to provide equal accesses and opportunities in education through the interpretation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment which states:

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1)

Many colleges and universities adopted Affirmative Action policies to comply with pressures for equality and access to certain federal funds. Such policies varied from minority quotas to complex calculations based on the gender, race, religious, and socioeconomic class status of their applicants (Bowen & Bok, 1998).

Legally, Affirmative Action in higher education admissions has been repetitively challenged. Though created as a means of providing equal opportunities, Affirmative Action has been negatively associated with racism, quotas, and reverse discrimination (Echols, 1997). The first challenge to Affirmative Action in college admissions came from *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978). The court found that the use of race could be a factor in admissions, but that commonly used quota systems used to ensure minority enrollment were unconstitutional (Anderson, 2004). Regardless of one's position on Affirmative Action, the *Bakke* case "legitimated" and "institutionalized" the practice of Affirmative Action in higher

education (Welch & Gruhl, 1998, p. 697). This case, in part, has since served as a legal precedent concerning quota systems in higher education admissions.

In 2003, the United States Supreme Court upheld Affirmative Action citing that there was a compelling interest in promoting student diversity on college campuses (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003). In writing the majority opinion, Justice O'Connor noted that "perhaps twenty-five years hence, racial affirmative action would no longer be necessary to promote diversity" (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003 p. 306). With this ruling, the court facilitated a shift in the underpinnings of Affirmative Action from a means of correcting historical acts of discrimination to a "compelling interest" of the state by promoting diversity on college campuses (Bhagwat, 2002).

Regardless of the intent, attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in admissions vary. Echols (1997) conducted one of the earliest studies to examine attitudes and knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions. In this study, Echols noted five primary factors that contribute to the prevailing views. These include:

- 1) conflicting messages and misconceptions about the need for affirmative action;
- 2) attitudes and perceptions of individuals about the purpose and reasons for continued existence of affirmative action remedies;
- 3) inadequate enforcement of existing affirmative action laws;
- 4) lack of stringent implementation mechanisms and tools;
- 5) overt institutional and bureaucratic barriers to access in equal educational opportunity, employment, tenure, and promotion. (p. 4)

The most recent attempt to oppose Affirmative Action in higher education admissions came in the case of *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2016). In a 4-3 verdict, the United States Supreme Court once again found for Affirmative Action citing that the narrowly tailored use of race in admissions was constitutional in that it contributed to the creation of a diverse student body. While Affirmative Action has alternately gained and lost support through specific court cases, the highest court in the United States does and continues to support, aspects of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions.

Critics of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions suggest that these policies weaken the student body by allowing underqualified applicants access and promote reverse discrimination against the majority (Crawford, 2000). Additionally, they claim that racism no longer exists as it once had and that Affirmative Action is no longer needed (Beckwith & Jones, 1997). Opponents of Affirmative Action suggests that racism is an ongoing issue in this country and that the benefits of having a diverse student body outweigh the criticisms (Carroll, Tyson, & Lumas, 2000). While both sides continue to support their respective arguments, attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education likely change over time depending on factors such as current court cases, media coverage, and educational emphases on the historical nature and ethical responsibilities that are often associated with a liberal arts education.

Much of this change is due to misconceptions as to what Affirmative Action is (Arriola & Cole, 2001; Kravitz et al., 2000; Zamboanga, Covell, Kepple, Soto, & Parker, 2002). Such understandings have been demonstrated to sway one's reactions to Affirmative Action (Golden, Hinkle, & Crosby, 2001). Ultimately, one's attitudes and general knowledge are defined through exposures to these understandings as well as personal and societal experiences. According to the website of the National Conference of State Legislatures (2014), Affirmative Action in higher education admissions practices refers to "admission policies that provide equal access to education for those groups that have been historically excluded or underrepresented, such as women and minorities" (para. 1).

Higher education has the responsibility to advance social progress (Bowen, 1977) and promote democratic principles (Gutmann, 1999). One way to accomplish this advancement is through the education of our citizenry and the next generation of office holders who will be charged to design solutions to lingering social issues (Gutmann, 1999). Affirmative Action in

higher education has been largely developed and refined on college and university campuses. Despite the opposition, administrators have historically shaped Affirmative Action on their campuses in response to their institutional missions, and their shareholder's (community) views (Carr, 2007). The continual assessment of attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions are required to assist institutions of higher education with this task of correcting the misconceptions of their citizenry and for institutional policy-making, training, and curriculum design (McGahey, 2007; Sternberg, 2005).

The assessment of attitudes and knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions has been a common dissertation topic for researchers (see Carr, 2007; Echols, 1997; McGahey, 2007; Virgil, 2000). While researchers continue to assess attitudes toward Affirmative Action, the assessment of knowledge of this topic has declined since the late 2000s. It has been demonstrated that knowledge of Affirmative Action influences attitudes toward Affirmative Action (Bell, 1996; Golden et al., 2001; Goldsmith, Cordova, Dwyer, Langlois, & Crosby, 1989; Stout & Buffum, 1993). The apparent lack of assessment of knowledge of Affirmative Action since the late 2000s raises questions as to how attitudes toward this topic are affected. This current study has been designed as a follow-up study that will assess both attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action at one Historically Black College or University (HBCU) in Tennessee.

Statement of Problem

The focus of this study will be an HBCU in Tennessee. This institution was chosen because a similar study was conducted on its campus ten years ago by McGahey (2007). Due to the environment at an HBCU, academic exchange of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions is limited promoting systemic sufferage (McGahey, 2007). With “much of what we

learn in college is a result of the people with whom we mix,” (p. 6) it is essential that topics, such as Affirmative Action, be continually reexamined (Sternberg, 2005).

The purpose of this survey study was to assess attitudes and general knowledge of the use of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee. The need to examine attitudes and general knowledge at this institution was identified by McGahey (2007) as further research that could inform his study conducted in 2007. As such, the results of this proposed study will be descriptively compared to those identified by McGahey (2007) to examine to what extent attitudes and general knowledge have changed over the past decade.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study include the variables participant group, gender, race, and academic discipline:

Variable: Participant Group

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students)?

Variables: Participant Group by Gender

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Variable: Race

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI by race?

Variables: Participant Group by Race

Research Question 6: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Research Question 7: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Research Question 8: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Variables: Participant Group by Academic Discipline

Research Question 9: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Research Question 10: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Research Question 11: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Study Significance

This study is significant as it is designed to address questions that will help researchers understand attitudes and general knowledge associated with Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee. These results will be further subjected to statistical analyses to determine mean score differences of the variables above by gender, race, and academic discipline. Additionally, descriptive comparisons between two populations at the same institution over a ten-year period will be made to assess changes in attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action. This study is timely given the latest decision from the U.S. Supreme Court in *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2016).

The results of this study may be used by institutions of higher education as institutions struggle to understand the attitudes and general knowledge of shareholders and legal precedents associated with Affirmative Action in higher education admission practices. Such information can additionally be used to guide institutional policies, training initiatives, and curriculum design to serve their constituents better.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are included as they are directly related to this study and serve to provide greater clarity.

Affirmative action: Are policies and programs that seek to eliminate disparate treatment, disparate impact, and institutionalized hurdles to access for minorities and women (Crosby, Iyer, & Sincharoen, 2006; Rubio, 2001; Spann, 2000; Zamani-Gallaher, 2007)

General Knowledge: Information on subjects, from reading, television, etc., rather than detailed information on subjects that you have studied formally (General Knowledge, 2017). For this study, general knowledge is assessed through the use of a survey designed to measure whether respondents can properly identify statements about Affirmative Action and related topics to be true or false.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

This study was delimited to administrators, faculty, staff, and students from one university in Tennessee. Therefore, the results are not generalizable to higher education institutions at-large. Additionally, the university under study is an HBCU with an approximate enrollment of 67% students and a statistically higher percentage of administrators, faculty, and staff who identify as African American. As such, the results are not generalizable to higher education students, staff, faculty, and administrators at-large. Lastly, this study assesses the attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions. Some respondents may be more familiar with Affirmative Action in hiring practices which may increase biases due to confusion between these two Affirmative Action policies.

This study was limited by the appropriateness of the theoretical framework in determining how well the survey instrument can predict attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action. It was assumed that the EAAI survey instrument was valid and reliable. It was also assumed that the methodology adequately addressed the research questions and that the statistical analyses were appropriate and possessed the power to identify differences in variables when present. Lastly, it was assumed that administrators, faculty, staff, and students completed the EAAI truthfully and followed the same set of instructions.

Summary

As Affirmative Action in higher education admissions continues to be debated at multiple levels, it is imperative that institutions of higher education continue to assess the attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action of their constituents so that proper interventions can be used in the education of their citizenry. Additionally, these results can be informative for guiding institutional policy-making, training initiatives, and curriculum design toward this end.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

For this literature review, sources were selected, analyzed, and ordered for inclusion in a dissertation that examines attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admission policies at one Historically Black University in Tennessee. The sources that are included in this literature review encompass two major themes. To assess knowledge, a review of the legal history informs an understanding of the evolution of Affirmative Action policies, legal precedents, and laws to provide a historical account of how Affirmative Action has shaped and continues to shape admission policies at institutions of higher education. Topics such as diversity in higher education and fairness are reviewed to assess attitudes toward Affirmative Action and serve to provide background for the controversy surrounding Affirmative Action.

Affirmative Action evolved from the social justice agendas of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson through Executive Orders 10925 and 11246 (Zamani-Gallaher, 2007). From the start, Affirmative Action was a controversial topic described by Kellough (2006) as being “the most controversial and divisive issues ever placed on the national agenda in the United States” (p. 3). The rationale behind such policies, in part, was conceived as an attempt to correct acts of discrimination against minorities and to provide equal access and opportunities (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Kurland & Casper, 1978). Affirmative Action has been attacked vehemently (Chavez, 1998; Pusser, 2004). Motivations for these attacks are partly due to Affirmative Action being negatively associated with racism, quotas, and reverse discrimination (Espenshade & Radford, 2009; Garry, 2006; Kennedy, 2013).

Overview of Discrimination in the United States 1850-1900

Much of the debate over Affirmative Action came from governmental policies and legal precedents set by district, circuit, and higher courts including the United States Supreme Court. Several pivotal events shaped these legal precedents starting in the late 1850s and 1860s as outlined by Holladay (2004). One of the first legal cases that addressed the measure of African Americans was seen in the critical case of *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857) (Lovett, 2011). This case directly addressed the status of Blacks before the start of the Civil War. In this case, the court held that Blacks, free or enslaved, were not citizens of the United States, and as such, were not party to rights afforded by the United States Constitution (Lovett, 2011). The aftermath of this case had little effect on the lives of Blacks in the South but was pivotal in the escalating tensions between Southern and Northern states during the Civil War. Near the end of the Civil War, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which freed slaves in southern states (Lewis & Lewis, 2009). Toward this end, the Thirteenth Amendment was enacted effectively abolishing slavery (Lewis & Lewis, 2009). While the Thirteenth Amendment granted freedoms, few previous slaves possessed the resources to live effectively as freed men and women. Regardless of the provisions set forth by the Thirteenth Amendment, newly freed slaves continued to suffer in parts of the South due to lack of local enforcement (Lewis & Lewis, 2009). In 1868 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified guaranteeing *equal protection under the law* and citizenship was extended to Blacks (Lewis & Lewis, 2009). This ratification forced some municipalities to enforce these newly found freedoms, but many southern states continued to ignore the law. In 1875 Congress passed the Civil Rights Act. This federal law banned discrimination against Blacks affording equal treatment in public accommodations, transportation, and jury selection (Gudridge, 1989). The 1875 Civil Rights Act was overturned in

1883 by a near-unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court citing that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment grants jurisdiction to the state, not the federal government (Gerber & Friedlander, 2008).

Further segregation legislation was passed in 1890 in Louisiana with the first of the so-called Jim Crow laws (Perman, 2001). The Jim Crow laws were enacted at the state or local levels and mandated *de jure* segregation in all public facilities in many, if not all, southern states. Segregation in education was set at the federal level in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). In this case, the United States Supreme Court allowed state level segregation as long as *separate but equal* facilities were made available. Though the case specifically involved separate accommodations for Blacks and Whites on railroads, the legal precedent had been set to accept separate but equal accommodations in many aspects of life during this time, including education (Anderson, 2004). Not only did this ruling set a legal precedent that was not challenged for another 60 years, but it granted federal support to the Jim Crow laws that served the southern states *de jure* and the northern states *de facto* (Lewis & Lewis, 2009). Lastly, in 1899 the United States Supreme Court failed to overturn a ruling that allowed the general state level taxation to support a White only high school system in *Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education* (1899). The Court's decision affirmed that there were many more Black children than White and that the Richmond County Board of Education simply could not afford to educate everyone at that level (Holladay, 2004).

Overview of Affirmative Action in Education 1900-Present

During the early to mid-20th century, three significant events helped shape what would become known as Affirmative Action in education admissions. In 1908, Berea College was a private institution of higher education that was desegregated admitting both White and Black

students (Holladay, 2004). A 1904 Kentucky State law prohibited desegregation or the teaching of both White and Black students within twenty-five miles of each other (Bernstein, 2000). Berea College challenged this law, the Day Law, unsuccessfully. Upon defeat, the college appealed to the United States Supreme Court in *Berea College v. Kentucky* (1908). The court ruled for the state citing that Berea College, a corporation, was chartered under the laws of Kentucky and as such, fell under the purview of the state (Bernstein, 2000). The rationale behind this verdict focused on the state's rights to govern corporations and not that of the individual (Kahlenberg, 2014).

While the Berea College case strengthened the position of the state, it took 30 years before the United States Supreme Court had the opportunity to revisit segregation in higher education. During those 30 years, similar cases were brought before the lower courts. The following paragraphs detail some of the pivotal cases as chronologically outlined by Kluger (1976).

In 1938, the Law School of the University of Missouri had denied admission to a Lloyd Gaines, an otherwise qualified Black student, and instead offered to cover tuition at a law school in an adjacent state (Kluger, 1976). In refusing the offer, Mr. Gaines sought legal representation from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (Kluger, 1976). The NAACP brought litigation in *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada* (1938) citing that it violated Mr. Gaines's Fourteenth Amendment rights to *separate but equal*. Because Missouri did not have a Black law school to appease the *separate but equal* clause, it was forced to either build a Black law school or desegregate those schools in existence (Kluger, 1976). In response to the case's outcome, Missouri converted a cosmetology school in St. Louis to Lincoln University School of Law (Parks, 2007). In a similar case, *Sipuel v. Board of Regents of the University of*

Oklahoma (1948), Ada Lois Sipuel, a Black female student, was denied admission to the University of Oklahoma Law School, the only professional law school in the state. The defendant's case was hinged upon the pending opening of a state-run Black law school (Kluger, 1976). The United States Supreme Court found for the plaintiff citing the precedent set by *Missouri ex rel. Gains v. Canada*, concluding that "The State must provide it for her in conformity with the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and provide it as soon as it does for applicants of any other group" (p. 631). According to Kluger (1976), the significance of this case was not that the plaintiff won, but that it came with the inclusion that the University of Oklahoma must provide comparable education as it would for White students without delay.

