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Abstract

# *Purpose*

As more and more women are entering the workforce, there continues to be an increase of gender inequity in many organizations. Women are not visible in upper management or supervisory positions; continue to be paid less than men, not being promoted at the rate of the men, etc. The purpose of this proposal is to examine further the perceptions of gender discrimination of men and women in the workplace. Within the next year, a sample of 380 participants will be surveyed. The significance of this study is to decrease gender inequity in the workforce and to examine whether more can be done to assist organizations, including managers and the employees in dealing with diversity in the workplace.

*Procedures*

The population that has insight to the proposed research questions will be individuals living in the Austin and surrounding areas, who are employed at different businesses and organizations. The sample that will be drawn from the population will be approximately 380 individuals. An electronic survey will be administered via email, and the data collected will be analyzed through SPSS (Version 12).

*Significance*

Despite having laws and policies in place that prohibit discrimination in the workplace, women continue to be invisible in upper management positions. The significance of the study is to decrease gender discrimination in the workplace, decrease the negative perceptions that some male employees may have about the leadership abilities of women in the workforce, and provide alternatives to ensure that gender equality in the workforce.
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Chapter I

## *Statement of the Problem*

The proposed research activities are the result of the continuous issues of gender discrimination in the workplace, and are the perceptions the same or different for the female employees in the workforce. Although, there is little disagreement that gender discrimination is wrong and should not be tolerated; social psychologists have found that prejudice and discrimination are harmful to disadvantaged groups, which includes minorities and women (Schmidt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz & Owen, 2002). Previous researches have also shown that women perceive more gender discrimination against their group than men perceive against their group (Gutek, Cohen & Tsui, 1996; Kobrynwciz & Branscombe, 1997). Despite having laws in place that protect women from discrimination, women as leaders in industry, business and the public sector continue to be underrepresented (Noble & Moore, 2006).

## *Purpose*

The main purpose of this study is to determine within the next year, if men and women continue to have the same perceptions of gender discrimination in the workplace? The non-experimental research will include a population of 380 employees working in the Austin and the surrounding county areas. The possible variables range from the following: gender, age, type of occupation, length of service, and supervisor status.

## *Objectives*

The researcher will work with the faculty advisor in accomplishing the following specific objectives:

1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas.
   1. Identify the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.
   2. Identify and select a research sample from the target population.
2. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous research study.
   1. Modify the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are relevant to the topic of this research.
   2. Perform a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document is reliable and has validity.
   3. Review and revise the survey instrument if necessary.
   4. Administer the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses.
3. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitor the database to ensure that all survey instruments are returned back to the researcher.
   2. If necessary, follow up with the sample to ensure that the survey instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.
   3. Review and eliminate cases where any of the cells do not have any data, or the data is zero.
4. Enter the complete research data results into SPSS.

4.1 Analyze and compose the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Create PowerPoint slides for the research results that will be presented at a graduate forum or professional/academic conference.

1. Develop and submit the final report that lists the findings of the research.

5.1 Revise the final report, if necessary.

There are typically 5 objectives (though this specific research may have more) that need to be accomplished in this research endeavor. These are sample selection, instrument development/preparation, data collection, data analysis, and research documentation.

## *Assumptions and Limitations*

The research has the following assumptions:

1. The population will be willing to complete the survey.
2. The participants will answer the survey truthfully.
3. The participants will thoroughly answer each question or statement in the survey.

This research has the following limitations:

1. The length of the period for the research may not be long enough to obtain a sufficient amount of completed surveys.
2. The research survey may have too many questions or statements.
3. Obtaining electronic access of the entire sample population may be difficult.

## *Relationship to Academic Program and Experience*

The purpose of the research relates to the Entry and Academic modules of my Master’s of Science Interdisciplinary Studies (MSIS) – Occupational Education (OCED) degree. The Entry module deals with communication and interpersonal relations skills, and the Academic module is relating to my career direction and personal growth. Courses in Career & Technology (CATE) and Political Science (POSI) have provided me insights, knowledge, and skills in completing this research activity. *CATE 5314 – Human Relations* focused on dealing with difficult people in our personal lives and professional occupations. The course also provided information about how to effectively communicate and work with individuals who have different types of behaviors. *POSI 5315 – Problems in Public Administration* focused on issues relating to the administration of public personnel and labor relations to public administrators. There are two remaining courses that need to be taken in the Exit module in order to complete the MSIS program. In OCED 5301, the data will be gathered and the survey will be implemented for the proposed research. In OCED 5302; the data will be analyzed, findings will be submitted in a report, which may need to be revised, and present my results in a final report. The previous mentioned courses have provided a strong foundation to build on in designing, implementing, and reporting the results of the proposed research.

Chapter II – Review of the Literature

*Introduction*

For over 50 years, laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended in 1991, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 have protected women from apparent discrimination (Sipe, Johnson, & Fisher, 2009). The purpose of employment laws gives people legitimacy in interpreting and labeling unequal treatment as discrimination. To the extent that interpreting discrimination is based on the existence of equal employment opportunity laws. Interpreting and labeling treatment as discriminatory is a cognitive way of mobilizing the law and within the workplace (Balser, 2002). Despite having existing laws in place that prohibit gender discrimination in the workplace, previous research studies continue to show that the gender inequity gap exists in the workplace. According to Bible & Hill (2007), the equity gap between men and women in management careers appears to be closing. In the United States workforce, women occupy about 30% of all salaried manager positions, 20% of middle management positions, and about 5% of executive level positions (Bose & Whaley, 2001). The preceding statement is also consistent with the findings of Besen and Kimmel (2007), the disproportional representation of women in managerial positions is due to glass ceiling: blocked opportunities for women, and many scholars argue that it is due to the sticky floor - *keeping women in lower paying jobs*. The term *“the glass ceiling”* refers to invisible or artificial barriers that prevent women and (people of color) from advancing past a certain level (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission – FGCC, 1997). Current observations of different organizations within our society reflect that the number of women in the workforce is increasing. However, women are increasingly common as midlevel management in the workplace, but rarely reach positions of highest authority (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Despite having laws in place that prohibit gender inequity in the workplace, why does the glass ceiling still exist in today’s business environment for women?

