STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2016

From the Yellow Peril to the Model Minority: An Experimental Survey Examining Racial Attitudes towards Asian Americans

Jenny Nguyen
University of Central Florida

Part of the Sociology Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

STARS Citation

University of Central Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

FROM THE YELLOW PERIL TO THE MODEL MINORITY: AN EXPERIMENTAL
SURVEY EXAMINING RACIAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS ASIAN AMERICANS

by

JENNY NGUYEN
B.A. Texas Christian University, 2007
M.S. Oklahoma State University, 2013

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2016

Major Professor: Scott Carter

ABSTRACT

Attitudinal research continues to show a more liberal trend in racial attitudes of Whites towards Blacks across a spectrum of issues (i.e. interracial marriage, residential integration, etc.) leading some to believe that we are moving into a post-racial society. However, a growing body of research has brought into question this utopian post-racial assertion. While Whites express support for racial equality in principle, they vehemently oppose race-targeted policies aimed to address racial inequality. This principle-policy gap has been consistently associated with persistent racial resentment; thus, contradicting the notion that of a post-racial era.

Existing attitudinal research is often limited to the Black-White binary. Asian Americans in particular are often omitted from attitudinal research. Through a group threat framework, which argues that racial resentment occurs when there exists a threat to valued resources, this dissertation research examines racial attitudes towards Asian American in four domains: education, jobs, marriage, and residential integration. Given the stereotype of the model minority and the successes made by many Asian Americans, the project assesses whether there continues to be underlying racial resentment toward Asian Americans by Whites and whether the racial resentment is based in feelings of threat to valued resources.

This study utilized an experimental list survey design, which addresses social desirability bias in traditional survey research. Quantitative analyses were conducted from a sample collected at a large public university. Traditional difference-in-means approach along with Ordinary Least Squares Regression were conducted to examine what factor(s) significantly predicted anger towards Asian Americans in these domains. Results suggests that group threat significantly predicted the presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the job domain, but not in the

education, marriage, or residential domains. As group threat increased in the job domain, presence of anger also significantly increased. Results suggest that not every domain stimulates feelings of anger towards Asian Americans. Moreover, not every domain evokes feelings of threat to valued resources.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Scott Carter, *my dissertation chair*: I could never thank you enough for your guidance and support throughout this journey.

Dr. Shannon Carter, Dr. Amanda Anthony, and Dr. Mamadi Corra, my committee members: I thank you all for your advice and encouragement.

Dr. Jana Jasinski: Thank you for your support all these years and for trusting me to manage a research project for you during my last year in the program.

Dr. Melanie Hinojosa: Thank you for always believing in me and always sharing your experiences with me.

Traci Milbuta: Thank you for everything—from my very first visit to the department, to getting the final form for my dissertation defense submitted.

Abigail M., Nicole O., Carrie W.: I am so glad that I met each of you. Abigail, thank you for always being there—through both the tears and joy. Nicole, thank you for the constant support and motivation. Carrie, thank you for being such a part of my support system—from climbing walls to late night talks.

Edwanna A., Sara S., Boniface N., and Alyssa M.: Our cohort has been through so much together. I want to thank each of you for being by my side all these years: Edwanna for answering my panic texts, Boniface for many home cooked meals, and Sara and Alyssa for the so many motivational phone calls.

Rameika N.: I am so glad we shared an office and it grew into something much more. Thank you.

Eder Iracheta, my life partner: I thank you for being my side all these years. Thank you for the constant support, motivation, and inspiration**.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Chapter

This chapter first reviews early attitudinal research and the concept of a post-racial society. This review of existing attitudinal research will expose lack of research on attitudes towards Asian Americans. Symbolic racism and principled objection will be explored as factors that impact attitudes towards Blacks. This chapter then argues that factors that impact attitudes towards Blacks and Asians are rooted in feelings of threat towards resources. The chapter then briefly introduces the theoretical framework of this study: group positioning (Blumer, 1958)— which argues that threat is at the heart of racism. Finally, the chapter provides an overview of the dissertation.

Introduction

Racism is defined as "any attitude, belief, behavior, or institutional arrangement that favors one race or ethnic group over another" (Farley, 2012:15). Sociologists have studied racial attitudes, or the evaluation and assessment of race-related factors including relations/interactions between racial groups and public policies related to race/ethnicity since the 1950s (Greeley & Sheatsley, 1971;Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Hyman & Sheatsley, 1964; Hyman & Wright, 1974). These studies that greatly focus on Black-White dichotomy argued that racial attitudes of Whites towards Blacks have greatly improved since the 1950s. Generally speaking, the literature continues to illustrate a more politically liberal trend in Whites' attitudes towards Blacks over the past 50 years across a spectrum of issues, including racial desegregation, political participation, and interracial marriage to name a few (Schuman et al., 1997).

Upon the election of Barack Obama in 2008, many pundits have argued that we have entered into a post-racial society, where individuals can be judge by their character and not by the color of their skin (Tesler & Sears, 2010). However, during that same time period, researchers noted a distinct principle-policy gap in attitudes among whites—that while Whites in general support ideas of racial equality, they oppose race-targeted policies that address racial inequality (Kinder & Sears, 1981; Krysan, 2000; Bobo, 2000; Bobo et al., 1997; Sears, 1988; Sears & Kinder, 1971; Schuman et al., 1997; Sears et al., 2000; Sniderman & Piazza, 1993; Tuch & Hughes, 2011).

Debate around the root cause of this principle-policy divide has been quite heated. On one side, scholars argue that this gap reflects a new more subtle form of racism that is quite distinct from traditional racism found before and during the Jim Crow era (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich 2011; Bobo et al., 1997; Cashmore, 2008; Hughey, 2012; Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Sears & Henry, 2003; Sniderman & Piazza, 1993; Tarca, 2005). As racism is "now regarded as undesirable," people favor "disguised, indirect ways to express it" (Snideman et al., 1994, p. 424). Bonilla-Silva (2003) refers to this type of racism as "racism without racist." While different in character, this new more subtle racism contrasts sharply with the research that proclaims a utopian post-racial society. Others, however, pose that the lack of support expressed by Whites is simply a principled objection to policies they see as violating tenets of individualism and are unjust (Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Sniderman & Carmines, 1997). Therefore, under principle objection, people oppose these policies because the feeling that other people are trying to get things that they did not work for and deserve.

A third argument takes a more sociological approach to the study of racial attitudes. Blumer argued that racial attitude formation exists in the distant. That is, outside entities have the

ability to shape the images people have of the out-group. Racial prejudice, therefore, should be understood in terms of "the process by which racial groups form images of themselves and of others" (Blumer, 1958, p. 3).While this approach understands that individual-level racial resentment is important, it positions the group level as what shapes racial status quo in America.

Racial prejudice according to Blumer (1958) is more than just negative stereotypes and feelings. The most potent aspect of racial prejudice are feelings of competition. Indeed, Blumer (1958) poses that Whites develop four feelings that form the basis of racial prejudice, including the feeling of natural superiority, the feeling that the other group is alien or different, the feelings of ownership over valued resources and the feeling that the out-group threatens those resources. While these first two feelings reflect the import of stereotypes in separating the out-group, the second set of feelings set them up as a threat to valued resources. This framework, according to Bobo and Tuan (2006), actually combines the individual theories of prejudice (e.g., symbolic racism) with a more sociological history-cultural view of racism (group competition) to explain the complicated nature of racial prejudice we know today. Racial prejudice, therefore, is a historical and collective process in which racial groups define and redefine in-groups and out-groups over time.

Yet, within the racial prejudice and politics literature, Asian Americans along with other immigrant groups have traditionally been excluded in attitudinal studies (Bobo & Tuan, 2006; Tuch & Martin, 1997). The focus has been almost universally on attitudes toward the growing threat of Blacks to valued resources in various domains, including residential neighborhoods, marriage, and education (Bobo et al., 2012; Samson & Bobo 2014; Sears et al., 2000; Schuman et al., 1997). At the same time, racial stereotypes of Asian Americans throughout history have positioned Asian Americans as a threat to Whites in different domains like the workplace or

3

educational setting (Cho & Feagin 2008). Such positioning within Blumer's (1958) group positioning framework should reflect continued and even heightened racial prejudice among not only Whites toward Asians but by other groups as well. To contribute to existing literature, this study examines Whites', Blacks', and Hispanics' attitudes towards Asian American through four different domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential neighborhoods using an experimental survey deisgn. These domains have been the object of extensive amounts of racial resentment when Whites feel they are being threatened (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996; Charles, 2003; Emerson et al., 2001; Harris, 2001; Iceland & Sharp, 2013; Massey, 2012; Qullian & Pager, 2001; Schuman et al., 1998; Xie & Zhou, 2012).

This project uses the cutting edge experimental design to limit social desirability bias (Brueckner et al., 2005; Kuklinski et al., 1997).This study took place at a large southeastern university. The list survey consisted of demographic questions along with one baseline and four test groups. Participants were randomly assigned to the baseline control group (three statements unrelated to Asian Americans) or one of the four test groups (same three statements plus one test statement about Asian Americans) that examines attitudes towards Asian Americans in four different domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential neighborhood. Participants were asked on the survey to indicate how many of the statements on the list angered them—not which ones, but just how many. This, therefore, limits social desirability bias as participants were not asked directly how they feel about Asian Americans.

First, this study assesses whether or not there is anger towards Asian Americans in these different domains. Second, if anger is present, then what predicts the presence of anger? As Bobo and Zubrinsky (1997) suggests, there exists some type of rank-ordering, or hierarchy, of racial minority groups by domains. As different studies suggests, Asian Americans are placed closer to

4

Whites in different domains. For example, opponents of affirmative action frame their discussion by saying that policies like affirmative action hurts both Whites and Asian Americans (Omi & Takagi, 1996). In terms of educational attainment, Asian Americans ages 25 and older hold more bachelor's degrees compared to any other racial group (PEW, 2012). This leads to the perception that Asians have the most financial resources in terms of "purchasing power" for home-buying (Zubrinsky & Bobo 1996). Therefore, if Asian Americans are place closer to Whites but at the same time outdoing Whites, do Whites feel threat toward Asian Americans? This is an important question to explore as Blumer (1958) argued, threat to valuable resources is at the root of persistent racial resentment/prejudice and Asian Americans continue to be placed closed to Whites in the racial ranking. Finally, this seeks to examine how do perceptions of threat towards Asian Americans vary by domain of interest—i.e. education, workplace, marriage, and residential neighborhood.

The following chapters will provide more a more in-depth discussion of literature, methods, and analyses/results. Below is a chapter-by-chapter outline of the rest of this dissertation project.

<div align="center">Outline of Chapters</div>

The chapters in this dissertation follow the format of this first chapter. Chapter 2 is a literature review that is broken into three parts. Part 1 presents the literature review that is focused on racial attitudes. In this section, attitudinal studies that focus on the domains of education, workplace, marriage, and residential neighborhood will be briefly explored. Part 2 will give a historical overview of attitudes towards immigrant groups. This is an important area of literature as the category of "Asian Americans" also encompasses Asian immigrants. Finally, Part 3 will review literature on racial stereotypes of Asian Americans—from the yellow peril to

the model minority. This section will explore how Asian Americans have been historically constructed as a threat to other groups through these stereotypes.

Chapter 3 explores the theoretical framework of this dissertation research. This chapter first provides a brief overview of theories of racial prejudice. This overview discusses how these theories are very "individualistic" in nature and do not account for the collective aspect of social life. From there, the chapter will explore group positioning as proposed by Blumer (1958) and further developed by Bobo and Tuan (2006). This theoretical perspective was chosen as the main theoretical framework as it allows for a more sociological analysis—looking at how groups in general formulate their views over time.

Chapter 4 explains the method that this dissertation research utilized. The first part of Chapter 4 explains a major problem in existing attitudinal studies that rely on survey data—social desirability bias. Then, the chapter discusses benefits of experimental designs—specifically the list experiment—and how it eliminates social desirability bias. This section of the chapter also reviews a few major attitudinal studies using experimental list survey designs—one particular attitudinal study on the "New South" by Kuklinski et al. (1997), which is also one of the first experimental list studies in attitudinal research. The chapter then describes the experimental list survey method used in this study. This section will also discuss the statistical data analysis method of the difference-in-means estimator and OLS regression (multivariate analysis). The chapter will end with a section on data collection, sample size, and time frame of the study.

Chapters 5-9 each follow the format of a research manuscript and dissertation: Introduction, Literature, Data, Measures, Results, and Discussion. Each of these analytical chapter focuses on one domain. Chapter 5 focuses on factors that predict anger towards Asian

Americans in the education domain. Chapter 6 focuses on factors that predict anger towards

Asian Americans in the job domain. Chapter 7 focuses on factors that predict anger towards

Asian Americans in the marriage domain, and Chapter 8 on the residential domain. In Chapters

5-8, the hypotheses are very similar. The measures for these chapters will be kept the same to

keep the multivariate regression models consistent. Chapter 9, however, is slightly different in

that it combines all the experimental groups described in Chapters 5-8 into one and compares

attitudes towards Asian Americans overall with the control group. In each chapter, a sample

characteristics table, bivariate tables, and OLS regression tables will be presented. At the end of

each of these analytic chapters, a discussion that provides a more-in-depth discussion on the

findings will be presented.

  Chapter 10 is the final chapter of the dissertation. Chapter 10 unifies the findings into a

concluding chapter and discusses limitations of the study and future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Purpose of Chapter

This Chapter first reviews existing attitudinal research with regards to policy and immigration. Second, a historical overview of attitudes towards immigrants will be discussed. The review will focus on White's attitudes towards Blacks along with limited literature that has also examined Whites' attitudes towards Hispanics under these domains. The review will highlight a need to incorporate Asian Americans into racial attitudinal studies. Finally, the chapter will end with an examination of the historical constructions of stereotypes of Asian Americans—focusing on how stereotypes of Asian Americans have transitioned from the "yellow peril" to the "model minority" and how these stereotypes have positioned Asian Americans as a threat to valued resources.

Racial Attitude: Review of Literature

Since the 1950s, sociologist have studied white's racial attitudes towards desegregation (Hyman & Sheatsley 1956). Hyman & Sheatlsey (1964, p.23) were convinced that racism has diminished and that the "principle of integration seems to have already won" over the majority of Americans (Hyman & Sheatsley 1964, p. 23). As studies using national data during the 1950s to 1970s revealed more liberal racial attitudes (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1964; Greeley & Sheatsley, 1971; Hyman & Wright 1974; Taylor et al., 1978), Hyman & Sheatsley (1956) argued that this trend is due to cohort effects that are ongoing and learned from childhood to adulthood. Younger generations, for example, are more racially tolerating than older generations as they grew up in less racially hostile environments (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Schuman et al., 1997). Over the past 50 years, studies continue to suggest a more liberal trend in Whites' attitudes towards

Blacks (Samson & Bobo 2014; Schuman et al. 1997). For example, White's attitudes show a decline in support for school and residential segregation. However, as further discussed below, studies also began revealing a principle-policy gap in racial attitudes (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Bobo et al., 1997; Sears, 1979; Quillian, 2008), and researchers started to question this decline in racism and the notion of a post-racial society.