In 1946 Heman Marion Sweatt was denied admission to the School of Law at the University of Texas. Aware of the recent outcome in Oklahoma, the state district court continued the case for six months giving the University of Texas time to establish an alternative law school for Blacks called the Texas State University for Negroes (Kluger, 1976). The decision to continue this case until suitable accommodations could be arranged avoided the precedent set by *Missouri ex rel. Gains v. Canada* that specified *without delay*. Once accommodations were created, classes were held in the basement of a building in downtown Houston, 165 miles from the White law school (Kluger, 1976). After several appeals, the case was heard by the United States Supreme Court in *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950). The court ruled for the plaintiff on the basis that Texas failed to provide separate but equal education. The opinion pointed out the superior education afforded the White students and the inability of the Black students to interact with their White counterparts.

In the same year, the University of Oklahoma once again found itself in court in *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents* (1950) (Kluger, 1976). While the University of Oklahoma had desegregated, Black students were forced to attend classes, use library services, and eat in designated areas (Kluger, 1976). While lower courts sided with the institution, an appeal to the United States Supreme Court found that these actions violated students' Fourteenth Amendment rights of *equal protection*. The verdict of this case, along with the outcome of *Sweatt v. Painter*, laid the groundwork for the start of an end to the *separate but equal* doctrine set by *Plessy v. Ferguson* in higher education (Motley, 1992).

With the establishment of the *separate but equal* doctrine from *Plessy v. Ferguson*, states were able to continue segregation in education. The landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), building on the momentum that came from the verdicts of the 1950 cases, definitively ended the *separate but equal* doctrine. This case was a class action lawsuit that originated from similar cases in Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware (Anderson, 2004; Patterson, 2002). In each of these cases, Black students were denied admission to White public schools due to race and forced to attend Black public schools. These Black public schools were underfunded, often in various states of disrepair, and few. In the case of Delaware, the state had only one Black school (Patterson, 2002).

The landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) was handed down on May 17, 1954. In a unanimous decision, the United States Supreme Court rescinded its *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision finding that separate public schools for Blacks and Whites were “inherently unequal” (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954, p. 483). While this ruling was perceived as a victory for the growing civil rights movement, the Court asked for another round of arguments to decide upon implementation (Patterson, 2002). These arguments came a year later in *Brown v.*

Board of Education (1955), often referred to as *Brown II*, where the Court ordered federal courts to oversee desegregation “with all deliberate speed” (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1955, p. 294).

In the years following this decision, hundreds of school desegregation hearings took place as local governments worked to comply with desegregation. As the 1960s gave way to the 1970s, civil rights activists, fueled by continued racial discrimination, fought for change (Patterson, 2002). Institutions of higher education commonly enacted Affirmative Action policies in fear of being found noncompliant. A popular response was to develop quota systems that guaranteed a set number of seats for minority students (Anderson, 2004; Fiscus, 1992).

Challenging Affirmative Action in Higher Education

The first challenge to the use of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions practices came in 1978 from the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*. Allan Bakke, a former White Marine officer, was denied admission to 12 separate medical schools due to quota systems set by administrators aimed to increase minority enrollment (Anderson, 2004). Bakke filed suit and a fractured United States Supreme Court found in favor of Bakke citing that it was unconstitutional to reserve seats for minority students (in this case Black and Latino students) (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978). While the court noted that Affirmative Action was beneficial, citing the “atmosphere of ‘speculation, experimentation and creation’--so essential to the quality of higher education--is widely believed to be promoted by a diverse student body” (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978, p. 265), the majority opinion noted that Affirmative Action could not be the deciding factor for admission standards (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978). While many predicted that Bakke’s victory would signal the end of Affirmative Action in higher education admission practices

(Anderson, 2004), the court recognized that race could be a factor in admissions, but that quota systems were unconstitutional (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978). The outcome of this trial was best characterized by the Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Anthony Lewis, “Mr. Bakke won, but so did the general principle of affirmative action” (Lewis, 1978, p. 1).

A similar case was brought before the Fifth Circuit in *Hopwood v. Texas* (1996). In this case, five White students were denied admissions to the University of Texas School of Law despite being better qualified than some minority candidates (Kahlenberg, 2014). Though the University won at the district level citing the precedent set by *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, the plaintiffs appealed to the Fifth Circuit. The outcome of this appeal reversed the previous district court’s opinion citing that:

The University of Texas School of Law may not use race as a factor in deciding which applicants to admit in order to achieve a diverse student body, to combat the perceived effects of a hostile environment at the law school, to alleviate the law school's poor reputation in the minority community, or to eliminate any present effects of past discrimination by actors other than the law school (p. 962).

While the University of Texas appealed the outcome to the United States Supreme Court in *Texas v. Hopwood* (1996), the justices declined to review the case allowing the opinion of the Fifth Circuit to stand.

In addition to individual or group legal cases, three state-level challenges to Affirmative Action were won by electoral majorities in the mid to late 1990s (Hinrichs, 2014). In 1996, Tom Wood and Glynn Custred, both members of the professoriate, drafted a proposal that would serve as the first electoral test of Affirmative Action in the United States (Hadley, 2005). The State of California sought to amend its constitution with the proposal of the California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI), or Proposition 209. Proposition 209 was modeled on the Civil Rights Act of

1964 and was a ballot proposition which aimed to amend the state constitution prohibiting the use of race, sex, or ethnicity in areas of public education, employment, and contracting (Kidder, 2001). Proposition 209 won by a narrow margin and was enacted in 1997. Following suit, Washington and Florida passed similar proposals, Initiative 200 in 1998 and “One Florida” in 2000, respectively (Kidder, 2001). Each of these amendments was legally challenged but continue to withstand legal scrutinies (see *Hi-Voltage Wire Works, Inc. v. City of San Jose*, 2000; *NAACP, Inc. v. Florida Board of Regents*, 2003).

The precedent set in *Hopwood* stood in the Fifth Circuit until 2003 when the U.S. Supreme Court abrogated the decision in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003). In this case, a White female was denied admissions to the University of Michigan Law School despite being better qualified than some minority candidates (Kahlenberg, 2014). In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court found for the University citing that the Constitution “does not prohibit the law school's narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body” (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003, p. 306).

The significance of this case stems from changes in the way the courts viewed Affirmative Action. Before *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003), Affirmative Action was justified as being a “compelling interest” in serving to correct a long history of discrimination against minorities. In the majority opinion of this case, the *compelling interest*, written by Justice O’Connor, shifted to the “educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body” (p. 306).

In this same year, the United States Supreme Court decided a case brought against the undergraduate admissions policy at the University of Michigan in *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003). In this case, Jennifer Gratz and Patrick Hamacher were denied admissions to undergraduate

programs at the University of Michigan. The University's admission policies ranked students using a 150-point scale that granted 20 points to applicants of African American, Hispanic, and Native American heritage (Anderson, 2004). In a 6-3 decision, the court ruled that the use of a point system with "predetermined point allocations...ensures that the diversity contributions of applicants cannot be individually assessed" (p. 244) and were, therefore, unconstitutional. While touted by many national news sources as a win for Affirmative Action interest groups, the details of the verdict merely affirmed the precedent set by *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), namely that quota systems were unconstitutional (Anderson, 2004).

Closely following the two cases involving the University of Michigan, the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative (MCRI), or Proposal 2, was introduced. Similar to the proposals that were passed in California, Washington, and Florida, Proposal 2 sought to ban discrimination based on race, color, sex, or religion in publicly funded institutions of Michigan (Cohen, 2006). Proposal 2 was passed into Michigan Constitutional law by a narrow margin and took effect later that year. Legal challenges ensued. In 2013, The United States Supreme Court granted *certiorari* in *Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action* (2013). The court sided with the defendants citing, "that there is no authority... for the judiciary to set aside Michigan laws that commit to the voters the determination whether racial preferences may be considered in governmental decisions, in particular with respect to school decisions" (p. 49). This ruling found Proposal 2 constitutional rendering the verdict of *Grutter v. Bollinger* moot in the state of Michigan.

The most recent case involving Affirmative Action in higher education admissions policies was brought against the University of Texas at Austin in *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2013). In this case, Abigail Fisher, a White applicant was denied admissions due to a state policy that automatically granted admissions to any high school student who finished in the top

10% of their graduating class. Lower courts sided with the University citing that their admissions policies met the standards of using ‘strict scrutiny’ set by *Grutter v. Bollinger* and that the policies ‘narrowly tailored’ the use of race (Kahlenberg, 2014). In a 7-1 decision, the United States Supreme Court vacated and remanded the rulings of the lower courts returning the case to the Fifth Circuit for further deliberations (*Fisher v. University of Texas*, 2013). The Fifth Circuit revisited the case and ultimately found in favor of the University of Texas citing that, “it is equally settled that universities may use race as part of a holistic admissions program where it cannot otherwise achieve diversity” (*Fisher v. University of Texas*, 2014, p. 633). In 2015, the United States Supreme Court agreed to hear the case again. During oral arguments, Justice Scalia noted that:

There are those who contend that it does not benefit African Americans to get them into the University of Texas, where they do not do well, as opposed to having them go to a less-advanced school, a slower-track school where they do well. One of the briefs pointed out that most of the black scientists in this country don’t come from schools like the University of Texas. They come from lesser schools where they do not feel that they’re being pushed ahead in classes that are too fast for them (*Fisher v. University of Texas*, 2015, p. 2198).

Before the conclusion of the case, Justice Scalia died, leaving the remaining justices to decide the fate of the case. In June 2016, a 4-3 verdict affirmed the Fifth Circuit’s decision in favor of the University of Texas (*Fisher v. University of Texas*, 2016).

As it currently stands, the constitutionality of using race as a factor in admission into institutions of higher education is predicated on the benefits that stem from having a diverse student body. The following section outlines the controversy, attitudes, and general knowledge of Affirmative Action.

The Controversy

Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education

Advocates for Affirmative Action argue that these policies are necessary to promote a racially diverse student body. Much of the evidence behind these arguments stem from the position that diversity contributes to positive educational and social outcomes (Flagg, 2003; Lawrence, 2001; Ledesma, 2013). Hurtado (2007) identified three incentives for increasing diversity in higher education. The first reiterates Gutmann (1999) in that it would serve to better position the next generation for the advancement of social progress. Secondly, Hurtado noted this linkage would “achieve greater coherence in undergraduate preparation” (p. 186). Lastly, he found that diversity is directly or indirectly linked to institutional missions through the educational outcomes benefits that support academic excellence. Hurtado (2005) also noted, “Diversity in campus social structures, knowledge production and dissemination, and experience is central to the teaching and learning and public service mission of higher education” (p. 607). Psychologists have proposed that Affirmative Action is needed to not only assure this diversity (Miller, 1997; Tierney, 1997) but that it helps ensure that admissions selection procedures and decisions are fair (American Psychological Association, 2003).

Diversity exists in multiple forms allowing students opportunities to interact and learn to tolerate differences required for success in a cross-cultural global society (Jayakumar, 2008). Diversity can be experienced in a number of ways on college campuses. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) identify three types of diversity experienced on college campuses. Structural diversity refers to having a diverse student body. Institutions publish statistical data associated with the demographic makeup of their campuses. The more diverse a student body, the greater the probability of interactions between students who are racially different (Gurin et al., 2002).

Additionally, it has been found that the benefits gained from structural diversity, to include educational, cultural, and interpersonal benefits, lessens when structural diversity declines (Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Pascarella, Palmer, Moye, & Pierson, 2001; Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea, 2007). Another type of experience that students may encounter is called classroom diversity. This type of interaction occurs in the controlled setting of a classroom where students interact through various activities that include discussions and assignments (Gurin et al., 2002). The benefits of this type of interaction are that it can be facilitated and guided by an authority figure (e.g., professor or staff member). The last type of experience is called informal-interactional diversity. This type of interaction occurs outside for the formal classroom environment and may take place on and around campus such as in the library, through interactions with clubs, or at local eateries (Gurin et al., 2002). Regardless of the types of diversity, positive student outcomes have been associated with increased student diversity on college campuses (Bernard, Alger, Shru, Olswang, & Al, 2003).

Early research into the effects of Affirmative Action was dominated by autobiographies, anecdotal evidence, and “armchair philosophizing” (Crosby et al., 2006, p. 586). The mid-1980s saw an increase in the use of empirical data from a number of disciplines including education, law, sociology, and economics (Cordes, 2004; Cunningham, Loury, & Skrentny, 2002; Hochschild, 1999).

Diversity on college campuses has been positively linked to educational outcomes.

Bernard et al. (2003) stated:

Affirmative action policies reflect twin commitments to academic excellence and a diverse student body. Just as important, the policies reflect a commitment to the principle that these two values are in harmony, and that they produce important synergies. A growing body of research has demonstrated that students learn better when they interact with diverse classmates in and outside the classroom. (p. 31)

These outcomes include enhanced cognition (Antonio et al., 2004), cultural awareness and racial understanding (Astin, 1993), openness to diversity, self-confidence, and cognitive development (Chang, Denson, Saenz, & Misa, 2006), active thinking and intellectual engagement (Gurin et al., 2002), racial acceptance, tolerance, interpersonal skills, cultural acceptance, and critical thinking (Hurtado, 2001), and cognitive growth and more complex modes of thought (Pascarella et al., 2014). Additionally, at least one longitudinal (10-year) study found that diversity experiences in higher education promote growth in cross-cultural workforce competencies later in life (Jayakumar, 2008).

In addition to educational outcomes, institutional metrics have also been assessed. Studies have been conducted to examine how Affirmative Action policies have affected enrollment, student success, and professional success (Alon & Malamud, 2014; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Lempert, Chambers, & Adams, 2000). In addition to studies that examined populations who benefited from Affirmative Action policies, social scientists have also had the opportunity to study states where Affirmative Action bans have occurred. These opportunities are unique in that comparisons can be made between the pre-ban eras and post-ban eras in states that had experienced bans in Affirmative Action such as California, Florida, Washington, and Michigan. The following section will begin with a review of studies that took place at institutions with existing Affirmative Action programs and follow with studies that examined institutions which experienced state-driven bans.

One of the largest studies was conducted by Bowen and Bok (1998), who conducted a large-scale quantitative study that investigated the consequences of Affirmative Action. They presented a careful analysis of the data from more than 80,000 students from 28 elite colleges and universities in 1951, 1976, and again in 1989. The results reported in this study are

voluminous, but one important finding was that race-conscious admissions policies significantly increased the numbers of minority (Black) students who were admitted to these institutions and that their graduation rates were not significantly different from their majority (White) classmates. In another study, Lempert et al. (2000) examined graduates of the University of Michigan Law School between 1970 and 1996. During these 27 years, the University implemented a number of race-conscious policies which gradually increased the minority populations over time. Lempert et al.'s (2000) results were similar to Bowen and Bok (1998) suggesting that minority graduates from the University of Michigan Law School passed bar exams and had successful careers as compared to their White counterparts. Lastly, Alon and Malamud (2014) examined a class-based Affirmative Action policy that was instituted at four Israeli flagship universities in the early to mid-2000s. They found that students who applied under this policy had a significantly higher probability of admission and enrollment and greater success in coursework. Additionally, this policy led to higher rates of admission to “selective” programs suggesting the potential for social and economic mobility (Alon & Malamud, 2014).

