

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE MANITOBA CIVIL SERVICE

- AN EXAMINATION -

A Thesis

**Submitted to the Joint Discipline Committee
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTERS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg

by

**© Kenneth W. Kowalski
Student Number: 0523375
April, 1988**

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-47910-8

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE MANITOBA CIVIL SERVICE
-AN EXAMINATION-

BY

KENNETH W. KOWALSKI

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

© 1988

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the attitudes of provincial government employees toward the Manitoba Government's Affirmative Action Program. A 1980 Transport Canada study on the differences between male and female civil servant attitudes toward the Federal Government's Equal Opportunity for Women Program established a comparative base for this study's format and analysis.

The Transport Canada research was designed to examine the extent to which males and females actually received differential treatment and to examine the goals, expectations and work attitudes of men and women in the Department. There were significant differences in attitudes between the male and female employees toward work-related initiatives; men exhibited a more negative attitude toward these initiatives; and women did not want special privileges or preferential treatment during their employ. In addition, the Transport Canada researchers concluded that programs designed to provide preferential treatment to one group over another would tend to foster negative attitudes on the part of those affected by such programming. Based on these results, it was predicted that the attitudes of Provincial civil servants toward the Affirmative Action Program, focussing as it did on preferential treatment for target groups, would be negative as well.

A questionnaire was mailed to 946 provincial civil service employees. The 245 responses were analyzed to examine the differences in attitude between the male/female respondents and the target/non-target group respondents.

It was concluded that, consistent with the Transport Canada study, the Manitoba Government's Affirmative Action Program has a low level of acceptance by its employees and that, in general, the Provincial civil servant has a negative attitude toward the program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to a number of people whose support, guidance and encouragement assisted in the completion of this thesis.

First to my thesis advisor, Dr. Nina Colwill, whose constant input of ideas, analysis expertise and encouragement even at great distances sustained the author throughout the study. In addition, I must acknowledge the technical support provided by Ms Marcy Pollock and Dr. Ken McVicar.

I am obliged to all those civil servants who felt strongly enough about the subject matter to complete and return the questionnaire. In this regard, I am grateful to Mr. Paul Hart, the Manitoba Civil Service Commission and the members of the Central Affirmative Action Steering Committee for their support and their agreement that the subject matter warranted exploration.

To my friend and daunting word processing ace, Cindy, whose patience throughout the thesis preparation was reassuring, a heartfelt thank you is due.

The patience, understanding and support of my wife Valerie and daughter Dana throughout the seemingly endless process was a source of encouragement and strength that may never be repaid.

Finally to my parents who instilled a great sense of value to the pursuit of higher education a great debt is owed. Particularly to my mother, Elizabeth, who would be especially proud, this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Background	11
Methodology	26
Results	33
Discussion	54
Conclusion and Recommendations	63
Appendices	71
References	96

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Typical Monitoring Matrix	25
Table 2 Salary as a Function of Sex	34
Table 3 Target Grouping Membership as a Function of Sex	36
Table 4 Self-Declared as a Function of Sex	37
Table 5 Self-Declared as a Function of Target Group Membership	39
Table 6 Target Group Member as a Function of Target Group Membership	40
Table 7 Major Variable Grouping Correlations	42
Table 8 Means, Standard Deviations and <u>T</u> -Tests for Advertising Statements as a Function of Target Group Membership	45
Table 9 Means, Standard Deviations and <u>T</u> -Tests for Advertising Statements as a Function of Sex	47
Table 10 Means and Paired <u>T</u> -Tests for Advertising Statements as a Function of Target Group Membership and Sex	48
Table 11 Means, Standard Deviations and <u>T</u> -Tests for Target Group Membership Scores	51
Table 12 Means, Standard Deviations and <u>T</u> -Tests for Male and Female Scores	52

INTRODUCTION

Affirmative Action has existed as a concept in some form or another for better than three decades. Over this period the principle of affirmative action has been expressed in a variety of ways. The method of expression has depended, to a large extent, on the definition of the phrase itself.

In an historical context, the first use of the phrase "affirmative action" is linked to an Executive Order issued by President Kennedy in 1961 (Kelly, 1986). Executive Order 10925 was designed to address employment discrimination in relation to Federal Government contract compliance. Previous orders had had similar purposes, in that equal opportunity in the employment process was a concept rooted in the equal rights movement. Order 10925 is reported as being the first attempt to legislate the principle of affirmative action in the employment process. Under this Executive Order, a contractor was required to take proactive employment action within its workforce in order to bid on federal contracts successfully. The Order outlined procedures for the systematic implementation of equal opportunity recruitment, selection and training. In addition, it created the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) to oversee the implementation of the Order. This Federal agency was a landmark in the field of social policy.

These first attempts of the Order and its associated monitoring agency had somewhat less than a clear and precise mandate, including the absence of enforcement authority. Social policy legislation and the respective attempts to enforce legislative compliance are often difficult. As Lance Roberts (1982), a sociologist at the University of Manitoba, noted: "To know what policy makers mean when they talk of affirmative action is not always easy. Affirmative action involves political action and, as we all realize, the language of politics is notoriously obscure."

Given the relative obscurity of political reformation, the evolution of affirmative action can be portrayed as the latest generation of policies designed to provide remedial action to historic inaction. Whereas past policies have seemed to concentrate on the employment processes and practices, they have fallen short of addressing employment attitudes and behaviors.

The notion of equality in employment is not new, as evidenced by Executive Order 10925, but does provide a continuing basis for debate on the correction of prevailing employment injustices. As the Abella Report (1984) states: "... equality is thus a process - a process of constant and flexible examination, of vigilant introspection, and of aggressive open-mindedness."

The Report of the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment (1984) by Judge Rosalie Abella is a formative document - a document that has received critical acclaim for its unique insight into employment equality and distributive justice. Abella maintains that: "Equality in employment is not a concept that produces the same results for everyone. It is a concept that seeks to identify and remove, barrier by barrier, discriminatory disadvantages."

Affirmative Action is a fundamental extension to a society's attempt to reconcile human rights, discrimination, and social justice. Actions directed only at particular peoples have been a part of our societal fabric for as long as we have recorded our actions. Dr. David Hunter (1979) commented on this struggle by saying:

Modern day human rights legislation is predicated on the theory that the actions of prejudiced people and their attitudes can be changed and influenced by the process of re-education, discussion and presentation of dispassionate socio-scientific materials that are used to challenge popular myths and stereotypes about people...

The attempts to secure equity in our multi-cultural society over the last three decades have witnessed a wide variety of progressive efforts to eliminate discrimination. Prejudice and discrimination are central to this issue. Discrimination is the outward

manifestation of our prejudices toward particular peoples. Employment discrimination is of three types: intentional discrimination, unequal treatment, and systemic discrimination.

Intentional discrimination focuses on the prejudice of an employer, on specific prohibited discriminatory behaviour exhibited by an employer towards an employee, or by one employee towards another identifiable employee. The refusal to hire a candidate for a position because of race, sex, or disability, even though the candidate is adequately qualified, is an example of intentional discrimination.

Another distinct form of employment discrimination is that of unequal treatment. Also called differential discrimination, it focuses on differential or comparative treatment according to sex, ethnicity, religious belief, and ability. This occurs when the actions of an employer create methods and procedures in the workplace that result in unwarranted treatment of groups on prohibited grounds. Questions about child-care arrangements asked of a woman but not of a man during an employment interview represent unequal treatment because such arrangements are not job-related and can be used to disqualify female applicants.

The last distinct form of employment discrimination is systemic. This type of discrimination does not arise as a function of individuals interacting

with individuals, but because of individuals' interactions with an employment system. These systems unintentionally ingrain unjustifiable employment criteria into their recruitment and selection processes - criteria that disadvantage specific groups in the population. Systemic discrimination means that an arbitrary barrier stands between a person's ability and his or her opportunity to demonstrate that ability. An example would be the use of mandatory height and weight criteria for employment in certain job classifications. If these selection criteria cannot be justified as a "bona fide occupational qualification" for the job, it would be considered a discriminatory barrier for certain classes of people. A weight restriction of 185 pounds coupled with a minimum height restriction of six feet would exclude many visible minorities and women from employment eligibility. The central issue here is whether the employment criteria are essential to the safe and effective operation of the job to which they apply. If the criteria cannot be justified, they would be deemed to be systemically discriminatory. In most cases this type of discrimination occurs as a result of historical practice. Over time, some employment eligibility criteria become accepted, not because they are valid and justifiable, but merely because they have existed for many years.

The Abella Report (1984) summarizes the discrimination issue as it relates to equality in employment as follows:

Equality in employment means that no one is denied opportunity for reasons that have nothing to do with inherent ability. It means equal access free from arbitrary obstructions. Discrimination means that an arbitrary barrier stands between a person's ability and his or her opportunity to demonstrate it. If the access is genuinely available in a way that permits everyone who wishes the opportunity to fully develop his or her potential, we have achieved a kind of equality. It is equally defined as equal freedom from discrimination.

Cohen (1982) addressed the importance of redressing the presence of employment discrimination in the context of sound business practice.

Canadian companies are finding that elimination of systemic discrimination and establishment of special measures to increase their utilization of women, native people and physically disabled people make sound business sense. The reason is that in essence, affirmative action is a part of overall human resource planning, and the management of human resources is one of the most important challenges facing business organizations today.

Sound human resource planning is considered to be no less important in the public sector. The challenge will be to accomplish affirmative action goals within the context of the public sector environment.

It is important at this point to discuss the semantics of equality in employment. A publication called Affirmative Action for Women in Canada goes to some length to point out that: "... this insistence on positive movement helps to distinguish affirmative action from the more passive policies of equal employment opportunity which only demand a neutral attitude for the employer" (Hendlesz, 1982, 10). In contrast, the Abella report notes that a new neutral term, "employment equity", "... be adopted to describe programs of positive remedy for discrimination in the Canadian workplace. No great principle is sacrificed in exchanging phrases of disputed definition for newer ones that may be more accurate and less destructive of reasonable debate" (Abella, 1984).

Thus an employment equity program can be defined as an affirmative action program if some form of positive action or preferential treatment is being implemented as the means of achieving the desired results. In practice, however, many "equal opportunity" programs employ preferential treatment measures in the same manner as do "affirmative action" programs. Consequently, the program itself must be examined in order to identify if any attendant preferential treatment is present.

