



LIBRARY Michigan State University

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN COLLEGE ADMISSIONS AND RACIAL DIVERSITY BEFORE AND AFTER PROPOSITION 209

presented by

WILLIAM A. EDWARDS

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education

Listen a. Rem

Major Professor's Signature

12/11/08

Date

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due. MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.		
DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
051310		
	5/08 K:/F	Proj/Acc&Pres/CIRC/DateDue.indd

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN COLLEGE ADMISSIONS AND RACIAL DIVERSITY BEFORE AND AFTER PROPOSITION 209

By

William A. Edwards

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education

ABSTRACT

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN COLLEGE ADMISSIONS AND RACIAL DIVERSITY BEFORE AND AFTER PROPOSITION 209

By

William A. Edwards

Using a sample of California four-year college freshmen, this study examines attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209 in California. The results showed an increase in support for affirmative action in college admissions, but less concern for racial diversity from 1996 to 2000. Attitudes toward affirmative action and racial diversity were less polarized in 2000 than in 1996. Whites and Asian-American students were more opposed to affirmative action in college admissions than African-American or Hispanic/Latino students. Women and those with more liberal political ideologies were more likely to support affirmative action in college admissions and were more concerned about racial diversity. Regression analyses was included to show how the factors used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity changed from 1996 to 2000.

Copyright by William A. Edwards 2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee who provided a wealth of expertise on this study. Your support and advice was appreciated every step of the way. I would especially like to thank my chair, Dr. Kristen A. Renn, for guiding me through this long process. I would also like to thank my family, especially Le'Ann Duran, for encouraging and challenging me to complete my Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
The Diversity Rationale	3
Affirmative Action in College Admissions and the	5
Impact on the U.S. Workforce	5
The Current Study	6
The Impact of Policy on Attitudes	0
Overview of the Study	13
	10
CHAPTER 2	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Affirmative Action Defined	15
Alternative Strategies to Promote Diversity on Campus	16
The Development of Affirmative Action in the United States	17
The California Civil Rights Initiative	31
The Impacts of Banning Affirmative Action on Enrollment	35
California	36
University of Texas	48
University of Washington	50
University of Georgia	53
University of Florida	54
Summary	56
Attitudes toward Affirmative Action	57
Student Attitudes toward Diversity.	63
Conceptual Framework	
Hypotheses	67
.,,	
CHAPTER 3	
METHOD	70
Research Questions	70
Instrumentation	71
Sample	73
Variables	73
Dependent Variables	73
Survey Year	75
Student Background Characteristics	76
Self-Interest	76
Method of Analysis	80
-	

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

RESULTS	
Mean Differences	85
Percent Distributions	87
Correlation Matrices	
Chow's Test and Regression Analyses	
Summary	

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION	
Research Question 1	
Research Question 2	
Research Question 3	
Gender	
Political Ideology	
SES	
Academic Preparation	
Choice of College	
Research Question 4	
Kev Findinas	
Limitations	
Suggestions for Future Research	
Implications for Promoting Diversity within Higher Education	
Conclusions	
APPENDICES	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. African-American Undergraduate Enrollments at University of California System Institutions
Table 2. African-American Undergraduate Enrollments at California StateUniversity System Institutions39
Table 3. African-American Community College Enrollments in California from1995 - 2005
Table 4. Hispanic/Latino Undergraduate Enrollments at University of CaliforniaSystem Institutions from 1995 – 2005
Table 5. Hispanic/Latino Undergraduate Enrollments at California StateUniversity System Institutions44
Table 6. Hispanic/Latino Community College Enrollments in California from 1995- 2005
Table 7. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Texas by Race/Ethnicity 48
Table 8. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Washington by Race/Ethnicity 51
Table 9. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Georgia by Race/Ethnicity 52
Table 10. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Florida byRace/Ethnicity54
Table 11. Percent Distribution of California freshmen included in the sample bypolitical ideology and year
Table 12. Percent Distribution of California freshmen included in the sample for gender and race by year 84
Table 13. Percent Distribution of total enrollment in four-year postsecondary institutions in California gender and race by year
Table 14. Mean Responses of California Freshmen for each dependent variable by year

Table 15. Percentage distribution for "Affirmative action in college admissionsshould be abolished" by year
Table 16. Percentage distribution for "Racial discrimination is no longer a majorproblem in America" by year
Table 17. Percentage distribution for "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding" by year
Table 18. Correlation matrix for all dependent variables 90
Table 19. Correlation matrix for all independent variables 91
Table 20. Correlation matrix for SES and Academic Preparation
Table 21. Chow Tests comparing separate regression equations for 1996 and2000 for each dependent variable
Table 22. Regression and t-test comparisons for "Abolish affirmative action incollege admissions" in 1996 and 2000
Table 23. Regression for "Abolish affirmative action in college admissions" byracial/ethnic group
Table 24. Regression for "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America" in 1996 and 200096
Table 25. Regression for "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem inAmerica" by racial/ethnic group97
Table 26. Regression for "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding"in 1996 and 2000
Table 27. Regression for "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding"by racial/ethnic group
Table A1. Mean responses for each dependent variable by race and year
Table B1. Mean responses for each dependent variable by race, gender, and year

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Variable Coding Scheme74	'4
------------------------------------	-----------

CHAPTER 1

The debate over affirmative action, preferences granted to groups based on race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability status, or national origin, has intensified over the last decade as opponents of affirmative action have challenged the practices at the state and federal level. California, Texas, Washington, and Florida eliminated the use of affirmative action in college admissions during the 1990s. Two Supreme Court cases involving admissions practices at the University of Michigan were decided in 2003. In 2006, voters in Michigan passed a constitutional amendment banning the use of affirmative action (Schmidt, 2007a). In November 2008, voters in Colorado and Nebraska voted on similar measures (Wiedeman, 2008). Although the measure passed in Nebraska, voters in Colorado narrowly rejected the ballot initiative marking the first time that a state ballot initiative has failed. Policies concerning affirmative action attract particular attention and "have brought this very controversial issue to the forefront of national debate" (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999, p. 439). Opponents of affirmative action continue to challenge race-conscious admissions policies at the state level leaving the future of affirmative action in college admissions in doubt.

Proponents and opponents of affirmative action in college admissions seem to agree that more minorities successfully earning postsecondary degrees is a desirable outcome, but they disagree on how to get there (Crosby, Iyer, &

Clayton, 2003). Opponents argue that affirmative action institutionally discriminates against people of certain races and genders. They also point to studies in which the authors concluded that systems built using racial and gender preferences lead to negative attribution toward racial minorities and women, by others and themselves (Carter, 1991; Crosby et al., 2003; Heilman & Blader, 2001). Loury (1998) argued that affirmative action has created a greater chasm between middle-class and lower-class African-Americans.

Proponents argue that there are tangible benefits to society because affirmative action promotes diversity in educational institutions and the workplace (Crosby et al., 2003). Organizations that have tapped into the potential of a diverse workforce have seen growth in market segments and productivity. Benefits also exist for postsecondary institutions. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) included over 10,000 students at multiple colleges and universities to study the educational benefits of diversity. The authors found that diversity in higher education increases academic skills and promotes intellectual motivation and engagement. Bowen and Bok (1998) found that students admitted under affirmative action programs were more likely than white students to be active civic leaders.

The battle over affirmative action in college admissions garners particular attention by proponents and opponents because postsecondary education serves as a gateway to postgraduate learning opportunities and jobs (Wise, 2005). The 1978 Supreme Court decision in the case of *University of California Regents v. Bakke*, which has guided U.S. affirmative action policy in college

admissions for the last 30 years, articulated the link between affirmative action in postsecondary education and the availability of qualified professionals from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds (Pusser, 2004). However, *Bakke* only provides vague guidelines about what is and is not allowed within college admissions, leading to persistent challenges to affirmative action within the courts (Wise, 2005). In the employment sector, federal law lays out clearly the requirements of companies, but there are far fewer stipulations about what is required with college admissions. The lack of clarity around affirmative action policies has contributed to the complex political landscape surrounding the issue.

Institutions of higher education have a vested interest in the outcome of the political battle over affirmative action. Bans on affirmative action in California, Washington, Georgia, Florida, and Texas have resulted in a decrease in the number of underrepresented racial minorities, especially African-Americans at the most selective public universities (Look what happens, 2001-2002). Across the country, colleges and universities have made substantial financial commitments to assembling diverse student bodies and faculty (Carnevale & Fry, 2000). Eliminating affirmative action challenges postsecondary institutions to explore alternative mechanisms to increase the representation of minority students in postsecondary education.

The Diversity Rationale

Colleges and universities across the country are increasingly concerned with promoting diversity on campus in order to foster a better learning environment for all students (Gurin, 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000; Witt, Chang, &

Hakuta, 2003). A diverse student body and faculty help prepare students to succeed in an increasingly complex and diverse society (Hurtado, 2001). Without affirmative action in college admissions the elite public universities have struggled to provide a diverse learning experience for students, harming the educational mission of colleges and universities within the U.S.

The diversity rationale has only recently become the primary argument by colleges and universities in their efforts to continue affirmative action practices (Hurtado, 2005). Affirmative action was initially established as a policy to redress long-standing social injustice by an executive order signed by Franklin Roosevelt in 1941. The 2003 Supreme Court cases in *Grutter* and *Gratz* marked a significant change in the approach to defend affirmative action in college admissions. Rather than redressing past discrimination, the University of Michigan argued that diversity benefited all students and served to promote a better educational environment for all students.

As measures against affirmative action continue to succeed at the statelevel, the socioeconomic gap between Caucasian and other racial groups is increasing in the United States (Schmidt, 2007b). Whites are significantly outpacing other racial groups in income, net worth (Bucks, Kennickell, & Moore, 2006), housing (Bostic, 1996), and education (Schmidt, 2007b). Though overt forms of discrimination are less common in American, covert discrimination toward women (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Hall & Sandler, 1984) and racial minority groups (Virtanen & Huddy, 1998) is persistent within the United States.

Affirmative Action in College Admissions and the

Impact on the U.S. Workforce

Though public sentiment has mounted against affirmative action, demographic profiles demonstrate that racial minority populations, especially African-Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and American-Indians, are underrepresented on college and university campuses (Morfin, Perez, Parker, Lynn, & Arrona, 2006) largely due to inequities in the K-12 educational system (Bali & Alvarez, 2004; Farkas, 2003; Vernez, Krop, & Rydell, 1999), but this has made little difference to the public or the courts. Education in the U.S. is largely segregated at the K-12 and postsecondary levels, pushing minority students into lower-tier schools. Attending a lower-tiered school affects a student's opportunity to pursue graduate and professional degrees (Trent et al., 2003).

One role of U.S. colleges and universities is to prepare students to meet the needs of the workforce (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Being able to supply the country with an adequate number of qualified professionals from all backgrounds is critical for the economic competitiveness of locales and the country as a whole. As public sentiment against affirmative action grows, the next decade could significantly shape the future of race-conscious policies in the United States. Existing segregation within U.S. schools and neighborhoods threatens the supply of minority or female doctors, lawyers, engineers, nurses, and teachers. Each of these professions rely on U.S. public universities for training. If banning affirmative action leads to fewer minority and female

graduates in these programs the result would likely be a shortage of qualified professionals in places with high minority populations (Glaesor & Vigdor, 2001).

The Current Study

Previous research has been occupied with the effects of affirmative action on admissions and enrollment, but other outcomes of banning affirmative action are relevant to this controversial policy issue. Only since 1996 when California and Texas implemented bans on affirmative action could one study the impact of eliminating affirmative action on college and university campuses. As more states continue to eliminate affirmative action, researchers will be given the opportunity to study the impacts that banning affirmative action has on enrollment, but also on other outcomes like student attitudes.

Scholars have given considerable attention to the way in which the bans on affirmative action and the systems used in their place have affected the representation of racial minorities in colleges and universities (Bastedo, 2003; Brown & Hirschman, 2006; Horn & Flores, 2003; Marin & Lee, 2003; Rendon, Novack, & Dowell, 2005; Timar, Ogawa, & Orillion, 2004). Demographics are important, but they do not tell the whole story. Bans on affirmative action likely have significant ramifications on employee morale (America, 1986), employee recruitment (Vernon-Gerstenfeld & Burke, 1985), student recruitment (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Peterson, & Allen, 1998), scholarships (Crosby, Iyer, & Sincharoen, 2006), student retention (Moore, 1982), fund-raising (Schmidt, 2006), and many other areas of the university.

Through the current study I add a different layer to the growing debate about affirmative action by examining how Proposition 209, which banned affirmative action in California, has impacted student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Though researchers have studied student attitudes toward affirmative action (Meader, 1998; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000), an examination of the impact of banning affirmative action on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity is lacking. I pose the following research questions:

- What differences exist between aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?
- 2) Do gender, political ideology, race/ethnicity, parent's educational attainment, parent's estimated income, average high school grade, college entrance exam scores, and college choice predict California freshmen attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity at four-year institutions?
- 3) What differences exist between factors used to predict aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?

4) If differences are found between the variables used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, how did these vary by racial group?

I will answer these questions by examining data from the 1996, 1998, and 2000 CIRP Freshmen Surveys. Regression equations will be constructed controlling for student background characteristics and self-interest variables. Using Chow's test, I will determine whether the equations for 1996 and 2000 are significantly different. I will also determine whether significant differences exist between the beta coefficients for the two equations.

The current study examines the implications of the ban on affirmative action on student attitudes toward two distinct areas: affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Measuring the impact on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions can help to understand how the newest group of voters views this controversial policy issue (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999). The current study offers a unique contribution in this area by examining how attitudes have changed over time across different racial groups.

The policy process has often been viewed as a one-directional process with various actors exerting influence. However, the framing of policy events especially by the media influences the attitudes of the citizenry (Lewis, 2001). In this case, college students are particularly important because they are directly impacted by the outcome of the affirmative action debate and they represent the new generation of voters and potential political leaders. Changes in the way that students view affirmative action in college admissions may offer an indication of

what the future holds for affirmative action in college admissions. If the ban has resulted in more support for affirmative action in college admissions, it may point toward a changing public sentiment in the future. If the ban results in less support for affirmative action in college admissions, it may suggest that affirmative action is not likely to return.

Understanding the impact of banning affirmative action on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions is a relevant issue for policymakers. Not only should policymakers be concerned with the effect that affirmative action policies have on enrollment patterns, but they should also be responsive to student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Trends in student attitudes could yield some insight into the future direction of public opinion about affirmative action in college admissions as this generation moves into leadership roles across the country. Furthermore, because affirmative action directly impacts college students, their attitudes toward the issue should be a primary concern for policymakers.

Measuring the change in student attitudes toward racial diversity provides insight into how banning affirmative action in college admissions impacts campus climate. College and universities invest significant resources into improving campus climate through formal and informal education and efforts to recruit a diverse student body and faculty (Chang, 2002; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2001). However, Whitt, Edison, Pascarella Terenzini, & Nora (2001) found that students' openness to diversity and challenge was the most significant predictor of openness to diversity and challenge after three years of college. If banning

affirmative action in college admissions results in less concern for racial diversity, this may be an indication that colleges and university will have a steeper learning curve as they work to promote racial diversity and create a positive campus climate for all students.

As students matriculate into the workforce they will be the future leaders who are expected to interact in an increasingly diverse society. Students are increasingly expected to enter the workforce promoting positive racial policies and attitudes (Meader, 1998). The attitudes of entering freshmen toward racial diversity can serve as a baseline for colleges and universities promoting diversity as an intended education outcome. Examining student attitudes toward racial diversity can also provide administrators with insight into the college racial climate (Inkelas, 2003).

Measuring student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity would also be useful in understanding the impact that banning affirmative action has on the college aspirations of students, especially racial minorities. Though the current study does not address this issue, research in this area could help explain why applications from minority students drop after affirmative action is banned. Horn and Flores (2003) found that minority applications at UC-Berkeley and UCLA declined with the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996. As of 2001, the percentage of applications from minority populations had still not recovered to 1995 levels. Research that measures changes in student attitudes could be used to provide more detailed analyses

into the contributing factors for the decrease in flagship applications among minority students.

There is still much to learn about a world without affirmative action. Raceconscious policies have many opponents. However, Zamani and Brown (2003) found that people may not fully understand what affirmative action is and what it is designed to achieve. The picture should become clearer as the body of research about the lack of affirmative action or policies used to replace affirmative action grows. It could be that affirmative action in college admissions is the most effective way to ensure proportional access to postsecondary education for racial minority groups, despite its downsides. Scholars should explore the affirmative action debate from multiple levels. This study provides insight into one area of this very important policy issue.

The Impact of Policy on Attitudes

In the current study I hypothesize that policies banning the use of affirmative action will decrease support for affirmative action in college admissions and decrease support for racial diversity among college students in California. Political scientists have long studied public opinion to determine how best to shape policy to gain the support of the public, but the policy process is iterative (Lewis, 2001). Policies and the media attention devoted to them heavily influence how the public views policy issues. This is especially the case with affirmative action because of the controversy that surrounds the issue (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999).

Politicians are increasingly using polarizing issues like affirmative action to build successful campaigns to garner support from particular segments of the electorate (Cain & MacDonald, 1997). As politicians continue to use issues as a means to increase their political clout, studies that address attitudes toward political issues become increasingly important in explaining the policy process. Additionally, studies like the current one can be used to explain how the policy process impacts students, an increasingly important group of voters.

The media play a vital role in the formation of attitudes about policies in the amount of coverage they provide to an issue and the way in which the policies are framed. The media are capable of casting the spotlight on political issues and bringing them to the forefront of public attention. They are also able to focus less attention on certain policy issues, ensuring low levels of public awareness about those policy issues (Lewis, 2001). Kellstedt (2000) found that media framing for racial policies has a significant impact on policy attitudes. When policies such as affirmative action are cast in individualistic terms, the public tends to oppose them and when policies are framed in terms of egalitarian values the public is more supportive. The language used for state ballot initiatives to eliminate affirmative action has been highly contested. For instance, the wording over a measure in Missouri in 2008, which failed to garner enough signatures to be placed on the ballot, initially referred to affirmative action. A county circuit judge changed the wording to preferential treatment (Lieb, 2008; Weidman, 2008).

The heightened attention given to Proposition 209 is important to establish given the current goal of examining the relationship between the voter referendum and student attitudes. The debate over race-conscious policies in California before voters passed proposition 209 produced significant media attention around the issue of affirmative action. Nicholson (2003) analyzed California ballot propositions from 1956 through 2000 to determine how the political environment impacted public awareness of the propositions. Nicholson found that propositions concerning civil liberties like affirmative action generate significantly greater awareness among the public than propositions that do not concern civil liberties. Specific to the ban on affirmative action in California, Nicholson found that 84% of voters were aware of Proposition 209 compared to a mean of 63.97% awareness of all of the propositions included in the study. Furthermore, organized protests on college and university campuses numbered in the thousands (Bacon, 1996; Bowman, 1996). Given the heightened level of awareness about Proposition 209, I will examine in the current study how student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and diversity were impacted by this controversial ballot measure.

Overview of the Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter Two presents the literature relevant to the present study including a brief summary of the history of affirmative action, the unfolding of the California Civil Rights Initiative, previous research on the impacts of banning affirmative action in college admissions, prior research on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions,

and previous research about the benefits of diversity. Chapter Three details the theoretical framework and methodology employed for the study. Chapter Four presents the findings of the study. Chapter Five includes a discussion of the results, limitations of the current study, and directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter examines previous work about affirmative action that has laid the groundwork for the current study. Initially, I provide a brief examination of the meaning of affirmative action. Second, I summarize alternative strategies used by postsecondary institutions to increase diversity. Third, I offer an overview of some of the more important historical events related to affirmative action in the United States is presented. The account is not comprehensive, but is offered to provide a basic overview of how this controversial issue has unfolded over the years. Then I provide a specific examination of the California Civil Rights Initiative. Fifth, I examine previous literature on the role of student attitudes in shaping campus climate. Sixth, I will address previous research on the impacts of banning affirmative action in college admissions. Seventh, I provide a summary of previous research about student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Finally, I examine previous research about the benefits of diversity in postsecondary education.

Affirmative Action Defined

Affirmative Action was implemented in the United States during the 1960s and has been the source of ongoing debate ever since (Aberson, 2003). Although the issue has proven divisive, the term is often confusing and misunderstood (Zamani & Brown, 2003). Affirmative action refers to both voluntary and mandatory efforts undertaken by federal, state, and local

governments; private employers; and schools to combat discrimination and to promote equal opportunity in education and employment for all (American Psychological Association, 1996). In the United States, affirmative action policies have primarily benefited women and racial/ethnic minority groups, but disability status, religion, and sexual preference have been the focus of affirmative action in other countries (Affirmative Action, 2004).

Whether affirmative action programs violate the equal protection clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which makes it unlawful to discriminate in employment or education against any person because of one's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, has been the point of contention over affirmative action (Pusser, 2004). Opponents of affirmative action would restrict such policies to enforcing non-discrimination, but would prohibit policies that systematically use racial preferences. Proponents argue that racial preferences are necessary to redress past discrimination and to promote diversity within schools and the workplace. Though affirmative action encompasses a wide range of policies related to employment and education, in the current study I focus on race-conscious admissions in postsecondary education, which lies at the heart of the debate over the use of affirmative action in postsecondary education (Wise, 2005).

Alternative Strategies to Promote Diversity on Campus

Postsecondary institutions employ numerous strategies to promote diversity on campus that are not considered affirmative action according to state law. Targeted outreach efforts have been one tactic employed by universities,

especially those in states that have banned the use of affirmative action in college admissions. Using race as a basis for recruitment could be considered a form of affirmative action (American Psychological Association, 1997), regardless of whether applicants are given any preferential treatment. However, targeting a geographic area with large concentrations of minority students has been allowed in states that have banned affirmative action in college admissions. If a university fails to meet admissions goals for a certain racial/ethnic group, it might step up recruiting efforts by sending more recruiters to high schools with large concentrations of that particular racial/ethnic group.

Besides the racial composition on campus, universities promote formal and informal cross-group interactions among students on campus and diversityrelated initiatives such as diversity courses, workshops, and intergroup dialogues (Milem & Hakuta, 2000). Living-learning communities, study-abroad, and community service activities have all shown positive impacts on student's openness to diversity (Astin & Sax, 1998; Laubscher, 1994; Pike, 2002). Many colleges and universities have special support programs for minorities as well (e.g., Federal TRIO programs, academic support, residence life programs).

The Development of Affirmative Action in the United States

Affirmative action was implemented in the United States as a means to redress the historic institutionalized discrimination against racial minority groups and women. Federal and state laws, including the original Constitution, condoned and perpetuated the institution of slavery and discrimination against women. After the Civil War, slaves were granted many rights that had previously been

denied, but support for such policies was sparse, particularly in the South (Witt & Shin, 2003). Government intervention was necessary to combat discrimination against racial minorities and women.

The first federal affirmative action program was implemented in 1934 when Harold Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior under President Franklin Roosevelt, ordered no discrimination to be exercised against a person because of color or religion on Public Works Administration (PWA) projects. Enforcement was lacking for the nondiscrimination policy (Anderson, 2005). So, Ickes ordered all PWA housing contractors that accepted federal contracts in cities with a large African-American population to employ a certain percentage of African-American workers.