*Perceiving Gender Discrimination*

As previously mentioned in this proposal, women comprise of 30% of all managers, but less than 5% of executive managers in the U.S. (Bose & Whaley, 2001). So, why is gender discrimination in the workplace is still occurring? Schmidt, Branscombe, Kobynowicz and Owen (2002), suggests that the perceptions of gender discrimination can differ in meaning and there is no one answer to the question. The fact that gender discrimination is prevalent in the workplace could be any following examples: 1) men and women have different perceptions of gender discrimination, 2) in an indirect way, the structure of organizations could allow gender discrimination to take place, or 3) it could possibly be the negative stereo-types labeling the leadership of women in the workplace. The patterns of vertical segregation are noticeable in male-dominated fields, such as business management (Prime, Jonsen, Carter & Maznevski, 2008).

Why do men and women perceive things differently? Men and women often differ in their perceptions, and these gender perceptions maybe innate, a product of socialization, or a person’s value system, or due to prior experience (Rotundo et al., 2001). Gender socialization theory also proposes that male and females regard their work environments with different attitudes and expectations (Smith & Rogers, 2000). The societal norms and perceptions of gender-appropriate occupations have led to occupational sex segregation. This is where men are traditional employed in male-dominate occupations; such as oil riggers, pilots, fireman, etc. In the past three decades occupational sex-segregation has declined, however; many of the jobs remain sex-segregated (Bose & Whaley, 2001). In the U.S., women constitute the majority of nurses, flight attendants, and secretaries in positions that are supportive of men, who comprise the majority of the following occupations: physicians, pilots, and executives (Roos & Gatta, 2001). 7 of 10 most common jobs for women are the following: secretaries, cashiers, registered nurses, nursing aides/orderlies/assistants, elementary school teachers, and servers/waitresses (Bose & Whaley, 2001). The preceding statements are consistent with Phelan (1994), women usually experience worse work conditions in the workplace. Such as, lower pay, less autonomy, and less authority in the workplace than their male counterparts. The continued existence of the preceding barriers is often subtle, and includes gender stereotypes and lack of opportunities for women to gain the job experiences necessary to advance within the organization and lack of management commitment to gender equity and equal employment in initiatives (Bell, McLaughlin & Sequeira, 2002). It has been established by previous research that gender inequity is unethical and violates human dignity and autonomy, which often leads to the withdrawal of rights that should be available to all members of society (McEwan, 2001). This study will not attempt to determine gender inequity exists at any specific organization, but to determine if gender inequity is perceived to exist.

Is the perceived discrimination based on the length of employment at the organization, or the type of job duty that has to be performed? As individuals use members of their own and the opposite gender as their reference groups when evaluating the distribution of organizational resources, they tend to perceive inequity that favors males (Ngo, Foley, Wong & Loi, 2003). Also, individuals that have been employed at an organization for a long period of time have observed promotions, training opportunities, etc. Therefore, would have data on which to base their perceptions about gender inequity. However, employees with a short tenure time have little or not enough background information to perceive inequity in the organization than those with a longer tenure period (Ngo, Foley, Wong & Loi, 2003). Perceiving gender discrimination could be based on the tenure of the employees in an organization. As well as, the negative stereo-types of classifying what type of occupations women are expected to work. Leading to women to continuing working occupations that are traditionally dominated by other women, which can leads to on-going gender inequity in organizations.

*Methodology*

Review of previous literature reviews related to this proposed research topic gender inequity, revealed that surveys and questionnaires were administered to the samples in the studies. The Likert-type scale was the most common used, and the survey was mailed to the participants. Since some of the surveys were mailed to the sample, the researchers had to mail a follow up letter to the sample to remind them to complete the survey and return it by the specified date. The sample population for the past research studies varied in sizes. The samples sizes ranged from 100 to 1176 in some of the past researches. The sample size was determined based on the entire population and the issue that was being researched.

Another observation was made in reviewing the research of Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, and Taylor (2002), which the researcher used a survey instrument for a sample of 687 that consisted of a series of questions about perceptions of discrimination and group attitudes. Validity was established because the questions in the instrument were relevant to the study. However, in exchange for the respondents’ participation in the study, they could choose to have their names entered into a lottery to win one of four $50 prizes.

However, in the research of Elkins, Phillips, Konopaske, and Townsend (2001), involved investigating the possible existence of gender similarity biases in evaluations of gender discrimination allegations in a laboratory experiment, where the strength of the evidence against the defendant company and the gender of the plaintiff were manipulated. The sampled consisted of 120 undergraduate students (60 women and 60 men) from diverse ethnic groups (35% Asian, 6% African American, 18% Hispanics, and 41% Caucasian). The results suggested that female mock jurors favored female plaintiffs over the male plaintiffs. There were no gender-related differences in perceptions of male plaintiffs. There was a tendency for the women to be biased in favor of female plaintiffs. As previously mentioned, this research will be no-experiment and the sample size will be 396. An electronic Likert-typed scale will also be used for the purpose of this study. However, no gift cards or prizes will be offered to any participants in this study.

*Results and Analysis*

According to Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz & Owen (2002) research, women clearly reported experiencing more discrimination against their gender than men. Their findings are consistent with the continuing issue of gender inequity in the workplace, and they are relevant to this study in attempting to determine if the same results would be achieved. Another, question was presented in this proposal relating to gender inequity based on the length of employment at an organization.

In the research of Ngo, Foley, Wong & Loi (2003), a T-Test was performed for the hypnosis - Employees with a long organizational tenure will perceive a higher gender inequity than those with a shorter tenure. The results were that the mentioned hypnosis had no significant relationship between organizational tenure and gender inequity. However, the same hypnosis could be applied to a similar research, and there could be different results based on previous discrimination experience of the participants. Overall, the female participants in this study perceived more gender inequity than the male participants.

The research of Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas & Taylor (2002), the descriptive statistics for perceived gender, ethnic, and general discrimination at the personal and group levels, were broken down by gender and ethnicity revealed that women perceived more gender discrimination than men. White women expected more personal discrimination than did white men. However, male and female African-Americans and male and female Latinos expected similar levels of personal discrimination. The results also showed that both women and men perceived that women experienced more gender inequity than men in the workplace.