Not all of the research resulted in pro-Affirmative Action results. Sander (2004) analyzed 27,000 students who were admitted into law schools in 1991. He found that Black students applied and gained admission to higher-tier law schools compared to their White counterparts. Additionally, Black students were less likely to be retained or to pass the bar exam. Sander interpreted these results to suggest that Affirmative Action admissions policies, in fact, reduced the number of minority students thus reducing diversity at the higher education institutions and in the field of law. Sander (2004) also speculated that without such race-conscious policies, Black students would enter lower-tier schools and be more likely to complete. This disparate notion that race-conscious admissions policies led some minority students to apply to higher-tier

schools became known as the “mismatch” theory (Sander & Taylor, 2012). This theory was used by Justice Scalia during the *Fisher v. University of Texas (2014)* case, drawing outraged criticism when he suggested African-Americans would do better in less advanced, slower-track schools (Friedersdorf, 2015).

Garces and Mikey-Pabello (2015) examined effects of Affirmative Action bans in public medical schools in California, Washington, Florida, Texas, Michigan, and Nebraska. They found a 17% decrease of underrepresented students of color. In a similar study, Hinrichs (2014) utilized data from the National Center for Education Statistics’ Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to examine graduation rates and degree attainment by race within states that ban race-conscious admissions policies. He suggested that even though fewer underrepresented minorities graduated from “selective” colleges, the graduation rates of underrepresented minorities increased (p. 46). While these results may seem contradictory, Hinrichs surmised that this increase in graduation rates is likely due to reduced numbers of underrepresented minorities and a population of underrepresented minorities who are better academically prepared.

Opponents of Affirmative Action tend to recognize the importance of diversity; they merely believe that race-based Affirmative Action is an immoral means to achieve diversity (D’Souza, 1991). Additionally, there seems to be disagreement with the way that diversity is defined. Arrendondo (2002) studied how institutions of higher education defined diversity and found that most narrowly define diversity as referencing African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans. While these three populations do tend to be underrepresented in higher education, other groups, such as Asian Americans, often fail to benefit from Affirmative Action policies (Arrendondo, 2002).

Fairness

Proponents for Affirmative Action base their views on the fact that racism persists in America (Crosby et al., 2006) and that such policies provide reparations for past wrongs and assure social equality (Hicklin, 2007). While the origins of racism in America are somewhat ambiguous, Horsman (1981) credited the film, *The Birth Of A Nation* (1915), in creating the White (American Anglo-Saxon) as a “separate, innately superior people who were destined to bring good government, commercial property, and Christianity to the American continent and to the World” (p. 2). Regardless of the origin, the roots of racism were historically experienced by any racial differences (Native Americans, African-Americans, etc.) experienced by Whites (Echols, 1997). While few argue that racism exists, much of the emphasis is placed on the role that racism plays and how racism can be corrected. “Presumptions of a level playing field in higher education suggest that affirmative action is passé, yet students of color continue to face situations with which other students do not have to contend” (Carroll et al., 2000, p. 128). Also, proponents claim race-conscious admissions policies are no different from the practices that benefit legacy children (Crosby et al., 2006). One study found that legacy children were three to four times more likely to be granted admissions in comparison to comparable (non-legacy) candidates (Guerrero, 1997). Additionally, similar admissions criteria have been reported for student-athletes even though some universities fail to profit from athletic programs (Bowen & Levin, 2003).

Opponents would downplay the significance of racism or even suggest that Affirmative Action produces racism against the majority through reverse discrimination (Beckwith & Jones, 1997; Cabrera, 2014; Crawford, 2000; Crosby et al., 2006; Garrison-Wade & Lewis, 2004; Greenberg, 2001; Lawrence, 2001). This form of discrimination increases intergroup tension

(Lynch, 1992) to the degree that Maio & Esses (1998) found that even the mention of Affirmative Action in one laboratory study was enough to increase students' intolerance against out-group members. In a similar study, Cabrera (2014) found that white students minimized racism and often framed themselves as victims of reverse racism. Additionally, Cabrera noted that white students frequently blamed racial minorities for racial antagonism which promoted segregation on college campuses. Those in opposition additionally claim that basing admissions decisions on race, at the expense of ability and achievement, violates an honorable system of meritocracy (Zuriff, 2004).

It has been demonstrated that feelings toward Affirmative Action are largely due to an individual's sense of fairness (Culpepper, 2006; Ling, 2007). Another factor that can play a role in feelings toward Affirmative Action is whether the policies are "soft" or "hard," where "soft" forms, such as training programs, generally garner greater support (Crosby et al., 2006; Harper & Reskin, 2005). Feelings toward Affirmative Action may play a role in the development of one's attitudes toward the subject.

Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action

Many researchers have examined attitudes toward Affirmative Action. Variables that have been investigated include race, ethnicity, gender, political ideology, educational background, and socio-economic status. This section reviews the findings of these studies to present generalizations based on these variables.

Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Several researchers examined attitudes of Affirmative Action by race, ethnicity, and gender. Overall, race was found to be the most significant factor. Individual respondents who are of color tend to view Affirmative Action favorably compared to individual respondents who are

not of color (Bell, Harrison, & McLaughlin, 1997; Carr, 2007; Echols, 1997; Klineberg & Kravitz, 2003; Park, 2009; Sax & Arredondo, 1999; Sidanius, Levin, van Laar, & Sears, 2008; Virgil, 2000). With respect to gender, women view Affirmative Action favorably compared to men (Bell et al., 1997; Park, 2009; Sax & Arredondo, 1999).

Echols (1997) administered the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) to 705 undergraduate and graduate students at two large public universities in Ohio. She found significant differences in attitudes by gender and race. Specifically, White females were opposed (33.1%) to Affirmative Action compared to African American females (16.3%). Also, White males were opposed (69.8%) to Affirmative Action compared to African American males (30%) (Echols, 1997).

Sax and Arredondo (1999) examined 277,850 undergraduate freshmen who had participated in the 1996 Freshman Survey of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the University of California, Los Angeles. They found that White respondents exhibited the highest percentage of opposition to Affirmative Action (25.6%) compared to African Americans (5.3%). Inversely, African American respondents reported favorable attitudes toward Affirmative Action (43.8%) as compared to White respondents (8%). Additionally, each racial/ethnic group (to include Asian Americans and Mexican Americans), measured on a four-point Likert scale, exhibited ambivalence in their position toward Affirmative Action at least 50% of the time having selected *somewhat agree* or *somewhat disagree*. In this same study, the researchers found that males reported a higher percentage of opposition to Affirmative Action than females for all four racial/ethnic groups.

Using the EAAI, Virgil (2000) surveyed graduate and professional students from one major research university in Missouri. With 228 usable respondents, Virgil found similar

relationships. Males were less likely to support Affirmative Action compared to females. Also, White respondents were less likely to support Affirmative Action compared to nonWhite respondents (Virgil, 2000).

Using a modified version of the EAAI, Carr (2007) distributed her version of the survey at one mid-size university in Michigan shortly after a state-wide vote to eliminate the use of Affirmative Action in college admissions. With 562 respondents, Carr found significant differences by race. Specifically, White respondents reported a less favorable attitude toward Affirmative Action compared to African and Asian American respondents. Contrary to Echols' findings, Carr failed to find significant differences in attitude toward Affirmative Action by gender.

None of the previous studies considered how attitudes changed over time. The following studies were longitudinal to ascertain whether campus and formal educational experiences impact attitudes toward Affirmative Action. Aberson (2007) surveyed 1,062 students from the University of Michigan both in 1990 and 1994. He found that Black students were more supportive of Affirmative Action. Additionally, Aberson found that Asian American women felt that Affirmative Action programs did not compromise academic quality compared to their male counterparts. From the longitudinal nature of this study, Aberson found that participating in diversity-related campus activities was positively related to more favorable attitudes toward Affirmative Action across racial and ethnic groups. Sidanius et al. (2008) surveyed students attending the University of California over the course of five years. They found that White and Asian American students entered college opposing Affirmative Action but became increasingly supportive toward the end of their fourth year. Lastly, in a broader study, Park (2009) examined 18,000 students from 169 institutions during their first and fourth years in college to assess

whether attitudes change in response to formal higher education experiences. She found that Black students were not only less likely to agree with abolishing Affirmative Action compared to all other racial/ethnic groups but that after four years, they became increasingly steadfast in their attitudes toward abolishing Affirmative Action. When considering gender differences, Park (2009) found that while men were more likely than women to *agree strongly* that Affirmative Action should be abolished, women were more likely to positively change their attitudes toward Affirmative Action over four years.

Socio-Economic Status

While Echols (1997) found no significant differences in attitudes toward Affirmative Action in comparing individual respondents between several socioeconomic classes, Sax and Arredondo (1999) did. They found that the higher socio-economic classes for Whites, Asian Americans, and Mexican Americans were more likely to oppose Affirmative Action policies. Alternatively, they found the reverse to be true for African Americans. Individual respondents who reported earning in the higher socio-economic classes were more supportive of Affirmative Action policies. Contrary to these findings Zamani-Gallaher (2007) and Park (2009) did not find a significant effect on income levels of Blacks and Hispanic students.

Zamani-Gallaher (2007) utilized data collected from the 1996 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). In surveying 20,339 community college freshmen she found that while White students classified with higher annual family income tended to disfavor Affirmative Action in college admissions, there was no effect for higher annual family income with Black and Hispanic students. In another study, Park (2009) found changes in attitudes toward Affirmative Action when surveying students during their first and fourth years of college. Students who identified as belonging to the high parental education/income category during their

first year of college were most likely to *agree strongly* to the question asking whether Affirmative Action in college admissions ought to be abolished. The responses of students in their fourth year in college found that students who identified as belonging to the middle socioeconomic bracket were most likely to have responded that they “agree strongly” to the same question. While the findings of the study suggest that background traits and attitudes toward Affirmative Action brought to college were the most significant predictor of attitudes after college, campus experiences play some role in changing attitudes toward Affirmative Action.

Political Ideology

Attitudes of Affirmative Action have been found to align with political party affiliation (Bobo, 1998; Echols, 1997; Sax & Arredondo, 1999; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996; Sidanius et al., 2008). Sidanius et al. (1996) used data from three studies to test hypotheses associated with racism, conservatism, and educational attainment. Two of the three studies surveyed students while the third surveyed randomly selected adults. The authors suggested that the relationships between racism and political conservatism increase as a function of “educational sophistication” (Sidanius et al., 1996, p. 476). They also found a relationship between opposition to affirmative action and political conservatism.

Bobo (1998) examined attitudes of Affirmative Action across political ideologies and found a relationship, especially among Whites. He noted that the relationships were influenced by racial attitudes strongly affiliated with political ideologies rather than the ideologies themselves.

Ideological identification has a real net effect on beliefs about the impact of affirmative action among Whites. However, part of the gross effect of ideology stems from its correlation with explicitly racial attitudes and, what is more, the effects of perceived threat and of symbolic racism are a good deal more consequential. (Bobo, 1998, p. 998)

Echols (1997) found that party affiliation was a strong predictor of attitudes toward Affirmative Action. According to Echols, 19.9% of individuals who identified as Democrats supported Affirmative Action compared to only 6.5% of respondents who identified as being Republican. Similarly, Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found that students who self-identified as being *conservative* across racial groups were more likely to denounce Affirmative Action compared to those who self-identified as being *liberal*. They also found that individuals who self-identify as *moderates* tend to fall between *conservatives* and *liberals*.

Sidanius et al. (2008) found in a longitudinal study that the political orientation and attitudes of White students were more definitive upon entering college compared to Asian Americans and Latino/as. Additionally, they found that upon graduation, the political orientation and attitudes of Asian Americans were still less definitive compared to their White counterparts. Sidanius et al. (2008) noted that understanding the development of political orientation and ideology was important given the role that these orientations and ideologies play in shaping attitudes toward Affirmative Action.

In contrast to the results of Sax and Arrendondo (1999), Crawford and Pilanski (2012) examined tolerance to some issues that included Affirmative Action. Contrary to the authors' expectations, there was no relationship between conservatism and intolerance toward Affirmative Action. One explanation of these unexpected results could be extreme outliers in a relatively small sample (N = 160). While the researchers considered this as a possible bias and identified at least one extreme outlier using Mahalanobis distance, the outlier's responses were retained. Additionally, the 160 survey participants were recruited through Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online labor market where participants are recruited to complete

survey research for compensation as compared to earlier studies that utilized administrators, faculty, staff, and students of higher education (Crawford & Pilanski, 2012).

Educational Sophistication

Several researchers have examined the effects of educational sophistication on attitudes toward Affirmative Action resulting in mixed findings. Sax and Arrendondo (1999), Golden et al. (2001), and Wodtke (2012) found that educational attainment positively influenced attitudes on Affirmative Action. Wodtke (2012) specifically conducted a multiracial analysis noting that much of the previous research focused on attitudes of Whites. He found that Whites, Hispanics, and Blacks who had attained higher levels of education were more likely to reject negative stereotypes and exhibited positive effects on awareness of discrimination against minorities.

Both Echols (1997) and Carr (2007) found no significant relationship between one's educational sophistication and attitudes toward affirmative action though Carr noted that education level approached significance. Additionally, Carr found from an open-ended question that asked respondents to define Affirmative Action, an 11% increase in positive definitions between undergraduate students and those who had obtained a terminal degree. Frederico and Sidanius (2002) found that educational attainment strengthened the relationship between concerns and "principled objections" toward Affirmative Action where "principled objections" were defined as specific race-neutral rationales for opposing such policies (p. 488). Additionally, they found that additional years of college boosted the correlation between racism and these "principled objections" (p. 497).

General Knowledge of Affirmative Action

Studies that assess knowledge of Affirmative Action have been limited (Carr, 2007). Of the available research, general knowledge of Affirmative Action has been shown to vary

significantly by racial/ethnic groups, party affiliation, institutional position (higher education), and educational sophistication (Arriola & Cole, 2001; Carr, 2007; Echols, 1997; Kravitz et al., 2000; Zamboanga et al., 2002). Also, relationships have been established between an individual's general knowledge of Affirmative Action and their attitude toward Affirmative Action (Bell, 1996; Golden et al., 2001; Goldsmith et al., 1989; Stout & Buffum, 1993). Bell (1996) surveyed 610 survey participants and found a negative relationship between self-reported knowledge and attitudes toward Affirmative Action. Conversely, Stout and Buffum (1993) surveyed 193 social workers and found a positive relationship between self-reporting knowledge of Affirmative Action and experiences with Affirmative Action. Even though poignant attitudes have been presented in courts of law, at least one study found that some percentage of the population are easily influenced. Fletcher and Chalmers (1991) discovered that half of the respondents they polled indicated that they would reconsider their views when presented with opposition suggesting their attitudes were "soft" (p. 87).

Echols (1997) demonstrated that knowledge of Affirmative Action varied by race and gender. Results of knowledge by race were similar to those reported by Carr (2007) with Blacks having significantly more knowledge than Whites. When considering knowledge by gender, Echols noted that White women, though often themselves recipients of Affirmative Action policies, aligned themselves with the dominant White male culture; rather than with people of color. Attesting to these findings, Echols reported that women, in general, were found to possess less knowledge of Affirmative Action than their male counterparts.

McGahey (2007) examined general knowledge of Affirmative Action by position (participant group), gender, race, and academic discipline. The results of his study suggested that the only significant differences were between African Americans and Caucasians. Similar to the

findings of Echols (1997) and Carr (2007), McGahey found that African Americans demonstrated greater knowledge of Affirmative Action compared to Caucasians.

Carr (2007) found that knowledge of Affirmative Action varied by race and educational sophistication. Specifically, she found that African American respondents were significantly more knowledgeable of Affirmative Action than Whites and that respondents who had attained higher levels of education possessed more knowledge.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this survey study was to assess attitudes and general knowledge of the use of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee. The need to examine attitudes and general knowledge at this institution was identified by McGahey (2007) as further research that could inform his study.