The 1930s and the New Deal brought only short-term, minor changes. For African-Americans, policies that promoted nondiscrimination were rarely enforced (Anderson, 2005). State governments often ignored federal guidelines with little recourse. Women were unlikely to find skilled or professional work, instead usually working in food service, sewing, or housekeeping. The disproportionate effect on African-Americans helped spur their political activity (Weiss, 1997)

In the 1940s the United States implemented the first peacetime draft in preparation for a possible war in Europe and Asia (Anderson, 2005). In 1941, African-Americans comprised over 16% of enlistments that year compared to only 10% of the U.S. population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975). Unfortunately, they were relegated to duty as messmen and officers' stewards.

President Roosevelt was pressured to end segregation in the armed forces, but did not comply.

Instead, on June 25, 1941 President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802, which ordered nondiscrimination for all training and vocational programs for jobs with government defense contractors with regard to race, creed, color, or national origin (Witt & Shin, 2003). The executive order also created the Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC) to investigate complaints of discrimination, but the commission had little means of enforcement. Although the order did not end segregation in the military, it provided further support from the President to change employment practices in the United States (Anderson, 2005).

In 1945, the State of New York passed the Ives-Quinn Act, which barred discrimination by employers and labor unions. The state FEPC was more powerful than Roosevelt's FEPC because it provided an enforcement mechanism. In instances where employers were found to have discriminated against persons based on race, creed, color, or national origin the commission had the authority to require the employer to "take such affirmative action, including (but not limited to) hiring, reinstatement or upgrading of employees, with or without back pay, restoration to membership in any respondent labor organization" (Weiss, 1997, pp. 40-41).

The 1950s produced a number of court cases that prevented educational institutions from segregating or discriminating against persons based on race. In *Sweatt v. Painter*, the Supreme Court in 1950 struck down segregation in state-

run law schools. In 1954 the Supreme Court decided in *Brown v. Board of Education* that state policies on public education supporting "separate but equal" treatment for persons of color were unconstitutional (Moore, 2005). Though the case concerned K-12 education, the decision applied to higher education as well (Brown, 2001). In subsequent decisions, the Supreme Court struck down "separate but equal" policies and laws for other publicly funded facilities (Witt & Shin, 2003). However, southern states paid little attention to ending segregation within postsecondary education for another ten years (Brown, 2001).

The 1960s brought increasing activism on the part of African-Americans, particularly in the South (Anderson, 2005). Colleges and universities began recruiting and admitting greater numbers of African-American students (Witt & Shin, 2003). The Civil Rights Movement was gaining momentum and led to a number of policy changes to offer opportunities to minorities in the United States. In March 1961, President John F. Kennedy issued executive order 10925, which required employers to take affirmative action to employ without discrimination and to treat employees fairly without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin (Anderson, 2005). The executive order was the first to provide penalties for non-compliance (Witt & Shin, 2003).

Between May 13, 1963 and June 20, 1963, 127 civil rights bills were introduced in the United States Legislature (Weiss, 1997). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 compiled many of the previous executive orders into a single bill. The bill prevented discrimination in the workplace for private companies as well, but did not explicitly require employers to give preferential treatment to any individual

based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin (Anderson, 2005). The bill also created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which was charged with investigating and eliminating discrimination in private employment. Title VI of the act restricted the awarding of federal funds to segregated K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions (Brown, 2001).

A year later, President Lyndon Johnson issued Executive Order 11246, which superseded previous executive orders and became the standing rule on affirmative action for the next several decades (Anderson, 2005). The order reinforced non-discrimination, but added new requirements on contractors and subcontractors with more than fifty employees and contracts worth \$50,000 or more requiring them to periodically submit a written report about minority participation on their projects and their affirmative action plans (Weiss, 1997). In 1967, President Johnson extended affirmative action provisions to include sex discrimination.

Also in 1967, the EEOC issued a report which claimed that current measures to diversify the workforce and end discrimination were having little effect on most businesses. So, the federal government began to focus on the construction industry and devised plans for specific urban areas. In 1969, specific targets were laid out by the Department of Labor to increase African-American participation on construction projects from 5% in 1969 to between 19% and 26% by 1973 for Philadelphia (Witt & Shin, 2003). Similar plans were implemented in Washington, D.C., Seattle, St. Louis, Atlanta, and San Francisco.

During the 1970s, numerical formulas were increasingly used by the courts in instances where companies had been found guilty of discriminating in the workplace. The judgments were viewed as temporary preferences for minority applicants rather than quotas, which were prohibited under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Weiss, 1997). The use of specific quantifiable remedies was a necessary response to the failure of non-discrimination policies that lacked successful enforcement mechanisms.

In 1971, the Department of Labor issued Order #4 and later Revised Order #4, which expanded the Philadelphia Plan to all federal contractors (Anderson, 2005). The orders removed all references to proportional hiring that previous directives had included and required all contractors with 50 or more employees and contracts of \$50,000 or more to submit a written affirmative action plan for hiring minorities and women within 120 days of the start of a contract (Weiss, 1997; Witt & Shin, 2003). The plans were to account for the size of the minority population in the local region and demanded that contractors establish specific goals and timetables within the plan. At the time, the policy affected a quarter million contractors and 20 million workers or about a third of the entire U.S. labor force.

During the same year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Griggs v. Duke Power Company* that using a paper-and-pencil test as part of the criteria for hiring was a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 if the test was not deemed a business necessity (Weiss, 1997). Because African-Americans had been denied access to education and were more likely than whites to live in impoverished

conditions, the use of such tests had an adverse impact on minority applicants. In 1977, Eleanor Holmes Norton was appointed to the Chair of the EEOC by President Jimmy Carter. The commission had a backlog of 130,000 discrimination complaints to investigate. In an effort to reduce the backlog, Norton ordered the agency to shift from investigating individual complaints to investigating broader patterns and practices.

The U.S. Supreme Court directly addressed the issue of affirmative action in college admissions for the first time in 1978 with the *University of California Regents v. Bakke* decision (Newman, 1989). Allan Bakke, the plaintiff, had been denied admission to the University of California, Davis medical school, which reserved 16 spots in each entering class out of 100 total incoming students for African-American, Latino, and Asian-American students who had experienced racial discrimination (Witt and Shin, 2003). Bakke, a white applicant, sued the university claiming that the admissions plan violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Moore, 2005). Bakke sought an injunction against the special admissions program that gave preferences to minority applicants and demanded admission to the medical school.

The court was sharply divided with four justices siding with the plaintiff, four siding with the university, and Justice Powell siding with the plaintiff, but refusing to end affirmative action at the university. Six separate opinions were issued in the case, but Justice Powell's decision became the opinion of the court (Pusser, 2004). Powell viewed the set-aside slots as quotas, which he viewed as

unconstitutional. Powell applied the strict scrutiny standard, which required the plan to have a compelling objective and racial classification had to be necessary to achieve the objective. Set-aside spots did not meet this standard for Powell, but he claimed that race could be used as a "plus factor" that treated each applicant as an individual (Newman, 1989). This became the standard for affirmative action programs in college admissions for the next two decades.

During the 1980s, the Reagan Administration took a number of steps to curtail previous efforts for affirmative action (Weiss, 1997). Justices Scalia and Kennedy, open opponents of affirmative action, were appointed to the Supreme Court. Clarence Thomas was appointed to chair the EEOC in 1982 and reverted to addressing individual complaints of discrimination rather than addressing systemic patterns of discrimination. Numerical goals and timetables were gradually eliminated as requirements for government contractors.

In 1986 the Supreme Court ruled in *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education*. The Jackson board of education developed an affirmative action program that had achieved gains in employing more African-American teachers, but layoffs soon became necessary. Historically, the board would lay off the least senior members of the faculty, but doing so would have resulted in the termination of too many of the African-American teachers (Anderson, 2004). So, the board modified the policy, splitting the teachers into white and African-American groups and laying off the same percentage of teachers from each group. The Supreme Court ruled that societal discrimination did not provide a compelling objective and that the policy would be unconstitutional even if the
goals were permissible (Newman, 1989). The court held that the loss of an existing job was more intrusive than denial of a future opportunity in college admissions or in hiring.

In 1987 U.S. v. Paradise was decided by the Supreme Court. A federal district court had previously found that Alabama had discriminated against African-Americans in the hiring of state trooper positions. The district court ordered that for every white promoted to corporal the Alabama Department of Public Safety should promote an African-American as long as qualified applicants existed (Newman, 1989). In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court upheld the previous ruling. The case is the closest the Supreme Court has come to approving racial quotas (Witt & Shin, 2003).

In 1989 the court ruled in *Wards Cove v. Antonio* and in *City of Richmond v. Croson.* In the former, the Supreme Court's ruling moved the burden of proof from the employer to the plaintiff in demonstrating discrimination has occurred (Anderson, 2004).. In the latter, the Supreme Court ruled that the Minority Business Utilization Plan used by the city, which "required prime contractors on construction projects funded by the city to subcontract at least 30% of the dollar amount of the contract to one or more Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs). An MBE was a business that was at least 51% owned by minority group members" (Witt & Shin, 2003, p. 196). The court found that the program was not narrowly tailored and that the city failed to provide any evidence that past racial discrimination had actually occurred. Systemic racism was clearly not recognized by the Supreme Court as a justification for affirmative action.

In 1990, the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commissions (FCC).* The FCC was sued for favoring minority applicants for broadcast licenses (Witt & Shin, 2003). The FCC claimed that minority ownership was one factor among several that it used in awarding licenses. At the time, white ownership in the industry was at 98%. The court ruled in favor of the FCC declaring that diversity on the airwaves was an important governmental objective and that proof of remediation was not necessary.

In United States v. Fordice (1992) the Supreme Court for the first time since Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 issued a ruling evaluating whether a state had sufficiently "addressed its affirmative duty to dismantle prior de jure segregated systems of higher education" (Brown, 2001, p. 50). The ruling mandated the adoption of desegregation compliance policies including admissions policies to provide greater opportunities for African-American applicants to attend the state's historically White institutions (Olivas, 2005). To the Court's satisfaction, the State of Mississippi responded by broadening admissions criteria to include high school grades and rank in class and also implementing summer precollegiate programs that offer conditional admissions and remedial instruction.

The court also concluded that the State of Mississippi should permit historically Black institutions to develop more high-demand specializations and graduate programs. New programs in allied health professions, engineering, social work, urban planning, and business administration were awarded to historically black colleges, increasing the opportunities for African-Americans in

Mississippi to pursue these high-demand fields. In total, the state appropriated in excess of \$245 million over 17 years for the new programs at three historically Black institutions.

In 1995, the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in Adarand Constructors Inc. v. Peña. Adarand, a white-owned construction company, was not awarded a subcontract for a project in which they submitted the lowest bid. Instead, a minority-owned business was selected by the general contractor (Pusser, 2004). A financial incentive existed for the general contractor to select the minority-owned business. The Supreme Court overturned the Metro Broadcasting ruling holding that governmental affirmative actions should be subject to strict scrutiny like other affirmative action programs. However the court did not rule on whether this case met strict scrutiny, choosing to remand the case back to the lower court. Justice O'Connor wrote the opinion of the court, declaring that race-conscious policies aimed at responding to societal discrimination against minority groups could be allowed as long as the program is narrowly tailored. The Supreme Court suggested that the lower court consider whether the governmental interest was compelling, whether race-neutral alternatives could achieve the desired ends, and whether the remedy would be short-lived.

The 1990s also brought increasing scrutiny to the use of affirmative action in college admissions. Because of a history of school segregation in the K-12 system and exclusion from many postsecondary institutions, colleges and universities had employed affirmative action in admissions to increase the

representation of minority and female students (Moore, 2005). The use of affirmative action in college admissions has become a prime target for opponents of race-conscious policies. Voter referendums and Supreme Court cases have cast a spotlight on the issue and have led to major policy changes for California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Washington, and Michigan.

In 1996, California voters passed proposition 209, which prohibited discrimination against or preferential treatment based on sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public employment, public education, or public contracting. In the same year, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals issued its ruling in *Hopwood v. Texas* (Moore, 2005). The plaintiff claimed that the University of Texas Law School had lower requirements for minority applicants than it had for white applicants. The Court of Appeals decided that *Bakke* had no legal standing because it did not have a majority decision. The court ruled that diversity was not a compelling state interest and the university failed to prove the need for affirmative action. The ruling effectively forced institutions in Texas to eliminate affirmative action from their admissions policies.

In 1997, the University of Georgia was sued by eleven students, seven whites and four African-Americans, who claimed that affirmative action led to racial segregation in the public university system (Moore, 2005). The court found that the University of Georgia used an unconstitutional admission policy from 1990 to 1995 by giving preferences to African-Americans. By this time the university had abandoned the use of affirmative action. So, the ruling had no impact, but the judge ruled anyway to prevent the policy from being reinstated.

In 1998, voters in Washington passed a referendum banning the use of affirmative action in hiring, contracting, and college admissions (Witt & Shin, 2003). Led by the Center for Individual Rights and Ward Connerly, the same man responsible for leading the opposition against affirmative action in California, the referendum easily passed with 54% of voters supporting the ban. Although the ban in Washington drew much less attention than in California, it reinforced perceptions that more and more states would experience challenges to their affirmative action policies (Healy, 1998).

Building on the momentum against affirmative action, Ward Connerly threatened to push a similar campaign in Florida. Florida's Governor, Jeb Bush, preempted such a measure by offering a plan to end affirmative action in college admissions and to admit the top 20% of each high school graduating class to at least one of the public universities in the state (Moore, 2005). Similar plans had been implemented in California and Texas in an attempt to maintain diversity without the use of race-conscious admissions policies. The plan was adopted by the Board of Regents and affirmative action in college admissions was quickly eliminated in Florida.

In 2003, the Supreme Court ruled in two cases involving the University of Michigan (Moore, 2005). In *Gratz v. Bollinger* the court ruled that the undergraduate admissions policy was not narrowly tailored and violated the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. The policy employed a point system that required the applicant to achieve a score of 100 points to be admitted. Underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities were automatically

awarded 20 points, which the court found did not allow for individual consideration.

In *Grutter v. Bollinger* the court ruled in favor of the University of Michigan Law School holding that a racially and ethnically diverse student population is a compelling societal interest (Green, 2004). Furthermore, the court determined that the admissions policy was narrowly tailored such that race was used as one factor, but was not the defining feature of a student's application. As long as the policy avoided formulas and each applicant was viewed as an individual, the court ruled that race could be used in college admissions.

The University of Michigan cases were major milestones in the history of affirmative action in college admissions. At a time when affirmative action programs were being dismantled in a number of states and public sentiment had moved largely against such policies, the Michigan cases could have marked the end of affirmative action in college admissions. Instead, the Supreme Court reaffirmed *Bakke* by ruling that affirmative action in college admissions served a compelling interest by increasing diversity on college campuses.

However, it is not clear how long the court will continue to uphold the use of affirmative action in college admissions. Justice O'Connor, writing for the court in *Grutter*, indicated that in 25 years affirmative action should not be needed. The articulation of a specific time-frame that the court expects affirmative action to be unnecessary is profound (Moore, 2005). If the number of racial and ethnic minorities fails to increase substantially over the next 25 years, the court may reconsider the time-frame that was established. At the same time, the court may

hold institutions of higher education to this time-frame. Either way, the inclusion of the time-frame certainly made it clear that the Supreme Court expects that affirmative action will be abandoned in the near future.

In November 2006, voters in Michigan passed Proposition 2, which banned the use of racial and gender preferences by public colleges and other state agencies (Selingo, 2006). In November 2008, voters in Nebraska passed a similar measure (Wiedeman, 2008). During the same election cycle, voters in Colorado narrowly defeated a measure eliminating affirmative action in the state, marking the first time that a state measure banning affirmative action did not pass voters in the state. There are likely to be additional state measures in the future challenging the use of affirmative action in college admissions and employment.

The California Civil Rights Initiative

California has held a prominent position in the affirmative action debate over the years. The University of California had pursued aggressive affirmative action policies since the early 1960s despite facing substantial legal challenges (Timar, Ogawa, & Orillion, 2004). The landmark *Bakke* case pushed California into the public spotlight and continues to be the litmus test for race-conscious admissions policies since 1978. However, during the 1990s several forces led to more public resentment of affirmative action policies and California again was pushed into the spotlight as voters passed a measure to ban affirmative action for public hiring, contracting, and college admissions.

In 1991, the California State Assembly considered legislation that would have required the freshman classes in California's public colleges and universities to reflect the ethnic composition of the class that graduated from the state's public high schools (Chavez, 1998). The bill was vetoed by Governor Pete Wilson, but it heightened debate around the use of racial preferences in college admissions. Most importantly, the California Association of Scholars, a conservative organization, became a vocal opponent of the bill and would later draft Proposition 209 in response.

In 1993, Governor Pete Wilson, concerned about the increasing burden that immigrants were placing on social services, set out to curb immigration in the state and the cost of supporting such a high immigrant population (Chavez, 1998). The highlight of Wilson's initiative was Proposition 187 in 1994, which outlawed public benefits for illegal aliens and their families in California, signaling to some an increased level of resentment toward minority populations in the state. Proposition 187 helped pave the way for the California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI), which eliminated the use of preferential treatment by the state to anyone based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin (Mukherjee, 2000).

The eventual authors of the CCRI, Thomas Wood and Glynn Custred, had tried for two years to place a measure on the ballot to eliminate state-sponsored affirmative action (Mukherjee, 2000). In 1994, they incorporated a political committee, California Against Discrimination and Preferences, to organize in support of the CCRI. The mid-term elections that year saw unexpected victories for Republicans and the passage of Proposition 187 (Raza, Anderson, &

Custred, 1999). Although proposition 187 was overturned by the courts, it heightened tensions over government policies targeting minority groups in the state.

In 1995, Ward Connerly successfully convinced Governor Pete Wilson, who had been a long-time proponent of affirmative action, to reverse his position on the matter (Timar et al., 2004). Wilson issued Executive Order W-124-95 on June 1, 1995, which required the University of California to end preferential treatment and promote merit instead. On July 20, 1995, the University of California Board of Regents adopted SP-1, which eliminated the use of race and gender in the admissions process (Mukherjee, 2000). Even though the Board of Regents eliminated affirmative action, SP-1 mandated that the university system remain committed to maintaining a diverse student body through means other than affirmative action (Timar et al., 2004).

In 1996, the political landscape had sufficiently changed with the passage of proposition 187 and SP-1. The public was now clearly leaning against programs that provided assistance to immigrants and minority groups. Custred and Wood wrote the referendum to mirror that of the 1964 Civil Rights and made no mention of affirmative action (Raza, Anderson, & Custred, 1999). Opponents sued to have the term affirmative action inserted into the measure. The trial judge ordered the words inserted, but the ruling was overturned by the appellate judge.

Out of fear that SP-1 might be overturned, Ward Connerly agreed to chair the initiative to get Proposition 209 on the ballot (Chavez, 1998). Connerly offered the initiative a black man opposed to affirmative action, a direct

connection to Governor Wilson, and ties to wealthy potential supporters of the initiative. With his support and that of the Governor, the initiative had ample political and financial support to succeed (Raza, Anderson, & Custred, 1999).

In November 1996, California voters passed proposition 209 with 54% of the vote, making it illegal for the state to discriminate or give preferential treatment to anyone based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin (Mukherjee, 2000). Exit polls indicated that the measure was opposed by 76% of Latinos, 74% of African-Americans, and 61% of Asian-Americans (Hajnal & Louch, 2001). However, there were only 6 out of 58 counties where more voters opposed the measure than supported it.

The proposition was immediately challenged in court by a group of CCRI opponents. A temporary injunction was issued in December 1996 when the court sided with the CCRI opponents that the measure violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights (Raza et al., 1999). However, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit U.S. District Court of Appeals ruled in April 2007 that the measure did not violate the equal protection clause and the full Ninth Circuit Court declined a request to delay implementation. The U.S. Supreme Court denied a motion to block enforcement of the measure and in 1998 Proposition 209 took effect (Timar et al., 2004). Passage of the proposition led to numerous other lawsuits as particular practices came under increased scrutiny. Proposition 209 was a major blow to California's selective universities, which now faced an uphill battle in recruiting and enrolling minority applicants. California universities continue to seek ways to increase minority enrollment without the use of

affirmative action through increased outreach and geographically tiered admissions (Rendon, Novack, & Dowell, 2005).

The Impacts of Banning Affirmative Action on Enrollment

Significant attention has been focused on the impact that banning affirmative action has had on minority enrollment in California, Washington, Georgia, Texas, and Florida. Each state has distinct differences in the way that affirmative action was banned and in the way the state has responded in trying to ensure adequate minority representation within higher education institutions after eliminating affirmative action in college admissions. However, in the absence of affirmative action public universities with selective admissions have struggled to increase minority enrollments, especially African-American enrollments, as a whole (Look what happens, 2001-2002).

For instance, African-American undergraduate enrollment dropped at the University of California at Berkley (UC-Berkeley) from 1,200 in 1995 to 829 in 2005. At the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) African-American undergraduate enrollment dropped 1,433 in 1995 to 799 in 2005 (University of California, n.d.). Over the same time period UC-Berkley dropped from 2,696 to 2,484 Hispanic/Latino undergraduates while UCLA dropped from 4,009 to 3,788 (University of California, n.d.). At the University of Texas, African-American enrollments dropped from 1,469 in 1995 to a low of 1,277 in 1999 (University of Texas, 2005). Only in 2005 did African-American enrollments reach 1995 levels with a total of 1,482 African-American undergraduates. Hispanic/Latino enrollment declined slightly from 5,143 in 1995 to a low of 5,106 in 1999 before

steadily increasing to 5,919 in 2005. Though I seek to move beyond enrollment data to examine the impact that the ban on affirmative action in California has had on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, it is important to consider the impact of the bans on minority enrollment because it significantly contributes to the ongoing debate across the country about affirmative action.

California

Though minority enrollments have increased in some institutions within California, the flagship universities have faced an uphill battle in attempting to enroll minority students (see Table 1). For instance, while UC-Berkeley and UCLA have seen decreases in the number of African-American enrollments, UC-Irvine has increased from 353 in 1995 to 453 in 2005. UC-Riverside has increased from 382 to 957 over the same time period. As minorities have been pushed down to less prestigious universities and colleges, higher education scholars, elite institutions, and policymakers have become increasingly concerned about the unequal stratification of minority enrollments (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Bastedo, 2003). Trow (1999) guestioned the distinctions that have been made between the value of a flagship education and an education from other publicly-funded institutions. However, having fewer minority students within flagship institutions limits the structural diversity and the educational benefits of a diverse undergraduate student body at those institutions (Hurtado, Dey, & Treviño, 1994).