*Discussion and**Conclusion*

Previous has also shown that both men and women perceive more gender discrimination against women than against men. Women also perceive more discrimination against women than men do (Gutek et al., 1996). Regardless of the factors for gender inequity, there are more men in the management positions (Bible & Hill, 2007; Wentling, 2003). To continue to under represent women in leadership positions in the workforce is of great concern for reasons (Noble & Moore, 2006). First, it violates human rights (equal rights and equal participation as full productive citizens). Second, it hinders diversity, and excluding women from leadership roles affects productivity and works against diversity in the workplace. Based on the continued research in the area of gender discrimination in the workplace, it is apparent that this topic is still an issue that needs to be researched. Large amounts of previous research studies have shown that perceptions exist about inequity among men and women. It has been established that the framing assumptions about the work that women and men are suited for are based on hegemonic gender beliefs that can become embedded in the organizational structures, authority lines, job classifications, institutional rules, and administrative procedures of employment firms (Reskin &McBrier, 2000). Therefore, gender inequity will continue to be in the workplace.

So, how can this issue be resolved? Before members of a disadvantage group can engage in collective action that is aimed reducing inequity, they must first acknowledge that discrimination exists (Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz & Owen, 2002). Organizational support of gender inequity can be demonstrated by having women placed in non-stereotyped positions, in decision making and supervisory positions, and the women should be earning pay comparable to men (Bell & McLaughlin, 2002). The research of Prime, Jonsen, Carter & Maznevski (2008), suggests that organizations should take the steps to ensure that the key processes in performance appraisals and candidate selection is not undermined by stereotypic bias. Such as, increasing employee awareness about gender stereotyping and its effects on decision-making, training managers on how to avoid stereotypic bias when evaluating talent, and having in place a systemic checks and balances in place to ensure the outcome of all talent decisions in hiring and promoting are routinely monitored for gender disparities. Diversity programs and policies could also be an important factor in decreasing gender inequity. However, the programs would need to be held on a regular basis; not just at new hire orientation, or annually. A similar suggestion was also identified by Sipe, Johnson, & Fisher (2009), “employers and employees must recognize and prepare for the continuing existence of gender discrimination in the present workforce, or they may risk real opportunities to correct gender discrimination through training, enforcement, and deliberate human resources planning.”

To effectively minimize gender discrimination in the workplace, women and men in any organizations will need to be willing to understand how such inequity barriers affect the individuals, and actively participate in breaking those existing barriers in the workplace. According to Ngo, Foley, Wong & Loi (2003), the fact that the gender difference in perceived inequity was larger for women than men calls for further research to determine the origin of the difference. The purpose of the research will help us increase our awareness of gender inequity in the workplace. Another possible area of future research would be to explore the circumstances under which high-level women affect organizational atmosphere (Elvira & Cohen, 2001). If there were more women in supervisory roles in management, would there be less perceptions of gender discrimination in the workplace?

*Need for the Research Activity*

Previous research within the last 10 years regarding gender discrimination in the workplace revealed that gender inequity continues to exist. The importance of this research is to determine if the women and men perceptions of gender discrimination have minimized, and the significance will be to explore other effective solutions in promoting gender equity in the workforce, which includes having more women in supervisory roles in the workforce.

*Research Questions / Hypothesis*

1. Do minority and non-minority women have different perceptions of gender discrimination?
2. Does the perception of gender discrimination vary based on the length of employment?
3. Does a particular occupation have higher perceptions of gender discrimination?
4. Do the perceptions of female employees’ abilities to perform job duties increase or decrease gender discrimination?
5. Would more women in supervisory roles decrease perceptions of gender discrimination?
6. What could be possible effective solutions to counter gender discrimination?

Chapter III – Methodology and Procedures

*Overview*

An electronic Likert survey will be implemented in the research focusing on the issue of gender discrimination in the workplace. The survey will have approximately 17 statements relating to gender discrimination, and seven questions relating to demographics. The proposed research will be non-experimental, and there will no known risk to the participants.

*Population and Sample*

The population that has insight to the proposed research questions will be individuals living in the Austin and surrounding areas, who are employed at different businesses and organizations. The demographic of the population will be men and women from various ethnic backgrounds and ages. The sample that will be drawn from the population will be approximately 380 individuals. However, a test run of the survey will be administered to an additional 16 individuals. The sample size was determined based on the number of businesses and organizations that the researcher would have access to the participants via email. Also, the sample size calculator was used from the following website: [www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm](http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm)

*Variables / Constructs*

The variables that will be used in this research are the following: gender, age, ethnicity/race, employment status (part-time or full-time), occupation, length of service, and employer’s category (city, county, state, federal, private sector, non-profit). All will be used as nominal and descriptive variables. The variables will be structured into graphs and tables once the data is collected.

*Instrumentation*

An electronic Likert scale will be method used for this research. Permission was given to the researcher to sample a survey that was used in a previous research. The survey will consist of 17 statements and 7 demographic questions, which will take 10 – 15 minutes to complete. The participants will only be allowed to choose one of the following five selections for each statement in the survey: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree. The will have the consent information on the first page. However, if the participant does not consent to the participation in the survey; the individual will not be granted access to continue on in completing the electronic survey. The survey has validity because it lists content information that is relevant to the research topic of gender discrimination in the workplace. However, the reliability of the survey may not be accurate due to the following: some participants may have some pre-existing bias towards some of the statements in the survey, some of the participants may not answer the survey truthfully, or they may not thoroughly complete the entire survey.

*Date Collection Process*

The electronic survey will be sent to the participants email addresses in the sample. Once the survey is completed the data will be uploaded in the Survey Monkey database until the data is ready to be retrieved. However, it is possible to have a low response rates due to participants did not consent to participating in the research, or not all of the surveys were thoroughly completed.

*Data Analysis Process*

The data collected will be analyzed through SPSS, and the output data will be converted into a word document and stored on a flash drive for reviewing and editing. This will significant if SPSS (Version 12) is not readily available to the researcher. The processes for preparing the data will be to download the data from Survey Monkey. Once the data is retrieved, open it up in SPSS and verify the contents to ensure that all of the data element cells are complete. If there are any data elements have missing information in the record information, those records will be eliminated from the results. Once all of the records with the completed data elements are selected, the data will be filtered and calculated through SPSS (Version 12). If the output data is not analyzed correctly, the data will have to re-analyzed, filtered, and calculated until the output data is correct.

