1

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

EGALITARIANISM VERSUS INDIVIDUALISM
CONFLICT THEORY:
EXPLAINING PEOPLE'S SUPPORT FOR
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY POLICIES

by

C. CORALIE LALONDE

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

April 26, 1993

© copyright

1993, C. Coralie Lalonde

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0 315-84060-9

Canada

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0379
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0361
Library Science	0369
Mass Communications	0768
Music	0412
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0466

EDUCATION

Education
General
Administration
Adult and Continuing
Agricultural
Art
Bilingual and Multicultural
Business
Community College
Curriculum and Instruction
Early Childhood
Elementary
Finance
Guidance and Counseling
Health
Higher
History of
Home Economics
Industrial
Language and Literature
Mathematics
Music
Philosophy of
Physica

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0627
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0540
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Terminology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

- Language
 - General
 - Ancient
 - Linguistics
 - Modern
- Literature
 - General
 - Classical
 - Comparative
 - Medieval
 - Modern
 - African
 - American
 - Asian
 - Canadian/English
 - Canadian (French)
 - English
 - German
 - Latin American
 - Middle Eastern
 - Romance
 - Soviet and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0459

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0324
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce/Business	0505
Finance	0538
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0259
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0749
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General
Agronomy
Animal Culture and Husbandry
Animal Pathology
Food Science and Technology
Forestry and Wildlife
Plant Culture
Plant Pathology
Plant Physiology
Range Management
Wood Technology

Biology

General	100
Anatomy	100
Biostatistics	100
Botany	100
Cell	100
Ecology	100
Entomology	100
Genetics	100
Immunology	100
Microbiology	100
Molecular	100
Neuroscience	100
Oceanography	100
Physiology	100
Radiation	100
Veterinary, Toxicology	100
Zoology	100
Biophysics	100
Genetics	100
Medicine	100

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 15425
Geochemistry 15426

Geology	0370
Geography	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0380
Mineralogy	0411
Planetary Science	0421
Soil Science	0426
Palaeontology	0438
Planetary Science	0440
Planetary Science	0441
Planetary Science	0442
Planetary Science	0443
Planetary Science	0444
Planetary Science	0445
Planetary Science	0446
Planetary Science	0447
Planetary Science	0448
Planetary Science	0449
Planetary Science	0450
Planetary Science	0451
Planetary Science	0452
Planetary Science	0453
Planetary Science	0454
Planetary Science	0455
Planetary Science	0456
Planetary Science	0457
Planetary Science	0458
Planetary Science	0459
Planetary Science	0460
Planetary Science	0461
Planetary Science	0462
Planetary Science	0463
Planetary Science	0464
Planetary Science	0465
Planetary Science	0466
Planetary Science	0467
Planetary Science	0468
Planetary Science	0469
Planetary Science	0470
Planetary Science	0471
Planetary Science	0472
Planetary Science	0473
Planetary Science	0474
Planetary Science	0475
Planetary Science	0476
Planetary Science	0477
Planetary Science	0478
Planetary Science	0479
Planetary Science	0480
Planetary Science	0481
Planetary Science	0482
Planetary Science	0483
Planetary Science	0484
Planetary Science	0485
Planetary Science	0486
Planetary Science	0487
Planetary Science	0488
Planetary Science	0489
Planetary Science	0490
Planetary Science	0491
Planetary Science	0492
Planetary Science	0493
Planetary Science	0494
Planetary Science	0495
Planetary Science	0496
Planetary Science	0497
Planetary Science	0498
Planetary Science	0499
Planetary Science	0500
Planetary Science	0501
Planetary Science	0502
Planetary Science	0503
Planetary Science	0504
Planetary Science	0505
Planetary Science	0506
Planetary Science	0507
Planetary Science	0508
Planetary Science	0509
Planetary Science	0510
Planetary Science	0511
Planetary Science	0512
Planetary Science	0513
Planetary Science	0514
Planetary Science	0515
Planetary Science	0516
Planetary Science	0517
Planetary Science	0518
Planetary Science	0519
Planetary Science	0520
Planetary Science	0521
Planetary Science	0522
Planetary Science	0523
Planetary Science	0524
Planetary Science	0525
Planetary Science	0526
Planetary Science	0527
Planetary Science	0528
Planetary Science	0529
Planetary Science	0530
Planetary Science	0531
Planetary Science	0532
Planetary Science	0533
Planetary Science	0534
Planetary Science	0535
Planetary Science	0536
Planetary Science	0537
Planetary Science	0538
Planetary Science	0539
Planetary Science	0540
Planetary Science	0541
Planetary Science	0542
Planetary Science	0543
Planetary Science	0544
Planetary Science	0545
Planetary Science	0546
Planetary Science	0547
Planetary Science	0548
Planetary Science	0549
Planetary Science	0550
Planetary Science	0551
Planetary Science	0552
Planetary Science	0553
Planetary Science	0554
Planetary Science	0555
Planetary Science	0556
Planetary Science	0557
Planetary Science	0558
Planetary Science	0559
Planetary Science	0560
Planetary Science	0561
Planetary Science	0562
Planetary Science	0563
Planetary Science	0564
Planetary Science	0565
Planetary Science	0566
Planetary Science	0567
Planetary Science	0568
Planetary Science	0569
Planetary Science	0570
Planetary Science	0571
Planetary Science	0572
Planetary Science	0573
Planetary Science	0574
Planetary Science	0575
Planetary Science	0576
Planetary Science	0577
Planetary Science	0578
Planetary Science	0579
Planetary Science	0580
Planetary Science	0581
Planetary Science	0582
Planetary Science	0583
Planetary Science	0584
Planetary Science	0585
Planetary Science	0586
Planetary Science	0587
Planetary Science	0588
Planetary Science	0589
Planetary Science	0590
Planetary Science	0591
Planetary Science	0592
Planetary Science	0593
Planetary Science	0594
Planetary Science	0595
Planetary Science	0596
Planetary Science	0597
Planetary Science	0598
Planetary Science	0599
Planetary Science	0600
Planetary Science	0601
Planetary Science	0602
Planetary Science	0603
Planetary Science	0604
Planetary Science	0605
Planetary Science	0606
Planetary Science	0607
Planetary Science	0608
Planetary Science	0609
Planetary Science	0610
Planetary Science	0611
Planetary Science	0612
Planetary Science	0613
Planetary Science	0614
Planetary Science	0615
Planetary Science	0616
Planetary Science	0617
Planetary Science	0618
Planetary Science	0619
Planetary Science	0620
Planetary Science	0621
Planetary Science	0622
Planetary Science	0623
Planetary Science	0624
Planetary Science	0625
Planetary Science	0626
Planetary Science	0627
Planetary Science	0628
Planetary Science	0629
Planetary Science	0630
Planetary Science	0631
Planetary Science	0632
Planetary Science	0633
Planetary Science	0634
Planetary Science	0635
Planetary Science	0636
Planetary Science	0637
Planetary Science	0638
Planetary Science	0639
Planetary Science	0640
Planetary Science	0641
Planetary Science	0642
Planetary Science	0643
Planetary Science	0644
Planetary Science	0645
Planetary Science	0646
Planetary Science	0647
Planetary Science	0648
Planetary Science	0649
Planetary Science	0650
Planetary Science	0651
Planetary Science	0652
Planetary Science	0653
Planetary Science	0654
Planetary Science	0655
Planetary Science	0656
Planetary Science	0657
Planetary Science	0658
Planetary Science	0659
Planetary Science	0660
Planetary Science	0661
Planetary Science	0662
Planetary Science	0663
Planetary Science	0664
Planetary Science	0665
Planetary Science	0666
Planetary Science	0667
Planetary Science	0668
Planetary Science	0669
Planetary Science	0670
Planetary Science	0671
Planetary Science	0672
Planetary Science	0673
Planetary Science	0674
Planetary Science	0675
Planetary Science	0676
Planetary Science	0677
Planetary Science	0678
Planetary Science	0679
Planetary Science	0680
Planetary Science	0681
Planetary Science	0682
Planetary Science	0683
Planetary Science	0684
Planetary Science	0685
Planetary Science	0686
Planetary Science	0687
Planetary Science	0688
Planetary Science	0689
Planetary Science	0690
Planetary Science	0691
Planetary Science	0692
Planetary Science	0693
Planetary Science	0694
Planetary Science	0695
Planetary Science	0696
Planetary Science	0697
Planetary Science	0698
Planetary Science	0699
Planetary Science	0700
Planetary Science	0701
Planetary Science	0702
Planetary Science	0703
Planetary Science	0704
Planetary Science	0705
Planetary Science	0706
Planetary Science	0707
Planetary Science	0708
Planetary Science	0709
Planetary Science	0710
Planetary Science	0711
Planetary Science	0712
Planetary Science	0713
Planetary Science	0714
Planetary Science	0715
Planetary Science	0716
Planetary Science	0717
Planetary Science	0718
Planetary Science	0719
Planetary Science	0720
Planetary Science	0721
Planetary Science	0722
Planetary Science	0723
Planetary Science	0724
Planetary Science	0725
Planetary Science	0726
Planetary Science	0727
Planetary Science	0728
Planetary Science	0729
Planetary Science	0730
Planetary Science	0731
Planetary Science	0732
Planetary Science	0733
Planetary Science	0734
Planetary Science	0735
Planetary Science	0736
Planetary Science	0737
Planetary Science	0738
Planetary Science	0739
Planetary Science	0740
Planetary Science	0741
Planetary Science	0742
Planetary Science	0743
Planetary Science	0744
Planetary Science	0745
Planetary Science	0746
Planetary Science	0747
Planetary Science	0748
Planetary Science	0749
Planetary Science	0750
Planetary Science	0751
Planetary Science	0752
Planetary Science	0753
Planetary Science	0754
Planetary Science	0755
Planetary Science	0756
Planetary Science	0757
Planetary Science	0758
Planetary Science	0759
Planetary Science	0760
Planetary Science	0761
Planetary Science	0762
Planetary Science	0763
Planetary Science	0764
Planetary Science	0765
Planetary Science	0766
Planetary Science	0767
Planetary Science	0768
Planetary Science	0769
Planetary Science	0770
Planetary Science	0771
Planetary Science	0772
Planetary Science	0773
Planetary Science	0774
Planetary Science	0775
Planetary Science	0776
Planetary Science	0777
Planetary Science	0778
Planetary Science	0779
Planetary Science	0780
Planetary Science	0781
Planetary Science	0782
Planetary Science	0783
Planetary Science	0784
Planetary Science	0785
Planetary Science	0786
Planetary Science	0787
Planetary Science	0788
Planetary Science	0789
Planetary Science	0790
Planetary Science	0791
Planetary Science	0792
Planetary Science	0793
Planetary Science	0794
Planetary Science	0795
Planetary Science	0796
Planetary Science	0797
Planetary Science	0798
Planetary Science	0799
Planetary Science	0800
Planetary Science	0801
Planetary Science	0802
Planetary Science	0803
Planetary Science	0804
Planetary Science	0805
Planetary Science	0806
Planetary Science	0807
Planetary Science	0808
Planetary Science	0809
Planetary Science	0810
Planetary Science	0811
Planetary Science	0812
Planetary Science	0813
Planetary Science	0814
Planetary Science	0815
Planetary Science	0816
Planetary Science	0817
Planetary Science	0818
Planetary Science	0819
Planetary Science	0820
Planetary Science	0821
Planetary Science	0822
Planetary Science	0823
Planetary Science	0824
Planetary Science	0825
Planetary Science	0826
Planetary Science	0827
Planetary Science	0828
Planetary Science	0829
Planetary Science	0830
Planetary Science	0831
Planetary Science	0832
Planetary Science	0833
Planetary Science	0834
Planetary Science	0835
Planetary Science	0836
Planetary Science	0837
Planetary Science	0838
Planetary Science	0839
Planetary Science	0840
Planetary Science	0841
Planetary Science	0842
Planetary Science	0843
Planetary Science	0844
Planetary Science	0845
Planetary Science	0846
Planetary Science	0847
Planetary Science	0848
Planetary Science	0849
Planetary Science	0850
Planetary Science	0851
Planetary Science	0852
Planetary Science	0853
Planetary Science	0854
Planetary Science	0855
Planetary Science	0856
Planetary Science	0857
Planetary Science	0858
Planetary Science	0859
Planetary Science	0860
Planetary Science	0861
Planetary Science	0862
Planetary Science	0863
Planetary Science	0864
Planetary Science	0865
Planetary Science	0866
Planetary Science	0867
Planetary Science	0868
Planetary Science	0869
Planetary Science	0870
Planetary Science	0871
Planetary Science	0872
Planetary Science	0873
Planetary Science	0874
Planetary Science	0875
Planetary Science	0876
Planetary Science	0877
Planetary Science	0878
Planetary Science	0879
Planetary Science	0880
Planetary Science	0881
Planetary Science	0882
Planetary Science	0883
Planetary Science	0884
Planetary Science	0885
Planetary Science	0886
Planetary Science	0887
Planetary Science	0888
Planetary Science	0889
Planetary Science	0890
Planetary Science	0891
Planetary Science	0892
Planetary Science	0893
Planetary Science	0894
Planetary Science	0895
Planetary Science	0896
Planetary Science	0897
Planetary Science	0898
Planetary Science	0899
Planetary Science	0900
Planetary Science	0901
Planetary Science	0902
Planetary Science	0903
Planetary Science	0904
Planetary Science	0905
Planetary Science	0906
Planetary Science	0907
Planetary Science	0908
Planetary Science	0909
Planetary Science	0910
Planetary Science	0911
Planetary Science	0912
Planetary Science	0913
Planetary Science	0914
Planetary Science	0915
Planetary Science	0916
Planetary Science	0917
Planetary Science	0918
Planetary Science	0919
Planetary Science	0920
Planetary Science	0921
Planetary Science	0922
Planetary Science	0923
Planetary Science	0924
Planetary Science	0925
Planetary Science	0926
Planetary Science	0927
Planetary Science	0928
Planetary Science	0929
Planetary Science	0930
Planetary Science	0931
Planetary Science	0932
Planetary Science	0933
Planetary Science	0934
Planetary Science	0935
Planetary Science	0936
Planetary Science	0937
Planetary Science	0938
Planetary Science	0939
Planetary Science	0940
Planetary Science	0941
Planetary Science	0942
Planetary Science	0943
Planetary Science	0944
Planetary Science	0945
Planetary Science	0946
Planetary Science	0947
Planetary Science	0948
Planetary Science	0949
Planetary Science	0950
Planetary Science	0951
Planetary Science	0952
Planetary Science	0953
Planetary Science	0954
Planetary Science	0955
Planetary Science	0956
Planetary Science	0957
Planetary Science	0958
Planetary Science	0959
Planetary Science	0960
Planetary Science	0961
Planetary Science	0962
Planetary Science	0963
Planetary Science	0964
Planetary Science	0965
Planetary Science	0966
Planetary Science	0967
Planetary Science	0968
Planetary Science	0969
Planetary Science	0970
Planetary Science	0971
Planetary Science	0972
Planetary Science	0973
Planetary Science	0974
Planetary Science	0975
Planetary Science	0976
Planetary Science	0977
Planetary Science	0978
Planetary Science	0979
Planetary Science	0980
Planetary Science	0981
Planetary Science	0982
Planetary Science	0983
Planetary Science	0984
Planetary Science	0985
Planetary Science	0986
Planetary Science	0987
Planetary Science	0988
Planetary Science	0989
Planetary Science	0990
Planetary Science	0991
Planetary Science	0992
Planetary Science	0993
Planetary Science	0994
Planetary Science	0995
Planetary Science	0996
Planetary Science	0997
Planetary Science	0998
Planetary Science	0999
Planetary Science	1000

**HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL
SCIENCES**

- Psychology**
- Behavioral Psychology
- Counseling
- Anthropology
- Developmental Psychology
- Gerontology
- Ergonomics
- Housing & Home Management
- Human Development and Learning
- Mental Health
- Nursing
- Nutrition
- Obstetrics and Gynecology
- Occupational Health and Safety
- Therapy
- Optical Malware
- Pathology
- Pharmacology
- Physiology
- Physical Therapy
- Public Health
- Radiology
- Recreation

Spanish Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0380

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry	
General	0485
Organic	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmacology	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0495
Physics	
General	0495
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and	
Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and	
High Energy	0778
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0615

Applied Sciences

Applied Business	0346
Applied Mechanics	0982
Computer Science	0982

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0548
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0429
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

Thesis Acceptance Form

The undersigned recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

"EGALITARIANISM VERSUS INDIVIDUALISM
CONFLICT THEORY:
EXPLAINING PEOPLE'S SUPPORT FOR
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY POLICIES"

submitted by

C. CORALIE LALONDE

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

May 17, 1993

Abstract

The egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory, derived from ideas initially proposed by Lipset and Schnieder (1978), attempts to explain the ambivalence associated with people's support for employment equity policies by attributing this ambivalence to a conflict between the values of egalitarianism and individualism. In this study, 914 full-time employees at Carleton University completed a questionnaire designed to assess this theory. Support was found for the effects of a person's belief in the values of egalitarianism and individualism and the effects of the degree to which a policy violates the principles of individualism on support for employment equity policies. The effects of three qualification variables, the belief that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities, are also assessed. The implications of this theory on support for employment equity policies are discussed.

Acknowledgments

I would especially like to thank my advisor, Tom Ryan, for the guidance, wisdom and support he has given me both academically and personally. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Fran Kladowski, Dr. Bob Hoffman, Dr. Kim Matheson and Dr. Don Zimmerman for their time and for their helpful advice throughout the execution of this study. I wish all the best to both Tom Ryan and Don Zimmerman in their retirement and I am grateful to have had the opportunity to work with these two exceptional people.

I would like to express a very special thank you to Veronica Balcome, who volunteered a considerable amount of time and patience to independently rating the content analyses of this thesis. The task was huge, tedious and frustrating yet she accomplished it in a professional and conscientious manner. A thank you is also extended to Richard DeBoer, Tracey Blomquist, Penny McGregor, Lisa McAvoy and Krista Bristow for independently rating the policies used in the Guttman scale.

I am very grateful to the Carleton University community for their cooperation and support throughout this study. Thanks to all of the employees who took the time to complete the questionnaire and who provided valuable and interesting feedback on the study itself and on the subject of employment equity. I would especially like to thank Susan Gottheil for her support and valuable assistance in understanding employment equity at Carleton University. I would also like to thank Dr. Erika Boukamp-Bosch for her help in finding information on the representation of designated groups in Canada.

I am especially grateful to my parents for providing me with the freedom and opportunity to enjoy learning and for encouraging me to pursue my own goals and I am always grateful to my partner, Richard, for his never ending support. Finally, I would like to thank Penny, Lisa, Tracey, Amanda and Michi for their friendship throughout this project, and Ernie and Elmo for their love.