Year	Berkeley	NCLA	Davis	Irvine	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Total UC System
1995	1200	1,433	661	353	382	327	419	241	5,016
	(2.9%)	(%0'9)	(3.6%)	(2.6%)	(2.0%)	(2.2%)	(2.6%)	(2.7%)	(4.0%)
1996	1,181	1,437	632	337	439	300	420	226	4,972
	(5,5%)	(6,0%)	(3 3%)	(2 3%)	(5.6%)	12 0%)	(26%)	(2 5%)	(3 9%)
1997	1,270	1,407	583	298	460	302	457	226	5,003
	(2.8%)	(2.9%)	(3.0%)	(2.1%)	(5.4%)	(2.0%)	(2.7%)	(2.4%)	(3.9%)
1998	1160	1,305	591	292	478	278	442	218	4,764
	(5.2%)	(5.4%)	(3.0%)	(2.0%)	(5.2%)	(1.7%)	(2.6%)	(2.2%)	(3.6%)
1999	1,065	1,167	545	294	552	258	424	227	4,533
	(4.7%)	(4.7%)	(2.8%)	(1.9%)	(5.4%)	(1.6%)	(2.4%)	(2.2%)	(3.3%)
2000	980	1,068	552	32 4	650	211	450	231	4,478
	(4.3%)	(4.3%)	(2.7%)	(2.0%)	(5.6%)	(1.3%)	(2.6%)	(2.1%)	(3.2%)
2001	871	948	587	397	713	222	4 47	277	4,452
	(3.7%)	(3.7%)	(2.7%)	(2.2%)	(5.6%)	(1.3%)	(2.5%)	(2.3%)	(3.0%)
2002	879	921	584	4 35	826	219	469	295	4,629
	(3.7%)	(3.7%)	(2.6%)	(2.2%)	(5.8%)	(1.1%)	(2.6%)	(2.3%)	(3.0%)
2003	924	895	590	432	984	241	452	328	4,846
	(4.0%)	(3.5%)	(2.5%)	(2.1%)	(6.4%)	(1.2%)	(2.5%)	(2.4%)	(3.0%)
2004	833	829	590	4 38	999	269	474	349	4 ,781
	(3.6%)	(3.3%)	(2.5%)	(2.2%)	(6.6%)	(1.3%)	(2.6%)	(2.5%)	(3.0%)
2005	829	799	581	453	957	278	478	352	4,781
	(3.5%)	(3.2%)	(2.5%)	(2.3%)	(6.5%)	(1.3%)	(2.6%)	(2.6%)	(3.0%)

Table 1. African-American Undergraduate Enrollments at University of California System Institutions

The elite public universities stand the most to lose in their efforts to promote diversity as states consider banning affirmative action. Even if the difference in the education one would receive between two institutions is merely perception, these perceptions are important. Such perceptions are likely to permeate the workforce. If employers perceive a difference between educational institutions, then the value of an education from a particular institution becomes concrete in the form of employment, wages, and advancement opportunities (Alexander, 2000).

The total percentage of African-Americans enrolled in California colleges and universities has decreased across the University of California (UC) System, the California State University (CSU) System, and the California Community Colleges (CCC) System. The UC System dropped from 4% African-American undergraduate enrollment in 1995 to 3% in 2005. The CSU System dropped from 6.3% in 1995 to 5.9% in 2005. The CCC System dropped from 7.8% to a low of 7.3% from 2000-2001 before climbing to 7.6% in 2005. Across the two public university systems and the community college system, the percentage of African-Americans enrollments have dropped from 1995 levels.

UC–Berkeley and the UCLA have severely struggled to enroll a critical mass of African-American and Hispanic/Latino students. Both in raw numbers and in percentages of total undergraduate enrollment, the representation of African-Americans (see Table 1) on the UC and the UCLA campuses have declined since affirmative action was banned. UC-Berkeley dropped from 5.9% African-American enrollment in 1995 to 3.5% in 2005. UCLA dropped from 6% in

		ß						200
Year	California Maritime Academy	California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	California State University, Bakersfield	California State University, Channel Islands	California State University, Chico	California State University, Dominguez Hills	California State University, East Bay
1995	13 (3.5%)	313 (2.0%)	601 (3.6%)	327 (6.1%)		343 (2.5%)	2769 (27.8%)	1491 (11.8%)
1996	13 (3.6%)	302 (1.8.0%)	639 (3.8 %)	322 (5.9%)		342 (2.5%)	3005 (28.9%)	1531 (11.9%)
1997	15 (3.9%)	287 (1.7%)	644 (3.7%)	350 (6.1%)		312 (2.2%)	307 4 (28.7%)	1579 (12.3%)
1998	20 (4.5%)	240 (1.5%)	62 4 (3.6%)	350 (6.3%)		306 (2.0%)	319 4 (26.5%)	1522 (11.8%)
1999	18 (3.1%)	212 (1.3%)	622 (3.5%)	366 (5.9%)	ı	280 (1.8%)	339 4 (27.1%)	1503 (11.9%)
2000	17 (2.6%)	168 (1.0%)	589 (3.2%)	398 (6.2%)	•	289 (1.8%)	3442 (26.8%)	1417 (11.2%)
2001	20 (3.3%)	163 (0.9%)	61 4 (3.2%)	4 57 (6.5%)		31 4 (1.9%)	3590 (27.9%)	1387 (10.5%)
2002	19 (2.6%)	158 (0.9%)	661 (3.3%)	514 (6.6%)	9 (1.4%)	292 (1.8%)	3637 (26.9%)	137 4 (9.9%)
2003	23 (3.3%)	177 (1.0%)	709 (3.6%)	538 (6.8%)	25 (1.6%)	27 4 (1.8%)	353 4 (26.7%)	1311 (9.7%)
2004	25 (3.3%)	179 (1.0%)	716 (3.8%)	537 (6.9%)	37 (1.8%)	28 4 (1.8%)	3330 (26.4%)	1378 (10.6%)
2005	21 (2.4%)	209 (1.1%)	739 (3.7%)	540 (7.2%)	59 (2.3%)	303 (1.9%)	3259 (26.4%)	1409 (11.2%)
Note: Fi http://w	rom "Custom ww.cpec.ca.g	ו Data Reports," C gov/OnLineData/O	alifornia Posts inLineData.asp	econdary Edu)	ication Comr	<i>iission</i> , retriev	ed July 18, 2008	8 from

Table 2. African-American Undergraduate Enrollments at California State University System Institutions

ns	
tio	
Ĩ	
sti	
Ē	
Шe	
<u>ís</u>	
Ś	
Ę	
2°	
Ž	
5	
Ę	
Sta	
3	
Ē	
ifo	
Sal	
L L	ļ
8 8	
ň	
Ĕ	
J	
Ľ.	
ш ө	
lati	
np	
gra	
er	
pu	
2	
än	
J L	
Ĕ	
Ă	
än	
Ţ.	
Ł	
Ð.	
Ľ.	
Ö	
2	
-	
ble	
Fable	

Year	California State University, Fresno	California State University, Fullerton	California State University, Long Beach	California State University, Los Angeles	California State University, Monterey Bay	California State University, Northridge	California State University, Sacramento	California State University, San Bernardino	California State University, San Marcos	California State University, Stanislaus
1995	913	673	2065	1654	22	1792	1448	1013	118	226
	(5.2%)	(3.0%)	(7.8%)	(9.0%)	(3.4%)	(7.2%)	(6.4%)	(8.5%)	(3.2%)	(3.8%)
1996	95 4	70 4	2135	1653	51	2145 .	1567	1091	161	231
	(5.5%)	(2.9%)	(7.8%)	(8.8%)	(4.1%)	(7.9%)	(6.7%)	(9.0%)	(3.7%)	(3.8%)
1997	984	720	2144	1618	68	2137	1563	1198	166	227
	(5.4%)	(2.9%)	(7.7%)	(8.4%)	(4.3%)	(7.7%)	(6.7%)	(9.0%)	(3.5%)	(3.7%)
1998	946	737	2076	1587	86	2068	1533	1209	151	208
	(5.2%)	(2.9%)	(7.2%)	(8.0%)	(4.4%)	(7.6%)	(6.5%)	(8.9%)	(3.0%)	(3.3%)
1999	940	747	2023	1560	85	2082	1535	133 4	187	19 4
	(5.1%)	(2.7%)	(6.7%)	(7.9%)	(3.8%)	(7.4%)	(6.3%)	(9.3%)	(3.3%)	(3.0%)
2000	926	772	2025	1513	103	2122	1595	1443	180	220
	(4.9%)	(2.7%)	(6.5%)	(7.7%)	(3.9%)	(7.3%)	(6.2%)	(9.7%)	(2.9%)	(3.1%)
2001	945	845	2116	1515	117	2352	1576	1596	178	222
	(4.7%)	(2.8%)	(6.4%)	(7.3%)	(3.9%)	(7.5%)	(5.9%)	(10.0%)	(2.7%)	(2.9%)
2002	917	888	2038	1570	142	2527	1668	1708	205	228
	(4.3%)	(2.8%)	(5.9%)	(7.4%)	(4.0%)	(7.5%)	(5.8%)	(10.4%)	(2.7%)	(2.9%)
2003	994	930	2038	1589	148	2455	1638	1880	209	23 4
	(4.4%)	(2.9%)	(5.9%)	(7.7%)	(3.9%)	(7.3%)	(5.8%)	(11.1%)	(2.7%)	(2.9%)
2004	897	964	1934	1560	152	2366	1603	183 4	208	266
	(4.5%)	(2.9%)	(5.8%)	(7.7%)	(3.9%)	(7.5%)	(5.7%)	(11.3%)	(2.8%)	(3.4%)
2005	963	1154	1913	1575	144	2658	1772	1868	233	309
	(4.7%)	(3.3%)	(5.5%)	(7.9%)	(3.8%)	(8.0%)	(6.3%)	(11.4%)	(3.1%)	(3.8%)

Table 2 (cont'd). Africar	-American L	Indergraduate I	Enrollments at (California Stat	e University S	ystem Institutio	ns
					San			
	CalState		Humboldt	San Diego	Francisco	San José	Sonoma	
Year	International Programs	CalState TEACH	State University	State University	State Universitv	State Universitv	State Universitv	Total
1995		1	123	1593	1750	1193	234	20674
			(1.7%)	(5.4%)	(6.5%)	(4.6%)	(3.5%)	(6.3%)
1996	ı	ı	123	1606	1833	1185	231	21824
			(1.6%)	(5.4%)	(6.7%)	(4.6%)	(3.3%)	(6.5%)
1997	ı	ı	124	1594	1810	1225	166	22005
			(1.7%)	(5.2%)	(6.7%)	(4.6%)	(2.4%)	(6.4%)
1998	•	ı	131	1538	1725	1136	137	21524
			(1.8%)	(4 .9%)	(6.3%)	(4.3%)	(2.0%)	(6.2%)
1999	·	ı	152	1424	1684	1084	138	21564
			(2.0%)	(4.5%)	(6.1%)	(4.0%)	(1.9%)	(%0.9)
2000	·	·	165	1353	1530	1075	158	21500
			(2.2%)	(4.3%)	(5.7%)	(4.0%)	(2.1%)	(2.9%)
2001	ı	ı	190	1333	1604	1258	157	23097
			(2.5%)	(4 .0%)	(5.8%)	(4.1%)	(2.1%)	(2.8%)
2002	·	•	584	435	826	219	469	295
			(2.5%)	(3.9%)	(5.7 %)	(4.1%)	(1.9%)	(5.7%)
2003	·	ı	212	1275	1715	1159	139	23206
			(2.7%)	(3.8%)	(2.8%)	(4.0%)	(1.7%)	(2.7%)
2004	ı	ı	209	1214	1641	1249	145	22728
			(2.8%)	(3.7%)	(5.7%)	(4.3%)	(1.8%)	(5.7%)
2005	თ	23	228	1237	1681	1311	148	23765
1	(1.6%)	(3.2%)	(3.1%)	(3.8%)	(5.8%)	(4.4%)	(1.9%)	(5.9%)

Year	Enrollments	Percent of Total Enrollments
1995	166145	7.8
1996	173742	7.8
1997	181499	7.7
1998	186517	7.7
1999	191393	7.5
2000	193273	7.3
2001	205862	7.3
2002	211342	7.5
2003	190844	7.5
2004	191677	7.6
2005	194522	7.6

 Table 3. African-American Community College Enrollments in California from 1995

 2005

Note: From "Custom Data Reports," *California Postsecondary Education Commission*, retrieved July 18, 2008 from http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/OnLineData.asp

1995 to 3.2% in 2005. With black residents accounting for 7.4% of California's population, it is clear that the flagship institutions do not sufficiently represent the racial demographics of the state (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). However, across California the drop in percentages of African-American enrollments is pronounced. Even with California's top 4% plan that automatically admits students graduating in the top 4% of their high school class, African-American enrollments have not sufficiently recovered to their levels before affirmative action was banned in the state.

Hispanics/Latinos saw significant gains in California undergraduate enrollments in the 1990s sparked largely by the increase of Hispanics/Latinos within the general population of the state. As a percentage of total population, Hispanics/Latinos increased from 20.5% to 32.4% (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990; U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). Within the UC System the percentage of

- CARL	CUUS								
					1	San	Santa	Santa	Total
Year	Berkeley	NCLA	Davis	Irvine	Riverside	Diego	Barbara	Cruz	System
1995	2,696	4,009	2,036	1,839	1,388	1,655	1,869	1,356	17,024
	(13.2%)	(16.9%)	(11.2%)	(13.3%)	(18.3%)	(11.1%)	(11.7%)	(15.2%)	(13.7%)
1996	2,827	4,044	1,999	1,817	1,499	1,612	2,077	1,400	17,281
	(13.2%)	(16.9%)	(10.6%)	(12.7%)	(19.3%)	(11.0%)	(12.8%)	(15.2%)	(13.7%)
1997	2,771	3,946	1,971	1,635	1,650	1,625	2,218	1,376	17,195
	(12.7%)	(16.5%)	(10.2%)	(11.5%)	(19.3%)	(10.7%)	(13.3%)	(14.3%)	(13.3%)
1998	2,523	3,736	1,978	1,596	1,903	1,562	2,314	1,361	16,978
	(11.3%)	(15.5%)	(10.2%)	(11.0%)	(20.5%)	(%8.6)	(13.6%)	(13.7%)	(12.8%)
1999	2,349	3,605	1,933	1,686	2,140	1,584	2,425	1320	17,052
	(10.3%)	(14.6%)	(%6.6)	(10.9%)	(%6.0%)	(8.7%)	(13.7%)	(12.9%)	(12.4%)
2000	2,188	3,499	1,983	1,797	2,437	1,661	2,417	1,408	17,402
	(%9.6)	(14.0%)	(%2.6)	(11.0%)	(21.1%)	(10.0%)	(13.8%)	(12.7%)	(12.3%)
2001	2,175	3,545	2,146	2,069	2,792	1,689	2,611	1,601	18,633
	(6.3%)	(14.0%)	(10.0%)	(11.6%)	(21.8%)	(%9.6%)	(14.7%)	(13.3%)	(12.6%)
2002	2351	3,633	2,254	2,177	3,245	1,885	2,761	1,740	20,048
	(%6.6)	(14.6%)	(%6.6)	(11.2%)	(22.8%)	(%6.6)	(15.6%)	(13.5%)	(12.9%)
2003	2,450	3,956	2,456	2,315	3,584	2,036	2,885	1,952	21,634
	(10.6%)	(15.4%)	(10.4%)	(11.5%)	(23.3%)	(10.2%)	(16.2%)	(14.3%)	(13.6%)
2004	2,410	3,821	2,465	2,307	3,567	2,120	3,102	1,960	21,752
	(10.5%)	(15.3%)	(10.6%)	(11.5%)	(23.5%)	(10.4%)	(17.1%)	(14.3%)	(13.7%)
2005	2,484	3,788	2,469	2,310	3,529	2,220	3,233	1,995	22,221
	(10.6%)	(15.3%)	(10.8%)	(11.5%)	(24.1%)	(10.7%)	(17.9%)	(14.6%)	(14.0%)
Note. Fro the Presid	m "Statistica <i>Jent</i> , retrieve	l Summary a	and Data on y 8, 2008 fro	UC Studen m http://ww	ts, Faculty, w.ucop.edu	and Staff," /ucophome	University o e/uwnews/st	of California, atl.	Office of
							,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		

Table 4. Hispanic/Latino Undergraduate Enrollments at University of California System Institutions from

Table 5. I	Hispanic/Lat	ino Undergraduate	Enroliments at C	alifornia State	University Systen	n Institutions		
		California	California State	California		California	California State	California
	California	Polytechnic	Polytechnic	State	California State	State	University,	State
Year	Maritime Academy	State University, San Luis Obispo	University, Pomona	University, Bakersfield	University, Channel Islands	University, Chico	Dominguez Hills	University, East Bay
1995	23	2233	3255	1223	1	1307	2442	1313
	(6.2%)	(13.9%)	(19.6%)	(23.0%)		(8.5%)	(24.5%)	(10.4%)
1996	32	2304	3520	1322		1355	2783	1356
	(8.7%)	(13.6.0%)	(% 6.02)	(24.3%)		(%7%)	(26.8%)	(10.5%)
1997	28	2268	3692	1415	·	1343	3047	1395
	(7.2%)	(13.6%)	(21.4%)	(24.8%)		(8.4%)	(28.5%)	(10.9%)
1998	30	2004	3799	1510	·	1394	3203	1361
	(6.7%)	(12.3%)	(21.6%)	(27.0%)		(8.3%)	(26.6%)	(10.6%)
1999	34	1824	3933	1715	•	1418	3486	1376
	(2.8%)	(11.1%)	(21.8%)	(27.6%)		(8.3%)	(27.8%)	(10.9%)
2000	39	1803	4083	1758	ł	1437	3757	1401
	(%0.9)	(10.7%)	(22.2%)	(27.5%)		(%0.6)	(29.2%)	(11.0%)
2001	41	1862	4306	1978	ı	1557	4028	1290
	(6.8%)	(10.3%)	(22.6%)	(28.1%)		(8.3%)	(31.3%)	(%26)
2002	44	1751	4601	2265	135	1573	4176	1369
	(6.1%)	(8.5%)	(23.2%)	(29.2%)	(21.4%)	(6.7%)	(30.9%)	(%6 [.] 6)
2003	43	1777	4834	2415	350	1562	4249	1485
	(6.2%)	(8.7%)	(24.4%)	(30.4%)	(22.4%)	(10.1%)	(32.1.7%)	(11.0%)
2004	58	1725	4752	2484	492	1649	4173	1551
	(%9`L)	(%8.6)	(25.0%)	(32.0%)	(24.3%)	(10.5%)	(33.1%)	(11.9%)
2005	63	1810	5139	2482	605	1717	4013	1534
	(7.3%)	(9.8%)	(25.8%)	(32.9%)	(23.5%)	(10.8%)	(32.5%)	(12.2%)
Note: Fron http://www.	n "Custom Da cpec.ca.gov/	ta Reports," <i>Californ</i> OnLineData/OnLinel	ia Postsecondary I Data.asp	Education Com	mission, retrieved .	July 18, 2008	from	

Ū mia Stata Ilniv at Califo 1 ů -Tahle 5. Hispanic/Latino Un

Table 5	(cont'd). His	panic/Latinc	Undergrad	Jate Enrollme	ents at Calify	ornia State Ui	niversity Syste	em Institution	S	
			California	California	California			California	California	
	California	California	State	State	State	California	California	State	State	California
	State	State	University,	University,	University,	State	State	University,	University,	State
	University,	University,	Long	Los	Monterey	University,	University,	San	San	University,
Year	Fresno	Fullerton	Beach	Angeles	Bay	Northridge	Sacramento	Bernardino	Marcos	Stanislaus
1995	4217	4163	4719	7096	143	5045	2725	2495	290	1133
	(24.2%)	(18.4%)	(17.9%)	(38.6%)	(21.9%)	(20.2%)	(12.0%)	(20.9%)	(16.2%)	(19.0%)
1996	4412	4593	5055	7731	291	5654	2857	2635	707	1246
	(25.6%)	(19.1%)	(18.4%)	(41.0%)	(23.2%)	(20.8%)	(12.2%)	(21.7%)	(16.0%)	(%70.4%)
1997	4616	4952	5288	8222	390	5981	2938	3059	773	1321
	(25.5%)	(19.9%)	(19.0%)	(42.9%)	(24.6%)	(21.6%)	(12.5%)	(23.0%)	(16.5%)	(21.3%)
1998	4744	5401	5684	8752	490	5979	2895	3324	853	1411
	(26.2%)	(21.0%)	(19.8%)	(44.4%)	(25.0%)	(22.0%)	(12.2%)	(24.4%)	(17.0%)	(22.2%)
1999	4869	5796	6134	8886	575	6383	2968	3620	989	1497
	(26.6%)	(21.3%)	(20.4%)	(44.9%)	(25.4%)	(22.8%)	(12.1%)	(25.4%)	(17.2%)	(23.1%)
2000	5117	6209	6427	8968	671	6837	3191	3882	1120	1638
	(26.9%)	(21.9%)	(20.8%)	(45.8%)	(25.6%)	(23.5%)	(12.4%)	(26.0%)	(17.9%)	(23.2%)
2001	5395	6920	7147	9533	771	7596	3443	4264	1137	1757
	(27.0%)	(22.8%)	(21.5%)	(46.1%)	(25.5%)	(24.2%)	(12.8%)	(26.7%)	(17.5%)	(23.3%)
2002	4857	7443	7492	9574	918	8306	3676	4490	1323	1841
	(22.8%)	(23.2%)	(21.7%)	(45.4%)	(25.9%)	(24.7%)	(12.9%)	(27.5%)	(17.2%)	(23.5%)
2003	5793	7923	8048	9454	1011	8158	3775	4841	1503	1961
	(25.9%)	(24.3%)	(23.2%)	(45.8%)	(26.9%)	(24.4%)	(13.3%)	(28.6%)	(19.3%)	(24.3%)
2004	5569	8304	8073	8959	1067	8333	3885	5022	1494	2023
	(28.2%)	(25.4%)	(24.1%)	(44.1%)	(27.0%)	(26.6%)	(13.9%)	(31.0%)	(20.3%)	(25.7%)
2005	5880	8922	8367	8721	1026	8777	3952	5203	1494	2157
	(28.9%)	(25.5%)	(24.2%)	(43.5%)	(27.2%)	(26.4%)	(14.1%)	(31.7%)	(19.9%)	(26.5%)

Table 5 (cont'd). Hispanic	/Latino Under	graduate Enro	Ilments at Californi	ia State Unive	ersity System	Institutions	
					San			
	CalState International	CalState	Humboldt State	San Dieno	Francisco State	San José Stata	Sonoma	
Year	Programs	TEACH	University	State University	University	University	University	Total
1995	•	,	585	5399	2921	3366	626	57019
			(%6`L)	(18.4%)	(10.9%)	(12.9%)	(9.2%)	(17.5%)
1996	•	·	611	5853	3115	3493	626	61551
			(%6'2)	(19.5%)	(11.4%)	(13.5%)	(8.9%)	(18.3%)
1997	·	ı	617	6226	3153	3709	646	62079
			(8.2%)	(20.4%)	(11.78%)	(13.8%)	(9.2%)	(18.9%)
1998	ı	ı	630	6443	3165	3639	676	67387
			(8.4%)	(20.5%)	(11.5%)	(13.7%)	(%1%)	(19.3%)
1999	ı	ı	579	6394	3239	3714	643	70072
			(7.7%)	(20.4%)	(11.7%)	(13.8%)	(9.1%)	(19.5%)
2000	ı	·	573	6344	3224	3718	697	72894
			(7.7%)	(20.1%)	(12.0%)	(13.9%)	(6.4%)	(19.8%)
2001	ı	ı	547	6826	3194	3966	707	78265
			(7.4%)	(20.0%)	(11.9%)	(14.2%)	(6.3%)	(20.2%)
2002	ı	ı	597	6787	3223	4197	782	81420
			(7.8%)	(19.8%)	(11.4 %)	(13.8%)	(8.5%)	(20.0%)
2003	·	·	614	6946	3564	3820	817	84943
			(%6`L)	(20.6%)	(12.0%)	(13.2%)	(%8.6)	(20.8%)
2004		ı	588	6002	3677	4043	810	85740
			(7.8%)	(21.3%)	(12.8%)	(13.9%)	(10.2%)	(21.7%)
2005	84	118	<u>696</u>	6769	3798	4303	815	88445
	(14.6%)	(16.6%)	(9.3%)	(20.7%)	(13.1%)	(14.4%)	(10.5%)	(21.8%)

Year	Enrollments	Percent of Total Enrollments
1995	166,145	22.5
1996	173,742	23.1
1997	181,499	23.4
1998	186,517	23.9
1999	191,393	24.4
2000	193,273	25.2
2001	205,862	26.3
2002	211,342	26.5
2003	190,844	27.2
2004	191,677	27.8
2005	194,522	28.5

 Table 6. Hispanic/Latino Community College Enrollments in California from 1995

 2005

Note: From "Custom Data Reports," California Postsecondary Education Commission, retrieved July 18, 2008 from http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/OnLineData.asp

Hispanics/Latinos grew only .3% (z = 3.178, p<.01) from 13.7% in 1995 to 14% in 2000 (see Table 4). UC-Berkeley dropped from 2,696 Hispanic/Latino undergraduates in 1995 to a low of 2,175 in 2001, reaching 2,484 in 2005. UCLA dropped from 4,009 Hispanic/Latino undergraduates in 1995 to a low of 3,499 in 2000, reaching 3,788 in 2005. Neither institution has recovered to 1995 levels.