*Expected Presentation of Research Results*

In presenting the results of the research data analysis, four – six tables and charts will be used in displaying the data. The attempt will be to determine if the perceptions of gender discrimination are based on the age of the participants, the length of service, or type of occupation, etc. Also, in the presentation, possible solutions on how to counter gender discrimination in the workplace will be discussed, and to what extent does the effect of gender discrimination have on the female employees? Examples of the charts are on pages 20 and 21.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of the Population*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Variable n Percentage

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Gender:

Male

Female

Age Groups:

18 – 25

26 – 33

34 – 41

42 – 50

51 – 58

59 or older

Ethnicity:

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Asian

African-American, not Hispanic origin

White, not of Hispanic origin

Hispanic/Latino

Middle East/Arab

Multi-racial

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

Occupation:

Law Enforcement

Healthcare/Medical

Professional/Executive

Administrative/Clerical

Education and Research

Sales Occupations

Laborer/Mechanical

Service Occupations

Technical Occupations

Length of Employment:

Less than 1 year

Between 1 – 5 years

Between 5 – 10 years

Between 10 – 15 years

Between 15 – 20 years

More than 20 years

Total

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Male | | Female | |
|  |  | ( ) | | ( ) | |

Mean Scores

n = ( ) GENDER

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| -2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| -4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| -6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0-17 | | 18-25 | | 26-33 | | 34-41 | | 42-49 | | 50-57 | | 58 | |
|  |  | ( ) | | ( ) | | ( ) | | ( ) | | ( ) | | ( ) | | ( ) | |

*Figure 1.* Perception of Gender Inequity

Mean Scores

n = ( ) AGE GROUPS

*Figure 2*. Perception of Gender Inequity by Age Groups

*Procedures for Semester 1 (OCED 5301)*

1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas.
   1. Identify the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.
   2. Identify and select a research sample from the target population.
2. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous research study.
   1. Modify the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are relevant to the topic of this research.
   2. Perform a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document is reliable and has validity.
   3. Review and revise the survey instrument if necessary.
   4. Administer the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses.
3. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitor the database to ensure that all survey instruments were returned back to the researcher.
   2. If necessary, follow up with the sample to ensure that the survey instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Review and eliminate cases where any of the cells for any given case do not have data or the data entered is zero.

*Pre-contractual.* List the procedures you are going to need to accomplish in prior to beginning your research.

1. Submit my IRB request before the semester begins.
2. Revise my research proposal, if necessary.
3. Finalize my contract with my instructor.

*Contractual*.

1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the

surrounding areas.

* 1. Identify the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-

profit agencies.

* 1. Identify and select a research sample from the target population.

1. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous

research study.

* 1. Modify the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are

relevant to the topic of this research.

* 1. Perform a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that

the document is reliable and has validity.

* 1. Review and revise the survey instrument if necessary.
  2. Administer the electronic survey to the research sample through email

addresses.

1. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitor the database to ensure that all survey instruments were returned

back to the researcher.

* 1. If necessary, follow up with the sample to ensure that the survey

instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Review and eliminate cases where any of the cells for any given case do not have data or the data entered is zero.

*Post-contractual*.

1. Complete my formative and summative evaluations.
2. Complete an interim report. If necessary, make revisions as needed.

*Start Date and Duration of Activity.*

Charts for Chapter 3

5301 – Course 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Pre  3 weeks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | Post  2 weeks | Hrs. | Finish Date |
| Meet with class to discuss course structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review Proposal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review Objectives and Tasks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IRB submission and approval |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Identify target population who are currently employed at the agencies. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Select a sample from the target population. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous research study. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Modify the survey instrument that contains information relevant to the research topic. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Perform a test run of survey document on 16 individuals to verify reliability and validity. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 Review and revise the survey instrument, if necessary. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 Administer the electronic to the sample through their email addresses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather the electronic survey. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 Monitor the database to ensure that all surveys are completed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 If necessary, follow up with the sample to make certain that all surveys are returned in the specific time frame. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 Review and eliminate cases if any of the cells do not have any data, or the data is zero. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Procedures for Semester 2 (OCED 5302)*

4. Enter the complete research results data into SPSS.

4.1 Analyze and compose the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Create PowerPoint slides for the research results that will be presented at a graduate forum or professional/academic conference.

1. Develop and submit the final report that lists the findings of the research.

5.1 Revise the final report, if necessary.

*Pre-contractual.*

1. Finalize my contract with my instructor.
2. Communicate with faculty advisor the progress of the final report.
3. Attend class regularly and complete required assignments.
4. Submit a final report of the research results to my instructor.
5. Revise the final report, if necessary.

*Contractual*.

4. Enter the complete data research results into SPSS.

4.1 Analyze and compose the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Create PowerPoint slides for the research results that will be presented at a graduate forum or professional/academic conference.

1. Develop and submit the final report that lists the findings of the research.

5.1 Revise the final report, if necessary.

*Post-contractual*.

1. Present my research at a graduate forum, or professional academic conference.
2. Complete my formative and summative evaluations.
3. Communicate with the faculty advisor regarding the final report progress.
4. Complete a final research report. Revise the final report, if necessary.
5. Submit final research report to the University Commons.

*Start Date and Duration of Activity.*

5302 – Course 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Pre  3 weeks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | Post  2 weeks | Hrs. | Finish Date |
| Meet with class to discuss course structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review Final Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review Objectives and Tasks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.Enter the complete research data into SPSS. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 Analyze and compose the data into complete tables and graphs. If necessary, re-analyze and modify the tables and graphs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 Create PowerPoint slides for research results to be presented at graduate forum or professional/academic conference. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Develop and submit the final report that lists the research findings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 Revise the report if necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Chapter IV – Research Evaluation Plan

*Formative Evaluation*

The formative evaluation allows the faculty responsible for your research to evaluate your ability to conduct the nuts and bolts of the research process. The evaluation is not concerned with what you find (your results), but with how you go about developing a finding.

*Procedures to be Evaluated*. The researcher will assume evaluative accountability for the following:

1. Identifying the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas.
   1. Identifying the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.
   2. Identifying and select a research sample from the target population.
2. Requesting permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous research study.
   1. Modifying the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are relevant to the topic of this research.
   2. Performing a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document is reliable and has validity.
   3. Reviewing and revising the survey instrument if necessary.
   4. Administering the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses.
3. Creating an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitoring the database to ensure that all survey instruments were returned back to the researcher.
   2. If necessary, following up with the sample to ensure that the survey instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.
   3. Reviewing and eliminating cases where any of the cells for any given case do not have data or the data entered is zero.
4. Entering the complete research data results into SPSS.

4.1 Analyzing and composing the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Creating PowerPoint slides for the research results that will be presented at a graduate forum or professional/academic conference.

