

4-2012

EXPLAINING ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL PREFERENCES AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A MULTI-RACIAL PERSPECTIVE

Rebekah Myers

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/honors_etd



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

**EXPLAINING ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL PREFERENCES
AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A MULTI-RACIAL PERSPECTIVE**

by

Rebekah Myers

Undergraduate honors thesis under the direction of

Dr. James Garand

Department of Political Science

Submitted to the LSU Honors College in partial fulfillment of
the Upper Division Honors Program

April, 2012

Louisiana State University
& Agricultural and Mechanical College
Baton Rouge, LA

EXPLAINING ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL PREFERENCES AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A MULTI-RACIAL PERSPECTIVE

Abstract

In previous research scholars have studied the attitudes of white Americans toward race-conscious policies, but with a few notable exceptions attitudes toward racial preferences and affirmative action among other racial and ethnic groups have received scant attention. The purpose of this paper is to explore the determinants of attitudes toward racial preferences and affirmative action policies among different racial and ethnic groups in the American political system. We use data from the 2004 National Politics Survey (NPS) to develop and test models of attitudes toward affirmative action and racial preferences. Because of large subsamples of whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the 2004 NPS, I am able to estimate the models separately for these groups, as well as for all groups combined. The models include independent variables representing three broad clusters of variables, including political attitudes, demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and racial attitudes and identity. We find that Americans express very different views toward affirmative action and racial preferences, with the former garnering majority support and the latter garnering majority opposition. We also find that a wide range of independent variables—representing each of the three broad clusters of independent variables—have discernible effects on the dependent variables. We note, however, that there is variation in the effects of several independent variables across racial and ethnic groups.

Affirmative action policies are designed to help minorities and women overcome the effects of past discrimination and to create greater diversity in employment and in education. Affirmative action has been the subject of intense debate over the past 40 years. The term affirmative action is often considered an ambiguous term, the definition provided by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1977 will define affirmative action for this study, “any measure, beyond simple termination of discriminatory practice, adopted to correct and compensate for past or present discrimination or to prevent discrimination from recurring in the future.” Those opposed to these programs state that they create reverse discrimination and challenge many Americans’ views of fairness by granting unwarranted favoritism on the basis of minority or gender status alone to individuals applying for employment or for university admissions and scholarships (Feldman and Huddy, 2005). Moreover, opponents of affirmative action suggest that minorities and women are actually hurt by these policies, insofar as affirmative action (1) creates a stigma that calls into question the accomplishments of beneficiaries of this program and (2) creates a “mismatch” in higher education where minority students are enticed to take jobs or attend schools where they are less likely to be successful (Sander 2004). On the other hand, proponents see affirmative action as invaluable for efforts to overcome the effects of past discrimination, propel minorities into the upper echelons of employment and education, and foster much-needed diversity in education and the work force. The legal status of affirmative action programs has been fought out in the courts, most recently in 2003 with the Grutter and Gratz cases (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 2003; *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244, 2003). As of this writing the U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to hear a potentially major case involving affirmative action programs by the University of Texas (Fisher vs. University of Texas). Obviously affirmative action policies remain among the most contentious policies in American politics.

Americans remain sharply divided on the value and fairness of affirmative action policies. Majorities of Americans state that they are opposed to racial preferences, though support for affirmative action for

women draws somewhat higher support (Wilson, Moore, McKay, and Avery, 2008). There is some question about the degree to which affirmative action programs draw greater support from members of various minority groups, as well as whether the determinants of attitudes toward affirmative action vary across racial groups. This is the question to which this study turns.

The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of support for affirmative action policies in the mass public and among members of specific racial minority groups. Extending the research program on attitudes toward affirmative action is very important because most of the previous research on the subject has been focused on whites' perception of affirmative action (cf., Kinder and Sanders, 1996; Kuklinski et al., 1997; Feldman and Huddy, 2005). Very little scholarly research has been dedicated to understanding how minorities perceive affirmative action, with notable exception (cf., Gay, 2006; Mangum, 2008). This study explores the determinants of attitudes toward affirmative action in the general public, as well as among whites, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians in the United States. Specifically, the study considers the effects of general political attitudes, racial attitudes, racial identity, and demographic and socioeconomic attributes on attitudes toward affirmative action. I hypothesize that each of these clusters of independent variables has an effect on individuals' attitudes toward affirmative action, though the magnitude and direction of these effects may vary in predictable ways across racial and ethnic groups. This study builds on previous research by extending the study of affirmative action to encompass the views of both majority- and minority-group members.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Although affirmative action has been a contentious issue in American politics, it is surprising that the literature on attitudes toward affirmative action has focused primarily on the attitudes of white Americans. There are a few exceptions in the literature (cf., Tate, 2003; Jacobson, 1983; Mangum, 2008; Gay, 2006). Affirmative action policies obviously affect individuals of all racial and ethnic groups (as well

as men and women), so in one sense it is surprising that so little has been written about affirmative action attitudes among members of minority groups.

This brief section discusses the literature on attitudes toward affirmative action among African Americans. Obviously, there is a substantial amount of scholarly writing about attitudes toward affirmative action among whites (cf., Feldman and Huddy, 2005; Sniderman and Carmines, 1997; Sniderman, Crosby, and Howell, 2000). Some of this literature focuses on a “principled approach” to race conscious policies. For many Americans, race-conscious policies violate American principles such as egalitarianism and fairness, and this prompts many white Americans to dismiss race-conscious policies based on ideological arguments, not prejudice. This literature also finds that race neutral programs in education and hiring receive much more support among white educators. On the other hand, a variety of scholars (cf., Kinder and Mendelberg, 2000; Kinder and Sears, 1981; Sidanius, Pratto, and Bobo, 1996) find that racial prejudice and/or racial resentment does drive a majority of whites’ opposition to race-conscious policies.

What do we know about attitudes toward affirmative action among African Americans? In one of the earliest works on black attitudes toward affirmative action, Jacobson (1983) seeks answers to two questions: (1) which groups within the black community are the strongest supporters of affirmative action? and (2) what effects do the experiences that blacks encounter in American society have on their attitudes toward affirmative action? In answering these two questions, Jacobson found that education and occupation have only a slight effect on support for affirmative action. Strong support comes from blacks in higher paid jobs and with high levels of education. Weak support comes from blacks who hold labor-type jobs and have minimal education. His findings also show a strong correlation between perceived discrimination and support for affirmative action. The respondents in the study who perceive a high amount of discrimination and alienation in American society are extremely likely to support affirmative action. Also contact with whites has an effect on support or opposition for blacks. Jacobson

concludes that “most of the variation for attitudes of blacks about affirmative action remains unexplained.”

Gay (2006) studies how blacks’ attitudes towards race-based policies, such as affirmative action, are affected by the relative position of Hispanics in black respondents’ home neighborhoods. Gay looks at how contextual variables such as income and education affect these attitudes. In this study Gay questions the degree to which blacks view Latinos as being equally deserving of civil protections or not. She finds overall that blacks with economic disadvantages are more reluctant to give Latino’s the same benefits from race-based policies. Blacks are also often likely to see Latino economic advancement as at odds with their own group’s interest. Moreover, Gay finds that when the Hispanic population in a black respondents’ neighborhood reaches a majority and above, blacks significantly disapprove of preferential hiring and affirmative action for Latinos. They are also significantly more likely to view race-based policies that help Latinos as detrimental to blacks in the area.

Mangum (2008) aims to develop and test an empirical model of black opinions toward affirmative action policies. He uses self-interest, group consciousness, reference groups, and social justice as variables to explain opinions among African Americans toward affirmative action. The findings of this study lead Mangum to conclude that self interest, group consciousness, and perceived discrimination have the strongest effects on support for affirmative action. The study focuses on the components of group consciousness. Three components of group identification deal with how blacks perceive their group as compared to other racial groups. In studying blacks’ perception of themselves as compared to other racial groups, Mangum is able to explore all aspects of group identification, and this provides us with a better understanding of affirmative action related to group progression. The study concludes that a strong racial bond will fuel support for affirmative action because people with strong group identification believe that what is best for their racial group is best for them.