The largest gains in Hispanic/Latino enrollment have been within the CSU System (see Table 5) and within the community colleges (see Table 6). The percentage of Hispanic/Latino undergraduates within the CSU System significantly increased (z = 46.102, p<.001) from 17.5% to 21.8% from 1995 to 2005 (California Postsecondary Education Commission, n.d.). The percentage of Hispanic/Latino students within the CCC System increased from 22.5% to 28.5% (z = 148.053, p<.001) from 1995 to 2005. However, the lower number of

Year	African- American Enrollment (Percent)	Hispanic/La tino Enrollment (Percent)	American Indian Enrollment (Percent	Asian Enrollment (Percent)	White Enrollment (Percent)	Total
1995	1,469 (4.2%)	5,143 (14.7%)	131 (.4%)	4,213 (12%)	22,961 (65.4%)	35,086
1996	1,479 (4.1%)	5,247 (14.7%)	156 (.4%)	4,459 (12.5%)	23,345 (65.2%)	35,789
1997	1,353 (3.7%)	5,234 (14.2%)	182 (.5%)	4,783 (13%)	24,219 (65.7%)	36,861
1998	1,311 (3.5%)	5,154 (13.9%)	182 (.5%)	5,104 (13.7%)	24,200 (65%)	37,203
1999	1,277 (3.4%)	5,106 (13.7%)	166 (.4%)	5,372 (14.5%)	24,007 (64.6%)	37,159
2000	1,298 (3.4%)	5,152 (13.5%)	175 (.5%)	5,695 (14.9%)	24,341 (63.8%)	38,162
2001	1,335 (3.5%)	5,236 (13.6%)	164 (.4%)	6,124 (15.9%)	24,199 (62.7%)	38,609
2002	1,372 (3.5%)	5,459 (13.8%)	175 (.4%)	6,616 (16.7%)	24,453 (61.7%)	39,661
2003	1,400 (3.6%)	5,505 (14.3%)	148 (.4%)	6,541 (17%)	23,254 (60.6%)	38,383
2004	1,405 (3.8%)	5,647 (15.1%)	158 (.4%)	6,399 (17.1%)	22,326 (59.7%)	37,377
2005	1,482 (4%)	5,919 (16.1%)	162 (.4%)	6,270 (17%)	21,588 (58.5%)	36,878

Table 7. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Texas by Race/Ethnicity

Source: University of Texas, Office of Institutional Research, Statistical Handbook 2004-2005 Hispanic/Latino students within the UC System further demonstrate how minority students are being concentrated at the less prestigious institutions within California.

University of Texas

In 1996, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against the University of Texas (UT) Law School in the case of *Hopwood* effectively eliminating the use of affirmative action in admissions by public universities in Texas (Pusser, 2004; Raza et al., 1999). In an effort to implement a race-neutral alternative Governor

George W. Bush signed legislation that automatically admitted the top 10% of graduates from each high school in Texas to their top choice public university in the state. The number of African-American undergraduates at the University of Texas dropped from 1,469 in 1995 to a low of 1,277 in 1999 (see Table 7). Only in 2005 did the number of African-American undergraduates reach 1995 levels. The number of Hispanic/Latino undergraduates dropped from 5,143 in 1995 to a low of 5,106 in 1999 before climbing to 5,919 in 2005.

Compared to the state population, which is comprised of 12% African-Americans and 32% Hispanics/Latinos (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002), enrollment at the University of Texas as of 2005 comprised of 4% African-Americans and 16.1% Hispanics/Latinos. In contrast, Asians, which account for only 3.1% of the population of Texas, have seen enrollments steadily increase over the past decade. Asians now comprise 17% of undergraduate enrollments.

In 2003, the Supreme Court ruled in *Grutter* and *Gratz*, which supersedes the *Hopwood* decision. Whereas *Hopwood* effectively reversed *Bakke* within Texas, *Grutter* reaffirming the *Bakke* ruling that race could be used as one factor to evaluate an individual for college admissions. The *Grutter* ruling reestablished affirmative action as one tool that postsecondary institutions can use to promote diversity on campus. As a result, the University of Texas began considering race as a factor once again in admissions. A consequence of the 10% plan has been the inundation of UT by those who finish in the top 10% of their class (Fischer, 2005). Nearly three-quarters of admissions offers to Texas applicants are made on the basis of class rank alone. In 2003 and 2004 freshmen outside of the top

10% outscored those within the top 10% on the SAT. As the flagship institution in the state, the implications of a lower average SAT score could demonstrably impact the national prestige of the University of Texas.

University of Washington

Voters in Washington approved Proposition 200 in 1998, which banned the use of racial preferences by any agency of the state government (Moses, 2001). After the ban minority enrollments dropped at the research universities in Washington (Brown & Hirschman, 2006). African-American undergraduate enrollment at the University of Washington fell from 832 in 1995 to a low of 678 in 2000 (University of Washington, n.d.). Only in 2000 did the number of African-American undergraduates return to 1995 levels. The number of applications received by the University of Washington (UW) has rebounded to the levels before I-200 partly due to an increase in outreach programs to high schools and community groups to increase the number of applications submitted from minority students (Brown & Hirschman, 2006).

The drop in admissions at UW is particularly noteworthy because the university is not academically selective at the undergraduate level. Approximately 80% of all students who apply to the UW-Seattle campus are admitted. Under such circumstances one would expect that African-American enrollments would only be marginally impacted, but the drop in enrollments and applications to the University of Washington indicate that African-American undergraduates are

Year	African-	Hispanic/La	American	Asian	Other	Total
	American	tino	Indian	Enrollment	Enrollment	
	Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	(Percent)	(Percent)	
	(Percent)	(Percent)	(Percent			
1995	832	935	264	5,033	17,774	24,838
	(3.3%)	(3.8%)	(1%)	(20.2%)	(71.6%)	
1996	838	984	274	5,190	17,942	25,228
	(3.3%)	(3.9%)	(1%)	(20.6%)	(71.1%)	
1997	841	1,022	410	5,697	17,852	25,822
	(3.3%)	(4.0%)	(1.6%)	(13%)	(69.1%)	
4000	744	1 022	274	5 620	47 760	05 540
1998	(2.0%)	1,032	3/1	3,039 (22,19/)	17,700	25,540
	(2.9%)	(4.0%)	(1.5%)	(22.1%)	(09.5%)	
1000	600	980	327	5 705	17 927	25 638
1333	(2.7%)	(3.8%)	(1 3%)	(22.3%)	(69.9%)	25,050
	(2.170)	(0.070)	(1.070)	(22.070)	(00.070)	
2000	678	935	318	5.888	18,026	25.845
	(2.6%)	(3.6%)	(1.2%)	(22.8%)	(69.7%)	_0,0 .0
	(,	(0.0)	(,	(,	(,	
2001	695	956	299	6,081	18,829	26,860
	(2.6%)	(3.6%)	(1.1%)	(22.6%)	(70.1%)	• • •
	· · /	. ,	· · ·	· · ·	· ,	
2002	733	944	297	6,605	20,449	29,028
	(2.5%)	(3.3%)	(1%)	(22.8%)	(70.4%)	
2003	731	985	289	6,855	19,002	27,862
	(2.6%)	(3.3%)	(1%)	(24.6%)	(68.2%)	
2004	799	1,018	313	7,031	18,571	27,732
	(2.9%)	(3.7%)	(1.1%)	(25.4%)	(67%)	
2005	940	1 161	224	7.054	19 100	07 400
2005	840	1,101	331	7,054	18,102	27,488
	(3.1%)	(4.2%)	(.4%)	(1/%)	(00.9%)	

 Table 8. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Washington by

 Race/Ethnicity

Source: University of Washington, Office of Institutional Studies, Student Headcount by Ethnicity and Student Level

turning to other institutions. Brown and Hirschman (2006) attributed the drop in minority enrollments to a discouragement effect. They argued that students' plans for college were likely affected by their expectations for success in the admissions process and in completing their degrees. Students with any doubt about their chances to be admitted or to succeed at UW likely opted for a less prestigious institution where they perceived greater chances for success.

Year	African- American Enrollment	Hispanic/La tino Enrollment	American Indian Enrollment	Asian Enrollment (Percent)	White Enrollment (Percent)	Total
1995	1,604 (6.8%)	214 (.9%)	33 (.1%)	636 (2.7%)	20,551 (87.2%)	23,572
1996	1,570 (6.8%)	227 (1%)	36 (.2%)	643 (2.8%)	20,092 (87.6%)	22,946
1997	1,516 (6.5%)	250 (1.1%)	33 (.1%)	702 (3%)	20,418 (87.9%)	23,236
1998	1,499 (6.4%)	257 (1.1%)	36 (.2%)	698 (3%)	20,724 (88.3%)	23,479
1999	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2000	1,425 (5.9%)	350 (1.4%)	40 (.2%)	796 (3.3%)	21,344 (88.2%)	24,213
2001	1,337 (5.4%)	370 (1.5%)	35 (.1%)	857 (3.5%)	21,965 (88.5%)	24,829
2002	1,247 (5%)	392 (1.6%)	42 (.1%)	967 (3.9%)	22,079 (88.4%)	24,983
2003	1,214 (4.8%)	439 (1.7%)	35 (.1%)	1,069 (4.2%)	22,410 (88.2%)	25,415
2004	1,153 (4.6%)	43 9 (1.8%)	39 (.2%)	1,134 (4.5%)	22,009 (88%)	25,019
2005	1,351 (5.4%)	480 (1.9%)	46 (.2%)	1,139 (4.5%)	21,738 (86.2%)	25,204

Table 9. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Georgia by Race/Ethnicity

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Peer Analysis System.

The situation is worse in graduate admissions at UW. African-American graduate enrollment dropped from 184 in 1995 to a low of 156 in 2001 at the University of Washington (see Table 8). Between 1998 and 2000 African-American graduate enrollments dropped by 12%. African-American enrollments at the law and medical schools were poor before the ban on affirmative action and have seen little effect since the ban (Look what happens, 2001-2002). In 1998 and in 2000, there was only one African-American in the first-year law

school class. In 1998 and in 2001, there was only one African-American in the first-year medical school class. Though undergraduate numbers may suffer as a result of banning affirmative action, the net effect on graduate numbers and eventually employment may have more severe consequences.

University of Georgia

The University of Georgia did not admit an African-American student until 1961 (Cooper, 2000). But in 1996, the state attorney general, Michael Bowers, used the Hopwood ruling in Texas as justification against the use of affirmative action in college admissions even though the ruling had no bearing in Georgia (Kahlenberg, 1996). He ordered the state university system to stop using affirmative action in college admissions. In 2000, a federal court struck down the use of affirmative action at the University of Georgia in the case of Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University of Georgia. African-American enrollment at the University of Georgia dropped each year from 1,604 in 1995 to a low of 1,153 in 2004 before jumping to 1,351 in 2005 after the *Grutter* decision (see Table 9). Hispanic/Latino enrollment has steadily increased from 214 in 1995 to 480 in 2005. Still, with African-American students comprising only 5.4% of undergraduate enrollment compared to 29.9% of the state population and Hispanic/Latino students comprising only 1.9% of undergraduate enrollments compared to 7.5% of the state population, the University of Georgia does not reflect the racial demographics of the state (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002).

Year	African- American Enrollment (Percent)	Hispanic/La tino Enrollment (Percent)	American Indian Enrollment (Percent	Asian Enrollment (Percent)	White Enrollment (Percent)	Total
1999	2358 (7.13%)	3401 (10.29%)	133 (.40%)	2079 (6.29%)	24108 (72.92%)	33060
2000	2725 (7.98%)	3601 (10.54%)	174 (.51%)	2248 (6.58%)	24231 (70.95%)	34154
2001	2712 (7.87%)	3632 (10.54%)	182 (.53%)	2291 (6.65%)	24388 (70.79%)	34450
2002	2905 (8.23%)	3877 (10.99%)	187 (.53%)	2390 (6.77%)	24586 (69.68%)	35282
2003	2993 (8.51%)	4159 (11.82%)	177 (.50%)	2407 (6.84%)	24389 (69.30%)	35191
2004	2983 (8.55%)	4182 (11.99%)	152 (.44%)	2382 (6.83%)	24050 (68.94%)	34883
2005	3133 (8.72%)	4485 (12.49%)	125 (.35%)	2560 (7.13%)	24366 (67.84%)	35918

Table 10. Yearly Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of Florida by Race/Ethnicity

Source: University of Florida Factbook

University of Florida

In November 1999, Florida Governor Jeb Bush announced his plan to eliminate affirmative action in Florida and replace it with the Talented 20 Program (Marin & Lee, 2003). The initiative guarantees admission to one of the institutions in the State University System (SUS) for those students graduating within the top 20% of their class who complete the required high school credits and submit their ACT or SAT scores. Due to mounting pressure from Ward Connerly who had successfully led campaigns in California and Washington to ban affirmative action, Governor Bush preempted court involvement or a ballot referendum by implementing his One Florida Initiative (Lookwhat happens, 2001-2002). He touted the measure as a way to increase minority enrollment at Florida's colleges and universities without resorting to racial preferences (Marin & Lee, 2003). The University of Florida (UF) serves as the state's flagship campus with total enrollment in excess of 50,000 students. Unlike other flagship institutions UF has managed to steadily increase the representation of racial minority groups on campus (see Table 10). However, the increases may be more a function of the proactive outreach efforts of UF rather than the Talented 20 program. Marin and Lee (2003) conducted an analysis of the Talented 20 program and found that minority students were not being assisted as much as enrollment numbers might appear. The percentage of white Talented 20 applicants increased from 70.4% in 2000 to 72.9% in 2001 indicating that the program actually decreased the number of minority applicants automatically granted admission to a SUS institution.

The reasons for the University of Florida's success probably lies in its heavy use of race-targeted recruitment of minorities rather than the Talented 20 program, which has largely been ignored by UF (Marin & Lee, 2003). However, while Hispanic/Latino enrollment has increased at SUS institutions, likely due to the surge in Hispanic/Latino students enrolled in the state's primary and secondary schools, African-American enrollment has not kept pace (Chandler, 2005). Though overall African-American enrollment at SUS institutions held fairly steady in terms of real numbers, as a percentage of total freshman enrollment the representation of African-Americans has decreased 11% since 2002. The enrollment of American Indians at the University of Florida has been historically low, but there has been a steady decline from 182 in 2000 to only 125 in 2005.

Summary

Except for the University of Florida, the other flagship institutions have struggled to increase the representation of African-American students on campus. Raw numbers dropped as a result of bans on affirmative action at the flagship public universities in California, Texas, Washington, and Georgia. Even more telling are the drops in percentage of the overall student population. As of 2005, California and Georgia still had not recovered to 1995 levels for African-American undergraduate enrollment. As of 2005, Texas and Washington had just returned to 1995 levels, but the percentage of African-American undergraduates has still not recovered to 1995 levels.

Enrollment for Hispanic/Latino students at the flagship public universities where affirmative action has been eliminated has fair better than enrollment for African-American students largely because of the rising Hispanic/Latino population. However, UC-Berkeley and UCLA are clear exceptions. Hispanic/Latino enrollment has still not recovered to 1995 levels in raw numbers and as a percentage of total enrollment Hispanics/Latinos fell from 13.2% in 1995 to 10.6% in 2005 at UC-Berkeley and from 16.9% in 1995 to 15.3% in 2005 at UCLA. With such a large Hispanic/Latino population, the drop in Hispanic/Latino enrollments at UC-Berkeley and UCLA are striking. Texas and Florida with large Hispanic/Latino populations as well have faired much better at enrolling Hispanics/Latinos at the state flagship institutions.

Attitudes toward Affirmative Action

A large body of research exists about public opinion and there is a growing body of research on student attitudes toward affirmative action. However, current research has not adequately addressed how attitudes toward affirmative action have changed over time (Citrin, 1996). Additionally, no previous studies were uncovered that examined the impact of affirmative action policies on student attitudes toward affirmative action. In order to understand the significance of the currently study, it is important to look back at the previous work concerning public opinion and student attitudes toward affirmative action.

Public opinion research has revealed a great deal about how Americans view affirmative action. Citrin (1996) points out that the public is opposed to both racial discrimination and to racial preferences. The public often views affirmative action programs with suspicion believing that affirmative action is the equivalent of using quotas and perceiving that reverse discrimination should be of greater concern than discrimination against minorities. This lack of trust among the public of government and academic affirmative action programs has contributed a great deal to the recent dismantling of affirmative action in several states across the country.

A number of factors that relate to attitudes toward affirmative action have been explored. Citrin (1996) explains that:

Recent research concerning the underpinnings of attitudes toward affirmative action has centered on the relative importance of four main motives: (1) self-interest, defined broadly as the perceived impact of a

policy on both one's own well-being and on the wealth, status, and power of one's ethnic or gender group; (2) individualist values, in the sense of how strongly one is committed to a notion of equity that defines fair treatment as rewarding people on the basis of individual merit rather than social back-ground; (3) beliefs that attribute racial inequality to personal causes such as lack of motivation or ability rather than to structural discrimination; (4) sheer prejudice, that is hostility to a particular group whose members are stereotyped as lacking requisite skills or character traits. (pp. 45-46)

Suthammanont and Peterson (2004) argue that prejudice and political belief primarily drive attitudes toward affirmative action and often at the expense of one another. Feldman and Huddy (2005) found that white liberals had higher levels of resentment toward scholarship policies targeted at other races. For white conservatives, political ideology was a more significant factor in predicting attitudes toward the scholarship policy.

Kinder and Winter (2001), using data from the 1992 National Election Study, found a substantial difference in the way whites and African-Americans view a number of different political issues. Many of the different views could be a result of self-interest or socioeconomic status, but the researchers found that African-Americans also hold more favorable views toward social welfare programs that do not directly benefit them than do whites. Kinder and Winter argued that the gaps between African-Americans and whites are based in

fundamental philosophical differences on the role of government in this country. Affirmative action policies are certainly at the forefront of this divide.

Aberson (2003) conducted a path analysis and found that self-interest and the structure of affirmative action policies are significant predictors of support for affirmative action. Aberson included only 114 college students and the model was not robust enough to account for many other factors than influence attitudes toward affirmative action, but the model showed some promise in predicting student attitudes toward affirmative action.

For the current study I draw on the work of Sax and Arrendondo (1999), who used data from the 1996 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey to examine how attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions varied by race and gender. The sample for the study consisted of 277,850 first-time freshmen across the United States. The researchers grouped variables around three constructs: self-interest, political ideology, and racial affect. They found that men were more likely than women to oppose the use of affirmative action in college admissions. For socioeconomic status and academic preparation, the researchers found that for whites, Asian-Americans, and Mexican-Americans those with higher socioeconomic status or higher levels of academic preparation are more strongly opposed to affirmative action in college admissions. For African-Americans those with higher socioeconomic status and those with more academic preparation were less likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) also found that across

all racial groups those with more conservative political views were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions.

Zamani (2000) followed up on the work of Sax and Arrendondo using the 1996 CIRP Freshman Study data to analyze community college students' attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani found that gender, age, parents education, political view, likelihood to go on to obtain a bachelors degree, and GPA were all related to support for affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani did not address the extent to which community college students differ from other postsecondary students in their attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions.

Meader (1998) included over 2000 responses to the Midwest College Study to examine factors that contribute to white and African-American students' attitudes toward affirmative action. Meader found that white students whose parents had lower educational levels were more likely to oppose race-based policies. Using Astin's Input-Environment-Output model, Meader found that environmental variables had a more significant impact on student attitudes toward affirmative action than input variables. Taking a black studies course, being involved on campus, and living on campus were all shown to have a significant relationship with attitudes toward affirmative action for at least one of the racial groups.

Kane and Kyyro (2001) conducted a study to determine the relationship between education and beliefs about racial and gender inequality. They found that greater levels of education for white men, white women, and African-
American men were more likely to reinforce views that promote racial inequality. African-American women with higher levels of education were more likely to possess views more critical of racial and gender inequality. Specific to affirmative action, white men were more likely to oppose affirmative action while African-American women were more likely to support affirmative action.

Inkelas (2003) studied Asian Pacific American (APA) students' attitudes toward affirmative action and found that more than any other ethnic group APA students were more likely to support affirmative action in principle, but to disapprove of the use of affirmative action in practice. Inkelas also found that APA women were more likely to support affirmative action than were APA men. Inkelas also found a positive relationship between those APA students majoring in social science and humanities disciplines and their views of the potential fallibility of the dominant ideology and the racial climate around them. Finally, Inkelas found that APA students who engaged in more conversations about diversity with their peers and students who had greater exposure to Universitysponsored diversity programs were more likely to support affirmative action.

Andolina and Mayer (2003) studied the differences between members of Generation X, those born between 1961 and 1981, and previous generations in their attitudes toward race and racial equality. The researchers used data from the General Social Survey and the American National Election Study and found that members of Generation X were more likely to support school integration efforts, but less likely to support affirmative action. The shift in values experienced by Generation X is further evidence that the political environment

around affirmative action has become complex. Americans continue to demonstrate their belief that increasing the representation of racial minorities in higher education or in the workplace is not the way to increase diversity.

Rothman, Lipset, and Nevitt (2002) surveyed students, faculty, and administrators across the nation to compare their views on diversity and affirmative action. The researchers found that about 66.7% of the students, compared to 34% of the faculty and 26% of the administrators opposed affirmative action. The majority of the student participants would have grown up with affirmative action programs used in college admissions and in hiring. However, the researcher did not distinguish between those participants living in states where affirmative action was no longer employed. Students attending school in Washington, California, Florida, or Texas may have different views about affirmative action than those in other states.

The previous research indicates that certain groups view affirmative action in significantly different ways. Differences can be found with respect to race (Meader, 1998; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000), gender (Inkelas, 2003; Kane & Kyyro, 2001; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000), socioeconomic status and parental education (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999), and generations (Rothman, Lipset, & Nevitt, 2002). In the current study I will carry this further to see how the introduction of the ban on affirmative action in California impacted student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions.

Student Attitudes toward Diversity

Diversity has become a primary educational outcome for many campuses because it helps maintain a positive campus climate and provides students with opportunities to engage with people from other cultures (Hurtado et al., 1998). Campus climate - the current patterns, perceptions, and attitudes about organizational life, and culture, the deeply held meanings, beliefs, and values of institutional members - define academic institutions (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Campus climate is particularly impacted by the perceptions and attitudes that students, faculty, and staff have about diversity on campus. Additionally, diversity has become a primary goal of many postsecondary institutions as they seek to prepare students to succeed in an increasingly complex and diverse society (Hurtado, 2001).