Much of the discussion in this thesis focuses on two programs: the Equal Opportunity Program for Women in the Federal Government and the Affirmative Action Program

in the Manitoba Provincial Government. Although entitled differently, each of these programs use preferential treatment to achieve equality, and thus represent examples of the controversy surrounding the terminology debate.

STUDY HYPOTHESIS:

The present study was conducted in order to gain information on the attitudes of the general civil service population toward a number of aspects of the Affirmative Action Program. The data provided a basis for comparison between various representative groups within the workforce. Critical aspects of the Affirmative Action Program of particular interest were the attitudinal differences between target group and non-target group members. It was hoped that this study would identify the strengths and weaknesses of the policy's application and create a foundation for practical remedial recommendations.

This research was modelled on Colwill and Josephson's (1980) study of the Central Region of Transport Canada. In 1979 they measured employees' attitudes toward and opinions of the implementation of the Federal Government's 1975 Equal Opportunities for Women Program, focussing on the need for such a program and the actions that should be taken to implement the program. Primary data in the Colwill and Josephson study were

collected through mail-out questionnaires to all Central Region Transport Canada employees.

The present study concentrated on a unique subset of equal opportunity programming and looked at the employees' attitudes toward the policy's component parts more closely. Like the Colwill and Josephson study, the present research involved a comprehensive attitude survey that was mailed to prospective respondents. However, this study involved a cross-section of Provincial Government employees from a number of departments.

The Colwill and Josephson study (1980) examined differences in Federal Government employees' attitudes toward a gender-biased program. The Federal Equal Opportunity for Women Program was designed to enhance the opportunities for women in the Federal Public Service. Their study concluded that the Federal Government:

... need not and should not give women special privileges. Special privileges are an insult to women and the antithesis of equal opportunity; and women, at least in our study, did not ask for them. Preferential treatment oversimplifies a complex situation and benefits the few rather than the majority.

In drawing that conclusion, Colwill and Josephson also noted that the male respondents feared the Equal Opportunity for Women Program, in that it was, or that

they feared that it would become, a program for the preferential treatment of women. The study concluded that female respondents did not ask for special favours and that the introduction of preferential treatment would result in a negative reaction from both women and men. It recommended a gender-neutral program including the use of bridging positions, underfilling, and non-sexist promotions - one that would assist all employees within the Civil Service equally and redress some of the inequity without implementing a preferential program for women.

The current study seeks to examine similar attitudinal reactions to the Affirmative Action Program in the Manitoba Provincial Government. The Affirmative Action Program is intended to preferentially treat specified groups of people. Like the Equal Opportunity for Women Program in the federal system, the provincial Affirmative Action Program would provide differential treatment of its employees in order to redress historic under-representation and to establish a system of employment equity. Thus it is hypothesized that Manitoba's Affirmative Action Program will have generated negative reactions among provincial employees, as measured by a survey of their workplace attitudes.

BACKGROUND

Affirmative Action Programs have existed in Canada in some form for more than three decades. In Manitoba, however, affirmative action programming in the public sector began in earnest in the early 1970's. This preliminary initiative was rooted in a study produced by a committee of Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba in 1973. The report, Women in the Manitoba Civil Service, recommended the formation of a taskforce on equal employment opportunities.

In 1974, the taskforce completed its report on employment practices and patterns in the Manitoba Civil Service. The Report of the Task Force on Equal Opportunities in the Civil Service contained two major recommendations based on its findings. The first recommendation outlined the establishment of an Affirmative Action Program to ensure equal opportunities within the government service for all Manitobans and outlined that this commitment to the philosophy and goals of such a program be demonstrated at the outset by a public directive from the Premier. The second recommendation suggested that the Government, through the cooperation of the Manitoba Civil Service Commission and the operating Departments, should design, implement and evaluate more innovative recruitment, selection, and training programs to ensure that visible minority groups, women, and the physically disabled would be adequately

represented in the Civil Service (Civil Service Commission, 1977).

By the late 1970's, the Civil Service Commission established the Career Planning Office (CPO) which would have three mandates: to expedite and coordinate the development and the implementation of affirmative action plans throughout the government service; to become involved in cooperative efforts to remove arbitrary barriers to employment access and career advancement in the Civil Service; and to improve and expand training opportunities in general. Following the creation of the Career Planning Office, on November 21, 1975, then Premier Edward Schreyer announced the following equal employment opportunity policy:

The Manitoba Government is committed to the concept of equal employment opportunities in the Civil Service for those groups of Manitobans who appear to have been barred from fair and meaningful participation in the labour force: women, Native people, older workers and the physically, mentally and economically handicapped. Positive efforts will be undertaken to ensure equal opportunity for members of these groups both in securing Civil Service employment and in career advancement within the Civil Service.

All Ministers and Deputy Ministers will be responsible for the development and implementation of affirmative action programs in their departments. The Career Planning Office of the Civil Service Commission will provide guidance

and assistance in the development and monitoring of programs. All departments will be required to file their departmental affirmative action programs with the Career Planning Office in the next fiscal year and provide for any necessary additional funding of approved programs in their 1977-78 departmental estimates. Our goal will be to ensure that the designated groups will be appropriately represented at all levels of employment in the Civil Service.

Schreyer's policy announcement was the first step in implementing an Affirmative Action Program in the Provincial Civil Service. The policy recognized that every individual must receive a fair chance for access to training, employment, and advancement, and that special programs must be developed in order to provide this access where it has been denied in the past. Under this special effort, the aged and the mentally disabled were designated for assistance with respect to recruitment and selection activities. A promotional brochure, published by the Career Planning Office (1976), noted that there was evidence available to indicate that the problems associated with age and mental disabilities were apparent only during recruitment and selection, and that affirmative measures should be undertaken only in terms of these processes.

A policy such as this, designed to assist specific, designated groups, runs the risk of being perceived by many employees of the Civil Service as

discriminatory. However, Manitoba's social justice legislation, enacted in preceding years, protects the rights of an individual against such discrimination. Through Section 9, the Manitoba Human Rights Act (SM 1974) provides the Human Rights Commission with the ability to approve affirmative action programs. Specifically, Section 9 provides that:

... the Commission may, upon such conditions or limitations and subject to revocation or suspension, approve in writing any special plan or program by the Crown, any agency thereof, or any person, to increase the employment of members of a group or class of persons on the basis of race, nationality, religion, colour, sex, age, marital status, ethnic or national origin of the members of the group or class of persons.

At its July 9, 1976 meeting, the Manitoba Human Rights Commission (MHRC) "...granted conditional and tentative approval to the Career Planning Branch to proceed with an affirmative action program under Section 9 of the Human Rights Act ..." (Moats, 1977). This approval was conditional on the CPO, as the plan sponsor, approving each specific departmental affirmative action plan. Once this condition was met, the overall program would be approved by the MHRC. This would effectively waive Section 6 of the Human Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination in employment.

In addition, the MHRC cautioned the Career Planning Office that despite this approval, the Commission was obliged to investigate any complaints of "reverse discrimination" that might be brought to its attention, in accordance with Section 20 of the Act, which states that: "The Commission shall, as soon as is reasonably possible, investigate any complaint of an alleged contravention of the Act" (Human Rights Act, 1974).

"Reverse discrimination" is an expression that has developed in conjunction with employment equity programming. Affirmative action policies, as an implicit part of their operational mandate, delineate a variety of implementation measures that clearly advocate the use of preferential treatment to assist identified target groups. Consequently, non-target group people often see the preferential treatment of the target group people as being discrimination against non-target groups. This "reverse" discrimination is a central point of contention in any such proactive effort.

Throughout 1977 and into 1978, government departments, in cooperation with the Career Planning Office, worked within the context of the overall policy by assessing the current representative status of each designated group and by developing their respective remedial programs. As a result of the 1977 election whereby the Progressive Conservative Party formed the

government, the efforts of the Career Planning Office to implement the affirmative action policy were truncated. By mid-1978, the Career Planning Office was disbanded and affirmative action plans, per se, were abandoned. This is not to say, however, that the Conservative government abandoned the concept of affirmative action entirely. Rather, it seems that they chose to play an advocacy role with respect to promoting affirmative action principles through an Equal Opportunity Council.

The New Democratic Party was returned to power in 1982 and at that time reaffirmed its commitment to redressing employment inequities. In contrast to the policy introduced by the Schreyer administration, the forthcoming policy was developed in concert with representatives of the Manitoba Government Employees Association (MGEA). The addition of the MGEA in the policy process established the framework for a cooperative effort to address issues and to achieve goals. The forthcoming policy went further than the Schreyer program in its clarity of purpose and its goals.

By June 1983, the Province and the MGEA signed a joint policy statement to establish an Affirmative Action Program for departments and agencies governed by the Civil Service Act. The intent of the policy was to ensure that Manitobans who have been underrepresented in the Government in the past have equal access to employment

within the Civil Service and a reasonable career path within that employ. The policy statement, signed by the Honourable Al Mackling, the Minister responsible, and Gary Doer, President of the MGEA (1983), stated:

The Government of Manitoba and the M.G.E.A. are committed to the concept of Affirmative Action, to redress existing discriminatory barriers, and to enhance promotion and equality of treatment within the provincial government for women, physically disabled persons, natives and visible minorities.

The union and government agree jointly to ensure Manitobans underrepresented in government employ have access to employment and opportunity for career path development within that employ, consistent with the Civil Service Act and relevant collective agreements. While the present restraint on hiring throughout the Civil Service will make it more difficult to implement Affirmative Action policies, both parties recognize the need to lay the groundwork for more equitable systems. To this end a joint union/management Affirmative Action Committee will be established both at the central and departmental level. This committee will design a plan that will include outreach recruitment, special training and management development programs to redress the effects of past practices and to accelerate equalized representation in the work force. Given the systemic discrimination across Departments in the clerical category, the Central Committee will also develop specific strategies and action to accelerate the promotion of persons classified in this category.

Joint union/management committees in each Department were established to design monitoring strategies and to develop out-reach recruitment systems, career development initiatives, and methods to accelerate the promotion of clerical staff. And, as in the past, the program established groups of people on whom these efforts would be targetted.