Mangum also finds that perceived racial discrimination has a strong effect on support for affirmative action. As he suggests (2008: 362), “blacks who believe discrimination is the most important problem confronting blacks are more supportive of affirmative action than those who do not.” Further, Mangum concludes that “blacks who believe there has not been much progress in eliminating discrimination support affirmative action more than blacks who believe there has been much progress” (Mangum: 2008: 363).

Other scholars have focused on the determinants of attitudes toward other race-conscious policies. For instance, Tate’s (2003) study of black attitudes towards race-based redistricting applies well to what can be expected from a survey on black attitudes towards affirmative action. Tate is able to measure how blacks think about a policy that favors blacks—i.e., race-based redistricting—that can then be directly related to how blacks view affirmative action policies. Tate (2003: 45) finds that “education and racial identification are key predictors of black opinion on racial redistricting.” As to be expected, those who are less educated and who identify more with blacks exhibit increased support for race-based districts. Tate also finds that ideology has a strong effect on how blacks view racialized policy, suggesting that “blacks who are self-declared political conservatives have become visibly active in the drive to eliminate government affirmative action programs” (Tate 2003: 51). Ultimately, Tate shows that several factors are very important to how blacks perceive racial policies.

Also relevant are two studies done on students’ attitudes towards affirmative action (Sax and Arredondo, 1999; Park, 2009). While these studies are limited by the fact that they only use student attitudes which are different from a nationally representative sample, I can make some assumptions about attitudes towards affirmative action in the general public. Sax and Arredondo (1999) did a nation-wide survey of college freshmen. They find that white and Asian American students are twice as likely to oppose affirmative action than African American students. They also find that white and Asian-American students with a higher SES and academic preparation are less likely to support affirmative action. Black

students with a higher SES and academic preparation are more likely to support affirmative action. They suggest that these two findings could be correlated with self-interest for an individual as well as for that individual's group. Support for affirmative action also comes from students who are "committed to promoting racial understanding and believe more strongly that racial discrimination is still a major problem in America". Park (2009) updates the previous study by surveying college students once while they are freshmen and again when they are seniors. This study finds that over the years, African American students become firmer in their support of affirmative action. Both Asian American and Latino/a students became more supportive of affirmative action over their the years of college. Students who think that there is little discrimination in society are more likely to agree with abolishing affirmative action. This study basically confirms the study by Sax and Arredondo (1999), but does find some results that suggest that college does have an influence on affirmative action.

In terms of research on the attitudes toward race-based policies among members of other minority groups, the scholarly literature is much less well developed. There are quite a few studies that include racial variables in their models of affirmative action attitudes. In a meta-analysis of these findings, Harrison, Kravitz, Mayer, Leslie, and Lev-Arey (2006) document a pattern of moderate relationships between racial and ethnic identity (e.g., black, white, Hispanic) and attitudes toward affirmative action. However, there have been few efforts to explore the degree to which the determinants of attitudes toward affirmative action differ across racial and ethnic groups. It is this issue that is explored in this paper.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

In this paper I consider the effects of several clusters of independent variables on individuals' attitudes toward affirmative action. Specifically, I suggest that attitudes toward affirmative action are a function of general political attitudes, self-interest, racial attitudes and perceptions, demographic attributes, and context. The study includes in the models a set of variables that represents each of these

perspectives. In some cases these variables are expected to have similar effects for each racial or ethnic group, while in other cases the effects will differ across groups.

General political attitudes

Individuals often hold political attitudes that have possible effects on their attitudes toward affirmative action. These attitudes represent general political dispositions that lead individuals to take a position either in favor of or opposed to affirmative action and racial preferences.

Partisan identification. Individuals vary in their loyalty or attachments to the various political parties. In the United States the Democratic and Republican parties often stake out distinctive policy positions, and it is no surprise that many partisans take the same positions as the parties with which they identify. On the issue of affirmative action, Democrats are generally seen as being more supportive, while Republicans are generally less supportive.

Given this, I hypothesize that respondents of all races who identify themselves as Democrats are more likely to support affirmative action than those who consider themselves to be Independents or Republicans. This is because Democrats are generally seen as proponents of government activity, especially in the area of civil rights policy. Blacks generally categorize themselves as Democrats because of the Democratic Party's support of government action and especially because the Democratic Party of the 1960s was the party that significantly pushed civil rights legislation (Mangum 2008). Hence black Democrats should be strongly supportive of affirmative action policies. Because of the support by the Democratic Party for civil rights and historic support by the Democrats for affirmative action policies, I hypothesize that partisanship will be related to support for affirmative action for respondents of all racial groups.

H₁: Republican partisanship is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Liberal-conservative ideology. Conservatives and liberals have traditionally staked out very different positions on the issue of affirmative action, with conservatives usually in opposition and liberals often in

support. I hypothesize that respondents of all races who consider themselves to be liberal are more likely to support affirmative action than those who consider themselves to be conservative. Liberal ideology generally involves a belief in expansive government, especially in the area of civil rights, while conservatives tend to reject this ideal. As is the case for party identification, liberal should be the most supportive of affirmative action policies, while conservatives should have the strongest negative attitudes towards affirmative action.

H₂: Conservative ideology is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Political trust. Respondents who have a high level of political trust in political institutions will be less likely to support affirmative action policies. These respondents will believe that affirmative action policies are unnecessary because institutions already exhibit fair practices in hiring, university admissions, and the allocation of other resources. This effect is likely to be found for members of every racial group who support affirmative action. Those respondents who do not trust institutions are likely to be more supportive of affirmative action policies. These respondents will see affirmative action as necessary to create fair practices in hiring and education. Distrust in institutions should create support for affirmative action regardless of the respondent's race.

H₃: Political trust is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Demographic and socioeconomic attributes

Education. Black, white, and Hispanic respondents who have obtained a college degree are more likely to support affirmative action than those with only a high school education or less. Blacks and Hispanics who have a higher education level likely have had favorable experience with affirmative action policy. Also, they are more likely to truly understand the benefit of the program and know more people who have had success with the policy than not. Also Sax and Arrendondo (1999) find that higher educated blacks tend to have "more liberal political and racial attitudes than less academically prepared African-Americans." For whites, education is related to tolerance of members of minority groups, and

highly educated whites are more likely to understand the program and see positive results from those who have succeeded from affirmative action. On the other hand, for Asians education is likely to depress support for affirmative action. When looking at education, Espenshade and Chung (2005) find that “the acceptance rate for Asians, who experience a disadvantage in admission, would increase slightly from 53 to 57 percent”. Asians are often hurt by affirmative action policies, and Asians are often underrepresented at many universities because of the limits of affirmative action policies for minorities.

H₁₇: For whites, blacks, and Hispanics, education status is positively related to support for affirmative action. For Asians, education status is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Age. Older Americans should be less supportive of affirmative action policies. Typically older Americans hold significantly more traditional values than younger Americans. These conservative values should create opposition for affirmative action policies. Moreover, older Americans may have stronger attachments to merit systems for allocating values, and insofar as affirmative action policies are viewed as being at odds with pure merit systems it is likely that older Americans will be more likely to oppose affirmative action.

H₁₈: Age is negatively related to support for affirmative action policies.

The role of self-interest in determining political behavior and attitudes has been widely discussed in the scholarly literature (Downs, 1957; Green and Shapiro, 1994; Sears, Hensler, and Speer, 1979). On one hand, many scholars speculate that attitudes relating to politics are related to individuals’ perceptions of what is in their best interests. Given this, one might expect beneficiaries of government policies to support those policies out of a self-interest motivation. On the other hand, empirical support for a self-interest basis for political attitudes is mixed at best (Sears et al., 1979). Nonetheless, there is reasonable potential that self-interest may have an effect on attitudes toward affirmative action, so in this paper I

explore the effects of several self-interest variables. Personal income, adverse employment status, gender, and race and ethnicity can be discussed in a self interest frame work.