With increased resources being channeled into activities designed to promote diversity on campus, more attention has been given to race, ethnicity, and cultural diversity within higher education (Antonio, 2001). Supporters and critics have formed polarized views about the likely outcomes of diversity efforts in postsecondary education. Still, little empirical research exists to document the relationship between diverse experiences on campus and the development of college students (Antonio, 2001; Hurtado, 2001). Furthermore, the research that has been conducted exists within insular intellectual communities divided by methodologies and theoretical perspectives (Bobo & Fox, 2003).

Only recently have researchers established the benefits of diversity (Antonio et al., 2004; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Gurin, 1999; Gurin, 2002; Whitt,

Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001). Researchers have demonstrated positive relationships between diversity and a number of outcomes for college students, including civic outcomes (Astin, 1993; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Hurtado, 2001), learning outcomes (Antonio et al., 2004; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2001; Milem & Hakuta, 2000), student retention (Chang, 1996; Smith & Associates, 1997), and satisfaction with college (Astin, 1993; Chang, 1996). Diversity efforts also improve the campus climate (Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996) and prepare students to enter an increasingly diverse workplace (Bikson & Law, 1994).

Measuring the effects of diversity efforts is problematic because the effects can not always be observed directly. Instead, the impacts of diversity efforts lie in long-term outcomes like career choices, personal beliefs, and friendship patterns (Hurtado, 2001). The short-term nature of most research makes measuring these outcomes difficult. Researchers have begun measuring student attitudes toward diversity in specific contexts, building a body of literature around the topic. Still, more longitudinal research is needed to examine how student attitudes toward diversity change over time.

Loo and Rolison (1986) interviewed 163 undergraduate students at a small public university within the University of California system. The researchers found that minority students compared to white students experienced greater levels of sociocultural alienation on campus marked by feelings of cultural domination and ethnic isolation. "No matter how outstanding the academic institution, ethnic minority students can feel alienated if their ethnic

representation on campus is small" (p. 72). Loo and Rolison also found that black and Chicano students attributed their academic alienation to poorer academic preparation in high school and being confronted with a new and different culture in college.

Sedlacek, Helm, and Prieto (1997) surveyed students at the University of Maryland – College Park to examine the relationship between perceptions of diversity and student satisfaction. A positive relationship existed between comfort in cross cultural situations and student satisfaction for all races. Diversity awareness among Asian-American, Hispanic/Latino, and white students was negatively correlated to overall student satisfaction. For African-American and Hispanic/Latino students, comfort with their own culture was positively correlated with student satisfaction in college. Predictor variables that had positive relationships with overall satisfaction for all races included fair treatment by students and teachers, comfort in cross-cultural situations, and respect for other cultures. Negative correlations existed between satisfaction and perception of racial tension and lack of support.

Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, and Nora (1996) surveyed a national sample of white college students to examine the effects of diversity awareness programs on attitudes toward diversity. The researchers found that women and those in more liberal majors were significantly more likely to hold favorable attitudes toward diversity on campus. However, students who participated in diversity awareness workshops had more favorable attitudes toward diversity on campus regardless of gender or major. Students who did not

participate had less favorable attitudes toward diversity on campus. Henderson-King and Kaleta (2000) found similar results with students at the University of Michigan.

Hurtado (2001) examined a national sample of faculty and student responses to surveys administered by UCLA's Higher Educational Research Institute to determine the impact that students' exposure to diversity had on student civic, job-related, and learning outcomes. Students who reported studying with someone of another race/ethnicity reported gains in civic, jobrelated, and learning outcomes. Hurtado found that interacting with diverse peers was more important than curricular diversity on all three outcomes.

Gurin (1999) found that diversity in the classroom and diverse informal interactions are related to a diverse student body. Gurin (2002) found that students with more racially diverse classrooms and informal interactions demonstrate the greatest growth in academic skills and in intellectual motivation and engagement. Gurin argued that students exposed to diverse peers will be better equipped for an increasingly diverse society.

In spite of the evidence to support the benefits of diversity in education, there is much to learn about the ways diversity is woven into the fabric of postsecondary institutions and how specific events impact attitudes toward diversity. In the current study I will examine the impact that banning affirmative action has had on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. The U.S. is at a critical juncture with affirmative action. With several states having banned affirmative action and possibly more to

come, academic administrators, policymakers, and scholars should carefully examine all outcomes associated with banning affirmative action to examine the impact that these important policy decisions have on diversity within postsecondary education.

Conceptual Framework

I use the work of Sax and Arrendondo (1999) as the basis of the conceptual framework for the current study. Their study provided a theoretical basis for the relationship between student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and a number of predictor variables. The current study incorporates the same variables included in the work of Sax and Arrendondo including race, gender, measures of self-interest, and measures of political ideology. In the Sax and Arrendondo study, data from only 1996 were examined. The current study offers a unique contribution by measuring change in attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity from 1996, when Proposition 209 was passed in California, to 2000.

Hypotheses

The ban on affirmative action is expected to have shifted student attitudes more strongly against affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Such a result would point toward the legitimizing power of the referendum process. The Supreme Court has the ability to legitimize affirmative action policies among supporters and opponents (Mondak, 1994). I expect that Proposition 209 will have a similar legitimizing affect on student attitudes with more students opposing affirmative action in college admissions and racial

diversity after the ban on affirmative action in California. It is also expected that women are more likely to favor affirmative action in college admissions than men, that African-American and Hispanic/Latino students are more likely to favor affirmative action in college admissions, and that those with more conservative political ideologies are more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions.

This study questions the extent to which the ban on affirmative action has impacted student attitudes toward racial diversity and affirmative action in college admissions. I examine freshmen cohorts at California four-year institutions across a five year span from 1996 to 2000. The level of support for affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity can provide insight for college faculty and staff in designing diversity initiatives. A number of precollege factors impact student attitudes toward diversity including gender, race, and political orientation (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). Policy initiatives like Proposition 209 in California may affect student attitudes toward racial diversity before they arrive on campus. If students are less supportive of racial diversity, this makes the task of increasing openness to racial diversity more challenging for faculty and staff.

Examining student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity can also provide administrators with a lens into the college racial climate (Inkelas, 2003). More polarized views, especially between racial groups, on affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity may be a sign that the campus racial climate has worsened. Though the

current study cannot make direct attributions to Proposition 209, less favorable views toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity after the ban on affirmative action in college admissions may be an indication that the policy has negatively impacted the college racial climate. Less polarized views may signal that without affirmative action the racial climate on campus improves.

Furthermore, student attitudes offer a glimpse into the likely voting patterns of the college-educated in California. Student attitudes toward racial diverserve as useful proxies to determine whether college students are more likely to support policy measures that are race-neutral in the future. Under such a scenario, banning affirmative action would not only have significant consequences on the representation of racial minorities on university campuses, but also on the diverse learning outcomes that most colleges and universities strive to achieve. If California college graduates are less supportive of affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity after the ban on affirmative action, then the policy may be reinforcing negative attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions.

CHAPTER 3 METHOD

The purpose of the current study was to examine how the attitudes of college students toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity changed after affirmative action was banned in California. Additionally, further analysis was conducted to explore the extent to which the factors that contribute to students' attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity changed after the ban on affirmative action in California. This chapter is presented in the following six sections: research questions, conceptual framework, instrumentation, variables, participants, and method of analysis.

Research Questions

In an attempt to study how eliminating affirmative action in college admissions impacts student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, the following research questions are posed:

- What differences exist between aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?
- Do gender, political ideology, race/ethnicity, parent's educational attainment, parent's estimated income, average high school grade, college entrance exam scores, and college choice predict California freshmen

attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity at four-year institutions?

- 3) What differences exist between factors used to predict aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?
- 4) If differences are found between the variables used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, how did these vary by racial group?

Instrumentation

The data for the study were drawn from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Surveys from 1996, 1998, and 2000. The ban on affirmative action was passed by California voters in 1996, but did not take effect in undergraduate admissions until 1998 (Timar, Ogawa, & Orillion, 2004). 1996 was the first year that the item on affirmative action was included in the CIRP Freshman Survey.

The CIRP Freshman Survey has been administered annually since 1966 by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles. The survey is typically administered to incoming freshmen students during orientation. The instrument collects data on a "range of student characteristics: parental income and education, race/ethnicity, and other demographic items; financial aid; secondary school achievement and activities; educational and career plans; and values, attitudes, beliefs, and self-concept"

(Sax & Arrendondo, 1999, p. 443). The survey is modified each year to include questions pertaining to important issues of the day and items are removed from the survey as well. Postsecondary institutions pay a fee to participate in the survey. HERI estimates that the survey is administered to over 400,000 first-time freshmen at over 700 institutions each year (Higher Education Research Institute, n.d.).

With over 40 years of data, the CIRP Freshmen Survey has exhibited "a great deal of stability over time" for most items (University of California at Los Angeles, n.d., p. 1). "Changes that are observed do not represent wild or random fluctuations, but can be linked to temporal trends or to real and meaningful exogenous shocks (the events of September 11th, for example)" (University of California at Los Angeles, n.d., p. 1). Approximately 90 percent of the schools included in the CIRP Freshman Survey sample are repeat participants, creating a consistently reliable sample from year to year.

The CIRP Freshmen Survey is the most appropriate data source for the study because it provides relatively broad coverage of student inputs and includes items related to student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. The CIRP Freshmen Survey data has been used in numerous studies by higher education researchers to examine attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions (e.g., Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000) and diversity (Antonio, 2001; Astin, 1993; Hurtado, 2001). Furthermore, because UCLA administers the survey, a large number of California institutions regularly participate in the survey.

Sample

The sample was comprised of freshmen from California four-year colleges and universities whose students completed the (CIRP) Freshman Survey each year in 1996, 1998, and 2000. Because I am primarily interested in the attitudes of United States citizens toward affirmative action in college admissions, international students were excluded from the analysis. The number of American Indians in the sample was too low to include in the study. The CIRP Freshman Survey did not include the item about affirmative action, which serves as a dependent variable for the study, in 1998. So, data from that year was excluded from the regression analyses. The resulting sample represents a total of 73,642 students from 33 different institutions.

Variables

This section describes the variables to be used in the study. For details about the coding schemes for all variables, see Figure 1.

Dependent Variables

Student attitudes toward racial diversity and affirmative action in college admissions served as the dependent variables for the study. Students rate on a four-point scale the extent to which they agree that "affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished" from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly." Higher scores indicate students' agreement that affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished.

Measures of attitudes toward racial diversity included two items on the survey: the student's belief that "racial discrimination is no longer a major

Variable	Coding Scheme
Affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished	1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = agree somewhat, and 4 = agree strongly
Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America	1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = agree somewhat, and 4 = agree strongly
Importance of helping to promote racial understanding	1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important
Gender	0 = male and 1 = female
Political Ideology	1 = far right, 2 = conservative, 3 = middle of road, 4 = liberal, 5 = far left
Race/Ethnicity	A series of dummy variables representing five racial/ethnic categories: White/Caucasian, African-American/Black, American Indian, Asian-American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and Other. Puerto Rican and Other Latino, included on the HERI survey, were recoded to Hispanic/Latino. Multiple responses were allowed. 0 = not marked, 1 = marked
Parents' Educational Attainment	The original instrument asks for mother's and father's highest level of formal education on an 8-point scale from grammar school or less to graduate degree. A new variable was created with scores equal to the highest value entered for mother or father.
Parents' Estimated Income	Measured on a 22-point scale from less than \$6,000 to \$200,000 or more
Average High School Grade	1 = D, 2 = C, 3 = C+, 4 = B-, 5 = B, 6 = B+, 7 = A-, 8 = A or A+
College Entrance Exam Scores	Participants were asked to report their scores on the SAT and ACT. ACT scores were converted to their SAT equivalent. ^b In cases where students provided ACT and SAT scores, the higher of the two was chosen.
College Choice	1 = less than second choice, 2 = second choice, 3 = first choice

Figure 1. Variable Coding Scheme

Note. ^aCoding scheme was reversed from the original survey to align with the other dependent variables

^bEquivalency scale taken from The Princeton Review at http://www.princetonreview.com/college/testprep/testprep.asp?TPRPAGE=8&TYPE=ACT.

problem in America" and commitment to "promoting racial understanding." The items were incorporated by Sax and Arrendondo (1999) as independent variables in their analysis of student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions using the 1996 CIRP Freshman Survey data. The CIRP Freshman Survey does not contain items that directly measure students' attitudes toward racial diversity, but these two variables can "shed light on students' general affect toward racial/ethnic groups" (p. 444).

Sax and Arrendondo (1999) and Zamani (2000) found that students who believed that racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. In the Sax and Arrendondo study, students who reported that they were not committed to promoting racial understanding were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions. For two-year college students, Zamani found this to be the case only for white students.

Survey Year

The primary variable of interest was the survey year. A dummy variable was created to distinguish between the 1996 and 2000 cohorts and was used in the regression analyses to measure differences between the two years. Descriptive results include 1998 to give some indication of the pattern of change, but data from 1998 were not included in the regression analyses. Chow's Test and the comparison of regressions coefficients require a dichotomous dummy variable. To avoid confusion, I included only the 1996 and 2000 cohorts in the regression analyses to focus on the overall change for the five-year period. It is

expected that students will hold less favorable views toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity in 2000 compared to 1996.

Student Background Characteristics

In addition to the survey year, I examined variables that have shown a relationship to attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions to see if the variables maintain a similar relationship in 2000. The previous work of Sax and Arrendondo (1999) and Zamani (2000) included CIRP data only from 1996. In the current study I examined how well the same variables perform in 2000.

Political ideology was also included in the analysis as a background characteristic. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found that for all racial groups, students with more conservative political ideologies were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani (2000) found that white two-year college students with conservative political ideologies were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions than white students with more liberal political views. However, no significant relationship existed between political views and support for abolishing affirmative action in college admissions for African-Americans or Hispanics/Latinos. In line with the previous research, it is expected that those with more conservative political ideologies will be more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions

Self-Interest

Those who are more likely to benefit from affirmative action have a vested stake in supporting affirmative action policies. Measures of self-interest included

in the study are gender, race/ethnicity, parents' educational attainment, estimate of parents' income, average high school grade, college entrance exam scores, and whether students attend their first-choice college or not.

In previous research, gender has had a significant relationship to attitudes toward affirmative action with men more opposed to affirmative action in general (Kravitz & Plantania, 1993; Meader, 1998; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000). Using data from the 1990-91 Midwest College Study, Meader (1998) found white males were more likely to oppose race-based policies than white females. However, differences were not present for African-American students. Zamani (2000) studied two-year college students who completed the 1996 CIRP Freshman Survey to find that across all racial categories males were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found using the 1996 CIRP Freshmen Survey that males were more like than women to oppose affirmative action in college admissions. Kravitz and Platania (1993) also found that women were more likely to support affirmative action policies than were men. Because women have benefited from affirmative action programs, it is expected that women will be more supportive of affirmative action in college admissions than men. It is also expected that women will be more concerned about racial diversity than men.

Because affirmative action as a social policy is designed to benefit minority applicants in college admissions, race/ethnicity contributes significantly to one's perceived self-interest in maintaining or eliminating affirmative action. Previous research indicates that African-American and Hispanic/Latino students

are more likely to support affirmative action than are whites. Kravitz and Platania (1993) and Zamani (2000) found that African-Americans and Hispanics/Latinos had more positive attitudes toward affirmative action than whites. Meader (1998) found that African-American students were more likely to support affirmative action that white students. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) included Asian-Americans in their analysis and found that whites and Asian-Americans were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions than were Mexican-Americans and African-Americans. In the current study it is expected that whites and Asian-Americans will be more likely to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions and less concerned about racial diversity than African-Americans or Hispanics/Latinos.

Parents' educational attainment and estimated income were included by Sax and Arrendondo (1999) and Zamani (2000) in their studies. Sax and Arrendondo found that for whites, Asian-American, and Mexican-American students a positive correlation existed between both, higher levels of parental education and annual family income, and support for abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. For African-Americans, higher levels of parental education and annual family income were associated with support for affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani found a positive correlation between higher levels of both, parental education and annual family income, and support for abolishing affirmative action in college admissions for white two-year college freshmen only. It is expected that students whose parents had higher levels of education and

higher incomes will be more likely to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions and less concerned about racial diversity.

Average High school grade and college entrance exam scores were included as measures of academic preparedness. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found that for whites, Asian-Americans, and Mexican-Americans a positive relationship existed between academic preparation and support for abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Freshman students with higher levels of academic preparation were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani (2000) found the same pattern, but only for white freshmen at two-year institutions. In line with previous research, it is expected that those students with higher average high school grades and college entrance exam scores will be more likely to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions and less concerned about racial diversity.

It is expected that students who indicated that they were not attending their first-choice college would be more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found that for whites and Asian-Americans opposition to affirmative action in college admissions was more likely to come from those freshman students who were not attending their first-choice institution. Among Mexican-Americans, those who were attending their first-choice institution were more likely to support abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Zamani (2000) found that among white two-year college students support for retaining affirmative action in college admissions decreased as students reported attending a lower-choice institution. No

significant differences were present for African-American or Hispanic/Latino students.

Method of Analysis

Data analyses were conducted in six stages: mean difference tests for each dependent variable between 1996 and 2000, descriptive analysis, a modified Chow's test (Gujarati, 1970) of the equivalence of 1996 and 2000 regression equations for all dependent variables, examination of the separate regression equations for 1996 and 2000, a comparison of regression coefficients for each of the predictors before and after the ban on affirmative action in California, and a comparison of regression coefficients for each of the predictors for each racial group before and after the ban on affirmative action in California. Initially, mean comparisons were computed to examine differences between 1996 and 2000 for each of the outcome variables. Descriptive analyses describe student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity by each of the independent variables. Cross-tabulation tables with percent distributions were created to show how attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity break down for each independent variable by survey year.

In the third stage, a modified version of Chow's test was conducted using a dummy variable where 0 = 1996 and 1 = 2000. The purpose of the Chow test is to determine whether two regression lines are the same or, in other terms, if the sets of coefficients and the intercepts are equal (Gujarati, 1970). Chow's test measures the equality of error variances between two regression models

(Ghilagaber, 2004). The test is appropriate with large sample sizes, but small samples can prove misleading. Additionally, the test is appropriate when the sample sizes are equal and the form of heteroscedasticity is the same across the two models. When samples sizes are unequal, considerable differences may exist between the average variances of the error terms in the two models.

In the fourth stage, I examined the regression equations to determine whether the independent variables predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity in 1996 and 2000. The independent variables have all been shown to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, but previous research using the CIRP Freshman Survey only included data from 1996. In the current study, I examined how well the independent variables predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions five years later. I also explored how well the same independent variables predict attitudes toward racial diversity in 1996 and 2000.

The Chow Test determines whether two regression equations are significantly different from one another, but does not pinpoint where these differences lie within the equation (Gujarati, 1970). The fifth stage involved additional regression analyses to compare the regression coefficients from 1996 to 2000 for each of the dependent variables. A t-test was performed comparing regression coefficients for each of the dependent variables. Fairweather (1995) explains that this procedure permits one to test the equivalence of regression coefficients across groups. The test will reveal any changes in the factors that predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial

diversity. In the sixth stage I used the same procedure, but compared the regression coefficients for each racial group separately. As an example the equation for the affirmative action dependent variable in examining differences across racial groups was:

$$\begin{split} ABOLISHAA &= INTERCEPT + (INTERCEPT*YEAR) + b_1GENDER + \\ b_2(GENDER*YEAR) + b_3POLITICALVIEW + b_4(POLITICALVIEW*YEAR) + \\ b_5SES + b_6(SES*YEAR) + b_7ACADEMICPREPARATION + \\ b_8(ACADEMICPREPARATION*YEAR) + b_9COLLEGECHOICE + \\ b_{10}(COLLEGECHOICE*YEAR) + e \end{split}$$

In this case, the t-test indicates whether or not the coefficient for GENDER differed between 1996 and 2000. If there is a difference, the test can also indicate in which direction. Positive signs for the t-test indicate that that the absolute value of the coefficient for 1996 is significantly greater than the absolute value of the coefficient for 2000 (Fairweather, 2005). Negative signs indicate that the absolute value of the coefficient for 2000 is significantly greater than the results of the coefficient for 1996. In the next chapter, I present the results of the current study.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The results are presented in this chapter beginning with an examination of the sample demographic characteristics, which show the sample to have a higher representation of whites and women compared to the total California 4-year enrollment. Then mean differences and percent distributions are presented. The mean trends provide an easy snapshot of the trends for each of the dependent variables. Then, the results for Chow's test and the regression analyses are presented. Though the independent variables served as good predictors for Sax and Arrendondo (1999) using only 1996 data, I found the variables to be less predictive in 2000. Significant differences between 1996 and 2000 are explored for each set of dependent and independent variables.

The percent distributions for political ideology are presented in Table 11 for 1996, 1998, and 2000. The percentage of California 4-year freshman who reported being far left or conservative dropped from 27% in 1996 to 22.8% in 2000. At the same time the percentage who classified themselves as middle of the road, liberal, and far left increased from 1996 to 2000. I computed means for

Item	1996	1998	2000
FAR RIGHT	1.5	1.3	1.4
CONSERVATIVE	25.5	22.7	21.4
MIDDLE OF ROAD	43.6	45.2	44.3
LIBERAL	27.3	28.5	29.9
FAR LEFT	2.1	2.3	3.0

 Table 11. Percent Distribution of California freshmen included in the sample by political ideology and year

Item	1996	1998	2000
Gender			
Male	44.8	42.9	42.4
Female	55.2	57.1	57.6
Race/Ethnicity			
White	63.8	62.0	61.9
African-American	3.7	4.1	4.1
American Indian	.5	.5	.5
Asian-American	16.9	17.8	17.9
Hispanic/Latino	15.1	15.5	15.5

Table 12. Percent Distribution of California freshmen included in the sample for gen	der
and race by year	

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to rounding

each year (1996 = 3.03, 2000 = 3.12) and a two-tailed t-test (t = 10.10, df = 34792, p < .01), which showed that the students in 2000 were significantly more left of the political spectrum than students in 1996.

Percent distributions for gender and race/ethnicity for the sample population are provided in Table 12 for 1996, 1998, and 2000. Table 13 provides the percent distribution by gender and race/ethnicity for overall enrollment in fouryear postsecondary institutions for the same years. Using contingency tables, I computed X^2 values to test whether there were significant differences in gender

Table 13.	Percent Distribution	of total enrollment in fo	our-year postseconda	ry institutions in
California	a gender and race by	year		-

ltem	1996	1998	2000
Condor			
Gender			
Male	48.0	47.2	46.3
Female	52.0	52.8	53.7
Race/Ethnicity			
White	51.0	48.6	47.6
African-American	7.7	7.5	7.3
American Indian	1.2	1.1	1.0
Asian-American	18.3	18.9	18.6
Hispanic/Latino	21.8	23.8	25.4

Note: Totals may not add to 100 due to rounding

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission, Online Data – Customized Reports, retrieved July 5, 2007 from http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/OnLineData.asp

or race between the sample and the population for each of the three years. No statistical differences were found using this method meaning the sample is statistically representative of the population along gender and racial categories. *Mean Differences*

For each of the dependent variables, Table 14 displays the mean responses for each of the three years included in the study. Mean responses divided by racial groups can be found in Appendix A or by race and gender in Appendix B. Overall, students supported abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. Support for abolishing affirmative action in college admissions diminished slightly from 2.76 in 1996 to 2.71 in 2000. The means are statistically different (t = 4.49, df = 29529, p < .001), but the change is slight given the large sample size. This is opposite of the hypothesized direction of change. Students in 2000 were more supportive of affirmative action in college admissions than in 1996. The mid-point for the scale is 2.5 with mean responses for each year considerably above the mid-point still indicating an overall desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions.