While Whites are more likely than ever before to embrace and support racial equality across domains: education, marriage, and neighborhood to name a few Samson and Bobo (2014) found Whites generally still prefer to have a distance from non-Whites. For instance, while a majority of Whites no longer support school segregation, Whites oppose sending their children to a school with Black children as the proportion of Blacks increases, and while more Whites support interracial marriage, they prefer Hispanic and Asian partners. Consistent studies illustrate that while Whites support racial equality in principle, Whites do not support race-target policies (i.e. affirmative action, busing, etc.) aimed to alleviate racial inequality (Bobo et al., 2012; Samson & Bobo, 2014; Schuman et al., 1997; Sears et al., 2000). For example, in two different studies, one in 1996 and one in 2008, Tuchs and Hughes (2011, p. 150) reached a similar conclusion—"the salience of racial affect in shaping Whites' views of policy initiatives." They concluded that Whites' racial policy attitudes have had little changes and racial resentment is still as prevalent in 2008 as it was in 1996.

Supporters of affirmative action programs raise the issue that there are very few minority professionals—i.e. few minority students entering law school and professional school. Opponents of affirmative action fear that minority gains will be at Whites' expense (Moore, 2003). When examining data on employment and income, studies on affirmative action hiring programs suggests that there are significant racial disparities (Farley, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau,

2007; Pew, 2012). Blacks and Hispanics with college degrees are making much lower annual salaries compared to their white counterparts. In 2006, among college graduates, black males were making 75% and Hispanics making 81% of comparable salaries of white workers (Farley, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). Women, overall, continue to make less than White males.

Following the election of Barack Obama in 2008, many pundits argued that we have entered into a post-racial society (Tesler & Sears, 2010). Arguments of a post racial society stem from token success stories combined with colorblind ideologies in which race doesn't exist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Cashmore, 2008). Dawson and Bobo (2009) noted that the election of President Obama was mistakenly perceived by many as evidence of a post-racial society, that African Americans as a group have achieved racial equality. Yet, Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich (2011) argues that for non-Whites, President Obama became a symbol of a more egalitarian society and of the American Dream. However, for Whites, Obama became a token success story like Oprah or Tiger Woods—representing a post-racial society (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011; Cashmore, 2008). As racial categories are mechanisms of stratification by which material, symbolic, and emotional resources become unequally distributed (Massey, 2007), research examining Whites' attitudes towards Blacks consistently illustrates a principle-policy gap (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears, 1979; Quillian, 2008).

<div align="center">Different Theoretical Frameworks</div>

Different theoretical frameworks on racism and racial prejudice discuss the lack of support by white Americans towards certain policies, specifically race-targeted policies like affirmative action, product of the Civil Rights movement of the 1960's (Blumer, 1958; Bobo et al., 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Sears, 1979; Quillian, 2008). This has stimulated research and

debate between symbolic racism, principle objection and group positioning scholars in the past 30 years.

Because of this principle-policy gap, symbolic racism as a theoretical framework emerged. Symbolic racism is a modified version of the orthodox prejudice model—which suggests that prejudice is formed through "individual's learned negative feeling and beliefs as the fundamental force animating ethno racial antagonism" (Bobo & Tuan, 2006, p. 29). Sears et al. (1988) "proposed the concept of 'symbolic racism' to describe a qualitative change in the content of significant racial attitudes and to explain widespread resistance to black candidates for political office, school busing, and strong forms of affirmative action" (Bobo &Tuan, 2006). As Sears and Henry (2003) suggests, symbolic racism, is a combination of anti-black affects with conservative values (including that of individualism). The anti-black affect, as they noted, is a hypothetical assessment of blacks that in turn, result in negative feelings and emotions towards blacks. Theoretically, symbolic racism rests on four themes/ideas: (a) blacks no longer face much prejudice or discrimination, (b) blacks' failure to make progress results from their unwillingness to work hard enough, (c) blacks are demanding too much too fast, and (d) blacks have gotten more than they deserve (Sears & Henry 2003, p. 260). Symbolic racism scholars suggests that this principle-policy gap is due to a combination of learned anti-black affects with conservative values as cultural stereotypes of Blacks represent Blacks as the lazy and underserving, this in turn creates negative feelings and emotions towards Blacks (Sears & Henry 2003).

Principle objection scholars theorize that Whites generally oppose race-targeted policies like affirmative action because they violate basic foundations of American ideologies (Sniderman & Carmines, 1997)—e.g., individualism and equal opportunity in a merit-based

11

society, (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993, p.176). Principle objection, therefore, takes race out of the equation to focus on objection to American concepts of meritocracy.

While acknowledging the power of these beliefs, Group positioning scholars suggest that racial resentment expressed by Whites in general and by Whites' toward affirmative action is grounded in a felt threat to valued resources and, thus, group position on the status hierarchy. Developing a sense of group position and the sense of ownership by the majority is a collective process that occurs over time (Bobo & Tuan, 2006; Carter & Lippard 2015; Samson & Bobo, 2014). Thus, when it is perceived that an out-group is seeking to gain resources that don't belong to them, the out-group reacts.

Indeed, threat has been used as a catalyst to produce racial resentment in various areas, including in arguments made to the Supreme Court. For instance, Carter and colleagues (Carter & Lippard 2015; Carter & Baird. N.d.) found that opponents of affirmative action and immigration reform make use of threat to elicit negative feelings in justices of the Supreme Court. For instance, Carter and Baird (N.d.) found that in almost all the amicus briefs submitted in support of the petitioner in the Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin case contained argument frames based in threat to various resources, threats to "greater society" and/or to the position of the majority via reverse discrimination.

<u>Historical Review: Attitudes towards Immigrants</u>

Currently, in the United States, "67% of Asians and 38% of Hispanics of any race are foreign-born, compared with only 8% of Blacks and 4% of non-Hispanics Whites" (Fussell, 2014, p. 483; US Census Bureau, 2013). Therefore, it is important to also understand current overall trends in public opinion regarding immigration and the formation of anti-immigration

sentiment as prejudice is connected to preference for limiting immigration and stringent law enforcement policies (Fussell, 2014). Further, many Asian Americans are also immigrants.

Scholars argue that anti-immigration sentiment derive from a collective reaction to threat posed by immigrants (Carter & Lippard, 2015; Ceobanu & Excandell, 2010; Chavez, 2008; Galindo & Vigil, 2006). Public opinion polls, for example, reveal concerns that immigrants are taking away valuable resources—i.e. economic (jobs) and public resources (public assistance)— and connected to the increase crime rate in the United States (Chavez, 2008; Galindo & Vigil 2006). Feagin (2000) explores the history of immigration in the United States and explains that between1880-1914, immigrants to the United States came from Europe, West Africa, Austro-Hungary, Prussia, China, Japan, Canada, and Mexico. With a huge influx of immigrants, nativism also changed over time across various immigrant groups.

As Galindo and Vigil (2006) noted, throughout the history of the U.S. there has been three type of nativists: political nativism, religious nativism, and radical nativism. During political nativism, certain political activities were seen as a threat to the nation. Religious nativism typically targets a specific religious group. And radical nativism targets an ethnic group. As these scholars further suggests, radical nativism has been the most "prominent"— especially during times of war. Currently, there exist this radical nativism toward immigrants that manifests fear affects policies—i.e. English-only and anti-bilingual education initiatives, affirmative action, California's Proposition 187, Arizona's 200 (Galindo & Vigil, 2006, p. 424). The influence of nativism, therefore, is visible when examining several key policies and programs.

Galindo and Vigil (2006) argue that an opposition to immigration is due to perception of threat to nativists—native born citizens. In 1965, the United States government passed the

13

Immigration Act—which abolished immigrant quotas, resulting in a huge increase in Latin American and Asian immigrants from developing countries (Fetzer, 2000). As Fetzer (2000, p. 42) noted, while nativism appear to remain relatively low since 1966, by 1972, there opposition to immigration appeared again, this time targeting those entered the United States illegally—"In that year the GOP's platform called for a 'halt to the illegal entry' of foreigners, or at least those not 'specially talented." In a study on public attitudes towards immigration, Hainmuller and Hopkins (2014) found that both rich and poor natives are opposed to low-skill immigration in general. Larsen et al. (2009) suggests that in the United States, perceived threat from immigration, both legal and undocumented, is increasing.

There has been over 550 bills introduced in Congress to address the issue of undocumented immigration (Larsen et al., 2009). A prominent argument among opponents of immigration reform is that immigration poses a threat to the limited available resources in the labor market. Esses, Jackson, and Armstrong (1998), for example, argue that competition over economic resources contribute to the negative attitudes towards immigrants in the United States. Burns, Peter, and Gimpel (2000), in exploring racial stereotypes, noted that there is a rise in opposition to immigration in during times when the economy is experiencing a recession. Further, the "issue of immigration" has typically been framed as an issue caused by Mexicans and undocumented immigrations (Abrego, 2011; Ayers et al., 2009). Chavez (2008, p. 26) wrote, "Asians and Mexicans became legally racialized ethnic groups…Asian immigrants were denied a pathway to citizenship, and Mexicans were associated with illegal alien status and subjected to Jim Crow segregation throughout the U.S. Southwest." Threat, therefore, is built into the discourse on immigration. Brader, Valentino, and Suhay (2008) found—in examining the "cost of immigration" through media/news portrayal of Latino immigrants—trigger emotion and

14

feelings of threat. Undocumented immigrants, for instance, continue to be constructed as "undeserving criminals and possible terrorists," as part of the Latino Threat Narrative (Chavez, 2008, p. 10). Asian Americans, therefore, are at first immigrants who have experience much racial hostility and inequality in the United States through the use of racial stereotypes (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kawai, 2005).

<div align="center">Racial Stereotypes: From the Yellow Peril to the Model Minority</div>

Before the stereotype of the model minority, there was the "yellow peril"—a negative stereotype that can traced back to "the medieval threat of Genghis Khan and the Mongolican invasion of Europe" (Kawai, 2005, p. 112; Marchetti, 1993). During the 19th and 20th century, the West feared that Asians would threaten the white race's domination because of East Asia's large and increasing population size, China's military and economic power, and Japan becoming an imperial power (Kawai, 2005, p. 112; Okihiro, 1994). As Kawai (2005) argues, the yellow peril represented threats to Whites culturally, economically, and politically. For instance, between 1850s and 1880s, white employers had a preference for Chinese labors who migrated in huge numbers to the West Coast, creating racial tension between White and Asian workers as Asians were taking away jobs from White workers (Chou & Feagin 2008).This construction of threat by the yellow peril stereotype was further evident during World War II.

Despite a history of exclusion and racialized stereotypes, theories on race and racial prejudice have generally left Asian Americans and other minority groups out of the racial rhetoric in attitudinal studies. This is due to the construction of racism and prejudice through a black-white binary. Zubrinski and Bobo (1996) argued that the United States' racial and ethnic composition is diverse and a multiracial analyses should "reflect a spectrum of colors" and not just the black-white binary. Alongside the model minority stereotype are other stereotypes that

generate negative attitudes toward Asian Americans: nerdy, humorless, unassimilated, and nonathletic (Ho & Jackson, 2001). The model minority has positioned Asian American as a competitive threat to different resources like education and jobs. The model minority therefore, can be a threat to both Whites and other minority groups as Asian Americans continue to be placed closed to Whites, but also outdoing Whites and other minority groups in some instances. Asian Americans, therefore, are a competitive threat to available resources. Yet, as scholars have increasingly acknowledged and included other minority groups into the racial discourse and research, attitudinal research on Asian Americans and/or other minorities are still very limited in scope.

Discussion

While Asian Americans are positioned close to Whites in certain policies like affirmative action, through the use of racial stereotypes, Asian Americans have also been constructed as a threat to Whites in different domains. Maddux et al. (2008, p. 87) argues that research "should examine a variety of threats" and their "prejudice relationship with regards to Asian-Americans.". What the model minority has created is the assumption that all Asian Americans are successful and experience little to no racial discrimination, as they are viewed as closer to Whites in the racial hierarchy. However, as Chou and Feagin (2008) illustrated, Asian Americans experience anti-Asian discrimination in many public spaces, from a bar setting to shopping to public education. As the model minority continues to be associated with Asian Americans, this places Asian Americans as a competitive threat to other groups in different domains i.e. workplace, education, etc.

The model minority has positioned Asian Americans as a competitive threat to educational and occupational resources. At the same time, as immigrants, Asian Americans

16

continue to be viewed as the outsider in American society, regardless of the length of time they have been in U.S. Through group positioning and group threat framework, this assesses feelings of anger toward advancements of Asian Americans in four domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential. Second, this study assesses whether threat (those who feel threat) predict the presence of anger. As Bobo and Tuan (2006) further argued, not every valued resource stimulates feelings of group threat. Therefore, group threat might not be as prevalent in very domain. For Asian Americans, this study argues that only certain domains will stimulate feelings of group threat and significantly predict anger towards Asian Americans. Just as stereotypes of hypersexualized, violent, and aggressive Blacks positioned Blacks as a threat to neighborhood safety, does feelings of threat shape perceptions of Asian American across domains that historically been dominated by the majority?

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Purpose of Chapter

This Chapter focuses on the group positioning framework—the guiding theoretical framework of this study. A rationale for using group positioning will be explored as group positioning involved exclusion and inclusion of certain members within society. The chapter then discusses literature on historical exclusionary policies aimed at Asian Americans. Finally, Blumer's (1958) critique of survey research will be discussed—which brings forth the next chapter on the survey design of this study.

Group Positioning and Group Threat

Symbolic racism and principle objection, as discussed in the previous chapter, have garnered a great deal of attention in the literature. Critics of these perspectives argue that they do not account for collective aspects of social life nor do they consider the competitive nature between groups and how competition is incorporated into group racial resentment (Bobo & Tuan 2006). Given the gains and position of Asian Americans through the model minority stereotype, this group seems to be in direct competition to Whites in terms of valued resources. This study, therefore, will utilize the group positioning framework introduced by Blumer (1958) that was further developed into a group threat framework by Bobo (1983)—while controlling for symbolic racism and principle objection—to examine racial attitudes towards Asian Americans.

Group threat is a more is a more sociological approach that incorporates historical definitions of racial prejudice that moves beyond individual-based definitions of racial prejudice. For example, Blumer (1958, p. 3) argues that racial prejudice should be understood in terms of "the process by which racial groups form images of themselves and of others." Racial prejudice,

therefore, is a collective process/construction. For Blumer (1958, p. 4), four types of feelings are shared by the dominant group feel in relation to the subordinate groups that produce prejudice: 1) feeling superiority over other group, 2) feeling that subordinate group is different and alien, 3) feeling of proprietary claim to resources, 4) fear that subordinate group will challenge the power of the superior group. As Blumer (1958) further notes, the feeling of natural superiority combined with the feeling that the subordinate race (thereby creating ideologies of distinctiveness) is different, creates negative feelings or antipathy towards the subordinate group. However, according to Blumer (1958), it is these two feelings interwoven with the latter two that create prejudice. Racial prejudice, therefore, is not just "individual feelings of group identity" but rather a process that is shaped by a social and historical process in which ideas of where the in-group stands in relation to other groups emerge (Bobo & Hutchins, 1996). As Bobo and Tuan (2006, p. 32) argues, "the bedrock assumption of the group position model is that dominant group members must make an affectively important distinction between themselves and subordinate group members," and the distinction can be connected to "traits, capabilities, and likely behaviors or subordinate group members." In other words, ethnocentrism and serotyping together form a basis for racial prejudice (Bobo and Tuan 2006). This model accordingly incorporates ideas of self-interest and individual level racial resentment into group interest.