Personal income. Income can be seen as an indicator of economic vulnerability, and it is economic vulnerability that is at the core of many discussions of affirmative action policies. I suggest that the effects of income on attitudes toward affirmative action will be similar across racial and ethnic groups, though the process underlying these similar effects will differ. Specifically, the vulnerability associated with low income will have different implications for affirmative action for whites and members of minority groups. For whites, the economic vulnerability associated with low income should predispose them to oppose affirmative action policies, since they are not beneficiaries of these programs. Hence there should be a positive relationship between income and support for affirmative action. On the other hand, blacks and Hispanics are potential beneficiaries of affirmative action programs, and blacks and Hispanics who have a high income are more likely to support affirmative action than those with a low income. This is expected to be true because blacks and Hispanics who are upper or middle class are the primary recipients of affirmative action policies. Some observers have suggested that affirmative action programs are much more likely to benefit high-income, high-education minorities than those who come from low income, low education environments (Wilson 1978, 1987). There is some evidence that Asian Americans are greatly disadvantaged by affirmative action policies, particular in university admissions, and it is unclear if low- and high-income Asians will differ systematically in their attitudes toward affirmative action. Sax and Arredondo (1999) argue that high income Asians will be less supportive because it harms their self interest.

H₄: Personal income is positively related to support for affirmative action for blacks, Hispanics, and whites, but negatively related to support for affirmative action by Asian Americans.

Adverse employment status. Respondents who are laid off or unemployed will be divided in their support for affirmative action based on race and ethnicity. I hypothesize that black and Hispanic workers

who are laid off will be more favorable towards affirmative action because it will be seen as an extra boost to their prospects during their job searches. White and Asian respondents who are unemployed or laid-off will see affirmative action in hiring as a threat to their job prospects and economic well-being. Therefore the employment status of white respondents should have a significant effect on attitudes of affirmative action policy.

H₅: For blacks and Hispanics, unemployment status is positively related to support for affirmative action. For whites and Asians, unemployment status is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Gender. Women are also beneficiaries of affirmative action programs, so it can be speculated that women should be more likely than men to support affirmative action. Hence for respondents of all races, gender should have a positive effect on support for affirmative action. Women are also more likely to hold political dispositions, such as partisanship, ideology, and support for expanded government programs that benefit under-represented groups in society. Besides the fact that women may believe that they are recipients of benefits from affirmative action policies, their political dispositions may lead them to support affirmative action policies.

H₆: Gender is positively related to support for affirmative action.

Race and ethnicity. Members of different racial and ethnic group are likely to see affirmative action policies in very different ways. For blacks and Hispanics, affirmative action policies are likely to provide significant potential benefits, since members of these two groups are beneficiaries of these policies. Hence self-interest can be expected to motivate blacks and Hispanics to support affirmative action. On the other hand, whites and Asians are often deemed to be the losers from affirmative action policies, since the preferences that benefit blacks and Hispanics are likely to come at the expense of whites and Asians. Chin et. al (1996) state that many proponents of affirmative action have urged Asian Americans

to disregard their self interest and support affirmative action. We expect that whites and Asians will exhibit lower levels of support for affirmative action. Specifically:

H₇: Blacks and Hispanics are more likely to support affirmative action, while whites and Asians are less likely to support affirmative action.

Racial attitudes and perceptions

How people view race and ethnicity in American society matters for affirmative action policies. Americans differ in their racial identities and evaluations of other racial and ethnic groups, as well as in their perceptions of the state of racial and ethnic relations in the United States. These attitudes and perceptions are likely to influence how Americans think about racially-charged policies such as affirmative action.

Racial identity. How individuals identify themselves in terms of their race and ethnicity can have a powerful effect on how they perceive the need for policies such as affirmative action. Blacks and Hispanics who identify more with their race than with a broader American identity are more likely to support affirmative action policies. Previous research shows this pattern, and it is quite obvious that a strong racial identity would lead blacks to support affirmative action. For instance, affirmative action programs were instituted largely to help blacks overcome past discrimination, so blacks who identify strongly with their race will see affirmative action as a way to improve conditions for members of their racial group and thus for themselves (Mangum 2008). On the other hand, whites and Asians who identify more strongly with their race are less likely to be supportive of affirmative action. Whites and Asians are adversely affected by affirmative action policies and so would be less favorably oriented towards affirmative action as a function of their racial/ethnic identity. All respondents who identify primarily as American instead of as members of a racial group will be less likely to support affirmative action policies. Affirmative action is a highly racialized policy and will be seen as in conflict with a more generalized American identity.

H₈: Blacks and Hispanics who exhibit strong identification with their race/ethnicity will be more likely to support affirmative action than those who exhibit a strong American identity; whites and Asians who exhibit strong identification with their race/ethnicity will be more likely to oppose affirmative action than those who exhibit a strong American identity.

Perceptions of Discrimination. Perceived discrimination against blacks in the United States should have a significant effect on affirmative action attitudes of all respondents, regardless of race. Blacks who perceive a high amount of racial discrimination in their lives and in society overall are more likely to support affirmative action than those who do not. Asian, Hispanic, and white respondents who believe discrimination to be a major issue for blacks will also be more likely to support affirmative action. These respondents will see affirmative action as an equalizer for blacks and as a policy to eradicate impediments to progression for minorities in the job and education markets due to past and continuing discrimination. Those who do not perceive a high level of racial discrimination will not see affirmative action as an important policy because they believe that blacks no longer need an advantage in obtaining jobs or education in this country. Also, those respondents who perceive discrimination against Hispanics and Asians in society will also be more supportive of affirmative action. However, perceived discrimination against blacks should have the strongest affect across all racial groups.

H₉: Perceptions of discrimination against blacks are positively related to support for affirmative action.

Linked fate. The concept of linked fate captures the degree to which individuals perceive their personal wellbeing as being linked to the general wellbeing of a group of which the individual is a member. For instance, African Americans who perceive that their personal wellbeing is determined by the general wellbeing of African Americans would score high on racial linked fate.

When considering support for or opposition to affirmative action, the idea of linked fate depends largely on a respondent's race. Black and Hispanic respondents who believe in the idea of linked fate

should be more likely to be supportive of affirmative action policies. Affirmative action was created to help minorities overcome discrimination in hiring and education; black and Hispanic respondents who directly relate their personal wellbeing to what happens to other members of their racial/ethnic group will favor affirmative action policies. Likewise, white and Asian respondents who see affirmative action as negatively affecting their racial groups will more likely to oppose affirmative action if they believe in linked fate. These respondents will feel threatened by a policy, which they may perceive as adversely affecting their racial group at large. (Sax and Arredondo 1999; Espenshade and Chung 2005).

H₁₀: For blacks and Hispanics, linked fate is positively related to support for affirmative action. For whites and Asians, linked fate is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

American melting pot. The idea of the American “melting plot” depicts a process of acculturation, with group distinctions disappearing over time as members of different groups become integrated into American society. I hypothesize that respondents of all races who believe in the idea of the “American melting pot” will be less likely to support affirmative action. These respondents will believe that affirmative action policy gives advantages to certain members of American society and takes away the fundamental belief in a “melting pot” (or blended) society. For other respondents who oppose the idea of the “American melting pot,” support and opposition to affirmative action will be divided by race. Black and Hispanic respondents who do not favor the “melting pot” will still be supportive of affirmative action policy because it will be seen as beneficial to their racial identity and the benefit of their group members. White and Asian respondents who do not favor a “melting pot” will be opposed toward affirmative action policies. These respondents will favor racial distinction and thus be more likely to oppose affirmative action.