Table of Contents

	Page
Thesis Acceptance Form	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	viii
List of Appendices	xi
Introduction	1
History of Employment Equity	4
Employment equity in Canada	4
Employment equity in the United States	10
Statistical Evidence for Inequality in the Workforce	12
Should Something be Done to Eliminate Employment Inequities?	16
Discrimination as a cause of employment inequities	19
Egalitarianism Versus Individualism	24
Defining egalitarianism and individualism	25
Evidence in support of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory	26
Hypotheses	28
Method	29
Subjects	29
Materials	30
Questionnaire development	31
Procedure	36
Results	37
Quantitative Analyses	37

	<i>Employment Equity</i> Page
Egalitarianism and individualism scales	38
Measuring support for employment equity	44
Prerequisites to support for employment equity	47
Assumptions of multivariate analyses	50
The effects of prerequisites on support for employment equity policies	52
The effect of egalitarianism and individualism on support	55
Analysis of the Guttman scale	57
Reasons for support of employment equity policies	60
Qualitative Analysis	60
Procedure comments	61
Meaning comments	63
Discussion	69
The Effects of the Prerequisites on Employment Equity	70
The Effects of Egalitarianism and Individualism on Support for Employment Equity	72
Applications of the Results of this Study	77
Limitations of this Study and Suggestions for Future Research	78
Generalization of the results	78
Measuring egalitarianism and individualism	81
Measuring support for employment equity	84
The conflict theory and future research	86
Conclusion	88
References	90
Appendix A: The Final Questionnaire to be Given to All Full-Time Employees at Carleton University	96
Appendix B: The Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire	99

	<i>Employment Equity</i>
	Page
Appendix C: The Informed Consent Form Used in the Pilot Studies	101
Appendix D: The Debriefing Used in the First Pilot Study	102
Appendix E: The Second Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire	103
Appendix F: The Employment Equity Policy Questions Given to Independent Raters	105
Appendix G: The Cover Letter to Accompany the Questionnaire Package	106
Appendix H: The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Egalitarianism and Individualism Questions	107
Appendix I: The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Policy Questions	108
Appendix J: The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the General Comments	111

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1	The Percentage Representation of Designated Group Members in the Canadian Population, the Canadian Labour Force and the Workforce Subject to the Employment Equity Act	14
2	The Statistical Characteristics of the Final Egalitarianism and Individualism Test Items	33
3	The Independent Ratings of the Employment Equity Policies	36
4	The Number and Percentage of Total Respondents, of Females and of Members of the Other Three Designated Groups in Each of the Employment Categories	39
5	The Means and Standard Deviations of Responses Given on the Four Egalitarianism Items and the Four Individualism Items	40
6	The Cross Correlations Between Egalitarianism Items and Both the Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores	42
7	The Cross Correlations Between Individualism Items and Both the Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores	43
8	The Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores by Employment Location, Presented in Ascending Order	45
9	The Means and Standard Deviations of Responses Given on the Five Support for Employment Equity Policies Questions	46

Table	Description	<i>Employment Equity</i> Page
10	The Cross Correlations Among Support for the Four Specific Employment Equity Policies and the Mean Support Scores on these Four Policies	48
11	The Mean Support for Employment Equity Scores and the Mean Qualification Scores by Employment Location, Presented in Ascending Order	49
12	The Means and Standard Deviations of the Belief that Employment Inequities Exist, Workforce Discrimination Exists and that Intervention is needed	50
13	The Differences in Mean Egalitarianism Scores, Mean Individualism Scores and Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies Between those Respondents who Met the Three Prerequisites and those who Did Not Meet the Three Prerequisites	53
14	A Summary Table for the Three By Three Analysis of Variance in Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies Between High, Medium and Low Mean Egalitarianism and Mean Individualism Scores	56
15	Results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance in Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies by Combined Levels of Egalitarianism and Individualism	58
16	The Distribution (in Terms of Number of Comments) of Procedure and Meaning Comments Across Sections of the Questionnaire	62

Table	Description	Page
17	The Percentage Agreement Over the Content Scoring Conducted by the Investigator and the Independent Rater and the Number of Scores that are Agreed Upon Over the Number of Scores for Each Item by Each Category	65
18	The Number of Uncertain Responses Reported by the Investigator and the Independent Rater for Each Categorical Rating	66
19	The Number of Comments in Each Section of the Questionnaire that Reflect Egalitarianism, Individualism, Support for Employment Equity Policies, a Conflict in Support for Employment Equity Policies and that Offer an Explanation of Support for Employment Equity Policies as Reported by the Investigator	67

List of Appendices

Appendix	Description	Page
A	The Final Questionnaire to be Given to All Full-Time Employees at Carleton University	96
B	The Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire	99
C	The Informed Consent Form Used in the Pilot Studies	101
D	The Debriefing Used in the First Pilot Study	102
E	The Second Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire	103
F	The Employment Equity Policy Questions Given to Independent Raters	105
G	The Cover Letter to Accompany the Questionnaire Package	106
H	The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Egalitarianism and Individualism Questions	107
I	The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Policy Questions	108
J	The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the General Comments	111

Egalitarianism versus Individualism Conflict Theory:

Explaining People's Support for Employment Equity Policies

Since the 1950's, the Canadian government has been addressing the issue of employment inequities for members of various minority groups. The government's involvement in these issues has resulted in legislation that encourages the implementation of special measures within the employment setting towards a number of designated groups including women, aboriginal peoples, members of visible minority groups and people with disabilities. These special measures are considered to be short-term policies or practices that are designed to ensure that the degree of representation of the designated groups in all positions of employment is proportional to their representation within the workforce from which employers can reasonably be expected to draw employees. In this study, an examination of the controversy surrounding employment equity policies will be conducted.

A considerable amount of evidence demonstrates the existence of employment inequities, yet the implementation of employment equity policies has been controversial to say the least. Opposition begins with disagreement over the existence of employment inequities and continues with the issues of the causes of these inequities, whether intervention is needed and what type of intervention is warranted. Some people feel that employment inequities do not in fact exist. Others feel that while inequities exist, intervention is unnecessary either because these inequities should naturally occur or because they will eventually work themselves out. Still others feel that employment settings harbor blatant and more often subtle forms of discrimination towards designated groups and that intervention is needed to eliminate these barriers to employment opportunities. Even upon agreement that intervention is needed, there exists controversy surrounding the method of intervention. Some people believe that change should occur slowly with as little interference as possible, others believe that whatever method will produce the fastest results is necessary.

An examination of public opinion polls illustrates the confusion and conflict

surrounding employment equity policies. Some evidence exists for support of employment equity policies while other evidence indicates that people are against such policies. In one study conducted in the United States, 76% of whites and 96% of blacks agree that "affirmative-action programs that help blacks and other minorities to get ahead should be supported" (Klugel & Smith, 1986). These authors also found that 60% of whites surveyed agree that higher education institutions should set aside a number of positions for qualified minority applicants and 51% of whites agree that employers should do the same. At the same time, 65% of whites feel that such preferential treatment would be unfair. Of those who view preferential treatment as fair, only 10% of them would support this treatment. In 1977, 59% of white Americans and 83% of blacks supported the idea of special consideration towards the best minority applicants in schools (Bunzel, 1986). A Newsweek poll conducted in 1988 found that 14% of whites agreed that because of past discrimination, qualified blacks should "receive preference over equally qualified whites in such matters as getting into college or getting jobs."

Confusion surrounding employment equity policies is also evident in Canada (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991). These authors found that almost all Canadians support "guaranteed equality between men and women in all aspects of life." Over half of both male (53.2%) and female (54.8%) Canadians think that the government "should make sure that a certain proportion of top jobs in the government go to women." However, there is much less support for quotas when the question is phrased "Do you think large companies should have quotas to ensure a fixed percentage of women are hired, or should women get no special treatment." About half of those people who were against quotas would feel differently if it meant that women would remain economically unequal. In a rare question dealing with aboriginal people, little support (ranging from 24% to 29% depending on political party membership) was given for the statement that "universities should have special programs and admission standards for native Canadians."

A number of theories have arisen to explain the inconsistent support for employment equity policies. One theory can be derived from ideas that were first formulated by Lipset and Schneider (1978). This theory, the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory, states that people's support for employment equity policies can be explained by a conflict between two core North American values, egalitarianism and individualism. These two values are highly regarded in our society and yet employment equity policies seem to put these values in conflict with each other. There is considerable disagreement about the definitions of these values and a complete discussion of this will be conducted in a later section. Briefly, egalitarianism is the principle that every person should have an equal opportunity to succeed in life and individualism is the principle that each person's success should be based on his or her own abilities and merit. The theory states that the extent to which each person believes in these two values will influence the degree to which they will support a particular employment equity policy. These policies are designed to appeal to a person's belief in egalitarianism. The existence of employment inequities based on group membership conflict with a person's belief that every individual should have an equal opportunity in life and thus that person will support policies designed to remedy these inequities to the extent that he or she believes in egalitarianism. The conflict arises when the policy itself violates the principles of individualism, that is it threatens the person's belief that success is based on an individual's abilities and merit. The person is then left to judge a policy that appeals to his or her belief in egalitarianism but violates his or her belief in individualism. The extent to which the person believes in these two values will determine the extent to which he or she will support the policy.

A conflict between the values of egalitarianism and individualism has been repeatedly mentioned in the literature concerning support for employment equity policies (see for example, Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989; Kleugel & Smith, 1983) and yet to this author's knowledge it has not been clearly defined or formally tested. The purpose of

this study is to examine the effect of a person's belief in egalitarianism and individualism on their support for employment equity policies. In doing so, the concepts within the theory and the theory itself will be more clearly defined.

In order to introduce the study, this paper will present a history of employment equity in Canada and the United States. The evidence for the existence of employment inequities will then be examined and the controversy surrounding the reasons for these inequities and what should be done about them will be addressed. The discussion will then turn to explanations of the conflicting support for employment equity policies and the theory of the conflict between egalitarianism and individualism will be introduced and defined. This introduction will conclude with a discussion of the hypotheses of this study.

History of Employment Equity

Employment equity in Canada. It was during the 1950's and the 1960's that policies addressing the concerns of employment equity in Canada began to take form. By the end of this time period, most Canadian jurisdictions had implemented statutes that prohibited discrimination on the basis of racial or religious characteristics and that advocated pay equity for men and women (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1990b).

During the 1970's, various voluntary affirmative action program initiatives were implemented by governments at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. These initial attempts to promote affirmative action were further encouraged by the enactment of the Canadian Human Rights Act in 1978. This Act is described by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981) as stating that it is discriminatory for employers to establish policies or practices that deprive individuals of employment opportunities on the basis of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, physical handicap or the conviction of an offence that has been pardoned. It further states in section 15 of the Act that it is not discriminatory to adopt special programs to eliminate, reduce or prevent disadvantages and to improve employment opportunities for groups that are

disadvantaged on the basis of the above mentioned group memberships. This may be achieved by "improving opportunities respecting goods, services, facilities, accommodation or employment in relation to that group" (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1981).

The implications of this Act on the initiation of affirmative action programs are numerous. First it allows for complaints concerning discriminatory practices to be publicly addressed. This publicity not only draws attention to discriminatory practices within organizations but contributes to increased awareness of discrimination issues and may generate debate concerning possible solutions to these issues. Secondly, the Act allows the Canadian Human Rights Commission to recommend the implementation of a special program as a solution to a complaint of discrimination that has been substantiated by the Human Rights Tribunal. Thus it encourages the adoption of special programs when conditions within an organization warrant such adoption. Thirdly, by defining these special programs as non-discriminatory, the Act protects organizations from charges of reverse discrimination while allowing the adoption of such programs to be used as a defense against charges of discrimination. This protection may encourage employers to initiate policies directed at eliminating discriminatory employment procedures within their organization.

The 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms constitutionally affirmed the right to equality in employment by guaranteeing every individual the right to equal treatment without discrimination. The Charter encourages a comprehensive approach to the elimination of discriminatory practices and sanctions the adoption of laws and policies to improve the condition of disadvantaged individuals. It further acknowledges that discriminatory acts may not always be deliberate but may instead be the result of societal or institutional practices that may adversely affect members of particular groups. These practices became known as systemic discrimination.

By 1984, increasing pressure from interest groups combined with evidence of continued inequality in the work force from a number of sources (see for example: Daudlin, 1983; Special Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped, 1981) culminated in the establishment of the Abella commission on Equality in Employment (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1989a). After conducting an in-depth analysis of current affirmative action programs and their effectiveness, the Royal Commission (Abella, 1984) concluded that voluntary affirmative action programs were insufficient at establishing equality in the workforce for women, native people, disabled persons and members of visible minority groups and recommended that employment equity programs be made mandatory. The term employment equity became the Canadian equivalent to the American term affirmative action in order to differentiate our policies from those of our neighbours. The Commission further concluded that systemic remedies were required to eliminate systemic discrimination and therefore recommended a results-oriented approach to identifying and eliminating discriminatory barriers.

On April 23, 1986 the Federal Employment Equity Act, Bill C-62, was passed by the House of Commons in response to the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. The purpose of this act is to obtain equality in the workplace by ensuring that employment opportunities are not denied for reasons other than ability. It further proposes to correct any "conditions of disadvantage" experienced by women, aboriginal people, persons with disabilities or members of visible minority groups by way of the implementation of "special measures" and by requiring "accommodations of differences" in employment settings.

The definitions of the terms used in the Employment Equity Act are discussed in other government documents (such as Employment and Immigration Canada, 1986a, 1986b, 1989a). The conditions of disadvantage for the four designated groups include such employment patterns as higher than average unemployment, lower than average pay rates

and concentration in lower status jobs. Special measures are considered to be short-term policies and practices designed to ensure a degree of representation of the designated groups in all positions of employment that is proportional to their representation in the workforce from which employers can reasonably be expected to draw employees. This workforce may be identified by qualification, eligibility and geography. Special measures may include such policies as the active recruitment of minority group members, equity training of staff members or the identification and elimination of discriminatory procedures and practices. The mention of accommodation of differences is included to ensure equal representation by accommodating differences that may be attributable to the four designated groups. Accommodating differences may include such practices as the adjustment of the worksite to allow access to persons with disabilities, the provision of assistance with daycare or the accommodation of cultural or religious practices of minority groups.

Membership definitions of the designated groups are also specified in the employment equity regulations associated with the Employment Equity Act (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1986b). Aboriginal peoples include those individuals that agree to be identified as Indian, Inuit or Metis. Persons with disabilities are defined as those individuals who have a persistent physical, mental, psychiatric, sensory or learning impairment, who consider themselves or believe that employers may consider them as disadvantaged because of their disability and who agree to be identified as a person with a disability. Visible minority members are those individuals who agree to be identified as a member of a visible minority group because of their race or color, who are considered to be non-Caucasian in race or non-white in color and who are not of aboriginal descent. For obvious reasons, the definition of women was not considered necessary.

Crown corporations and federally regulated businesses employing one hundred or more employees are targeted by the Employment Equity Act of 1986. Each year, these organizations must prepare a plan for implementing employment equity and provide a

timetable for reaching their goals. These goals should involve the identification and elimination of any employment barriers within their organization and should involve the institution of policies designed to ensure a representation of designated groups that is proportional to their representation in the qualified and eligible workforce from which an employer is expected to draw employees. They must also file a public certified report showing employment information from the previous year. The report must include the number, location and industrial sector involved for all employees and the number of employees within the designated groups for each location and industrial sector. It must also include the occupational groups, salary ranges and number of employees that are hired, promoted or terminated and the degree of representation of employees from designated groups within this information. Failure to submit this report can result in a fine of up to fifty thousand dollars.

The Federal Contractors Program was also initiated in 1986. This program requires companies who employ one hundred or more people or who are bidding for contracts with the federal government of two hundred thousand dollars or more to provide a written commitment to implementing employment equity as a condition of their bid. The goals of this program are the same as those for the Legislated Employment Equity program responsible for the implementation of the Employment Equity Act. The organization is expected to meet eleven criteria including (a) a communication of employment equity commitment, (b) assignment of senior personnel with responsibility for employment equity, (c) the collection and maintenance of work force and applicant data on designated group membership, (d) analysis of designated group representation within the organization in relation to their representation of qualified workers from which the employer is expected to undertake recruitment, (e) the elimination of discrimination in employment policies, practices and systems, (f) the establishment of goals for the hiring, training and promotion of designated group employees, (g) the establishment of a work plan concerning these

goals, (h) the adoption of special measures to ensure these goals are achieved, (i) the establishment of a climate favorable to the integration of designated group members, (j) the adoption of procedures to monitor the progress and results achieved through employment equity, and (k) the authorization to allow representative(s) of the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission access to the business premises and to the records in order to conduct compliance reviews. The major difference between the Federal Contractors Program and the Legislated Employment Equity Program is the method of enforcement used. Instead of submitting a yearly report, federal contractors must allow on-sight compliance reviews of their policies and programs by Employment and Immigration Commission officials. A negative review could result in sanctions against that organization including the possibility of the withdrawal of the right to bid on future contracts.

The Legislated Employment Equity Program and the Federal Contractors Program comprise the current position of the federal government concerning employment equity. A review of the Employment Equity Act was conducted in May of 1992 (Redway, 1992) and thirty-one recommendations have been made to improve the act. At the time of this writing these recommendations have not yet been addressed by parliament.

The Ontario government also has taken steps to ensure employment equity. The Ontario Human Rights Code of 1981 guarantees the right to equal treatment in employment without discrimination. Any policy that results in the exclusion, restriction or preference of a group is considered an infringement on these rights unless that policy is designed as a special measure to reduce disadvantages or achieve equal opportunity for disadvantaged groups. This Code is therefore an attempt to eliminate systemic discrimination while at the same time allowing for special measures to be implemented that are also designed to eliminate systemic discrimination.

The current NDP government in Ontario promised to introduce employment equity legislation in its speech from the Throne in 1990. In 1991, the province's first

Employment Equity Commissioner was appointed. A discussion paper on Employment Equity Legislation was made public in that same year (Ministry of Citizenship, 1991) which states that it has been decided that (a) employment equity will be legislated, (b) the four designated groups covered under the legislation will include aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, racial minorities, and women, (c) employment equity will cover the public, broader public and private sectors and (d) it will be mandatory. On June 25th, 1992 the first reading of Bill 79, an Act to Provide for Employment Equity for Aboriginal People, People with Disabilities, Members of Racial Minorities and Women was conducted. At the time of this writing, the bill had not yet been passed.

Much of the research on affirmative action that will be discussed in later sections of this paper have been conducted in the United States. It is therefore important to briefly examine the context concerning employment equity from which these studies stem.

Employment equity in the United States. As early as 1941, The United States government has made attempts to achieve a representative workforce. The first two decades of employment equity initiatives consisted primarily of voluntary, complaint-oriented policies that focused on eliminating intentional acts of discrimination in the workforce and which did not include the implementation of special measures or affirmative action (Robertson, 1984). In 1961, a centralized Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was established by President Kennedy to evaluate complaints of discrimination, to conduct compliance reviews and to impose sanctions for violations of compliance for federal contractors (Robertson, 1984). It was in this same year that a commitment to affirmative action became a requirement for contractors in addition to nondiscrimination.

In 1965, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which prohibited discrimination in employment on the basis of race, sex, color, creed, religion, and national origin began to take effect. This Title covers both private and public sector employers with 15 or more

employees with some exceptions such as religious institutions (Kelly, 1986). Employers of 100 or more employees are required to submit statistics on job classification by designated group (Harvey & Blakely, 1985).

Executive Order 11246, issued in 1965 by President Johnson requires federal contractors with 50 or more employees and bidding on a contract of fifty thousand dollars or more to include in the government contract a commitment to non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. They must also include a commitment to affirmative action although this term was not initially defined. The office of the Federal Contract Compliance Programs was established to administer and to enforce this order.

Executive order 11246 with minor amendments is still currently practiced in the United States. In addition, government contractors are also required to comply with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which prohibits discrimination against and requires affirmative action policies for handicapped individuals and with the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1974 which prohibits discrimination against disabled veterans (Kelly, 1986). Since 1965, the definition of discrimination has evolved from more blatant and intentional forms of bias to a systemic definition similar to that in Canada. The term affirmative action has also since been clarified as a results-oriented practice to ensure equal employment opportunity and which may include goals to correct instances of systemic discrimination (Holloway, 1989).

The United States contract compliance program shares a number of similarities with the Federal Contractors Program and the Legislated Employment Equity Program in Canada (Jain, 1988). Each of these programs involve a commitment to employment equity, the development of goals and timetables for the achievement of this equity, the collection of data on the representation of designated groups, the implementation of special measures to ensure employment equity and to eliminate discrimination, a method of evaluating compliance to these regulations and sanctions against noncompliance.

These programs vary in the degree of regulation they impose on companies with programs in the United States being the most regulatory and intrusive and the Federal Contractors program in Canada being the least regulated (Jain, 1988). A review of studies evaluating the impact of contract compliance programs in the United States (Jain, 1988) has suggested that increases in the effectiveness of programs may be due to increases in aggressive enforcement procedures and to stricter guidelines in reporting on affirmative action programs. Early studies indicated improvements in employment opportunities for minorities however these opportunities primarily involved low-skilled jobs. Later studies showed increases in employment of minorities for both white-collar positions and unskilled positions. It is important to note that increases in educational opportunities for minorities may also be contributing to the rise in minority representation in higher skilled occupations.

Canadian employment equity programs are not as strictly enforced as those in the United States. However, our programs are relatively new and little assessment has been done on their effectiveness. It remains to be seen as to whether stricter enforcement is needed in Canada or whether the public display of employment statistics is enough to encourage employers to comply with the goals of employment equity. We now turn to an examination of the existence of inequities in employment.