The results of this study may be used by institutions to better understand attitudes and general knowledge of shareholders and in guiding institutional policy-making, training, and curriculum design toward the education of their citizenry. This chapter includes a list of research questions and null hypotheses, a description of the survey instrument, a description of the population under study, data collection methods, analysis, and concludes with a chapter summary.

I chose a non-experimental, quantitative methodology with a comparative (survey) design to determine attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admission practices. The research questions sought to describe relationships in attitudes and general knowledge between variables such as participant group (administrators, faculty, staff, and students), race, gender, and academic discipline. While some of these questions could be addressed qualitatively, the nature of the survey instrument used and the number of study variables lend themselves to quantitative methodologies. In addition, Carr (2007) identified a quantitative approach as an “excellent way” of measuring attitudes and knowledge of Affirmative Action (p. 58).

Additionally, this approach was chosen so that the results of the study could be descriptively compared to a similar study conducted at this same institution (McGahey, 2007). Central to this study is the intent to determine any change over time in attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee.

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

The following research questions were investigated. The research instrument that was used is a modified version of the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) (Appendix C):

1. Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students)?

H₀1. There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students).

2. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

H₀2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

3. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

H₀3. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

4. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

H₀4. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

5. Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI by race?

H₀5. There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI by race.

6. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

H₀6. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

7. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

H₀7. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

8. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

H₀8. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

9. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

H₀9. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

10. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

H₀10. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

11. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

H₀11. There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

Instrumentation

A survey method was chosen to assess these questions due to the ease of data collection, the ability to gather attributes of a population from a small sample of responses, the ability to explore relationships between variables, and its ease of distribution (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006; Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006). For this study, a modified version of the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI), was used.

Instrument Development

The original EAAI was developed by Echols (1997) guided by Alreck and Settle (1985), Dillman (1977), Schuman and Presser (1981), and Sudman (1977). These guidelines considered factors that may affect or introduce biases such as question-order effects, question form and content, and tone and intensity of language (Echols, 1997). The original survey consisted of 67 questions that fell under five domains:

1. Knowledge of facts concerning affirmative action
2. Diversity and affirmative action
3. Quotas, diversity and affirmative action
4. Morals and ethics of affirmative action
5. Demographic information of survey respondents (p. 50)

According to Echols (1997), "It was developed by the researcher after a careful examination of the U.S. government's definition of affirmative action and anti-discrimination policies, review of literature and theory on affirmative action, previous research on race and gender studies" (p. 48).

In designing the survey, Echols (1997) noted that the first section of the survey was created to assess the subject's general knowledge of the facts about the issues and purposes of anti-discrimination laws and federal affirmative action programs and policies. The second section was created to assess the subject's level of participation in diversity and affirmative action events. The third section was created to assess the subject's beliefs about the issues of diversity, quotas, preferences, and affirmative action. The fourth section was created to assess the subject's moral and ethical beliefs about affirmative action policies, programs, and laws. The last section was created to collect basic demographic, religious, and political data (Echols, 1997, p. 50).

The survey was subjected to reliability and validity testing by distributing it to a group of 30 student volunteers and six experts defined as being professionals in the fields of Affirmative Action and constitutional law (Echols, 1997). Respondents were given detailed instructions to complete the survey and asked to make notes and suggestions on questions that required further clarification. Afterward, the responses were collected, and the six experts were consulted (Echols, 1997).

Two domains of the survey demonstrated overall low reliability, specifically the domains that assessed "Knowledge of Facts" ($\alpha = .2300$) and "Diversity and Affirmative Action" ($\alpha = .1930$). Alternatively, both the "Diversity/Quotas" and the "Moral/Ethics of Affirmative Action" sections demonstrated good overall reliability levels ($\alpha = .7393$ and $\alpha = .7863$, respectively) (Echols, 1997).

Upon further investigation, Echols (1997) noted that while overall reliability measures were low for the "Knowledge of Facts" and "Diversity and Affirmative Action" domains, individual questions on the survey within these domains were found to have higher alpha levels.

For example, questions 4, 5, and 8 of the “Knowledge of Facts” dimension demonstrated alpha scores of .5000 and questions from the “Diversity of Affirmative Action” dimension demonstrated alpha levels of .8503 (see Echols (1997) for details).

Echols (1997) hypothesized that the low reliability of the overall “Knowledge of Facts” section might be due to sensitivities to issues involving race and gender and response bias due to discomfort and resentment regarding the “facts” of Affirmative Action. Additionally, the low overall reliability in this section might also be related to sampling errors such as the number of questions, question selection, and response error (Alreck & Settle, 1985). Lastly, Echols (1997) pointed out that “facts” about Affirmative Action in this country were “unclear” and attaining reliable responses to “Knowledge of Facts” were difficult. Having identified individual questions that exhibited lower reliability, Echols (1997) surmised that “reliability is less of an issue when validity is robust” (p. 56).

Face validity refers to the degree to which the survey questions appear to be meaningful dimensions of the domains of Affirmative Action, based on the subjective judgment of experts and the pilot sample of intended populations (Virgil, 2000, p. 90). To assess sampling and face validity, Echols (1997) used the responses from the pilot consisting of 30 student volunteers and six experts. In general, a test is valid if the degree to which scientific explanations of phenomena match reality (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Sampling validity was established when respondents agreed that each of the five domains was adequately represented (Echols, 1997; Baker, 1989). Both students and experts agreed that the level and extent of coverage of Affirmative Action issues provided a fair representation of the issues of Affirmative Action (Echols, 1997). Permission to use and modify the Echols’s Affirmative Action Inventory was granted by Echols via email.

Instrument Modification & Testing

Researchers in four later studies utilized, and in three cases modified, the EAAI (Carr, 2007; McGahey, 2007; Smith, 2015; Virgil, 2000). Virgil (2000) used the original EAAI without modifications or further reliability testing. However, the results obtained by Virgil were similar to those obtained by Echols which does provide evidence of reliability (Carr, 2007).

Carr (2007) modified the EAAI and subjected her version of the EAAI to Cronbach's alpha for the reliability of both attitude and knowledge items of the survey, constructs that were emphasized in her study (see Appendix B). Cronbach's alpha represents the expected correlation of two tests that measure the same construct (Nunnally, 1978). These analyses resulted in a $\alpha = .772$ for the aggregated knowledge items, and a $\alpha = .779$ for the aggregated attitude items (p. 68). Both aggregates were considered reliable due to the .70 threshold supported by Nunnally (1978, p. 245). Permission to use and modify the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory was granted by Carr via email.

McGahey (2007) modified the EAAI using the same original five domains (see Appendix C). The modifications consisted of reducing the number of questions from 67 to 42 to improve completion time and the "succinctness" of the survey instrument (McGahey, 2007). Relying on the results from previous studies (Echols, 1997 & Virgil, 2000), McGahey did not subject the instrument to further reliability and validity testing. McGahey granted permission to use and modify the version of the EAAI that was used in his study.

Lastly, Smith (2015) modified the EAAI to address research questions related to class-based Affirmative Action. Revisions to the EAAI included alterations, rearrangement, deletions, and additional questions. To reestablish validity and reliability, Smith (2015) conducted a pilot study consisting of an expert panel of three researchers. Next, Smith (2015) administered the

instrument to 10 assistant principals resulting in a Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .82$) suggestive of high reliability.

For this current study, I modified McGahey's (2007) survey instrument. The modifications reflect changes in terminology and demographic responses, such as salary ranges. These changes were formulated in response to feedback gathered from two individuals with backgrounds in Affirmative Action. The first reviewer was Dr. Derick Virgil, Associate Dean at Winston-Salem State University. Having completed his doctoral dissertation on Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at the University of Missouri, Dr. Virgil suggested minor updates to terminology. The second reviewer was Ms. Joan Bates, Director of Human Resources at Cleveland State Community College. Joan serves as Cleveland State Community College's Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Liaison. After reviewing my proposed survey instrument, Joan offered minor terminology recommendations such as updating acceptable terms for race categories.

The instrument used for this study consisted of 42 questions that fall under the constructs of General Knowledge, Diversity and Affirmative Action, Support of Affirmative Action, Morals/Ethics of Affirmative Action, and Demographic Information. The questions were selected carefully to ensure adequate reliability, and validity testing has been conducted by previous researchers through the use of specific testing (Cronbach's alpha) and the repetition of results. This instrument, as well as the instruments used by Carr (2007) and McGahey (2007), are available in the appendices (Appendices A, B, & C, respectively).

Sample

I examined the attitudes and general knowledge of administrators, faculty, staff, and students at one HBCU in Tennessee. According to this institution's website, the Fall 2016

enrollment at this institution consisted of approximately 7,000 undergraduates and 2,000 graduate students. The racial profile of the student body consisted of approximately 70% Black, 20% White, and 10% other. During the Fall 2016 semester, the institution employed approximately 350 full-time and 200 adjunct faculty. While the population of administrators and staff was not made available for this specific institution, research conducted by Chen Chao (2014) concluded that the average administrators and administrative staff-to-faculty ratio for public universities in the United States from 1995-96, 2005-06, and 2012-13 is 3.79 suggesting that the study institution supports approximately 2,085 administrators and administrative staff.

A power analysis was used to determine the sample size required to facilitate statistical significance. Power is described as the probability of rejecting a null hypothesis when it is false (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).

Data Collection

I uploaded this survey instrument in an online survey development cloud-based software program. The survey instrument, along with the home and target Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval letters were submitted to the Vice President over the Office of Information Technology at the target institution. A link to the survey was electronically distributed over the exchange email server on November 3rd, 2017 to every member of the university administration, faculty, staff, and student body. Questions on the survey were designed to create variables for the study that includes participant group (administrator, faculty, staff, or student), race, gender, and academic discipline.

Participation in this online survey was voluntary and anonymous. A small monetary reward was offered to one respondent from each participant group (administrators, faculty, staff, and student) to incentivize response rates. Two questionnaires were created to ensure anonymity.

The first was the survey instrument. The second was a short form that allowed for the collection of identifying information (respondent's name and email). Once the survey links were distributed; a reminder email was sent to the same sample group one week after the initial invitation to participate. Two weeks (14 days) after the initial email, the survey closed. Within one week of the deadline for submission, randomly selected respondents were chosen and contacted to receive the gift cards. Gift cards were mailed on November 24th, 2017.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were generated to display frequencies and percentages of respondents' participant group (administrator, faculty, staff, or student), race, gender, and academic discipline. Descriptive statistics "transform a set of numbers or observations into indices that describe or characterize the data" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p. 150). After frequencies were generated; the data was subjected to inferential statistical analyses using IBM-SPSS version 21.0. Inferential statistics "make inferences or predictions about the similarity of a sample to the population from which the sample is drawn" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p. 150). The inferential statistical analyses that best fit this study were the chi-square analyses and two-way analysis of variance (two-way ANOVA). Chi-square analyses are used to find deviation of observed frequencies from expected frequencies. Two-way ANOVA is employed when studies contain three or more sample means compared to two independent variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). For research questions 1 and 5, I subjected the data to chi-square analyses. For research questions 2-4 and 6-11, I subjected the data to two-way ANOVAs since these questions contain two independent variables (i.e., participant groups, gender, race, and academic discipline). If significances were found, post hoc testing was conducted.

Summary

The research methodologies employed in this study have been reported in Chapter 3. The research questions and null hypotheses were introduced. An overview of the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI), the population under study, data collection, and data analyses were described. The results of the data analyses will be presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to assess general knowledge and attitudes toward Affirmative Action at one Historically Black University (HBCU) in Tennessee. Affirmative Action in higher education admission practices has been a heated topic for debate for decades. This study's population consisted of administrators, faculty, staff, and students of one HBCU in Tennessee. The institution's population at the time of survey distribution consisted of approximately 8,700 students, 550 faculty members, and 2,100 administrators and staff.

Surveys were sent over the institution's exchange email server to every member of the institution's administration, faculty, staff, and student body. At the conclusion of the collection period, 269 surveys were deemed usable. Of these, 31 surveys were completed by administrators, faculty completed 62 surveys, 55 surveys were completed by staff, and 121 surveys were completed by students. Frequencies and percentages of respondents' participant groups are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Participant Groups

Participant Group	N	%
Administrators	31	11.52
Faculty	62	23.05
Staff	55	20.45
Students	121	44.98
Total	269	100.00

Of the 269 respondents, 94 identified as male and 175 identified as female . Five respondents self-identified as “other.” Due to the small number of respondents who selected this option, their gender selection was removed from the analyses. Frequences and percentages of respondents’ gender are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents’ Gender

Gender Group	N	%
Male	94	34.94
Female	175	65.06
Total	269	100.00

Question 32 of the survey asked the respondents to identify by race. Nine options were available for selection (White (N = 80), African American (N = 169), American Indian (N = 2), Asian American (N = 3), Non-Black Latin American (N = 2), Asian (N = 8), Alaskan (N = 0), Pacific Islander (N = 6), and Hispanic (N = 2). These selections were categorized into White and Nonwhite due to the small samples sizes for many of the categories. With this modification, 80 respondents identified as “White” and 192 identified as “Nonwhite.” Frequencies and percentages of respondents’ race are outlined in Table 3. Differences in totals in these frequency tables (Table 3 differed from Tables 1 and 2) were due to some respondents not answering some questions.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Race

Race Group	N	%
White	80	29.41
Nonwhite	192	70.59
Total	272	100.00

Lastly, respondents were asked (in question 38) to identify with a college or school within the institution. Twelve options were available to include Agriculture, Human, & Natural Sciences (N = 32), Business (N = 28), Education (N = 44), Engineering (N = 2), Graduate Studies & Research (N = 10), Health Sciences (N = 43), Liberal Arts (N = 41), Life & Physical Sciences (N = 9), Public Service (N = 13), Aerospace Studies (AFROTC) (N = 1), Non-academic Staff (N = 20), and Non-academic Administrator (N = 8). Due to the small sample sizes for several of the options, the 12 categories were reduced to four based on common academic requirements. These four included the Sciences (Agriculture, Human, & Natural Sciences, Health, Aerospace Studies), the Humanities (Education, Liberal Arts, Public Service), Advanced Studies (Business, Graduate Studies & Research, Engineering), and Nonacademic (Administrator, Staff). With this modification, 85 respondents were classified as Sciences, 98 respondents were classified as Humanities, 40 were classified as Advanced Studies, and 28 respondents were classified as Nonacademic. Frequencies and percentages of respondents' academic disciplines are outline in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Academic Disciplines

Academic Discipline Group	N	%
Sciences	85	33.90
Humanities	98	39.04
Advanced Studies	40	15.94
Nonacademic	28	11.16
Total	251	100.00

Eleven research questions were developed for this study. Each research question and corresponding null hypothesis were tested. Chi-Square tests were used to assess the existence of associations between the variables that included the General Knowledge Dimension (research questions 1 and 5) which consisted of nine survey questions requiring a “yes” or “no” response. Two-way ANOVAs were used to determine whether any statistically significant differences existed between the means of two independent variables on a dependent variable (research questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11). The results of the data analyses follow.

Research Question 1

Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension (questions 1-9) of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students)?

Two-way contingency tables analyses were used to evaluate the null sub-hypotheses associated with each of the nine questions. The results of these analyses follow.