Under the 1983 Program, target groups were defined as those groups of people who are underrepresented in all job categories in the workforce plus a special emphasis on the clerical category of employees. The term "workforce" is meant to include all government departments and all crown agencies covered by the Manitoba Civil Service Act (1960). An informational brochure (Civil Service Commission, 1986) provided the following definitions of the target groups:

Native: includes Status Indians, Non-Status Indians, Metis and Inuit.

Physically Disabled: includes persons with physical disability, infirmity, malformations or disfigurations caused by bodily injury, birth defects or illness and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes epilepsy, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech

impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or a wheelchair or other appliance or device.

Visible Minority: includes all non-white Canadians, with the exception of native Indians and Inuit. Included are Blacks, Chinese, Japanese, South Asians, Southeast Asians and Latin Americans.

In addition to these target groups, women in occupations nontraditional for their sex were included as a target group and the employees in the clerical category were identified for special treatment. The target group "women" does require some discussion however. An effort would be made to eliminate systemic barriers, and to provide special opportunities for women to be recruited or advanced only into job roles nontraditional for their sex. However, for monitoring purposes, all female employees were considered as members of the target group "women".

The Program established representational goals for each of the target groups as follows:

Women make up 50% of the Manitoba population, natives 10%, physically disabled 7%, and visible minorities 6%. The long-range goal is to have the Manitoba Civil Service reflect this representation in all job classifications, taking into account relevant labour force data. Annual targets and timetables will be set based on the availability of qualified target group candidates

for different job classifications, so that practical results can be achieved and monitored on a yearly basis. (Civil Service Commission, 1986).

The Affirmative Action Program recognized that any regional or geographic differences in target group member levels would be unavoidable but that in a province-wide aggregate any geographic representational anomalies would be averaged.

The program also delineated the following three major objectives (Civil Service Commission, 1986):

1. to ensure that women, natives, physically disabled persons and visible minorities are fairly represented throughout the Manitoba Job Classification System;
2. to identify and eliminate discrimination in employment systems of the Civil Service;
3. to provide special measures to remedy the effects of past discrimination in Provincial Government employment.

In order to begin implementing the policy, the Affirmative Action Committee infrastructure had to be instituted. Centrally, a Provincial Coordinator position was established to work with a committee of three MGEA representatives and three senior government representatives. Each department established committees of similar size and representation.

Each Department Committee began to develop its respective plans in concert with the overall policy/legislative framework and was requested to ensure that its plan reflected Affirmative action and equality principles. The planning process was divided into four phases and included the following activities and responsibilities:

Phase I - ORIENTATION: a commitment made by the organization which included the appointment of an Affirmative Action Coordinator reporting to the Deputy Minister; a statement issued by the Minister to all staff outlining the department's commitment; the appointment of a six-member Departmental Committee to oversee the departmental program.

Phase II - ANALYSIS: data collection on existing departmental staff profiles in terms of existing representation levels by job cluster through self-declaration, historical staffing/recruitment patterns, turnover statistics, salary distribution across target groups and job clusters; employment systems reviewed in concert with central agencies to eliminate systemic employment barriers.

Phase III - DESIGN: numerical targets established, based upon departmental staff turnover rates, existing population profile, predicted rates of qualified target group candidate availability in specific under-represented job clusters; recruitment, selection, promotion, classification and training systems reviewed and appropriate upgrades made; special measures designed in the areas of promotional advertising, educational seminars, and in-service career development incentives; appropriate statistical monitoring/reporting methods established.

Phase IV - IMPLEMENTATION: plans reviewed, approved and filed with the Central Steering Committee and the Human Rights Commission; regular progress reports produced; results measured against goals and short-term targets revised in concert with evolving patterns.

The Central Committee required each department to report its progress and/or to seek approval for each phase completed. The entire plan had to be submitted for approval on or before February, 1985.

While the Central Committee provided overall direction, regular meetings of Departmental Coordinators dealt with the technical details of analysis and design. It remained the responsibility of the individual Departmental Committees to develop a plan that could work within their own unique population and job classification mix.

Guidelines, such as self-declaration form design and timetable scheduling, were established through Committee forums. Techniques for developing an accurate baseline picture of the existing employee population blend were debated. This baseline was a critical component of the design phase. It was imperative that departments establish, to the best of their abilities, their departmental profiles (the number of members of each target group that were currently represented in their respective staff complement). As the self-declaration process was completely voluntary, forecasting short-term goals based solely on self-declaration returns could be suspect.

The issue of voluntary self-declaration is both sensitive and controversial. After much discussion, the Central Committee decided that a combination of progressive methods would be acceptable in determining the representational levels. That is, if, after the self-declaration canvass, it was the opinion of the Departmental Committee that a low response rate

contributed to an unrealistic count of their target group population, the Departmental Coordinator could approach those "visually identifiable" target group staff members to encourage their self-declaration.

The departmental plan was to delineate, over the program's 20-year mandate, a systematic and progressive outline of numerical targets to be achieved. These numerical goals were to be established for each target group and arranged into some convenient job classification groupings. A matrix was developed with the target groups on one axis and the job classification groups on the other.

The departmental long-range and short-range goals and numerical targets were established using the job classification cluster-target group matrix. Table 1 illustrates a typical example of a matrix used by departments to monitor and report progress. Job classifications were clustered by using the existing civil service job family system that grouped job classifications by similar job function. For example, all clerical jobs would be grouped; all professional classifications would be grouped; all administrative functions would be grouped. This system facilitated the monitoring process that would occur regularly throughout the program's time line.

Once departmental plans were approved, the implementation phase could begin.

TABLE 1
TYPICAL MONITORING MATRIX
(for monitoring progress toward goals)

TARGET GROUP: WOMEN

<u>Job Cluster</u>	<u>Benchmark*</u>		<u>Actual</u>		<u>Goal</u>
	<u>December 1985</u>		<u>October 1987</u>		<u>March 1991</u>
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Managerial	1	8.3	0	0.0	16.7
Professional	14	17.5	18	21.4	25
Technical	7	20.0	7	17.9	28.6
Administrative	4	36.4	5	41.7	45.5
Clerical	<u>52</u>	<u>89.7</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>92.3</u>	<u>81.0</u>
	78	39.8	78	39.0	42.9

* Benchmark: the date that would be used as the comparative point for future goal assessment.

METHODOLOGY

This study will examine the extent to which the predictions made by Colwill and Josephson for Transport Canada in 1980 hold true for the employees of the Manitoba Civil Service today. The recommendations of the Transport Canada study identified that the use of preferential treatment would result in a negative attitudinal reaction by employees toward the program. Similarly, the Affirmative Action Program uses preferential treatment to accomplish its goals. It was predicted, that therefore employees of the Manitoba Civil Service would have reacted negatively to the Affirmative Action Program.

STUDY DESIGN AND PRE-TEST:

The questionnaire design for this study was modeled after the Colwill and Josephson Transport Canada study instrument. Both instruments used a combination of closed and free-answer questions to assess respondent attitudes toward a variety of variables. However, the Transport Canada study instrument probed attitudes toward career advancement and development opportunities more deeply than did this study, while the instrument employed in the current study examined attitudes toward the Affirmative Action Program.

Twenty-five employees of Manitoba Energy and Mines were asked to complete a preliminary version of the questionnaire. These volunteers were known to the author and represented a number of different positions and classifications. Each respondent was asked to take the questionnaire home and to complete it as if it had been received at home in the mail. In addition, the respondents were asked to comment on the questionnaire design and question clarity.

The comments and suggestions of the 22 pre-test respondents were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The pre-test yielded no substantive changes but resulted in question re-ordering for better flow between question groupings. Data from the pre-test were not included in the study which is reported here.

STUDY PERMISSION:

As the Civil Service Commission maintains a comprehensive data base on all provincial employees, access to the data base was critical in order to extract the names and home addresses of the proposed sample. To that end, Paul Hart, the Civil Service Commissioner, was approached to seek his approval for access to the confidential information on the employees. Mr. Hart agreed to the proposal in principle on behalf of the Civil

Service Commission but requested that the research concept be presented for approval to the Central Affirmative Action Steering Committee.

On April 17, 1986, the study proposal was presented to the Central Steering Committee. The Committee, comprised of three senior Staff Representatives of the M.G.E.A. and three Deputy Ministers, provided constructive comments on question format and asked for the inclusion of questions of particular interest to the Committee. Questions requested by the Committee which were consistent with the aims of the study were included in the questionnaire. The unanimous approval of the Central Committee was forthcoming.

STUDY RESPONDENTS:

The Manitoba Employee Information System (MEIS), which contains the names and addresses of approximately 17 800 Provincial civil servants, was sorted by home address postal code group. Every sixth name and address in each postal code group was selected for the sample. This yielded a sample of 1 200, or 6.74% of the total population. The sample was then culled to remove the names and addresses of MLA's and of civil servants in small rural communities where the sample yielded less than four possible respondents. The balance of the names and addresses were subsequently printed on mailing labels.

A portion of the resulting sample included a number of rural employees who lived in communities that did not enjoy the benefit of the government's inter-departmental mail service. The labels for these rural employees were applied to a covering envelope with the correct postage and mailed through the national postal system.

A final total of 946 questionnaires (5.3% of the entire Civil Service population) was mailed by the end of July, 1986. The cut-off date for response acceptance was set at the end of September 1986.

STUDY INSTRUMENT:

The questionnaire package (Appendix A) consisted of the following components:

1. a covering letter over the signature of the Civil Service Commissioner, Paul Hart, introducing the survey and ensuring respondent anonymity;
2. a copy of the questionnaire;
3. either a self-addressed inter-departmental return envelope (to Winnipeg respondents) or a self-addressed, stamped manilla return envelope (to rural respondents).

The questionnaire was comprised of 90 items and was divided into two questioning formats: the first

format involved fixed-alternative (closed) questions, the second format used open-ended (free answer) questions. The response categories, in most instances, were represented by a 5-point Likert (1932) scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement. For example:

1. I am satisfied with my present job.
strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

Likert-type items were used to supply attitudinal data on various aspects of the affirmative action program. However, other types of multiple-choice questions were used for items with clear dichotomous choices (e.g. "yes" or "no"; "male" or "female") or a finite number of choice possibilities.