Agreement with the statement, "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America" increased from 1.68 in 1996 to 1.84 in 2000 (t = -19.75, df = 32492, p < .001). Even though the change is significant, using 2.5 as the midpoint of the scale again indicates that the means all lie on the side of disagreement with the item. Though this is a substantial change in aggregate student cohort attitudes toward the perception of racial discrimination in the U.S,

1996	1998	2000
2.76	-	2.71
14750	-	20232
1.063	-	.956
1.68	1.79	1.84
15036	19024	20781
.755	•.766	.759
2.66	2.76	2.79
14858	18504	20269
.925	.897	.897
	1996 2.76 14750 1.063 1.063 1.68 15036 .755 2.66 14858 .925	1996 1998 2.76 - 14750 - 1.063 - 1.063 - 1.5036 19024 .755 .766 2.66 2.76 14858 18504 .925 .897

Table 14. Mean Responses of California Freshmen for each dependent variable by year

Note: The abolishing affirmative action item was not asked on the 1998 CIRP Freshmen Survey. ^a Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = agree somewhat, and 4 = agree strongly

^b Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = essential, 2 = very important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not important

the trend is equally present before and after the implementation of Proposition

209 in 1998.

The trend is similar for the item measuring belief in the importance of helping to promote racial understanding, which declined from 2.34 in 1996 to 2.21 in 2000. Though not as dramatic as the previous item, there is still significant change (t = 13.34, df = 31234, p < .001). The two items together provide an initial indication that in the years around Proposition 209, student attitudes toward racial diversity shifted away from recognizing racial discrimination as a major problem in American and away from promoting racial understanding.

Percent Distributions

In order to capture more detail in how responses changed over time, I computed the percent distribution for each dependent variable by individual answer choices for each year. Though changes in means were relatively small, there was a shift toward more centric views for each of the dependent variables. Table 15 shows the percent distribution for the affirmative action item and the change from 1996 to 2000 ($X^2 = 515.64$, df = 3, p < .001). The percentage of people who disagreed strongly fell 4.8% and the percentage that agreed strongly fell 7.1% from 1996 to 2000. There is movement toward the center of the scale on affirmative action in college admissions after Proposition 209.

 Table 15. Percentage distribution for "Affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished" by year

Affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished	Disagree Strong	Disagree Some	Agree Some	Agree Strong
1996	15.3	25.4	27.2	32.1
2000	10.5	32.7	31.8	25.0

This trend is apparent in the mean breakdowns by racial group as well. Appendix A shows the mean scores for each of the dependent variables across both years by race. Mean scores for whites decreased .24 (p<.001) and for Asian-Americans .05 (p<.05). For African-Americans and Hispanics/Latinos mean scores increased .33 (p<.001). So, whites and Asian-Americans who tend to more strongly oppose affirmative action in college admissions held less opposition in 2000 compared to 1996. African-Americans and Hispanic/Latinos who tend to more strongly support affirmative action in college admissions were less supportive in 2000 compared to 1999. Leading up to the passage of Proposition 209, there was significant media attention and increased public

Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America	Disagree Strong	Disagree Some	Agree Some	Agree Strong
1996	47.4	39.4	11.1	2.2
1998	39.6	43.5	14.8	2.1
2000	35.8	46.2	15.9	2.1

 Table 16. Percentage distribution for "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America" by year

awareness about affirmative action (Nicholson, 2003). As the media attention shifted to other issues and events the 2000 freshmen cohort would have faced less exposure to mainstream media coverage of affirmative action than the preceding cohorts as they prepared to enter college.

Table 16 shows the change in percent distributions for the item "racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America" ($X^2 = 527.82$, df = 3, p < .001). The percentage of respondents who disagreed strongly dropped 11.6% while the percentage who disagreed some increased 6.8% and the percentage who agreed some increased 4.8% from 1996 to 2000. Similar to the affirmative action item, there was a higher percentage of responses in the middle of the scale with the exception of the percentage that agreed strongly, which remained relatively unchanged.

Percent distributions for the "importance of helping to promote racial understanding" item are displayed in Table 17 ($X^2 = 181.19$, df = 3, p < .001). The majority of freshmen in each year indicated that helping to promote racial understanding was either not important or somewhat unimportant. The percentage of respondents indicating that promoting racial understanding is essential decreased 3.3% and the percentage that indicated it was somewhat important decreased 3% over the five-year span. The percentage that indicated it

Importance of helping to promote racial understanding	Essential	Somewhat Important	Somewhat unimportan t	Not Important
1996	12.7	27.8	40.7	18.8
1998	9.9	25.4	43.5	21.2
2000	9.4	24.8	43.3	22.5

Table 17. Percentage distribution for "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding" by year

was not important increased 3.7% and the percentage that indicated it was somewhat important increased 2.6%. Combined with the change in means, the percentage changes show a clear decline in the importance of helping to promote racial understanding from 1996 to 2000.

For the affirmative action dependent variable there was movement to the center of the scale. More polarized views in 1996 are likely the result of increased media attention around Proposition 209. There was an increase in the percentage of respondents who believed that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America and decline in the percentage who believed in the importance of helping to promote racial understanding.

Correlation Matrices

The descriptive statistics are useful in seeing detailed changes over time, but they do not account for other variables included in the study. The multivariate regression analyses provide a more thorough understanding of how each of the independent variables, controlling for the others, impacts the dependent variables. I computed correlations between each of the dependent variables combining data from 1996 and 2000 to determine the extent to which each measured separate constructs. Table 18 displays the correlation matrix for

Item	Abolish affirmative action in college admissions	Racial discrimination is no longer a problem	Promote racial understanding
Abolish affirmative action in college admissions	1.000		
Racial discrimination is no longer a problem	.171*	1.000	
Promote racial understanding	.209*	.224*	1.000

Table 18. Correlation matrix for all dependent variables

Note: Correlations computed using Spearman's Rho

***** p ≤ .05

all dependent variables. Low correlations suggest that all items can be treated independently in the analysis. Table 19 displays the correlation matrix for all independent variables. Large correlations between parent's educational attainment and parent's estimated income and between average high school grades and college entrance exam scores could have resulted in unacceptable levels of multicollinearity.

To reduce the impact this would have on the explanatory power of the regression analyses, composite scales were created for the variables with correlations over .5. SES, a new variable, was formed adding the values for parent's educational attainment and parent's estimated income. The new variable formed a scale from 2-30. Another new variable, academic preparation, was created using the same procedures employed by Sax and Arrendondo (1999). The new variable was computed by dividing the college entrance exam score by 100 to form a scale from 4 to 16 and then adding the 8-point scale of average

ltem	Gender ^a	Political Ideology	Race/ Ethnicity ^a	Parent's Educational Attainment	Parent's Estimated Income	Average High School Grades	College Entrance Exam	Choice Of College	Survey Year
Gender ^a	1.000					Giadeo	00003		
Political Ideology	** 760.	1.000							
Race/Ethnicity ^a	.054**	** 260 [.]	1.000						
Parent's Educational Attainment	.067**	.021 **	.266**	1.000					
Parent's Estimated Income	.093**	027 **	.202**	.505**	1.000				
Average High School Grades	.064**	030 **	.105**	.163**	.089 **	1.000			
College Entrance Exam Scores	.191*	.073**	.212 **	.360**	.275 **	.519 ^{**}	1.000		
Choice of College	.028 **	045 **	.106**	001	.004	.054**	006	1.000	
Survey Year	.019 ^{**}	.042**	.014*	019 **	.057**	.002	.011*	019 **	1.000
Note: ^a Computed using Cr	amer's V. Al	l other corre	lations comp	uted using Spe	arman's Rho				

Table 19. Correlation matrix for all independent variables

קט צי

** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05

Item	SES	Academic Preparation
SES	1.000	
Academic Preparation	.260**	1.000
Gender ^a	.096**	.187**
Political Ideology	016**	.033**
Race/Ethnicity ^a	.246**	.195**
Choice of College	.003	.005
Survey Year	.044**	.011*

 Table 20. Correlation matrix for SES and Academic Preparation

Note: ^a Computed using Cramer's V. All other correlations computed using Spearman's Rho ** $p \le .01$ * $p \le .05$

high school grades to form a 20-point scale. Table 20 shows the correlations

between the new composite variables and all other independent variables.

Chow's Test and Regression Analyses

I compared 1996 and 2000 regression equations for each of the

dependent variables using Chow's Test to determine whether significant

differences existed between the two years. Table 21 displays the Chow Test

comparisons of the regression equations between 1996 and 2000 for each of the

dependent variables. All three dependent variables revealed significant

differences between 1996 and 2000. The F-test demonstrates that for each of the

Item	F	df
Abolish affirmative action in college	46.54 [*]	9, 30950
Racial discrimination is no longer a	54.28 [*]	9, 31486
Promote racial understanding	36.35 *	9, 30939

 Table 21. Chow Tests comparing separate regression equations for 1996 and 2000 for each

 dependent variable

Note: * p < .001

Item	1996	2000	T-test comparisons
	(R ² =.251)	(R ² =.133)	
Intercept	3.78*	3.098*	
	(.061)	(.051)	-
Gender	139*	153*	- 643
	(.016)	(.014)	040
Political Ideology	297*	148*	11 605***
	(.010)	(.008)	11.000
African-American	-1.234*	841*	7 107***
	(.044)	(.034)	1.121
Asian-American	280*	202*	2 704**
	(.022)	(.018)	2.704
Hispanic/Latino	-1.000*	556*	13 405***
	(.026)	(.022)	10.400
SES	.005*	.005	.501
	(.001)	(.001)	
Academic Preparation	.012*	.018	2 485*
	(.002)	(.001)	2.400
Choice of College	038*	030*	.462
	(.014)	(.011)	···

Table 22.	Regressior	n and t-test	comparisons [·]	for "Abolish	affirmative	action in	i college
admissio	ns" in 1996	and 2000					

Note: *** p < .001 ** p < .01 * p < .05

dependent variables the regression equations for 1996 are not equal to the regression equation for 2000. However, the test does not reveal where the differences lie within the equations. So, t-test comparisons were computed comparing the regression coefficients from 1996 to 2000 for each dependent variable.

Table 22 shows the regression coefficients and t-test comparisons for "Abolish affirmative action in college admissions." Gender was a significant predictor across both years with men more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions. Political ideology was a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 and 2000. Those with more conservative views were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions in both years, but more so in 1996. All three racial minority groups were more likely than white students to favor keeping affirmative action in college admissions, but differences between the attitudes of white students and minority students was greater in 1996 around the passage of Proposition 209. In line with the findings of Sax and Arrendondo (1999), Asian-American students had less favorable attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions than African-American and Hispanic/Latino Students. SES and Academic preparation were minor but significant predictors in 1996, but not in 2000. Choice of College was small, but significant predictor in both years with no statistical difference in the predictive power of the variable across the two years.

Regression equations were constructed for each racial category to more closely examine the differences between racial groups. Table 23 shows the results of the regression analyses and t-test comparisons for "Abolish affirmative action in college admissions" across the four racial categories. For all four racial categories those who held more conservative political views were more likely to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 than in 2000. The difference between coefficients is small, but white students with higher SES levels were more likely to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions in 1996. For Hispanics/Latinos higher levels of SES were more strongly correlated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 than in 2000. Higher levels of academic preparation for white students were more strongly associated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 than in 2000.

Table 23. Reç	ression for	r "Abolish	affirmativ	re action in	college ad	Imissions	arial stacial	l/ethnic gro	dno			
ltem		White		Afric	an-America	n	Asi	an-America	n	Ξ	spanic/Latir	Q
	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test
Intercept	4.192*** (.080)	3.402*** (.070)	,	2.194*** (.249)	1.838*** (.209)	1	2.986*** (.144)	2.343*** (.105)	1	2.182*** (.154)	2.230*** (.124)	1
Gender	- 170*** (020)	199*** (.018)	-1.06	- 048 (.075)	032 (.068)	1	107** (.041)	094** (.030)	.28	- 088* (043)	055 (.036)	.56
Political Ideology	336*** (.012)	186*** (.010)	9 [.] 69 [.] 8	- 157** (.053)	.003 (.041)	2.43**	169*** (.028)	073*** (.021)	2.74***	230*** (.029)	- 074*** (023)	4.43***
SES	002 (.002)	.003** (.002)	2.44**	.003 (.005)	.001 (.005)	24	.003 .003)	008*** (002)	1.23	018*** (003)	.00 4 (.002)	-3.83***
Academic Preparation	010*** (002)	019*** (002)	3.38***	004 (.008)	001 (.007)	15	.022*** (.004)	.026*** (.003)	.74	.007 (.004)	.003 (.003)	97
Choice of College	063*** (.018)	078*** (.015)	64	- 023 (.054)	.025 (.049)	.63	068* (.028)	002 (.021)	1.98*	.042 (.037)	.050 (.029)	.26
N ote: ***p < .	001 ** p <	.01 * p <	.05									

cial/athnic 2 ž 5 1 ŝ ŝ ; ò Table 23.
Item	1996	2000	T-test comparisons
	(R ² =.059)	(R ² =.046)	
Intercept	2.294***	2.348***	_
	(.048)	(.042)	-
Gender	129***	095***	4.007*
	(.013)	(.011)	1.967
Political Ideology	131***	128***	300
	(.008)	(.007)	.322
African-American	448***	439***	208
	(.034)	(.028)	.200
Asian-American	181 ***	091***	2 974***
	(.018)	(.015)	3.074
Hispanic/Latino	222***	150***	0.070**
	(.020)	(.018)	2.078
SES	003***	.001	<u> </u> ***
	(.001)	(.001)	3.527
Academic Preparation	003*	004***	058
	(.001)	(.001)	900
Choice of College	.017	.018*	088
	(.011)	(.009)	.000

Table 24	. Regression f	or "Racial	discrimination i	is no longe	er a major	problem in	America"
in 1996 a	ind 2000						

Note: *** p < .001 ** p < .01 * p < .05

their first choice institution were more likely to prefer eliminating affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 than in 2000.

Table 24 shows the regression coefficients and t-test comparisons for the dependent item "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America." Males were slightly more likely in 1996 than in 2000 to believe that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem. Whites were more likely than all three minority groups to believe that racial discrimination is no longer a problem for both years, but differences were slightly larger in 1996 than in 2000. The low R^2 values indicate that the model, which was originally designed to measure attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, is less appropriate for this outcome. Additional variables or constructs might improve the predictability

Table 25. Reg	ression fo	r "Racial d	iscriminat	ion is no k	onger a ma	ajor probl	em in Ame	erica" by ra	icial/eth	nic group		
ltem		White		Afric	an-Americ	an	Asia	In-Americar		Hisp	anic/Latino	
	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test
Intercept	2.355*** (.066)	2.441*** (.057)	ı	1.355*** (.181)	1.400*** (.156)	1	1.867*** (.102)	2.162*** (.090)	1	1.994*** (.122)	1.965*** (.108)	
Gender	150*** (.017)	- 094*** (014)	2.57***	011 (.055)	141* (.051)	-1.74*	054 (.029)	078** (.026)	- '60	178*** (.034)	099** (.031)	1.85*
Political Ideology	- 157*** (010)	- 160*** (008)	25	019 (.039)	.005 (.030)	07	049* (.020)	067*** (.018)	65	080*** (.023)	062 ** (.020)	.46
SES	004** (.001)	.002 (.001)	2.91***	00 4 (.004)	004 (.004)	.04	004 * (.002)	001 (.002)	1.30	003 (.002)	.003 (.001)	1.76*
Academic Preparation	003 (.002)	003* (.002)	.03	.011 (.006)	.003 (.005)	76	001 (.003)	008** (.003)	-1.56	006 (.003)	006* (.003)	13
Choice of College	.037 (.015)	.01 4 (.012)	-1.16	048 (.040)	.045 (.036)	1.64	008 (.020)	.011 (.018)	69	.007 (.029)	.025 (.025)	.40
Note: ***p < .	.001 ** p <	.01 * p <	.05									

26
ပ်
Ï
etl
al
Ū.
E
ğ
س
<u>ič</u>
er
E
Ē
Ë
en
ð
20
ö
g
a
er
ğ
<u>ō</u>
0
S
. <u></u>
<u>ē</u>
lat
j.
Ë
õ
ij
a
Ū
Ra
ē
Ĕ
Sic
ŝŝ
JE.
Š
25
e
ð

Item	1996	2000	T-test comparisons
	(R ² =.110)	(R ² =.070)	
Intercept	3.471 ***	3.430***	
	(.058)	(.049)	-
Gender	156 ***	091 ***	2 211***
	(.015)	(.013)	-3.211
Political Ideology	222 ***	178 ***	2 610***
	(.009)	(.008)	-3.012
African-American	769 ***	606 ***	-3 071**
	(.041)	(.033)	-3.071
Asian-American	258 ***	183 ***	-2 744**
	(.021)	(.017)	-2./44
Hispanic/Latino	383 ***	- 282 ***	3 150**
	(.024)	(.021)	-5.152
SES	.001	.002 *	- 885
	(.001)	(.001)	
Academic Preparation	001	003 *	1,185
	(.002)	(.002)	
Choice of College	.024	.027 *	170
	(.013)	(.010)	

Table 26.	Regression for	"Importance of	ⁱ helping to	promote	racial (understanding'	' in	1996
and 2000	-							

Note: *** p < .001 ** p < .01 * p < .05

of the model, but these initial findings suggest that during the height of the Proposition 209 debate, white and male students were more likely to hold opinions in their own self-interest.

Table 25 displays the regression coefficients and t-test comparisons for "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America" by each racial category. For white students, a more conservative political ideology was a significant predictor of desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions across both years. Males and those with higher SES levels were more likely in 1996 compared to 2000 to believe that racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America. African-Americans females more likely to believe that racial discrimination is still a major problem in the U.S. Among Hispanic/Latino

Table 27. Reç	gression for	"Importar	nce of help	oing to pro	mote racial	l unders	tanding" b	y racial/eth	nic grou	d		
ltem		White		Afric	an-America	u	Asi	an-Americai	c	His	panic/Latinc	
	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test
Intercept	3.554 *** (.076)	3.689*** (.066)		2.594*** (.266)	2.726*** (.216)		3.117*** (.130)	2.804*** (.107)	,	2.823*** (.153)	3.051*** (.125)	1
Gender	166 *** (.019)	080*** (.017)	-3.36***	- 168* (082)	083 (.071)	65*	- 189* (.037)	100*** (.031)	-1.90*	- 123** (.042)	142*** (.036)	.35
Political Ideology	249 *** (.011)	211*** (.010)	-2.59***	056 (.056)	- 120** (042)	66	- 167* (.026)	102*** (.021)	-1.95*	- 145*** (028)	096*** (.023)	-1.40
SES	005 (.002)	.000 (100.)	.07	(900 [.] -	005 (.005)	- 46	.000 .003)	.002 (.002)	76	.005 (.003)	.003 (.002)	.55
Academic Preparation	002 (.002)	004* (.002)	.64	013 (.008)	01 4 (.007)	.02	.004 (.004)	.00 4 (.003)	01	001 (.004)	009** (.003)	1.51
Choice of College	.049** (.017)	.003 (.014)	2.07**	019 (.059)	.083 (.050)	-1.37	026 (.026)	.053* (.021)	- 2.43**	.003 (.036)	003 (.029)	.21
Note: ***p < .	001 ** p <	01 * p < .	05									

students, gender was a more significant predictor in 1996 than in 2000 with women more likely than men to disagree with the item. The low R² value suggests the model accounts for only a small portion of the overall variance.

Table 26 presents the regression coefficients and t-test comparisons for "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding." Gender was a more significant predictor in 1996 than in 2000 with women more likely to believe in the importance of promoting racial understanding. A less conservative political ideology was more significantly related to support for promoting racial understanding in 1996 than in 2000. Students with more self-reported liberal political ideologies were also more likely to believe that helping to promote racial understanding is important. All three racial minority groups were more likely than white students to believe that promoting racial understanding is important, but more so in 1996 than in 2000.

Table 27 displays the regression coefficients and t-test comparisons for 1996 and 2000 on the dependent item "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding." Females across all four racial categories were more likely than males to indicate that helping to promote racial understanding is important. For white, African-American, and Asian-American students, being female was more significantly related to the belief that promoting racial understanding is important in 1996 than in 2000. For white and Asian-American students, a liberal political ideology was more significantly related to support for promoting racial understanding. Attending less than a first choice institution was more negatively associated in 1996 than in 2000 with the perceived importance of promoting

racial understanding for white students. For Asian-American students, attending one's first choice institution was more positively related to support for promoting racial understanding in 2000 than in 1996.

Appendix A shows the mean responses for each of the dependent variables by race for 1996 and 2000. African-American students were most supportive of affirmative action in college admissions and most concerned about racial diversity across both years. Appendix B shows mean responses for each dependent variable by race and gender for 1996 and 2000. For each racial category and across both years the mean scores for women were more favorable toward affirmative action in college and racial diversity. African-American women in particular were the most supportive of affirmative action in college admissions and most concerned about racial diversity.

Summary

In this chapter, I have provided a detailed look at the descriptive and inferential statistics included in the study. Students were slightly more favorable toward affirmative action in college admissions, but less concerned about racial discrimination or promoting racial understanding. The descriptive statistics show clear trends in how California freshmen responded on each of the outcome variables. Students were less polarized on the affirmative action item with more responses in the center of the scale.

The regression analyses revealed poor model fits, especially in 2000 for each of the equations. The variables, in less politicized times, were less predictive of the outcome variables offering additional support that student

attitudes were less polarized in 2000 than in 1996. The regression analyses revealed that women and those with more liberal political ideologies were more likely to support affirmative action in college admissions, to consider racial discrimination as a remaining problem in the U.S., and to believe in the importance of promoting racial understanding. All three racial minority groups when compared to whites were more supportive of affirmative action in college admission and more concerned about racial discrimination and promoting racial understanding.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this chapter I offer an analysis of the findings and draw conclusions about the implications of the study to scholars, practitioners, and policymakers. Drawing upon the original research questions I explore the differences among the dependent variables and then turn to the predictive ability of each of the independent variables. Finally, I offer insights on how others may use the results of the study to inform scholarship, practice, and policy.

This study is a first step in examining the relationship between banning affirmative action and student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, but additional work is needed. Though the case for the educational benefits of diversity have been well documented (e.g., Gurin, P., 1999; Gurin et al, 2002; Hurtado et al, 1998; Smith & Associates, 1997), the political battle over the relative importance of the benefits of diversity versus a desire for a college admission system that treats people the same regardless of race is heating up.

Research Question 1

What differences exist between aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?

In this study, I have shown how California freshmen attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity differed before and

after Proposition 209. There were significant changes in attitudes from 1996 to 2000 for the affirmative action item and both of the racial diversity items with the mean of each item moving closer to the mid-point of the scale. Students were generally opposed to affirmative action in college admissions, but more so in 1996 than in 2000. This finding is a contrast to the hypothesis for this dependent variable. It was expected that the policy would legitimize opposition to affirmative action in college admissions, but students were more supportive of affirmative action in college admissions is 2000 than in 1996. The difference in mean scores dropped slightly from 2.76 to 2.71. Though the difference was significant, a drop of .05 in the mean score is quite small. It is possible that the increased media attention and more polarized views led to a greater level of opposition to affirmative action in college admissions in 1996, but the mean changed only slightly from 1996 to 2000.