Ho₁₁: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question one of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question one was designed to assess whether Affirmative Action was designed to correct past discrimination against all minorities. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question one, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 7.52, p = .057, \text{Cramér's } V = .17$.

Ho₁₂: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question two of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question two was designed to assess whether anti-discrimination laws protect the rights of all people. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question two, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 4.68, p = .197, \text{Cramér's } V = .13$.

Ho₁₃: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question three of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question three was designed to assess whether Affirmative Action should be implemented because it is required, irrespective of morality. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question three, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 4.65, p = .199, \text{Cramér's } V = .13$.

Ho₁₄: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question four of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators,

faculty, staff, and students). Question four was designed to assess whether federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect African Americans, American Indians, Asians, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question four, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 7.65, p = .054, \text{Cramér's } V = .17$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the differences among these proportions. The results are in Table 5. The Holm's sequential Bonferroni method was used to control for Type I error at the .05 level across all comparisons. The only pairwise differences that were significant were between faculty and administrators and between staff and administrators. The probability of a faculty member selecting "No" for this question was approximately 6.77 times more likely than an administrator. Similarly, the probability of a staff member selecting "No" for this question was approximately 5.25 times more likely than an administrator.

Table 5

Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 14

Comparison	χ^2	<i>p</i> value (Alpha)	Cramér's V
Student vs. Staff	1.18	.277	.08
Student vs. Administrator	2.13	.145	.118
Student vs. Faculty	3.28	.070	.133
Faculty vs. Staff	.314	.575	.051
Faculty vs. Administrator	6.12	.013*	.255
Staff vs. Administrator	4.17	.041*	.219

* p value \leq alpha .05

Ho₁₅: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question five of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question five was designed to assess whether federal guidelines define underrepresented groups as ethnic minorities, veterans, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question five, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 1.16, p = .763, \text{Cramér's } V = .07$.

Ho₁₆: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question six of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question six was designed to assess whether the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments prohibit discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, age, national origin, and religion. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null

hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question six, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 5.50, p = .138$, Cramér's $V = .14$.

Ho17: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question seven of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question seven was designed to assess whether anti-discrimination laws prohibit discrimination against all races. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question seven, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 4.69, p = .196$, Cramér's $V = .13$.

Ho18: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question eight of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question eight was designed to assess whether gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question eight, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 11.25, p = .010$, Cramér's $V = .20$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the differences among these proportions. The results are in Table 6. The Holm's sequential Bonferroni method was used to control for Type I error at the .05 level across all comparisons. The only pairwise differences that were significant was between faculty and administrators and between staff and administrators. The probability of a faculty member selecting "No" for this question was approximately 5.85

times more likely than an administrator. Similarly, the probability of a staff member selecting “No” for this question was approximately 4.00 times more likely than an administrator.

Table 6

Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 18

Comparison	χ^2	<i>p</i> value (Alpha)	Cramér’s V
Student vs. Staff	.03	.861	.01
Student vs. Administrator	5.19	.023	.18
Student vs. Faculty	3.33	.068	.13
Faculty vs. Staff	1.91	.167	.13
Faculty vs. Administrator	11.07	.001*	.34
Staff vs. Administrator	4.88	.027*	.24

* *p* value \leq alpha .05

Ho19: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question nine of the EAAI among participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students). Question nine was designed to assess whether federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect African Americans, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question nine, $\chi^2(3, N = 273) = 8.12, p = .044, \text{Cramér’s } V = .17$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the differences among these proportions. The results are in Table 7. The Holm’s sequential Bonferroni method was used to

control for Type I error at the .05 level across all comparisons. The only pairwise differences that were significant was between faculty and administrators, student and administrators, and staff and administrators. The probability of a faculty member selecting “No” for this question was approximately 16.86 times more likely than an administrator. The probability of a staff member selecting “No” for this question was approximately 9.99 times more likely than an administrator. Lastly, the probability of a student selecting “No” for this question was approximately 21.22 times more likely than an administrator.

Table 7

Results for the Pairwise Comparisons for Research Question 1₉

Comparison	χ^2	<i>p</i> value (Alpha)	Cramér’s V
Student vs. Staff	.02	.898	.01
Student vs. Administrator	3.88	.049*	.16
Student vs. Faculty	2.52	.113	.12
Faculty vs. Staff	1.41	.235	.11
Faculty vs. Administrator	7.58	.006*	.28
Staff vs. Administrator	3.87	.049*	.21

* *p* value \leq alpha .05

Research Question 2

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and gender on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and gender consisting of two levels: males and females. The dependent variable was the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension which consisted of five survey questions (questions 10-14) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 8. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and gender, $F(3, 256) = 1.02, p = .386$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and the main effect for gender, $F(1, 256) = 1.84, p = .177$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, but significant main effects for participant group, $F(3, 256) = 13.23, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. Male and female respondents exhibited similar total means and standard deviations (males = 13.05-3.47, females = 12.39-3.17).

The purpose of the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI was to assess how often participants volunteered or were mandated to attend or participate in diversity functions. Follow-up analyses to the main effect for participant groups examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators attended or participated in diversity functions significantly more than students, faculty, or staff.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity

Dimension of the EAAI

Gender	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Male	Students	12.17	3.40
	Faculty	12.08	2.91
	Staff	13.80	3.75
	Administrators	16.13	2.39
Female	Students	12.10	3.47
	Faculty	12.08	2.57
	Staff	11.92	2.64
	Administrators	15.69	2.12

Research Question 3

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Ho3: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and gender on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of

four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and gender consisting of two levels: males and females. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward support dimension which consisted of seven survey questions (questions 16-22) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 9. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and gender, $F(3, 254) = .89, p = .446, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, and the main effect for gender, $F(1, 254) < .01, p = .985, \text{partial } \eta^2 < .01$, but significant main effects for participant group, $F(3, 254) = 4.53, p = .004, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$. Male and female respondents exhibited similar total means and standard deviations (males = 17.34-3.16, females = 17.31-2.61).

The purpose of the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants supported quota systems associated with Affirmative Action policies. Follow-up analyses to the main effect for participant groups examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to students, faculty, and staff.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI

Gender	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Male	Students	17.92	3.48
	Faculty	16.08	3.11
	Staff	17.00	2.27
	Administrators	18.47	2.59
Female	Students	17.59	2.92
	Faculty	17.05	2.65
	Staff	16.47	1.87
	Administrators	18.31	1.70

Research Question 4

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender?

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by gender.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and gender on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and gender consisting of two

levels: males and females. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension which consisted of eight survey questions (questions 23-30) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 10. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and gender, $F(3, 248) = .71, p = .547$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, the main effect for gender, $F(1, 248) = .14, p = .708$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and the main effect for participant group, $F(3, 248) = 1.67, p = .174$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Male and female respondents exhibited similar total means and standard deviations (males = 22.32-4.29, females = 21.98-3.60).

The purpose of the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants believed that Affirmative Action is moral and ethical. The results of this analysis suggest there are no significant differences in beliefs that Affirmative Action is moral and ethical between the participant groups and gender.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI

Gender	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Male	Students	23.14	4.37
	Faculty	21.96	4.10
	Staff	22.25	4.00
	Administrators	21.00	4.74
Female	Students	22.55	3.66
	Faculty	21.49	3.39
	Staff	21.11	3.41
	Administrators	22.38	3.91

Research Question 5

Is there a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension of the EAAI by race?

Two-way contingency tables analyses were used to evaluate the null sub-hypotheses associated with each of the nine questions. The results of these analyses follow.

Ho5₁: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question one of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question one was designed to assess whether Affirmative Action was designed to correct past discrimination against all minorities. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of

responses to the general knowledge dimension question one, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 6.66, p = .010$, Cramér's $V = .16$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The probability of a Non-White respondent selecting "Yes" for this question was approximately 2.89 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White.

Ho5₂: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question two of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question two was designed to assess whether anti-discrimination laws protect the rights of all people. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question two, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = .47, p = .495$, Cramér's $V = .04$.

Ho5₃: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question three of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question three was designed to assess whether Affirmative Action should be implemented because it is required, irrespective of morality. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question three, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 2.28, p = .131$, Cramér's $V = .09$.

Ho5₄: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question four of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question four was designed to assess whether federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect African Americans, American Indians, Asians, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference

in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question four, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 2.32, p = .128, \text{Cramér's } V = .09$.

Ho5₅: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question five of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question five was designed to assess whether federal guidelines define underrepresented groups as ethnic minorities, veterans, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question five, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = .23, p = .635, \text{Cramér's } V = .03$.

Ho5₆: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question six of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question six was designed to assess whether the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments prohibit discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, age, national origin, and religion. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question six, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = .45, p = .501, \text{Cramér's } V = .04$.

Ho5₇: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question seven of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question seven was designed to assess whether anti-discrimination laws prohibit discrimination against all races. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question seven, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 2.56, p = .110, \text{Cramér's } V = .10$.

Ho5₈: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question eight of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question eight was designed to assess whether gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question eight, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 13.34, p < .001$, Cramér's $V = .22$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The probability of a Non-White respondent selecting "Yes" for this question was approximately 3.85 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White.

Ho5₉: There is no significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question nine of the EAAI by race (White and Non-White). Question nine was designed to assess whether federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect African Americans, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women, and the disabled. A two-way contingency table analysis was used to evaluate the null hypothesis. The results indicated there was a significant difference in the proportion of responses to the general knowledge dimension question nine, $\chi^2(1, N = 272) = 4.68, p = .031$, Cramér's $V = .13$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The probability of a Non-White respondent selecting "Yes" for this question was approximately 2.76 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White.

Research Question 6

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Ho6: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and race on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and race consisting of two levels: White and Non-White. The dependent variable was the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension which consisted of five survey questions (questions 10-14) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 11. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and race, $F(3, 259) = .59, p = .623$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and the main effect for race, $F(1, 259) = 1.55, p = .214$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$. The significance of the main effect for participant group for this dimension has already been established in research question two ($F(3, 256) = 13.23, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$). White and Nonwhite respondents exhibited similar total means and standard deviations (White = 13.03-3.53, Non-White= 12.46-3.17).

The purpose of the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI was to assess how often participants volunteered or were mandated to attend or participate in diversity functions. Follow-up analyses to the main effect for participant groups examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the

pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators attended or participated in diversity functions significantly more than students, faculty, or staff.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity

Dimension of the EAAI

Race	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
White	Students	12.25	3.69
	Faculty	12.04	2.41
	Staff	13.00	3.95
	Administrators	16.83	2.37
Non-White	Students	12.06	3.40
	Faculty	12.24	2.88
	Staff	12.25	2.66
	Administrators	15.32	1.97

Research Question 7

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Ho7: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and race on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and race consisting of two levels: White and Non-White. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward support dimension which consisted of seven survey questions (questions 16-22) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 12. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and race, $F(3, 258) = 1.53, p = .208, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, and the main effect for race, $F(1, 258) = .64, p = .424, \text{partial } \eta^2 < .01$. The significance of the main effect for participant group for this dimension has already been established in research question three ($F(3, 254) = 4.53, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$). White and Nonwhite respondents exhibited similar total means and standard deviations (White = 16.96-2.80, Non-White= 17.45-2.84).

The purpose of the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants supported quota systems associated with Affirmative Action policies. Follow-up analyses to the main effect for participant groups examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to both faculty and staff.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI

Race	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
White	Students	16.70	3.84
	Faculty	16.79	2.22
	Staff	17.07	2.30
	Administrators	17.75	2.34
Non-White	Students	17.93	2.87
	Faculty	16.56	3.37
	Staff	16.34	1.98
	Administrators	18.79	1.96

Research Question 8

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race?

Ho8: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by race.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and race on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and race consisting of two levels: White

and Non-White. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension which consisted of eight survey questions (questions 23-30) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 13. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and race, $F(3, 251) = 1.65, p = .179, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, and the main effect for participant group, $F(3, 251) = .52, p = .666, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, but significant main effects for race, $F(1, 251) = 13.20, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$.

The purpose of the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants believed that Affirmative Action is moral and ethical. Follow-up analyses of the main effect for race examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the two categories of race. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that respondents who identified as Non-White were more likely to agree Affirmative Action is moral and ethical compared to respondents who identified as White.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI

Gender	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
White	Students	21.15	5.06
	Faculty	20.85	3.46
	Staff	21.20	4.13
	Administrators	19.08	4.14
Non-White	Students	23.05	3.56
	Faculty	22.45	3.73
	Staff	21.54	3.38
	Administrators	23.37	3.61

Research Question 9

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Ho9: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and academic discipline on the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and

academic discipline consisting of four levels: Science, Humanities, Business, and Nonacademic. The dependent variable was the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension which consisted of five survey questions (questions 10-14) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 14. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and academic discipline, $F(3, 254) = 1.20, p = .301$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$, and the main effect for academic discipline, $F(3, 254) = 1.51, p = .214$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The significance of the main effect for participant group for this dimension has already been established in research question two ($F(3, 256) = 13.23, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$).

The purpose of the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension of the EAAI was to assess how often participants volunteered or were mandated to attend or participate in diversity functions. Follow-up analyses to the main effect for participant groups examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators attended or participated in diversity functions significantly more than students, faculty, or staff.

Table 14

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity**Dimension of the EAAI*

Academic Discipline	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Science	Students	12.81	3.55
	Faculty	12.24	2.64
	Staff	13.00	2.07
	Administrators	15.50	1.38
Humanities	Students	12.34	3.02
	Faculty	12.06	2.89
	Staff	15.38	3.62
	Administrators	16.00	2.28
Business	Students	10.87	3.63
	Faculty	11.88	2.48
	Staff	11.54	2.60
	Administrators	17.20	3.11
Nonacademic	Staff	11.33	3.03
	Administrators	15.33	2.12

Research Question 10

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Ho10: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and gender on the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and academic discipline consisting of four levels: Science, Humanities, Business, and Nonacademic. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward support dimension which consisted of seven survey questions (questions 16-22) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 15. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and academic discipline, $F(9, 251) = .98, p = .459$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, but significant main effects for academic discipline, $F(3, 251) = 2.95, p = .034$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. The significance of the main effect for participant group for this dimension has already been established in research question three ($F(3, 254) = 4.53, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$).

The purpose of the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants supported Affirmative Action policies. Follow-up analyses of the main effect for participant groups and academic disciplines examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of participant groups and the four categories of academic discipline. The Tukey HSD procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. The results of this analysis indicate that administrators were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to both

faculty and staff. Also, respondents who identified as belonging to Humanities were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to respondents who identified as belonging to the Business.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the EAAI

Academic Discipline	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Science	Students	18.49	3.08
	Faculty	15.95	3.47
	Staff	16.57	1.95
	Administrators	18.50	1.64
Humanities	Students	17.65	3.27
	Faculty	17.25	2.49
	Staff	18.33	.52
	Administrators	18.82	2.09
Business	Students	16.74	2.65
	Faculty	16.25	2.38
	Staff	15.46	2.15
	Administrators	16.80	3.35
Nonacademic	Staff	16.68	2.08
	Administrators	18.67	1.58

Research Question 11

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline?

Ho11: There is no significant difference in the mean scores on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI among the participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) by academic discipline.