Included in Blumer's (1958) group positioning model are exclusion and inclusion dimensions that "identified the American black-white divide as an important" function of group position (Bobo & Tuan, 2006). The color line, as Blumer (1965, p. 322), is defined by group positioning—"the color line stems from a collective sense held by whites that Negroes as a racial group do not qualify for equal status, and that because their racial differences Negroes have no claim to being accepted socially." Like group positing, the color line consists of different levels

(Blumer, 1965; Bobo & Tuan, 2006). First, the civil rights movement did not fundamentally changed the color line because its focus was on economics and politics—which are not the only underlying causes of racial prejudice. Second, there is a sense of "socioemotional component" to group positioning that is not objective (Bobo & Tuan, 2006, p. 42). Finally, meanings have been attached to institutionalized forms of racial prejudice—meanings which rationalize existing racial hierarchy and stratified racial order (Bobo & Tuan, 2006; Blumer, 1965).

This group positioning model by Blumer (1958) has been further developed and applied by Bobo et al. (1997) to form a group positioning/threat framework through the concept of Laissez-faire Racism. Bobo et al. (1997) and Bobo and Tuan (2006) argues that racial group hostility is due to members of the dominant group feeling a sense of groups positioning and experiencing group threat when there is a competition of resources. Laissez-faire Racism emerged post World War II, after the decline of Jim Crow Racism (Bobo et al. 1997). As Bobo et al. (1997) defined it, Laissez-faire Racism is racism in which "institutionalized racial inequalities created by the long slavery and then Jim Crow eras are now popularly accepted and condoned under a modern free market or laissez-faire racist ideology."

Laissez-faire Racism encompasses negative-stereotyping of African-Americans and blaming them for their social and economic conditions. As it further emphasizes the American ideology of equal opportunity in a merit-based society, by taking race out of the equation, it justifies covert racism by placing responsibility on individual minorities for not achieving their full potential—"Laissez-faire racism is racism that disadvantages blacks by refusing to acknowledge the group's disadvantage" (Tarca, 2010, p. 107). This form of racism blames blacks for the black-white gap and disparities (Bobo et al., 1997). This form of racism, therefore, create a sense of group positioning as it draws a distinction of whites from blacks based on

20

negative stereotypes of blacks. For Bobo et al (1997, p. 25), then, this group positioning combined with feelings of experiencing group threat to resources forms racial prejudice, "laissez-faire racist attitudes emerged to defend white privilege and explain persistent black disadvantage under sharply changed economic and political conditions."

Studies that have addressed attitudes between minority groups have found variations in racial attitudes that reflect some sense of group positioning and group threat (e.g., Bell, Harrison, McLaughlin, 1997; Bobo & Tuan, 2006; Brader et al., 2008; Burns & Gimpel, 2000; Cheng & Espiritu, 1989). For example, in terms of neighborhood racial characteristics, Whites generally want to live in a majority White neighborhood (Charles, 2003). Charles (2006) found that negative stereotyping significantly influenced Whites' neighborhood preferences. Further neighborhood racial preferences had a significant effect where Whites actually lived according to the census tracts (Charles, 2006). Studies also found that that the presence of Blacks also significantly affected Whites' likelihood to purchase a home in a particular neighborhood (Emerson et al., 2001). Whites were unlikely to buy a home—regardless of its school quality or crime rate—in a neighborhood with more than fifteen percent Blacks in its racial makeup (Emerson et al., 2001). Also, as Quillian and Pager (2001) noted, the more young black men in a neighborhood, the higher Whites "perceived" crime (Quillian & Pager, 2001).
As Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) and Zubrinsky and Bobo (1996) suggests, there is racial ranking of minority groups through different domains.

Bobo (1983) suggests that while general attitudes towards blacks have made some progress and change in theory, in practice, inequalities continue to exist between Blacks and Whites in terms of economics, residential segregation, and media portrayals. Further, the struggle for racial equality "will likely entail some material sacrifice by whites or upset some aspects of

21

the social experience of most whites" (1983, p.1198). While residential segregation has been associated with social class differences, Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) found that Blumer's (1958:903) theory of group position, applied to residential segregation as well—"For Blacks, Latinos, and Asians, economic and social advancement is associated with greater proximity and similarity to white Americans. For Whites, integration — especially with Blacks — brings the threat of a loss of relative status advantages." In a much earlier study, Fosset and Kiecolt (1989, p. 833), found that "whites' perception of threat from blacks increases, and their support for racial integration decreases, as the relative size of the black population increases." Yet, limited attitudinal studies have addressed Asian Americans and other minority groups—at the same time, Asian American have been racially triangulated between Blacks and Whites (Kim, 1999). A review of historical exclusionary policies against Asian Americans helps to rationalize how and why the group positioning framework can be used to study attitudes towards Asian Americans.

<u>Exclusionary Policies</u>

Historically, Asian American have been position as subordinate group a through various exclusionary policies. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 prohibited Chinese labor immigrants to enter the United States for ten years. If this policy was violated, this particular immigrant group could be imprisoned or deported. "Beginning in 1885, for instance, Whites in cities all over the West Coast rioted against the Chinese, and in 1890s unemployed white farm workers in California violently expelled their Chinese "competitors" from the fields" (Fetzer, 2000, p.20). Many other immigrant groups faced nativism violence and racial prejudice as time progressed. During the period of and after World War I, for example, there were even stricter policies limiting immigration into the United States. "By 1921, much of the public was very anti-

22

immigrant; invidious distinctions were made between old immigrants (Northern/Western Europeans) and the racially and culturally 'different and inferior' new immigrants (Southern/Eastern Europeans and Asians)" (Jaret, 1999, p. 13).

The Johnson-Reed or National Origins act of 1924 "drastically reduced entries from southern and eastern Europe and prohibited any immigration from Asia" (Fetzer, 2000, p. 31). Between 1925 and 1940, there was a significant rise of immigrants from the Americas (Mexico and Canada) due to the restriction of immigration from Asia and Europe (Fetzer, 2000). Then as World War II took place, and there was a shortage of wartime labor—the United States government, therefore, implemented the bracero program which "allowed ostensibly temporary entry for over 100,000 Mexican agricultural and railroad workers" (Fetzer, 2000, p. 37). In 1942, there was an executive order to force Japanese Americans into concentration camps—at the same time violence against Mexican immigrants continue to rise (Fetzer, 2000). As racial group hostility is due to a sense of group positional and feeling of group threat, this creates negative feeling towards the outgroup (Bobo, 1983).Yet, minorities like Asian Americans and other immigrant have not really been included in the racial discourse and theories and racial prejudice and racism. There is a need to incorporate other racial groups so that researcher can develop a multiracial perspective to account for the growing diversity in America today. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to assess racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in different domains though an experimental list survey.

<div align="center">Survey Research and Blumer's Critque</div>

By using survey research, social scientists are able to quantify phenomena that are not directly measureable—things such as attitudes, emotions, satisfaction, happiness, etc. Therefore, researchers construct scales/indexes and operationalize variables so that they are able to

<div align="center">23</div>

accurately and consistently measure certain phenomena (Marsden & Wright, 2012). Attitudinal researchers often times rely on existing survey data. Yet, while some surveys are designed with racial attitudes in mind, the primary goal of surveys vary. Hainmueller and Hopkins (2014), for example, noted when exploring existing research on attitudes towards immigration that many researchers rely on survey data that were not collected to examine attitudes towards immigration and cannot account for complexity of attitudes towards immigration. Therefore, survey data has its various limitations and are affected by response bias, sampling, validity and reliability—and specifically in terms of attitudinal research, social desirability bias (Marsden & Wright, 2012).

Blumer (1948/1969) was actually very critical of public opinion research and survey data. Bobo and Tuan (2006) noted that Blumer (1969) questioned whether or not attitude constructs can accurately measure human social behavior. Further, public opinion and public opinion polling is problematic in that it assumes that society is only an "aggregation of disparate individuals…a quantitative distribution of individuals" (Blumer, 1948, p. 546). Attitude constructs also make assumptions about stereotypes and negative feelings.

As Bobo and Tuan (2006) argued, however, there has been a lot of changes to public opinion research and survey methodology that have been able to addressed some of Blumer's (1948/1969) concerns. For example, now, survey research can measure intensity of opinion, conduct multivariate analyses, and even combine elements of experimental research into survey design (Bobo & Tuan, 2006). Therefore, the complexity of attitudes and opinions can now be addressed.

Through an experimental survey design that address social desirability bias, this study addresses these gap in literature by assessing feelings of anger toward advancements of Asian Americans in four domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential. Second, this study

examines whether or not group threat (those who feel threat) significantly predict the presence of anger.

CHAPTER 4: METHOD

Purpose of Chapter

This study utilizes an experimental list survey to examine racial attitudes towards Asian Americans. First, this chapter will discuss a problem that is specific to attitudinal studies using survey research—social desirability bias. Following the discussion on social desirability bias will be a discussion of the experimental list design and how the experimental list design has minimized social desirability bias in attitudinal research. The purpose of this section is to provide a rationale for an experimental list survey in examining attitudes towards Asian Americans. Finally, this chapter will discuss the research methods used in this dissertation including research questions, method, and questionnaire.

Social Desirability Bias and Experimental List Designs

As mentioned in Krosnick and Presser (2010, p. 285), "for many survey questions, respondents have no incentive to lie, so there is no reason to believe they intentionally misreport." However, social desirability bias occurs when respondents answer the questions in a matter which they think is viewed more favorably by others (Krosnick & Presser, 2010). Existing attitudinal research is often affected by social desirability bias (Brueckner et al., 2005, p. 6). As Kuklinski et al. (1997) argued, social desirability bias has led researchers to believe that White Americans have more positive attitudes towards Blacks when White respondents simply do not want to be perceived as prejudice. Therefore, social desirability bias can lead to the false assumption that racial attitudes have positively changed significantly over the last few decades— that people are more accepting of racial differences, thereby, creating a more equal and just

society. To deal with social desirability, survey instruments have been combined with experimental designs.

An experimental survey is a survey which the researcher "varies one or more elements" across subjects and "assesses the effect of that variation on one or more measured outcomes" (Nock and Guterbock, 2010, p. 838). More specifically, an experimental list survey, is an item count technique used to minimize bias and dishonest answers (Glynn, 2010). As Glynn (2010) noted, the list experiment only requires that respondents answer how many items on a list apply to them—not which ones. This, in turn, inspires more trust and produces more reliable answers from respondents compared to traditional survey design that involve randomized response techniques (Coutts & Jann, 2009; Glynn, 2010; Hubbard et al., 1989). At the same time, however, this survey technique also requires a large sample size for precision and limits the type of multivariate analyses that can be conducted (Corstange, 2009; Glynn, 2010; Tsuchiya, 2005). Using this unobtrusive method, Kuklinski et al. (1997) explored the concept of the "New South," which suggests that racial prejudice in the South has substantially declined.

While scholars argued that racial prejudice has declined faster in the South than in the North (Firebaugh & Davis, 1988; Reed, 1993, p. 115), Kuklinski et al. (1997) argued that that region no longer plays a significant role as a predictor of racial attitudes because social desirability was not taken into consideration in previous studies and could have potentially contaminated the measures for racial attitudes. Kuklinski et al. (1997) found, contrary to the New South hypothesis, that a large percentage of Whites in the South expressed anger and hostility towards Blacks. Their control group was asked how many of the following statements upset them—not which ones, just how many:

1) The federal government increasing the tax on the gasoline

2) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

3) Large corporations polluting the environment

Participants were randomized into the control or one of the two experimental groups which also consisted of the one of the following statements:

1) A black family moving in next door

2) Black leaders asking for affirmative action

After analyzing the data by comparing the averages of the control group with that of the test groups, they found that about ten percent of non-southerners as compared to forty-two percent of southerners had strong negative feelings about a Black family moving next door (in other words, living next to a Black family). In their discussion of the New South, they suggests that new south is "not a convergence of racial attitudes between the South and the rest of the country, but a reluctance among many of today's southerners to admit their feelings about blacks, at least to survey interviewers who ask them directly" (Kuklinski et al., 1997, p. 347). As they also noted, there has been a gradual withdrawal of white southerners from the Democratic Party—during the same time that Blacks became a part of the democratic platform. Further, southern states do not typically have an African American in Congress—"when districts are reconfigured to favor their election, Whites resist the redistricting" (Kuklinski et al., 1997, p. 324). Kuklinski et al. (1997), therefore, illustrated how social desirability can affect the results of racial attitudinal studies, making the population appear less racially-biased than is revealed through other measures.

In a different study also utilizing the list experiment, Brueckner et al. (2005) examined whether or not biological definitions of race are still relevant today as biological discussions of race continue to appear in literature. Their test statement was "Genetic differences contribute to income inequality between black and white people." The researchers found that certain

characteristics were significant with support for the test statement. For example, both men and women were equally likely to support to the test statement. "Similarly, Whites—who make up the majority of the respondents—also show a statistically significant degree of revealed support for the race statement (20 percent)" (Brueckner et al., 2005, p. 12).

What Kuklinski et al. (1997) and Brueckner et al. (2005) illustrated is that experimental list surveys yield different results compared to the traditional survey method. Experimental list surveys significantly reduce social desirability bias to get at the underlying racial attitude. As noted by Herman and Campbell (2012, p. 344) "There is less survey evidence about the attitudes of Whites towards dating, cohabiting, marrying and having children with members of specific racial groups" –at the same time, people who say that they do not object to interracial marriages on surveys often express objections during interviews (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Bonilla-Silva, 2002). This study, therefore, seeks to use the technique of the experimental list survey in studying racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in four different domains: education, residential integration, marriage, and workplace.

Current Study

Using an experimental list survey similar to Kuklinski et al. (1997) and along with multivariate statistical analyses (Blair & Imai, 2012; Corstange, 2009; Glynn, 2010), this study assesses anger towards Asian Americans and the root of that anger under four different domains: education, jobs, marriage, and residential neighborhoods. This is an important area of research because the model-minority stereotype can have detrimental effects on Asian American groups who are struggling in educational and socioeconomic attainment, yet are still associated with the "model minority" stereotype—a stereotype that can ultimately affect the allocation of various resources.

While list surveys generally have a random assignment of participants into one baseline/control and one test group, this study has one baseline group and four test groups. The baseline group is asked how many of the four items make them angry, not which items, just how many. Each experimental group will also receive the same list of four items plus an additional race item that falls under a specific domain. The logic of an experimental list survey is, therefore, to compare the difference-in-means from the baseline group to the test groups (Kuklinski et al., 1997, p. 328). As further reasoned by Kuklinski et al. (1997, p. 328), by subtracting the baseline (control) from the experimental mean and multiplying by 100, researchers can access an estimate of level of "anger directed towards the race item." This process is known in experimental research as the "difference-in-means estimator" (Blair & Imai, 2012).