Statistical Evidence for Inequality in the Workforce

The evidence for the existence of employment inequities can be derived from a number of sources such as census results, surveys, specific studies and from employment statistics for various companies. Studies conducted in the United States have primarily focused on racial and gender inequalities in the workforce and have shown that while improvements are evident, women and visible minorities are still at a disadvantage in employment situations (see for example: Benokraitis & Gilbert, 1989; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; Jain, 1988; Jain & Sloane, 1981). Evidence of employment inequities for women, visible minorities, persons with disabilities and aboriginal people in Canada can

also be obtained from a number of sources (see for example: Employment and Immigration Canada, 1985, 1988, 1989b, 1990a; Jain, 1988; Secretary of State, 1990; Statistics Canada, 1988). A large number of reports examining employment statistics for minority groups are available and a complete discussion of this evidence is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, a report prepared by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (1991) which examines the employment statistics received under the Employment Equity Act from 1987 to 1990 will be used to demonstrate the presence of inequities in this particular Canadian workforce and the effectiveness of employment equity legislation.

A sample of employment statistics from this report are shown in Table 1 and can be compared to the representation of women, aboriginal peoples, disabled persons and members of visible minority groups in the entire Canadian population and in the Canadian labour force as determined by the 1986 Census (also shown in Table 1). The representation of the designated groups within the employment equity workforce of 1987, the first year of reporting, is much lower than their representation within the general Canadian population and within the Canadian labour force. Women in the 1987 workforce experienced a double disadvantage if they were also of aboriginal descent or disabled. Women who are members of visible minority groups were better represented in the employment equity workforce than in the Canadian labour force. When the 1987 and 1990 employment equity workforces are compared, improvements in the representation of each of the designated groups are apparent. The double disadvantage experienced by female members of other designated groups has improved and female members of visible minority groups are actually better represented than their male counterparts. It is important to note that women are more likely to be employed on a part-time or temporary basis and that when employment statistics for full-time positions are examined separately, the disparities between men and women are more apparent. Once again however, members of designated groups are better represented in 1990 than in 1987. Despite the improvements, except for

Table 1

**The Percentage Representation of Designated Group Members in the Canadian Population,
the Canadian Labour Force and the Workforce Subject to the Employment Equity Act.**

	Total		Aboriginal		Disabled		Visible Minority	
	Population		Peoples		Persons		Group Members	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Canadian Population ^a	49.4	50.6			3.6 ^c	3.7 ^c		
Canadian labour force ^{ad}	56.0	44.0	1.2 ^e	1.0 ^b	3.2 ^c	2.3 ^c	3.4	2.9
Employment Equity Workforce ^e (1987)								
Total	58.9	41.1	0.4	0.3	1.0	0.6	2.2	2.8
Permanent Full Time Only	62.4	37.6	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.5	2.3	2.7
Employment Equity Workforce ^e (1990)								
Total	56.3	43.7	0.5	0.4	1.2	1.2	3.2	4.0
Permanent Full Time Only	59.9	40.1	0.5	0.3	1.4	1.1	3.3	3.9
Banking Industrial Sector	24.0	76.0	0.1	0.6	1.1	3.0	3.6	9.2
Communications Industrial Sector	58.8	41.2	0.4	0.3	1.0	0.5	3.0	2.5
Transportation Industrial Sector	80.8	19.2	0.8	0.2	1.5	0.2	2.9	1.0
Other Industrial Sectors ^f	73.7	26.3	1.0	0.4	2.2	0.5	3.0	1.6
Occupations Excluding Clerical-Total	76.4	23.6	0.7	0.2	1.6	0.5	3.7	1.7
Occupations Excluding Clerical-Hired	79.7	20.3	1.2	0.3	0.7	0.2	6.3	1.6

Note: All values indicate the percentage of representation of each designated group within the entire population for that row heading.

^aUnpublished data from 1986 Census. The number of aboriginal people and visible minority group members were not available for the Canadian population. ^bAn estimated 45,000 people on reserves did not complete the 1986 Census. ^c1986 Health and Activity Limitations Survey. Disabled persons include those aged 15 to 64 who indicate that they are limited in the kind or amount of work they can do. ^dIncludes those aged 15 or more who worked in 1985 or 1986 or those disabled persons who worked anytime from 1981 to 1986. ^eIncludes full-time, part-time and temporary employees unless specified. ^fIncludes Nuclear energy, frontier land oil and gas, flour and feed mills, commercial grain elevators.

female visible minority group members the representation of designated groups in 1990 is still below their representation in the general population and in the Canadian labour force.

Employment statistics on designated groups in the employment equity workforce are also presented according to the industrial sectors for which they pertain. The major industrial sectors include the banking, communications and transportation sectors and another sector which comprises a group of other industries such as nuclear energy, frontier lands oil and gas, flour and feed mills and commercial grain elevators. Women in general and women members of other designated groups are strongly overrepresented in the banking industrial sector. In fact, the overrepresentation of female visible minority group members can largely be accounted for by their strong representation within the banking sector. These findings are not surprising because 54.7% of jobs in the banking industry are of a clerical nature, a percentage that is at least twice as large as any other industrial sector, and 66.5% of women are clerical workers (Employment and Immigration, 1988). While clerical workers (76.5%), supervisors (60.2%), service workers (54.9%) and sales workers (54.4%) are primarily female, skilled crafts and trades workers (97.7%), forepersons (96.5%), semi-skilled manual workers (95.8%), other manual workers (92.9%), upper-level managers (92.3%), semi-professionals (81.2%), middle-level or other managers (60.4%) and professionals (58.6%) are primarily male. It is apparent that differences in employment become increasingly obvious when industrial sectors and occupational groups are also taken into consideration. The final series of statistics in Table 1 illustrates that despite improvements in the representation of designated groups when examining overall employment statistics, a closer look at the breakdown of these statistics is warranted to obtain a better understanding of what they mean. In terms of the newly hired workforce, women are even more highly overrepresented in the clerical fields with 75.1% of females hired being clerical workers. If the number of male and female clerical workers that were hired and terminated in 1990 are compared, a net increase of 1442

females and a net decrease of 198 males would be found.

This discussion of employment statistics for the employment equity workforce is by no means exhaustive, however, it does suggest that inequities exist. There is also some evidence in favor of the effectiveness of the employment equity legislation. What is not apparent from this discussion is the solution to these inequities.

Should Something be Done to Eliminate Employment Inequities?

In order for people to support employment equity policies they must first believe that employment inequities exist (Kleugel & Smith, 1983; Tougas & Veilleux, 1989). Considering the overwhelming evidence for the existence of inequities it is not surprising that most of the literature in this area does not dispute its existence, however some authors believe that the statistical evidence is methodologically flawed and that this evidence gives a biased view of employment equity (Block, 1982; Hoffmann & Reed, 1982; Sowell, 1982). These authors believe that inequities are not the result of discriminatory practices, but occur naturally and reflect real differences in abilities and skills between majority and minority groups. If these real differences were controlled for, inequity between the groups would disappear. These real differences may be the result of such variables as age, geography, culture, education, motivation and the breakdown of the family unit to name a few.

Even when the existence of employment inequities is acknowledged, support for intervention designed to eliminate these inequities is not always considered desirable. Thus supporters of employment equity policies must not only feel that employment inequities exist, but also feel that something should be done to eliminate these inequities. For example, those authors who feel that inequities are caused by natural differences in abilities and skills feel that intervention is not only unnecessary but useless and even possibly harmful to the minority group (Block & Walker, 1982, Sowell, 1982). According to this line of reasoning, employment equity policies will only result in the hiring of unqualified minority group members and result in decreased productivity. The reasoning of these

authors is based on a false assumption. They are assuming that employment equity is equivalent to hiring unqualified employees. In fact, according to the Legislated Employment Equity Act of 1986, employment equity policies are designed to ensure that the proportion of designated group members within the various employment positions in the workforce is similar to the proportion of qualified designated group members available for employment in these positions. Thus the goal is to hire qualified applicants.

It is also important to note that what is considered differences in skills may in fact be attributed to discrimination. Individuals will usually differ on a number of characteristics that may be considered relevant to employment selection. Crosby (1984) suggests that as long as one person (i.e., majority group member) surpasses a second person (i.e., minority group member) on any one input variable or as long as that second person is less qualified on one input variable than the first person, a plausible explanation for any outcome decision favoring the first person can be given despite any other differences between the two people. The problem with this type of discrimination is that it is not usually apparent because in each case, the outcome decision is plausible. It is when a number of cases within the same company are examined together that discrimination becomes apparent (Crosby, Clayton, Alksnis, & Hemker, 1986). An illustration of this (Twiss, Tabb, & Crosby, 1989) would be a situation in which an all-male university department hires a male applicant over an equally qualified female because her research overlaps with other research being conducted in the department. This explanation is certainly plausible but suppose another all-male department in the same institution hires a male applicant over an equally qualified female because her research is too divergent from the rest of the department. Again, this explanation is plausible but not if the two cases are examined together.

Differences in employment factors between minority and majority group members that are attributed to differences in skills may also be discriminatory if the skills that are

sought are not relevant to job performance. In a study of the policy changes made by the New York City fire department in response to charges of discrimination, the two major factors that contributed to discrimination were found to be the validity of the tests used for screening applicants and the relevancy of these same tests towards job performance (Norris & Reardon, 1989). If an invalid test is used to determine the abilities required of an applicant to effectively perform his or her job, then any negative selection decisions made on the basis of this test will discriminate against a person on the basis of irrelevant information. Similarly, any test, no matter how valid, that is used to determine abilities that are not required for effective job performance will discriminate against those who perform poorly on that test.

It is also important to consider that different groups may effectively perform the same tasks using different methods. These methods may not have been previously encountered and are therefore not considered in the applicant screening process. For example, in the case of the New York City fire department (Norris & Reardon, 1989), size and upper body strength were strongly emphasized in the screening process because of the difficulties encountered in holding a charged hoseline. When women were finally admitted into the department other techniques of holding the hoseline were developed that maximized the use of leg strength and minimized the use of upper body strength allowing shorter and smaller firefighters effective control over the hose. These holding methods had probably not been previously considered by the fire department since they had always hired men with strong upper body strength. The methods traditionally used to hold the hose involved this increased upper body strength and thus the screening process for applicants required high scores in this strength. It was not until an in-depth job analysis was conducted in response to complaints of discrimination by women that other methods of holding the hose became apparent.

Another example of a case where employment inequities are believed to exist yet

intervention is discouraged is taken from an economic point of view (Becker, 1982).

According to this theory, discrimination is considered to be an economic disadvantage to employers. If a group is discriminated against by a company, then that company will face decreased productivity since it does not consist of the best possible employees. For example, if a company discriminates against women, then they are selecting the most qualified applicant for a particular job from only the male applicants, and thus they may not be selecting the best and most productive applicant since that applicant may be female. As a result of this discrimination, the wages for the disadvantaged group that has been discriminated against will decrease since they are under-employed. That is, because female job applicants are being discriminated against, there are more of them unemployed and they are therefore willing to accept a lower salary in order to get a job. It then becomes financially beneficial for the company to start hiring the members from the disadvantaged group and their wages will again increase because they are now in demand. Thus, employment equity legislation is not needed. The problem with this theory is that the disadvantaged group is only of value if their wages are lower than the rest of the population. Otherwise they will not be hired. It is precisely this type of discrimination that proponents of employment equity seek to eliminate.

As stated earlier, support for employment equity policies relies on the belief that inequalities in the workforce actually exist. Since these policies are directed at eliminating discriminatory practices in the workforce, supporters must also believe that discrimination in the workforce exists. The research evidence for discrimination against minority groups is extensive and a complete examination of this literature is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, a brief review of this evidence will be conducted.

Discrimination as a cause of employment inequities. There is a considerable amount of evidence that people are becoming increasingly more egalitarian in their attitudes towards minority groups. For example, in 1958, 38% of the American public expressed a

willingness to vote for a black president. Twenty years later, this percentage had increased to 81% (Kleugel & Smith, 1986). Similarly, the percentage of individuals that supported a woman running for the presidency increased from about 60% in 1958 to 87% in 1983. In the late 1940's, approximately one-half of the American public responded positively to the latter part of the statement, "Do you think Negroes should have as good a chance as white people to get any kind of job, or do you think white people should have the first chance at any kind of job?". By 1972, this percentage was reduced to 5% (Miller, W.E., Miller, A.H., & Schneider, 1980). In 1944, 49% of whites felt that blacks "should have as good a chance as white people to get a job." This percentage increased to 97% by 1972 (Schuman, Steeh, & Bobo, 1985).

Despite the decline in the most obvious forms of discrimination towards minority groups, more subtle forms of bias still exist. Many authors have made the distinction between blatant, overt and obvious forms of discrimination which are found to be declining and more subtle, covert forms of discrimination that are currently of concern (see for example Benokraitis & Gilbert, 1989; Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989; McConahay, 1986). It is believed that the increasing egalitarian values in our society contribute to the reduction of the more obvious forms of discrimination (see for example Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989). According to the proponents of the duality of discrimination theory, people are believing more and more in the principles of equality and therefore the social desirability of positive attitudes towards minority groups has increased. Nonetheless, consciously or unconsciously, many people still harbor negative attitudes towards minority groups which are expressed in the form of subtle discrimination.

Several theories exist to explain the reasons for and the expression of this covert form of discrimination. One group of researchers (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986) believe that ambivalence has occurred among majority group members and is caused by the

simultaneous existence of both positive and negative attitudes towards minority groups.

According to the ambivalence theory, people with conflicting attitudes feel vulnerable and insecure in situations where they are in contact with the group they feel ambivalent about and thus they are likely to express stronger positive or stronger negative reactions towards this group than people who have less conflicting attitudes.

Another theory that attempts to explain the duality of discrimination is the idea of modern racism (McConahay, 1986). Modern racism is distinguished from old-fashioned racism which is more blatant and involves stereotypic negative beliefs concerning blacks. According to modern racism theory, people believe that racism is bad and that discrimination is a thing of the past. At the same time they believe that blacks are now making unfair demands and that these demands are undeserved. Therefore people resent the attention and increased status that is being received by blacks. Modern racists do not believe that their own beliefs and attitudes are racist because they do not support old-fashioned racism and because they believe that their own negative attitudes are warranted and justified.

Another form of racism called aversive racism has also been identified (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). This type of racism is distinguished from the more overt type which they label as dominative racism and which is similar to the concept of old-fashioned racism proposed by McConahay (1986). The aversive racists also regard themselves as nondiscriminatory. They sympathize with past injustices and they support equality policies at least in principle but they also harbor negative attitudes towards blacks of which they are unaware. It is this conflict between their egalitarian beliefs and their unconscious negative attitudes towards blacks that contribute to their ambivalence. According to the aversive racism theory, blacks will be treated the same as whites when the situation clearly and unambiguously calls for such behavior to conform to their egalitarian image and avoid behaving inappropriately. It is when the situation is less clearly defined that negative

attitudes are expressed since they can more readily be justified and thus the individual continues to conform to his or her egalitarian self-image.

Other proponents of the duality theories of discrimination describe a slightly different reason for the existence of discrimination which they call symbolic racism (see for example, Kinder, 1986; Kinder & Sears, 1981). This theory holds that whites may support equality in principle but will oppose racial change due to a mixture of racial attitudes combined with a belief in traditional American values such as individualism, self-reliance and the work ethic.

The existence of more subtle forms of discrimination are apparent from the literature review on unobtrusive studies of discrimination (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980). Despite the decrease in survey evidence of overt forms of discrimination, these authors found that when less reactive, unobtrusive studies were conducted, the support for the presence of discrimination became evident. When studies on helping behavior of whites towards blacks were examined, discrimination was found to increase in situations where the possibility of surveillance was negligible and when the costs of refusing to help were low. A review of the studies on aggressive behavior towards blacks in which subjects are provided with a socially acceptable way to express this aggression, indicate that whites exhibit less aggression towards blacks than towards whites if the potential costs are high but this aggression may then be exhibited in a less direct form. Aggression towards blacks increased if the costs were perceived to be low.

Another covert form of discrimination is the idea that minority groups are not inferior to the majority but the majority is superior to the minority. When white subjects were asked to describe white and black people on bipolar adjective scales, there were no differences in the ratings of blacks and whites; however, when the scales were divided into positive and negative characteristics, a subtle form of bias became evident. Blacks were not rated lower on negative characteristics, but whites were rated higher on positive

characteristics (Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989). When positive-positive and negative-negative scales replaced conventional positive-negative scales, blacks and whites were rated equally on the negative scales but whites were rated better on the positive scales (Gaertner & McLaughlin, 1983). With similar results, a lexical decision procedure was used to examine the time it took to link positive or negative descriptive words such as lazy, stupid, ambitious or smart, with the word blacks and the word whites (Gaertner & McLaughlin, 1983). It was found that white subjects responded faster when positive words were linked with the word whites but responded equally fast when linking negative words with both the word blacks and the word whites.

Another study, using a bogus pipeline procedure, supports the presence of more subtle forms of discrimination (Sigall & Page, 1971). In this procedure, subjects who believed they were being monitored by lie detecting apparatus expressed more negative attitudes towards blacks and more positive attitudes towards whites than a control group.

It is apparent from the above discussion that discrimination exists. It is also assumed that a person will not support employment equity policies if they do not believe that discrimination in the workforce exists. A number of surveys were examined in an attempt to get a more complete picture of Americans beliefs and attitudes about inequality (Kleugel & Smith, 1986). From the results of their survey examinations, it is apparent that in general, people do believe that discrimination exists. The 1977 General Social Survey found that 41% of white people surveyed believe that the reason "blacks have worse jobs, income and housing than whites" is "mainly due to discrimination" (Davis, 1982). Kleugel and Smith (1983) found that 74% of white respondents felt that there was at least some discrimination against blacks which limited their chances to get ahead. This percentage increased to 89% when the respondents were black. When differences in sex were examined, 96% of male respondents and 95% of female respondents felt that there was at least "a little" discrimination against women which limited their chances to get ahead

(Kleugel & Smith, 1986). Additionally, 82% of respondents reported "seeing discrimination against women" and 76% of respondents reported "seeing discrimination against blacks." Given that people generally believe that employment inequities exist, and given that they also generally believe that discrimination in the workforce exists, why do people have such mixed feelings about employment equity policies? One of the theories proposed to explain these mixed feelings involves the conflict these policies elicit between a persons belief in the principles of egalitarianism and the principles of individualism. We now turn to an examination of this theory.

Egalitarianism Versus Individualism

The conflict theory between egalitarianism and individualism was derived from ideas that were first proposed by Lipset and Schneider (1978). Upon examination of the results of public opinion polls concerning employment equity policies, these authors felt that the inconsistencies in people's support for employment equities policies could be explained by a contradiction between two core values in North American society; egalitarianism and individualism. Most people support policies that Lipset and Schnieder have labeled as compensatory action. These policies are aimed at improving the resources and opportunities available to disadvantaged groups and include such policies as special training programs and special consideration being given to the best minority applicants. It is when these policies lead to preferential treatment, that support declines. Preferential treatment includes policies that give preference or special advantages to minority group applicants. People generally believe in the principles of egalitarianism and equality of opportunity. Thus policies that are designed towards equality of opportunity and compensation for past discrimination are consistent with egalitarian values and will be supported. People also believe in the principles of individualism and equality of results and will therefore reject policies that violate the notion of individual competition.

Based on the views of Lipset and Schneider, it may be possible to predict people's

support for employment equity policies based on the relative extent to which they believe in the values of egalitarianism and individualism. According to the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory, the more a policy violates individualism, the less support that policy would receive. However some people will not support a policy that is primarily egalitarian in nature and some people will support policies that violate individualism. Since it is a conflict between these two values that determines people's support, the relative extent to which they believe in these two values should determine the extent to which they will accept or reject a policy based on the extent to which the policy violates individualism. A person who believes more strongly in egalitarianism than individualism, should be more likely to support policies that increasingly violate individualism. A person who believes more strongly in individualism than egalitarianism should be less likely to support policies that increasingly violate individualism.

Defining egalitarianism and individualism. Although the principles of egalitarianism and individualism have been repeatedly mentioned in the employment equity literature (see for example, Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989; Kluegel & Smith, 1983; Lipset & Schneider, 1978), a definition of these two concepts has not been made. In a review of these concepts, it has been argued that they are difficult to define since they can be conceived of in a number of ways (Beteille, 1986). The purpose of this section is to define these values as they pertain to the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory.

Egalitarianism has been described as reflecting the values of equality, liberalism and social justice (Beteille, 1986; Lipset & Schneider, 1978). Those who believe in egalitarianism support the idea that all people deserve the same opportunities for success. Thus they believe that minority group members should have the same opportunities as the majority and are offended by practices that restrict this equality of opportunity.