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the effects of four participant groups (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) and academic discipline on the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI. The independent variables included the participant groups consisting of four levels: administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and academic discipline consisting of four levels: Science, Humanities, Business, and Nonacademic. The dependent variable was the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension which consisted of eight survey questions (questions 23-30) of the EAAI. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward support dimension of the EAAI as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 16. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between participant group and academic discipline, $F(9, 244) = 1.14, p = .333$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$, and the main effect for participant group, $F(3, 244) = .84, p = .475$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, but significant main effects for academic discipline, $F(3, 244) = 3.42, p = .018$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$.

The purpose of the attitudes toward morals/ethics dimension of the EAAI was to assess whether participants believed that Affirmative Action is moral and ethical. Follow-up analysis of the main effect for academic disciplines examined this issue. The follow-up tests consisted of all pairwise comparisons among the four categories of academic discipline. The Tukey HSD

procedure was used to control for Type I error across the pairwise comparisons. However, the results of this analysis found no significance between any of the pairwise comparisons. This may be a result of the wide difference in sample sizes of the subgroups. To assess whether sample sizes affected the results, the Scheffe' procedure was also used. The results of this analysis resulted in similar findings.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for the Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the EAAI

Academic Discipline	Participant Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Science	Students	22.50	3.93
	Faculty	20.71	4.44
	Staff	21.73	1.94
	Administrators	18.17	3.60
Humanities	Students	23.07	4.07
	Faculty	22.84	2.99
	Staff	21.14	2.04
	Administrators	23.91	4.13
Business	Students	22.52	3.78
	Faculty	19.71	2.70
	Staff	20.31	4.92
	Administrators	19.60	2.61
Nonacademic	Staff	22.11	3.93
	Administrators	22.56	4.16

Chapter Summary

Chapter four presented analyses for 11 research questions. All data were derived from the modified version of the EAAI. Findings included some significant differences between participant groups, race, and academic discipline for all four dimensions. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Affirmative Action in college admissions has been the most volatile and divisive issue in higher education that arose from the civil rights movements of the 1960s (Echols, 1997; Kellough, 2006). Legally, Affirmative Action has been repetitively brought before the courts resulting in landmark decisions such as *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), and a recent United States Supreme Court reaffirmation of the importance of Affirmative Action in *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2016).

As legal battles continue, institutions of higher education must assess the attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action of their constituents to properly educate their citizenry and guide policymaking. Additionally, this information can inform training initiatives, and curriculum design. Llewellyn (1995) noted that social issues are reflective of educational issues citing that schools are a microcosm of society. Toward this end, the purpose of this study was to assess attitudes and general knowledge of the use of Affirmative Action in higher education admissions at one HBCU in Tennessee. This institution was selected based on a similar study conducted at this institution by McGahey (2007). While this research was designed to assess current attitudes and general knowledge, it can also be descriptively compared to the results of this previous study.

The population for this study was students, faculty, staff, and administrators at the HBCU being studied. The instrument used was a modified version of a survey called the Echols's Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI). Originally developed by Echols (1997), the EAAI has been utilized for similar studies by Virgil (2000), McGahey (2007), Carr (2007), and Smith

(2015). The instrument consists of questions that measure respondent's attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action as well as demographic information such as race, gender, and academic discipline.

Summary of Findings

An analysis of the data found several areas of significance related to participant groups, race, and academic disciplines. The organization of this chapter provides a comparison of results of these variables to similar previously published studies.

Research Questions Addressing General Knowledge Dimension

The General Knowledge Dimension of the modified EAAI consisted of nine questions designed to assess respondent's knowledge of the history Affirmative Action along with Federal guidelines and anti-discrimination laws that govern the topic. For each survey question, sub-hypotheses were created. Research question one (sub-hypotheses Ho1₁ - Ho1₉) examined the dependent variable "participant group" and research question five (Ho5₁ - Ho5₉) examined the dependent variable "race." Significance was found in sub-hypotheses Ho1₄, Ho1₈, Ho1₉, Ho5₁, Ho5₈, Ho5₉. In reviewing all nine questions, questions four, eight, and nine were written with specific demographic characteristics. Question four asked if Federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect African American, American Indians, Asians, and the disabled. Question eight asked if gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws. Finally, question nine asked if Federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect African Americans, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women, and the disabled. Comparatively, the majority of the other six questions were demographically inclusive written in such a way that represents all persons. For example, questions one, two, and seven

asks whether Affirmative Action or anti-discrimination laws protect “all minorities,” “all people,” and “all races,” respectively.

For the three sub-hypotheses associated with research question one (participant group) that resulted in significances, the pairwise comparisons used to evaluate differences among proportions found that administrators differed from other participant groups in all three cases. In sub-hypothesis Ho14, when asked whether “federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect African Americans, American Indians, Asians, and the disabled,” faculty were 6.77 times more likely to select “No” compared to administrators, and staff members were 5.25 times more likely to select “No.” In sub-hypothesis Ho18, when asked whether “gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws,” faculty were 5.85 times more likely to select “No” compared to administrators, and staff members were 4.00 times more likely to select “No.” Lastly, in sub-hypothesis Ho19, when asked whether “federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect African Americans, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women and the disabled,” faculty were 16.86 times more likely to select “No” compared to administrators, staff members were 9.99 times more likely to select “No,” and students were 21.22 times more likely to select “No.”

Previous studies that addressed knowledge of Affirmative Action and participant group (or education level) found mixed results. McGahey (2007) found no significant differences between the general knowledge dimension and participant group. The sample sizes and means from McGahey’s analysis included: Administration ($N = 23 / M = 2.60$), Faculty ($N = 63 / M = 2.49$), Staff ($N = 73 / M = 2.32$), and Students ($N = 151 / M = 2.29$). In a similar study conducted that same year, Carr (2007) found that individuals who attained higher levels of education were found to be more knowledgeable. The results of these studies seem to contradict the findings of

the current study partially. In all three cases of significance, administrators consistently demonstrated greater knowledge of the topic. Administrators opted to respond “Yes” when asked to consider specific groups of individuals (e.g., disabled, Asians, Hispanics, gays, lesbians, illegal aliens, etc.) compared to faculty. Possible explanations for this may be due to institutional training revolving around sensitivity or societal pressures associated with “political correctness.” These potential explanations, coupled with the “administrative role,” may explain why administrators were more likely to affirm that these groups of individuals are protected by Affirmative Action, federal guidelines, and anti-discrimination policies.

For the three sub-hypotheses associated with research question five (race) that resulted in significances, the pairwise comparisons used to evaluate differences among proportions found that Non-White respondents differed from White respondents in all three cases. In sub-hypothesis Ho5₁, when asked whether “Affirmative Action is designed to correct past discrimination against all minorities,” the probability of a Non-White respondent selecting “Yes” for this question was 2.89 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White. In sub-hypothesis Ho5₈, when asked whether “gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws,” the probability of a Non-White respondent selecting “Yes” for this question was 3.85 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White. Lastly, in sub-hypothesis Ho5₉, when asked whether “federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect African Americans, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women and the disabled,” the probability of a Non-White respondent selecting “Yes” for this question was 2.76 times more likely than a respondent who identified as White.

Previous studies that addressed general knowledge of Affirmative Action and race are limited (Carr, 2007). Much of the available research stem from graduate theses and dissertations.

The majority of these studies found that individuals who personally benefited from Affirmative Action or who identified as Non-White tended to have a greater knowledge of the topic (Carr, 2007; Echols, 1997). McGahey (2007) found no significant differences between three ethnicity groups and knowledge of Affirmative Action in his study. The three ethnic groups included African-American, Caucasian, and “other.” In reviewing the survey instrument that McGahey (2007) used, the “other” category consisted of many ethnic groups who could have benefited from Affirmative Action programs (Asian American, Latino, Native America, etc.). If these “other” ethnic groups were added to the Non-White (African American) group, significance might have been found.

Research Questions Addressing Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension

The Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity Dimension of the modified EAAI consisted of five questions designed to determine how often respondents interacted with interracial or ethnic issues and whether respondents attended or participated (voluntarily or involuntarily) in diversity functions. Three research questions addressed this dimension varying by the dependent variables of participant group, gender, race, and academic discipline. The results of this analysis failed to indicate significant interactions between the pairs of independent variables (participant group and gender), (participant group and race), and (participant group and academic discipline), but significance was found in the means of the participant groups for this dimension. The results implied that administrators interacted with ethnic issues and attended or participated in diversity functions more than faculty, staff, and students.

These results resemble those of the study conducted by McGahey (2007). McGahey found nonsignificant interaction between participant group and gender but a significant main effect for participant group. Other studies found significant relationships among gender, and an

individual's support or non-support for diversity functions (Echols, 1997; Sax & Arredondo, 1999; Virgil, 2000). These studies all suggest that females exhibited greater support for diversity programming compared to their male counterparts. While Sax and Arredondo (1999) were unable to explain why women were less opposed to diversity functions, they suggested that women may be driven by a sense of self-interest. This suggestion was further supported by Tougas, Beaton, and Veilleux (1991) in that since most Affirmative Action policies are designed to promote a type of equality, that women may juxtaposition gender equality to the racial underpinnings of Affirmative Action.

Research Questions Addressing Attitudes Toward Support Dimension

The Attitudes Toward Support Dimension of the modified EAAI consisted of seven questions designed to determine whether respondents felt that Affirmative Action reduces academic standards, reduces self-esteem, and assess overall support for Affirmative Action. Three research questions addressed this dimension varying by the dependent variables of participant group, gender, race, and academic discipline. The results of this analysis failed to indicate significant interactions between the pairs of independent variables (participant group and gender), (participant group and race), and (participant group and academic discipline), but significance was found in the means of the participant groups and academic discipline for this dimension. Administrators are more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to both faculty and staff. Also, respondents who identified as belonging to the humanities discipline were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action should be legally acceptable compared to respondents who identified as belonging to the business discipline.

These differences may be explained by the fact that administrators are often required to participate in training (diversity, sensitivity, etc.) and attend diversity functions. Also,

administrators are also experiencing increased pressure to conform to political correctness. These factors may positively impact administrator's attitudes toward Affirmative Action.

As for the significant differences found between the academic disciplines, the curricula found in the humanities has been well documented to explore a variety of social issues compared to the curricula found in vocational or technical disciplines. This exposure to curricula has been directly linked to student development (Chickering, 1969). Chickering (1969) also indirectly linked college major to levels of tolerance with respect to social issues. In his classic text, *Education and Identity*, Chickering classified curricula into two groups. The "rocket" curriculum focused on technical and vocational fields, and the "Cadillac" curriculum represented individuals in the liberal arts and social education fields. Chickering (1969) felt that the "Cadillac" curriculum offered venues that promoted intellectual banter allowing students to contemplate personal meaning and tolerance.

McGahey (2007) reported significant results for the main effect of participant group citing that the post hoc analyses found significant differences between staff and students. While McGahey (2007) noted differences between staff and students, no additional information was available suggesting which group (staff or student) was supportive. In comparing this dimension with the dependent variable of academic discipline, McGahey (2007) found no significant differences.

Other studies examined how attitudes toward how Affirmative Action impacts academic standards, reduces self-esteem, or overall support for Affirmative Action. Echols (1997) examined support for Affirmative Action by several variables to include race, gender, age, education, income class, and political party affiliation. From these analyses, no significances were found between income class, education, or age (Echols, 1997). The variables that

demonstrated significances were political party, gender, and race. Echols (1997) found that 70% of Black males supported Affirmative Action compared to only 30% of White males.

Additionally, Echols (1997) found that 19.3% of respondents who identified as belonging to the Democratic Party opposed Affirmative Action compared to only 15.5% of respondents who identified as belonging to the Republican Party ($p < .001$). Virgil (2000), using a modified version of the EAAI, found that White females were more likely to support Affirmative Action compared to White males. Additionally, Virgil (2000) also noted that gender aside, that African Americans supported Affirmative Action over that of respondents who identified as White.

Unlike many variables within this study, the issue of support toward Affirmative Action can be found in the literature outside of theses and dissertations. Schman, Steeh, Bobo, and Krysan (1997) found that females favored preferences for African Americans over males. Interestingly, these preferences were less favored by both females and males when associated with an official policy or given a title such as Affirmative Action (Schman et al., 1997). In a similar study of employees in the California State Department of Parks and Recreation before the legislative mandate of Proposition 209, Taylor (1991) reported similar findings.

Research Questions Addressing Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension

The Attitudes Toward Morals/Ethics Dimension of the modified EAAI consisted of eight questions designed to determine whether respondents felt that Affirmative Action was morally and ethically right. Three research questions addressed this dimension varying by the dependent variables of participant group, gender, race, and academic discipline. The results of this analysis failed to indicate significant interactions between the pairs of independent variables (participant group and gender), (participant group and race), and (participant group and academic discipline), but significance was found in the means of race for this dimension. Individuals who identified as

Non-White were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action was morally and ethically right compared to individuals who identified as White.

Of the five dissertations that utilized the EAAI, only two researchers examined attitudes toward morals/ethics. MaGahey (2007) reported similar results noting significant differences between Caucasian respondents and African American respondents, and Caucasian respondents and respondents who identified as “other.” These results suggested that African Americans and respondents who identified as “other,” were more likely to agree that Affirmative Action was moral and ethical compared to Caucasians. Virgil (2000) found that White males were most opposed to the morality of Affirmative Action. Also, Virgil (2000) found that those who advocated most strongly for Affirmative Action were women and respondents who identified as Non-White.

Conclusions

In summary, institutions of higher education are encouraged to examine the attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action of their constituents. By doing so, they will be better equipped to educate their citizenry, to guide institutional policy making, to create training initiatives, and guide curriculum design. The results of this study suggest that knowledge and attitudes vary among the groups examined. By understanding how general knowledge and the variables under study combine to create individuals’ attitudes, institutions of higher education can better understand what can influence attitudes.

The scope of this research project was the administrators, faculty, staff, and students of one HBCU in Tennessee. This research revealed the following:

1. Not all administrators, faculty, staff, and students maintain the same general knowledge of Affirmative Action, federal guidelines, and anti-discrimination laws.

2. Not all the administrators, faculty, staff, and students maintain the same levels of support for diversity programming.
3. Not all academic disciplines or administrators, faculty, staff, and students maintain the same levels of support for Affirmative Action or believe that Affirmative Action benefits recipients holistically.
4. Not all races (White vs. Non-White) believe that Affirmative Action is moral and ethical.

These findings are similar to previously published research (Carr, 2007; Echols, 1997; McGahey, 2007; Virgil, 2000). With respect to the finding of McGahey (2007) using the same survey instrument at this same institution, the only differences existed between participant groups and academic disciplines. McGahey (2007) found that administrators and faculty often responded similarly. These findings were partially attributed to these groups having attained higher levels of education (McGahey, 2007). Additionally, McGahey (2007) found significant differences between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business in the perceptions and behaviors exhibiting diversity dimension. McGahey (2007) notes that these differences were likely due to the sample sizes citing that the College of Arts and Sciences had more respondents.

Recommendations for Further Research

In researching, developing, and conducting studies, researchers happen upon research questions that would further inform or impact their original design. Often nascent researchers must prune their research projects to reasonable sizes and scopes. The experiences that were encountered during the tenure of this project serve as the basis for the following recommendations that could further inform this study.