1. Developing and submitting the final report that lists the findings of the research.

5.1 Revising the final report, if necessary.

*Evaluation Parameters (Time and Quality).*

The purpose of the Formative Evaluation Forms will be used my instructor to adequately track the amount of time that the researcher spent on each of the objectives and procedures for the research, which includes the quality of the work performed. The instructor will review the research work to determine if the researcher adequately completed all of the objectives and procedures that are related to the contracts, and determine if the final product is within APA guidelines.

*Weight.* The weight for the research will not be less than 40%, or more than 70%. In order to accomplish this, the researcher will send the electronic survey to the entire sample of 396 individuals, which will be compromised of the following: 198 – men and 198 women. The rationale was based on an equal representation of the participants that will complete the survey, so that the results could not be biased. However, the researcher will not have any control over the number of the surveys that are thoroughly completed and submitted back to the researcher for review.

*Summative Evaluation*

The summative evaluation looks at the products developed through this research. The products will be evaluated by an Independent Evaluator.

*Products to be Evaluated.*

1. Identifying the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas. The population will be based on the number of the city, county, state, federal, private and non-profit organizations within the Austin area. The total population will be approximately 32,000 individuals.

1.1 Indentifying the target population for the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.

1.2 Indentifying and selecting the research sample from the target population.

To determine the actual sample size, the sample size calculator was utilized. The confidence level was assessed at 95%, which is the accuracy of how the participants might answer the survey. The Confidence Interval was assessed at 5, which is the margin of error for the entire population. The population total was assessed at 32,000, which resulted in a sample of 380 participants.

1. Requesting permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous

research study.

Permission was granted from the three researchers, who indicated that the researcher could use, or modify the survey questions that were used in their research earlier this year.

2.1 Modifying the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are relevant to the topic of this research.

2.2 Performing a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document is reliable and has validity.

2.3 Reviewing and revising the survey instrument, if necessary.

2.4 Administering the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses. The researcher will disseminate the survey to the sample via work or personal email addresses, which access has been granted. The participants will have a specific timeframe to complete and return the survey to the researcher.

3. Creating an online database by using SurveyMonkey to capture the electronic surveys. The researcher will create a database through Survey Monkey to store the completed surveys. Once the surveys have been completed and returned within the specified timeframe, the researcher will review the surveys to ensure that all were thoroughly completed.

3.1 Monitoring the database to ensure that all survey instruments are returned back to the researcher.

3.2 If necessary, following up with the sample to ensure that the survey instrument is returned within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Reviewing and eliminating cases that have cells that do not have any data or the data in the cells are zero.

4. Entering the specific research data results into SPSS.

4.1. Analyzing and composing the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Creating PowerPoint slides to present the results at a graduate forum, or a

professional/academic conference. The researcher will enter the results in SPSS, and analyze the data set cells to make certain that all samples have completed cells. If the samples have any missing data in any of the cells, those samples will be deleted from SPSS output data results. Then, table and graphs will be created to show the specific research results. The researcher will also create PowerPoint slides to illustrate the research results.

5. Developing the final report for the research results.

5.1. Revise the final report, if necessary for final approval by instructor.

The researcher will develop a final report that will list the findings of the research. The final report will be submitted to the instructor for review to ensure compliance with APA guidelines. However, if revisions are need the researcher will revise the final report; and re-submit the report for final approval.

*Evaluation Parameters*.

The summative evaluation forms will be used by the Independent Evaluator to determine the quality of products created from the research. The evaluating scale ranges from 60 points to 100 points.

1. Identified the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas. The population was based on the number of the city, county, state, federal, private and non-profit organizations within the Austin area. The total population was approximately 32,000 individuals.

1.1 Indentified the target population for the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.

1.2 Indentified and selected the research sample from the target population.

The independent evaluator will determine if the population and the sample used for the research was an adequate reflection of the number of the city, county, state, federal, private and non-profit organizations selected within the Austin area for this research.

1. Requesting permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous

research study. Permission was granted from the three researchers, who indicated

that the researcher could use, or modify the survey questions that were used in

their research earlier this year.

2.1 Modified the survey instrument to include questions and statements that were relevant to the topic of this research.

2.2 Performed a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document was reliable and had validity.

2.3 Reviewed and revised the survey instrument, when necessary. The evaluator will assess if the survey instrument created contained relevant information, and the information was consistent with the research topic.

2.4 Administered the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses. The evaluator assess if the researcher’s process to disseminate the electronic survey to the sample via email addresses was sufficient.

3. Creating an online database by using SurveyMonkey to capture the electronic surveys. The evaluator will determine if the researcher created an adequate database through SurveyMonkey to store the completed surveys and processed the data results.

3.1 Monitored the database to ensure that all survey instruments were completed.

3.2 When necessary, followed up with the sample to ensure that the surveys were returned within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Reviewed and eliminated cases that had cells that did not have any data or the data in the cells were zero.

4. Research data was accurately entered into SPSS to analyze specific results, which included creating tables and graphs showing the results.

4.1. Created PowerPoint slides and presented the research results at a graduate forum, or a professional/academic conference.

4.2 Analyzed and composed the data into complete tables and graphs. The evaluator will determine if the researcher adequately analyzed and utilized the appropriate SPSS output data results, including if the table and graphs were consistent with APA guidelines, and if the researcher’s PowerPoint presentation information was consistent with the research results.

5. Developed and submitted the final report that listed research results.

5.1. Revised the final report, if necessary for final approval by instructor. The independent evaluator will determine if the developed final report contained the following: Abstract, Introduction, Review of the Literature, Methodology, Results, Discussion and Conclusion, and Reflection on the Research Process.

*Weight*. The weight of the research will not be less than 30% or more than 60% regarding the research results. However, the researcher will not control how many completed surveys that are thoroughly completed and if the information was answered honestly by the participants.