This study examines racial attitudes towards Asian American through a group positioning/threat perspective. First, the study aims to address whether or not certain domain elicit anger towards Asian Americans more than others. This would imply that certain domains touch on insecurities that are perceived as more threating. Second, do feelings of group threat significantly predict the presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the various domains? Finally, is group threat a better predictor of anger towards Asian Americans in these domains than symbolic racism and principle objections?

As Bobo and Zubrinski (1996) suggest, there is a perceived racial hierarchy in terms of feelings of threat in different domains. For example, Whites are less likely to purchase or live in a home as the proportion of blacks increase, less likely to marry someone who is black, or send their children to school that is predominantly black (Samson and Bobo 2014). Feelings of threat, however, may vary by racial group and domains of interest.

This study examines the presence of "anger" towards Asian-Americans in four domains: education, job, marriage, and residential neighborhood. The presence of anger, therefore, is the dependent variable whereas group threat is an independent variable. Through multivariate analyses, group threat will directly be tested in relation to level of anger. While studies utilizing the list experiment have predominantly used the differences-in-means estimator approach (Kuklinski, Cobb, & Gilens, 1997; Presser & Stinson, 1998; Gingerich, 2010; Bullock, Imai, & Shapiro, 2011), Blair and Imai (2012) proposed that multivariate analysis can be done as well— they conducted multivariate analyses of the original analysis done by Kuklinski et al (1997). In this study, OLS regression models modeling Janus (2010) illustrates the relationship between feelings of group competition and "anger" towards the race item in the experimental groups— this therefore, directly tests the theory of Group Positioning. For example, does group positioning predict feelings of anger towards Asian Americans in each of the four domains (education, jobs, marriage, and residential)? The four experimental groups are each first examined in their own OLS model compared to the control. Then, in the last chapter, all the experimental groups are combined into one to compare with the control. This will increase the overall sample size and allow for smaller standard errors. Below is the survey design.

Participants are all given the following instruction: The following are a list of things that sometimes make people feel angry. After you read them, mark HOW MANY of the statements make you feel angry. Do NOT indicate which statements—just HOW MANY.

<center>Control Statements</center>

1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline

2) That it is legal for same-sex couples to marry

3) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

<center>31</center>

4) Large corporations polluting the environment

Experimental Statements

1) The large number of Asian-Americans entering higher education

2) If someone in your family married an Asian-American

3) The large number of Asian-Americans taking away jobs from others

4) An increasing number of Asian-Americans moving into your residential neighborhood.

These four test statements address different possible domains of threat towards Asian Americans: education, marriage, workplace, and residential neighborhood. These four domains were chosen as the domains of interest because a substantial amount of attitudinal studies have examined white's attitudes towards Blacks in these different domains (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Bobo & Zubrinsky; Charles, 2003; Emerson et al., 2001; Harris, 2001; Iceland & Sharp, 2013; Massey, 2012; Qullian & Pager, 2001; Schuman et al., 1998; Xie & Zhou 2012). Each race item is added to the four control statements for the experimental groups. For example, someone that is assigned to the education experimental group would be given the four control statement plus the race item on education. Therefore, there is a total of one control group and four experimental groups.

Measures

Besides group competition items, items measuring symbolic racism, racial resentment (stereotypes), and principled objection are also controlled for in this study As racial resentment is often discussed as the primary reason that people are against race-targeted policies, and often compared to group positioning and principled objection, it is important to be able to include all three measures in one study and examine which has the strongest effect on anger towards Asian Americans. The following are all the measures used in this study and how they are coded.

Measures for group threat, negative stereotypes, principle objection, and symbolic racism were all drawn from Bobo and Tuan (2006) and modified to apply to Asian Americans.

Group Competition/Threat is a composite variable that is created through five 5-point Likert scale question modified and drawn from Bobo and Tuan (2006). The five statements were: "Court rulings that favor the rights of Asian Americans usually hurt the rights of others"; "Many Asian Americans have been trying to get ahead economically at the expense of others"; "Asian Americans share many basic values and goals with non-Asians"; "Asian-Americans have too little influence on federal policy concerned with racial equality"; and "Feelings towards Asian Americans as a group." A polychoric factor analysis indicated one factor with an alpha of 0.66.

Symbolic racism rests on four themes/ideas: (a) Blacks no longer face much prejudice or discrimination, (b) Blacks' failure to make progress results from their unwillingness to work hard enough, (c) Blacks are demanding too much too fast, and (d) Blacks have gotten more than they deserve (Sears & Henry, 2003, p. 260). Bobo and Tuan (2006) modified these four themes to study racial prejudice against the Chippewa Indians in Wisconsin. Using Bobo and Tuan (2006), a modified version of symbolic racism was used to examine racial attitudes towards Asian Americans. A composite measure for symbolic racism was created through three modified 5-point Likert scale items drawn from Bobo and Tuan (2006): Most Asian Americans take unfair advantage of privileges given to them by the government, Asian Americans have been getting less attention from the government than they deserve, and Most Asian Americans work hard to make a living just like everyone else. These items were coded to represent increasing in symbolic racism from 1-5. A polychoric factor analysis revealed that these items can be combined into one measure. The alpha for the composite measure is 0.40.

Principled objection rests on the idea that Whites generally oppose race-targeted policies like affirmative action because they violate basic foundations of American ideologies (Sniderman & Carmines, 1997)—e.g., individualism and equal opportunity in a merit-based society (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993, p. 176). A composite measure for principled objection was created through two 5-point Likert scale items also drawn from Bobo and Tuan (2006): "Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure everyone has an equal opportunity" and "One of big problem in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance." Items were coded to represent decrease in principled objection. The alpha for the final composite variable was 0.59.

Negative Stereotypes is a composite variable created through three 7-point scale questions modified from Bobo and Tuan (2006): "Where would you rate Asian Americans on this scale where 1= "tend to be rich" and 7= "tend to be poor"; 1= "tend to be hardworking" and 7= "tend to be lazy"; 1= "tend to prefer to be self-supporting" and 7 = "tend to prefer to live welfare." These items were combined and coded to represent increasing in negative stereotypes. The alpha for this final composite variable is 0.63.

Sex is dummy coded as 1=Male and 0=Female. The reason that female is the comparison is because there were more females in the sample compared to men. The category with the highest frequency is used as the reference in all the measures.

Race is coded as a series of dummies (1=Hispanics, 1=Blacks, 1=Asians, and 1=Multiracial/Other). The reference category for race is Whites.

Age is a continuous variable that is recoded from the initial variable "year of birth". Employment is a categorical variable with three categories: unemployed, full-time, and part-times. The categories were dummy coded.

Income was initially measured in ranges and recoded by the midpoint to represent "thousands of dollars".

Conservativeness is a scale that derived from the question, "The following 7-point scale illustrates a range of political views that people might hold arranged from extremely liberal point 1 to extremely conservative point 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale?" The final measure was kept on the scale of 1-7.

Data Collection

The experimental list survey took place at a large public university in the southeastern United States. A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. Respondents were randomly assigned into the control or one of the experimental groups through an online survey using Qualtrics. Data were collected using a convenience sampling of university students from June 25, 2015 to September 18, 2015 consisting of both undergraduate and graduate students at least 18 years of age. Participants were recruited through an iPad survey team that was trained and also through the email contact with instructors across campus. After listwise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four experimental group was N=1184. The final sample sizes in each group are as follow: Control N=225, Education N=233, Jobs N=220, Marriage N=240, and Residential N=240.

CHAPTER 5: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1: EDUCATONAL DOMAIN

Introduction

A substantial amount of attitudinal studies have examined Whites' attitudes towards Blacks in four different domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential integration (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Charles, 2000; Zubrinsky & Bobo, 1996). Because of a Black-White focus in attitudinal studies, Asian Americans along with other immigrant/minority groups have traditionally been excluded (Bobo & Tuan, 2006; Massey, 2007; Pager & Shepherd, 2008; Schuman, 1997; Tuch & Hughes, 2011). Through the model minority stereotype, Asian Americans have been placed closer to Whites in terms of educational attainment and socioeconomic status—high educational attainment and income comparable to Whites. Therefore, to explore racial attitudes and animus towards Asian Americans in the educational domain, this chapter first provides a review of literature on how Asian Americans have been constructed as a threat to valued resources through the model minority stereotype.

This chapter will provide a historical overview of the educational segregation in the United States to illustrate a racial hierarchy that places Asian Americans closer to Whites—if not outdoing Whites—in educational attainment. Group Competition/Threat argues that racial prejudice is a collective process that should be understood in terms of "the process by which racial groups form images of themselves and of others" (Blumer, 1958, p. 3)—at the heart of racism and racial prejudice, accordingly, is feelings of group threat to valued resources. Therefore, at the same time that Asian Americans are positioned closer to Whites in this domain, they can also be perceived by Whites and other racial groups as a threat to educational resources contributing to animus towards Asian Americans. This study seeks to explore this gap in

literature by examining racial attitudes towards Asian American in the educational domain. Specifically, this chapter examines whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans is present in this domain. Further, if feelings of threat are present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans in this domain? These research questions will be explored through the following hypotheses and statistical analyses:

> H1: The mean for the educational experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

As the model minority stereotype places Asian Americans closer to Whites in the educational domain, it also positions Asian Americans as a threat to available educational resources. This hypothesis predicts that there is a difference in the means of the experimental group compared to the control group. If the experimental group mean significantly higher than the control group, then the presence of the race item (in the experimental group) increased feelings of anger. This hypothesis is tested through the difference-in-means estimator using one-way ANOVA.

> H2: There are significant racial differences in the presence of anger towards Asian Americans in educational experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on domains.

Per the literature and theoretical framework, this study seeks to examine perceptions of threat towards Asian Americans. Because past attitudinal studies have predominantly focused on a black-white binary, this study seeks to address this gap by including other racial groups into attitudinal studies. First, if Asian Americans are placed closer to Whites in the educational domain, then they can be perceived as a threat to Whites in terms of educational resources. At the same time, Asian Americans can also be perceived as a threat to other racial groups.

Therefore, different racial groups might have varying degrees of feelings of threat towards Asian American in these different domains.

> H3: Group threat will be the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes.

H3 suggests that while symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes can be significant predictors of anger towards Asian Americans in the educational domain, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor. Group threat argues that "feelings of ownership over valued resources" and "feelings that outgroup threatens those resources" form the basis for racial prejudice—threat to valued resources is at the heart of racism. As Asian Americans are placed closer to Whites in this domain, this positions them as threat to educational resources. If Whites and other racial groups feel ownership over educational resources, then they might also feel that Asian Americans are threatening the availability of these resources. In this way, then, group threat will be the strongest predictor of anger and animus towards Asian Americans. This hypothesis is tested through the use of OLS regression.

Following the literature review, this chapter will focus on the data, methods, and statistical analyses to examine racial attitudes and factors predicting animus towards Asian Americans. The final Ordinary Least Squares regression model illustrates what best predicts presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain and whether or not group threat emerged as the strongest predictor.

<div align="center">Literature</div>

Scholars suggests that the shift from the "yellow peril" to the "model minority" stereotype reflects changing racial attitudes towards Asian Americans (Hurh & Kim, 1989;

<div align="center">38</div>

Osajima, 2005; Sue & Kitano, 1973). The two stereotypes are opposite from each other, but are also intertwined (Kawai, 2005; Lee, 1999). As Lee (1999) argues, the model minority constructs Asian Americans as a "new yellow peril" (p. 190). On one hand, Asian Americans are the model minority—the group doing better or are more successful than other minority groups. On the other hand, Asian Americans "become the yellow peril when they are described to outdo White Americans." (Kawai, 2005, p. 115). As Gotanda (1995) noted, it is difficult to discuss Asian Americans without referring to the stereotype of the model minority—a stereotype that potentially contributes to negative attitudes towards Asian Americans as negative attitudes can arise from seemingly positive stereotypes (Ho & Jackson, 2001; Maddux, Galinsky, Cuddy, & Polifroni, 2008).

The stereotype of the yellow peril, therefore, emerged and often resurfaced during times of military threats to the U.S. As Lyman (2000) argued, the yellow peril spread throughout different Asian ethnic groups at different points in history including the Japanese during WWII and Vietnamese during the Vietnam War: "During the course of its becoming embedded in America's consciousness of itself, America's sense of its own basis for nationhood, and America's establishment of itself as a world power…the yellow peril appeared first as China, then as Japan, then as China and North Korea, then as China and Vietnam, then briefly as a temporarily prosperous Japan again, and, at the moment-once again as China" (p. 685). For example, stories of Chinese invasion contributed to racial tension due to feelings of military threat: e.g., *A Short and Truthful History of the Taking of California and Oregon by the Chinese in the Year A.D. 1899* by Robert Wolters or Pierton W. Dooner's (1880) *Last Day of the Republic* (Lyman, 2000).

Negative framing of Asian Americans became evident in mainstream media during

World War II. For example, in an article from Time magazine in the 1940s, "How to Tell Your

Friends from the Japs," scholars argued that the author of the article offered a biological and

racist explanation of differences between Japanese and Chinese (Chou & Feagin, 2008). *Know

Your Enemy—Japan* (145), a propaganda film, depicted Japanese soldiers as being all the same

in every way. Popular propaganda songs like "Mow the Japs Down" also emerged and

contributed to the negative framing and stereotyping of Asian Americans (Dower, 2012; Koppes,

1990). Images such as the "buck-toothed Japs" contributed to racial animosity and Anti-Asian

hostility in the United States (Chou & Feagin, 2008). The high racial tension further culminated

into the extreme actions of internment camps taken by the U.S. government towards Japanese

Americans during WWII (Chou & Feagin, 2008).

After World War II, the model-minority image became a narrative first introduced by

sociologist William Petersen (1966) in an article for the *New York Times Magazine*, "Success

Story, Japanese-American Style." The article explored the success of Japanese immigrants in the

U.S. In the same year, in the *U.S. News and Worlds Report*, the same sociologist published an

article entitled "Success Story of One Minority in U.S.'' that focused on success of Chinese

Americans (Peterson, 1966). Over time, this became a prominent stereotype for Asian-

Americans in the U.S. (Kawai, 2005; Gotanda, 1995). Lee (1999) and Okihiro (1994) argue that

that this stereotype is an attempt at a less threatening stereotype compared to the stereotype of

the yellow peril as this stereotype positions Asian Americans as the successful minority group in

American society, a group that embodies traditional American values of hard work and

educational attainment (Kawai, 2003). Because of their hard work, the model minority has

achieved great success—high educational attainment, high income, and occupational prestige (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kawai, 2003; Kawai, 2005).