1. Investigate reasons that administrators differed from the other participant groups for the General Knowledge, Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity, and Attitudes toward Support Dimensions of this current study.
2. Study a different population of administrators, faculty, staff, and students at a non-HBCU and compare the findings of that study with the findings of this current study.
3. A follow-up study could be conducted to address the differences between the results of this current study and the results of MaGahey (2007). Namely how administrators differed from the other participant groups for the General Knowledge, Perceptions and Behaviors Exhibiting Diversity, and Attitudes toward Support Dimensions of this current study.
4. A follow-up study could be conducted at this same institution in 10 years to examine changes in institutional attitudes and general knowledge of Affirmative Action over time.

REFERENCES

- Aberson, C. L. (2007) Diversity experiences predict changes in attitudes toward affirmative action. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*(4), 285-294. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.13.4.285
- Alon, S., & Malamud, O. (2014). The impact of Israel's class-based affirmative action policy on admission and academic outcomes. *Economics of Education Review, 40*, 123-139. Retrieved December 2, 2017, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.02.004>
- Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1985). *The survey research handbook*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Barbara Grutter, Petitioner; v. Lee Bollinger, et al., Respondents, and Jennifer Gratz and Patrick Hamacher; Petitioners, v. Lee Bollinger, et al., Respondents. Brief amicus curiae of the American Psychological Association in support of respondents. Washington, DC: Gilfoyle, N. F. P., Childress-Beatty, L., & Friedman, P. R..
- Anderson, T. H. (2004). *The pursuit of fairness: A history of affirmative action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science, 15*, 507-510. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00710.x
- Arredondo, D. (2002). The demise of affirmative action in college admissions. *Journal of College Admissions, (175)*, 20. Retrieved December 2, 2017, from <https://login.iris.etsu.edu:3443/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.iris.etsu.edu:3443/docview/219106127?accountid=10771>
- Arriola, K. R., & Cole, E. R. (2001). Framing the affirmative action debate: Attitudes towards out-group members and white identity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology 31*(12), 2462-2483. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00185.x
- Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change, 25*(2), 44-49. Retrieved December 2, 2017, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1993.9940617>
- Baker, T. (1989). *Doing social research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Beckwith, F. J., & Jones, T. E. (1997). Introduction: What is affirmative action and what is the controversy about? In F. J. Beckwith & T. E. Jones (Eds.), *Affirmative action: Social justice or reverse discrimination?* (pp. 9-17). Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

- Bell, M. P. (1996). *Attitudes toward affirmative action: Tests of a comprehensive framework* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Arlington.
- Bell, M. P., Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (1997). Asian American attitudes towards affirmative action employment: Implications for the model minority myth. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 33(3), 356-377. doi: 10.1177/0021886397333006
- Berea College v. Kentucky, 211 U.S. 45 (1908).
- Bernard, P., Alger, J. R., Shur, G., Olswang, S., & Al, E. (2003). A status report: A look ahead at various issues from the standpoint of college and university attorneys. *Change*, 35, 30-42. Retrieved November 23, 2016, from <http://search.proquest.com.iris.etsu.edu:2048/docview/208052258?accountid=10771>
- Bernstein, D. E. (2000). Plessy vs. Lochner: The Berea College case. *Journal of Supreme Court History*, 25(1), 93-111. doi: 10.1111/1059-4329.00006
- Bhagwat, A. (2002). Affirmative action and compelling interests: Equal protection jurisprudence at the crossroads. *Journal of Constitutional Law*, 4(2), 260-280. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://repository.uchastings.edu/faculty_scholarship/1375
- Bobo, L. (1998). Race, interests, and beliefs about affirmative action: Unanswered questions and new directions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7), 985-1003. Retrieved December 5, 2016, from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764298041007009>
- Bowen, H. R. (1977). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. C. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admission*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bowen, W. G., & Levin, S. S. (2003). *Reclaiming the game: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).
- Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(1), 30-55. doi: 10.1080/13613324.2012.725040
- Carr, E. A. (2007). *Attitudes toward and knowledge of affirmative action in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest. (Order No. 3293159)

- Carroll, G., Tyson, K., & Lumas, B. (2000). Those who got in the door: The University of California-Berkeley's affirmative action success story. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 128-144. Retrieved May 22, 2015, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696269>
- Chavez, L. (1998). *The color bind: California's battle to end affirmative action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Chang, M. J., Astin, A. W., & Kim, D. (2004). Cross-racial interaction among undergraduates: Some consequences, causes, and patterns. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(5), 529-553. Retrieved September 9, 2016, from <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RIHE.0000032327.45961.33>
- Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Saenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 430-455. Retrieved September 9, 2016, from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2d83s4q0>
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chao, C. (2014). *The ratio of administrators and administrative staff-to-faculty in public universities and its implications* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved September 12, 2016, from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/document/31230_Chao-ratio.ppt
- Cohen, C. (2006). The Michigan civil rights initiative and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *Michigan Law Review First Impressions*, 105, 117-122. Retrieved August 16, 2016, from http://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr_fi/vol105/iss1/5
- Cordes, M. W. (2004). Affirmative action after Grutter and Gratz. *Northern Illinois University Law Review*, 24, 691-752. Retrieved January 3, 2017, from <http://commons.lib.niu.edu/handle/10843/16455>
- Crawford, C. (2000). Racial promotion through racial exclusion. *Society*, 37(5), 37-43.
- Crawford, J. T., & Pilanski, J. M. (2012). Political intolerance, right and left. *Political Psychology*, 35(6), 841-851. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00926.x
- Crosby, F. J., Iyer, A., & Sincharoen, S. (2006). Understanding affirmative action. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 585-611. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190029
- Culpepper, S. A. (2006). *Race, equity, and the pattern of opportunity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minnesota.
- Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education, 175 U.S. 528 (1899).
- Cunningham, C. D., Loury, G. C., & Skrentny, J. D. (2002). Passing strict scrutiny: Using social science to design affirmative action programs. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 90, 835-883.

- Dillman, D. A. (1977). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Echols, C. V. (1997). *Measuring the attitudes and perceptions of students on affirmative action and anti-discrimination: A quantitative analysis*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International, 58(10), 4080A. (Accession No. ADG9813607)
- Epps, G. (2006). *Democracy reborn: The Fourteenth amendment and the fight for equal rights in post-Civil War America*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Espenshade, T. J., & Radford, A. W. (2009). *No longer separate, not yet equal: Race and class in elite college admission and campus life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fiscus, R. (1992). *The constitutional logic of affirmative action*. New York, NY: Duke University Press.
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, 133 S. Ct. 2411 (2013).
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, 758 F. 3d 633 (2014).
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, 136 S. Ct. 2198 (2016).
- Flagg, B. J. (2003). Diversity discourses. *Tulane Law Review*, 78, 827-851.
- Fletcher, J. F., & Chalmers, M. (1991). Attitudes of Canadians toward affirmative action: Opposition, value pluralism, and nonattitudes. *Political Behavior*, 13(1), 67-95. doi: 10.1007/BF00996999
- Frederico, C. M., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Racism, ideology, and affirmative action revisited: The antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(4), 488-502. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.4.488
- Friedersdorf, C. (2015, December 15). Does affirmative action create mismatches between students and universities? The Atlantic's Politics & Policy Daily. Retrieved January 2, 2017, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/12/the-needlessly-polarized-mismatch-theory-debate/420321/>
- Garces, L. M., & Mickey-Pabello, D. (2015). Racial diversity in the medical profession: The impact of affirmative action bans on underrepresented students of color matriculation in medical schools. *Journal of Higher Education*, 86(2), 264-294. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2015.0009

- Garrison-Wade, D. F., & Lewis, C. W. (2004). Affirmative action: History and analysis. *Journal of College Admission*, (184), 23-26.
- Garry, P. M. (2006). *Cultural whiplash: The unforeseen consequences of America's crusade against racial discrimination*. Nashville, TN: Cumberland House.
- Gerber, R. A., & Friedlander, A. (2008). *The Civil Rights Act of 1875: A reexamination*. New Haven, CT: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glazer, N. (1998, April 6). In defense of preference-affirmative action is bad. Banning it is worse. *New Republic*, 218, 18-25. Retrieved May 7, 2017, from <https://newrepublic.com/article/104772/in-defense-preference>
- Golden, H., Hinkle, S., & Crosby, F. J. (2001). Reactions to affirmative action: Substance and semantics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31(1): 73-88. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02483.x
- Goldsmith, N., Cordova, D., Dwyer, K., Langlois, B., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Reactions to affirmative action: A case study. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative action in perspective* (pp. 139-146). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244 (2003).
- Greenberg, J. (2001). Affirmative action in higher education: Confronting the condition and theory. *Boston College Law Review*, 43(3), 521-621. Retrieved January 24, 2018 from <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclr/vol43/iss3/1>
- Gutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
- Gudridge, P. O. (1989). Privileges and permissions: The Civil Rights Act of 1875. *Law & Philosophy*, 8(1), 83-130. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3504632>
- Guerrero, M. A. J. (1997). Affirmative action: Race, class, gender, and NOW. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(2), 246-255. doi: 10.1177/0002764297041002007
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366. doi: 10.17763/haer.72.3.01151786u134n051
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Hadley, E. (2005). Did the sky really fall? Ten years after California's Proposition 209. *Brigham Young University Journal of Public Law*, 20(103), 129-130. Retrieved November 25, 2016, <http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/jpl/vol20/iss1/5>
- Harper, S., & Reskin, B. (2005). Affirmative action at school and on the job. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31(1), 357-379. Retrieved November 10, 2017, from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.31.041304.122155>
- Hicklin, A. (2007). The effect of race-based admissions in public universities: Debunking the myths about Hopwood and Proposition 209. *Public Administration Review*, 67(2), 331-340. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00716.x
- Hinrichs, P. (2014). Affirmative action bans and college graduation rates. *Economics of Education Review*, 42, 43-52. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.06.005
- Hi-Voltage Wire Works, Inc. v. City of San Jose 24 Cal. 4th 537 (2000).
- Hochschild, J. L. (1999). Affirmative action as culture war. In M. Lamont (Ed.), *The cultural territories of race: Black and white boundaries* (pp. 343-368). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Holladay, J. (2004). *Brown v. Board: Timeline of school integration*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Poverty Law Center.
- Hopwood v. Texas, 78 F. 3d 932 (1996).
- Horsman, R. (1981). *Race and manifest destiny*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield & M. Kurleander (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187-203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group and The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(3), 595-610. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00422.x
- Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 185-196. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2006.0070
- Jayakumar, U. M. (2008). Can higher education meet the needs of an increasingly diverse and global society? Campus diversity and cross-cultural workforce competencies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(4), 615-651. doi: 10.17763/haer.78.4.b60031p350276699
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (Ed.). (2014). *The future of affirmative action: New paths to higher education diversity after Fisher v. University of Texas*. New York, NY: Century Foundation.

- Kellough, J. E. (2006). *Understanding affirmative action: Politics, discrimination, and the search for justice*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kennedy, R. (2013). *For discrimination: Race, affirmative action, and the law*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Kidder, W. C. (2001). Affirmative action in higher education: Recent developments in litigation, admissions and diversity research. *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal*, 12(2), 172-230. doi: 10.15779/Z38NQ1Z
- Klineberg, S. L., & Kravitz, D. A. (2003). Ethnic differences in predictors of support for municipal affirmative action contracting. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(2), 425-440. doi: 10.1111/1540-6237.8402013
- Kluger, R. (1976). *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education, the epochal Supreme Court decision that outlawed segregation, and of black America's century-long struggle for equality under law*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Kravitz, D. A., Klineberg, S. L., Avery, D. R., Nguyen, A. K., Lund, C., & Fu, E. J. (2000). Attitudes toward affirmative action: Correlations with demographic variables and with beliefs about targets, actions, and economic effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30(6):1109-1136. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02513.x
- Kurland, P. B., & Casper, G. (Eds.). (1978). *Landmark briefs and arguments*, vol. 99, 294-295. Minneapolis, MN: University Publications.
- Lawrence, C. R. (2001). Two views of the river: A critique of the liberal defense of affirmative action. *Columbia Law Review*, 101, 928-975. doi: 10.2307/1123688
- Ledesma, M. C. (2013). Revisiting Grutter and Gratz in the wake of Fisher: Looking back to move forward. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 46, 220-235. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2013.779556
- Lempert, R. O., Chambers, D. L., & Adams, T. K. (2000). Michigan's minority graduates in practice: The river runs through law school. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 25(2), 395-505. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-4469.2000.tb00967.x
- Lewis, A. (1978, July 2). 'Bakke' may change a lot while changing no law. *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 25, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/1978/07/02/archives/bakke-may-change-a-lot-while-changing-no-law.html?_r=0
- Lewis, C. M., & Lewis, J. R. (2009). *Jim Crow America: A documentary history*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.

- Ling, G. (2007). *Validity and fairness of college admissions: Model choices and interaction with college characteristics* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fordham University, New York, NY.
- Llekwellyn, A. (1995). The abuse of children with physical disabilities in mainstream schooling. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 37(8), 740-743. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.1995.tb15020.x
- Lovett, B. L. (2011) *America's historically black colleges and universities: A narrative history, 1837-2009*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Lynch, F. R. (1992). *Invisible victims: White males and the crisis of affirmative action*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Maio, G. R., & Esses, V. M. (1998). The social consequences of affirmative action: Deleterious effects on perceptions of groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(1), 65-74. doi: 10.1177/0146167298241005
- McGahey, D. L. (2007). *Affirmative action in the higher education admission process* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tennessee State University, Nashville.
- McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents, 339 U.S. 637 (1950).
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Miller, F. (1997). The political rhetoric of affirmative action: Infusing the debate with discussions about equity and opportunity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41, 197-204. doi: 10.1177/0002764297041002002
- Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada, 305 U.S. 337 (1938).
- Motley, C. B. (1992). The historical setting of brown and its impact on the Supreme Court's decision. *Fordham Law Review*, 61(1), 9-17. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol61/iss1/2>
- NAACP, Inc. v. Florida Board of Regents, 28 Fla. L. Weekly S815 (2003).
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2014, February 7). Affirmative Action. Retrieved January 25, 2016, from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/affirmative-action-overview.aspx>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Park, J. J. (2009). Taking race into account: Charting student attitudes towards affirmative action. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(7), 670-690. doi: 10.1007/s11162-009-9138-7