Across both years an overwhelming majority of students believed that racial discrimination is still a major problem in America, but the majority did not believe that it was important enough to help promote racial understanding. In 2000 compared to 1996, students were substantially less likely to believe that racial discrimination is a problem in America and were less likely to believe that helping to promote racial understanding is important. Students in 2000 were significantly more likely to believe there are fewer racial problems in the U.S.

These trends are interesting given the increasing racial disparities in income, net worth, housing, employment, and education in the U.S. (Bostic, 1996; Bucks, Kennickell, & Moore, 2006; Schmidt, 2007b). Postsecondary

institutions continue to invest resources in diversity and multicultural programming (Gurin, 1999), but diversity programming has increasingly moved away from the promotion of equity (Hurtado, 2005; Tapia, 2007). The decreased belief that racial discrimination still exists and that promoting racial understanding is important marks a contrast to the increasing racial differences in society. As the racial gap widens, higher education should be challenging students and faculty to do more to address the social problems that lead to racial disparities. In order to address those challenges, students must increasingly understand how racial minorities are disproportionately impacted in the U.S.

In the University of Michigan cases in 2003 the Supreme Court determined that affirmative action can only be used as a tool to achieve diversity if diversity benefits all students (Hurtado, 2005). The ruling forces institutions to measure the value of affirmative action programs by how they impact diversity on campus. This move away from promoting racial equity to diversity is a stark contrast to the civil rights movement of the 1960s. The current study is limited by the items in the CIRP instrument, but the results suggest that California students are becoming less concerned about issues of race. Given the investment that postsecondary institutions are making on diversity efforts, such a shift in attitudes toward race is surprising.

In the current study, I hypothesized that the ban on affirmative action would lead to less favorable attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. While this was true for racial diversity, it was not true for affirmative action in college admissions. Though affirmative action

includes many other groups besides racial minorities, such policies are typically viewed as targeting race (Aberson, 2003; Hurtado, 2005; Mukherjee, 2000). Then it would stand to reason that attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions would move in the same direction as attitudes toward racial diversity. However, the current study demonstrates that the issue is more nuanced as attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and diversity shifted in opposite directions. It may be that respondents view affirmative action in college admissions as more than just racial preferences.

I have also shown in the current study how aggregate California student attitudes moved toward more centrist views on affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity after the implementation of Proposition 209. The previous research by Sax and Arrendondo (1999) and Zamani (2000) relied on data only from 1996, but the inclusion of data from 1998 and 2000 provides for a clearer picture of the trajectory of student attitudes toward racial diversity and affirmative action in college admissions. It could be that in the absence of affirmative action in college admissions, there is less tension over the policy or it could be that less media attention in 2000 produced fewer polarized views.

Research Question 2

Do gender, political ideology, race/ethnicity, parent's educational attainment, parent's estimated income, average high school grade, college entrance exam scores, and college choice predict California freshmen attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity at four-year institutions?

In the current study, I found that the previous variables used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions were applicable for the California 4-year freshman cohort in 1996. However, the regression analyses provide evidence that the factors were less predictive of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 2000. SES and Academic Preparation were not significant predictors in 2000. Additionally, the equations exhibited less predictive power in 2000 compared to 1996. During the build up to Proposition 209, the variables included in this study might have been more relevant in predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, but student attitudes in 2000 were less apt to follow the patterns from 1996. A significant drop was found in the relationship between the affirmative action outcome variable and political ideology. Significant drops were also found across all racial categories as well for the affirmative action outcome variable.

Combined with the percent distributions, the regression analyses show less polarized views in 2000 than in 1996 on the issue of affirmative action in college admissions. Political ideology, race, and academic preparation were all less significant predictors in 2000 than in 1996. Though it is unclear whether Proposition 209 had an impact on this trajectory, increased media attention and dialogue might have contributed to the more polarized views in 1996 leading up to Proposition 209 (Nicholson, 2003; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999).

Men and those with more conservative political ideologies were more likely to report that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in American across both years. All three racial minority groups were more likely than whites to

believe that racial discrimination is still a problem. Though the regression coefficient was very low, academic preparation was a significant predictor across both years with higher academic preparation correlated to greater concern for racial discrimination. Lower SES levels in 1996 and not attending one's choice of college in 2000 were positively correlated with the belief that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America.

Women and those with more liberal political ideologies were more likely to believe in the importance of promoting racial understanding across both years. All three racial minority groups were more likely than whites to believe in the importance of promoting racial understanding across both years. Lower levels of SES, higher levels of academic preparation, and attending one's top choice for college were all correlated with belief in the importance or promoting racial understanding for 2000. SES, academic preparation, and choice of college were not significant predictors in 1996.

Research Question 3

What differences exist between factors used to predict aggregate attitudes of California freshman cohorts at four-year institutions toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity before and after the passage of Proposition 209?

Using Chow's test, I found significant differences between the regression equations for 1996 and 2000 for the affirmative action in college admissions, racial discrimination is no longer a problem, and helping to promote racial understanding outcome variables.

T-tests of the regression coefficients for each of the outcome variables were computed to determine what variables contributed to the significant differences. I offer a discussion of the differences between 1996 and 2000 for each of the predictor variables below. The variables included in the study performed moderately well in predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 1996, but not as well in 2000. The same items performed poorly for the racial diversity outcome variables across both years.

Gender

Gender was a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions for whites and Asian-Americans across both years and for Hispanics/Latinos in 1996 with men more consistently opposed to the use of affirmative action in college admissions. Because women have traditionally benefited from affirmative action policies, it is not surprising that women would be more likely to support affirmative action in college admissions. Previous research has also found that women tend to support affirmative action more than men (e.g., Kravitz & Plantania, 1993; Meader, 1998; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999; Zamani, 2000). Zamani (2000) found that for two-year college students, gender was a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions across all racial groups.

In the current study gender was not a significant predictor for African-American students indicating that African-American men and women were equally likely to support affirmative action in college admissions. Gender was also not a significant predictor for Hispanics/Latinos in 2000. Though gender was

a significant predictor for Hispanics/Latinos in 1996 with women more likely than men to support affirmative action in college admissions, the regression coefficient was quite small. This result suggests that race has more of an impact on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions than gender. There were no significant differences in the predictive power of gender on attitudes toward from 1996 to 2000 for any of the racial groups.

Gender was a significant predictor of the belief that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America with women more likely to believe that it is still a major problem. For whites and Hispanics/Latinos being female was a more significant predictor in 1996 than in 2000, but being female was a more significant predictor in 2000 for African-Americans. For African-Americans, gender was not a significant predictor in 1996 but being female was significantly related to believing that racial discrimination is still a problem in America for the 2000 cohort. Appendix B shows that male and female African-Americans have both moved toward believing that racial discrimination is no longer a problem, but males more so than females.

Gender was also a significant factor for the dependent variable "importance of helping to promote racial understanding" and was a more significant factor overall in 1996 than in 2000. For whites, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans being female was a more significant predictor in 1996 than in 2000. The regression results for all three dependent variables suggest that women are generally more supportive of affirmative action in college admissions,

believe that racial discrimination is still a problem, and that promoting racial understanding is important.

Political Ideology

Political ideology was a more significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 than in 2000 for all four racial groups, but especially with whites. Consistent with the findings of Sax and Arrendondo (1999) and Zamani (2000), I found in the current study a relationship between opposition to affirmative action in college admissions and more conservative political ideologies with one exception. The variable was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 2000 for African-American respondents indicating that in that year African-American students regardless of their political affiliations supported affirmative action in college admissions.

Table 11 displayed the political ideology percentage distributions for both years, which showed the sample was slightly more conservative in 1996. The significant change in regression coefficients for each racial group from 1996 to 2000 suggests that political ideology was a major factor in shaping attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions for California freshmen. It is unclear from the current study what role Proposition 209 had in shaping attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, but the more significant relationship between conservative political ideologies and opposition to affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 is likely explained by the increased attention given to the issue of affirmative action.

There was a relationship between conservative political ideologies and the belief that racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America for white, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students, but there were no significant differences in the predictive power of this variable between 1996 and 2000. For the dependent variable "importance of helping to promote racial understanding," a more conservative political ideology was a more significant predictor in 1996 than in 2000 for whites and Asian-Americans. In both cases, those with more liberal views were more likely to believe that promoting racial understanding is important.

SES

SES was a significant factor in 1996 for the regression model with the affirmative action dependent variable, but was not a significant factor in 2000. Racial breakdowns indicate that SES was only a significant factor in 1996 for Hispanic/Latino students with higher levels of SES associated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions. SES was a significant factor in 2000 for white and Asian-American students with higher levels of SES associated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions. SES was a significant factor in 2000 for white and Asian-American students with higher levels of SES associated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) also found SES to be a small but significant factor for a national sample of 1996 CIRP data. In their study, a positive correlation existed between SES and desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions for white, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students. Higher levels of SES for African-Americans were associated with the desire to keep affirmative action in college admissions in college admissions likely do to the contentious ballot initiative in 1996. Zamani

(2000) found that for two-year college students higher levels of SES were correlated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions for white students only.

In the current study, the relationship between SES and attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions are less clear given the mixed findings over the two years. The results provided by Sax and Arrendondo (1996) and Zamani (2000) were not replicated with the sample drawn from California. The small beta coefficients for each of the affirmative action regression models is evidence that SES is not a major predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, but in some cases can account for a small portion of the overall variance.

Higher levels of SES were negatively associated with the two racial diversity dependent variables in 1996, but the beta coefficients were low at -.003 and -.002. SES was not a significant predictor for either outcome in 2000. The racial breakdowns showed that lower levels of SES were only a significant predictor of belief that racial discrimination is no longer a problem for whites and Asian-Americans. As was the case with the affirmative action item, SES has little impact on attitudes toward racial diversity.

Academic Preparation

Like SES, the beta coefficients were small indicating that academic preparation was not a major predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. However, there were several significant findings of note. Higher levels of academic preparation were positively correlated with the desire

to abolish affirmative action in college admissions for white and Asian-American students for both years but there was a stronger correlation in 2000 than in 1996 for white students. Sax and Arrendondo (1999) found a positive relationship for white, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students. Zamani (2000) found the same pattern, but only for white freshmen at two-year institutions. The absence of similar results among African-Americans and Hispanic/Latinos demonstrates the importance that race plays in predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Whites and Asian-Americans are less likely to support affirmative action in college admissions overall. The combination of being white or Asian-American and having higher levels of academic preparation leads to greater opposition to affirmative action in college admissions confirming the findings of Sax and Arrendondo (1999).

Academic preparation was a small but significant predictor of the belief that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem for white, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students in 2000, but not in 1996. Higher levels of academic preparation were positively associated with placing a greater level of importance on helping to promote racial understanding for white and Hispanic/Latino students in 2000, but not in 1996. In sum, higher levels of SES are associated with believing that racial discrimination still exists and the importance of promoting racial understanding, but those with higher levels of academic preparation are more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions as a mechanism to combat that discrimination.

Choice of College

Consistent with the findings of Sax and Arrendondo (1999). I found that for white and Asian-American students in California attending less than the student's first-choice institution was correlated with the desire to abolish affirmative action in college admissions across both years. For white students, the correlation was significantly higher in 2000 than in 1996. This is interesting given that affirmative action policies were not in place in selecting the 2000 California freshmen cohort. This finding may indicate that white students not attending their first-choice institution still blame affirmative action. For Asian-American students the correlation was significantly lower in 2000 than in 1996, which may indicate that this group is less likely to blame affirmative action for their choice of institution. The variable was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions for African-American or Hispanic/Latino students. The combination of being white or Asian-American and not attending one's firstchoice institution led to greater opposition to affirmative action in college admissions.

Choice of college was a significant predictor of believing that racial discrimination still exists today with race included in the model in 2000. There was a small, positive relationship between attending one's first-choice institution and believing that racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in American for 2000. However, the variable was not a significant predictor for 1996 or for any of the regression models by race. Attending one's first-choice institution was negatively associated with placing a high level of importance on promoting racial

understanding for the overall regression model in 1996. The relationship only held for white students in 1996 and for Asian-American students in 2000.

Research Question 4

If differences are found between the variables used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, how did these vary by racial group?

African-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students were significantly less likely than white students to favor abolishing affirmative action in college admissions. The largest gap existed between white and African-American students. The gap between the attitudes of white students toward affirmative action in college admissions and the attitudes of African-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students was greater in 1996 than in 2000. Appendix A shows how white and Asian-American students became more tolerant of affirmative action in college admissions in 2000. In contrast, African-American and Hispanic/Latino students were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions in 2000 than in 1996.

Though the regression model including race for the affirmative action dependent variable performed well in 1996 it did not perform as well in 2000. Table 23 shows the breakdown by racial groups. Every factor except for SES in 1996 was significant for white students. For Asian-Americans, SES in 1996 and College Choice in 2000 were not significant. Overall, the factors were less applicable to African-American and Hispanic/Latino students. Political ideology in

1996 was the only significant factor for African-Americans, meaning the group is largely homogenous on the independent variables included in the study.

For the dependent variable "racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America," African-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students were significantly more likely than white students to disagree. For Asian-American and Hispanic/Latino students the difference was significantly greater in 1996 than in 2000. For white and Hispanic/Latino students, gender and political ideology were significant factors across both years. Political ideology was also a significant factor for Asian-American students across both years and gender was significant in 2000. The regression model performed poorly in both years, but race, gender, and political ideology are factors that should be explored further in examining beliefs about racial discrimination.

For the dependent variable "importance of helping to promote racial understanding," all three racial minority groups were significantly more likely than white students to place a greater importance on promoting racial understanding, but more so in 2000 than in 1996. Gender and political ideology were significant predictors for white, Asian-American, and Hispanic/Latino students. Again, the models performed very poorly for both years, but the findings are similar to a study conducted by Umbach and Milem (2004), in which they found that race, gender, and interactions with people of another color were significant predictors of attitudes toward racial diversity.

White students were significantly different from students in the other three racial groups in their attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and

racial diversity. The differences between racial groups could actually be larger given previous research that found that white respondents sometimes provide socially desirable answers rather than their honest opinions (Cobb, 2001). Still, it is clear that race continues to play a major factor in shaping policy attitudes with the largest differences between white and African-American students.

Key Findings

There are four key findings from the study that I highlight here. First, the mean changes for the affirmative action variable and the two racial diversity variables moved in opposite directions. There was an increase in support for affirmative action in college admissions in 2000 compared to 1996, counter to the original hypothesis. At the same time there was a decrease in concern over racial discrimination and in promoting racial understanding. This finding suggests that attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and attitudes toward racial diversity are distinct from one another. Affirmative action is often viewed primarily as racial preferences (Aberson, 2003; Hurtado, 2005, Mukherjee, 2000). However, the findings from the current study suggest that respondents do not view affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity in the same way.

The second key finding pertains to more centrist views about affirmative action in college admission after the ban in California. More polarized views about affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 were likely to due to Proposition 209 and the media build up about the issue (Nicholson, 2003). For each racial group from 1996 to 2000, there was movement toward the middle of the scale for attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. More

centrist views in 2000 make sense as students in that cohort would likely have less concern over affirmative action policies and would have been less exposed to the media influence regarding affirmative action. The rhetoric over affirmative action is often intense with the media having particular influence in how the issue is presented to the public (Kellstedt, 2000). The data in the current study suggests that in the absence of intense media scrutiny and a major ballot proposition, student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions are more moderate than the typical rhetoric over the issue.

The third key finding is that being male, having a more conservative political ideology, and being white were significant predictors of opposition to affirmative action in college admissions and less concern for racial diversity. The significant coefficients for these three predictor variables on all three outcome variables for both years demonstrate the importance of these variables in predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. The consistency for each of these predictor variables across both years and all three dependent variables is noteworthy. Future research into attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity should account for each of these variables. Furthermore, campus staff and faculty can use this data to provide a general sense of how particular groups of students will view affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Less consistent findings among the other predictor variables limit such generalizations.

Fourth, the data indicate that race is the most significant variable in predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial

diversity. Similar to the finding of Sax and Arrendondo (1999), whites and Asian-Americans hold similar opposition to affirmative action in college admissions while African-Americans and Hispanics/Latinos are more supportive. The regression analysis for the affirmative action outcome variable by racial groups shows that higher levels of academic preparation and choice of college are only significant predictors for whites and Asian-Americans. In 2000 with a less tense political climate, none of the variables predicted opposition to affirmative action in college admissions for African-Americans and having a more conservative political ideology was the only significant predictor for Hispanics/Latinos. For whites in 2000 every variable was a significant predictor and for Asian-Americans in 2000 every variable except college choice was a significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. The model is less applicable in measuring attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions for African-American and Hispanic/Latino students.

Limitations

The CIRP Freshman Survey provided a broad sample for the current study, but the use of a secondary data set limited the variables and the years available. The study is particularly hampered by the absence of the affirmative action item on the CIRP Freshman Survey before 1996 and in 1998. The current study could have offered a more complete story had the question been asked before 1996 allowing for a more complete picture of the trajectory of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Including data beyond the 2000

cohort could also provide useful insight into the more recent trajectory of student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity.

The sample was limited to freshman attending four-year postsecondary institutions in California. Students at two-year institutions and students outside of California may have different views on affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. The current study examined differences between cohorts, but more longitudinal research is needed to examine how students develop attitudes toward racial diversity and affirmative action in college admissions over the college years. Additional research is needed to establish a baseline of student attitudes toward racial diversity and then examines how that changes as students advance in through college.

The R² value for the affirmative action dependent variable dropped from .251 in 1996 to .133 in 2000 indicating that the model had less predictive power in 2000. Political ideology, race, and academic preparation were more significant factors of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions in 1996 leading up to the ban on affirmative action in California. Given the lack of model fit in 2000, more work is needed to improve the model for predicting attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. More exploratory work is needed, but the CIRP Freshmen Survey is limited by the variables included each year. Yet, the CIRP Freshmen Survey offers a unique opportunity to explore affirmative action and racial diversity using longitudinal data.

The low R² values for the three racial diversity regression models indicate a need to improve the models. Measuring attitudes toward racial diversity

requires exploring multiple dimensions beyond just race. Other items could have been included from the CIRP Freshman survey that might have provided a more robust model for the diversity outcome variables. I chose to include independent variables that had previously been used to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, but these items performed less well for the racial diversity outcome variables. In order to develop a more robust measure of student attitudes toward diversity, more exploratory work is needed with the CIRP data across multiple years.

Suggestions for Future Research

The current study offers additional insight into the attitudes of freshman toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. The data from 1996 and 2000 indicate that student attitudes, at least in California, have shifted significantly over the five year period. I found in the current study that previous factors used in regression models to predict attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions were less applicable in 2000 and that the model was less applicable in measuring attitudes toward racial diversity. I did find a consistent relationship between gender, political ideology, and race on each of the outcome variables. Males, those with more conservative political ideologies, and white students were more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions and less concerned about racial diversity across both years. Given these findings and their consistency with previous research (e.g., Meader, 1998; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999, Zamani, 2000), these variables should be included in studies measuring

student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity.

In the current study, I also found that race was the most significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. Though other factors such as SES and college choice were significant predictors, on the whole, they applied only to whites and Asian-Americans. Higher levels of SES and not attending one's first-choice college were not significantly related to attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions for African-American and Hispanic/Latino students. This indicates that among African-American and Hispanic/Latino students, affirmative action in college admissions is supported regardless of SES or choice of college. Because whites and Asian-Americans are more likely to oppose affirmative action in college admissions in general, the addition of other variables appears to add toward opposition. However, race is the most significant predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions.

The current study revealed more centrist views toward affirmative action in college admissions across all four racial categories. Future research could explore whether attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions become more polarized because of other major policy events around the issue. The absence of the affirmative action item on the CIRP Freshman Survey prior to 1996 prevents the current study from using a pre-post design. With other states considering ballot initiatives to eliminate affirmative action, researchers can explore whether similar results exist across different years and states. The CIRP

Freshmen Survey provides a useful tool for the current study because the survey is housed in California. However, other states may have smaller, less representative samples using the CIRP dataset.

The current study provides initial evidence that students became less concerned about racial diversity but more supportive of affirmative action in college admissions from 1996 to 2000. The current study does not offer data to sufficiently explain this finding. It does indicate that students have a nuanced understanding of affirmative action and do not necessarily see it as just a racebased policy. This finding could suggest that less concern about racial diversity goes in hand with a decrease in opposition to affirmative action in college admissions. However, this seems unlikely. Though students reported less concern about racial discrimination and promoting racial understanding, the shift toward more support for affirmative action in college admissions is likely due to less polarization around the issue in 2000. Additional research is needed to determine how students view affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity differently.

Researchers using the CIRP or other similar datasets are limited to a finite set of questions that may not adequately measure the intended constructs. I was interested primarily in the impact of Proposition 209 on attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity, but the current study can not attribute causality. More complex survey designs that ask specific questions about affirmative action policy events could provide more direct data about the impact that such policies have on student attitudes. More work is

needed by researchers and postsecondary institutions to gather longitudinal data on student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Such a framework allows institutions to see how students on campus are changing over time. It would allow postsecondary institutions to examine how certain events, whether they are related to state policy or campus happenings, impact student attitudes.

The current study uses quantitative methods to explore student attitudes toward racial diversity and affirmative action in college admissions, but more qualitative work is needed to examine how students make sense of affirmative action. Previous research has shown that people do not fully understand affirmative action (Zamani & Brown, 2003). Student development professionals could benefit from more exploratory work on attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity. Though separate from racial diversity, affirmative action as a policy is intended to increase diversity on campus. More qualitative work is needed to explore how the two concepts are related, which may also offer additional assistance in building more robust quantitative instruments to measure the two constructs.

Implications for Promoting Diversity within Higher Education

The passage of Proposition 209 in California marked a major turning point in the battle over affirmative action. In the current study, I have shown how student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions and racial diversity changed after affirmative action was banned in California. The current study shows that the 2000 freshmen cohort entered college believing that racial

discrimination was less of a problem than the 1996 cohort and that promoting racial understanding was less important. Appendix A and Appendix B show that the trend toward less concern for racial diversity is present for male and female students across all four racial categories.

The data indicates that in the absence of affirmative action policies in college admissions, students are less concerned about racial diversit. Thernstrom and Thernstrom (1997) argued that race-sensitive admissions increases racial hostility among students. Though evidence has been lacking to support this claim, the current study indicates that across all four racial categories race becomes less of a factor without affirmative action admissions policies. However, the interpretation of this finding depends on one's perspective about the role of race on college and postsecondary campuses. If the objective is to have a color-blind campus, then this finding suggests that in the absence of affirmative action in college admissions, students arrive to college more color-blind. However, this belief may ignore racial divisions that are prevalent in society.

The decrease in concern for racial diversity by students is important given the ongoing disparities between racial groups in the U.S. Statistics for housing, education, income, and wealth indicate that racial divisions still exists within the U.S. (Bostic, 1996; Bucks, Kennickell, & Moore, 2006; Schmidt, 2007b), but across all four racial groups the trend indicates that students believe that discrimination is less of a problem. Colleges and universities actively promote diversity as an intended learning outcome and this should include the historical

legacy of discrimination in the U.S. (Chang, 2002; Hurtado et al., 1999). The CIRP survey questions are not nuanced enough to make distinctions between students perception of historical discrimination and views on the role of race in contemporary society, but the decrease in concern for racial diversity indicates that practitioners seeking to educate students about the importance of racial diversity may have a longer way to go in educating students about existing racial discrimination and the importance of promoting racial understanding.