The model minority image serves to "disprove the existence of American racism" (Abelmann, Lie, & Abelmann, 2009). The stereotype places Asian-Americans in the colorblind ideology that perpetuates racial inequality as Asian Americans are positioned as the "successful" minority that are close to Whites (if not overdoing white in areas such as income and education)—suggesting that other minority groups can also do the same, and that race should not matter. For example, according to a PEW (2012) survey Asian Americans lead other racial groups in education and income. In 2010, 49% of Asians ages 25 and older held a bachelor's degree or more compared to 28% of the total population: 31% of Whites, 18% of Blacks, and 13% of Hispanics (Pew, 2012). This image, therefore, positioned Asian Americans closer to Whites in educational attainment and socioeconomics. At the same time, this stereotype can potentially position Asian American as a threat to available resources—i.e. college admissions, scholarships/financial aid, and jobs.

Limited literature has examined perceived threat and general attitudes towards Asian Americans. This can be attributed to the myth that Asian Americans do not face racial discrimination, as they are the "model minority" (Chou & Feagin, 2008). Rather, much attitudinal research in the domain of education has been focused on attitudes of Whites towards Blacks due to the history of racism and racial segregation within the United States.

<div align="center">Educational Segregation</div>

In 1954, the United State Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Education* that "separate but equal" is unconstitutional, putting an end to legally mandated segregation in public schools. There was widespread resistance to this ruling throughout the South (Farley, 2011; Simpson &

Yinger, 2013).Gradually, and in certain instances forcefully (i.e. National Guard to Little Rock in 1957), segregated education started to disappear. According to Armor (1992), the number of black students attending public schools with 90 percent or more minority students decreased form 65 percent in 1965 to 40 percent by 1975 and to 32 percent by 1988. By 1988, however, scholars noted an increase in school segregation again as White, Black, and Latino student on average attended schools in which their own race was the majority (Orfield & Lee, 2007; Frankenberg, Lee, & Orfield, 2003). As survey data between the years of 1968-1980 illustrated, a large number of Americans favored integrated education but most children attended segregated schools (Orfield, 1983; Orfield & Monfort, 1992; Frankenberg et al., 2003).

Offered in the literature for school segregation, therefore, is residential segregation (Wilson & Taeuber, 1978; Farley, 2012). Where housing is highly segregated, education is often segregated as well (Wilson & Taeuber, 1978; Farley, 1984; Farley, 2012). As Whites tend to avoid enrolling their children in schools with large number of blacks and therefore search for residential neighborhoods that are predominantly White (Frankenberg et al., 2003; Levin et al., 1976; Taeuber, 1979; Taylor, 1981). Yet, court-ordered plans to desegregate school have declined or ended in certain cities especially as ideas of a post-racial society becomes widespread (Orfield & Eaton, 1996, Frankenberg et al., 2003; Kunen, 1996; Hansen, 1998). For example, a large number of Blacks and Whites are against busing for desegregation (Kim, 1997) as people increasingly view desegregation as an issue that has mostly been resolved (Kim, 1997). An argument used against busing, for instance, is that it wastes educational resources that could be used elsewhere to improve the quality of education.

Much literature on Whites' attitudes towards blacks and other minorities in terms of education revolve around the policy of affirmative action. Affirmative action policies are those

aimed at improving opportunities (i.e. workplace and school) for those that have been

historically excluded and disadvantaged (i.e. Blacks and other minorities) (National Conference

of State Legislators 2015). Affirmative action dates back to 1976, with President Lyndon B.

Johnson who ordered antidiscrimination requirements for any institution with contract with the

government, which included public institutions of higher education:

> "The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action against any employee or applicant to ensure that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin" (Seabury 1977: 99).

Since then, universities, businesses, unions, and nonprofit organizations took measures to ensure

that they meet federal requirements (Farley, 2012). In higher education admission programs, the

goal of affirmative action was to increase minority/underrepresented groups (Farley 2012).

However, the way in which affirmative action is implemented varies.

In a study of one of San Francisco's most prestigious public schools that operates under a

desegregation consent decree—they must enroll students from four of nine specified racial

groups and no racial groups should make up more than 40 or 45 percent of the student body—

Asian American student face many challenges (Dong, 1995). Because of the consent decree, the

school ended up raising "the admission standards for Chinese applicants in an effort to limit their

enrollment…held to a higher standard than other minorities or Whites" (1995:1030). The

Chinese American Democratic Club argued that this consent decree "operates as a form of

affirmative action for Whites" who without it, would be admitted in much lower numbers (1995,

p.133). Dong (1995) argues that the consent decree along with many college admission

processes and polices have left Asian American leaders on a "double-bind"—on one hand asking

for the same treatment between Asian Americans and Whites, on another, remaining committed

43

to the idea that true equality "is to treat minorities and whites differently." Affirmative Action, therefore, has been discussed with much controversy when applied to Asian Americans and education because of the perspective of having "too many Asians."

Similar to Whites, Asian Americans have been – positioned as those that are hurt by race targeted policies like Affirmative Action in the discourse against affirmative action (Omi & Takagi 1996). Bell et al. (1997, p. 374) found that Asian American attitudes towards Affirmative Action do differ from other racial groups, however, the most extreme difference is visible between Asians and Whites as Asian Americans also experience racial discrimination and have mixed view toward Affirmative Action programs like other minority groups in that "AAPs may indeed improve job opportunities for females and (some) minorities, for example, but in doing so, they may create perceptions that minorities and females would not qualify on their own merits. In this way, then, are Asian Americans perceived as a threat to Whites and other minorities?

<center>Impact of Racism on Education</center>

Many studies have explored the impact of racism and discriminatory practices on ethnic minority students (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Nora & Cabrera, 1996; Okazaki, 2009). These studies suggest that racism in the educational setting leads to feelings of alienation, frustration, negative health outcomes, create identity issues, and negatively affect academic performance For example, in a study of Asian American, African American, Latino, and White undergraduate students, (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000) found that "African American, Asian American, and Latino/a students were significantly more likely than their White counterparts to experience pressure to conform to racial and ethnic stereotypes regarding their academic performance and behavior as well as minimize overt racial-ethnic group

<center>44</center>

characteristics in order to be accepted" (p. 182). At the same time, there exists a radical nativism toward immigrants that manifests fear and affects educational policies—i.e. English-only and anti-bilingual education initiatives (Galindo & Vigil, 2006; Houvouras, 2001).

"Asian Americans face institutional, cultural, and individual racism in American society" (Museus & Park, 2015, p. 552). Yet, in the educational domain, the model minority myth is perceived to be so "true" that governments do not perceive a need to be concerned with Asian Americans facing discrimination (Chou & Feagin, 2008). In a study on Asian Americans in college, Museus & Park (2015) noted that Asian American college students encounter racial hostility and isolation. They argued that the model minority stereotype can be harmful and detrimental in college campuses. Walker-Moffa (1995) argues that "the amazing Asian American success story appears to be a new form of racism, which may be defined as any form of bigotry that contributes to racial intimidation and violence" (p. 20) as many Asian American college students report high issues of stress and alienation that are "exacerbated by racial harassment" (Schafer, 2016, p. 193). Schaefer (2016, p. 192) noted that the model minority stereotype is a "variation of blaming the victim: with Asian Americans, its praising the victim."

<div align="center">Data and Sample</div>

The purpose of this study is to examine if anger towards Asian Americans exists in the educational domain. For example, what factors predict anger towards Asian Americans in this domain? Further, the study aims to explore whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans are present in this domain—if group threat is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans in this domain?

Data for this study was collected during the months of June 2015 to September 2015 through an online survey program, Qualtrics. This was an experimental list survey named

"Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study." A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. After list wise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four experimental group was N=1184. The final sample size for this experimental group on education was N=233. This chapter focuses on this one experimental group, education, compared to the control.

The study was structured so that respondents in the control group was given four statements and asked how many of the statements angered them:

1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline

2) That it is legal for same-sex couples to marry

3) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

4) Large corporations polluting the environment

The experimental group had one added statement on race:

5) The large number of Asian-Americans entering higher education

As mentioned in the methods chapter, this method limits social desirability bias—as participants are not asked "which ones" but rather "how many." First, a difference-in-means estimator was use to examine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between this experimental group and the control group (Table 2). Second, bivariate analyses were conducted to examine racial differences in presences of anger towards the race item in this experimental group. Finally, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was conducted to examine increased in anger towards the race items—in other words, increased irritation when the race item was present. Traditionally, only the difference-in-means estimator was used in the past to illustrate differences between the experimental group and control in experimental surveys. However, more recently, scholars have developed complex ways to run multivariate analyses

(Blair & Imai, 2012; Janus, 2010). Measures included in the OLS regression are: race, sex, age, income, symbolic racism, principle objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat. In this study, to compare the effect sizes of the variables, the original scales of the variables were standardized and betas are reported.

Analysis and Results

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the sample in the experimental group for education compared to the control group. Of the experimental group, 63.09 % are female and 49.36% are white. Because the sample is a convenience sample of UCF students, many are currently unemployed at 44.64% followed by part-time employment at 40.34%. A little over half of the sample identified as a first generation student at 51.93%. The average age was approximately 21.95 years with an average of 3.41 on a conservative scale of 1-7, with 7 being extremely conservative. In terms of year in school, the sample consisted of about 24.03% freshmen, 13.30% sophomore, 30.47% junior, 23.61% senior, and another 8.58% Graduate students. Further, from this over all sample the average feeling of threat towards Asian Americans is 2.32 on a scale of 1-5 (5, high threat).

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of Control and Experimental Group (Education)

	Control Percent (%) N=225	Experiment Percent (%) N=233
Male	33.78	36.91
Race		
Whites	48.00	49.36
Hispanics	20.00	26.18
Blacks	19.11	12.88
Asians	6.67	6.44
Others	6.22	5.15
Employment Status		
Part-Time	39.11	40.34
Full-Time	16.44	15.02
Unemployed	44.44	44.64
Year in School		
Freshmen	22.22	24.03
Sophomore	12.44	13.30
Junior	29.33	30.47
Senior	26.22	23.61
Graduate	9.78	8.58
First Generation Student	52.89	51.93
	Control M(SD)	Experiment M (SD)
Age	23.25(8.23)	21.95(5.15)
Conservative [a]	3.46(1.22)	3.41(1.24)
Symbolic Racism[b]	2.29(0.55)	2.34(0.53)
Principled Objection[c]	1.89(0.90)	2.02(0.91)
Negative Stereotypes[d]	2.78(0.95)	2.61(0.89)
Group Threat[e]	2.34(0.56)	2.32(0.52)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H1: The mean for the experimental group will be significantly higher than the control group— indicating that the race item in this domain evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

Table 2 illustrates the difference-in-means estimator. As illustrated, the table compares the means between the control and experimental groups and shows whether or not these means are statistically different from one another through the use of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results from ANOVA that compared the experimental group to the control group indicated that the two groups are not statistically different from each other. Kuklinski et al. (1997) noted that by subtracting the baseline from the experimental mean and multiplying by 100, researchers can access an estimate of level of "anger directed towards the race item." However, in this case, the experimental group has almost the same mean as the control group. As Kuklinski et al. (1997) further suggested in the footnote, "Because the baseline and test conditions are independent samples, the test condition mean can be marginally smaller than the baseline mean when the test item evokes little or no anger. Therefore, this method of analysis alone (with no control variables) shows that the race item in education evoked little to no anger—indicating little to no difference from anger expressed in the control group. The first hypotheses that "The experimental group for education will have a significantly higher mean than the control group that is statistically significant" is rejected as Asian Americans in higher education evoked little to no anger by respondents in the sample.

Table 2. Difference in Means Estimator: One-Way ANOVA Comparing Experimental Means to Control

	Sample Size (*N*)	Mean (SD)
Control Group	225	2.00 (0.86)
Experimental: Education	233	1.99 (1.00)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H2: There are significant racial differences in presences of anger in the Experimental Group.

Table 3 illustrates One Way Analysis of Variance by racial category to test racial differences. As the table suggests, the difference in means between the racial group are not statistically significant (p<0.07). This indicates that presence of anger of Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics were not affected by the addition of the race item in the experimental group. For the educational domain, therefore, these different racial groups did not have significantly higher or lower anger presence towards Asian Americans compared to Whites. At the same time, *p* is approaching significance. With a larger sample size, there might have been some significant racial differences. This hypothesis of significant racial differences can be rejected. However, to see whether or not these racial groups had significant differences in presence of anger compared to each other, a pairwise comparison was conducted (Table 4).

Table 3. One Way ANOVA of Control and Education Experimental Group by Race

	Control			Experimental		
Categories	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*
Whites	1.92	0.86	108	1.98	0.95	115
Hispanics	2.02	0.75	45	2.11	0.98	61
Blacks	2.23	0.95	43	1.97	1.19	60
Asians	1.73	0.96	15	1.33	0.98	15
Others	1.92	0.73	14	2.33	0.98	12
Total	2.00	0.86	225	1.99	1.00	233

	Control				*Experimental*			
Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*
Between Groups	4	3.94	0.98	1.34	4	8.85	2.21	2.24
Within Groups	220	161.06	0.73		228	225.13	0.99	
Total	224	165.00	0.74		232	233.98	3.20	

Table 4 illustrates the pairwise comparison of means (post-hoc tukey test) by racial groups for this experimental group. The table compares each racial group with each other. The table shows that there is a statistically significant difference in responses by Asian Americans as compared to Hispanics in this experimental condition on education. This tukey post-hoc test revealed that presences of anger in this experimental group are statistically significantly lower for Asian Americans as compared to Hispanics ($p<0.05$)—as Asians would theoretically not feel angered by other Asians as they are in similar group positioning and seeking similar resources.

Table 4. Pairwise Comparison of Means by Race for Education Experimental Group

	Control			Experimental		
	Contrast	Tukey(t)	Confidence	Contrast	Tukey (t)	Confidence
Hispanics vs. Whites	0.09	0.57	-0.33, 0.50	0.13	0.84	-0.30, 0.56
Blacks vs. Whites	0.30	1.93	-0.13, 0.72	-0.02	-0.08	-0.58, 0.54
Asians vs. Whites	-0.20	-0.86	-0.85, 0.45	-0.64	-2.38	-1.40, 0.10
Others vs. Whites	-0.01	-0.03	-0.68, 0.66	0.35	1.16	-0.48, 1.17
Blacks vs. Hispanics	0.21	1.15	-0.29, 0.71	-0.14	-0.67	-0.78, 0.46
Asians vs. Hispanics	-0.29	-1.13	-0.99, 0.41	-0.78	-2.73*	-1.57, 0.01
Others vs. Hispanics	-0.09	-0.36	-0.81, 0.63	0.21	0.70	-0.64, 1.01
Asians vs. Blacks	-0.50	-1.95	-1.20, 0.21	-0.63	-2.02	-1.49, 0.23
Others vs. Blacks	-0.30	-1.15	-1.03, 0.42	0.37	1.08	-0.57, 1.30
Others vs. Asians	0.19	0.61	-0.68, 1.07	1	2.60	-0.06, 2.06

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of anger towards Asian Americans in the educational domain.

Modeling the analyses of Janus (2010), this study utilizes OLS regression to examine anger/irritation when the race item is present. The following regression model was estimated to calculate anger towards the race item:

(1)

$$Y_i = B_o + B_1 T_i + B X_i + e_i$$

In equation 1, Yi is the number of items that respondents are opposed to, Ti is dummy coded and equal to 1 for the treatment group and 0 when in the control group. "The slope coefficient for Ti,

B1, is therefore, equal to the difference in the mean number of items that respondents are opposed to between the baseline and treatment groups" (Janus 2010: 936).