*Independent Evaluator.* Susan M. Johnson, Associate Commissioner for Consumer Support and Workforce Services. In 2004, Susan M. Johnson was selected to lead Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) as the Office of the Ombudsman. She currently oversees the following: Office of the Ombudsman, Human Resources, Civil Rights, and the Office of Community Collaboration. Her previous work experience has included roles at the Texas Department of Human Services, the Texas Department of Transportation, Office of the Governor, and the Texas Department of Community Affairs. Her educational background consists of the following: a bachelor’s degree from Fisk University in Nashville, a master’s degree from the University of Texas at Austin, and doctorate in urban higher education from Jackson State University in Mississippi.
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Appendix

Table 1 - Demographic Characteristics of the Population

Figure 1- Perception of Gender Inequity

Figure 2 - Perception of Gender Inequity by Age Groups
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Texas State University

Student: Cedric M. Scott

Address: 2700 N AW Grimes Apt. #732 Round Rock, Texas 78665

Work Phone Number: 512-721-8374 Course Number: OCED 5301

Title of Proposed Activity: Gender Inequity in the Workplace: Have the perceptions of women and men changed?

Faculty Advisor: Matthew Eichler, PhD Agency: Texas State University

Address: Occupational Education, Pedernales Building 102 San Marcos, Texas 78666

Work Phone Number: 512-245-2115

1. GOALS
2. Assist the researcher in translating theory into practice.
3. Develop and refine the research skills of the researcher.

II. OBJECTIVES

The researcher will work cooperatively with the faculty advisor in accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the surrounding areas.
   1. Identify the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-profit agencies.
   2. Identify and select a research sample from the target population.
2. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous research study.
   1. Modify the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are relevant to the topic of this research.
   2. Perform a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that the document is reliable and has validity.
   3. Review and revise the survey instrument if necessary.
   4. Administer the electronic survey to the research sample through email addresses.
3. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitor the database to ensure that all survey instruments were returned back to the researcher.
   2. If necessary, follow up with the sample to ensure that the survey instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Review and eliminate cases where any of the cells for any given case do not have data or the data entered is zero.

III. PROCEDURES

The research will accomplish the aforementioned objectives by completing the following:

1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the

surrounding areas.

* 1. Identify the target population from the city, county, state, federal and non-

profit agencies.

* 1. Identify and select a research sample from the target population.

1. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous

research study.

* 1. Modify the survey instrument to include questions and statements that are

relevant to the topic of this research.

* 1. Perform a test run of the survey document on 16 individuals to ensure that

the document is reliable and has validity.

* 1. Review and revise the survey instrument if necessary.
  2. Administer the electronic survey to the research sample through email

addresses.

1. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather electronic survey.
   1. Monitor the database to ensure that all survey instruments were returned

back to the researcher.

* 1. If necessary, follow up with the sample to ensure that the survey

instrument is completed within the specified timeframe.

3.3 Review and eliminate cases where any of the cells for any given case do not have data or the data entered is zero.

1. IV. RESPONSIBILITIES
2. University
3. The faculty advisor will provide supervision and guidance to the researcher.
4. The faculty advisor will provide consultation on problem related to the research.
5. Researcher
6. The researcher will participate in weekly meetings with the faculty advisor.
7. The researcher will assume full responsibility for executing the objectives of the contract.

C. Duration and Hours per Week

Beginning Date Ending Date

Number of Weeks

Total Number of Contractual Hours

Average Hours/Week

V. TERMINATION

By the University:

The faculty advisor reserves the right to terminate the contract upon clear evidence that the research does not contribute to the researcher’s professional competencies, or if the researcher’s personal actions are deemed to be a source of embarrassment to or detrimental to the best interests of the University.

Researcher Date Faculty Advisor Date

Research Contract II

Texas State University

Student: Cedric M. Scott

Address: 2700 N AW Grimes Apt. #732 Round Rock, Texas 78665

Work Phone Number: 512-721-8374 Course Number: OCED 5302

Title of Proposed Activity: Gender Inequity in the Workplace: Have the perceptions of women and men changed?

Faculty Advisor: Matthew Eichler, PhD Agency: Texas State University

Address: Occupational Education, Pedernales Building 102 San Marcos, Texas 78666

Work Phone Number: 512-245-2115

I. GOALS

1. Assist the researcher in translating theory into practice.

2. Develop and refine the research skills of the researcher.

II. OBJECTIVES

The researcher will work cooperatively with the faculty advisor in accomplishing the following objectives:

4. Entering the complete research data results into SPSS.

4.1 Analyzing and composing the data into complete tables and graphs in the appropriate APA guidelines. If necessary, re-analyze and re-compose the tables and graphs.

4.2 Creating PowerPoint slides for the research results that will be presented at a graduate forum or professional/academic conference.

1. Developing and submitting the final report that lists the findings of the research.

5.1 Revising the final report, if necessary.

III. PROCEDURES

The research will accomplish the aforementioned objectives by completing the following:

1. Analyzing the research data results.
2. Developing a final report that lists the findings of the research.
3. Communicating with faculty advisor the progress of the final report.
4. Revising the final report, if necessary.
5. Presenting the results of the research final report.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. University

1. The faculty advisor will provide supervision and guidance to the researcher.
2. The faculty advisor will provide consultation on problem related to the research.

B. Researcher

3. The researcher will participate in weekly meetings with the faculty

advisor.

4. The researcher will assume full responsibility for executing the objectives

of the contract.

C. Duration and Hours per Week

Beginning Date Ending Date

Number of Weeks

Total Number of Contractual Hours

Average Hours/Week

V. TERMINATION

By the University:

The faculty advisor reserves the right to terminate the contract upon clear evidence that the research does not contribute to the researcher’s professional competencies, or if the researcher’s personal actions are deemed to be a source of embarrassment to or detrimental to the best interests of the University.

Researcher Date Faculty Advisor Date

**Formative Evaluation Form for Quantity – Semester 1**

Research Name: Gender Inequity in the workplace: Have the perceptions of women and men changed?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week No.** | **Hours/Week** | **Advisor’s Initials & Date** | **Objective No.** | **Procedure No.** |
| Third |  |  |  |  |
| Fourth |  |  |  |  |
| Fifth |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth |  |  |  |  |
| Seventh |  |  |  |  |
| Eighth |  |  |  |  |
| Ninth |  |  |  |  |
| Tenth |  |  |  |  |
| Eleventh |  |  |  |  |
| Twelfth |  |  |  |  |
| Thirteenth |  |  |  |  |
| Fourteenth |  |  |  |  |
| Fifteenth |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL HOURS EXPENDED |  |  |  |  |

I certify that the above information is accurate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor: Date:

/ =

Hours Contracted

Expended Hours

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Formative Evaluation Form for Quality – Semester 1