For campuses seeking to promote diversity as a learning outcome for students, the CIRP Freshman Survey data can provide a baseline to measure entering students' attitudes toward diversity, but to capture more detail regarding student attitudes toward racial diversity additional techniques should be employed. Gathering longitudinal data about student attitudes toward diversity is becoming increasingly important to establish the benefits of affirmative action in college admissions and diversity programming. Without such data, postsecondary institutions will struggle to justify policies and funding devoted to increasing diversity.

Those in higher education must do more to articulate the importance of examining racial disparities and develop purposeful educational opportunities for students to consider the role that race plays in society. As attacks on affirmative action mount in other states, postsecondary institutions should actively address the topic of race within the curriculum. Examining the racial gaps that still exist is needed to determine the relevance of affirmative action programs. Failing to

account for these differences could have serious consequences for racial minorities in the U.S.

Conclusions

The passage of Proposition 209 in California was a major policy event with significant ramifications for higher education in the state and across the country. Since California banned affirmative action in 1996, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Washington, Michigan, and Nebraska have banned the use of affirmative action in college admissions as well. The proposal to ban the use of affirmative action in Colorado in 2008 was rejected by voters with only 50.7% of the vote. Though the current study showed only minor changes in student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, it could be that small changes among voters could decide the fate of affirmative action in the near future.

Universities have an interest in the outcome of the debate over affirmative action. "The mission of virtually every college and university extends beyond the needs and rights of the individual student and institution to include as well an aspiration to improve the communities and lives of people who live beyond the university wall" (Whitt, Chang, & Hakuta, 2003, p. 10). The public, governments, and the courts will inevitably decide the fate of affirmative action in the United States, but more work is needed by the higher education community to fully explore the outcomes of eliminating affirmative action.

The current study is a first step in looking more broadly at the longitudinal outcomes of banning affirmative action. Though previous research has examined the longitudinal outcomes of banning affirmative action on student enrollment,

more work is needed to examine alternative outcomes. The psychological climate and behavioral climate on campus are an integral part of institutional diversity and should be regularly assessed. If done regularly, campuses in states that have passed measures to eliminate affirmative action should be able to examine the impact that such measures have on institutional diversity and campus climate.

As the debate over affirmative action continues to mount, postsecondary education will be pressed to justify the use of race-conscious admissions policies. The impact that race-based policies have on student development should be at the center of the debate given the importance that diversity plays in educating students of all races. However, due to the historical discrimination against minority groups in the U.S. and persistent disparities between racial groups in education and the workforce, higher education must ensure that racial and ethnic minority groups are represented adequately on campus (Loo & Rolison, 1986). If representation is lacking, the psychological and behavioral dimensions of campus climate will suffer as well (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998).

Table A1. Mean response	es for e	ach dep	endent v	ariable	by race	e and ye	ar					
		White		Afric	an-Ame	rican	As	ian-Ame	rican	Ï	ispanic/L:	atino
	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test	1996	2000	t-test
Affirmative action in college admissions should be												
abolished ^a												
Mean (t value)	3.06	2.92	(10.811)	1.57	1.90	(6.764)	2.72	2.67	(2.078)	1.86	2.19	(12.408)
N (df)	9128	12058	(21184)	517	809	(1324)	2386	3566	(2620)	2031	2775	(4804)
Standard Deviation (p <)	.952	.919	(100.)	.806	.903	(100.)	.963	.872	(.05)	.950	.881	(.001)
Racial discrimination is no												
longer a major problem in												
America ^a												
Mean (t value)	1.77	1.92	(14.481)	1.28	1.43	(4.112)	1.57	1.79	(11.588)	1.54	1.73	(8.666)
N (df)	9307	12414	(21719)	532	815	(1345)	2424	3623	(6046)	2075	2868	(4941)
Standard Deviation (p <)	.764	.749	(.001)	.608	.683	(.001)	.692	.744	(100.)	.745	.772	(.001)
Importance of helping to												
promote racial												
understanding ^b												
Mean (t value)	2.83	2.93	(8.264)	1.94	2.18	(4.728)	2.50	2.68	(7.791)	2.35	2.57	(8.386)
N (df)	9186	12118	(21302)	527	785	(1310)	2422	3535	(2955)	2037	2796	(4831)
Standard Deviation (p <)	.890	.863	(.001)	.893	.907	(100.)	.880	.873	(.001)	.915	890	(.001)
Note: t-test is two-tailed												
a Measured on a 1 to 4 scale v	vhere 1 =	= disagree	e strongly a	nd 4 = a	gree stro	yngly						
Measured on a 1 to 4 scale v	vhere 1 =		ortant and 4	i = esser	leit							

APPENDIX A

മ
\mathbf{X}
Q
ш
ð
Å

a r
×
р
ติ
٦,
ğ
Je
رن م
မီ
ā
à
e
lde
Lia
20
Ъ
de
Č
ğ
ð
Ч
ğ
Ē
ę
es
ŪS
õ
SS
2
an
٨e
2
8
Ð
able

		Ż	ite			African-A	merican	
	Σ	ale	Fen	nale	M	ale	Fer	ale
	1996	2000	1996	2000	1996	2000	1996	2000
Affirmative action in college admissions								
should be abolished ^a								
Mean	3.19	3.06	2.95	2.82	1.61	1.94	1.54	1.88
z	4205	5215	4923	6843	204	290	313	519
Standard Deviation	.934	.925	.954	006.	.838	.878	.784	.917
Racial discrimination is no longer a major								
problem in America ^a								
Mean	1.87	1.98	1.69	1.88	1.29	1.52	1.27	1.38
Z	4253	5309	5054	7105	209	293	323	522
Standard Deviation	.796	.785	.727	.718	.592	.747	.619	.639
Importance of helping to promote racial								
understanding ^b								
Mean	2.93	2.98	2.74	2.90	2.07	2.20	1.86	2.17
Z	4187	5158	4999	0969	202	274	325	511
Standard Deviation	.891	.883	.879	.847	.967	606.	.835	906
^a Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = disa	gree stror	ngly and	4 = agre	e strong	ly			

b Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = not important and 4 = essential
Table B1 (cont d). Mean responses fo	or each	depena	dent va	ariable	by rac∈	e, gend	er, and	year
		Asian-A	merican			Hispani	c/Latino	
	W	ale	Fen	nale	Ŵ	ale	Fen	ale
	1996	2000	1996	2000	1996	2000	1996	2000
Affirmative action in college admissions								
should be abolished ^a								
Mean	2.78	2.75	2.67	2.60	1.93	2.22	1.81	2.17
z	1070	1634	1316	1932	866	1028	1165	1747
Standard Deviation	.988	.891	.939	.850	.991	.897	.916	.871
Racial discrimination is no longer a major								
problem in America ^a								
Mean	1.61	1.83	1.54	1.76	1.64	1.79	1.46	1.69
Z	1082	1653	1342	1970	874	1047	1201	1821
Standard Deviation	.713	.769	674	.720	.811	.784	.683	.762
Importance of helping to promote racial								
understanding								
Mean	2.60	2.74	2.42	2.64	2.42	2.66	2.30	2.52
Z	1080	1621	1342	1914	854	1022	1183	1774
Standard Deviation	.875	.913	.876	.835	.929	.931	.901	.863
$\frac{a}{b}$ Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = disaction	aree stro	nalv and	4 = aor	ee stron	alv			

iweasured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = disagree strongly and 4 = agree strongly

b Measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1 = not important and 4 = essential

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberson, C. L. (2003). Support for race-based affirmative action: self-interest and procedural justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1-15.
- Affirmative action. (2004). The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Retrieved November 02, 2006, from http://www.answers.com/topic/affirmative-action
- Alexander, M. (2000, October 16). Elite for hire: Company business and marketing. *Industry Standard.* Retrieved February 11, 2007, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0HWW/is_42_3/ai_66672918
- America, R. F. (1986). Affirmative action and redistributive ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 5(1), 73-77.
- American Psychological Association (1996). *Affirmative Action: Who Benefits?* Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from http://www.apa.org/pubinfo/affirmaction.html
- American Psychological Association. (1997). *Testimony of the American Psychological Association: H.R. 1909 'The Civil Rights Act of 1997'* [Testimony]. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from the American Psychological Association Web site: http://www.apa.org/ppo/testimon.html.
- Anderson, T. H. (2004). *The Pursuit of Fairness: A History of Affirmative Action*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Anderson, T. H. (2005). The strange career of affirmative action. *South Central Review*, 22(2), 110-129.
- Andolina, M. W., & Mayer, J. (2003). Demographic shifts and racial attitudes: How tolerant are whites in the most diverse generation. *The Social Science Journal*, 40, 19-31.
- Antonio, A. L. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(1), 63-89.
- Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Pyschological Science*, 15(8), 507-510.

Astin, A. W. (1993). Assessment for excellence. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251-263.
- Bacon, J. (1996, November 12). California students protest affirmative action ban. USA Today, p. 3A.
- Bali, V. A., & Alvarez, R. M. (2004). The race gap in student achievement scores: Longitudinal evidence from a racially diverse school district. *Policies Studies Journal*, 32(3), 393-415.
- Bastedo, M. N. (2003, November). Cascading minority students in higher education: Assessing the impact of statewide admissions standards.
 Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Conference, Portland, Or.
- Bikson, T. K., & Law, S. A. (1994). *Global preparedness and human resources: College and corporate perspectives*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.
- Blacks remain an extreme minority at university of california campuses. (2005, October 6). *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 22(17), 9.
- Bobo, L. D., & Fox. C. (2003). Race, racism, and discrimination: Bridging problems, methods, and theory in social psychological research. *Social Pyschology Quarterly*, 66(4), 319-332.
- Bostic, R. W. (1997). The role of race in mortgage lending: Revisiting the boston fed study. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System Finance and Economic Discussion Series #97-2. Retrieved October 12, 2007, from http://ssrn.com/abstract=2135
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (2000). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Bowman, C. (1996, April 13). Liberal to rally against the right: S.F. march tomorrow in support of affirmative action. *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. A14.
- Brown, M. C. (2001). Collegiate desegregation and the public black college. Journal of Higher Education, 72(1), 46-62.
- Brown, S. K., & Hirschman, C. (2006). The end of affirmative action in washington state and its impact on the transition from high school to college. *Sociology of Education*, 79, 106-130.

Bucks, B. K., Kennickell, A. B., & Moore, K. B. (2006). Recent Changes in U.S.

Family Finances: Evidence from the 2001 and 2004 Survey of Consumer Finances. *Federal Reserve Bulletin.* Retrieved October 12, 2007, from http://www.federalreserve.gov/pubs/oss/oss2/2004/bull0206.pdf

- Cain, B. E., & Macdonald, K. (1997, Dec. 3 -5). Affirmative action as a wedge issue: Prop 209 and the 1996 presidential election. Paper presented at the Latino Civil Rights Crisis, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Retrieved February 5, 2007, from http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/latino97 /latino97.php
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (n.d). Custom Data Reports." Retrieved July 18, 2008 from http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/ OnLineData.asp
- Carnevale, A. P., & Fry, R. A. (2000). *Crossing the great divide: Can we achieve equity when generation y goes to college?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Carter, S. L. (1991). *Reflections of an affirmative action baby.* New York: Basic Books.
- Chandler, K. (2005, August 18 24). Black enrollment in florida colleges plummets as percentage of hispanics surges. *Westside Gazette*, p. 3.
- Chang, M. J. (1996). *Racial diversity in higher education: Does a racially mixed student population affect educational outcomes?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Chang, M. J. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 153-175.
- Chang, M. J. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 125-140.
- Chang, M. J., Witt, D., & Hakuta, K. (2003). Affirmative action practices in a broader context. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (pp.170-183). Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- Chavez, L. (1998). *The Color Bind: California's Battle to End Affirmative Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Citrin, J. (1996). Affirmative action in the people's court. *The Public Interest*, 122, 39-48.

- Clawson, R. A., Kegler, E. R., & Waltenburg, E. N. (2001). The legitimacyconferring authority of the u.s. supreme court: An experimental design. *American Politics Research*, 29(6), 566-591.
- Cobb, M. D. (2001). Unobtrusively measuring racial attitudes: The consequences of social desirability effects. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 2869. (UMI No. 3023034)
- Cooper, K. J. (2000, August 16). University of Georgia to appeal ruling against affirmative action. *Washington Post*, A10.
- Crosby, F. J., Iyer, A., & Clayton, S. (2003). Affirmative action: Psychological data and the policy debates. *American Psychologist*, 58(2), 93-115.
- Crosby, F. J., Iyer, A., & Sincharoen, S. (2006). Understanding affirmative action. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 585-611.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1995). Myths and realities of academic labor markets. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(2), 179-192.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401-422.
- Farkas, G. (2003). Racial disparities and discrimination in education: What do we know, how so we know it, and what do we need to know. *Teachers College Record*, 105(6), 1119-1146.
- Feldman, S., & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and white opposition to race-conscious programs: principles or prejudice. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(1), 168-183.
- Fischer, K. (2005, April 22). Class-rank plan faces trouble in texas. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(33), p. A25.
- Ghilagaber, G. (2004). Another look at chow's test for the equality of two heteroscedastic regression models. *Quality & Quantity*, 38, 81-93.
- Glaeser, E. L., & Vigdor, J. L. (2001, April). *Racial segregation in the 2000 census: Promising News.* Retrieved February 11, 2007, from The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban & Economic Policy Web site: http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/census/glaeser.pdf
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myth: Women in academe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins

- Green, D. O. (2004). Fighting the battle for racial diversity: A case study of michigan's institutional responses to gratz and grutter. *Educational Policy*, 18(5), 733-751.
- Gujarati, D. (1970, February). Use of dummy variables in testing for equality between sets of coefficients in two linear regressions: A note. *American Statistician*, 24(1), 50-52.
- Gurin, P. (1999). The compelling need for diversity in higher education: Expert testimony in gratz, et al. v. bollinger, et al. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, 5, 363-425.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S. & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330-366.
- Hajnal, Z. & Louch, H. (2001). Are there winners and losers: Race, Ethnicity and California's Initiative Process. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1984). *Out of the classroom: A chilly campus climate for women?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Healy, P. (1998, October 30). Foes of preferences try a referendum in washington state: Opinion is divided on affirmative action, but the debate is quiet at the state's flagship campus. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A34.
- Heilman, M. E. & Blader, S. L. (2001). Assuming preferential selection when the admissions policy is unknown: The effects of gender rarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 188-193.
- Henderson-King, D. & Stewart, A. J. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(2), 142-164.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (n.d.). *CIRP Program Overview*. Retrieved online October 31, 2008 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/ cirpoverview.php
- Horn, C. L., & Flores, S. M. (2003). *Percent Plans in College Admissions: A Comparative Analysis of Three States' Experiences*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Hurtado, A. (2005, Winter). Toward a more equitable society: Moving forward in

the struggle for affirmative action. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(2), 273-284.

- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action* (pp.187-203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Hurtado, S., Dey, E., & Treviño, J. (1994). *Exclusion or self-segregation: Interaction across racial/ethnic groups on college campuses*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, New Orleans.
- Hurtado. S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.
- Inkelas, K. K. (2003). Diversity's missing minority: Asian pacific American undergraduates' attitudes toward affirmative action. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(6), 601-639.
- Inkelas, K. K. (2004). Does participation in ethnic cocurricular activities facilitate a sense of ethnic awareness and understanding: A study of asian pacific american undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(3), 285-302.
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (1996). *The Remedy: Class, Race, and Affirmative Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kane, E. W., & Kyyro, E. K. (2001). For whom does education enlighten: Race, gender, education and beliefs about social inequality. *Gender and Society*, 15(5), 710-733.
- Kellstedt, P. M. (2000). Media framing and the dynamics of racial policy preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(2), 245-260.
- Kinder, D. R., & Winter, N. (2001). Exploring the racial divide: Blacks, whites, and opinion on national policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(2), 439-456.
- Laubscher, M. (1994). Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lewis, J. (2001). Constructing public opinion: How political elites do what they like and why we seem to go along with it. New York: Columbia UP.

- Lieb, D. A. (2008, January 8). Affirmative action ballot language unfair, judge rules. Retrieved November13, 2008, from http://www.columbiamissourian.com/ stories/2008/01/07/affirmative-action-ballot-language-unfair-judge-ru/
- Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominately white university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 58-77.
- Look what happens when affirmative action is banned: Black students are pushed down into second- and third-tier institutions of higher education. (2001-2002, Winter). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 34, 82-94.
- Loury, G. C. (1998). Performing without a net. In G. E. Curry (Ed.), *The Affirmative Action Debate* (pp. 49-64). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Marin, P., & Lee, E. K. (2003). *Appearance and Reality in the Sunshine State: The Talented 20 Program in Florida*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Meader, E. W. (1998, November). College student attitudes toward diversity and race-based politics. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Miami, FL.
- Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. Wilds (author), *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report* (pp.39-67). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Mondak, J. J. (1994). Policy Legitimacy and the Supreme Court: The Sources and Contexts of Legitimation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 47(3), 675-692.
- Moore, J. (2005). *Race and College Admissions: A case for Affirmative Action*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company.
- Moore, K. (1982). Women and Minorities. Leaders in Transition: A National Study of Higher Education Administrators. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED225459)
- Morfin, O. J., Perez, V. H., Parker, L., Lynn, M, Arrona, J. (2006). Hiding the politically obvious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 249-270.
- Moses, M. S. (2001). Affirmative action and more favorable contexts of choice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 3-36.

- Mukherjee, R. (2000). Regulating race in the california civil rights initiative: Enemies, allies, and alibis. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), pp. 27-47.
- Newman, J. D. (1989). Affirmative action and the courts. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative Action in Perspective* (pp. 31-50). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Nicholson, S. P. (2003). The political environment and ballot proposition awareness. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), 403-410.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piqueor, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36(4), 859-866.
- Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 68, 3-18.
- Pike, G. R. (2002). The differential effects of on- and off-campus living arrangement on students' openness to diversity. *NASPA Journal*, 39(4), 283-299.
- Proposal 2: Frequently asked questions. (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2007, from the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative Web site: http://www.michigancivilrights.org/media/MCRI_FAQs.pdf
- Pusser, B. (2004). Burning Down the House: Politics, Governance, and Affirmative Action at the University of California. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Raza, M. A., Anderson, A. J., & Custred, H. G. (1999). *The Ups and Downs of Affirmative Action Preferences*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rendon, L. I., Novack, V., & Dowell, D. (2005). Testing race-neutral admissions models: Lessons from California State University-Long beach. *Review of Higher Education*, 28(2), 221-243.
- Rothman, S., Lipset, S. M., & Nevitt, N. (2002, Fall). Diversity and affirmative action: The state of campus opinion. *Academic Questions*, 52-66.
- Sax, L. J., & Arrendondo, M. (1999). Student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 439-459.
- Schmidt, P. (2006, November 17). Michigan overwhelmingly adopts ban on affirmative-action preferences: Foes of the ballot measure vow to keep fighting while supporters eye new fronts. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(13), p. A23.

- Schmidt, P. (2007a, June 1). What color is an a: Colleges take on a persistent but rarely discussed issue - the poor grades earned by many minority students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(39), A24.
- Schmidt, P. (2007b, October 19). Five more states curtail affirmative action: Ballot measures pushed by ward connerly are likely to win passage. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(8), p. A1.
- Sedlacek, W. E., Helm, E. G., & Prieto, D. O. (1997). *The relationship between attitudes toward diversity and overall satisfaction of university students by race* (Report No. UMCP-RR-3-97). College Park, MD: Counseling Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411 752)
- Selingo, J. (2006, November 17). A new era for higher education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A1.
- Smith, D.G., & Associates. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Springer, L., Palmer, B., Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., & Nora., A. (1996). Attitudes toward campus diversity: Participation in a racial or cultural workshop. *Review of Higher Education*, 20(1), 53-68.
- Suthammanont, C. M., & Peterson, D. (2004). *Affect, cognition and the conditional nature of race-related policy attitudes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the The Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois. Retrieved October 5, 2007, from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p82357_index.html
- Tapia, R. A. (2007, September 28). True diversity doesn't come from abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(5), p. B34.
- Texas 10 percent plan has not improved minority representation, republican leader says. (2005, Feb. 10) *Black Issues in Higher Education*, p. 14.
- Thernstrom, S., & Thernstrom, A. (1997). *America in Black and White: One Nation Indivisible*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thurmond, V. A., Wambach, K., Connors, H. R., & Frey, B. B. (2002). Evaluation of student satisfaction: Determining the impact of web-based environment by controlling for student characteristics. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 16(3), 169-189.

Timar, T. B., Ogawa, R., Orillion, M. (2004). Expanding the university of

california's outreach mission. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 187-209.

- Trent, W., Owens-Nicholson, D., Eatman, T. K., Burke, M., Daugherty, J., & Norman, K. (2003). Justice, equality of educational opportunity, and affirmative action in higher education. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (pp.22-48). Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- Trow, M. (1999). California after racial preferences. *The Public Interest*, 135, 64-85.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1975). *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Time to 1970, Bicentennial Edition.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Census Bureau (1990). *General Population and Housing Characteristics:* 1990. Retrieved June 18, 2008 from U.S. Census http://factfinder.census.gov
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2002). *Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) 100 Percent Data, Table DP-1 Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000.* Retrieved 11 February 2007 from U.S. Census http://factfinder.census.gov.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.
- Umbach, P. D., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Applying holland's typology to the study of differences in student views about diversity. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 625-649.
- University of California. (n.d.). *Statistical Summary and Data on UC Students, Faculty, and Staff.* Retrieved online May 8, 2008 from http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/
- University of California at Los Angeles. (n.d.). *CIRP Freshman Survey: Reliability and Validity*. Retrieved online October 31, 2008 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/PDFs/CIRP_Reliability_Validity.PDF
- University of Texas. (2005). *Statistical Handbook 2004-2005*. Retrieved online May 8, 2008 from http://www.utexas.edu/academic/oir/

University of Washington. (n.d.). Student Headcount by Ethnicity and Student

Level. Retrieved online October 29, 2008 from http://www.washington.edu/admin/factbook/taba5.pdf

- Vernez, G., Krop, R. A., & Rydell, P. (1999). *Closing the Education Gap: Benefits* and Costs. Santa Monica: RAND.
- Vernon-Gerstenfeld, S., & Burke, E. (1985). Affirmative action in nine large companies: A field study. *Personnel*, 62(4), 54-60.
- Virtanen, S. V., & Huddy, L. (1998). Old-fashioned racism and new forms of racial prejudice. *The Journal of Politics*, 60(2), 311-332.
- Weiss, R. (1997). We Want Jobs: A History of Affirmative Action. New York: Garland.
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T, & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on student openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172-204.
- Wiedeman, R. (2008, November 14). State ballots on stem cells and race are decided. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(12), A1.
- Wise, T. J. (2005). Affirmative Action: Racial Preference in Black and White. New York: Routledge.
- Witt, D., Chang, M. J., & Hakuta, K. (2003). Introduction. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (pp.1-21). Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- Witt, D., & Shin, C. (2003). Historical summary of affirmative action. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (pp.185-201). Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.
- Witt, J. L. (1990). Affirmative action and job satisfaction: Self-interested vs. public spirited perspectives on social equity: Some sobering findings from the academic workplace. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 10(3), 73-93.
- Zamani, E. M. (2000). Aspiring to the baccalaureate: Attitudes of community college student toward affirmative action in college admissions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(5), 1724. (UMI No. 9971236)

Zamani, E. M., & Brown, M. C. (2003). Affirmative action in postsecondary

educational settings: The historic nexus of meritocracy and access in U.S. higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 27-38.