- Parks, A. G. (2007). *The campus history series: Lincoln University 1920-1970*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Martin, G. L. & Hanson, J. M. & Trolan, T. L. & Gillig, B. & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development* 55(1), 86-92. doi: 10.1353/csd.2014.0009
- Pascarella, E. T., Palmer, B., Moye, M., & Pierson, C. T. (2001). Do diversity experiences influence the development of critical thinking? *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(3), 257-271.
- Patterson, J. T. (2002). *Brown v. Board of Education: A civil rights milestone and its troubled legacy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Perman, M. (2001). *Struggle for mastery: Disfranchisement in the South, 1888-1908*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2007). Evaluating the rationale for affirmative action in college admissions: Direct and indirect relationships between campus diversity and gains in understanding diverse groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(2), 166-182. doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0018
- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Pusser, B. (2004). *Burning down the house: Politics, governance, and affirmative action at the University of California*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).
- Rubio, P. F. (2001). *A history of affirmative action 1619-2000*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Sander, R. H. (2004). A systemic analysis of affirmative action in American law schools. *Stanford Law Review*, 57, 367-483. doi: 10.2307/40040209
- Sander, R. H., & Taylor, S. (2012). *Mismatch: How affirmative action hurts students it's intended to help, and why universities won't admit it*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Sax, L. J., & Arredondo, M. (1999). Student attitudes toward affirmative action college admissions. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 439-459. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40196356>
- Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, 134 U.S. 49 (2013).
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., & Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981). *Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiment on question form, wording and context*. New York, NY: Academy.
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2008). *The diversity challenge*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 476-490. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.476
- Sipuel v. Board of Regents of Univ. of Okla., 332 U.S. 631 (1948).
- Smith, Z. T. (2015). *Principals' perceptions of race/ethnicity-based and class-based affirmative action in college/university admissions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens.
- Spann, G. A. (2000). *The law of affirmative action: Twenty-five years of Supreme Court decisions on race and remedies*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sternberg, S. (2005). Accomplishing the goals of affirmative action: With or without affirmative action. *Change*, 37(1), 6-13. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40178204>
- Stout, K. D., & Buffum, W. E. (1993). The commitment of social workers to affirmative action. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 20(2), 123-135. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol20/iss2/9>
- Sudman, S. (1976). *Applied sampling*. New York, NY: Academy Press.
- Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1950).
- Taylor, B. R. (1991). *Affirmative action at work: Law, politics, and ethics*. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Texas v. Hopwood, 518 U.S. 1033 (1996).
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). The parameters of affirmative action: Equity and excellence in the academy. *Review of Educational Research* 67(2), 165-196. Retrieved November 3, 2016, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170625>
- Tougas, F., Beaton, A. M., & Veilleux, F. (1991). Why women approve of affirmative action: The study of a predictive model. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26(6), 761-776. doi: 10.1080/00207599108247164

- Van Selm, M., & Jankowski, N. W. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality and Quantity*, 40(3), 435-456. doi: 10.1007/s11135-005-8081-8
- Virgil, D. M. (2000). *Perceptions of affirmative action in higher education: Graduate and professional student views at a Midwestern AAU university* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Welch, S., & Gruhl, J. (1998). Does Bakke matter? Affirmative action and minority enrollments in medical and law schools. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 59(3), 697-731. Retrieved July 27, 2016, from <http://hdl.handle.net/1811/64960>
- Wodtke, G. T. (2012). The impact of education on inter-group attitudes: A multiracial analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 75(1), 1-30. doi: 10.1177/0190272511430234
- Zamani-Gallaher, E. M. (2007). The confluence of race, gender, and class among community college student: Assessing attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40, 241-251. Retrieved July 27, 2016, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665680701434569>
- Zamboanga, B. L., Covell, C. N., Kepple, S. J., Soto, R. D., & Parker, K. D. (2002) White students' perceptions of affirmative action in graduate admission: Directions for programming and college personnel development. *Journal of College Admission*. 176, 22-30.
- Zuriff, G. E. (2004). Is affirmative action fair? *American Psychologist*, 59(2), 124-125. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.124

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Peters's Proposed Modified Version of the Echols' Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) ©

This questionnaire is designed to measure attitudes, general knowledge, and perceptions about affirmative action. Follow the directions for each section and thank you!

A. General Knowledge: For each statement, circle the number beside the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.

1. Affirmative Action is designed to correct past discrimination against all minorities.

Yes 1 No 0

2. Anti-discrimination laws protect the rights of all people.

Yes 1 No 0

3. Affirmative Action should be implemented because it is required, irrespective of morality.

Yes 1 No 0

4. Federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect Blacks, American Indians, Asians, and the handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

5. Federal guidelines define underrepresented groups as ethnic minorities, veterans, and handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

6. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments prohibit discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, age, national origin, and religion.

Yes 1 No 0

7. Anti-discrimination laws prohibit discrimination against all races.

Yes 1 No 0

8. Gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws.

Yes 1 No 0

9. Federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect Blacks, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women and the handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

B. Diversity and Affirmative Action: For each statement, circle the number that represents the phrase or word that best describes your behavior.

10. How often do you interact with interracial / ethnic issues?

- Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4
11. How often do you get involved in diversity function?
Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4
12. How often are you mandated to attend diversity function?
Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4
13. Do you participate in diversity functions?
Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4
14. Have you ever been required to attend diversity functions?
Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4
15. Where do you get most of your information on affirmative action?
Media-1 Educators-2 Family-3 Friends-4
- C. Quotas and Affirmative Action: Under each statement, circle the number under the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.
16. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for athletes and children of alumni.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
17. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for ethnic minorities.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
18. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for Blacks, Hispanics, and women.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
19. Affirmative Action reduces ethnic minorities and women's self-esteem.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
20. Affirmative Action reduces academic standards.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
21. Do you support affirmative action as a policy to remedy past discrimination?
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
22. Do you support anti-discrimination policies against discrimination?
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
- D. Morals/Ethics of Affirmative Action: Under each statement, circle the number under the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.
23. Affirmative action is morally right.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

24. Affirmative action is morally right and should be obeyed.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
25. Equal opportunity in hiring / admissions based on merit is a good moral principle.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
26. It is morally right to hold the U.S. government responsible for the consequences of slavery.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
27. Targeting underrepresented minorities for academic scholarships as a remedy to past discrimination is morally good.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
28. Preferential treatment of victims of past discrimination is morally appropriate compensation.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
29. White males should agree that preferential treatment of victims of past discrimination is morally appropriate compensation.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
30. Support for a person of my race / gender is acceptable, even when he / she is wrong.
Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4
- E. Demographic Information: Select the appropriate answer that best describes you.
31. What is your gender? (M/F)
32. What is your race? (White/African American/Native American/Asian American/Non-Black Latin American/Asian/Alaskan Pacific Islander/ Hispanic)
33. What is your position at the university? (Undergraduate = 1, Graduate Student = 2, Faculty = 3, Staff = 4, Administrator =5)
34. Are you a citizen of the USA? (Y/N)
35. Are you a veteran? (Y/N)
36. Are you physically challenged? (Y/N)
37. What is your age? (18-22 / 23-32 / 33-43 / 44-53 / 54-63 / 63+)
38. What is the highest degree you have earned?... (Doctorate/ Masters/ Bachelors/ Other Graduate/ Enter degree)

39. You are attending school... (Part-time/ Full-time)
40. You are enrolled in which college... (Business/ Arts & Sciences/ Education/ Agriculture/ Engineering/ Human Env. Sciences/ Physical Sciences/ Law/ Medicine)
41. In which specific academic discipline or field are you getting your degree? _____
42. Political Party Affiliation? (Republican/ Democrat/ Independent/ None/ Other)
43. Income (total family before taxes)? (Under \$7,000/ \$7,000-17,999/ \$18,000-28,999/ \$29,000-39,999/ \$40,000-49,999/ %50,000- or more)

Appendix B

Carr's (2007) modified version of the Echols' Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) ©

Definition of Affirmative Action		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please provide your definition of affirmative action in the space below.</i>	
Definition1	Define Affirmative Action:	Open-ended Question

General Knowledge		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please read the following questions and click whether the answer to each one is yes or no.</i>	
Knowl1	The original intent of affirmative action was to correct past discrimination against all minorities.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl2	The law requires that affirmative action policies be implemented, whether or not one is in agreement with their intent.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl3	Federal affirmative action was designed to protect minorities, women, veterans, and the handicapped.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl4	The Supreme Court ruled that using race and gender can be used as a factor in selecting an individual for admittance to a college or university.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl5	The use of quotas in affirmative action policies is illegal.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl6	Federal affirmative action guidelines only apply to college admissions.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl7	The use of goals and timetables in Affirmative Action policies is illegal.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl8	Currently more than 10 States have banned Affirmative Action policies through a statewide ballot.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl 9	The Michigan civil Rights Initiative (MCRI) seeks to eliminate affirmative action in the State of Michigan through a statewide election.	Yes = 1, No = 0
Knowl10	Federal Affirmative Action policies began in the 1920s	Yes = 1, No = 0

Attitudes		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please read the following questions below and click the boxes that most match your beliefs.</i>	
Attitude1	Getting involved in diversity function is important.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude2	Quotas should be legally acceptable in college admissions when used for athletes.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude3	Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for ethnic minorities.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude4	Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for women.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude5	Quotas should be legally acceptable when applied equally to all racial groups.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude6	Affirmative Action reduces women's self-esteem.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude7	Affirmative Action reduces academic standards.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude8	People should support Affirmative Action as a policy to remedy past discrimination.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude9	Affirmative Action is morally right.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude10	Equal opportunity in hiring/college admissions based on merit is a good moral principle.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude11	It is morally right to hold the U.S. government responsible for the consequences of slavery.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude12	Offering underrepresented minorities academic scholarships as a remedy to past discrimination is morally good.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Attitude13	Preferential treatment for victims of past discrimination is morally appropriate.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4

Perceived Impact		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please read the following questions below and click the boxes that most match your beliefs.</i>	
Impact1	Close family members and/or friends of mine have benefited from Affirmative Action.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4
Impact2	I have benefited from Affirmative Action.	Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Agree = 3, Strongly Agree =4

Support of Affirmative Action		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please read the question below and click the box that most matches your belief</i>	
Support1	To what extent do you support Affirmative Action	No Extent = 1, Small Extent = 2, A Good Extent = 3, A Great Extent = 4

Demographic		
<i>Directions</i>	<i>Please answer the following demographic questions.</i>	
Gender	What is your gender	Male = 0, Female = 1
Race	What is your race or ethnicity	White = 0, Black = 1, Latino = 2, Asian = 3, Native American = 4, Other = 5
Age	What is your age	
Education	What is your educational level	Undergraduate = 1, Bachelors = 2, Masters = 3, Doctorate = 4, Other = 5
Politics	What is your political affiliation	Republican = 1, Democrat = 2, Independent = 3, None = 4, Other = 5
Income	What is your total family income before taxes	Under \$7,000 = 1, \$7,000-\$17,000 = 2, \$18,000-\$28,000 = 3, \$29,000-\$39,000 = 4, \$40,000-\$50,000 = 5, \$51,000 or more = 6.
Position	What is your position at the university	Undergraduate = 1, Graduate Student = 2, Faculty = 3, Staff = 4, Administrator =5

Appendix C

McGahey's (2007) modified version of the Echols' Affirmative Action Inventory (EAAI) ©

This questionnaire is designed to measure attitudes, general knowledge, and perceptions about affirmative action. Follow the directions for each section and thank you!

A. General Knowledge: For each statement, circle the number beside the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.

1. Affirmative Action is designed to correct past discrimination against all minorities.

Yes 1 No 0

2. Anti-discrimination laws protect the rights of all people.

Yes 1 No 0

3. Affirmative Action should be implemented because it is required, irrespective of morality.

Yes 1 No 0

4. Federal Affirmative Action is designed to protect Blacks, American Indians, Asians, and the handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

5. Federal guidelines define underrepresented groups as ethnic minorities, veterans, and handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

6. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments prohibit discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, age, national origin, and religion.

Yes 1 No 0

7. Anti-discrimination laws prohibit discrimination against all races.

Yes 1 No 0

8. Gays, lesbians, and illegal aliens are all protected under federal anti-discrimination laws.

Yes 1 No 0

9. Federal, anti-discrimination laws are designed to protect Blacks, Whites, Native Americans, Asians, Hispanics, veterans, women and the handicapped.

Yes 1 No 0

B. Diversity and Affirmative Action: For each statement, circle the number that represents the phrase or word that best describes your behavior.

10. How often do you interact with interracial / ethnic issues?

Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4

11. How often do you get involved in diversity function?

Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4

12. How often are you mandated to attend diversity function?

Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4

13. Do you participate in diversity functions?

Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4

14. Have you ever been required to attend diversity functions?

Not at all-1 Not Often-2 Often-3 Very Often-4

15. Where do you get most of your information on affirmative action?

Media-1 Educators-2 Family-3 Friends-4

C. Quotas and Affirmative Action: Under each statement, circle the number under the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.

16. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for athletes and children of alumni.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

17. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for ethnic minorities.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

18. Quotas should be legally acceptable when used for Blacks, Hispanics, and women.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

19. Affirmative Action reduces ethnic minorities and women's self-esteem.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

20. Affirmative Action reduces academic standards.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

21. Do you support affirmative action as a policy to remedy past discrimination?

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

22. Do you support anti-discrimination policies against discrimination?

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

D. Morals/Ethics of Affirmative Action: Under each statement, circle the number under the phrase or word that best describes how you feel or believe.

23. Affirmative action is morally right.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

24. Affirmative action is morally right and should be obeyed.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

25. Equal opportunity in hiring / admissions based on merit is a good moral principle.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

26. It is morally right to hold the U.S. government responsible for the consequences of slavery.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

27. Targeting underrepresented minorities for academic scholarships as a remedy to past discrimination is morally good.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

28. Preferential treatment of victims of past discrimination is morally appropriate compensation.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

29. White males should agree that preferential treatment of victims of past discrimination is morally appropriate compensation.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

30. Support for a person of my race / gender is acceptable, even when he / she is wrong.

Strongly Disagree-1 Disagree-2 Agree-3 Strongly Agree-4

E. Demographic Information: Besides each statement, mark "X" beside the phrase or word that best describes you. Please provide specific information in the blanks as requested.

31. What is your gender? (M/F)

32. What is your race? (White/African American/Native American/Asian American/Non-Black Latin American/Asian/Alaskan Pacific Islander/ Hispanic)

33. Are you a citizen of the USA? (Y/N)

34. Are you a veteran? (Y/N)

35. Are you physically challenged? (Y/N)

36. What is your age? (18-22 / 23-32 / 33-43 / 44-53 / 54-63 / 63+)

37. You are working toward your... (Doctorate/ Masters/ Other Graduate/ Enter degree here_____)
38. You are attending school... (Part-time/ Full-time)
39. You are enrolled in which college... (Business/ Arts & Sciences/ Education/ Agriculture/ Engineering/ Human Env. Sciences/ Physical Sciences/ Law/ Medicine)
40. In which specific academic discipline or field are you getting your degree? _____
41. Political Party Affiliation? (Republican/ Democrat/ Independent/ None/ Other)
42. Income (total family before taxes)? (Under \$7,000/ \$7,000-17,000/ \$18,000-28,000/ \$29,000-39,000/ \$40,000-49,000/ % 50,000- or more)

VITA

JAMES EUGENE PETERS

- Education: B.A. Biology, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri 2002
- B.A. Theological Philosophy, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri 2002
- M.S. Biology, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois 2006
- Ed.D. Educational Leadership, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 2018
- Professional Experience: Associate Professor, Cleveland State Community College; Cleveland, Tennessee, 2009- present
- Instructor, Parkland College; Champaign, Illinois, 2006-2009
- Graduate Assistant, University of Illinois; Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, 2007-2009
- Graduate Assistant, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois, 2004-2006
- Publications: Peters, J. E., Axtell, R. W., & Kohn, L. A. P. (2010). Morphometric evaluation of the two mink subspecies in Illinois. *Journal of Mammology* 91(6), 1459-1466.
- Hubler, M., Niswander, L. A., Peters, J. E., & Sears, K. E. (2010). The developmental reduction of the marsupial coracoid: A case study in *monodelphis domestica*. *Journal of Morphology*, 271(7), 769-776.
- DeSheilds, A., Borman-Shoap, E., Peters, J. E., Gaudreault-Keener, M. Arens, M. Q., & Storch, G. A. (2004). Detection of pathogenic ehrlichia in ticks collected at acquisition sites of human ehrlichiosis in Missouri. *Missouri Medicine*, 101, 132-136.