Student: Cedric M. Scott

Please evaluate the researcher’s performance on the following specific duties and check the box that best describes their performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific procedural statements performed by the researcher: | Unsat. 20 pts. | Poor  40 pts. | Average  60 pts. | Good  80 pts. | Superior   1. s. |
| 1. Identify the city, county, state, federal, and non-profit agencies in Austin and the  surrounding areas. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Identify target population who are currently employed at the agencies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Select a sample from the target population. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Request permission to utilize and modify a survey instrument from a previous  research study. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Modify the survey instrument that contains information relevant to the research  topic. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Perform a test run of survey document on 16 individuals to verify reliability and  validity. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 Review and revise the survey instrument, if necessary. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 Administer the electronic to the sample through their email addresses. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Create an online database by using SurveyMonkey to gather the electronic survey. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 Monitor the database to ensure that all surveys are completed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 If necessary, follow up with the sample to make certain that all surveys are  returned in the specific time frame. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 Review and eliminate cases if any of the cells do not have any data, or the data is  zero. |  |  |  |  |  |

/ =

### Total Points No. of Procedural

Sentences

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Please identify areas that need to be improved.

Please make any general comments that you feel are appropriate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor Date

**Formative Evaluation Form for Quantity – Semester 2**

Research Name: Gender Inequity in the workplace: Have the perceptions of women and men changed?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week No.** | **Hours/Week** | **Advisor’s Initials & Date** | **Objective No.** | **Procedure No.** |
| Third |  |  |  |  |
| Fourth |  |  |  |  |
| Fifth |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth |  |  |  |  |
| Seventh |  |  |  |  |
| Eighth |  |  |  |  |
| Ninth |  |  |  |  |
| Tenth |  |  |  |  |
| Eleventh |  |  |  |  |
| Twelfth |  |  |  |  |
| Thirteenth |  |  |  |  |
| Fourteenth |  |  |  |  |
| Fifteenth |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL HOURS EXPENDED |  |  |  |  |

I certify that the above information is accurate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor: Date:

/ =

Hours Contracted

Expended Hours

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Formative Evaluation Form for Quality – Semester 2

Student: Cedric M. Scott

Please evaluate the researcher’s performance on the following specific duties and check the box that best describes their performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific procedural statements performed by the researcher: | Unsat. 20 pts. | Poor  40 pts. | Average  60 pts. | Good  80 pts. | Superior   1. s. |
| 4. Enter the complete research data into SPSS. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 Analyze and compose the data into complete tables and graphs. If  necessary, re-analyze and modify the tables and graphs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 Create PowerPoint slides for research results to be presented at  graduate forum or professional/academic conference. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Develop and submit the final report that lists the research findings. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 Revise the report if necessary |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

/ =

### Total Points No. of Procedural

Sentences

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Please identify areas that need to be improved.

Please make any general comments that you feel are appropriate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Cedric M. Scott

Production Description: Identify a sample from a target population.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Did the researcher select an appropriate sample from the research population?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form II

Name: Cedric M. Scott

Production Description: Develop and administer instrument that will be used to establish validity.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Did the survey instrument have relevant information that was related to the research?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form III

Name: Cedric M. Scott

Production Description: Collection and output of the research data sets.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Was the electronic research data adequately stored through Survey Monkey?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form IV

Name: Cedric M. Scott

Production Description: Composition of data set results into graphs and tables, and PowerPoint presentation slides.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Did the tables, graphs and PowerPoint presentation adequately reflect the research results?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form V

Name: Cedric M. Scott

Production Description: Develop and submit a final report that lists the findings of the research.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Did the final report contain the required 7 chapter (Abstract, Introduction, Review of the Literature, Methodology, Results, Discussion and Conclusion, and Reflection on the Research Process)?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Instrument

***Gender Inequity in the Workplace Survey***

|  |
| --- |
| **Consent Form**  IRB Number: TXSTATEXXXX Date of IRB Approval: XX/XX/XXXX  You have been selected to participate in a research study about perceptions of gender discrimination in the workplace. This research is being conducted by Ms. Cēdric M. Scott, graduate student at Texas State University – San Marcos. If you have any questions about completing the survey or about being in this research study, you may contact me at [cs1555@txstate.edu](mailto:cs1555@txstate.edu).  The purpose of this research is to determine whether or not men and women have the same perceptions of gender discrimination in the workplace. The research will be conducted in over 18 organizations in Austin and the surrounding areas, and is being administered to current employees of the organizations.  This survey is anonymous and your participation in this research is voluntary. There are no known risks if you decide to participate in the research, nor are there any costs to you for participating in the research. You may choose not to answer any of the questions for any reason.  Completing the survey should take about approximately 15 minutes.  The Texas State Institutional Review Board has reviewed my request to conduct this research study. If you have any questions about the research, research participants’ rights and/or research related questions, please contact Texas State IRB Chair, Dr. John Lasser at (512) 245-3413, or [lasser@txstate.edu](mailto:lasser@txstate.edu).  Completion and return of the survey implies that you agree to participate and that your data may be used in this research. The information that will be collected may not benefit you directly, but what I learn from this study should provide insight, which could be beneficial to employees, the organizations and other researchers.  You are 18 years of age, or older.    You understand the main objective of the study, which is voluntary. The results of this study will only be used for research purposes, and you are consenting to participate in this survey.  ***Thank you for your participation in this study!*** |

**Directions:** This survey should take about approximately 15 minutes to complete. Here is a definition that you will assist you in selecting **one** answer for each of the questions or statements in this survey.

**Gender Inequity** refers to gender-based behaviors, policies, and actions that adversely affect a person’s work by leading to unequal treatment or the creation of an intimidating environment because of an individual’s gender. Gender Inequity occurs when decisions are made based on gender relating to performance evaluations, promotions, or rewards allocation, etc.