Open-ended or free-answer items were used either to allow respondents to explain a preceding response or to discuss, in their own words, their feelings about a specific aspect of the program. In addition, the study included open-ended questions that allowed respondents to identify broad sweeping concerns. For example, Item 33 reads:

33. Do you have any suggestions that would assist you in understanding what the Affirmative Action Program is and does?

Each individual dependent variable was clustered into logical groups that identify the respondents feelings

toward the study's attitudinal testing premise. The variable groupings chosen to categorize the employees attitudes are as follows:

1. Job Satisfaction: This variable was assessed by asking how subjects like their job and whether they would like an increase or decrease in responsibility (see Appendix A, Item 1).

2. Feelings of Confidence in the Hiring/Promotion System: This variable was tested by asking respondents how fair they perceived the government's system of hiring/promoting to be and whether they felt that the Affirmative Action Program had changed their feelings (see Appendix A, Items 5a-6a).

3. Understanding About Affirmative Action Program: The respondents' understanding of the program were tested with these two variables (see Appendix A, Item 9).

4. Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment and Quotas: Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with preferential treatment and quota statements [see Appendix A, Items 9c, 9g, 9h, 9e (reversed)].

5. Positive Effects: Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements about the positive effects of the program (see Appendix A, Items 9d, 9f, 9i, 9j).

6. Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action Objectives:

Attitudes toward the objectives of the program were tested (see Appendix A, Item 12).

7. Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action Special Measures:

Respondent attitudes towards the implementation of a number of special measures were tested (see Appendix A, Item 14).

8. Attitudes Toward Employment Barriers: Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that various employment barriers disadvantage each of the target groups (see Appendix A, Item 21).

RESULTS

A total of 245 mail-out questionnaires were returned, representing a return rate of 25.9% based on the 946 questionnaires distributed for the study. Data were analyzed using the SAS software package (Nie, et al, 1975) on the University of Manitoba's Amdal mainframe computer via a remote terminal.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS:

The respondent group (N = 245) was composed of 116 females (47.3% of sample) and 115 males (46.9% of sample) with 14 people (5.8% of sample) giving no response to the gender question. At the time of the study the female/male mix in the Civil Service population was 51% and 49% respectively. The group ranged in age from 22 to 64 years of age. The age distribution within the group was relatively even, with no noticeable clustering around one particular age. The majority of responses (164 or 71.9%) were from civil servants in Winnipeg.

A number of demographic variables was cross-tabulated in order to examine their combined frequencies. Table 2 outlines the cross-tabulation of sex by salary.

A salary range of \$15,000 to \$34,999 included 82.6% of the female respondents, whereas 96.2% of the male respondents earned a salary in the \$20,000 to \$50,000 and

TABLE 2

SALARY AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

N = 213

<u>SALARY</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>MALE</u>	
under \$10,000	3 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.4%)
\$10,000 - \$14,999	4 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.9%)
\$15,000 - \$19,999	28 (25.7%)	4 (3.8%)	32 (25.0%)
\$20,000 - \$24,999	33 (30.3%)	9 (8.7%)	42 (19.7%)
\$25,000 - \$29,999	18 (16.5%)	17 (16.3%)	35 (16.4%)
\$30,000 - \$34,999	11 (10.1%)	20 (19.2%)	31 (14.6%)
\$35,000 - \$39,999	5 (4.6%)	21 (20.2%)	26 (12.2%)
\$40,000 - \$44,999	6 (4.6%)	15 (14.4%)	21 (9.9%)
\$45,000 - \$49,999	1 (0.9%)	9 (8.7%)	10 (4.7%)
\$50,000 or over	<u>1 (0.9%)</u>	<u>9 (8.7%)</u>	<u>10 (4.7%)</u>
	110 (100%)	104 (100%)	214 (100%)

over range. A \$5,000 salary differential existed between male civil servants and their female counterparts at the lower end of the salary range (\leq \$15,000). In addition, at the high end of the salary scale, 31.7% of the males earned in excess of \$40,000, whereas only 6.4% of the females earned salaries in excess of that amount.

Item 31c asked respondents to identify the target group to which they belonged. Responses to this question were collapsed into two responses: "yes" was used to indicate that respondents had chosen one of the target group categories, whereas "no" indicated that no category had been chosen. Table 3 delineates the dichotomized variables of sex differences by target group membership (all female employees are included in the target group "women"). The majority of the females (101 or 87.1%) indicated a positive response to target group membership, while the majority of males (96 or 83.5%) responded negatively to the question.

Item 31a asked if the respondent had voluntarily self-declared as a member of a target group (see Table 4). The majority of the male respondents (99, or 89.2%) said that they did not intend to self-declare, whereas 57, or 50.4% of the females indicated either that they had self-declared or that they planned to self-declare.

TABLE 3

TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

<u>GROUP MEMBERSHIP</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>MALE</u>	
Target Group	101 (87.1%)	19 (16.5%)	120 (51.9%)
Non-Target Group	<u>15 (12.9%)</u>	<u>96 (83.5%)</u>	<u>111 (48.1%)</u>
TOTAL	116 (100%)	115 (100%)	231 (100%)

TABLE 4

SELF-DECLARATION AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

<u>SELF-DECLARED</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>MALE</u>	
Yes	35 (31.0%)	8 (7.2%)	43 (19.2%)
No, but I plan to	22 (19.4%)	4 (3.6%)	26 (11.6%)
No, I don't intend to	<u>56 (49.6%)</u>	<u>99 (89.2%)</u>	<u>155 (69.2%)</u>
Total	113 (100%)	111 (100%)	224 (100%)

Item 11 asked respondents if they wanted more information on the program. The majority (150 or 63.3%) replied that more information was desired.

Item 8 asked respondents for their greatest source of information on the Affirmative Action Program. The majority of respondents (95, or 41.9%) indicated that the Inside Outlook newsletter was their chief source. Their departmental Affirmative Action Committee was least often mentioned as the main source (48, or 21.2%). A variety of "other" sources were identified as the greatest source by 84, or 37.0% of respondents. Newspaper articles, radio/television programs and reference literature were included in the "other" category.

Table 5 shows that 66.0% of the sample that belonged to a target group had either self-declared or planned to self-declare. On the other hand, 91.9% of non-target respondents did not identify themselves as target group members and did not intend to self-declare.

Table 6 outlines the relationship between being considered a target group member and self-declaring as a target group member. The vast majority of the self-declared respondents considered themselves to be target group members (97, or 82.2%), whereas the majority of the non-self-declared respondents did not consider themselves to be a member of a target group (106, or

TABLE 5

**SELF-DECLARATION AS A FUNCTION OF
TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

<u>SELF-DECLARED</u>	<u>TARGET</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	
Yes	42 (43.7%)	3 (2.7%)	45 (19.4%)
No, but I plan to	27 (22.3%)	0 (0.0%)	27 (11.6%)
No, I don't intend to	<u>52 (43.0%)</u>	<u>108 (91.9%)</u>	<u>160 (69.0%)</u>
Total	121 (100%)	111 (100%)	232 (100%)

TABLE 6

**TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP AS A FUNCTION
OF TARGET GROUP MEMBER**

<u>TARGET GROUP MEMBER</u>	<u>SELF-DECLARED</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	
Considered a target group member	97 (82.2%)	2 (1.9%)	99 (43.8%)
Not considered a target Group Member	<u>21 (17.8%)</u>	<u>106 (98.1%)</u>	<u>127 (56.8%)</u>
Total	118 (100%)	108 (100%)	226 (100%)

98.1%). Thus it appears there is strong concordance between target group membership and self-declaration.

All Likert-scale items were subjected to Pearson product moment correlations. Given the large number of correlations, only correlation coefficients of $\geq .35$ with a probability of $\leq .001$ were considered to be significant. The significant correlations are outlined in Table 7.

Item 1 asked respondents the degree to which they were satisfied with their present job. Those respondents who were satisfied with their present job agreed with the group of variables that represented a feeling of confidence in the government's hiring and promotion systems (Group 2); $r(237) = .45$; $p \leq .001$.

Those who agreed with preferential treatment of target group members and the use of a quota system in determining target group representative levels (Group 4): 1) agreed with use of special measures to ensure that target group members had access to employment and reasonable career paths in the civil service (Group 7), $r(236) = .43$, $p \leq .001$; 2) agreed with stated Affirmative Action Program objectives (Group 6), $r(237) = .39$, $p \leq .001$; 3) agreed that systemic barriers disadvantage all target groups (Syst), $r(218) = .40$, $p \leq .001$; and 4) agreed that employment barriers in general disadvantage target group members (Barriers), $r(227) = .36$, $p \leq .001$.

TABLE 7

MAJOR VARIABLE GROUPING CORRELATIONS

$p \leq 0.001$

	<u>Job Satisfaction</u>	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>	<u>Group 7</u>	<u>Barriers</u>
Job Satisfaction	--	--	0.45	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 2	0.45	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 4	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.39	0.43	0.36
Group 5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group 7	--	--	--	--	0.43	--	0.60	--	0.42
Barriers	--	--	--	--	0.36	--	0.42	0.42	--

Respondents who agreed with the program's objectives (Group 6), also: 1) agreed that special measures should be implemented (Group 7), $r(239) = .60$, $p \leq .001$; 2) agreed that employment barriers disadvantage target group members (Barriers), $r(230) = .42$, $p \leq .001$ and 3) agreed with the preferential treatment of target groups and the use of hiring and promotional quotas for each target group (Group 4), $r(237) = .39$, $p \leq .001$.

People who agreed with the use of special measures to ensure that target group members have employment and career path access (Group 7): 1) agreed with the use of preferential treatment and quotas (Group 4), $r(236) = .43$, $p \leq .001$ and 2) agreed that employment barriers disadvantage all target group members (Barriers), $r(229) = .42$, $p \leq .001$.

An additional analysis was performed to determine whether the difference between the means of target and non-target group member or between male and female responses were statistically significant. The significance level of each test was set at a probability of $\leq .005$.

The Civil Service Commission uses a published bulletin in addition to newspaper advertising to attract candidates to vacant positions. With the introduction of the Affirmative Action Program, a statement was to appear

in the career advertisement that outlined, in the qualifications portion of the advertisement, the Government's commitment to using affirmative action criteria as part of the selection process. Items 18a, 19a and 20a represent various degrees of affirmative action advertisement statements. These statements progress from a relatively benign statement in Item 18a ("Affirmative Action Target Group Members are encouraged to apply") to a very strong statement in Item 20a ("Only 'Specific Target Group' Members need apply"). These statements were included in the study in order to provide some measure of respondent agreement to their use. The relationship between various degrees of Affirmative Action career advertising statements (Items 18a, 19a and 20a) and those respondents who had or had not declared themselves to be a member of a target group (Item 31c) are outlined in Table 8.