Individualism has been described as reflecting the values of individual achievement

and competition, upward mobility (Lipset & Schnieder, 1978), meritocracy (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991), self-reliance and the Protestant work ethic (Katz & Hass, 1988).

Individualists believe that people should be judged on the basis of their abilities and devotion to work and rewards should be given on the basis of superior effort and talent.

These two values are not opposites on the same continuum and it is possible to believe in both. A person who values both egalitarianism and individualism believes that every person should have the same opportunities but what they do with these opportunities depends on the individual. For example, two students should be given the same opportunities to attend university and their work should be judged in an equal manner. However if one student works harder and performs better than the other that student should get higher marks.

It is when these two values come into conflict that a decision between the two must be made. Thus when an employment equity policy is designed to promote equality by violating the values of individualism, a person must decide between the relative importance of these two values in determining his or her support for the policy.

Evidence in support of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory. A survey of public opinion polls indicates that people have mixed feelings about employment equity policies as shown at the beginning of this paper. An analysis of public responses to these policies led to the suggestion that these mixed responses may be caused by a conflict between the principles of egalitarianism and individualism (Lipset & Schneider, 1978). People were more likely to show support for policies that were compensatory in nature and more likely to reject policies that could be considered to be preferential treatment.

Other authors have also noted that support of employment equity policies is related to the type of policy being implemented. Studies of women's support for employment equity policies (Matheson, Echenberg, & Taylor, 1992; Tougas & Veilleux 1988, 1989) have shown that policies that focus on the elimination of discriminatory practices elicit more

positive reactions than those that focus on preferential treatment. Similar results have been found when men's responses to employment equity policies are examined (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989).

The link between the value of egalitarianism by itself and support for employment equity policies is not strong. Most people believe in egalitarianism yet they do not necessarily support employment equity policies (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991; Lipset & Schneider, 1978). The idea that this support may be related to a combined effect of the values of egalitarianism and individualism is supported by findings that suggest that the judgement of fairness is related to these two value dimensions (Rasinski, 1987). Those individuals who primarily endorsed the value of individualism, or proportionality, judged equity-based policies to be more fair than equality-based policies. Similarly, those individuals who primarily endorsed the value of egalitarianism judged equality-based policies to be more fair than equity-based policies. This suggests a link between these two values and the type of policy that people will support.

The link between egalitarianism and individualism and support for employment equity policies has been demonstrated in relation to the policy of setting quotas for minority group members (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991). First the investigators determined that by appealing to the competing value a substantial number of individuals will reverse their support for quotas. Almost half of those people who opposed quotas initially, changed their minds when their opinion was sought in a manner that appealed to the value of egalitarianism. That is, these people responded that they would feel differently when asked, "Among those who oppose quotas, would you feel the same even if it means that women remain economically unequal?" Similarly, just over half of those individuals who initially supported quotas reversed their support when the question was rephrased in a way that appealed to the value of individualism. That is, these people responded that they would feel differently when asked, "Among those who support quotas, would you feel the

same even if it means not hiring the best person for the job?" The investigators then measured the importance that subjects attached to the values of egalitarianism and individualism and found that variations existed for the relative importance subjects placed on these two values. They found that the strongest proponents of quotas ranked highest on the values of egalitarianism and the strongest opponents of quotas ranked lowest. The reverse was found when the importance of the values of individualism were examined. They also found that the more a person values egalitarianism and the less that person values individualism, the greater their support for quotas.

The research by Fletcher and Chalmers (1991) goes far to demonstrate the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory. What these authors have not established is the relationship between the degree to which a policy violates individualism and the conflict between the two values. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between people's beliefs in the values of egalitarianism and individualism and their support for employment equity policies by assessing the effects of peoples beliefs in individualism and egalitarianism on policies that vary in the degree to which they violate the principles of individualism.

Hypotheses

A number of hypotheses were examined in this study. First, it was expected that the degree to which an individual believes that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that something should be done to eliminate these inequities is related to their support for employment equity policies. It was also expected that there is a difference in support for these policies between those who believe that inequities and discrimination exist and that intervention is needed, and those who do not.

Secondly, it was expected that among those who believe that inequities and discrimination in the workforce exist, and that intervention is needed, there is considerable variation in their support for employment equity policies. The degree to which these

individuals believe in the values of egalitarianism and individualism should be related to their support for these policies. More importantly, there should be differences in support for these policies among individuals who differ in the relative degree to which they value egalitarianism and individualism. Additionally, the degree to which a particular employment equity policy violates the principles of individualism should be related to support for employment equity policies.

Method

The Vice-President Academic at Carleton University gave permission for this study to be conducted using all full-time employees at Carleton. Participation in this study was voluntary and confidentiality was assured. The study was conducted in accordance with the Psychology Department's Ethics Committee's requirements.

Subjects

Two pilot studies were conducted to aid in the development of the questions designed to measure the extent to which people believe in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism. Subjects for the first pilot study consisted of 15 students in a third-year psychology course. Subjects in the second pilot study consisted of 74 students in a second-year psychology course.

The developed questionnaire was then given to all full-time employees at Carleton University except for the four committee members who participated in the prospectus examination of this thesis. In total, 1916 questionnaires were distributed. Approximately six weeks after this distribution, the number of responses still being returned were at a minimum (two in the previous week) and therefore a cut-off day was determined and responses that were received later than this date were not included in the analyses.

A total of 930 questionnaires were returned by the cut-off date. Four additional questionnaires were returned following the cut-off date and were excluded from the analyses. Of the returned questionnaires, thirteen were returned blank with an explanation

of why the respondent was not available at that time to complete the questionnaire. An additional three questionnaires were returned blank without explanation. Therefore, 914 completed questionnaires were used in this study, indicating a response rate of 47.7%. According to the personnel department at Carleton University, 125 employees were on sabbatical leave or long-term leave at the time of the distribution of the questionnaires. Thus approximately 51% of employees who were available at the time of the study completed and returned a questionnaire.

Materials

The questionnaire used in this study consists of four sections (see Appendix A). The purpose of the first section was to determine the department in which the subject is employed and the subject's membership in any of the four designated groups, that is, whether the subject is female, aboriginal, a member of a visible minority group or disabled.

The second section was designed to determine the extent to which the subject believes in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism. This section consists of eight statements (four egalitarian and four individualistic) in which the subject was asked to indicate the degree to which he or she agrees or disagrees with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The statements were presented in a random order. The process used to select these statements will be discussed in the next section on the development of the questionnaire.

The third section was designed to determine the extent to which a subject would support employment equity policies in general, and the extent to which they would support four specific employment equity policies. Subjects were asked to indicate the degree to which they would support each policy on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (would not support) to 5 (strongly support). The four policies were chosen to form a Guttman scale on the basis of the extent to which each policy violates the principles of individualism. The method used to select these four policies will be discussed in the next section on the

development of the questionnaire.

The fourth section was designed to determine the extent to which a subject believes that employment inequities exist, the extent to which they believe that designated groups are sometimes discriminated against, the extent to which they believe that action should be taken to eliminate employment inequities and the extent to which they agree to a list of four reasons why employment equity policies should or should not exist. Subjects were asked to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with a series of seven statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The four reasons why employment equity policies should or should not exist were chosen from either an egalitarianism or an individualism framework. Two of these statements were framed in support of employment equity policies, one from an egalitarian point of view and one from an individualistic point of view. The other two statements did not support employment equity policies, one for egalitarian reasons and one for individualistic reasons.

Questionnaire development. The questions used to determine the degree to which subjects believe in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism were derived from an initial list of 11 egalitarian and 11 individualistic questions (see Appendix B) that were chosen based on a review of the literature. These questions, in random order, were given to 15 third-year psychology students in order to conduct a preliminary investigation of their effectiveness. Ethics approval was obtained for this pilot study and each student was asked to read and sign an informed consent form (see Appendix C). A written debriefing was given to each student upon completion of the questionnaire (see Appendix D). Two of the questionnaires were not examined, the first because the student did not respond to every question and the second because the student altered one of the statements before responding. Thus the study resulted in 13 completed questionnaires.

Based on an analysis of the responses given to this questionnaire, one of the individualism questions and one of the egalitarianism questions were rejected. The range

and variance of the responses for these two questions were extremely low. An alteration was also made to one of the egalitarian questions in order to create a negative instance of this principle. Four of the individualism questions were already framed in a negative way. Two new questions were also added to replace the rejected questions. These new questions directly ask whether the subject believes in egalitarianism and individualism. These questions were later used to validate the remaining questions in the next phase of the questionnaire development.

The altered questionnaire (see Appendix E) was then given to a second-year psychology class. A total of 74 students returned the questionnaire. Ethics approval was obtained for this pilot study and each student was asked to read and sign an informed consent form (see appendix C) before completing the questionnaire. Upon completion, the investigator gave an oral debriefing to the students. Four of the returned questionnaires were incomplete resulting in a total of 70 completed questionnaires.

An item analysis was conducted on the completed questionnaires to determine the items that best measure a person's belief in egalitarianism and individualism. Items were chosen on the basis of four criteria: (a) the items should have a high range of responses and a high standard deviation, (b) the egalitarianism items should be highly correlated with the total egalitarianism score and the individualism items should be highly correlated with the total individualism score, (c) the egalitarianism items should not be correlated with the total individualism scores and the individualism items should not be correlated with the total egalitarianism scores and (d) the egalitarian items and the individualism items should be correlated with their respective validity questions. In addition, if two items are highly correlated with each other, only one of these two items should be chosen.

The items initially chosen for the final questionnaire and their statistical characteristics are given in Table 2. Responses to the two validity questions were highly positive with little variance (among the three lowest variances for all the items) and thus the

Table 2

The Statistical Characteristics of the Final Egalitarianism and Individualism Test Items

	Standard Deviation	Range	Correlation with total score	Correlation with opposite score	Correlation with validity question
Egalitarianism Questions					
People should be allowed to wear turbans to work if their religion expects it	1.873	6	0.737	-0.177	0.200
Those who are well off should help those who are less fortunate	1.452	6	0.663	-0.127	0.337
Homosexual couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexual couples	1.950	6	0.655	-0.111	0.086
Immigrants should not have the same opportunities as Canadian born citizens	1.622	6	0.706	-0.200	0.233
Individualism Questions					
Most people get what they deserve in life	1.463	5	0.597	-0.159	0.294
Because of their situations, some people couldn't get ahead even if they wanted to (negative)	1.779	6	0.666	-0.118	0.096
Most people who are unemployed are not trying hard enough to find work	1.596	6	0.729	-0.230	0.336
What happens to me is my own doing	1.351	6	0.708	-0.102	0.578

correlation between each question and its validity question was not given much weight in the item analysis. Responses to these two questions strongly suggest the possibility of a social desirability effect resulting in concern over their own validity.

As a result of discussion during the prospectus examination for this thesis, it was agreed that three of the individualism questions would be slightly modified in order to reflect a more philosophical approach to individualism. These modified questions are shown in the final questionnaire in Appendix A. The changes reflect a difference between a reality-based statement and a statement that reflects how the world should be. For example, the statement 'What happens to me is my own doing' was changed to 'What happens to me should be my own doing'. Thus the statement was no longer dependent on how the world actually is but on how the respondent felt that the world should be.

A Guttman scale is a scale in which the items move sequentially from weaker to stronger expressions of an idea. In a true Guttman scale, agreement with a stronger statement indicates agreement with all of the milder statements. The policies contained in the third section of the final questionnaire were designed to form a Guttman scale in which these policies could be ordered in terms of the degree to which they violate the principles of individualism.

In order to form a Guttman scale, a list of five policies that were pre-ordered by the investigator in terms of the degree to which they violate individualism, were written on five separate 3" by 5" cards (see Appendix F for a list of these policies and the order in which the investigator rated them). At the bottom of each card was a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (does not violate individualism) to 9 (strongly violates individualism). These cards were given, in random order, to five separate independent raters. The principles of individualism were explained to each rater and questions were answered until both the investigator and the rater felt confident that the term was understood. The raters were also asked to explain each of the policies to ensure that they were understood in the same way

by all. The raters were told to place the cards in the order of the degree to which they felt each policy violates the principles of individualism. They were to arrange the cards from the policy that least violates individualism to the policy that most violates individualism. They were also asked to indicate, using the 9-point scale, the degree to which they felt each policy violates individualism.

There was considerable disagreement surrounding the first employment equity policy (see Appendix F) and thus this policy was rejected from the Guttman scale. The order in which the remaining policies violate individualism was agreed upon by the five raters and corresponded to the pre-ordering of the policies conducted by the investigator. The ratings for these policies are shown in Table 3.

The actual wording of the four policies was altered slightly on the final questionnaire (see Appendix A). This was done to clarify some of the problems raters had with understanding the policy as it was initially written. Two of the raters were shown the altered wording of the policies and asked if the changes would affect the way they initially rated the policies. Both raters agreed that their ratings would not change with the new wording.

An analysis of these ratings indicated with a reasonable degree of certainty that the four policies selected form a Guttman scale. The five raters and the investigator agreed on the order in which these policies should be classified. The mean ratings for each of the policies are fairly spread out along the continuum of the degree to which they violate individualism. On closer examination of Table 3, it can be seen that the mean rating for each policy is higher than any of the individual ratings from the policies that are rated lower than that policy on the degree to which it violates individualism. The mean rating for each policy is also lower than each of the individual ratings of policies that are rated higher than that policy. For example, the mean rating for policy 2 is higher than any of the individual ratings for policy 1 and lower than any of the individual ratings for policy 3 and policy 4.

Table 3

The Independent Ratings of the Employment Equity Policies

Policy order ^a	Subjects' ratings on a 9-point scale ^b					Mean rating	Standard deviation
	1	2	3	4	5		
1	1	3	2	1	1	1.6	0.894
2	2	5	4	2	5	3.6	1.517
3	4	7	5	5	7	5.6	1.342
4	8	8	9	7	9	8.2	0.837

^aThe policies are ordered according to the degree to which they violate individualism. This order is given in Appendix F excluding the first policy which was rejected. ^bOn this 9-point scale, a score of 1 indicates that the policy does not violate individualism and a score of 9 indicates that the policy strongly violates individualism.

Procedure

Full-time employees at Carleton University received a package containing a questionnaire (see Appendix A), a cover letter (see Appendix G), and an addressed envelope in which they were to return the questionnaire. Packages were sent through the university's inter-office mail system and were returned through this same system. The cover letter conformed to the Psychology Department's Ethics Committee requirements for an informed consent form. Thus it included a description of the purpose of the study, an outline of the instructions for filling out and returning the questionnaire and a list of who to contact if the subject had any questions or ethical concerns. The cover letter also specified that participation was voluntary and that the data collected would be kept

confidential.

A time limit for receiving the completed questionnaires was not specified in the cover letter. Instead, questionnaires were accepted until such time as the number of responses were reduced to one or two a week (from an initial response rate of over 500 within the first three days). Approximately six weeks after the distribution of the questionnaires, a cut-off date was set after which returned questionnaires were no longer included in the analysis.

The debriefing of respondents has not yet occurred but will take place by the Summer of 1993 as specified in the cover letter. Because of the large number of respondents who completed the questionnaire and who provided comments on the questionnaire, it was decided by the investigator to wait until the results of the study were completed before providing a debriefing. The respondents can then be informed not only of the purpose of the study but of the results as well.

Results

Quantitative Analyses

The sample for this study consisted of 914 full-time employees at Carleton University. A series of t-tests were conducted to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the first and the last employees to return their questionnaire. No differences were found between thirty respondents from the first day of returns and the last thirty respondents in terms of their mean support scores for the four specified policies ($t(56) = 0.55, p > 0.01$), their mean egalitarianism scores ($t(53) = 1.02, p > 0.01$), their mean individualism scores ($t(54) = 1.30, p > 0.01$) and their mean qualification scores ($t(58) = 0.07, p > 0.01$). Briefly, a person's mean qualification score is their mean score on the three prerequisite variables, that is, whether they believe that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities. Thus there were considered to be no differences between the

respondents who immediately returned their questionnaire and the respondents who did not and therefore, all respondents were included in the analyses.

Table 4 describes the number and percentage of respondents in each of the employment categories specified in the questionnaire and the number and percentage who specified membership in the four designated groups. In order to ensure confidentiality, if the number of respondents in a reported category was less than ten, the exact number or percentage was not reported. Because of the small number of respondents belonging to the aboriginal ($n = 10$ or 1.1%), visible minority ($n = 69$ or 7.8%) and disabled ($n = 18$ or 2.1%) groups, these groups are reported under one heading, again to ensure confidentiality.

The large faculties of Arts and Social Sciences were more strongly represented among the academic faculty members and the large administration and academic departments were more strongly represented among the support services. Although there were less than ten respondents from the department of campus safety, this department was well represented given its small size. Among respondents to this survey, females and members of the other three designated groups were more likely to be employed in the support services than in the academic faculties. The library consisted of the highest percentage of designated group members with a total of 90.8% of the library employees who responded to this survey being members of one of the four designated groups.

Egalitarianism and individualism scales. This study involved the development of a scale to measure the degree to which a person values the principles of egalitarianism and individualism. The means and the standard deviations of the responses on the four egalitarianism items and the four individualism items are shown in Table 5. A larger score indicates higher agreement with the item. In general, people seem to respond more favorably to the egalitarianism items than the individualism items. The level of agreement with the third individualism item is unusually low. This score indicates that subjects tended

Table 4

The Number and Percentage of Total Respondents, of Females and of Members of the Other Three Designated Groups in each of the Employment Categories

Employment Category	Total		Female		Other Three Designated Groups	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Academic Faculty						
Arts	102	11.5	33	32.4	10	10.0
Social Sciences	131	14.8	43	32.8	13	10.3
Sciences, Computer Sciences	82	9.3	15	18.3	<10	
Engineering, Architecture, Industrial Design	48	5.4	<10		<10	
Support Services						
Administration departments	246	27.8	161	65.4	18	7.4
Academic departments	154	17.4	96	62.3	19	12.3
Library	65	7.3	53	81.5	15	23.4
Campus Safety ^a	<10		<10		<10	
Physical Plant	35	4.0	<10		<10	
Other ^b	13	1.5	11	84.6	<10	
Total ^c			425	48.0	97	

^asufficiently represented given the actual size of the department. ^brepresents employees in the union offices, the campus stores, Carleton University press, the student association, the campus daycare, and other unspecified locations. ^cThe total number of respondents cannot be presented in order to avoid revealing the number of respondents in the department of campus safety.

Table 5

The Means and Standard Deviations of Responses Given on the Four Egalitarianism Items and the Four Individualism Items

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Egalitarianism		
Egal1 (people should be allowed to wear turbans)	5.60	1.68
Egal2 (well off should help less fortunate)	5.77	1.20
Egal3 (homosexual couples entitled to same benefits)	4.54	2.15
Egal4 (immigrants should not have same opportunities) ^a	5.76	1.72
Mean Egalitarianism (mean score on the four items)	5.41	1.13
Individualism		
Ind1 (what happens should be my own doing)	5.47	1.42
Ind2 (people should get what they deserve)	4.65	1.66
Ind3 (some people couldn't get ahead if they wanted) ^a	2.84	1.67
Ind4 (unemployed should try harder to find work)	4.46	1.64
Mean Individualism (mean score on the four items)	4.38	0.92

^anegatively scaled items. These items were scored such that strongly disagree was scored as strongly agree, disagree was scored as agree and mildly disagree was scored as mildly agree.

to disagree with this item whereas they tended to agree with the other individualism items. The level of agreement with the third egalitarianism item is also much lower than the level of agreement with the remaining egalitarianism items.

Table 6 reports the cross-correlation matrix between the four items designed to measure egalitarianism and the mean scores across both the four egalitarianism items and the four individualism items. The inter-correlations among the egalitarianism items ranged from 0.16 to 0.38. These items were moderately correlated with the mean egalitarianism scores (from 0.59 to 0.75) and negatively correlated with the mean individualism scores (from -0.08 to -0.26).

When each of the egalitarianism items was directly correlated with each of the individualism items, the correlation coefficients ranged from -0.24 to 0.09. The correlation between the mean egalitarianism scores and the mean individualism scores was -0.29.

The reliability of the four egalitarianism items was measured using Cronbach's coefficient alpha and resulted in a reliability coefficient of 0.57. Alpha did not improve significantly with the removal of any one of the four items. Thus all four items were retained to form the scale that would measure the extent to which a person values the principles of egalitarianism.