H₁₁: Support for the American melting pot will be negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Closeness to whites. For members of American minority groups, attitudes toward affirmative action may well be shaped by how they perceive the white majority. For Hispanics, Asians, and blacks it is expected that the closer they feel to whites the more likely they are to oppose affirmative action. Respondents who feel close to whites are less likely to perceive that whites are a threat to them and hence are likely to hold the same beliefs that affirmative action is actually a negative program and that hiring should be based strictly on merit instead of race. Among whites, the same relationship should hold. Whites who perceive that they are close to whites should be less supportive of programs targeted in members of minority groups, while whites who perceive themselves as not being close to whites will be more accepting of policies directed toward members of other racial and ethnic groups.

We hypothesize that individuals of all races who do not feel close to whites will be more likely to support affirmative action. Minority respondents who do not have close contact with whites will feel more negatively towards whites and will perceive greater threat from the white majority. In return they will favor a program that helps them overcome discrimination in hiring or education. Whites who are not close to whites will be more likely to support affirmative action policies.

H₁₂: Closeness to whites will be negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Closeness to blacks. Attitudes toward affirmative action may also be a function of how individuals think about African Americans, who are likely the chief beneficiaries of affirmative action programs. For whites, Hispanics, and Asians, feeling close to blacks is likely to be related to support for affirmative action. Affirmative action was originally created to help minorities, blacks in particular, to overcome discrimination in hiring and education, and so respondents who feel close to blacks will support a program that is intended to benefit blacks. Those respondents who do not feel close to blacks will oppose affirmative action policies. They will see affirmative action policies as unnecessary and as a biased program for a specific group of society.

For blacks, the same relationship should be observed. Blacks who perceive themselves as being close to fellow blacks are more likely to have a strong racial identity and support policies that are deemed to benefit blacks. Hence closeness to blacks among blacks should be positively related to support for affirmative action.

H₁₃: Closeness to blacks will be positively related to support for affirmative action.

Job competition with whites. Job competition with whites should play a significant role in how minorities perceive affirmative action policies working. Those black and Hispanic (and possibly Asian), respondents who perceive strongly that they are in competition with whites for jobs will be supportive of affirmative action because this policy may give them an advantage in hiring. Respondents who do not believe that they have competition from whites for jobs will feel less strongly about affirmative action policies because they will not be seen as necessary for hiring.

H₁₄: For blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, perception of job competition with whites is positively related to support for affirmative action.

Job competition with blacks. Blacks are arguably the chief beneficiaries of race-based affirmative action policies, and we suggest that job competition with blacks should depress support for affirmative action. Simply, white, Hispanic, and Asian respondents who perceive strong competition with blacks for jobs will be more likely to oppose affirmative action policies. For these respondents, affirmative action policies are perceived as an unfair advantage that blacks have in the hiring process. Those who do not perceive that they compete with blacks for jobs will be less opposed to affirmative action. These respondents will not see affirmative action as a threat because they are not harmed by other applicants who may receive hiring assistance.

H₁₅: For whites, Hispanics, and Asians, perception of job competition with blacks is negatively related to support for affirmative action.

Racial stereotypes. Positive and negative stereotypes about racial groups can have an important effect on how individuals evaluate policies designed to assist one racial group over another. We suggest that the stereotype of how hardworking certain racial groups are will play a role in whether individuals support or oppose affirmative action. Those respondents who perceive whites as hardworking relative to blacks will likely be less supportive of affirmative action policies. This is because those respondents will see affirmative action policies as detrimental to the hard work of whites. Those who do not see whites as hardworking will more likely support affirmative action because it helps minorities get jobs over “lazy,” “undeserving” whites. Respondents who see blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as hardworking relative to whites will be supportive of affirmative action because it helps hardworking minorities achieve jobs without any discrimination in hiring. Those respondents who see blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as lazy relative to whites will be opposed to affirmative action because it gives a an unfair advantage to “lazy” minorities who do not deserve to have preferences in hiring or education.

H₁₆: Individuals who perceive whites as hardworking relative to blacks, Hispanics, or Asians will be more likely to support for affirmative action.

METHODOLOGY

Data

The data used in this study come from the 2004 National Politics Survey (NPS). This telephone survey was conducted over a five-month period in 2004 and includes data from 3,339 completed phone interviews. This study also has large oversamples of African American (n = 756) and Hispanic American (n = 757) respondents, as well as a large subsample of Asian American respondents (n = 503). The NPS also includes a full set of political, socioeconomic, and demographic variables, as well as separate measures of support for affirmative action and racial preferences.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variables in this study are based on questions pertaining to respondents' beliefs about affirmative action and racial preferences. In the 2004 NPS the first dependent variable is based on the following question:

Generally speaking, do you think affirmative action is a good thing or a bad thing?

This variable is coded as a three-point scale, ranging from -1 for those who think that affirmative action is a bad thing to +1 for those who think that affirmative action is a good thing. The second dependent variable from the 2004 NPS is based on the following question:

How strongly do you favor or oppose preferential hiring and promotion?

This variable is coded on a the-point scale that ranges from 0 for those who strongly oppose preferential hiring and promotion to 3 for those who strongly support preferential hiring and promotion.

Independent Variables

General Political Attitudes. We consider the effects of general political attitudes on respondents' attitudes towards affirmative action. First, we measure respondents' *partisan identification*. This variable is coded on a seven-point scale, ranging from -3 (strong Democrat) to +3 (strong Republican). *Political ideology* is also measured on a seven-point scale; in the 2004 NPS, this variable ranges from -3 (strong liberal) to +3 (strong conservative). *Trust in institutions* is coded on a the-point scale ranging from 0 (can never trust the government) to 3 (trust the government just about always).

Self Interest. *Income* is measured as family income in raw dollars, ranging from \$1 to \$8,000,000. We also measure if respondents' are *unemployed or laid off*. This variable is coded 1 for respondents who are unemployed or laid off, and 0 for all other respondents. *Gender* is measured as a simply binary variable, coded 1 for women and 0 for men. *Race and ethnicity* is measured on a simple nominal scale represent each racial or ethnic group; we recode this nominal variable into separate dichotomous

variables for whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, with each coded 1 for individuals in the respective racial or ethnic group, and 0 otherwise.

Racial attitudes and perception. These variables are predicted to have the strongest effects on how respondents' form their attitudes towards affirmative action. In the 2004 NPS, we use several independent variables to reflect racial attitudes and perceptions. *American vs. racial identity* is measured from 0 (race more important) to 3 (American more important). *Perceived discrimination against blacks* is measured on a the-point scale ranging from 0 (no perceived discrimination) to 3 (respondent perceives a lot of discrimination). *Linked fate* is measured on a scale ranging from 0 (respondents' race does not affect life at all) to 3 (respondents' race affects life a lot). *Support for an "American melting pot"* is measured on a scale ranging from -2 (strong preference for distinct culture) to +2 (strong support for melting pot). *Closeness to other races* is measured on a the-point scale for all racial groups ranging from 0 (not close at all) to 3 (very close). *Job competition with other races* asks respondents if more good jobs for another race means fewer good jobs "for people like me." In the 2004 NPS this variable is measured on a the-point scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree). The variable *Work harder* is based on respondents' perceptions that one race works harder than another race. In the 2004 NPS, we take the difference between the hard working item for whites and a similar item for blacks. This variable ranges from -6 (blacks are much more hard working than whites) to +6 (whites are much more hard working than blacks). We also include similar independent variables for other combinations of racial groups. We also include four variables that measure perceived discrimination against the minority racial groups in our study. This variable is measured from 0 (perceive no discrimination in society) to 3 (perceive a high amount of discrimination in society). We have variables on the perceived amount of discrimination for blacks, Hispanics, and Asians.