In this study, the final OLS model controls for the group that respondent is assigned to (experimental or control), sex, race, employment, age, income, conservativeness, and group threat. Due to minor issues of normality and heteroscedasticity, a robust regression model was estimated (Stata version 13.1). Variance inflation factors indicated no issues with multicollinearity as all vifs were below 5. A linktest and ovtest were also used to examine model specification error. The linktest result indicated no specification error.

Table 5 illustrates the results from the regression model testing the theoretical framework driving this study, group threat. The model is significant at $p<0.001$. According to the model, males have 0.25 units less in anger as compared to females ($p<0.01$). As level of conservativeness increases, presence of anger also increases by 0.11 units ($p<0.01$). Conservativeness had the strongest effect on presence of anger with a standardized coefficient (beta) of 0.15. Group threat had no impact on presence of anger towards the race item in this domain. Symbolic racism and principled objection also had no effect on anger.

Table 5. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race Item in Education Domain
N=458

	B	Robust SE B	B
Experimental Group	0.01	0.09	0.01
Male	-0.25**	0.09	-0.13
Race			
Hispanics	0.05	0.11	0.02
Blacks	0.10	0.14	0.04
Asians	-0.40	0.19	-0.11
Others	0.08	0.17	0.02
Age	-0.01	0.01	0.05
Employment			
Part Time	-0.02	0.09	-0.01
Full Time	-0.13	0.15	-0.05
Income	-0.001	0.001	-0.04
Conservativeness[a]	0.11**	0.04	0.15
Symbolic Racism	-0.01	0.12	-0.01
Principled Objection	-0.07	0.05	-0.07
Negative Stereotypes	-0.02	0.05	-0.07
Group Threat	0.16	0.11	0.09
R^2		0.07	
F		2.55**	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

<center>Discussion</center>

This study contributed to existing literature in several ways. Below is a summary of the three hypotheses and a discussion of the results:

H1: The mean for the experiment group will be significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item evoked feelings of anger/irritation.

The study rejected this hypothesis—the hypothesis is not supported. This indicates that the race item did not stimulate in this domain. There might be several different reasons for this. First, the respondents are already admitted into a university and are currently enrolled. This may limit anger towards Asian Americans in the educational domain. The means in presence of anger in this study were similar in both the control and experimental groups. Not one single participant in the experimental group indicated that all five items (including the race item) angered them. Therefore, the range of both the control and experimental group were 0-4 with a mean of 1.99 and 2.00. This could be attributed to the convenient sample of college students—a limitation of this study.

H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger in Experimental Group.

This study did not find any significant racial differences in presence of anger—therefore, this hypothesis was rejected. What this may suggest is that the different racial groups did not feel any threat towards Asian Americans in higher education. Once again, this could be due to the sample of college students.

H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of anger towards Asian Americans in the educational domain.

<center>56</center>

Group threat did not emerged as the strongest predictor in this domain. Symbolic racism, principle objection, and negative stereotypes all had no effect of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain. This could be due to the convenience sample of college students. First, these measures have typically been used to examine White's attitudes towards Blacks. Second, these measures have not been used to examine attitudes towards other racial groups at a university setting. Overall, this hypothesis is rejected. However, this study found that level of conservativeness is important in predicting presence of anger in both control and experimental groups—meaning regardless of whether or not the race item is present, conservativeness was significant. This is important for future experimental list studies using similar baseline statements as it illustrates that conservatives provokes anger towards these different statements.

This study illustrated that participants in this study were not threaded by Asian Americans in the educational domain. As previously mentioned, this can be explained through the convenient sample of college students. Participants were already in college and may feel less threatened by Asian Americans in higher education. At this stage in their educational career, it is no longer a competition to resources in term getting into an institution of higher education. Therefore, threat was not as prevalent or significant within this domain and for this particular population.

The following chapter examines the job domain. While this whole study used a convenient sample of college students, the results varied by domain. As Chapter 6 will illustrate, respondents felt more threat in this next domain.

CHAPTER 6: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2: JOB DOMAIN

Introduction

As previous studies have predominantly focused on White's attitudes toward Black in education, workplace, marriage, and residential integration (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Charles, 2000; Harris, 2001; Massey, 2007; Zubrinsky & Bobo, 1996), limited studies have addressed attitudes towards Asian American in these different domains. As the racial and ethnic composition of the Unites States has been growing in heterogeneity, it important to conduct a study that encompasses different minorities and examine how threat is constructed through different domains—this helps researchers to have a more holistic understanding of racial attitudes—to go beyond the white-black binary in attitudinal studies. This chapter, therefore, explores racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in the job domain.

According to Pew (2012), in terms of median household income in 2010 by race, Asians were the highest at $66,000 compared to the U.S. population at $49,800: Whites a $54,000, Hispanics at $40,000 and blacks at $33,300 (PEW 2012). This once again, places Asians closer to Whites than to other minority groups in terms of income despite the fact that "Asian American family income approaches parity with that of Whites because of their greater achievement than Whites informal schooling. If we look at specific educational levels, however, Whites earn more than their Asian counterparts at the same age" (Schaefer, 2016, p. 195). Yet, limited attitudinal studies have examined feelings of threat towards Asians in the workplace. Therefore, this study seeks to address this gap by examining racial attitudes towards Asian American in the job domain. Through the model minority stereotype, Asian Americans have been placed closer to Whites in terms of socioeconomics. At the same time, this might position Asian Americans as a

threat to economic resources such as jobs. This study seeks to examine if feelings of threat towards Asian Americans are present in this domain. Further if threat is present, does it significant predict animus towards Asian Americans in this domain? These research questions will be explored through the following hypotheses and statistical analyses:

H1: The mean for the job experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

As the model minority stereotype places Asian Americans closer to Whites in socioeconomics, it also positions Asian Americans as a threat to available jobs. This hypothesis predicts that there is a difference in the means of the experimental group compared to the control group. If the experimental group mean is significantly higher than the control group, then the presence of the race item (in the experimental group) stimulated feelings of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain. This hypothesis is tested through the difference-in-means estimator using one-way ANOVA.

H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in job experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on domains.

Per the literature and theoretical framework, this study seeks to examine perceptions of threat from Asian Americans. Because past attitudinal studies have predominantly focused on a Black-White binary, this study seeks to address this gap by including other racial groups into attitudinal studies. First, if Asian Americans are placed closer to Whites in socioeconomics (in annual income and earnings), then they can be perceived as a threat to Whites and others in terms of job

59

resources—especially if feelings of ownership over job-related resources are present as well because this can also position Asian Americans as threat to these valued resources.

> H3: Group threat will be the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes.

H3 suggests that while symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes will all be significant predictors of anger towards Asian Americans in the job domain, however, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor. Once again, through a group threat framework, if Whites and other racial groups feel ownership over job resources, then they might also feel that Asian Americans are threatening the availability of these resources. In this way, then, group threat will be the strongest predictor of anger and animus towards Asian Americans. This hypothesis is tested through the use of OLS regression.

The chapter first presents a review of literature on Asian American's socioeconomic status and their position in the workplace setting. As the model minority, Asian American are positioned as the group potentially taking away valuable resources. At the same time, limited to no studies have examined perceptions of threat towards Asian Americans in different domains. This study addresses the gap in literature by examining attitudes towards Asians in the workplace through an experimental list study that addresses social desirability bias. Following the literature review, the chapter will focus on the data, methods, and statistical analyses used to examine racial attitudes and factors predicting animus towards Asian Americans in this domain. The final OLS regression model illustrates what best predicts level of anger towards Asian Americans and whether or not group threat emerged as the strongest predictor.

<center>Literature</center>

In the history of Asian immigration, Asians have been positioned as the yellow peril—a threat to the well-being of Whites and others in the labor market and economy (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kawai, 2005). Yellow peril became a threat to the nation during World War II—as Japanese were seen as the enemy of American ideals. Yet, as the model minority image emerged after World War II, scholars argue that this positive stereotype can have negative effects on Asian Americans (Ho & Jackson, 2001; Maddux et al., 2008). Public opinion polls, for example, continue to reveal concerns that immigrants are taking away valuable resources—i.e. economic (jobs) and public resources (Chavez, 2013; Galindo & Vigil, 2006). Asian Americans is a group that can consist of both native and foreign born individuals. For example, according to PEW (2012), "Asians recently passed Hispanics as the largest group of new immigrants to the United States" (p.1). Further, more than six in ten Asian immigrants ages 25-64 have at least a bachelor's degree, this makes Asians "the most highly educated cohort of immigrants in U.S. history" (p.1). All the different Asian American success stories, further contribute to the model minority stereotype that is problematic as it "reaffirms the U.S. system of mobility: New immigrants as well as subordinate groups ought to achieve more merely by working with the system" at the same time suggesting that "if Asian Americans have succeeded, then Blacks and Latinos must be responsible for their own low status rather than recognizing society's responsibility" (Schaefer, 2016, p. 197).

As mentioned in the Kirwan Institute Implicit Bias Review (2014), despite the widely accepted stereotype of Asian Americans as well-educated model-minority (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000; The Rise of Asian Americans, 2012), Asian Americans in the workplace have not moved up to leadership positions. According to the API Representation on Fortune 500

<center>61</center>

Boards (2011) report, Asian and Pacific Islanders only make up 2.3% of Fortune 500 companies'

board seats. Further, close to 78% of these Fortune 500 companies had no Asians or Pacific

Islanders on their board. Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips (2008) found that the being white is

associated with being the prototype of business leaders, as Sy et al. (2010) noted that Asian

Americans are still perceive to be "less prototypic leaders" than white Americans in certain

leadership roles. At the same time, however, half of employed Asian Americans are in

"management, professional and related occupations, a higher share than the roughly 40% for

employed Americans overall" (Pew 2012, p. 27).

To dissect the model minority stereotype, Chun (1980) argues that researchers should

look beyond the numerical aspects. For example, it is problematic to associate certain

occupational categories and household incomes as measures of success. As Chun (1980, p. 4)

wrote, "To argue that a minority is doing well as the majority solely because of its proportion of

white-collar workers in the labor force, is overly simplistic, unless one is prepared to accept the

proposition that the position of a clerk typist is equivalent to that of a company president or a

mid-level staff member to an administrative chief." For instance, minority workers face glass

ceilings, which limit upward mobility within their jobs and the higher the position in rank, the

greater racial, ethnic, and gender disparity that exists (Thomas, 1990; Collins, 1993, 1997;

Dovidio, 1993; Kirwan Institute Implicit Bias Review, 2014). The glass ceiling in which Asian

American workers face has been referred to as the "bamboo ceiling" to reflect the barriers Asian

Americans faced due to racial resentment and intolerance (Hyun, 2005; Schaefer, 2016).

<div align="center">Impact of Racism on Jobs</div>

Lai (2013) summarized the model minority thesis as follows:

"Asian Americans have low unemployment rates and high occupational achievement

because they have a strong work ethic; Asian Americans have high educational attainment because Asian cultures place a strong emphasis on learning; Asian Americans have low delinquency rates because of a strong family value orientation." (p. 93)

At the same time that this thesis continues to be supported by different studies that focus on the achievements of Asian Americans in society, these studies have not addressed how seemingly positive stereotypes can lead to workplace discrimination (Lai, 2013). As Lai (2013) noted, studies on workplace discrimination, in the past, have focused predominantly on how "negative stereotypes of marginalized group (e.g., Blacks, individuals with disabilities) lead to workplace discrimination against them" (p. 93). Yet, the model minority stereotype is an "inaccurate depiction of Asian Americans" (Lai, 2013, p. 93) as Asian Americans continue to face racism and discrimination in the workplace (Hyun, 2005; Lai, 2013; Lien, 2004; Woo, 2000).

Lai and Babcock (2013) argues that there is a "disparity in career advancement between Asian Americans and Whites." As noted by Lai and Babcock (2013), different arguments exist in this debate on career advancement of Asian Americans. Some people argue that this is due to racial discrimination and structural barriers created within the workplace. Others argue that Asian Americans themselves are responsible i.e. lack of language skills or interest in managerial positions (Lai & Babcock, 2013: p. 311). Sy et al. (2010) found that perceptions towards Asian Americans for leadership positions in jobs that require social skills is not as favorable as jobs that require more technical skills. Lai and Babcock (2013), however, further found that the sex of the job evaluator interacts with race. In a study on Asian Americans and workplace discrimination using artificial candidate profiles (i.e. using typical Chinese and White last names), Lai and Babcock (2013) found that White female job evaluators were "more likely to perceive a deficiency in Asians' social skills" which negatively affected their hiring and promotion decisions. Hyun (2005) and Woo (2000), therefore, argue that one of the major indication of

63

workplace discrimination for Asian Americans is reflected in the fact that Asian Americans do not enter into leadership positions representative of their high educational attainment.

The model minority stereotype, therefore, "reifies the American ideological cannon that anyone can enjoy the American dream if he or she works hard enough" at the same that it creates barriers for Asian Americans in the professional workplace (Lai, 2013, p. 94). As further noted by Lai (2013, p. 93), this stereotype is harmful for Asian Americans because of the following reasons:

1) Oversimplified emphasis of model minority status of Asian Americans—overlooking the severity of glass ceilings for Asian Americans.

2) The model minority thesis implies that Asian Americans do not need societal support and government intervention to improve their socioeconomic status because they have "made it."

3) The model minority thesis can be viewed as a way of marginalizing Asian Americans in the workplace.

4) Wide acceptance of the model minority thesis may intensify intergroup relations.

The model minority, therefore, has positioned Asian American as a competitive threat to available economic resources like jobs. The model minority therefore, can be a threat to both Whites and other minority groups as Asian Americans continue to be placed closed to Whites, but also outdoing Whites and other minority groups in some instances. Asian Americans, therefore, can be perceived as a competitive threat to available resources for Whites and other racial groups.

The purpose of this study is to examine presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the job domain. For example, what factors predict anger towards Asian Americans in this domain? Further, the study aims to explore whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans are present in this domain—if group threat is present, is it the strongest predictor of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain?

Data for this study was collected during the months of June 2015 to September 2015 through an online survey program, Qualtrics. This was an experimental list survey named "Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study." A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. After list wise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four experimental group was N=1184. The final sample size for this experimental group on education was N=233. This chapter focuses on this one experimental group, education, compared to the control.

The study was structured so that respondents in the control group was given four statements and asked how many of the statements angered them:

1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline

2) That it is legal for same-sex couples to marry

3) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

4) Large corporations polluting the environment

The experimental group had one added statement on race:

5) The large number of Asian Americans taking away jobs from others

As mentioned in the methods chapter, this method limits social desirability bias—as participants are not asked "which ones" bur rather "how many" of the statements angered them. Similar to

the format of Chapter 5 (and later analysis chapters), first a difference-in-means estimator was use to examine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between this experimental group and the control group. Second, bivariate analyses were conducted to examine racial differences in presence of anger towards the race item. Finally, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was conducted to examine what factors increased anger towards the race items—in other words, increased anger when the race item was present.