Table 7 shows the cross-correlation matrix between the four items designed to measure individualism and the mean scores on both the egalitarianism items and the individualism items. The inter-correlations between the individualism items ranged from -0.09 to 0.29 and the correlations between these items and the mean egalitarianism scores ranged from -0.38 to 0.02. These items were not as strongly correlated with their mean values as the egalitarianism items, with correlations ranging from 0.51 to 0.63.

The internal consistency measure, again using Cronbach's coefficient alpha is lower for the individualism scale than the egalitarianism scale, with an alpha of 0.33. The removal of one of the items, the third individualism item shown in Table 5, would result in

Table 6

The Cross Correlations Between Egalitarianism Items and Both the Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores

	Egal1	Egal2	Egal3	Egal4	Mean Egal	Mean Ind
Egal1	1.00 (899)					
Egal2	0.33 (899)	1.00 (902)				
Egal3	0.38 (882)	0.27 (885)	1.00 (893)			
Egal4	0.21 (888)	0.20 (892)	0.16 (883)	1.00 (900)		
Mean Egal	0.72 (865)	0.60 (865)	0.75 (865)	0.59 (865)	1.00 (865)	
Mean Ind	-0.21 (779)	-0.20 (782)	-0.26 (778)	-0.08 (779)	-0.29 (763)	1.00 (785)

Note. The number of respondents included in each correlation is given in brackets.

an increase in alpha to 0.40, however, it was felt that this increase was not substantial enough to warrant the decrease in the number of items from four to three. The removal of the third individualism item would have resulted in an increase in the maximum possible validity (the squareroot of the reliability coefficient) from 0.57 to 0.63. This increase did not provide sufficient justification for the removal of the third item.

Thus for the purposes of further analyses, the mean of the original four egalitarianism items and the mean of the original four individualism items were used to reflect the degree to which a person values the principles of egalitarianism and individualism. These mean scores were calculated on the basis of responses to all four egalitarianism items and all four individualism items. Respondents who answered less than

Table 7

The Cross Correlations Between Individualism Items and Both the Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores

	Ind1	Ind2	Ind3	Ind4	Mean Egal	Mean Ind
Ind1	1.00 (845)					
Ind2	0.29 (803)	1.00 (833)				
Ind3	0.04 (832)	-0.09 (823)	1.00 (887)			
Ind4	0.09 (824)	0.17 (821)	0.21 (871)	1.00 (882)		
Mean Egal	-0.02 (809)	0.02 (802)	-0.30 (848)	-0.38 (845)	1.00 (865)	
Mean Ind	0.58 (785)	0.59 (785)	0.51 (785)	0.63 (785)	-0.29 (763)	1.00 (785)

Note. The number of respondents included in each correlation is given in brackets.

four of the egalitarianism items or less than four of the individualism items were excluded from further analyses that would have involved the use of their mean score on these two scales.

The distribution of the mean egalitarianism scores approximated a normal distribution with a mean of 5.41 and a standard deviation of 1.13. Statistically significant differences were not found between the mean egalitarianism scores of males ($M = 5.35$) and of females ($M = 5.50$), $t(851) = 1.89$, $p > 0.01$. Nor were statistically significant differences found between the mean egalitarianism scores of members of the other three designated groups ($M = 5.33$) combined and those who were not members of these groups

($M = 5.42$), $t(840) = 0.75$, $p > 0.01$.

The distribution of the mean individualism scores also approximated a normal distribution with a mean of 4.38 and a standard deviation of 0.92. Again statistically significant differences were not found between the mean individualism scores of males ($M = 4.42$) and of females ($M = 4.33$), $t(773) = 1.24$, $p > 0.01$, and between members ($M = 4.45$) and non-members ($M = 4.37$) of the other three designated groups combined, $t(766) = 0.83$, $p > 0.01$.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance indicate that there are statistically significant differences in mean egalitarianism scores, $F(9, 835) = 12.36$, $p < 0.01$ and in mean individualism scores, $F(9, 756) = 3.82$, $p < 0.01$ for the different employment locations specified in this study. Table 8 shows the mean scores on these two values for the various employment locations in ascending order. There are greater differences in mean egalitarianism scores than mean individualism scores across the different locations. Mean egalitarianism scores varied from a low of 4.42 to a high of 6.08 and mean individualism scores varied from a low of 4.06 to a high of 5.05. A close examination of Table 8 reveals a possible trend that the larger the mean egalitarianism score for a particular location, the smaller the mean individualism score for that same location. The various locations come close to increasing in the opposite order in terms of their mean egalitarianism and mean individualism scores. The assorted locations grouped into the Other category, which have the highest means for both egalitarianism and individualism, are a notable exception to this trend.

Measuring support for employment equity. The dependent variable in the majority of the analyses in this study is a measure of support for employment equity policies. Two possible measures of support were obtained from the questionnaire. The first measure consisted of a score ranging from 1 (would not support) to 5 (strongly support) on the question that asked the respondent to indicate the extent to which they support employment

Table 8

The Mean Egalitarianism Scores and the Mean Individualism Scores by Employment Location, Presented in Ascending Order

Egalitarianism		Individualism	
Location	Mean Egal	Location	Mean Ind
Physical plant	4.42	Social sciences	4.06
Campus safety	4.95	Arts	4.09
Academic departments	5.16	Library	4.42
Administration departments	5.24	Academic departments	4.43
Engineering, Arch., I.D.	5.31	Science, Comp. science	4.44
Science, Comp. science	5.32	Engineering, Arch., I.D.	4.46
Library	5.54	Administration departments	4.49
Social sciences	5.96	Campus safety	4.50
Arts	5.96	Physical plant	4.57
Other	6.08	Other	5.05

equity policies, in general. The second measure consisted of the mean score for responses to the four specific employment equity policies. The means and standard deviations of support for the four specific employment equity policies and for support for employment equity policies in general, are shown in Table 9. It is apparent by inspection of this table, that as employment equity policies increasingly violate individualism from policy1 to policy4, the mean support for employment equity policies decreases. This effect will be

Table 9

The Means and Standard Deviations of Responses Given on the Five Support for Employment Equity Policies Questions

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Policy1 (process of selecting employees should be modified)	4.52	0.80
Policy2 (encourage members of underrepresented groups to apply)	4.05	1.12
Policy3 (if two equally qualified, then underrepresented gets job)	3.10	1.45
Policy4 (only hire members of underrepresented groups)	1.93	1.15
General (in general, do you support employment equity policies)	4.04	1.00
Mean Support Score (Policy1 to Policy4)	3.39	0.75

discussed further in a latter section on the analyses of the Guttman scale.

The general question resulted in a highly negatively skewed distribution that was statistically significantly different from zero ($z = 13.11$, $p < 0.01$). An examination of this variable's normal probability and detrended normal probability plots indicated a significant departure from normality. The mean score for this variable was 4.04 with a standard deviation of 1.00 indicating that the majority of respondents reported fairly high support for employment equity policies, in general. The distribution of mean scores on the four specific employment equity policies was reasonably normally distributed with a mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 0.75. Partly because of the general question's violation of normality, an assumption that is required for most of the analyses conducted in this study, the mean score on the four specific employment equity policies was chosen as the

dependent variable. It should be noted that these two variables were alternative measures of the same construct but did not measure this construct in the same way. The correlation between these two variables was 0.47. It was felt that the mean support score may have more accurately reflected a person's support for employment equity policies since the score was derived from responses to particular employment equity policies that varied in their intrusiveness and in the degree to which they violated the principles of individualism. It was also felt that the mean scores across four policies were less likely to be influenced by social desirability factors than the scores on the one general question.

Table 10 shows the intercorrelations between the four individual support for employment equity policy items and the mean support score. The correlations among support for the different policies ranged from 0.01 to 0.40 and the correlations between support for these policies and the mean support scores ranged from 0.35 to 0.79. The reliability of the support scale as measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha was equal to 0.55.

There were no statistically significant differences between females ($M = 3.43$) and males ($M = 3.36$), $t(838) = 1.30$, $p > 0.01$, and between members ($M = 3.46$) and non-members ($M = 3.38$) of the other three designated groups, $t(830) = 0.96$, $p < 0.01$, in terms of their mean support for employment equity policies. Results from a one-way analysis of variance indicates that there were statistically significant differences between the various employment locations on their mean support for employment equity policies, $F(9, 822) = 6.98$, $p < 0.01$. These means ranged from a high of 3.78 in the department of campus safety, to a low of 2.95 from employees in the physical plant department and are given in the left column of Table 11. The right column of Table 11 will be discussed in the next section.

Prerequisites to support for employment equity. The three prerequisites to support for employment equity were measured by three questions which asked the respondent to

Table 10

The Cross Correlations Among Support for the Four Specific Employment Equity Policies and the Mean Support Scores on These Four Policies

	Policy1	Policy2	Policy3	Policy4	Mean Score
Policy1 (process of selecting employees should be modified)	1.00 (883)				
Policy2 (encourage members of underrepresented groups to apply)	0.19 (874)	1.00 (902)			
Policy3 (if two equally qualified then underrepresented gets job)	0.01 (871)	0.40 (890)	1.00 (898)		
Policy4 (only hire members of underrepresented groups)	0.01 (868)	0.28 (884)	0.40 (880)	1.00 (892)	
Mean Score (on all four policies)	0.35 (853)	0.73	0.79 (853)	0.68	1.00 (853)

Note. The number of respondents included in each correlation is given in brackets.

indicate the degree to which they agree that inequities in the workforce exist, discrimination in the workforce exists and that something should be done to increase the representation of underrepresented groups. The means and standard deviations of these variables are given in Table 12. In general, most people believe that employment inequities exist and that discrimination in the workforce exists. They are less likely to agree that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities.

Each of these three variables, taken individually, were highly negatively skewed.

Table 11

The Mean Support for Employment Equity Scores and the Mean Qualification Scores by Employment Location. Presented in Ascending Order

Support for Employment Equity		Qualifications	
Location	Mean Support	Location	Mean Qualification
Physical plant	2.95	Physical plant	5.14
Academic departments	3.23	Academic departments	5.59
Administration departments	3.29	Engineering, Arch., I.D.	5.61
Engineering, Arch., I.D.	3.33	Science, Comp. science	5.71
Library	3.35	Administration departments	5.79
Science, Comp. science	3.38	Library	5.83
Other	3.52	Other	6.21
Arts	3.68	Campus safety	6.23
Social sciences	3.69	Arts	6.26
Campus safety	3.78	Social sciences	6.27

Note. Mean support scores range from 1 to 5 whereas mean qualification scores range from 1 to 7.

thus in order to examine the effect of these qualifications on support for employment equity policies, the mean score on these three variables was calculated and used as an independent variable. The correlations between the three qualification variables ranged from 0.51 to 0.59 and the correlations between each of these variables and the mean scores on these variables ranged from 0.81 to 0.87. A person's mean qualification score was determined

Table 12

The Means and Standard Deviations of the belief that Employment Inequities Exist,
Workforce Discrimination Exists and Intervention is Needed

Item	Mean	Standard
Qualification1 (Employment inequity exists)	6.08	1.12
Qualification2 (Workforce discrimination exists)	6.07	1.08
Qualification3 (Intervention is needed)	5.40	1.54
Mean Qualification score (mean of the above qualifications)	5.85	1.03

on the basis of that person's response to all three of the qualification questions. Thus respondents who failed to answer all three of these questions were excluded from any analyses that involved their mean qualification score.

Once again there were no statistically significant differences between males ($M = 5.82$) and females ($M = 5.95$), $t(870) = 2.28$, $p > 0.01$, and between members ($M = 5.91$) and non-members ($M = 5.83$) of the other three designated groups $t(861) = 0.67$, $p > 0.01$ in terms of their mean qualification scores. The results of a one-way analysis of variance indicate that there were statistically significant differences in mean qualification scores between the various employment locations, $F(9, 854) = 8.37$, $p < 0.01$. The mean qualification scores ranged from a low of 5.14 for employees working in the physical plant, through to a high of 6.28 for faculty members in the social sciences, and are shown in the right column of Table 11.

Assumptions of multivariate analyses. Prior to any multivariate analysis, the involved variables being used were examined for violations of the assumptions of these

types of analyses. The dependant variable in these statistical manipulations was the mean support score for the four employment equity policies. Independent variables that were used included the mean egalitarianism scores, the mean individualism scores and the mean scores on the qualification variables. Because the variables used in the multivariate analyses were derived by taking the mean of a number of variables and because any one missing value in the initial variables resulted in a missing value on the mean score, there is a large number of missing values for these mean scores.

A series of t-tests were conducted to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in mean support for employment equity policies between respondents with or without missing values on any of the independent variables. No statistically significant differences were found between respondents with or without missing values on their mean egalitarianism scores ($t(851) = 2.24, p > 0.01$), their mean individualism scores ($t(851) = 1.75, p > 0.01$), and their mean qualification scores ($t(851) = 2.33, p > 0.01$). Because of these insignificant differences and because of this study's large sample, respondents' scores with missing values were therefore omitted from any analyses that involved these scores.

Three of the mean qualification scores were altered because of their extremely low univariate z scores. These values were raised by the addition of a constant of 0.50 which reduced the exaggerated effect these scores might have had on multivariate statistical manipulations while at the same time maintaining their relatively extreme position in the distribution. One of the mean egalitarian z scores was also extremely low and was raised by a factor of 1.00. Again its relatively extreme position in the distribution was unchanged. One multivariate outlier was identified through Mahalanobis distance with $p < 0.001$ and was deleted from the analyses. This outlying case was characterized by a fairly high mean egalitarianism score, a fairly low mean individualism score, a very low mean qualification score and low mean support for employment equity policies. Univariate and

bivariate scatterplots and residual analyses indicate confirmation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity, and an examination of bivariate correlations indicates confirmation of the assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity.

The effects of prerequisites on support for employment equity policies. The proportion of variance accounted for by the regression of mean qualification on mean support for employment equity was statistically significantly greater than zero ($F(1, 834) = 577.80, p < 0.01$). Mean qualification accounted for 41% of the variance in mean support for employment equity.

A dichotomous variable was created by scoring respondents according to whether or not they met all three prerequisites. Employees who responded with a score of three or less on any one of the three individual qualification questions were not considered to have met the prerequisites for support for employment equity policies. All other employees were considered to have met the prerequisites. As Table 13 shows, multiple t-tests indicate that there were statistically significant differences in mean egalitarianism scores, mean individualism scores and mean support for employment equity policies between those who met the prerequisites and those who did not. Those who did not meet the prerequisites scored statistically significantly lower in their mean egalitarianism scores and their mean support for employment equity policies and statistically significantly higher in their mean individualism scores than those who met the prerequisites. Because of these differences, the elimination from further analyses of respondents who failed to meet the prerequisites was not done as originally planned. The elimination of these respondents would likely result in the elimination of a segment of the population with unique and important egalitarianism and individualism characteristics.

In order to more closely examine the effects of these prerequisite variables on support for employment equity, mean qualification scores were regressed on mean support for employment equity policy scores with the effects of both the mean egalitarianism and

Table 13

The Differences in Mean Egalitarianism Scores, Mean Individualism Scores and Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies Between Those Respondents who Met the Three Prerequisites and Those who Did Not Meet the Three Prerequisites

	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	Probability
Mean Egalitarianism				
Met prerequisites	5.58	1.05	11.04	0.000
Did not meet prerequisites	4.41	1.10		
Mean Individualism				
Met prerequisites	4.30	0.89	5.20	0.000
Did not meet prerequisites	4.79	0.97		
Mean Support				
Met prerequisites	3.52	0.68	13.01	0.000
Did not meet prerequisites	2.59	0.61		

the mean individualism scores removed. The multiple correlation, using hierarchical regression techniques, between mean qualification scores and support for employment equity policies with the joint effects of mean egalitarianism and mean individualism removed, was statistically significantly greater than zero, $F(1, 719) = 212.08$, $p < 0.01$. Mean qualification scores accounted for an additional 16% of the variance in support for employment equity policies after the effects of mean egalitarianism scores and mean individualism scores had been removed.

The unique variance in mean support for employment equity policies accounted for

by the effects of mean egalitarianism scores ($F(1, 719) = 38.45, p < 0.01$), mean individualism scores ($F(1, 719) = 10.07, p < 0.01$) and mean qualification scores ($F(1, 719) = 212.08, p < 0.01$) were each statistically significantly greater than zero. As mentioned previously, the unique effect of mean qualification scores accounted for 16% of the variance in mean support for employment equity. Interestingly, the unique contribution of mean egalitarianism scores was only 3% of the variance in mean support for employment equity policies while the unique contribution of mean individualism scores was 0.8% of the variance in mean support for employment equity policies. These variances, while statistically significant, are quite small. The unique variance in support accounted for by the mean individualism scores is virtually meaningless. What is interesting about these results is that they indicate the presence of intercorrelations between these three predictor variables.

To examine the relationship between people's beliefs in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism and the extent to which people believe in the three prerequisite variables, mean egalitarianism scores and mean individualism scores were regressed on the mean qualification scores. The multiple correlation between the joint effects of mean egalitarianism and mean individualism scores and mean qualification scores was also statistically significantly greater than zero $F(2, 746) = 196.52, p < 0.01$. Mean egalitarianism and mean individualism scores jointly accounted for 35% of the variance in mean qualification scores.

Again, the proportion of variance in mean qualification scores accounted for by the unique effects of mean egalitarianism scores ($F(1, 746) = 279.90, p < 0.01$) and the unique effects of mean individualism scores ($F(1, 746) = 29.67, p < 0.01$) were both statistically significantly greater than zero. Mean egalitarianism scores uniquely accounted for 25% of the variance in mean qualification scores while mean individualism scores uniquely accounted for 3% of this variance.

The effect of egalitarianism and individualism on support. To assess the effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies, mean egalitarianism scores and mean individualism scores were regressed on the mean support for employment equity policies. The proportion of variance in mean support for employment equity policies accounted for by the joint effects of mean egalitarianism scores and mean individualism scores was statistically significantly greater than zero, $F(2, 730) = 154.48$, $p < 0.01$. These two mean scores accounted for 30% of the variance in mean support for employment equity. The unique variance in mean support scores accounted for by the effects of mean egalitarianism scores with the effects of mean individualism scores removed was statistically significantly greater than zero, $F(1, 730) = 207.61$, $p < 0.01$. Similarly, the unique variance in mean support scores accounted for by the effects of mean individualism scores with the effects of mean egalitarianism scores removed was statistically significantly greater than zero, $F(1, 730) = 30.36$, $p < 0.01$. Mean egalitarianism scores accounted for 22% of the unique variance while mean individualism scores accounted for 4% of the unique variance. This analysis indicates that as mean egalitarianism scores increase, support for employment equity policies increase, however, as mean individualism scores increase, support for employment equity policies decrease.

Both mean egalitarianism and mean individualism scores were divided into three groups in order to conduct a three by three analysis of variance. The groups were divided at approximately the 33.3 and the 66.7 percentile and were classified as high, medium and low mean egalitarianism scores and high, medium and low mean individualism scores. A summary of this analysis is given in Table 14. The interaction between levels of mean egalitarianism scores and levels of mean individualism scores was not statistically significant, $F(4, 724) = 0.78$, $p > 0.01$. The main effect due to levels of mean egalitarianism scores was statistically significant $F(2, 724) = 86.56$, $p < 0.01$ with means of 2.99, 3.40 and 3.85 for the low, medium and high levels of mean egalitarianism scores

Table 14

A Summary Table for the Three By Three Analysis of Variance in Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies Between High, Medium and Low Mean Egalitarianism and Mean Individualism Scores

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	E	Sig of E
Main Effects	103.39	4	25.85	60.81	0.000
Mean Egalitarianism	73.58	2	36.79	86.56	0.000
Mean Individualism	9.39	2	4.70	11.05	0.000
2-way Interaction	1.32	4	0.33	0.78	0.541
Explained	104.71	8	13.09	30.80	0.000
Residual	307.73	724	0.43		
Total	412.44	732	0.56		

respectively. The main effect due to levels of mean individualism scores was statistically significant, $F(2, 724) = 11.05$, $p < 0.01$ with means of 3.63, 3.32 and 3.14 for low, medium and high levels respectively. Thus as mean egalitarianism scores increased, respondents' support for employment equity policies increased. At the same time, as mean individualism scores increased, respondents' support for employment equity policies decreased.