Demographic variables. We include two demographic variables in the models. *Education* is coded in the 2004 NPS on a scale from 0 (sixth grade or less) to 8 (completed graduate or professional school). The *age* of respondents' is measured in years. In the 2004 NPS this ranges from 17 to 100 years.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Race and general attitudes toward racial preferences

In Table 1 we present a cross-tabulation that depicts the bivariate relationship between attitudes for racial preferences and respondent's race/ethnicity. As one can observe, there is considerable variation in support for racial preferences across racial groups. Among whites, 76.1% oppose racial preferences, while only 23.9% of white respondents support racial preferences. Clearly, whites are strongly opposed to racial preferences. For blacks, 48.9% oppose racial preferences and 51.1% support racial preferences. This is somewhat surprising, insofar as these results show that blacks themselves are divided on the issue of racial preferences. Hispanics fall between blacks and whites in their support for racial preference programs. For Hispanics, 63.2% oppose racial preferences while 35.8% support racial preferences. Asians are also between blacks and whites, with 33.1% in favor of racial preferences and 66.9% opposed. Overall across all racial groups 64.2% of respondents are opposed racial preferences while 35.8% support racial preferences.

The picture depicted here suggests that there are some differences across racial groups in support for racial preferences, though even among members of minority groups there is considerable opposition to such preferences. Given the variation in support for racial preferences *within* racial groups, it would seem reasonable to explore the determinants of these attitudes both across and within groups.

In Table 2 we present a cross-tabulation for the relationship between respondents' race/ethnicity and support for affirmative action. The concept of affirmative action is somewhat more ambiguous, and the term "affirmative action" does not include an explicit reference to race. It is interesting to note that there are substantial differences in respondents' support for "racial preferences" and "affirmative

action.” While there is quite a bit of division in support for racial preferences, Table 2 shows that there is more of a consensus in support for affirmative action. Unlike the case for racial preferences, a majority of respondents in each racial group support affirmative action. As to be expected more whites are opposed to affirmative action than any other racial group, but even here 59.6% of whites indicate that they support affirmative action. Also, blacks have the fewest respondents who oppose affirmative action, as is to be expected. Fully 85.7% of blacks support the concept of affirmative action, with only 11.0% opposed. As is the case for racial preferences, Hispanics and Asians fall between whites and blacks in their support for affirmative action, with 75.0% of Hispanics and 68.9% of Asians taking the supportive position. Overall, 73.4% of white, black, and Hispanic respondents support affirmative action. Clearly, Americans are more supportive of “affirmative action” than “racial preferences.”

The gap in support for “affirmative action” and “racial preferences” suggests some ambiguity among Americans in the meaning of affirmative action. How consistent are Americans in their support for these two concepts? In Table 3 we present a crosstabulation that depicts the simple bivariate relationship between support for racial preferences and support for affirmative action. This crosstabulation includes respondents from all racial/ethnic groups. As is to be expected, 59.8% of those who oppose racial preferences also oppose affirmative action. Only 14.4% of those who oppose affirmative action support racial preferences, as expected. When it comes to those who support affirmative action, we find some discrepancies in the results. Fully 54.5% of respondents who support affirmative action also express opposition to racial preferences; indeed, 27.9% of affirmative action supporters express strong opposition to racial preferences. Many political observers and scholars view racial preferences and affirmative action as synonymous terms, but clearly respondents find a fundamental difference between the two terms.

Modeling attitudes toward racial preferences

In Table 4 we report the results for the models of attitudes toward racial preferences, estimated separately for blacks, whites, Hispanics, and Asians. General political attitude variables have an effect only on whites', Asians', and blacks' attitudes towards racial preferences. For whites and blacks liberal-conservative ideology has an effect on attitudes towards racial preferences. Whites and blacks who identify as conservative are more likely to oppose racial preferences than whites or blacks who identify as liberal. Partisan identification has a significant effect on Asians' and whites' attitudes towards affirmative action. Asian and white respondents who identify as Republican are more likely to oppose racial preferences than those who identify as Democrat. Surprisingly general political attitudes did not have an effect on Hispanics' attitudes towards racial preferences.

Demographic and socioeconomic variables also have an effect on three of the racial groups' attitudes towards racial preferences. Education has a positive effect for both whites and Asians attitudes towards racial preferences. White and Asian respondents with higher levels of education are more likely to support affirmative action. Blacks who are either unemployed or laid-off are more likely to support racial preferences. No demographic or socioeconomic variables had an effect on attitudes towards racial preferences for Hispanics.

As expected racial identity and other attitudes had effects on all the racial groups. American identity versus racial identity was significant for blacks and Asians in the study but no other racial groups. Blacks and Asians who identify more strongly as American than with their race are more likely to oppose racial preferences. Interestingly, linked fate does not play any effect on support for racial preferences among the groups. Asian Americans, whites, and blacks who believe in the "American melting pot" are more likely to oppose affirmative action. As to be expected, whites who feel close to other whites are more likely to oppose racial preferences. Blacks and Asians who feel close to blacks are more likely to support racial preferences.. Surprisingly Hispanics who feel that they are in job competition with blacks are more

likely to support racial preferences. These may be because Hispanics associate racial preferences with their own advantages to hiring. Asian respondents who believe that blacks are more hardworking than Asians are more likely to support racial preferences. For all other groups job competition had no effect on attitudes towards racial preferences. Whites who perceive a high amount of discrimination against blacks in society are more likely to support affirmative action. No other discrimination variables had an effect on attitudes towards racial preferences for the other racial groups.

Modeling attitudes toward affirmative action

In Table 5 we report the results for the models of attitudes toward affirmative action, estimated separately for blacks, whites, Hispanics, and Asians. Starting with the general political attitudes variables, we see that there are some significant effects, though there is variation across racial and ethnic groups. First, partisan identification is found to have a negative effect on support for affirmative action among blacks and whites, but not Hispanics and Asians. For blacks and whites, respondents on the Republican side of the partisanship scale are significantly less likely to support affirmative action than other respondents. Second, liberal-conservative ideology has a negative effect on attitudes toward affirmative action for two of the racial / ethnic groups: blacks and whites. More conservative respondents in these two groups are significantly less supportive of affirmative action than are other respondents. Finally, trust in institutions depresses support for affirmative action among Asians, but the relationship is in the positive direction for Hispanics. Clearly the effects of trust in institutions on attitudes toward affirmative action are mixed at best.

What about the effects of demographic and socioeconomic variables? Based on the results in Table 5, there is only mixed evidence that these variables have a systematic effect on attitudes toward affirmative action. Education—which had a fairly consistent effect on attitudes toward racial preferences (see Table 4)—does not have a significant effect on attitudes toward affirmative action in any of the racial / ethnic groups. Age does have a significant negative effect on attitudes toward

affirmative action among whites, but among Asians the effect is significant and positive; this suggests that older whites are opposed to affirmative action but older Asians are in favor. Further, gender does not have an effect on attitudes toward affirmative action among blacks, but gender has a positive effect for whites, Hispanics, and Asians; simply, white, Hispanic and Asian women are more supportive of affirmative action than white, Hispanic, and Asian men, respectively. This is in keeping with the notion that women are also beneficiaries of affirmative action. Neither income nor unemployment status has an effect on attitudes toward affirmative action.

The racial identity and attitudes variables are similarly mixed in their effects on attitudes toward affirmative action. Perceived discrimination against blacks has a significant effect on affirmative action attitudes among blacks and whites, but not Hispanics and Asians. Whites and blacks that feel close to blacks are more likely to support affirmative action while support for affirmative action among Hispanics and Asians is not differentiated by how close these two groups feel to blacks. Perceptions of job competition with whites reduce support for affirmative action among blacks and Hispanics. This shows that minority groups do feel that affirmative action protects minority hiring, especially when they are in direct competition with whites. The remaining racial identity and attitudes variables have effects that are limited to only one racial / ethnicity group. Support for the melting pot depresses support for affirmative action among Asians (but no other group), perceived closeness to blacks increases support for affirmative action among whites (but no other group), and those whites who identify as American more than their race are less likely to support affirmative action. Hispanics who perceive a high level of discrimination against Hispanics in society are more likely to support affirmative action policy.