The majority of declared target group respondents (65, or 54.2%, $M = 2.59$) agreed with the statement that encouraged target group members to apply; whereas the majority of those who were not declared members (59, or 52.2%, $M = 3.46$) disagreed with the advertising statement, $t(12) = 4.36$, $p = .0001$. However, as the proactive level of statements increased, self-declared members were less likely to agree with them. For example, when asked if they agreed that a preference should be given to target group members, the majority of the self-declared respondents (82, or 67.8%, $M = 3.84$) as well as

TABLE 8

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND T-TESTS FOR ADVERTISING STATEMENTS
AS A FUNCTION OF TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP

ADVERTISING STATEMENT	TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP							
	YES			NO			T	P
	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>		
18a) Affirmative Action Target Group members are encouraged to apply	120	2.59	1.59	113	3.46	1.45	4.36	0.0001
19a) Preference will be given to Affirmative Action Target Group members	121	3.83	1.57	117	4.53	0.98	4.12	0.0001
20a) Only "Specific Target Group" members need apply	123	4.29	1.18	118	4.53	1.11	1.58	0.116

non-self-declared respondents (104, or 88.9%, $M = 4.53$), disagreed, $t(121) = 4.12$, $p = 0.0001$. The same pattern presented itself with the statement which indicated that "Only members of a 'Specific Target Group Members' need apply" for the advertised position. Again, both self-declared respondents (98 or 79.7%, $M = 4.29$) and non-self-declared respondents (102 or 86.4%, $M = 4.53$) disagreed with the use of the statement. However, self-declared respondents agreed with the use of this statement more than non-self-declared respondents.

Table 9 outlines the relationship between sex and advertising statements. There is very little difference in the frequency of responses between male or female agreement on the first statement which encourages target groups to apply. However, both the male and female respondents disagree with the preference advertisement (male = 95 or 83.3%, $M = 4.32$; female = 81 or 71.1%, $M = 3.97$). Male and female respondents also disagree with the use of the statement that indicates only specific target group members need apply (male = 94 or 81.8%, $M = 4.37$; female = 97 or 83.7%, $M = 4.42$).

The difference between the means of Item 18a and Item 20a was calculated and compared to the responses from target group members, non-target group members, males and females. Table 10 summarizes the t -test results of this analysis. The difference of means for target group

TABLE 9

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND T-TESTS FOR ADVERTISING STATEMENTS
AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

ADVERTISING STATEMENT	SEX						<u>T</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>MALE</u>			<u>FEMALE</u>				
	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>		
18a) Affirmative Action Target Group members are encouraged to apply	113	3.23	1.52	112	2.73	1.59	2.40	0.017
19a) Preference will be given to Affirmative Action Target Group members	114	4.32	1.16	114	3.96	1.54	1.99	0.048
20a) Only "Specific Target Group" members need apply	115	4.37	1.20	116	4.42	1.09	0.32	0.749

TABLE 10

MEANS AND PAIRED T-TESTS FOR ADVERTISING STATEMENTS
AS A FUNCTION OF TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND SEX

	ADVERTISING STATEMENT					
	<u>MEAN</u> <u>18A</u>	<u>MEAN</u> <u>20A</u>	<u>DIFFERENCES</u> <u>OF MEANS</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>PAIRED</u> <u>T</u>	<u>P</u>
Target Group Membership	2.59	4.29	1.71	0.17	10.18	0.0001
Non-Target Group Membership	3.46	4.53	1.04	0.16	6.69	0.0001
Female	2.73	4.42	1.71	0.17	9.89	0.0001
Male	3.23	4.37	1.13	0.16	7.27	0.0001

respondents ($M = 1.71$) differs significantly from the means of non-target group respondents ($M = 1.04$), $t = 10.18$, $p = .0001$ and $t = 6.69$, $p = .0001$ respectively. Target group respondents display a wider gap in their attitude between the passive and the active advertising. Their attitude is negative, but is not as negative as the responses from non-target group members. The difference of means for the latter is 1.04, which indicates a narrow attitudinal variation between advertising statements, and their strong disagreement. A similar significant difference existed between the answers from male and female respondents; ($M = 1.71$), $t = 9.89$, $p = .0001$ for females and ($M = 1.13$), $t = 7.27$, $p = .0001$ for males. Both males and females disagree with the advertising statements, but there is an increase in their disagreement from Item 18a to Item 20a. However, the female respondents indicate a wider variation in their disagreement from one statement to the other. Males are more consistent in their disagreement. These results confirm that there is increased disagreement with the use of the most pro-active advertising over the more benign advertising statement and that this disagreement is more pronounced with female respondents and target group members. Male respondents and non-target group members, however, are in greater disagreement with the passive statement than are females and target group members.

Table 11 delineates the t -test results on the analysis of target group membership versus the major variable groups. The attitudes of target group members ($M = 3.30$) differed significantly from those non-target group members ($M = 3.74$) on their attitudes towards the use of preferential treatment and quotas, $t(235) = 2.83$, $p = 0.005$. The means indicate that target group members agreed with the use of preferential treatment and quotas more than did non-target group members. On attitudes toward Affirmative Action Program objectives, target group members ($M = 2.02$) differed significantly from non-target group members ($M = 2.63$), $t(239) = 4.65$, $p = .001$. Target group members agreed with the objectives more than non-target group members. Target group members ($M = 2.30$) also differed significantly from non-target group members ($M = 2.80$), $t(238) = 4.41$, $p = .001$ in their attitudes toward special Affirmative Action Program measures. Again, target group members were more in agreement than were non-target group members. In addition, the analysis showed that target group members ($M = 2.64$) agreed more significantly in their positive attitudes toward employment barriers $t(229) = 5.32$, $p = .001$ than non-target group members ($M = 3.15$).

The difference in attitudes between males and females is outlined in Table 12. Males ($M = 2.54$) disagreed more than females ($M = 2.08$) on their attitudes toward Affirmative Action Program objectives,

TABLE 11

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND T-TESTS FOR TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP SCORES

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>YES</u>			<u>NO</u>			<u>T</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>		
1. satisfaction with present job	123	2.57	1.30	119	2.22	1.10	2.26	0.02
2. attitudes toward responsibility	121	3.31	0.59	119	3.49	0.64	2.18	0.03
3. feelings of confidence in promotion and hiring system	123	2.43	0.53	116	2.29	0.47	2.13	0.03
4. understanding of AA program	119	2.08	1.13	116	2.03	1.17	2.27	0.78
5. attitudes toward preferential treatment and quotas	121	3.30	1.20	117	3.74	1.16	2.83	0.005
6. attitudes toward positive effects of AA program	121	3.33	0.74	116	3.51	0.72	1.98	0.05
7. attitudes toward AA program objectives	123	2.02	1.08	118	2.63	0.95	4.65	0.001
8. attitudes toward special AA program measures	123	2.30	0.89	117	2.80	0.88	4.41	0.001
9. attitudes toward employment barriers	121	2.64	0.76	110	3.15	0.76	5.32	0.001

TABLE 12

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND T-TESTS FOR MALE AND FEMALE SCORES

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>MALE</u>			<u>FEMALE</u>			<u>T</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>		
1. satisfaction with present job	114	2.26	1.06	115	2.48	1.28	1.36	0.17
2. attitudes toward responsibility	114	3.42	0.63	113	3.37	0.62	0.59	0.55
3. feelings of confidence in promotion and hiring system	113	2.30	0.48	113	2.41	0.52	1.67	0.09
4. understanding of the program	112	1.91	1.04	111	2.08	1.11	1.18	0.34
5. attitudes toward preferential treatment and quotas	114	3.61	1.20	112	3.72	1.19	1.16	0.25
6. attitudes toward positive effects of program	114	3.45	0.72	112	3.36	0.74	0.99	0.032
7. attitudes toward program objectives	115	2.54	0.97	114	2.08	1.06	3.43	0.0007
8. attitudes toward special program measures	114	2.71	0.92	114	2.33	0.84	3.02	0.002
9. attitudes toward employment barriers	111	3.10	0.07	112	2.65	0.73	4.43	0.0001

$t(227) = 3.43, p = 0.0007$. On their attitudes toward special program measures, males ($M = 2.71$) disagreed more from females ($M = 2.33$) where $t(216) = 3.02, p = .002$. Males ($M = 3.10$) again disagreed more than females ($M = 2.65$) on their attitudes toward employment barriers, $t(221) = 4.43, p = .0001$.

DISCUSSION

While the study sampled a relatively small group (5.3%) of the Manitoba Civil Service population, there was a response of 25.9%. In contrast, the Transport Canada study yielded a response rate of 41.0% using a similar means to administer the instrument. However, the Transport Canada employees responded to a neutral body outside of the Federal Government and employees were assured that no one in Transport Canada would see their responses. Furthermore, the Transport Canada employees may have had a greater motivation to respond as they were told that their responses would be used to help develop the equal opportunity program. In contrast, the Provincial Government employees returned the questionnaires to the Affirmative Action Office in the Civil Service Commission and knew, even though it was suggested that their answers would make a difference, that the Affirmative Action Program was already in place.

The study was conducted in order to examine the attitudes toward the Affirmative Action Program as held by the civil service population and to test the degree of similarity in respondent attitudes between the Colwill and Josephson study and this study. The Colwill and Josephson study centered on gender-based differences in attitude toward a variety of employment initiatives in the Federal Civil Service. Primarily it concentrated on examining

various mechanisms within the Civil Service designed to assist and/or accelerate the position of women within the service. One purpose of the study was to explore the extent to which the differential treatment of males and females existed and to explore male and female attitudes toward their respective work goals and expectations. The fears of the respondents about the affects of preferential treatment were identified as having negative impact on the Equal Opportunity for Women Program's success.

This study examines a wider range of program objectives and target populations. Affirmative Action policies are a refinement of equal opportunity policies and as such, these policies tend to narrow the focus of programming initiatives and tend to be more aggressive and results-oriented. The trends identified in the Transport Canada research predicted accurately the general response to the Afffirmative Action Program by the Provincial Government employees.

The survey polled a wide range of job classifications. Responses were received from Senior Officer classifications at the high end of the salary scale to Administrative Secretary 2 classifications at the opposite end of the salary spectrum. For those who responded to the question, a total of 151 different classifications and classification levels were captured by the survey.