Differences in mean support for employment equity policies for the combined effect of levels of mean egalitarianism scores and levels of mean individualism scores were assessed by way of a one-way analysis of variance. Those respondents whose mean egalitarianism scores placed them in a higher level of egalitarianism than their level of

individualism were grouped to form the high egalitarianism/low individualism group. For example, a respondent whose egalitarianism score was extremely high and was thus placed in the high egalitarianism group, but whose individualism score was extremely low and was thus placed in the low individualism group, would have been now placed in the high egalitarianism/low individualism group. Those respondents whose mean individualism scores placed them in a higher level of individualism than their levels of egalitarianism were grouped to form the high individualism/low egalitarianism group. Finally, those respondents whose mean egalitarianism scores placed them at the same level as their mean individualism scores were grouped to form the equal egalitarianism/individualism group.

Table 15 provides a summary of the one-way analysis of variance in mean support scores by combined levels of egalitarianism and individualism. There were statistically significant differences between the means of the combined levels of egalitarianism and individualism $F(2, 730) = 87.17, p < 0.01$. The high egalitarianism/low individualism group had a mean support of 3.80, the equal egalitarianism/individualism group had a mean support of 3.33 and the high individualism/low egalitarianism group had a mean support of 3.03. Pairwise comparisons between the three means using Scheffe's approach with an alpha set to 0.01 indicate that all possible pairs of the three means for support for employment equity policies by combined levels of egalitarianism and individualism were statistically significantly different from each other. It should be noted that the difference in means of 0.30 between the equal egalitarianism/individualism group and the high individualism/low egalitarianism group is not excessive. Thus, although this difference is statistically significant, because of the large number of subjects available in this study, the difference may not be very meaningful and should be interpreted with caution.

Analysis of the Guttman scale. Guttman's scalogram analysis involves the assessment of the degree to which items in a scale are reproducible, that is, the extent to which the responses to items in a set can be reproduced based solely on knowledge of a

Table 15

Results of the One-way Analysis of Variance in Mean Support for Employment Equity Policies by Combined Levels of Egalitarianism and Individualism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Between groups	79.51	2	39.76	87.17	0.000
Within groups	332.93	730	0.46		
Total	412.44	732	0.56		

person's total score. Scalogram analysis involves the analysis of the items used in the scale and measures the degree to which these items vary from a Guttman scale. For the purposes of this analysis, it is not the degree to which items correspond to a Guttman scale but the degree to which the responses to these items correspond to a Guttman scale that is of interest. Thus a scalogram analysis was conducted in which a coefficient of reproducibility across people was obtained instead of a coefficient of reproducibility across items.

Although the logic of the method for determining the coefficient of reproducibility that is used in this analysis is the same as that proposed by Guttman (1974), the procedure used to determine the coefficient of reproducibility is not the same. Guttman determined the coefficient of reproducibility by determining the percentage of correct responses in a scale. The method for obtaining this percentage that is used in the present analysis is different from that used by Guttman because the coefficient of reproducibility is being determined across people instead of items.

When considering the five-point scale, two methods can be used to determine a coefficient of reproducibility. These two methods vary in their assessment of error of

responses. In the first method, policies are ordered in terms of the degree to which they violate individualism. The responses to each policy are then compared to the policy that is directly higher or lower in terms of the degree to which it violates the principles of individualism. Thus policy1 is compared to policy2, which is compared to policy3, which is compared to policy4, where these four policies increasingly violate individualism. An error is said to have occurred when the response to each policy is not higher or equal to the policy that directly follows it in the scale. Thus each person's response to policy1 should be higher or equal to that person's response to policy2, which should be higher or equal to that person's response to policy3, which should be higher or equal to that person's response to policy4. The number of errors in this scale can be determined and the percentage of correct responses constitutes a coefficient of reproducibility across items. This coefficient of reproducibility for the scale used in this study was 93.1%. According to Guttman (1974), a scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of 90% or greater is considered to be an efficient approximation of a perfect scale.

The second method of assessing errors is preferable because it is more conservative. In this case instead of only those responses to the item immediately above and below it on the scale, each pair of responses is examined for error. Thus each person's response to policy1 is not only compared to that person's response to policy2 but also that person's response to policy3 and policy4. Using this method, the scale in this study has a coefficient of reproducibility of 90.9%.

Schuessler (1974) has developed a method for assessing the statistical significance of a scalogram. This method assesses the difference between the number of scale types expected by chance and the number of observed scale types and determines the probability of this distance by chi-square. In order to conduct this test of significance, the items in the scale were made dichotomous by dividing the scores into those greater than 2 and those less than or equal to two. The coefficient of reproducibility across people of this

dichotomous scale using the more conservative method is 94.7%. A dichotomous scale is much easier to reproduce than a 5-point scale because there are less sources of error. The difference between the observed and the expected scale was statistically significant where $\chi^2(1) = 15.42, p < 0.01$. Thus the observed scale could not be attributed to chance.

Reasons for support of employment equity policies. The final four questions on the questionnaire were designed to assess the degree to which respondents either support employment equity policies or fail to support employment equity policies for egalitarian or individualistic reasons. As will be discussed later in the qualitative analyses section, problems arose surrounding the interpretability of the responses to these questions. Based on the comments provided by respondents, it was apparent that the wording of these questions caused enough confusion that the results of any analyses involving the responses to these questions would be difficult to interpret. Thus the analyses of these questions were not conducted.

Qualitative Analysis

A total of 181 respondents (20%) made a comment either in general or concerning one or more of the items on the questionnaire. A content analysis of these comments was conducted. Each questionnaire was examined and classified by the section of the questionnaire (part 1, 2, 3 and 4) referred to in the comment and by the items in that section of the questionnaire. For example, part 2 of the questionnaire includes the egalitarianism and individualism items. Each questionnaire was examined for comments concerning this section. Each comment concerning this section was then either classified as a comment concerning a particular item within that section, for example, the first egalitarianism item, or as a comment concerning that section in general, for example, a general comment on the method used for assessing these items. Each comment was also classified into two categories. Comments that were concerned with some aspect of the questionnaire itself (procedure comments) were separated from comments that were concerned with the issues

being addressed in the questionnaire (meaning comments). Finally, comments that did not pertain to any particular section of the questionnaire but rather reflected the questionnaire or the subject matter of the questionnaire in general, were also classified as procedure or meaning comments. A summary of the distribution of these two types of comments across sections of the questionnaire is given in Table 16. Comments concerning the egalitarianism items were more likely to be classified in the meaning category while comments concerning individualism were more likely to be classified in the procedure category. The reasons for support had a large number of procedure comments which reflect the problems respondents had with these questions.

Procedure comments. The procedure comments concern the questionnaire itself as opposed to the subject matter of the questionnaire. Thus these comments reflect positive or negative feedback on the assessment process used in this study and include feedback on such issues as the way the questions were worded, the methods used to obtain information and concerns about the way this obtained information might be interpreted. These comments were not analyzed in a quantitative manner but instead were examined for general themes that may impact on the interpretation of the results of this study. These general themes will be presented in this section and the implications of these themes will be examined in the discussion section. It should first be noted that while the majority of the procedure comments involved concerns over some aspect of the questionnaire, not all of the comments were critical. The complimentary comments were usually of a general nature however, and do not contribute to a better understanding of the interpretation of the results.

The remaining procedure comments express three major concerns. The most serious concerns involve the last four questions on the questionnaire addressing the reasons for support or non-support of employment equity. As shown in Table 16, 144 procedure comments were directed at these four questions, a much larger number than any other section of the questionnaire. These comments primarily involved two problems. The first

Table 16

The Distribution (in Terms of Number of Comments) of Procedure and Meaning Comments Across Sections of the Questionnaire

Item on Questionnaire	Procedure	Meaning
Demographic information	7	1
Individualism items ^a	85	38
Egalitarianism items ^a	28	70
Policy items	43	64
Qualification items	10	18
Reasons for support items ^b	144	35
General comments	82	74

^aAn additional 5 procedure comments were made concerning the section of the questionnaire that contained the egalitarianism and individualism items but not specifically addressing the egalitarianism or the individualism items.

^bAn additional 23 procedure and 4 meaning comments were given on the entire last section of the questionnaire including the qualification and the reasons for support items but not specifically addressing these items.

is that the last two questions were worded with double negatives in the question and this created a great deal of confusion over the interpretation of the question. The second is that these questions consisted of two parts which made it difficult to express agreement or disagreement when the respondent agreed with one part and not with the other. In general, there was a great deal of concern over whether the responses to these questions accurately

reflected the beliefs of the respondent. As mentioned in the quantitative results section, because of these concerns, the results of these questions were omitted from the analyses since the interpretation of these results is seriously limited.

The second major concern expressed in the procedure comments was that a definition of employment equity policies was not provided. Five questions were affected by this lack of definition, the last question in the third section that reflected the degree of support for employment equity policies in general, and the four final questions reflecting reasons for this support. A number of respondents felt that their answers to these questions depended on the exact definition of employment equity policies. This concern is not as serious in terms of the interpretation of the results since the five questions involved were not used in the analyses of this study.

The third major concern expressed in the procedure comments was about the meaning of the individual items in this questionnaire, particularly the egalitarianism and individualism items. Respondents were concerned that they were interpreting the meaning of the item or that their responses would be interpreted in a manner in which it was not intended. Many respondents felt frustration at the need to qualify their answers. The effect these concerns may have had on the use of the egalitarianism and individualism scales and on the interpretation of the results will be examined in the discussion section.

Meaning comments. The meaning comments were subjected to a content analysis that involved the classification of each comment into a number of categories. The procedure for this analysis first involved the re-examination of all of the meaning comments that were already sorted apart from the procedure comments and by the section and item to which the comment pertained. From this examination, three separate scoring sheets were created. Each of the egalitarianism and individualism items were scored according to the criteria in Appendix H, each of the policy items were scored according to the criteria in Appendix I and the general comments were scored according to the criteria in Appendix J.

The general comments from the egalitarianism and individualism section, the general comments from the policy section and the comments from any of the questions in the last section of the questionnaire were included in the general comments portion of the content analysis.

Each comment was then scored according to the same criteria but by an independent rater. The independent rater was an undergraduate student who volunteered for the position in order to obtain research experience. The concepts of egalitarianism and individualism were explained to the independent rater and the criteria for the scoring of the content analysis was reviewed. A few questionnaires were picked at random and their comments were examined according to the scoring criteria to illustrate the scoring process.

Table 17 illustrates the agreement between the content ratings of the investigator and the independent rater. These agreement figures are very conservative estimates because they depend on exact agreement in each category. Thus when one rater indicated that they were not sure of the direction of an egalitarian comment, for example, and the other rater thought the comment was in a positive direction, they were said to disagree. The frequency of the uncertainty of these ratings can be seen in Table 18. Naturally, the investigator was more certain of her responses than the independent rater. This uncertainty resulted in reduced agreement between the two raters. In addition, there was often agreement between whether a comment reflected the variable of interest but disagreement over the direction of that variable. This effect also contributed to the reduction of the agreement between the raters. Overall, given the subjectivity of the scoring, the agreement between the two raters was felt to be reasonably higher than chance (a minimum of 20% agreement assuming equal distribution of the categories for each question). In order to simplify the presentation of the results of the content analysis, only the ratings of the investigator will be presented. It should be kept in mind however that there was not perfect agreement between the two raters, and therefore the actual numbers reported in each category by the investigator are

Table 17

The Percentage Agreement Over the Content Scoring Conducted by the Investigator and the Independent Rater Presented as the Number of Scores that are Agreed Upon Over the Number of Scores for Each Item by Each Category

Item	Rating Category				
	Egalitarianism	Individualism	Conflict	Support	Support-other
Egal1	24/37	36/37			
Egal2	1/5	3/5			
Egal3	3/8	8/8			
Egal4	9/17	13/17			
Ind1	2/4	1/4			
Ind2	8/13	6/13			
Ind3	2/4	0/4			
Ind4	8/12	10/12			
Policy1	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3
Policy2	6/12	5/12	12/12	5/12	12/12
Policy3	13/15	9/15	13/15	13/15	14/15
Policy4	13/20	9/20	20/20	8/20	12/20
General	42/91	54/91	58/91	33/91	45/91
Total	132/231	156/231	105/141	61/141	95/141
Total %	57	68	74	43	67

Table 18

The Number of Uncertain Responses Reported by the Investigator and the Independent Rater for Each Categorical Rating

Rater	Rating Category				
	Egalitarianism	Individualism	Conflict	Support	Support-other
Investigator	20	21	4	19	6
Independent	52	46	12	22	15

subject to errors in scoring.

Table 19 presents the number of comments that reflect egalitarianism, individualism, support for employment equity policies, a conflict in support for employment equity policies and explanations for support of employment equity policies as determined by the investigator. Comments concerning the four egalitarianism questions primarily reflected egalitarianism in a negative direction. That is, they were non-egalitarian in nature. If these comments reflected individualism, the direction was usually positive. Comments concerning the four individualism questions were fairly divided in terms of the direction in which they reflected individualism.

When examining the comments concerning the policy questions and the general comments, it can be seen that these comments most often reflected both egalitarianism and individualism in a positive direction, if they reflected these values at all. It is also interesting to note that these comments more often reflected support both for and against employment equity policies as opposed to either for or against these policies. When the comments were seen to reflect a conflict in a person's support for employment equity, most

Table 19

The Number of Comments in Each Section of the Questionnaire that Reflect Egalitarianism, Individualism, Support for Employment Equity Policies, a Conflict in Support for Employment Equity Policies and that Offer an Explanation of Support for Employment Equity Policies as Reported by the investigator

Rating Category	Section of the questionnaire				Total
	Egalitarian	Individual	Policies	General	
Egalitarianism					
positive direction	9	4	10	49	72
negative direction	44	0	3	1	48
unsure direction	2	1	0	4	7
unsure if egalitarianism	6	0	3	4	13
not egalitarianism	6	28	47	33	114
Individualism					
positive direction	7	7	10	40	64
negative direction	0	9	0	3	12
unsure direction	0	5	0	0	5
unsure if individualism	0	3	11	2	16
not individualism	60	9	42	46	157

(Continued...)

Table 19 (continued)

Rating Category	Section of the Questionnaire				
	Egalitarian	Individual	Policies	General	Total
Reflects Support					
for EE policies			5	7	12
against EE policies			19	13	32
for and against EE policies			18	32	50
unsure if reflects support			6	13	19
does not reflect support			15	26	41
Reflects a Conflict					
egal and ind			2	21	23
egal and not ind			0	2	2
not egal and ind			0	1	1
not egal and not ind			0	1	1
unsure if a conflict			1	3	4
not a conflict			60	63	123
Explain Support					
explains support			28	58	86
does not explain support			33	29	62
unsure if explains			2	4	6

Note. EE means employment equity.

often this conflict was between egalitarianism and individualism, however, other conflicts were apparent. The implications of the results of the content analysis are addressed in the discussion section.

Discussion

The egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory states that the relative degree to which a person believes in the values of egalitarianism and individualism will determine their support for employment equity policies, given the degree to which the policy violates the principles of individualism. This theory was derived from the initial formulations of Lipset and Schneider (1978) who felt that inconsistencies in people's support for employment equity policies, as demonstrated through the results of public opinion polls, might be explained by a conflict between the values of egalitarianism and individualism. Other research has provided indirect support for the effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991; Katz & Hass, 1988; Matheson, Echenberg, & Taylor, 1992; Tougas & Veilleux, 1988), however, a direct examination of the relative effects of egalitarianism and individualism has not been conducted. This study develops the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory and directly examines the effects of people's beliefs in these values on support for employment equity policies.

It was initially hypothesized that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory only applies to individuals who meet three qualifications, that is, they believe that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities. The effects of these three qualifications on support for employment equity policies will be discussed in this section followed by an examination of the effects of people's beliefs in the values of egalitarianism and individualism on support for these policies. This will be followed by a discussion of the applications of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory and a discussion

of the limitations of this study with suggestions for future research.

The Effects of the Prerequisites on Employment Equity

It was hypothesized in this study that there are three qualifications that people must meet in order to support employment equity policies. First, they must believe that inequities in the workforce exist, second, they must believe that discrimination in the workforce exists and third, they must believe that something should be done to eliminate these inequities. From this sample of Carleton University employees it was found that in general, people meet these three qualifications. Responses to the qualification variables were highly positively skewed. Most people agreed that inequities exist and that discrimination exists. There was less support for the qualification that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities but, on average, support was still positive.

The proportion of variance in mean support for employment equity policies accounted for by the mean scores on these three qualification variables was found to be 41%. Thus these three qualifications are important factors in determining a person's support for employment equity policies. This of course makes sense since the less you believe these qualifications hold true, the less likely you are to support employment equity policies. For example, if you do not believe that something should be done to increase the representation in particular jobs of underrepresented groups, you are not likely to support employment equity policies.

As expected, statistically significant differences in mean support for employment equity policies were found between those who agreed that inequities exist, that discrimination exists and that intervention is needed and those who disagreed with at least one of these qualifications. Respondents who did not meet the qualifications were less likely to support employment equity policies than respondents who did meet the prerequisites. More importantly, however, is the finding that those who met the prerequisites differed from those who did not in terms of their mean egalitarianism scores

and their mean individualism scores. Those who did not meet the prerequisites scored significantly lower on their mean egalitarianism scores and significantly higher on their mean individualism scores than those who met the three prerequisites.

It was initially expected that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory would not apply to people who did not meet the prerequisites to support for employment equity policies. The results of this study however, indicate that the population of people who do not meet the prerequisites have unique egalitarianism and individualism characteristics. Thus, they can not be eliminated from the examination of the effects of these two values on support for employment equity policies. Their elimination would result in a truncated sample in which an important segment of the population is removed, that is, those who are low in egalitarianism, high in individualism and low in support for employment equity policies.

The results of this study clearly indicate that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory may account for variations in support for employment equity among people regardless of whether they meet the three qualifications. It may be that it is a conflict between these two values that accounts for differences in the degree to which people believe that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities. The unique effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies with the effects of qualification removed were fairly small. In addition, when the effects of egalitarianism and individualism were regressed on the combined effects of the three qualifications, it was found that the belief in these two principles accounts for 35% of the variance in qualification scores.

Thus it appears that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory plays a role in determining the extent to which a person meets the three qualifications. It may be that the belief in these three qualifications is affected by a conflict between the values of

egalitarianism and individualism. The content analyses of the comments associated with the three qualification items often revealed the effects of the values of egalitarianism and individualism. A number of comments directly reflect the value of individualism by expressing concern over whether intervention is based on merit. Other comments reflect egalitarianism through concern over whether intervention will lead to preference for a particular group. Thus, from an examination of the comments associated with the qualification items, the values of egalitarianism and individualism seem to play a role in people's responses to these qualification issues.

The results of this study indicate that the role of the three qualification variables may not actually be that of qualification. Although it was initially hypothesized that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory only applied to people who met the qualifications of believing that workforce inequities exist, that workforce discrimination exists and that intervention is needed, it now appears that these three variables play a more complex role in the egalitarianism and individualism conflict theory. The results of this study suggest that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory may apply to a person's belief in the three qualification variables, which have been shown to have a large effect on support for employment equity policies.

The Effects of Egalitarianism and Individualism on Support for Employment Equity

The results of this study support the value of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory in explaining people's support for employment equity policies. Jointly, mean egalitarianism and mean individualism scores accounted for 30% of the variance in mean support for employment equity policies with mean egalitarianism scores accounting for more of the unique variance (22%) than mean individualism scores (4%). There was no interaction between egalitarianism and individualism. As a person's belief in egalitarianism increased, so would their support for employment equity policies. Similarly, as their belief in individualism increased, their support for employment equity

policies would decrease. Thus, the more a person believes in the principles of egalitarianism, the more likely they are to support employment equity policies while the more the person believes in individualism, the less likely they are to support employment equity policies. The individual effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies, as expected according to the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory, are supported.

When the combined effects of egalitarianism and individualism are examined, those who believed more strongly in egalitarianism than individualism supported employment equity policies to a greater extent than those who believed more strongly in individualism than egalitarianism. Those respondents who supported egalitarianism and individualism to approximately the same extent, supported employment equity policies to an extent that was somewhere between the high egalitarianism and the high individualism group. These results support the hypothesis that it is not solely the individual effects of egalitarianism and individualism that explains people's support for employment equity policies. These results suggest the possibility that it is a combined effect of the relative extent to which they believe in these two values that explains people's support.