Global models of support for racial preferences and affirmative action

Thus far the study has reported ordered logit results for attitudes toward racial preferences and affirmative action, estimated separately for blacks, whites, Hispanics, and Asians. In this section we discuss empirical results for models in which all the racial / ethnic groups are combined into the same

model. In Table 6 reports the results of models of racial preferences and affirmative action, respectively, that include general political attitudes, demographic and socioeconomic variables, and racial identity and attitudes. Dichotomous variables for blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Caribbeans are also included, with whites the excluded comparison category.

Attitudes toward racial preferences. Turning first to the global model of attitudes toward racial preferences, we find that the lion's share of independent variables have significant effects on the dependent variable. This may be due in part to the larger sample size associated with pooling data from all racial and ethnic groups, or it may be due in part to inter-group differences that are not captured in the models estimated separate for each racial and ethnic group.

The results point to the importance of partisanship and ideology in shaping individuals' views toward racial preferences. Both partisan identification ($b = -0.105$, $z = -4.58$) and liberal-conservative ideology ($b = -0.130$, $z = -5.93$) have strong effects on the dependent variable. Clearly, Republicans and conservatives are much less supportive of racial preferences than Democrats and liberals, with all else being equal.

Among the demographic and socioeconomic variables, we must begin with the race and ethnicity variables, which have a strong effect on attitudes toward racial preferences. Clearly, blacks ($b = 0.945$, $z = 6.62$), Hispanics ($b = 0.529$, $z = 4.02$), and Asians ($b = 0.354$, $z = 1.70$) are significantly more likely than whites to support racial preferences, controlling for the effects of other independent variables. Moreover, education is positively and significantly related to support for racial preferences ($b = 0.057$, $z = 2.97$); this suggests that individuals with higher levels of education tend to be more supportive of racial preferences. On the other hand, gender, income, and unemployment status are unrelated to the dependent variable.

Several of the racial identity and attitude variables have significant effects on support for racial preferences. First, individuals who identify themselves as Americans rather than as members of their

racial / ethnic group are significantly less likely to support racial preferences ($b = -0.201$, $z = -2.51$). Second, support for the melting pot view of American society strongly and significantly depresses support for racial preferences ($b = -0.082$, $z = -3.45$); individuals who advocate the melting point view are substantially less likely to support racial preferences than other individuals. Third, individuals who see whites as working harder than blacks ($b = -0.100$, $z = -2.94$) and Hispanics ($b = -0.119$, $z = 03.31$) are significantly less likely to support racial preferences. Interestingly (and inexplicably), individuals who see whites as working harder than Asians—a relatively small group—are actually *more* likely to support racial preferences. Finally, perceptions of discrimination against blacks ($b = 0.322$, $z = 4.82$) and Asians ($b = 0.253$, $z = 4.51$) are positively related to attitudes toward racial preferences, though perceptions of discrimination against Hispanics ($b = -0.002$, $z = -0.03$) have no effect.

Attitudes toward affirmative action. As is the case for racial preferences, we find that support for affirmative action is highly related to partisan identification ($b = -0.195$, $z = -6.94$) and ideology ($b = -0.123$, $z = 4.47$). Republicans and conservatives are significantly less supportive of affirmative action than Democrats and liberals, holding the effects of other independent variables constant. In addition, trust in institutions is found to have a positive effect on support for affirmative action; contrary to expectations, individuals who trust government, the media, police, and the legal system are more likely to support affirmative action than other individuals.

Among the demographic and socioeconomic variables, we find, first, that race does have an affect on attitudes toward affirmative action. However, only blacks ($b = 0.695$, $z = 3.44$) and Caribbeans ($b = 0.766$, $z = 2.31$) are more supportive of affirmative action than whites, while Hispanics and Asians are not statistically distinguishable than whites on this issue. We also find that age ($b = -0.005$, $z = -1.66$) and gender ($b = 0.484$, $z = 5.04$) are related to attitudes toward affirmative action; older individuals are less likely to support affirmative action policies, while women are significantly more likely to support these policies. The coefficient for gender in the affirmative action model stands in sharp contrast to the

coefficient for gender in the racial preferences model. This suggests that women and men do not differ in their support for racial preferences, but women are significantly more supportive of affirmative action than men. This finding should definitely be investigated more thoroughly in future research. Finally, education actually has a negative effect on support for affirmative action ($b = -0.063$, $z = -2.67$); unlike the case of racial preferences, individuals are less likely to support affirmative action policies as their level of education increases.

Finally, the findings for racial identity and attitude variables indicate that “affirmative action” has less of a racial interpretation than “racial preferences.” This is not necessarily surprising, since affirmative action has somewhat ambiguous meaning that encompasses support for women as well as members of racial and ethnic minority groups. Specifically, we find that support for the melting pot has a negative effect on attitudes toward affirmative action ($b = -0.079$, $z = -2.69$); this finding is consistent with the findings relating to the effect of the melting pot on support for racial preferences. On the other hand, the only two other racial attitude variables that have an effect on support for affirmative action involve Asians. Individuals who perceive that whites work harder than Asians ($b = 0.192$, $z = 4.24$) and who perceive discrimination against Asians ($b = 0.150$, $z = 2.19$) are more likely to support affirmative action policies. Surprisingly, perceiving discrimination against blacks or Hispanics or perceiving that whites work harder than blacks or Hispanics is unrelated to attitudes toward affirmative action.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study is to broaden the understanding of individuals’ support for racial preferences and affirmative action policies. Most affirmative action research has been focused specifically on whites’ attitudes towards affirmative action (Kuklinski, Sniderman, Knight, et al. 1997; Feldman and Huddy, 2005; Sniderman and Carmines, 1997; Sniderman, Crosby, Howell, 2000), and a few other studies consider the attitudes by blacks toward affirmative action (Gay 2006; Mangum, 2008). In this study, we consider not only blacks’ attitudes towards affirmative action but also affirmative action attitudes

among other minority groups, along with whites. This research will help to provide more insight into what drives the attitudes of all racial groups towards race-conscious policies.

In many ways the findings presented here raise many more questions, and the research agenda on the effects of race and ethnicity on how individuals think about racial preferences and affirmative action is a full one. First, we are struck by the differences in attitudes expressed by Americans on racial preferences and affirmative action. Individuals are significantly more supportive of affirmative action policies; majorities of Americans and of each racial group profess support for affirmative action. On the other hand, the vast majority of Americans are opposed to racial preferences. Majorities of whites, Hispanics, and Asians express negative sentiments toward racial preferences, and even a near majority of black respondents are opposed to these policies. What explains these seemingly incongruent positions is certainly a subject worthy of study. Who are the individuals who are in favor of affirmative action while at the same time opposed to racial preferences? One possibility is that “affirmative action” is such a broad concept with multiple means, while “racial preferences” is quite clear. Another possibility is that affirmative action policies are not targeted just toward members of racial minority groups but rather can be viewed as more expansively including women, individuals from poor or working class backgrounds, or members of other groups that are underrepresented in the labor force or on college campuses.

Second, it is possible that scholars can gain some leverage over the differences in support for affirmative action and racial preferences by exploring further the degree to which the determinants of these two attitudes differ. We note that some of the independent variables that affect attitudes toward racial preferences do not affect attitudes toward affirmative action, and vice versa. For instance, why does gender have an effect on attitudes toward affirmative action but not on attitudes toward racial preferences? Is it simply self-interest, since women benefit from affirmative action but not—with the exception of African American women—from racial preferences? Before we can fully understand how

Americans view racial preferences and affirmative action, it is important to develop survey questions designed to measure the degree to which individuals support affirmative action programs that target women, as opposed to minorities.

Third, identifying differences in the determinants of attitudes toward racial preferences and affirmative action across racial and ethnic groups is not the same thing as explaining such differences. More work is needed to distill the explanations of support for these policies across racial and ethnic groups. For instance, why does partisan identification have an effect on racial preferences for white survey respondents but not for black respondents? Why does ideology matter for blacks and whites but not for Hispanics and Asians? Why does perceived discrimination against blacks lead blacks, whites, and Hispanics to support racial preferences but not Asians? These are the kinds of questions that we do not address directly in this paper but that should be the foundation for future research.