The respondent cross section yielded a nearly equal mix of female and male civil servants. At the time of this study, the survey results by gender were consistent with the male/female mix of the Provincial Civil Service population.

The responses to the salary question was revealing in terms of sex differences. As noted earlier, a female civil servant in the \geq \$35,000 salary group earned an average of \$15,000 less per year than did her male counterpart. The available literature and reports at that time seem to confirm this phenomenon. For example, the information that was compiled in other jurisdictions in support of forthcoming Pay Equity legislation suggested similar salary differentials. The civil servant salary differentials outlined in the Transport Canada study (Colwill & Josephson, 1980) confirms this wage gap.

A large number of respondents (78.9%) received the greatest amount of their Affirmative Action information from sources other than their respective departmental Affirmative Action Committees. The Civil Service newsletter, Inside Outlook, was listed as their most significant information source. This vehicle would not necessarily be the logical choice as an information source. Departmental committees, because of their employee representation and daily staff interaction, should have a more immediate and personal contact with

staff concerns and questions. Yet, a quarterly, generally distributed newsletter had a greater informational impact on the employees.

Both identified target group members and females indicated their intention to self-declare as a target group member or indeed had self-declared. This seems to indicate that these people identify with the program. The willingness to "stand up and be counted" is a conscious choice and, in fact, is somewhat troublesome to these people, in that, if one draws a parallel to other types of discriminatory issues, someone who declares his or her uniqueness, and hence minority status, invites resentment from the majority in a climate of minority preferential treatment. The author had received comments during the course of the study from target group members who, while they supported the program in principle, had no desire to have their minority status used to extend to them any type of preferential consideration. One woman went as far as to comment that if she could substantiate that her appointment to her position were based on her gender, she would resign.

As noted earlier, all female employees would be considered as members of the target group "women". However, not all female respondents identified themselves as a member of that target group. Of the 116 respondents who identified themselves as female, only 101 (87.1%)

answered the target group membership question. And of these, only 89 or 88.1% identified their membership as "women". Therefore, of the females responding to the target group membership question, only 76.7% considered themselves to be a member of the target group "women". A total of 10 or 8.6% of female respondents identified membership in one of the other target groups.

An integral part of the Affirmative Action Program was the use of special career advertising statements that would announce the advertising department's intention to give preference to target group members in the job competition. Initially, only the preference advertising was to be used by departments. The other two advertising statements used in the questionnaire represented examples of progressively stronger advertising that could be used in situations that required specific emphasis on the importance of target group membership in the selection process. It was conceivable that the stronger advertising would be used further into the program once a department had sensitized the population to recruit target group people.

The reaction of target group and non-target group members to the progressively more proactive advertising was consistent, as the statements isolated target group membership as being more important, the attitude of the target group members converged with the attitude of the

non-target group members in their disagreement with the use of the stronger advertising: "Only 'Specific Target Group Members' need apply". The polarized reaction between target group members manifested itself only with the first, passive advertising statement: "Affirmative Action Target Group Members are encouraged to apply". One might tend to expect target group members to agree less with the passive advertising and more with the active advertising, as the latter treats the identified target group as a special entity requiring preferential treatment. Yet, as the advertising became more active, both genders and all target group members displayed an increasingly negative attitude. There was no significant difference between male and female responses to the advertising question. Both sexes increasingly disagreed with the statements as the statements became more proactive.

A predictable result was the positive correlation between satisfaction with present job and confidence in the government's hiring and promotion systems. In addition, those people who agreed with the more controversial aspects of the Affirmative Action Program, namely the use of preferential treatment for target groups and the use of quota systems to determine target group levels, also agreed that special measures should be used. They also agreed that systemic employment barriers disadvantage all target groups.

Both target and non-target group members disagreed with the use of preferential treatment and quotas but target group members' attitudes were significantly more positive toward these aspects of the program than were those of non-target group members. This result is consistent with target group member attitudes toward other Affirmative Action Program measures. For example, target group member attitudes were significantly more positive with respect to program objectives, special measures and employment barriers. These attitudinal differences were predictable in that non-target group people would not be the recipients of any of the program features, would be nonparticipants in the program and would not benefit from hiring and promotional advantages.

There were a number of significant differences between males and females who participated in this study. Overall, males were less positive in their attitudes toward the program's objectives, special measures and employment barriers. These results were consistent with the Colwill and Josephson study.

The open-ended responses provided insight into the emotionality of the issues being polled in the survey. A synopsis of the open-ended question responses is attached as Appendix B. The vast majority of these responses were critical of the Affirmative Action Program and its intended results. These results were consistent

with the Colwill and Josephson study. A male respondent commented as follows:

Affirmative Action (AA) is a euphemism for discriminatory hiring practices employed by the Government to try and mask the failure or lack of adequate social programs to address the needs of people in remote areas with health/learning disabilities and/or cultural inhibitions, etc.

A female respondent commented:

Rather than target groups it would be more beneficial to help all employees and prospective employees fairly. Job performance evaluations can be motivators if promotion and hiring is based upon credentials and ability - even prospective abilities. Targeting groups tends to discriminate against others - and then Affirmative Action Programs will be needed for these groups!

In addition to these analytical comments on the Affirmative Action Program, there were more emotional responses to the policy. One male respondent, during the pre-test study, indicated the content of the questionnaire evoked such angry emotion that he could not answer any questions beyond the second page. A female respondent commented that she believed her gender was not a barrier in her employment and that it is an individual's responsibility to "make-it" in his/her employment.

There were 23 or 56.1% of the responses to the comments question (Item 33) which indicated the respondents desire for more and more effective communication on the program. The suggestions included the promotion of program successes and progress on a regular basis and the development of audio-visual promotional material. Clearly there seemed to be an informational void amongst the respondents with respect to the program.

However, despite the occasional positive comment and suggestion, the typical respondent denigrated some aspect of the program. Comments ranged from "I will not vote NDP again" to charges that the program was illegal. In fact 8 women and 13 men used the word "discrimination" in their description of what was wrong with the program. However, the phrase "reverse discrimination" was seldom mentioned.

The majority of the negative comments were made by the male respondents. The open-ended responses, some of which ran into pages of typed material, reinforced the statistical analysis reported earlier by identifying the male respondents as being less in agreement with many aspects of the program.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Affirmative Action Program was designed to accomplish two goals: the first was to redress the effects of historic employment practices by accelerating equalized representation of disadvantaged groups in the Civil Service workforce and the second was to establish a system of employment practices and processes free of discrimination for the future. As a consequence, an effort had to be made to reform existing policies and practices related to recruitment, selection, promotion, and training.

The existing bureaucratic employment policies and practices have developed, for all intents and purposes, within accepted societal social norms and values. The concept of Affirmative Action fundamentally disturbs this system of complex socioeconomic relationships. These relationships, in a public policy context are of central focus and concern in the design of the policy itself and of its subsequent delivery mechanisms.

Public acceptance of government initiatives is critical to the success or failure of policy implementation. The Affirmative Action policy, while focused on a small segment of the population, is no less subjected to the rigors of public acceptance. The acceptance of this program within the rank and file of the

Civil Service was critical to its relative success. The men and women of the Provincial Civil Service will, over the life of the program, inherit the positions in the bureaucracy responsible for the control and direction of this policy initiative. It is important, then, that during the fledgling first years of the initiative, the level of civil service acceptance of the Affirmative Action Program be raised. A positive attitudinal response will ensure that as people in the lower ranks of the Civil Service aspire to more senior levels the program's conceptual focus will become an inherent part of the bureaucratic employment mechanisms. However, "People generally have a sense that affirmative action refers to interventional government policies, and that is enough to prompt a negative reaction from many" (Abella, 1984).

This study was designed to examine the level of acceptance by the Civil Service of the Affirmative Action Program as demonstrated through attitudes toward various program principles and mechanisms. Overall, the responses in the study indicated a generally negative attitude toward the program. This attitude is consistent with the results of Colwill and Josephson's Transport Canada study. This study focused on examining gender differentials regarding a Federal program, where it outlined a clear sense of fear and apprehension toward the equal opportunity program. This negative sentiment was evident in this present study through the responses.

Males indicated a more negative acceptance of the program than did the female respondents. The same negative attitude toward the program was evident in the responses from non-target group members. Target group respondents generally had positive attitudes toward the program. The difference between male and female acceptance may also be due to the fact that women were identified as a target group. This aspect of the program would have contributed to the overall target group response to the program. The only evidence to the contrary would be responses from women who indicated their reluctance to be target group members.

This limited study of the Manitoba Government's Affirmative Action Program indicates that there is a low level of acceptance of the program by the civil service population and that there is a large segment of this population that sees the program as having negative influence on civil service employ.

The Colwill and Josephson study outlined a clear sense that programs designed to offer preferential treatment of one group over another results in a negative impact on the target population. It also identified a number of preferred strategies that could be implemented to ameliorate existing employment inequities. Strategies that would emphasize job training, career development and bridging positions elicited a more positive response than

did the preferential treatment of certain groups of these employees.

Such alternatives are unproven and were difficult to justify from a global policy perspective, as they typically result in longer timelines before tangible numerical changes in the target population are achieved. Affirmative action programming is designed to redress historical employment inequity and to change the representational make-up of the Civil Service within more reasonable and shorter time-frames. There may be no other realistic solution, however. This study does not necessarily imply that the Affirmative Action Program was a poor choice amongst a variety of policy choices available. Rather, given the formidable task of providing a solution to a historical, value laden problem, there may be no other alternative.

The Affirmative Action Program does provide a solution to correct employment inequality. But, as this study outlines, such programming is not without negative attitudinal consequences. Therefore, if the Affirmative Action Program continues, the following recommendations are made as possible solutions to remedy the less-than-positive acceptance of the Program by the Civil Service population.

RECOMMENDATION 1

It is recommended that the Government of Manitoba develop a comprehensive Affirmative Action communications strategy aimed at all segments of the civil service population. This strategy must include an emphasis on the program's accomplishments and non-adverse impact on the non-target group segment of the population and target group self-declaration.

The lack of communication and explanation of the program were identified by a majority of study participants. Information about the program itself and requests for progress reports were among the most frequent comments. Given the overwhelming consistent fear by male respondents of becoming victims of reverse discrimination, the communication strategy would be well designed to advertise a variety of accomplishments and emphasize the program's impact on the civil service target versus non-target group mix.