It should be noted that while the relative extent to which respondents believed in egalitarianism and individualism resulted in differential support for employment equity policies, the relative extent to which each of the two individual values influenced support for employment equity policies was not determined in this study. Although people who scored higher in egalitarianism than individualism supported employment equity policies to a greater extent than those people who scored lower in egalitarianism than individualism, the individual influence of egalitarianism and individualism on this effect may differ. That is, the extent to which a person believes in egalitarianism may play a greater role in determining people's support than the extent to which a person believes in individualism. This is supported by the finding that the unique proportion of variance in support for

employment equity policies accounted for by egalitarianism scores is greater than the unique proportion of variance accounted for by individualism scores.

The relative influence of the belief in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies needs to be further examined. In this study it was found that differences in support for employment equity exist between groups that differ in the relative degree to which they believe in egalitarianism and individualism. The relative influence of belief in these two values on the relative degree to which a person believes in these two principles should now be examined. The results of this study suggest that the principles of egalitarianism play a greater role than the principles of individualism, in the effects of the relative extent to which a person believes in egalitarianism and individualism on employment equity policies.

The analyses of the Guttman scale also supported the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory. The Guttman scale analyses indicate that the greater a policy violates the principles of individualism, the less likely people are to support that policy. As policies increase in the extent to which they violate individualism, people's support for these policies decreases.

It was previously suggested that the influence of a person's belief in the principles of egalitarianism on support for employment equity policies may be greater than the influence of that person's belief in individualism. It is possible that it is simply a person's belief in the principles of egalitarianism that is influencing people's support for employment equity policies. The Guttman scale analysis, however, suggests that the principles of individualism do in fact play a role in determining people's support for employment equity policies. The greater the extent to which a policy violates the principles of individualism, the less likely people are to support that policy.

When considering the relative influence of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies, the results of this study suggest that a person's

belief in the principles of egalitarianism may play a predominant role in determining that person's support. It may be that a person is primarily influenced by the extent to which they believe in equality of opportunity. Given that they believe in equality of opportunity they are then influenced by the extent to which a particular policy violates the principles of individualism. That is, they are willing to support employment equity to the extent to which they believe in equality of opportunity, however as the policy increasingly violates their values of individualism, support begins to decline. Thus, belief in egalitarianism plays a predominant role while belief in individualism plays a secondary role in determining the extent to which a policy violates individualism.

Another possible explanation for differences in the relative effects of belief in egalitarianism and individualism may simply be that people believe in egalitarianism more than they believe in individualism, and therefore the effects of belief in the principles of egalitarianism on support for employment equity policies is greater than the effects of belief in the principles of individualism. This suggestion is supported by the generally larger egalitarianism scores, although the values of these scores are artificially set and are difficult to compare since they are based on different scales. Future research is needed to assess the relative effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies and to examine alternate explanations for differences in the relative effects of these two principles.

Results from the content analyses also support the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory. A large number of respondents expressed concern over whether employment equity policies would lead to unqualified people being selected for a job position. These comments were primarily individualistic in nature. Respondents also expressed egalitarian concerns over ways to ensure that all people had an equal opportunity for jobs. Some of the comments that reflected egalitarianism took a different approach when respondents expressed concern over whether employment equity policies led to

discrimination against and unequal opportunity for, majority group members. Probably the most common comment was that job selection should be based on the best person for the job regardless of group membership, a comment that illustrates the influence of egalitarianism and individualism on employment equity issues.

A number of comments reflected a conflict between egalitarianism and individualism which normally involved the difficulty in compromising between selection systems based on merit and those based on equality of opportunity. Occasionally a conflict between two forms of egalitarianism was observed in which the respondent expressed concern about removing discrimination and ensuring equality of opportunity for underrepresented groups along with, or as well as, concern about reverse discrimination.

The possibility of a conflict between two forms of egalitarianism has not been previously considered. The stronger effect of egalitarianism on support for employment equity may in part be due to the effects of these two ways in which egalitarianism may influence support for employment equity. People are concerned about discrimination against underrepresented groups leading to increases in support for employment equity. They are also concerned about discrimination against majority groups leading to decreases in support for employment equity. Thus, the effects of egalitarianism on support for employment equity policies may be stronger than the effects of individualism because belief in the values of egalitarianism may influence support in both a positive and a negative manner.

The Guttman scale can also be interpreted in terms of this egalitarianism versus egalitarianism conflict since the four employment equity policies can also be seen as increasingly violating the principles of egalitarianism. That is, they increasingly lead to reverse discrimination. Thus, there may be two conflicts that affect people's support for employment equity policies, a conflict between egalitarianism and individualism and a conflict between egalitarianism and egalitarianism. The Guttman scale takes into account

both the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict and the egalitarianism versus egalitarianism conflict, but is unable to distinguish the effects of these two conflicts.

Although the results of this study only hint at the possibility, future research is needed to examine the possibility of the existence of an egalitarianism versus egalitarianism conflict theory and to compare the relative explanatory power of these two theories. A distinction should also be made between the positive and negative influence that belief in the principles of egalitarianism may have on support for employment equity policies. Unfortunately, the questions from this survey that were intended to examine the positive and negative influences of the principles of egalitarianism and individualism were not available for analyses because of the confusion surrounding the interpretation of these questions.

Applications of the Results of this Study

An understanding of the reasons people support and object to employment equity policies is important in the design, application and presentation of these policies. The more a policy violates the principles of individualism, the less likely people are to support these policies. The results of this study indicate that when deciding on the type of policy to be implemented in a particular organization, the policy that will achieve the goals of the organization with the least violation of these principles is desirable if support for the implementation of the policy is to follow.

To obtain the maximum support when presenting an employment equity policy, it may be best to present the policy in such a way as to emphasize its egalitarian properties and to minimize the extent to which it violates of the principles of individualism. It has been previously suggested that individuals who believe in egalitarianism and individualism to a relatively equal extent may be more influenced by the method of presentation of employment equity policies (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991). In this study, differences in support for employment equity policies were found between those who believed more

strongly in egalitarianism than individualism, those who believed relatively equally in the two values and those who believed more strongly in individualism than egalitarianism, although basically no differences were found between these three groups in terms of the coefficient of reproducibility of the support for employment equity scale. These differences neither support nor fail to support the possibility that the group who believes equally in both values is more easily influenced than the other two groups. The consistent support for the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory's explanation of people's support for employment equity policies, however, suggests that the equal group may be more vulnerable to any advantage or disadvantage given to either the egalitarian or individualistic side of the conflict. Further examination of the differences between these three groups in terms of the effects of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory is warranted.

Limitations of this Study and Suggestions for Future Research

The possible sources of limitations found in this study involve three separate issues: the ability to generalize the results of this study, the measurement of the principles of egalitarianism and individualism and the measurement of people's support for employment equity policies. Each of these possible sources of limitations will be discussed in turn and suggestions for addressing these limitations in future research will be made. Following this discussion, suggestions for the direction of future research into the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory and its ability to explain people's support for employment equity policies will be presented.

Generalization of the results. The completion rate for this study was approximately 51%, a reasonably good response rate for survey approaches to data collection. One of the drawbacks of using this approach to data collection is that there is little way of knowing whether differences exist between those employees of Carleton University who responded to this questionnaire and those who did not respond. The uncertainty surrounding the generalization of results is of concern in any research employing this type of data

collection.

In terms of this study, some of the likely reasons that employees might not have responded include time constraints, an unwillingness to respond to any survey, lack of interest in the subject matter and being unavailable at the time of the study. Although there is no obvious reason to suspect systematic differences between respondents and non-respondents, the possibility exists that people who responded differed from those who did not respond in terms of the variables being examined in this study.

In response to these concerns, a number of the characteristics of the respondents in this study indicate that they are fairly representative of the population under study. The sample of employees who responded to this survey is representative of the population of employees at Carleton University in terms of the distribution of respondents across sex and across employment locations. This can be seen from a comparison between the sample distributions from this study and the population distributions of employees for the 1991/1992 academic year (Carleton University, 1992). The sample percentage of employees within each faculty and support services classification approximated the percentage of employees within these employment locations for the entire university. For example, the percentage of Carleton University employees who were faculty members of the faculty of Arts in 1991/1992 was 12% which is comparable to a sample percentage of 11.5%. Similarly, the sample percentage of females within each of these employment locations approximated the population percentage of females within each employment location. For example, the percentage of female faculty members in the faculty of Arts in 1991/1992 was 30% as compared to a sample percentage of 32.4%. Population statistics were not available for the distribution of the other three designated groups across employment locations.

It should also be noted that the univariate distributions of variables being examined in this study were fairly normally distributed with ranges that extended to the extreme

values. Thus, the extreme responses on any of these variables of interest are represented in this sample. It does not appear to be the case, at least in a univariate sense, that a segment of the population did not respond. For example, the responses to each of the egalitarianism items and to the mean egalitarianism scores ranged from the lowest possible score of 1 to the highest possible score of 7, and therefore, the entire range of beliefs in egalitarianism were represented by this sample.

Another concern in terms of the generalization of these results is whether the employees of Carleton University are representative of the general population of employees. Universities are, of course, learning institutions in which knowledge is valued and issues are debated and assessed. These characteristics of the environment may result in the attraction of a unique population of employees that may differ from the general population in important ways. For example, the most obvious difference is that employees at Carleton University are more likely to have obtained a higher level of education than the general population, a variable that may influence their belief in egalitarianism and individualism and their support for employment equity policies. Educational attainment has been found to positively influence the perceived need for affirmative action among university administrators (Tickamyer, Scollay, Bokemeier, & Wood, 1989).

On the positive side, studying responses from employees at a university has the benefit of accessing a wide range of types of employment, from academic faculty members, to daycare workers, to safety officers and from maintenance workers to administrators to technicians. Similarly, representatives from a wide range of backgrounds and interests are available in a university environment from engineers to social workers to historians to biologists. It is obvious from the differences in subjects' scores for egalitarianism, individualism, qualification and support for employment equity policies, found between employment locations at Carleton, that a wide range of employment locations should be assessed in order to be able to generalize results to the general population.

The representation of respondents in this sample who are members of the four designated groups is remarkably similar to the representation of these groups in the employment equity workforce as was shown in Table 1. The overrepresentation of the designated groups in the support services and the underrepresentation of these groups in the professional fields (such as faculty members) is also similar to the employment equity workforce (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1991).

In general, the sample of employees of Carleton University that responded to this survey is similar in terms of employment location and designated group membership to the entire University population. The possibility exists, however, that the employees who responded to this questionnaire systematically differed from those who did not in terms of the variables under study. Similarly, although designated group membership in this sample is similar to that in the general population, because this sample is comprised of a specialized group of employees that may differ in important ways from the general population, care should be taken when generalizing these results outside the university community. Despite these limitations, the variables of interest reflect a wide range of responses from individuals with a wide range of jobs and interests. The extent to which these individuals support employment equity policies is affected by their beliefs in the values of egalitarianism and individualism. Future research should focus on a replication of these results among other populations of employees to ensure that these results apply to individuals outside the university population.

Measuring egalitarianism and individualism. The assessment of people's beliefs in the values of egalitarianism and individualism is fairly new and an established measure of these two values was not found. Two scales were therefore devised to determine the extent to which people believe in these two values. Despite the pilot work conducted to determine the items that best measure a person's belief in egalitarianism and individualism, the reliabilities of the newly devised scales were not especially high, with alpha coefficients

ranging from 0.57 for the egalitarianism scale to 0.33 for the individualism scale.

The reliability of the egalitarianism and the individualism scales limit the results of this study by limiting the maximum possible validity of the scales. Although it is desirable to increase the reliability of these scales, it is important to note the limitations in increasing the reliability of any scale that is designed to measure such broad and complex concepts as a person's belief in the principles of egalitarianism or the principles of individualism. First, these concepts are comprised of a number of diverging elements which result in a decrease in the internal consistency of any scale that tries to measure more than one of these elements. For example, the value of egalitarianism is a value that states that all people should have the same opportunities and that everyone should be equal. In order to measure this concept, different aspects of equality need to be addressed and equality among different groups needs to be assessed. Respondents may vary in the extent to which they support different aspects of the same value, resulting in decreased reliability. That is, they may support different types of equality but only for some groups, or they may support only certain types of equality but for all groups. Thus the nature of the concepts being measured will in itself limit the reliability of any scale designed to measure these concepts.

Secondly, as the responses to the validity questions in the pilot study indicate, there is a tendency for subjects to respond to the egalitarianism and individualism items in a socially desirable manner. The items in these scales must try and address the general aspects of the concept under investigation, as well as specific instances where the respondent might feel less pressure to respond in a socially desirable way. This method of trying to avoid the effects of social desirability leads to reduced inter-item consistency.

Finally, these concepts are difficult to measure in such a purely objective manner since responses to these items are usually dependent on a number of qualifications and situational factors. It was apparent from the content analyses that people found it difficult to assign a number to such complex issues as were comprised in the items of these scales

without clarification on a wide variety of other factors. This difficulty contributes to a reduction in the internal consistency of these scales.

The reliability of the egalitarianism scale was higher than the reliability of the individualism scale which was not surprising for two reasons. First, the intercorrelations among the egalitarianism items were higher than the intercorrelations among the individualism items. Similarly, the correlations between the egalitarianism items and the mean egalitarianism scores were higher than the correlations between the individualism items and the mean individualism scores. Thus, the scores on the egalitarianism items were more homogenous than the scores on the individualism items, resulting in an increase in reliability. It should also be noted that while the egalitarianism items were slightly negatively correlated with the mean individualism scores, two of the individualism items were moderately correlated with the mean egalitarianism scores indicating a relationship between these items and the measure of egalitarianism used in this study. These correlations were not as high as the correlation between these two individualism items and the mean individualism scores.

Secondly, there were proportionally more procedural comments addressing the individualism items than there were addressing the egalitarianism items. These procedural comments reflected difficulty in interpreting the meaning of the individualism items, especially the first and second items. Respondents were having difficulty determining exactly what was being asked by the question and were concerned that their answers reflected the same interpretation of the question as was intended. Respondents providing procedural comments addressing the egalitarianism items were less concerned with the intention of the question and more concerned with being able to qualify the answers. The content analyses on the egalitarianism and the individualism items suggest that the individualism items were less clear in meaning than the egalitarianism items and therefore, there may have been more fluctuation in the possible responses to the individualism items.

2 OF 2

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

resulting in decreased reliability.

Because of the limitations inherent in the measurement of such complex concepts as a person's belief in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism, the scales used in this study were considered to be sufficiently reliable for a preliminary examination of the effects of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity. Further research into the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory should focus on the assessment of a person's belief in these two values. Further use of objective measures of egalitarianism and individualism requires improvements in the clarity of the items and a larger sample involved in the item analysis stage of scale construction. Alternative methods for assessing a person's belief in egalitarianism and individualism, such as more open-ended response possibilities or situational assessments, should also be considered.

Measuring support for employment equity. There are a number of ways to measure support for employment equity policies, two of which are examined in this study. One of the possible measures of support was the results of a question that asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they support employment equity policies. This method is limited in two ways. One is that the definition of employment equity policies is not stable. Employment equity means different things to different people and there is no one definition that will satisfy everyone. Thus people's responses to this question vary not only in their support for employment equity policies but in their own view of what employment equity means. A number of procedural comments associated with this question indicate the concern over the question's lack of definition of employment equity policies. Most of these comments indicate that the response is dependent on the specific definition of employment equity policies.

The second limitation is that the question assessing general support for employment equity policies is susceptible to social desirability biases. This is obvious from the highly positively skewed distribution associated with responses to this question. It is also

apparent from the moderate correlation between these scores and the mean support scores.

Although this moderate correlation is partly due to the truncated range of general support scores, it is possible it is also partly due to inconsistencies between people's responses on these two methods of assessing support for employment equity policies. Most of these inconsistencies involve low mean support scores and higher general support scores. Thus a number of respondents support employment equity in general but do not support even the least intrusive of the employment equity policies given in the questionnaire. It may be that the policies given in the questionnaire are not the type of policies these individuals support or it may be that their responses to the general support question are being influenced by a social desirability factor.

In this study the mean support scores on four particular employment equity policies were used as a measure of support for employment equity. This method addresses the limitations of the direct approach by reducing the effect of social desirability responses and by providing specific examples to what is meant by employment equity. With this method, a sample of the possible employment equity policies is assessed. Thus the particular definition of employment equity for a person and what that person is willing to support in terms of employment equity may not be adequately measured in the scale.

In response to this problem it should be noted that the policies used in this study vary in terms of the degree to which they violate the principles of individualism. This variation, according to the independent raters who assessed these policies on the degree to which they violate individualism, is extensive. The policies can also be seen as varying in terms of the degree to which they intrude on the decision making strategies of the selectors or in terms of the extremeness of the policy at achieving its goal. In general, although this scale does not sample every possible employment equity policy, the policies chosen for this scale can be considered to be highly discriminating between levels of support for employment equity.

The conflict theory and future research. The results of this study indicate that the extent to which a person believes in the values of egalitarianism and individualism influences that person's support for employment equity policies. A number of suggestions for future research into the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory and its ability to explain people's support for employment equity policies can be made.

It was hypothesized in this study that individuals must meet three prerequisites in order for them to support employment equity policies, that is, they must believe that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists, and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities. The results of this study demonstrate the importance of these three qualifications in assessing people's support for employment equity policies. Future research into these prerequisite variables is needed to assess the individual effects of each of these qualification variables and their unique contributions to support for employment equity policies.

An examination of the unique effects of each of these qualification variables is dependent on better measures of these variables. The measures used in this study were designed for the exclusive purpose of distinguishing those people who met all three of the qualification variables from those people who did not meet the qualifications. The individual measures of the three prerequisites were therefore highly positively skewed which leads to difficulty in examining these variables on an individual basis. Measures that can better distinguish between different levels of belief in whether employment inequities exist, whether discrimination in the workforce exists and whether intervention is needed are required to further examine the effects of these variables on support for employment equity policies.

The results of this study suggest that the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory may play a role in the extent to which people meet the three prerequisites to support for employment equity policies. The possible effects of a person's belief in the

values of egalitarianism and individualism on their beliefs that employment inequities exist, that discrimination exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities should be examined. A better understanding of the possible mediating role of the three prerequisites on support for employment equity is needed to fully understand the implications of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory.

The relative effects of egalitarianism and of individualism on support for employment equity policies can be explored in future research projects. The results of this study suggest that people's belief in egalitarianism may be more influential than their belief in individualism in terms of influencing their support for employment equity policies. The degree to which each of these two values effect support for employment equity and the relative degree to which they influence this support should be explored.

The direction of the effect of belief in these principles and the possibility that these principles may influence support in opposite directions under various circumstances needs to be explored. The possibility of an egalitarianism versus egalitarianism conflict should be examined in the future and a comparison should be made between the two conflicts. The effects of violations of the principles of egalitarianism should also be examined and compared to the effects of violations of the principles of individualism. Other methods of assessing these conflicts and violations can be utilized, such as more open-ended methods that allow respondents to expand on their feelings concerning employment equity policies.

The relationship between people's beliefs in egalitarianism and individualism and a number of other possible moderating variables other than designated group membership should be examined in order to better predict peoples support for employment equity policies. Personal variables such as age and education levels, as well as organization variables such as public or private sector designation and organizational structure type, should be examined for their effects on the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory.

Conclusion

In 1978, Lipset and Schnieder first proposed that the ambivalence associated with people's support for employment equity policies might be explained by a conflict between two core North American values, egalitarianism and individualism. Since that time, little research has examined the effects of these two values on support for employment equity policies and no attempt has been made to formulate a formal theory explaining how the values of egalitarianism and individualism might explain people's support for employment equity policies.

In this study, the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory is proposed to explain how people's beliefs in the values of egalitarianism and individualism will affect their support for employment equity policies. This theory states that the relative extent to which a person believes in these two values, combined with the extent to which an employment equity policy violates the principles of individualism, will determine the person's support for that policy.

It was initially felt that people would have to meet three qualifications in order to support employment equity policies, that is, they would have to believe that employment inequities exist, that discrimination in the workforce exists and that intervention is needed to eliminate employment inequities. The results of this study indicate that these qualification variables are important in determining a person's support for employment equity policies, however, they are not a requirement for the application of the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory. In fact, the egalitarianism versus individualism conflict theory may play a role in determining the extent to which a person meets these three qualifications.

The results of this study support the effects of the belief in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism on support for employment equity policies. In general, the more a person believes in the principles of egalitarianism, the more likely it is that the

person will support employment equity policies. The more a person believes in the principles of individualism, the less likely it is that the person will support employment equity policies.