Finally, the global models reveal some differences compared to the models estimated separately for different racial and ethnic groups. How much of the effects of the independent variables due to inter-group differences, and how much of the effects are due to differences within groups? For instance, education seems to have an effect of support for racial preferences that is observed for all respondents combined and that extends to three of the racial and ethnic groups. On the other hand, prioritizing an American identity (as opposed to a racial identity) has a discernible effect in the global model but does not have an effect for three of the the racial / ethnic groups. Being able to ascertain which variables have effects within groups, which have effects between groups, and which have effect both within and between groups necessitates the estimation of models both separately by group and for all groups combined. It is important for researchers to be able to isolate, intra-group effects, inter-group effects, and effects that are observed in both intra- and inter-group contexts.

Table 1. Bivariate relationship between race and support for racial preferences.

		Whites	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	All Respondents
Oppose racial preferences	0	49.7% (448)	20.9% (152)	37.6% (274)	32.2% (155)	36.2% (1,169)
	1	26.4% (238)	28.0% (204)	25.6% (186)	34.7% (167)	28.0% (904)
	2	19.0% (171)	34.5% (251)	25.7% (187)	28.7% (138)	26.3% (849)
Support racial preferences	3	4.9% (44)	16.6% (121)	11.1% (81)	4.4% (21)	9.5% (307)
		100% (901)	100% (728)	100% (728)	100% (481)	100% (3,229)
Mean		0.790	1.468	1.103	1.052	1.091

Sthece: 2004 National Politics Survey

Table 2. Bivariate relationship between race and support for affirmative action.

		Whites	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	All Respondents
Oppose affirmative action	-1	37.2% (306)	11.0% (77)	22.6% (132)	28.5% (121)	23.7% (679)
	0	3.2% (26)	3.3% (23)	2.4% (14)	2.6% (11)	2.9% (85)
Support affirmative action	1	59.6% (490)	85.7% (597)	75.0% (438)	68.9% (293)	73.4% (2,106)
		100% (901)	100% (944)	100% (676)	100% (425)	100% (2,870)
Mean		0.224	0.746	0.524	0.405	0.497

Source: 2004 National Politics Survey

Table 3. Bivariate relationship between support for racial preferences and support for affirmative action.

		Support for Affirmative Action		
		Oppose	Neutral	Support
Oppose racial preferences	0	59.8% (403)	37.4% (31)	27.9% (574)
	1	25.8% (174)	44.6% (37)	26.6% (547)
	2	10.8% (73)	13.2% (11)	33.5% (689)
Support racial preferences	3	3.6% (24)	4.8% (4)	12.0% (248)
		100% (674)	100% (83)	100% (2,058)

Sthece: 2004 National Politics Survey

Table 4. Ordered logit results for model of attitudes toward racial preferences, by racial groups, 2004 National Politics Survey

Variable	Blacks		Whites		Hispanics		Asians	
	b	z	b	z	b	z	b	z
General political attitudes								
Partisan identification [-]	-0.001	-0.01	-0.082	-1.70*	-0.035	-0.76	-0.138	-1.97*
Liberal-conservative orientation [-]	-0.071	-1.87*	-0.196	-3.96**	0.009	0.22	-0.085	-1.29
Trust in institutions [-]	0.018	0.20	0.016	0.15	0.075	0.97	0.157	1.07
Demographic and socioeconomic variables								
Age [-]	-0.001	-0.27	-0.003	-0.61	-0.012	-1.93*	0.001	0.07
Gender [+]	-0.355	-2.14	0.194	1.16	0.002	0.02	0.052	0.23
Education [+]	0.031	0.79	0.145	3.42**	-0.033	-0.89	0.160	2.39*
Income [+]	-0.0000006	-1.00	-0.00000001	-0.08	-0.0000000	-0.06	-0.0000003	1.58
Respondent unemployed or laid off [+]	0.481	1.87*	-0.404	-0.95	0.322	1.12	-0.029	-0.07
Racial identity and other attitudes								
American vs. Racial identity [-]	-0.360	-2.07*	-0.076	-0.44	-0.097	-0.53	-0.398	-1.85*
Linked fate [+]	0.113	1.59	-0.002	-0.03	-0.061	-0.92	0.039	0.38
Support for melting pot [-]	-0.075	-1.65*	-0.090	-1.77*	-0.025	-0.52	-0.172	-2.52*
Closeness to whites [-]	0.132	1.27	-0.293	-2.07*	0.041	0.38	-0.205	-1.26
Closeness to blacks [+]	-0.041	-0.32	0.232	1.55	0.255	2.40*	0.378	1.99*
Closeness to Hispanics [+]	0.543	0.48	-0.061	-0.45	0.099	0.83	0.109	0.57
Closeness to Asians [+]	0.078	0.71	0.001	0.01	0.029	0.28	0.244	1.47
Job competition with whites [+]	-0.023	-0.30	---	---	0.060	0.71	0.208	1.44
Job competition with blacks [-]	---	---	-0.013	-0.12	0.271	2.89**	0.038	0.24
Whites work harder than blacks [-]	-0.084	-1.55	-0.084	-0.92	0.108	1.98*	---	---
Whites work harder than Hispanics [+]	---	---	-0.009	-0.12	-0.069	-1.11	---	---
Whites work harder than Asians [-]	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.065	0.52
Blacks work harder than Hispanics [+]	0.078	1.32	---	---	---	---	---	---
Blacks work harder than Asians [+]	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.165	1.83*
Perceived discrimination against blacks [+]	0.274	1.92*	0.503	3.23*	0.152	1.40	0.165	0.92
Perceived discrimination against Hispanics	0.140	1.06	-0.028	-0.19	-0.127	-1.05	0.127	0.66
Perceived discrimination against Asians	0.094	0.84	0.274	2.22*	0.032	0.31	0.019	0.09

Table 4 (continued)

Variable	Blacks		Whites		Hispanics		Asians	
	b	z	b	z	b	z	b	z
N	571		623		557		350	
R ²	0.040		0.109		0.030		0.089	
LR χ^2	61.51		159.21		43.69		75.61	
Prob χ^2	0.000		0.000		0.004		0.000	

**Prob < .01 *Prob < .05

Table 5. Ordered logit results for model of attitudes toward affirmative action, by racial groups, 2004 National Politics Survey