RECOMMENDATION 2

It is recommended that the Civil Service Commission's newsletter, Inside Outlook, be used as the primary information delivery vehicle for the Affirmative Action Program.

A substantial majority of respondents identified the employee newsletter as their most important source of Affirmative Action information. This quarterly medium could become the central means through which the Government promotes and advises the Civil Service on the program as long as some discretion is exercised to maintain its unbiased profile.

RECOMMENDATION 3

It is recommended that the Civil Service Commission provide a comprehensive outreach program to target groups that would promote the Government's initiative and goals.

Through a variety of responses, there is an expressed desire to centralize and focus the efforts of the program to attract qualified target group people to the civil service. An outreach service that would concentrate on target group needs would help to ameliorate the concerns of non-target group people regarding the integrity of target group hiring. This type of service could be expanded to include a supply and referral service for target group people to civil service employment opportunity.

RECOMMENDATION 4

It is recommended that the Affirmative Action Program concentrate its resources on developing a training program to assist target group members gain relevant on-the-job management experience.

Many of the female respondents' comments indicated the desire for a management training program. A program such as this would provide valuable on-the-job experience that would assist participants in their career development.

RECOMMENDATION 5

It is recommended that the Civil Service Commission, in cooperation with the universities and community colleges, establish scholarship programs in areas of study where particular target group members are poorly represented in terms of their graduation rate.

Again, comments from a number of respondents indicated the need for special incentives to encourage target groups to enter particular post-secondary educational programs, particularly programs that represent nontraditional employment opportunities or that for financial and/or social barriers have been inaccessible.

RECOMMENDATION 6

It is recommended that the Central Affirmative Action Steering Committee commission a similar study in 1991.

A study of similar scale and content would provide valuable comparative results in terms of employee's attitudes toward the Affirmative Action Program. This initial study provides a base of data and insight into employee acceptance of the program's goals and objectives. A subsequent examination after a passage of some time would allow testing of not only this study's variables, but of any ensuing program initiatives.

APPENDIX A

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE



Civil Service Commission

904 — 155 Carlton Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3C 3H8

Dear Respondent:

On June 7, 1983, the Government of Manitoba announced its Affirmative Action Policy in conjunction with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association (M.G.E.A.). One of the goals of this policy is to ensure that the designated target groups under-represented in the Government employ have equal access to Civil Service employment, and a reasonable career path within the Government.

Since the announcement, a joint union/management Central Affirmative Action Steering Committee has been working with each department in establishing similar joint committees and guiding the development of their respective Affirmative Action plans.

The attached questionnaire has been developed as part of a Masters in Public Affairs thesis by one of our Departmental Affirmative Action Co-ordinators. The questionnaire is designed to collect information about your understanding of and your attitude towards the Affirmative Action Program.

The Central Affirmative Action Steering Committee has reviewed the questionnaire and has approved its distribution. Through your co-operation, we will receive a valuable insight into the current attitudes of the Civil Service toward this program. These results will assist in the evaluation of current policies and plans and will provide feedback to direct our activities in pursuing the program's objectives.

Your name has been selected at random. You will not be asked to identify yourself on this questionnaire and therefore your anonymity will be assured.

Your co-operation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Paul Hart
Commissioner

Attachment

**A SURVEY OF THE MANITOBA GOVERNMENT'S
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM**

June 1986

PREFACE

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY: "The Government of Manitoba and the M.G.E.A. are committed to the concept of Affirmative Action to redress existing discriminatory barriers and to enhance promotion and equality of treatment within the provincial government for women, physically disabled persons, natives, and visible minorities.

The Union and Government agree jointly to ensure Manitobans under-represented in government employ have access to employment and opportunity for career path development within that employ, consistent with the Civil Service Act and relevant collective agreements. To this end, a joint union/management Affirmative Action Committee will be established both at the central and departmental level. This committee will design a plan that will include outreach recruitment, special training and management development programs to redress the effects of past practices and to accelerate equalized representation in the work force. Given the systemic discrimination across Departments in the clerical category, the Central Committee will also develop specific strategies and action to accelerate the promotion of persons classified in this category."

DEFINITIONS:

- Native:** Status Indians, Non-status Indians, Metis and Inuit.
- Visible Minority:** all non-white Canadians, with the exception of native Indians and Inuit, and including Blacks, Chinese, Japanese, South Asians, Southeast Asians, and Latin Americans.
- Physically Disabled:** those persons with a physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfiguration caused by bodily injury, birth defect, or illness, including epilepsy, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical coordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog, wheelchair or other appliance or device.
- Women:** all women who are employed in traditional roles.
- Underfill:** filling a vacancy with an incumbent at a lower classification until the person gains the required qualifications to be re-classified at the full working level (eg. classifying a person at an AY2 classification until he/she can meet the typing standards of the position classification of AY3).
- Bridging Position:** the establishment of a temporary position at a lower classification for a specific period of time with the sole purpose of developing the incumbent to the point where he/she can be promoted to the higher position classification (eg. re-classifying a person who is currently at a Clerk 4 classification to an Administrative Officer 1 classification where the full working level of the position is an Administrative Officer 2 classification).

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ATTITUDE SURVEY

Most of the following questions can be answered with a checkmark, or a number, or by circling a number. Please feel free to add your own comments in the spaces provided.

This is an anonymous survey, please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

Several questions that follow will ask the extent to which you agree or disagree with certain statements. Please circle the number that most closely represents your feelings about that statement. For example, if you strongly agree with the statement you would circle number 1; if you disagree with the statement, but not strongly, you would circle number 4.

1. I am satisfied with my present job.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

2. I would like to assume more responsibility in my present job.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

3. I would like a promotion with greater responsibility.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

4. I would like a decrease in responsibility.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

5. a) In general, how do you feel about the Government's system of filling vacant positions? Do you feel that it is:

___ *always fair*

___ *seldom fair*

___ *often fair*

___ *never fair*

b) Why do you feel this way?

c) Based on your response in 5 a), does the Affirmative Action program change your feeling towards the system of filling vacant positions?

___ *Yes: my feelings have become more positive*

___ *My feelings have not changed*

___ *No: my feelings have become more negative*

d) Why do you think your feelings have changed?

6. a) In general, how do you feel about the Government's system for promoting civil servants? Do you feel that it is:

___ *always fair*

___ *seldom fair*

___ *often fair*

___ *never fair*

b) Why do you feel this way?

c) Based on your response in 6 a) does the Affirmative Action program change your feeling towards the system for promoting civil servants?

Yes: *my feelings have become more positive*

My feelings have not changed

No: *my feelings have become more negative*

d) Why do you think your feelings have changed?

7. a) Does your Department have an Affirmative Action Committee in place?

yes

no

don't know

b) If your Department has a committee in place, does your Departmental Committee consist of:

M.G.E.A. members only

Management members only

both M.G.E.A and Management members

8. To date, what has been your greatest source of information on the Affirmative Action Program?

___ *Inside Outlook newsletter*

___ *Your Department's Affirmative Action Committee/Co-ordinator*

___ *Other, please indicate source: _____*

9. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements related to the Affirmative Action program?

a) The program is designed to assist under-represented target groups to gain employment with the provincial civil service.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) The program is designed to assist under-represented target groups to gain promotional opportunities within the provincial civil service.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

c) The program should establish hiring and promotional quotas for each target group.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

d) The program adequately addresses target group under-representation in the provincial civil service.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

e) The program discriminates against members of the provincial civil service who are not members of a target group.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

f) The program will have a positive psychological effect on those non-target group members of the provincial civil service.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

g) The program should provide preferential treatment in the hiring of qualified target group members.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

h) The program should provide preferential treatment in the promotion of qualified in-service target group members.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

i) The majority of provincial civil servants understand what the Affirmative Action program is attempting to accomplish.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

j) My career opportunities will be enhanced by the Affirmative Action program.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

10. a) Do you feel that your Department's Affirmative Action Committee has adequately communicated your Departmental plan of action to all staff?

_____ *Adequately* _____ *Not Adequately* _____ *No communication*
communicated *communicated*

b) What kinds of things do you feel your Departmental Affirmative Action Committee could do to help you better understand your Department's Affirmative Action objectives?

11. Do you feel that you would benefit from receiving more information on the Affirmative Action program in the Manitoba Civil Service?

_____ *yes* _____ *no*

12. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following objectives of the Affirmative Action program?

a) to ensure an appropriate representation of women, natives, physically disabled, and visible minorities in each job classification of the Manitoba Government

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) to identify and eliminate systemic discrimination in employment systems of the civil service

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

c) to provide special measures to remedy the effects of past discrimination in provincial government employment

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

13. What do you think the objectives of the Affirmative Action program should be?

14. The Affirmative Action Program is considering a number of special measures to ensure access to civil service employment and reasonable career paths within the civil service for target group members. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following special measures should be implemented?

a) The purchase of special equipment to accommodate the special needs of physically disabled persons.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) The establishment of work experience programs for the physically disabled.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

c) The creation of special training programs specifically for natives.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

d) The use of target group membership criteria in each job competition selection decision.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

e) The establishment of special development plans for women to assist their opportunities for entry into non-traditional job classifications.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

f) The more frequent use of underfilling to provide target group members with on-the-job training.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

g) The more frequent use of bridging positions to assist a target group member prepare for a higher job classification.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

15. How do you think these objectives should be implemented in the Manitoba Civil Service?

16. What do you feel would be an appropriate representation of each of the following target groups in your current job classification? (Assume that any one person will only be counted once, eg., a Native woman would be considered as either a Native member or a women member.)

- ____ % *Women*
- ____ % *Native*
- ____ % *Physically handicapped*
- ____ % *Visible minorities*

17. Given that the Affirmative Action program is designed to increase the overall representation of each target group in the Provincial civil service, it is essential that the program determine the actual number of people in each target group as a basis to set representative goals.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following methods of determining the number of civil servants who are target group members?

a) Count only those people who voluntarily self declare as target group members.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) Count those people who voluntarily self-declare and anyone else who can be visually identified as a target group member.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

c) Count only those people who can be visually identified as target group members.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

18. a) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the use of the following statement which may appear on some Civil Service career advertising bulletins: "Affirmative Action Target Group Members are encouraged to apply"?