More importantly, the relative extent to which a person believes in the principles of egalitarianism and individualism affects the extent of that person's support for employment equity policies. The more the person believes in egalitarianism relative to that person's belief in individualism, the more likely the person will support employment equity. Similarly, the more the person believes in individualism relative to that person's belief in egalitarianism, the less likely the person will support employment equity. This support is effected by the degree to which an employment equity policy violates the principles of individualism. That is, the more the policy violates the principles of individualism, the less likely people will support that policy.

References

- Abella, R. S. (1984). Equality in employment: A royal commission report. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Becker, G. S. (1982). An economic theory of discrimination. In W. E. Block & M. A. Walker (Eds.), Discrimination, affirmative action, and equal opportunity (pp.67-99). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.
- Benokraitis, N. V., & Gilbert, M. K. (1989). Women in federal government employment. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp.65-80). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Beteille, A. (1986). Individualism and equality. Current Anthropology, 27, 121-134.
- Block, W. E. (1982). Economic interventions, discrimination, and unforeseen consequences. In W. E. Block & M. A. Walker (Eds.), Discrimination, affirmative action and equal opportunity (pp. 101-125). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.
- Block, W. E., & Walker, M. A. (1982). Introduction. In W. E. Block & M. A. Walker (Eds.), Discrimination, affirmative action, and equal opportunity (pp. 1-31). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.
- Bunzel, H.J. (1986). Affirmative reactions. Public Opinion, 9, 45-49.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (1981). Special programs in employment: Criteria for compliance. Author: Ottawa.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (1991). Employment equity statistics (1987 - 1990). Author: Ottawa.
- Carleton University. (1992). Carleton university data book 1991-92. Printed by Carleton University Graphic Services.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black and white discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 87, 546-563.

- Crosby, F. (1984). The denial of personal discrimination. American Behavioral Scientist, 27, 38-386.
- Crosby, F., Clayton, S., Alksnis, O., & Hemker, K. (1986). Cognitive biases in the failure to perceive discrimination, Sex Roles, 14, 637-646.
- Davis, J. A. (1982). General social surveys, 1972-1982: Cumulative data. New Haven, Conn.: Roper Public Opinion Research Center.
- Daudlin, R. (1983). Equality Now! Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1986). Prejudice, discrimination, and racism: Historical trends and contemporary approaches. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism (pp. 1-34). Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Mann, J., & Gaertner, S. L. (1989). Resistance to affirmative action: The implications of aversive racism. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative Action in Perspective (pp.83-102). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1985). Data assembly project: Target groups. Author: Ottawa.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1986a). Employment equity: A guide for employers. Author: Ottawa.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1986b). Employment equity: Regulations and schedules. Author: Ottawa.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1988). Employment equity act: Annual report to parliament 1988. Author: Ottawa.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1989a). The employment equity act: From policy to implementation. Author: Ottawa.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. (1989b). Employment equity availability data report on designated groups. Author: Ottawa.

Employment and Immigration Canada. (1990a). 1990 annual report: Employment equity act. Author: Ottawa.

Employment and Immigration Canada. (1990b). Discussion paper on the employment equity act. Author: Ottawa.

Fletcher, J. F., & Chalmers, M. C. (1991). Attitudes of Canadians toward affirmative action: Opposition, value pluralism, and nonattitudes. Political Behavior, 13, 67-95.

Gaertner, S. L., & Mclaughlin, J. P. (1983). Racial stereotypes: Associations and ascriptions of positive and negative characteristics. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46, 23-30.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism (pp. 61-89). Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.

Guttman, L. L. (1974). The basis for scalogram analysis. In G. M. Maranell (Ed.), Scaling: A sourcebook for behavioral scientists (pp. 142-171). Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Company.

Harvey, E. B., & Blakely, J. H. (1985). Strategies for establishing affirmative action goals and timetables. In Equality in employment: A royal commission report-research studies (pp. 113-129) Ottawa: Ministry of Supply & Services.

Hoffmann, C. C., & Reed, J. S. (1982). When is imbalance not discrimination? In W. E. Block & M. A. Walker (Eds.), Discrimination, affirmative action, and equal opportunity (pp. 35-63). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Holloway, F. A. (1989). What is affirmative action? In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 9-19). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Jain, H. C. (1988). Employment discrimination against visible minorities and employment equity.

- Jain, H. C., & Sloane, P. J. (1981). Equal employment issues: Race and sex discrimination in the United States, Canada and Britain. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 893-905.
- Katz, I., Wackenhut, J., & Hass, R. G. (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality and behavior. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination, and racism (pp.35-59). Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press Inc.
- Kelly, J. G. (1986). Equal opportunity management: Understanding affirmative action and employment equity. Ontario: CCH Canadian Limited.
- Kinder, D. R. (1986). The continuing American dilemma: White resistance to racial change 40 years after Myrdal. Journal of Social Issues, 42, 151-171.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 414-431.
- Kleugel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1983). Affirmative action attitudes: Effects of self-interest, racial effect, and stratification beliefs on whites' views. Social Forces, 61, 797-824.
- Kleugel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). Beliefs about inequality. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Lipset, S. M., & Schneider, W. (1978). The Bakke case: How would it be decided at the bar of public opinion? Public Opinion, 1, 38-44.
- Matheson, K., Echenberg, A., & Taylor, D. M. (1992). Women's attitudes toward affirmative action: The discrimination-affirmative action context. Unpublished manuscript under review.

- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism (pp. 91-125). Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.
- Miller, W. E., Miller, A. H., & Schnieder, E. J. (1980). American national election studies data sourcebook. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ministry of Citizenship. (1991). Working towards equality: The discussion paper on employment equity legislation. Author: Ontario.
- Norris, W. L., & Reardon, M. (1989). Employment screening, qualifications, and gender discrimination: A case study of the New York City firefighters. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 51-63). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Rasinski, K. A. (1987). What's fair is fair-or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 201-211.
- Redway, A. (1992). A matter of fairness: Report of the special committee on the review of the employment equity act. Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Robertson, P. C. (1984). Affirmative action and contract compliance in the United States of America. Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada.
- Schuessler, K. F. (1974). A note on statistical significance of scalogram. In G.M. Maranell (Ed.), Scaling: A sourcebook for behavioral scientists (pp. 197-204). Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1985). Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Secretary of State. (1990). An economic profile of persons with disabilities in Canada. Author: Ottawa.

Sigall, H., & Page, R. (1971). Current stereotypes: A little fading, a little faking.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18, 247-255.

Sowell, T. (1982). Weber and Bakke, and the presuppositions of "affirmative action". In

W. E. Block & M. A. Walker (Eds.), Discrimination, affirmative action, and equal opportunity (pp. 35-63). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Special Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped. (1981).

Obstacles. Ottawa: House of Commons.

Statistics Canada. (1988). The health and activity limitation survey: Selected data for

Canada, provinces and territories. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Tickamyer, A., Scollay, S., Bokemeier, J., & Wood, T. (1989). Administrators'

perceptions of affirmative action in higher education. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J.

Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 125-138). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1988). The influence of identification, collective relative

deprivation, and procedure of implementation on women's response to affirmative

action: A causal modeling approach. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 20, 15-28.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1989). Who likes affirmative action: Attitudinal processes

among men and women. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative

action in perspective (pp. 111-124). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Twiss, C., Tabb, S., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Affirmative action and aggregate data: The

importance of patterns in the perception of discrimination. In F. A. Blanchard &

F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 159-167). New York:

Springer-Verlag.

Appendix A

The Final Questionnaire to be Given to All Full-Time Employees at Carleton University

Please indicate your response by placing an X in the appropriate box. When you are finished, place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and send the sealed envelope through Carleton's inter-office mail system. **Any comments would be gratefully appreciated but please write them on the back of the questionnaire.** Thank You.

Which of the following best describes where you work?

Academic Faculty:

- ☐ Arts
- ☐ Social Sciences
- ☐ Sciences or Computer Sciences
- ☐ Engineering, Architecture or Industrial design

Support Services:

- || Administration departments, technical and administration staff**
- || Academic departments, technical and administration staff**
- || Library**
- || Campus safety**
- || Physical plant**

Other: please specify: _____

Are you: male ☐ or female ☐

Do you consider yourself to be an aboriginal person? Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you consider yourself to be non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour? Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have a physical or mental disability which you believe has seriously limited, or might limit, your chances of getting/keeping a suitable job, or your chances of being promoted? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please read each of the following statements and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
What happens to me should be my own doing	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
People should be allowed to wear turbans to work if their religion expects it	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Those who are well off should help those who are less fortunate	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
People should get what they deserve in life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Homosexual couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexual couples	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Because of their situations, some people couldn't get ahead even if they wanted to	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Most people who are unemployed should try harder to find work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Immigrants should not have the same opportunities as Canadian-born citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate the degree to which you would support the following employment equity policies on a scale from 1 (would not support) to 5 (strongly support). In some cases the term 'underrepresented group' is used. An underrepresented group is a group of individuals (for example, women, aboriginal peoples, members of visible minority groups and people with disabilities) in which the percentage of group members working in a particular job is less than the percentage of qualified group members available for that job.

	Would Not Support			Strongly Support	
	1	2	3	4	5
If two equally qualified applicants are competing for a job, and if one of these applicants is a member of an underrepresented group, then that applicant should be hired	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The process of selecting employees should be modified to ensure that the criteria used for job selection are directly related to job success and are not unfairly biased against a particular group of applicants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employers should try to encourage members of underrepresented groups to apply for a job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
When a group is underrepresented in a particular job, employers should try to hire only members of that group for the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In general, do you support the idea of employment equity policies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please read each of the following statements and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

[illegible]

Appendix B

The Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire

The following questions were given to each subject in the order presented. Instructions were given orally and were also described on the informed consent form attached to the questionnaire (see Appendix C).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Each person deserves to be treated the same as everyone else	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
The more productive a person is, the more he or she should be rewarded	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Every person should have the same opportunity in life regardless of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, age, sex, sexual preference, marital status and religion	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Marks in school should be given solely on a pass or fail basis	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
There are too many people getting something for nothing in this society	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
People should be allowed to wear turbans to work if their religion expects it	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Those who are well off should help those who are less fortunate	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Most people get what they deserve in life	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
People who face disadvantages in life should be compensated for these disadvantages	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Homosexual couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexual couples	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
The government should provide basic services such as health care and legal assistance to everyone free of charge	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Employment Equity 100

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The amount of money a person makes should depend on how hard that person works and how talented that person is	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Because of their situations, some people couldn't get ahead even if they wanted to	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Immigrants should not have the same opportunities as Canadian born citizens	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
The government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic positions of disadvantaged people	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Most people who are unemployed are not trying hard enough to find work	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
A person's success should be based on his or her own abilities	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Every student should have access to university regardless of how well they did in high school.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Competition is unhealthy	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
What happens to me is my own doing	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Clubs that restrict their membership to a certain group of individuals such as males or the wealthy should not be allowed to exist	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
People who don't work hard deserve to be poor	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Appendix C

The Informed Consent Form Used in the Pilot Studies

Informed Consent

The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time.

Coralie Lalonde (Principle Investigator, 728-2046)

Dr. Tom Ryan (Faculty Supervisor, 788-2600, ext. 4025)

Should you have any ethical concerns about this study please contact

Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, 788-2600 ext. 2644)

Dr. W. Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology, 788-2600 ext. 2648)

The purpose of this pilot study is to develop a questionnaire on peoples values and ideologies. These initial questions that will be given to you will be analyzed and then used to make up a more formal questionnaire on the degree to which people support a number of different values.

You will be given a series of statements. You will be asked to read each statement carefully and to place a check mark in the box that corresponds to the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. The entire task takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. There are no potential physical or psychological risks in this experiment.

The data collected in this experiment is confidential. You will not be asked to give your name or to provide any information that may identify you at a later date on the questionnaire. You will only be asked to put check marks in boxes. You will be asked to sign this informed consent form however this information will also be kept confidential.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, you have the right to withdraw from the research at anytime. You do not have to answer any questions that you don't want to answer. If you choose not to participate, or to withdraw, or not to answer a question you may do so without any question and without any penalty.

I have read the above description of this study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in this study.

Participants name:

Participants signature:

Researcher name:

Researcher signature:

Appendix D

The Debriefing Used in the First Pilot Study**Debriefing**

There are two ideologies that are being addressed by the statements on the questionnaire you were given. The first is egalitarianism which is the belief that all people are equal and should have an equal opportunity in life. The second is individualism which is the belief in individual freedom, self-reliance and devotion to work. That is, peoples' achievements are based on their own abilities and willingness to work and that people are responsible for their own successes.

The questionnaire you were given consists of a number of statements that are designed to measure the degree to which a person values the ideologies of egalitarianism and individualism. The information obtained in this pilot study will be used to select the statements that best measure these principles while distinguishing them from each other. The new series of statements will be used in a study on attitudes towards affirmative action policies.

The values of egalitarianism and individualism are quite commonly held in our society however it is not difficult to see how they can sometimes be in conflict with each other. Individualism emphasizes the differences in people in terms of their efforts while egalitarianism emphasizes the equality of people. The hypothesis of the study on attitudes towards affirmative action is that it is this conflict between egalitarian and individualistic values that determines the degree to which an individual will support affirmative action. The more an affirmative action policy violates individualistic values the more likely people are to reject that policy.

If you have any questions regarding this study or wish to learn about the results please contact Coralie Lalonde at 728-2046.

The Second Egalitarianism/Individualism Pilot Questionnaire

The following questions were given to each subject in the order presented. The instructions were given orally and were also described on the informed consent form attached to the questionnaire (see Appendix C).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Each person deserves to be treated the same as everyone else	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
The more productive a person is, the more he or she should be rewarded	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
Marks in school should be given solely on a pass or fail basis	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
There are too many people getting something for nothing in this society	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
People should be allowed to wear turbans to work if their religion expects it	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
Those who are well off should help those who are less fortunate	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
Most people get what they deserve in life	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
People who face disadvantages in life should be compensated for these disadvantages	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
Homosexual couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexual couples	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
The government should provide basic services such as health care and legal assistance to everyone free of charge	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
The amount of money a person makes should depend on how hard that person works and how talented that person is	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}
Because of their situations, some people couldn't get ahead even if they wanted to	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}	{}

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Immigrants should not have the same opportunities as Canadian-born citizens	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
The government should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic positions of disadvantaged people	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Most people who are unemployed are not trying hard enough to find work	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Every student should have access to university regardless of how well they did in high school.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Competition is unhealthy	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
What happens to me is my own doing	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Clubs that restrict their membership to a certain group of individuals such as males or the wealthy should be allowed to exist	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
People who don't work hard deserve to be poor	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I believe in egalitarianism, that is I believe every person should have the same social and political rights and the same opportunities to succeed in life	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I believe in individualism, that is I believe that each person's success in life should be based on the merit, abilities and hard work of that person and that each person is responsible for his or her own success.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Appendix F

The Employment Equity Policy Questions Given to Independent Raters

The following five employment equity policies were each written on a separate 3" by 5" card. At the bottom of each card was a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (does not violate individualism) to 5 (strongly violates individualism). Subjects were asked to put the policies in order of the degree to which they violated the principles of individualism. They were then asked to rate each policy on the degree to which it violates the principle of individualism using the 9-point scale. The policies listed here appear in the order that the investigator rated them on the degree to which they violate the principle of individualism. The order is from least violating to most violating.

1. Nothing should be done to increase the representation of underrepresented groups in a particular job.
2. The process of selecting employees for a job should be examined to ensure that the criteria used for job selection is directly related to future job success and is not biased against a particular group of applicants.
3. Employers should actively try to recruit applicants from groups that are underrepresented in the job position they are trying to fill.
4. If two completely equally qualified applicants are competing for a job, and if one of these applicants is from an underrepresented group, that person should be hired.
5. When a group is underrepresented in a particular job, employers should try to hire only members of that group for the job.

Appendix G

The Cover Letter to Accompany the Questionnaire Package

December 1992

Dear Colleague,

This may be the first time you have received a letter from me that is not involved with fund raising. Instead, I am writing to request your assistance in completing a questionnaire that will enable my student, Coralie Lalonde, to complete her M.A. thesis.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine a theory that attempts to explain the ambivalence associated with peoples' support for employment equity policies. Your participation is, of course, voluntary but we are seeking as broad a response as possible from the Carleton community in order to allow for the most useful analysis. The task takes approximately 10 minutes to complete and we are unaware of any potential physical or psychological risks for participants. Also you do not have to respond to any questions you do not wish to. The data provided in this research are confidential and you will not be asked to give your name nor will any data that may identify you at a later date be made public. You will only be asked to put marks in check boxes.

The results of this research will be made public by the summer of 1993 either in *This Week at Carleton* or through some other public outlet.

This project has the approval of the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology. By virtue of your completion of the questionnaire it will be assumed that you have consented to participate and a separate consent form which would require your name and signature has not been included. The following people are involved in this research and may be contacted at any time.

Coralie Lalonde (Principal Investigator, 788-2600 ext. 2644)

Dr. Tom Ryan (Faculty Supervisor, 788-2600 ext. 4025)

Should you have any ethical concerns about this study, please contact

Dr. Kim Matheson (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee,
788-2600 ext. 7513)

Dr. W. Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology, 788-2600 ext. 2648)

If you agree to participate, an immediate response would be appreciated so that we can get on with the analyses. Simply place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and send it through the University's inter-office mail system. Thank you for taking the time to read this as well as for any assistance provided.

Sincerely

Thomas J. Ryan
Professor

Appendix H

The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Egalitarianism and Individualism Questions

EGALITARIANISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT EGALITARIANISM.

INDIVIDUALISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT INDIVIDUALISM.

Appendix I

The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the Policy Questions

EGALITARIANISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT EGALITARIANISM.

INDIVIDUALISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT INDIVIDUALISM.

SUPPORT

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT FOR THE POLICY

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT AGAINST THE POLICY

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT BOTH FOR AND AGAINST THE POLICY

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT SUPPORT

SUPPORT-OTHER

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT OFFERS AN EXPLANATION OF SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT OFFER AN EXPLANATION OF SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT OFFERS AN EXPLANATION OF SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY.

PLEASE LIST EXPLANATIONS FOR SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY (INCLUDE THE ID NUMBER FOR EACH EXPLANATION AND INDICATE WHETHER THE EXPLANATION IS FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY).

CONFLICT

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN EGALITARIANISM AND INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN EGALITARIANISM AND SOMETHING OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIVIDUALISM AND SOMETHING OTHER THAN EGALITARIANISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN SOMETHING OTHER THAN EGALITARIANISM AND INDIVIDUALISM

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT A CONFLICT.

Appendix J

The Content Analysis Scoring Sheets for the General Comments

EGALITARIANISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS EGALITARIANISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT EGALITARIANISM.

INDIVIDUALISM

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A POSITIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM IN A NEGATIVE DIRECTION

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM, BUT UNSURE OF THE DIRECTION

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT INDIVIDUALISM.

SUPPORT-GENERAL
(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT FOR EE POLICIES

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT AGAINST EE POLICIES

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT BOTH FOR AND AGAINST EE POLICIES

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS SUPPORT

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT SUPPORT.

SUPPORT-OTHER
(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

**THIS COMMENT OFFERS AN EXPLANATION OF SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST
EE POLICIES**

**THIS COMMENT DOES NOT OFFER AN EXPLANATION OF SUPPORT FOR OR
AGAINST EE POLICIES**

**UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT OFFERS AN EXPLANATION OF
SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST EE POLICIES.**

**PLEASE LIST EXPLANATIONS FOR SUPPORT FOR OR AGAINST THE POLICY
(INCLUDE THE ID NUMBER FOR EACH EXPLANATION AND INDICATE
WHETHER THE EXPLANATION IS FOR OR AGAINST EE POLICIES).**

CONFLICT

(PLEASE MARK EACH ID NUMBER IN ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES)

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN EGALITARIANISM AND INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN EGALITARIANISM AND SOMETHING OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIVIDUALISM AND SOMETHING OTHER THAN EGALITARIANISM

THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT BETWEEN SOMETHING OTHER THAN EGALITARIANISM AND INDIVIDUALISM

UNSURE AS TO WHETHER THIS COMMENT REFLECTS A CONFLICT

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REFLECT A CONFLICT.

END

15-1 2-93

FIN