Variable	Blacks		Whites		Hispanics		Asians	
	b	z	b	z	b	z	b	z
General political attitudes								
Partisan identification [-]	-0.230	-2.78**	-0.172	-3.14**	-0.090	-1.42	-0.085	-0.97
Liberal-conservative orientation [-]	-0.136	-2.15*	-0.155	-2.73*	-0.027	-0.47	-0.176	-2.19*
Trust in institutions [-]	0.078	0.52	0.151	1.21	0.442	3.93**	-0.417	-2.17*
Demographic and socioeconomic variables								
Age [-]	0.007	0.72	-0.015	-2.51*	-0.001	-0.09	0.024	2.16*
Gender [+]	-0.287	-1.04	0.382	2.01*	0.594	2.62**	0.633	2.17*
Education [+]	0.016	0.23	-0.055	-1.17	-0.031	-0.60	0.054	0.66
Income [+]	-0.000001	-1.60	-0.0000002	-1.22	-0.0000003	0.65	-0.0000001	0.37
Respondent unemployed or laid off [+]	-0.297	-0.81	-0.181	-0.36	0.023	0.06	-0.307	-0.58
Racial identity and other attitudes								
American vs. Racial identity [-]	0.098	0.35	-0.362	-1.82*	-0.011	-0.04	-0.223	-0.80
Linked fate [+]	0.104	0.87	-0.002	-0.02	0.129	1.35	0.142	1.07
Support for melting pot [-]	-0.033	-0.42	-0.075	-1.28	-0.018	-0.25	-0.186	-2.15*
Closeness to whites [-]	-0.170	-1.03	-0.051	-0.32	-0.022	-0.14	-0.172	-0.81
Closeness to blacks [+]	0.550	2.73**	0.458	2.76*	-0.162	-1.03	0.294	1.23
Closeness to Hispanics [+]	-0.222	-1.12	-0.299	-1.83	0.083	0.52	0.072	0.30
Closeness to Asians [+]	0.059	0.33	0.031	0.21	0.079	0.55	0.042	0.20
Job competition with whites [+]	-0.322	-2.49*	---	---	0.199	1.66*	0.135	0.74
Job competition with blacks [-]	---	---	0.010	0.08	0.096	0.68	0.051	0.25
Whites work harder than blacks [-]	0.002	0.02	-0.020	-0.20	-0.034	-0.45	---	---
Whites work harder than Hispanics [-]	---	---	0.137	1.54	-0.072	-0.92	---	---
Whites work harder than Asians [-]	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.101	0.65
Blacks work harder than Asians [+]	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.115	1.05
Perceived discrimination against blacks [+]	0.299	1.42	0.280	1.64	0.087	0.56	-0.102	-0.44
Perceived discrimination against Hispanics [+]	0.043	0.21	0.027	0.16	0.303	1.81*	-0.049	-0.19
Perceived discrimination against Asians [+]	0.169	0.94	0.129	0.90	0.016	0.10	0.163	0.67

Table 5 (continued)

Variable	Blacks		Whites		Hispanics		Asians	
	b	z	b	z	b	z	b	z
N	548		590		466		323	
Pseudo-R ²	0.096		0.126		0.083		0.114	
LR χ^2	51.92		116.29		51.43		52.80	
Prob χ^2	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	

**Prob < .01

*Prob < .05

Table 6. Ordered logit results for global model of attitudes toward racial preferences and affirmative action, respondents from all racial groups combined, 2004 National Politics Survey

	Racial Preferences		Affirmative Action	
	b	z	b	z
General political attitudes				
Partisan identification [-]	-0.105	-4.58**	-0.195	-6.94**
Liberal-conservative orientation [-]	-0.130	-5.93**	-0.123	-4.47**
Trust in institutions [-]	0.019	0.41	0.174	3.00**
Demographic and socioeconomic variables				
Black [+]	0.945	6.62**	0.695	3.44**
Hispanic [+]	0.529	4.02**	0.192	1.14
Asian [+]	0.354	1.70*	0.392	1.39
Caribbean [+]	0.324	1.46	0.766	2.31*
Age [-]	-0.004	-1.48	-0.005	-1.66*
Gender [+]	0.055	0.71	0.484	5.04**
Education [+]	0.057	2.97**	-0.063	-2.67**
Income [+]	-0.0000001	-1.70	-0.0000002	-0.20
Respondent unemployed or laid off [+]	0.128	0.85	-0.050	-0.26
Racial identity and other attitudes				
American vs. Racial identity [-]	-0.201	-2.51*	-0.122	-1.23
Linked fate [+]	-0.061	-1.83	-0.002	-0.05
Support for melting pot [-]	-0.082	-3.45**	-0.079	-2.69**
Whites work harder than blacks [-]	-0.100	-2.94**	-0.057	-1.41
Whites work harder than Hispanics [-]	-0.119	-3.31**	-0.022	-0.52
Whites work harder than Asians [-]	0.106	2.93**	0.192	4.24**
Perceived discrimination against blacks [+]	0.322	4.82**	0.141	1.77*
Perceived discrimination against Hispanics [+]	-0.002	-0.03	0.146	1.83*
Perceived discrimination against Asians [+]	0.253	4.51**	0.150	2.19*
N	2513		2300	
Pseudo-R ²	0.083		0.116	
LR χ^2	517.08		400.42	
Prob χ^2	0.000		0.000	

Note: Symbols in brackets represent the expected direction of the coefficient.

Sthece: 2004 National Politics Survey

** prob < .01 * prob < .05

REFERENCES

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. ***An Economic Theory of Democracy***. New York: Harper and Row.
- Espenshade, T. J., & Chung, C. Y. (2005). "The Opportunity Cost of Admission Preferences at Elite Universities." ***Social Science Quarterly*** 86(2): 293–305.
- Feldman, Stanley and Leonie Huddy. 2005. "Racial Resentment and White Opposition to Race-Conscious Programs: Principle or Prejudice?" ***American Jthenal of Political Science*** 49(1): 168-183.
- Gay, Claudine. 2006. "Seeing Difference: The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes toward Latinos." ***American Jthenal of Political Science*** 50: 982-997.
- Green, Donald and Ian Shapiro. 1994. ***Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science***. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, David A., et al. 2006. "Understanding Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action Programs in Employment: Summary and Meta Analysis of 35 Years of Research." ***Jthenal of Applied Psychology*** 91(5): 1013-1036.
- Gratz v. Bollinger***, 539 U.S. 244,2003.
- Grutter v. Bollinger***, 539 U.S. 306,2003.
- Jacobson, Cardell. 1983. "Black Support for Affirmative action Policies." ***Phylon*** 44: 299-311.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Tali Mendelberg. 2000. "Individualism Reconsidered." In ***Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America***. In David O. Sears, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo (eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 44-74.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn Sanders. 1996. ***Divided By Color***. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., and David O. Sears. 1981. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism versus Racial Threats to the Good Life." ***Jthenal of Personality and Social Psychology*** 40(3): 414- 31.
- Kuklinski, James H., Cobb, Michael D. Cobb, and Martin Gilens. 2007. "Racial Attitudes and the New South." ***Jthenal of Politics*** 59(2): 323-349.

Mangum, Maurice. 2008. "Testing Competing Explanations of Black Opinions on Affirmative Action."

Policy Studies Journal 36: 347-366.

Park, Julie J. 2009. "Taking Race into Account: Charting Student Attitudes Towards Affirmative Action."

Research in Higher Education 50: 670-690.

Sander, Richard. 2004. "A Systematic Analysis of Affirmative Action in American Law Schools." *Stanford*

Law Review 57: 367-483).

Sax, Linda J. and Marisol Arredondo. 1999. "Student Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action in College

Admissions. *Research in Higher Education* 40(4): 439-459.

Sears, David, Carl Hensler, and Leslie Speer. 1979. "White Opposition to Busing: Self-Interest or Symbolic

Politics." *American Political Science Review* 73: 369-84.

Sidanius, Jim, Felicia Pratto, and Lawrence Bobo. 1996. "Racism, Conservatism, Affirmative Action, and

Intellectual Sophistication: A Matter of Principled Conservatism or Group Dominance?" *Jthenal of*

Personality and Social Psychology 70(3): 476-90.

Sniderman, Paul M., and Edward G. Carmines. 1997. *Reaching Beyond Race*. Cambridge: Harvard

University Press.

Sniderman, Paul M., Edward G. Carmines, Geoffrey C. Layman, and Michael Carter. 1996. "Beyond Race:

Social Justice as a Race Neutral Idea." *American Jthenal of Political Science* 40(1):33-55.

Sniderman, Paul M., Crosby, G. C., & Howell, W. G. (2000). "The Politics of Race". In D. O. Sears, J.

Sidanius, & L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*. p. 236-279.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tate, Katherine. 2003. "Black Opinion on the Legitimacy of Racial Redistricting and Minority-

Majority Districts." *American Political Science Review* 97: 45-56.

Wilson, David C., David W. Moore, Patrick F. McKay, Derek R. Avery. 2008. "Affirmative Action for

Minorities and Women." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72(3):514-522.

Wilson, W.J. 1978. ***The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions.***

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W.J. 1987. ***The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy.*** Chicago:

University of Chicago Press.

Vaca, Nicolas. 2004. ***Presumed Alliance.*** New York: Harper Collins.