Analysis and Results

Sample Characteristics

Table 6 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the sample in the experimental group for education compared to the control group. Of the experimental group, 33.78% are male and 53.64% are white. In this sample of UCF students, 40.91% indicated that they are currently employed part-time, followed by 39.09% unemployed, and 20% who are full-time. The average age was approximately 22.89 years with an average of 3.44 on a conservative scale of 1-7, with 7 being extremely conservative. In terms of year in school, the sample consisted of about 22.73% freshmen, 12.73% sophomore, 28.18% junior, 21.36% senior, and another 15% graduate students. Further, from this over all sample the average feeling of threat towards Asian Americans is 2.39 on a scale of 1-5 (5, high threat).

Table 6. Sample Characteristics of Control and Experimental Group (Jobs)

	Control Percent (%) N=225	Experiment Percent (%) N=220
Male	33.78	31.82
Race		
Whites	48.00	53.64
Hispanics	20.00	20.00
Blacks	19.11	12.73
Asians	6.67	6.36
Others	6.22	7.27
Employment Status		
Part-Time	39.11	40.91
Full-Time	16.44	20.00
Unemployed	44.44	39.09
Year in School		
Freshmen	22.22	22.73
Sophomore	12.44	12.73
Junior	29.33	28.18
Senior	26.22	21.36
Graduate	9.78	15.00
First Generation Student	52.89	46.36
	Control M(SD)	Experiment M (SD)
Age	23.25(8.23)	22.89(6.56)
Conservative [a]	3.46(1.22)	3.44(1.20)
Symbolic Racism[b]	2.29(0.55)	2.39(0.49)
Principled Objection[c]	1.89(0.90)	1.96(0.89)
Negative Stereotypes[d]	2.78(0.95)	2.77(0.89)
Group Threat[e]	2.34(0.56)	2.39(0.57)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H_1: The mean for the experiment group will be significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

Difference-in-Means Estimator

Table 7 illustrates the difference-in-means estimator. ANOVA results compared the experimental group to the control group indicated that the two groups are statistically different from each other at ($p<0.05$). Following Kuklinski et al. (1997), the estimated level of anger directed towards the race item is calculated as such:

$$(2)$$

(Experimental Mean - Baseline Mean)/100

(2.16 – 2.00)/100= 16%

Therefore, 16 percent of the participants in this study were angered by the race item. This method of analysis shows that the race item for jobs evoked anger and indicated a significant difference in the level of anger between the experimental group and control. The first hypotheses that "The mean for the experiment group will be significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item increased feelings of anger/irritation" fails to be rejected as Asian Americans in the job market evoked anger.

Table 7. Difference-in-Means Estimator: Estimated Mean Presence over Jobs

	Sample Size (*N*)	**Mean (SD)**
Control Group	225	2.00 (0.86)
Experimental: Jobs	220	2.16 (1.00)
Estimated % of Anger		16

One-Way ANOVA

	SS	Df	MS	F
Between Groups	3.14	1	3.14	3.77*
Within Groups	369.10	443	0.83	
Total	372.25	444	0.84	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); *p<0.05

Testing: H_2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger in both the Control and Experimental Group—indicating that racial groups might have difference presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on domain.

Table 8 indicates no significant difference by race and presence of anger. However, the post-hoc tukey test (Table 9) pairwise comparison of means by race suggests that there is Asians had a significantly lower mean level of anger as compared to Whites in this experimental group ($p<0.05$).

Table 8. One Way ANOVA of Control and Job Experimental Group by Race

	Control			Experimental		
Categories	Mean	SD	Freq.	Mean	SD	Freq.
Whites	1.92	0.86	108	2.25	0.98	118
Hispanics	2.02	0.75	45	2.09	0.83	44
Blacks	2.23	0.95	43	2.21	1.07	28
Asians	1.73	0.96	15	1.50	1.02	14
Others	1.92	0.73	14	2.25	0.86	16
Total	2.00	0.86	225			

	Control				Experimental			
Source	Df	SS	MS	F	Df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	4	3.94	0.98	1.34	4	7.39	1.85	0.09
Within Groups	220	161.06	0.73		215	196.72	0.91	
Total	224	165.00	0.74		219	204.11	0.93	

Table 9. Pairwise Comparison of Means by Race for Job Experimental Group

	Control			Experimental		
	Contrast	Tukey(t)	Confidence	Contrast	Tukey (t)	Confidence
Hispanics vs. Whites	0.09	0.57	-0.33, 0.50	-0.15	-0.92	-0.62, 0.31
Blacks vs. Whites	0.30	1.93	-0.13, 0.72	-0.03	-0.16	-0.58, 0.52
Asians vs. Whites	-0.20	-0.86	-0.85, 0.45	-0.75	-2.76*	-1.49, -0.01
Others vs. Whites	-0.01	-0.03	-0.68, 0.66	0.01	0.02	-0.70, 0.71
Blacks vs. Hispanics	0.21	1.15	-0.29, 0.71	0.12	0.53	-0.51, 0.76
Asians vs. Hispanics	-0.29	-1.13	-0.99, 0.41	-0.59	-2.01	-1.40, 0.22
Others vs. Hispanics	-0.09	-0.36	-0.81, 0.63	0.16	0.57	-0.61, 0.93
Asians vs. Blacks	-0.50	-1.95	-1.20, 0.21	-0.71	-2.28	-1.58, 0.15
Others vs. Blacks	-0.30	-1.15	-1.03, 0.42	0.04	0.12	-0.79, 0.86
Others vs. Asians	0.19	0.61	-0.68, 1.07	0.75	2.14	-0.21, 1.71

Testing: H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, Group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the educational domain.

Once again, modeling the analyses of Janus (2010), this study utilizes OLS regression to examine anger/irritation when the race item is present using the following regression model where Ti is dummy coded and equal to 1 for the treatment group and 0 when in the control group.

$$(3)$$

$$Y_i = B_o + B_1 T_i + BX_i + e_i$$

In this study, the final OLS model controls for the group that respondent is assigned to (experimental or control), sex, race, employment, age, income, conservativeness, and group threat. Due to minor issues of normality and heteroscedasticity, a robust regression model was estimated (Stata version 13.1). Variance inflation factors indicated no issues with multicollinearity as all vifs were below 5. A linktest and ovtest were also used to examine model specification error. The linktest result indicated no specification error.

Table 10 illustrates the results from the regression model that included symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes. The overall model is significant at $p<0.001$ and explains 13 percent of the variability in the model. According to the model, the experimental group had a statistically significant higher presence of anger compared to those in the control group. Those in the experimental group had 0.17 units higher presence of anger compared to the control group ($p<0.05$). Males had 0.24 units lower in level of anger compared to females ($p<0.01$). As level of conservativeness increased by one unit, level of anger increased by 0.16 units in level of anger. In this model, principled objection was significant. As principled

objection increased, presence of anger decreased by 0.15 units (p<0.01). Finally, group threat was significant at p<0.01. As group threat increased by one unit, presence of anger increased by 0.31 units. From the beta coefficients, the variable with the greatest effect size was level of conservativeness (*B*=0.21) followed by group threat (*B*=0.19). For every standard deviation increase in level of conservatives, there is a 0.21 standard deviation increase in presence of anger. Further, for every standard deviation increase in group threat, there is a 0.19 standard deviation increase presence of anger. Out of the different theoretical measures, therefore, group threat emerged as the strongest predictor in presence of anger towards the race item. This hypothesis, therefore, fails to be rejected.

Table 10. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race
Item in Job Domain N=445

	B	Robust SE B	B
Experimental Group	0.17*	0.08	0.09
Male	-0.24**	0.09	-0.12
Race			
Hispanics	-0.11	0.10	-0.05
Blacks	0.07	0.13	0.03
Asians	-0.35	0.18	-0.10
Others	-0.05	0.15	-0.02
Age	-0.001	0.01	-0.02
Employment			
Part Time	0.003	0.09	0.001
Full Time	0.001	0.13	0.001
Income	-0.003	0.002	-0.06
Conservativeness[a]	0.16***	0.04	0.21
Symbolic Racism	-0.07	0.12	-0.04
Principled Objection	-0.15**	0.05	-0.15
Negative Stereotypes	0.07	0.05	0.07
Group Threat	0.31**	0.10	0.19
R^2		0.13	
F		5.07***	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

<center>Discussion</center>

This study contributed to existing literature in several ways. First, conservativeness was once again significant in both the control and experimental group—indicating that as conservativeness increases, so do feelings of anger. This was also evident in the last experimental group in the education domain. Second, as principled objection increased, feelings of anger in this job experimental group decreased. This could be due to a variety of reasons. For example, principled objection takes race out of the equation and focuses on American values of individualism and meritocracy. The race items in these domains are oriented around attitudes towards Asian Americans as a group. This, therefore, can affect the significance of principled objection. Third, consistent to studies in survey research that suggests males and females tend to respond differently to surveys depending on the topic (De Vaus, 2013), the OLS regression model suggests that the difference between men and women's anger level are statistically significant for this experimental group at $p<0.05$. Females, similar to the first experimental group in the education domain, have a statistically significant higher mean anger level compared to males. Below is an in-depth summary of the three hypothesis and a discussion of the results.

> H1: The mean for the job experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

Unlike in the educational domain, this hypothesis fails to be rejected—therefore, it is supported. Respondents in the experimental group for jobs did have increased presence of anger with the addition of the race statement. This could be due to the fact that college students might not feel as threatened in the education domain compared to the job domain—they have already secured their spots in the education domain. However, they may feel threaten in terms of the future—the

<center>75</center>

workplace and securing a job. Therefore, feelings of group threat are more significant within this domain as sixteen percent of the respondents felt anger by the race statement within this experimental group. Theoretically, the purpose of higher education for many students is to secure a decent paying job. In this study, a majority of the sample was undergraduate students—who most likely were more concerned about the job market. Therefore, statements regarding race connected with jobs will evoke anger and feelings of threat.

> H_2: There are significant racial differences in the presence of anger in towards Asian
> Americans in the job domain.

As indicated in the result section, this study did not find any significant racial differences in presence of anger. The post hoc test revealed that Asian Americans who answered the survey had lower presence of anger as compared to Whites. This was most likely due to the fact that Asian Americans are probably not threatened by their own racial group. As Asian Americans are placed close to Whites in terms of socioeconomics, it makes sense that Whites will feel more threatened by Asian Americans in this domain. There might be several reasons as to why the study did not find significant racial differences. First, because of a convenience sample, the racial make-up of the sample was probably not as diverse as it could be. Further, the small sample size might also have contributed to these limited findings in terms of racial difference.

> H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled
> objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of
> presence of anger towards Asian American in the job domain.

In this experimental group, group threat did emerge as the strongest predictor out of symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes. According to Blumer (1958), racial prejudice should be understood in terms of the "process by which racial groups form images of

themselves and of others" (p. 3). This study found that group threat significantly increased

presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the job domain—students are concerned over

jobs.

CHAPTER 7: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 3: MARRIAGE

Introduction

Interracial marriages in the United States have sharply increased since the 1960s –from 157,000 interracial couples in 1960 to 4.5 million in 2010 (Farley, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Overall, positive public attitudes towards interracial marriage have also increased substantially (Schuman et al., 1997). Yet interracial marriages are still very low, representing only 7.5 percent of married couples (Farley, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Blackwell and Litcher (2000) suggest that this can be connected to the idea that dating and cohabiting relationship criteria are different and less stringent than marriage. A 1997 poll suggests racial preference when it comes to interracial dating and marriages—interracial dating and marriages between Blacks and Whites is the least common compared to other combinations (Peterson, 1997). Yet, a substantial amount of this literature focuses on White's attitudes towards Blacks in this domain. This study examines attitudes towards Asian Americans in the realm of marriage and examines whether or not feelings of group threat are present in this domain.

This chapter will first provide an overview of research on attitudes towards interracial marriages. Blumer (1958) argues that racial prejudice is a collective process and feelings of group threat to valued resources is at the heart of racism. Marriage is often seen as a resource— i.e. emotional or financial support. At the same time that studies show an increase in positive attitudes towards interracial marriage, interracial marriages are highest for Asian Americans and Whites compared to any other racial groups (Farley & Frey, 1992; O'Hare, 1992). Some scholars suggest that survey research might be too optimistic and overestimating support for interracial marriages given the low proportion of marriages that are interracial (Bonilla-Silva & Forman,

2000; Bonilla-Silva, 2002). To address potential social desirability bias, this study utilizes an experimental list survey. This study seeks to explore the gap in literature by examining racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in the marriage domain. Specifically, this chapter examines whether Asian Americans are perceived as a threat in this domain. If threat is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans? These research questions will be explored through the following hypothesis:

> H1: The mean for the marriage experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked feelings anger towards Asian Americans.

As interracial marriages between Asian Americans and Whites are the highest compared to any other racial groups, this can position Asian Americans as a threat to available marriage partners—specifically, White marriage partners. This hypothesis predicts that there is a difference in the means of the experimental group compared to the control group. If the experimental group mean is significantly higher than the control group, this indicates that the race item incited feelings of anger. This hypothesis is tested through the difference-in-means estimator using one-way ANOVA.

> H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in marriage experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on the marriage domain.

Because past attitudinal studies have predominantly focused on a Black-White binary, this study seeks to address this gap in the literature by including other racial groups into attitudinal studies. First, since Asian Americans and Whites make up a large portion of interracial marriages, then

then they can be perceived as a threat to other racial groups in terms of availability of marital partners.

> H3: Group threat will be the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian
>
> Americans in this domain controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism,
>
> principled objection, and negative stereotypes.

H3 suggests that while symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes can be significant predictors of anger towards Asian Americans in the marriage domain, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor. As Blumer (1958) suggests, threat is at the heart of racism and racial prejudice. This hypothesis is tested through the use of OLS multivariate regression. Per the literature and theoretical framework, this study seeks to examine perceptions of threat towards Asian Americans.

Following the overview of research on attitudes towards interracial marriages, this chapter will focus on the data, methods, and statistical analyses used to test the above hypotheses. The final OLS model illustrates what factors significantly predictors anger towards Asian Americans in this domain.

<p align="center">Literature</p>

People tend to choose a marriage partner that is similar in terms of demographics such as age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, etc. (Mare, 1991; Qian, 1997; Rockwell, 1976). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010), interracial marriages represent 7.5 percent of all marriages. "Of all marriages in the United States, less than 1% (.7%) are Black/White interracial couples; Asian/ White marriages are 3.4% of all married couples" (Field, Kimuna, & Straus, 2013, p. 744).

Scholars argue that survey data on attitudes towards interracial marriages might be overestimating or too optimistic—people who might not object to interracial marriage in surveys actually raise objections in qualitative studies (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000; Bonilla-Silva, 2002). Family, for example plays an important role in interracial marriages. Joyner and Kao (2005), for instance, found that African American adolescents are less likely to introduce different-race partners to family members compared to same-race partners. Studies also suggests that parents and family members often times discourage interracial partnerships (Romano, 2003; Root, 2001). However, as Herman and Campbell (2012, p. 344) suggests "There is less survey evidence about the attitudes of Whites towards dating, cohabiting, marrying and having children with members of specific racial groups."