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) How likely would you be to apply to a position for which you felt you were qualified and that was advertised using the Affirmative Action statement in 18 a)?

highly likely 1 2 3 4 5 *highly unlikely*

19. a) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the use of the following statement which may appear on some Civil Service career advertising bulletins: "Preference will be given to Affirmative Action Target Group Members"?

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) How likely would you be to apply to a position for which you felt you were qualified and that was advertised using the Affirmative Action statement in 19 a)?

highly likely 1 2 3 4 5 *highly unlikely*

20. a) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the use of a statement on a Civil Service career advertising bulletin that asked that only members of a specific target group should apply? (eg. "Only Physically Disabled persons need apply")

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) How likely would you be to apply to a position for which you felt you were qualified and that was advertised using the Affirmative Action statement in 20 a)?

highly likely 1 2 3 4 5 *highly unlikely*

21. Listed below are several employment barriers that are thought to disadvantage the representation of the four target groups in the Civil Service. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that each of these employment barriers are, in fact, a disadvantage to each of the target groups?

a) Credentials Barriers: Lack of education, skill training or work experience necessary to perform a particular kind of work

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

b) Cultural Barriers: Lack of familiarity with urban and industrial life, language problems

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

c) Attitudinal Barriers: Bias and stereotyping on part of co-workers, managers and peers

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

d) Information Barriers: Lack of information about employment opportunities or lack of confidence in ability to access these opportunities

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

e) Geographical Barriers: Isolation from employment locations or lack of transportation

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

f) Systemic Barriers: Policies and procedures which in themselves or through inappropriate application disadvantage certain groups in the workforce

Native:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Physically disabled:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Visible minority:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

Women:

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 *strongly disagree*

22. Are you currently a member of your Department's Affirmative Action Committee?

_____ *Yes* _____ *no*

23. Have you been asked to complete an Affirmative Action self-declaration form by your Departmental Committee?

_____ *Yes* _____ *no*

24. Has your Departmental Affirmative Action Committee outlined your Department's Affirmative Action Plan to you?

_____ *Yes* _____ *no*

25. Sex: _____ *Female* _____ *Male*

26. Age: _____

27. How long have you been employed by the Provincial Government?

_____ *years* _____ *months*

28. What is the status of your present employment?

permanent term other

29. a) What was your job classification when you first started working with the Provincial Government?

b) What is your current job classification?

c) How long have you been in your current job classification?

years months

30. What is your gross salary range per year?

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> under \$10,000 | f) <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000-\$34,999 |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000-\$14,999 | g) <input type="checkbox"/> \$35,000-\$39,999 |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> \$15,000-\$19,999 | h) <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000-\$44,999 |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000-\$24,999 | i) <input type="checkbox"/> \$45,000-\$49,999 |
| e) <input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000-\$29,999 | j) <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 or over |

31. a) Have you self-declared as a member of a target group?

Yes No, but I plan to No; I don't intend to

b) Regardless of whether or not you have self-declared, would you be considered a member of an Affirmative Action Target Group?

Yes No

c) If you would be considered a Target Group member, to which target group would you belong?

Native

Physically disabled

Visible minority

Women

32. Do you work in Winnipeg?

Yes

No

33. Do you have any suggestions that would assist you in understanding what the Affirmative Action program is and does?

34. Please provide us with any further comments about your feelings towards the Affirmative Action program. (Attach additional pages if necessary.)

Thank you very much in taking the time necessary to complete this questionnaire. Please return the completed questionnaire to the Civil Service Commission by using either the Inter-Departmental mail envelope or the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided with this package.

APPENDIX B

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION RESPONSE SUMMARY

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION SURVEY
OPEN-ENDED QUESTION RESPONSES**

QUESTION #	RESPONSE #	RESPONSE
5. b)	1.	seniority more important than capability/reliability
	2.	who you know not what you know
	3.	political interference
	4.	position is filled before advertisement
	5.	male bias towards hiring males
	6.	extra A.A. selection points tip scales on ability
	7.	A.A. enhances opportunity for target groups
	8.	excessive time for advertising allows term incumbent in position to win
	9.	promotion from within
	10.	hiring system is abused
	11.	A.A. program retards equal opportunity
	12.	A.A. program is reversely discriminatory
	13.	position descriptions are written to suit specific candidates
	14.	people should be hired based on qualifications not allegiance
	15.	equal opportunity system
	16.	always fair
	17.	more accountability for actions
	18.	no input into decisions
5. d)	1.	have not seen any changes
	2.	hiring standards are lowered
	3.	quality of work lowered
	4.	reverse discrimination
	5.	trying to correct unfair past hiring too quickly
	6.	A.A. program is equitable
	7.	system is not personal enough
	8.	forces other options to be considered
	9.	favouritism
	10.	does not ensure best qualified candidate
	11.	no managerial support for hiring
	12.	hiring unqualified candidates under A.A. program
	13.	because the use of bridging/underfilling
	14.	system is fairer
	15.	better understanding of A.A.
	16.	program is hypocritical
	17.	demonstrate better results
	18.	political influence
6. b)	1.	being in the right place at the right time
	2.	political interference
	3.	who you know not what you know
	4.	senior positions are not filled with best qualified people
	5.	not seen any promotions
	6.	loyalty is not recognized
	7.	based only on seniority
	8.	cultural background more important than merit
	9.	reverse discrimination
	10.	people at the top of the salary range are not promoted
	11.	no chance of being promoted out of clerical component
	12.	system sacrifices quality
	13.	based only on merit
	14.	promotion criteria not clear

6. d)
1. political interference
 2. reverse discrimination
 3. concrete A.A. results are expected
 4. prejudice
 5. equal opportunity not A.A.
 6. because of bridging opportunities
 7. lose incentive to achieve
 8. no tangible evidence of A.A. program
 9. minorities more easily promoted
 10. quality of service lowered
 11. seniority more important than merit
 12. office politics
 13. no evidence

10. b)
1. more literature
 2. more information/communication
 3. education
 4. video cassette on program
 5. identify elements of plan
 6. clarify objectives
 7. nothing
 8. treat people as individuals
 9. foster better relations
 10. teach A.A. in school
 11. notify everyone of progress
 12. disband program
 13. encourage more line staff participation
 14. explain why special treatment
 15. demonstrate implementation policy

- 13.
1. promote hiring/promotion based on merit not status
 2. end discrimination bias of A.A.
 3. change school curriculum to encourage positive attitudes
 4. provide special measures
 5. promote equal rights/opportunity
 6. non-preferential hiring/promotion
 7. establish training programs
 8. eliminate systemic discrimination
 9. remove program
 10. cross-cultural training
 11. set specific targets
 12. investigate discriminatory complaints
 13. ensure representation in each department
 14. as set out

- 15.
1. on a trial basis with a test period
 2. council people at manpower
 3. do not implement for avowed purpose
 4. use Jobs Fund \$
 5. identify specific objectives
 6. devote more time and \$
 7. implement on a position by position basis
 8. no program
 9. should be controlled centrally at CSC
 10. no preferential treatment
 11. set aside union contract and let everyone bargain for themselves
 12. implement program gradually
 13. begin a dialogue with target groups
 14. patiently
 15. should be based on merit not status
 16. through training
- 33.
1. more information
 2. status reports on a regular basis
 3. more input from Central Co-ordinator
 4. remove political interference
 5. more training for staff
 6. pamphlets
 7. explain goals to staff
 8. outline available recourses against A.A.
 9. hire best qualified only
- 34.
1. pressure from Cabinet/Treasury Board on program and profile
 2. M.G.E.A. members should not be allowed to scuttle program
 3. promote success stories
 4. non-target group members will be discriminated against
 5. program wastes \$
 6. will not vote N.D.P. again
 7. do not use term people to temporarily fill vacancies
 8. integrate A.A. program with other programs
 9. find a fairer system
 10. change attitudes
 11. A.A. is decreasing the quality of civil service
 12. create a clerical target group
 13. centralize program
 14. do not include women as a target group
 15. dismantle program
 16. civil service commission should not be involved in society's problems
 17. A.A. program practices are illegal
 18. raise the morale of civil service
 19. provide more program resources
 20. accomplish goals without discrimination
 21. promote career development
 22. develop outreach programs

REFERENCES

- Abella, Rosalie Silverman J. (1984). Report of the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Abella, Rosalie Silverman J. (1985). Research Studies of the Commission on Equality in Employment,. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Agocs, Carol (1986). Affirmative Action, Canadian Style: A Reconnaissance, Canadian Public Policy XII:1.
- Civil Service Commission (January 15, 1977). Affirmative Action Newsletter, V.1,
- Civil Service Commission (1986). Affirmative Action Program, A promotional brochure, Queen's Printer: Winnipeg.
- Civil Service Commission (1976) Guidelines for Affirmative Action in the Manitoba Civil Service, p.5.
- Cohen, Leah (1982). Affirmative Action in Canada Ten Years After, Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Colwill, Nina L. & Josephson, Wendy L. (1980). A Report on Employees' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity, Winnipeg.
- Doer, Gary, & Mackling, Al (June, 1983) Joint Policy Statement.
- Groarke, Lea (1983). Beyond Affirmative Action, Atlantis Vol. 9 No. 1.
- Gross, Barry (ed.), (1977). Reverse Discrimination, Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
- Hendlesz, Lise (1982). Affirmative Action for Women in Canada, Montreal: Montreal Association of Women and the Law.
- The Human Rights Act (1974), Chapter H175, Queen's Printer: Winnipeg.
- Hunter, San (1979). "The Origin, Development and Interpretation of Human Rights Legislation", R. St. J. MacDonald, John P. Humphrey, eds., The Practice of Freedom, Toronto: Butterworth and Co.

- Kelly, John G. (1986). Equal Opportunity Management: Understanding Affirmative Action and Employment Equity, Don Mills: C.C.H. Canada Ltd.
- Likert, Remsis (1932). Archives of Psychology, Cary: SAS Institute Inc..
- Moats, Harvey (January 19, 1977). Letter to Career Planning Branch, January 19, 1977.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D. A., (1975) SAS, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Roberts, Lance W. (1982). "Understanding Affirmative Action", W. E. Block. M. A. Walter, eds., Discrimination, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Weinfeld, Morton, (1981). "The Development of Affirmative Action in Canada", Canadian Ethnic Studies XIII:2.