**Section I – Gender Discrimination towards Self:**

Select **one** of answer for **each** statement that best describes what you believe will occur or has happened in **your** professional career:

1. There will be gender-specific biases or obstacles to your career success.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. You will have less opportunity for advancement because of your gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. You will be paid less because of your gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. A parental leave will interfere with a future promotion or professional advancement opportunity.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

**Section II – Gender Discrimination towards Others:**

Select **one** of answer for **each** statement that best describes what you believe will occur or has happened in the workplace:

1. Women will face gender-specific biases or obstacles to their career success.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. A parental leave will interfere with a woman’s promotion or professional opportunity.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. Women will have less opportunity for advancement because of their gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. Women will be paid less because of their gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. Men will face gender-specific biases or obstacles to their career success.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. A parental leave will interfere with a man’s promotion or professional opportunity.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. Men will have less opportunity for advancement because of their gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. Men will be paid less because of their gender.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

**Section III – Response of Self (Gender Discrimination)**

Select **one** answer for **each** statement that best describes what you believe will impact **your** professional career:

1. If you experience gender discrimination in the workplace, it will have a negative effect on your confidence in yourself as a professional.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. If you experience gender discrimination in the workplace, it will have a negative effect on your career advancement.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. If you experience gender discrimination in the workplace, it will have a negative effect on your job satisfaction.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. If you experience gender discrimination in the workplace, it will have a negative effect on your organizational commitment.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

1. If you experience gender discrimination in the workplace, it will have a negative effect on your career commitment.

□ Strongly Disagree □ Disagree □ Slightly Disagree □ Neither Agree nor disagree □ Slightly Agree □ Agree □ Strongly Agree

**Section IV - Demographics:**

1. What is your gender? □ Male □ Female
2. Which one of the selections below best describes your current age?

□ 18 – 25 □ 42 – 50

□ 26 – 33 □ 51 – 58

□ 34 – 41 □ 59 or older

1. Which **one** selection best describes your ethnicity/race?

□ American Indian or Alaskan Native □ Hispanic/Latino

□ Asian □ Middle East/Arab

□ African-American, not Hispanic origin □ Multi-racial

□ White, not of Hispanic origin □ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

1. Which **one** of the selections below best describes your supervisory level at your **current** job?

□ Not a Supervisor □ Supervisor-middle management □ Supervisor-upper management

1. Which **one** of the selections below best describes your **current** type of occupation?

□ Law Enforcement □ Healthcare/Medical □ Professional/Executive

□ Administrative/Clerical □ Sales Occupations □ Education and Research

□ Laborer/Mechanical □ Service Occupations □ Technical Occupations

1. Which one of the selections best describes your length of employment at your **current** job?

□ Less than 1 year □ Between 1 – 5 years □ Between 5 – 10 years

□ Between 10 – 15 years □ Between 15 – 20 years □ More than 20 years

1. Which selection best describes your **current** employer’s level?

□ City □ County □ State of Texas □ Federal □ Private Sector



*Thank you for completing this survey!*Agency Approval

IRB Certification Completion Certificate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative** | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Human Research Curriculum Completion Report** | | | **Printed on 8/30/2010** | | |  | | | **Learner:** Cedric Scott (username: baap44) | | | **Institution:** Texas State University - San Marcos | | | **Contact Information** | Email: cs1555@txstate.edu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Social and Behavioral Research:**  **Stage 2. Refresher Course Passed on 08/23/10** (Ref # 4703928)   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Required Modules** | **Date Completed** | | Refresher Course 101 Introduction | 08/23/10 | no quiz | | SBR 101 REFRESHER MODULE 1. History and Ethics | 08/23/10 | 5/5 (100%) | | SBR 101 REFRESHER MODULE 2. Regulatory Overview | 08/23/10 | 5/5 (100%) | | SBR 101 REFRESHER MODULE 3. Fundamental Issues. | 08/23/10 | 5/5 (100%) | | SBR 101 REFRESHER MODULE 4. Vulnerable Subjects | 08/23/10 | 4/4 (100%) | | SBR 101 REFRESHER MODULE 5. Additional Topics | 08/23/10 | 5/5 (100%) | | How to Complete The CITI Refresher Course and Receive the Completion Report | 08/23/10 | no quiz |   **For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.**  Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D. Professor, University of Miami Director Office of Research Education CITI Course Coordinator |  |  | | --- | |  | |

<https://www.citiprogram.org/members/learnersII/crbystage.asp?strKeyID=DEC5DADD-0253-4BB9-A3F3-AB6B52C99922-6596751&gradebook=5736>

IRB Certification Completion Certificate

**CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Human Research Curriculum Completion Report** | | | **Printed on 8/30/2010** | | |  | | | **Learner:** Cedric Scott (username: baap44) | | | **Institution:** Texas State University - San Marcos | | | **Contact Information** | Email: cs1555@txstate.edu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Social and Behavioral Research:**  **Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 10/26/08** (Ref # 2144702)   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Required Modules** | **Date Completed** | | Introduction | 09/20/08 | no quiz | | History and Ethical Principles - SBR | 09/20/08 | 7/7 (100%) | | Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBR | 09/20/08 | 4/5 (80%) | | The Regulations and The Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR | 09/20/08 | 5/5 (100%) | | Assessing Risk in Social and Behavioral Sciences - SBR | 10/26/08 | 5/5 (100%) | | Informed Consent - SBR | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | Privacy and Confidentiality - SBR | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | Research with Prisoners - SBR | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | Research with Children - SBR | 10/26/08 | 5/5 (100%) | | Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBR | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | International Research - SBR | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | Internet Research - SBR | 10/26/08 | 5/5 (100%) | | Workers as Research Subjects-A Vulnerable Population | 10/26/08 | 4/4 (100%) | | Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects | 10/26/08 | 2/2 (100%) | | Texas State University - San Marcos | 10/26/08 | no quiz |   **For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.**  Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D. Professor, University of Miami Director Office of Research Education CITI Course Coordinator |  |  | | --- | |  | |

<https://www.citiprogram.org/members/learnersII/crbystage.asp?strKeyID=D294D9D0-665B-477C-B1AC-6D2CF4F4EF50-6596751>

##### **Proposal Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Unsatisfactory**  **20 pts.** | **Poor**  **40 pts.** | **Average**  **60 pts.** | **Good**  **80 pts.** | **Superior**  **100 pts.** |
| 1. How well is the research problem stated? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the research purpose clearly stated? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Are the research objectives formatted correctly? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Do the assumptions and limitations seem to addresses consequences associated with the proposed research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Does the review of the literature provide a reasonable theoretical argument for conducting the research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Is the review of the literature well organized? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Do the research questions align with the purpose of the research and the review of the literature? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. How appropriate is the scope and sequence of the procedures for the research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Is the formative evaluation model adequately described? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Does the summative evaluation model identify products, standards, and the product evaluation forms? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. How clearly is the proposal written and presented overall? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Is the proposal consistent with APA guidelines? |  |  |  |  |  |

Total points / 12 =

Researcher’s Signature