Qian and Litcher (2007) suggest that while overall rates of interracial marriages have increased, measurements and interpretations of the concept of interracial marriages have also changed. The year 2000 was the first time that Americans were allowed to choose more than one racial category on the U.S. census. Intermarriages and social distances from Whites vary significantly by race/ethnicity (Qian & Litcher, 2007). For example, immigrant minority groups have more social distance from Whites due to lack of access to resources for economic mobility i.e. living in more racially segregated neighborhoods with less interactions with Whites (Massey, 1995; Qian & Litcher 2007). As Waters (1999) also suggests, white perceive immigrant groups through negative stereotypical images. This, therefore, affects the rates of interracial marriages between Whites and growing immigrant groups (Qian & Litcher 2007). Yet, interracial marriage between Whites and Asian Americans remain the largest compared to any other racial and ethnic groups (Farley, 2012).

Interracial Marriages and Assimilation

While survey data suggest Americans' growing tolerance towards interracial marriages (Schuman et al., 1997; Farley, 2012), other evidence shows that Americans remain uneasy with "interracial sexual intimacy and marriage" (Qian & Litcher, 2007, p. 72). At the same time that interracial marriages have been increasing over the years, approval of Asian-White relationships remain higher than Black-White (Field et al., 2013). Gallup polls in 1968, 1972, 1978, 1983, and 1991 showed "that approval of White/Black intermarriage was consistently much higher for Blacks than for Whites" (p. 756). Yet, as further noted by Field et al. (2013), "Interracial dating and marriage are often used in sociological research as measures of the level of integration or assimilation for minority groups into the larger culture" (p. 742).

Studies that suggest social assimilation of immigrants through marriage focus on mobility indicators such as "economic mobility, spatial residential patterns (e.g., segregation in ethnic enclaves), or family formation" (Qian & Lichter, 2001, p. 290). As further noted by Qian and Lichter (2001), intermarriage "provides a measure of 'social distance' between groups" (p. 290). In a study on intermarriages among natives and immigrants, Qian and Lichter (2001) found that the most interracial marriages occur between Whites and other racial minorities than between different racial minority groups. At the same time, strong intermarriage barriers exists for Blacks that are weaker for Asian Americans and Latinos—"Blacks were more likely to be married to Latinos than to Whites and least likely to be married to Asians" (p. 308).

For Asian Americans, gender differences in interracial marriages are also prevalent. Asian American women and White men have higher rates of interracial marriage compared to Asian American men and White women (Qian & Litcher, 2001). This can be due to the media portrayals of Asian Americans and stereotypical representations of both Asian American men

82

and women (Espiritu, 1997; Fong & Yung, 1995; Spickard, 1991). For example, Asian American men are portrayed as "rigid in sex role ideologies" (Qian & Litchter, 2001, p. 295). Yet, as Qian and Lichter (2001) further noted, "many Asian immigrants from advantaged educational and occupational backgrounds assimilate rapidly, translating their socioeconomic and achievements into residential and marital assimilation" (p. 309).

As Asian Americans are perceived as the model minority in terms of educational and socioeconomic attainment, they are also positioned as potential marital partners in the marriage domain. As Whites and Asian Americans have the highest interracial marriage rates, this can position Asian Americans as a threat to availability of out-group marital partners for both Whites and other racial minority groups. This study, therefore, seeks to examine whether feelings of threat are present in the domain of marriage and if present, whether it significantly predicts animus towards Asian Americans in this domain.

Data and Sample

The purpose of this study is to examine anger towards Asian Americans in the marriage domain. For example, what factors predict anger towards Asian Americans in this domain? Further, the study aims to explore whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans in this domain and if it is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans in this domain?

Data for this study was collected during the months of June 2015 to September 2015 through an online survey program, Qualtrics. The name of the survey was "Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study." A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. After list wise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four

experimental group was N=1184. The final sample size for this experimental group on marriage was N=240. This chapter focuses on this one experimental group compared to the control.

The study was structured so that respondents in the control group were given four statements and asked how many of the statements angered them:

1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline

2) That it is legal for same-sex couples to marry

3) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

4) Large corporations polluting the environment

The experimental group had one added statement on race:

5) If someone in your family married an Asian American.

As mentioned in the methods and previous analytic chapters, this method limits social desirability bias—as participants are not asked "which ones" but rather "how many." First, a difference-in-means estimator was use to examine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between this experimental group and the control group (Table 12). Second, bivariate analyses were conducted to examine racial differences in presence of anger towards the race item in this experimental group. Finally, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was conducted to examine presence of anger while controlling for demographics—in other words, increased irritation when the race item was present. Traditionally, only the difference-in-means estimator was used in the past to illustrate differences between the experimental group and control in experimental surveys. However, more recently, scholars have developed complex ways to run multivariate analyses (Blair & Imai, 2012; Janus, 2010). In this study, to compare between the control and the experimental group, the original scales of both group was standardized and betas are reported.

Analysis and Results

Table 11 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the sample in the experimental group for education compared to the control group. Of the experimental group, 62.50% are female and 45.83% are white. Many are currently employed part-time at 44.17% followed by unemployed at 42.08%. Over half of the sample identified as a first generation student at 57.08%. The average age was approximately 21.54 years with an average of 3.57 on a conservative scale of 1-7, with 7 being extremely conservative. In terms of year in school, the sample consisted of about 30.83% freshmen, 11.67% sophomore, 27.08% junior, 25.00% senior, and another 5.42% graduate students. Further, from this over all sample the average feeling of threat towards Asian Americans is 2.29 on a scale of 1-5 (5, high threat).

Table 11. Sample Characteristics of Control and Marriage Experimental Group (Marriage)

	Control Percent (%) N=225	Experiment Percent (%) N=240
Male	33.78	37.50
Race		
Whites	48.00	45.83
Hispanics	20.00	23.33
Blacks	19.11	18.33
Asians	6.67	6.25
Others	6.22	6.25
Employment Status		
Part-Time	39.11	44.17
Full-Time	16.44	13.75
Unemployed	44.44	42.08
Year in School		
Freshmen	22.22	30.83
Sophomore	12.44	11.67
Junior	29.33	27.08
Senior	26.22	25.00
Graduate	9.78	5.42
First Generation Student	52.89	57.08
	Control M(SD)	Experiment M (SD)
Age	23.25(8.23)	21.54(4.84)
Conservative [a]	3.46(1.22)	3.57(1.25)
Symbolic Racism[b]	2.29(0.55)	2.29(0.55)
Principled Objection[c]	1.89(0.90)	1.94(0.91)
Negative Stereotypes[d]	2.78(0.95)	2.81(0.97)
Group Threat[e]	2.34(0.56)	2.29(0.55)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H_1: The mean for the experiment group will be significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item evoked feelings of anger/irritation.

Table 12 illustrates the difference-in-means estimator. The table compares the means between the control and experimental groups and determines whether or not these means are statistically different from one another through the use of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results from ANOVA comparing the experimental group to the control group indicated that the two groups are not statistically different from each other. Kuklinski et al. (1997) noted that by subtracting the baseline from the experimental mean and multiplying by 100, researchers can access an estimate of level of "anger directed towards the race item." However, in this case, the experimental group has a lower mean than the control group, "Because the baseline and test conditions are independent samples, the test condition mean can be marginally smaller than the baseline mean when the test item evokes little or no anger" (Kuklinski et al. (1997). Therefore, this method of analysis alone (with no control variables) shows that the race item in marriage evoked little to no anger—indicating little to no difference from anger expressed in the control group. This first hypothesis is rejected.

Difference-in-Means Estimator

Table 12. Difference-in-Means Estimator: Estimated Mean Differences over Marriage

	Sample Size (*N*)	Mean (SD)
Control Group	225	1.99 (0.86)
Experimental: Marriage	240	1.92 (0.95)

One-Way ANOVA Comparing Experimental Means to Control

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.65	1	0.65	0.79
Within Groups	378.49	463	0.82	
Total	379.14	464	0.82	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H$_2$: There are significant racial differences in the presence of anger in the marriage

experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have difference presence of anger based

on the marriage domain.

Table 13 illustrates One Way ANOVA for this experimental group by race. The results

indicate no differences by race. Even the pairwise comparison of means by race for marriage

indicated no significant relationships across the racial groups. This suggests that the race

statement on marriage did not evoke any significant feelings of anger across race. Therefore, this

hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 13. One Way ANOVA of Control and Job Experimental Group by Race

	Control			Experimental		
Categories	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*
Whites	1.92	0.86	108	1.93	0.86	110
Hispanics	2.02	0.75	45	2.07	1.08	56
Blacks	2.23	0.95	43	1.84	1.08	44
Asians	1.73	0.96	15	1.93	0.70	15
Others	1.92	0.73	14	1.53	0.74	15
Total	2.00	0.86	225	1.92	0.95	240

	Control				Experimental			
Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*
Between Groups	4	3.94	0.98	1.34	4	3.81	0.95	1.07
Within Groups	220	161.06	0.73		235	209.67	0.89	
Total	224	165.00	0.74					

Testing: H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the marriage domain.

Despite bivariate analyses showing that the race item in this domain evoked little to no anger, an OLS regression model was predicted to test these theoretical frameworks. Once again, modeling the analyses of Janus (2010), this study utilizes OLS regression to examine anger/irritation when the race item is present using the following regression model where Ti is dummy coded and equal to 1 for the treatment group and 0 when in the control group.

$$(4)$$

$$Y_i = B_o + B_1 T_i + B X_i + e_i$$

In this study, the final OLS model controls for the group that respondent is assigned to (experimental or control), sex, race, employment, age, income, conservativeness, and group threat.

Table 14 illustrates the result of the OLS regression model. The table supports the previous bivariate tests that there were no significant difference between the experimental and control group—even when controlling for other variables. The overall model is significant at $p < 0.05$ and explains 5 percent of the variability in the model. Males had 0.21 units lower in presence of anger as compared to females, controlling for all the other variables. As levels of conservativeness increased, presence of anger also increased by 0.08 units. And as principled objection increased, presence of anger decreased by 0.14 units, holding everything else constant. Principled Object was also the predictor with the greatest effect on presence of anger, with a beta coefficient of 0.14—for every standard deviation increased in principled objection, presence of

90

anger decreased by 0.14 standard deviations. Group threat did not emerge as a significant predictor of presence of anger in this marriage domain. This hypothesis, therefore, can be rejected.

Table 14. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race
Item in Marriage Domain N=465

	B	Robust SE B	B
Experimental Group	-0.07	0.08	-0.04
Male	-0.21*	0.09	-0.11
Race			
Hispanics	0.10	0.12	0.05
Blacks	0.08	0.13	0.04
Asians	-0.12	0.16	-0.03
Others	-0.25	0.15	-0.07
Age	-0.001	0.01	-0.004
Employment			
Part Time	-0.04	0.09	-0.03
Full Time	0.05	0.14	0.02
Income	-0.001	0.002	-0.02
Conservativeness[a]	0.08*	0.04	0.11
Symbolic Racism	0.13	0.14	0.08
Principled Objection	-0.14*	0.06	-0.14
Negative Stereotypes	0.05	0.05	0.06
Group Threat	-0.03	0.12	-0.02
R^2		0.05	
F		1.72*	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

 This study contributed to existing literature in several ways. First, conservativeness was once again significant in both the control and experimental group—indicating that as conservativeness increases, so do feelings of anger. This was also evident in the last two experimental groups for education and jobs. Second, as principled objection increased, presence of anger this experimental group increased. Third, consistent to studies in survey research that suggests males and females tend to respond differently to surveys depending on the topic (De Vaus, 2013), the OLS regression model suggests that the difference between men and women's anger level are statistically significant for this experimental group at $p<0.05$. Females, similar to the first two experimental groups in the education and job domains, have a statistically significant higher mean anger level compared to males. Below is an in-depth summary of the three hypothesis and a discussion of the results.

> H1: The mean for the job experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked anger towards Asian Americans.

This hypothesis is rejected as the experimental group for marriage did not have a significantly higher mean that the control group. The reasoning behind this could be similar to the experimental group on education—college students may not feel threatened in this domain. Due to their age group and the fact that they are currently students, marriage not be on their minds.

> H$_2$: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger the marriage experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger based on the marriage domain.

As indicated in the result section, this study did not find any significant racial differences in presence of anger. A post-hoc tukey test was ran and also revealed no significant results between the racial groups. Similar to the experimental group on education, there might be several reasons as to why the study did not find significant racial differences. First, because of a convenience sample, the racial make-up of the sample was probably not as diverse as it could be. Further, the small sample size might also have contributed to these limited findings in terms of racial difference.

> H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian American in the job domain.

In this experimental group, group threat did not emerge as the strongest predictor out of symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes. Out of these theoretical factors, principled objection was the strongest theoretical predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain. As principled objection increased, presence of anger in the marriage domain decreased. As principled objection rests on the idea that Whites generally oppose race-targeted policies like affirmative action because they violate foundations of individualism and equal opportunity in a merit-based society (Sniderman & Piazza 1993, p. 176), the stereotype of the model minority might be a representation of the concept individualism and equal opportunity. In this way then, as feelings principled objection increase, negative attitudes towards Asian Americans may actually decrease—especially if they are perceived to be the successful minority group in a "merit base society." Interracial marriages with Asian Americans, therefore, are not perceived to be as a threat.

Future studies on racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in this domain should attempt to have a larger sample size. The wording of the experimental statement can be more direct. For example, instead of "If someone in your family married an Asian American," the wording can be "If someone in your immediate family married an Asian American." Also, a more representative sample should be attempted instead of a convenient college-based sample. As previously mentioned, college students are probably not as concerned or feel threatened in the domain of marriage.

CHAPTER 8: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 4: RESIDENTIAL

<u>Introduction</u>

Throughout U.S. history, scholars have recognized that racial residential segregation contributed to the exacerbation of racial inequality and barriers to upward mobility (Charles, 2000; Dubois, 1903; Myrdal, 1944). For minority groups (Asian, Blacks, Latinos), economic and social progress is connected with being closer to White Americans. However, for Whites, "integration—especially with Blacks—brings the threat of a loss of relative status" (Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996, p. 885). According to many different studies, Black and White residential segregation is highest in metropolitan areas (Farley & Frey, 1992; O'Hare, 1992; Glaeser & Vigdor, 2001; Logan, 2001; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). These studies also suggest that housing segregation of Blacks and Whites remains high in many cities—with little reduction over the years (Farley, 2008; U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). More recent studies on residential segregation have also reached similar conclusions (Harris, 2001; Iceland & Sharp, 2013; Xie & Zhou, 2012). It is important to understand residential segregation as it also contributes to educational inequalities as public education is predominantly funded through state and property taxes (Pisko & Stern, 1985; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003, 2008).

As Zubrinsky and Bobo (1996) found, Whites preferred to live in a majority white neighborhood and are more likely to be comfortable with neighborhood integration when their non-white neighbors are Asian, followed by Latinos. Interestingly, Asian Americans are also perceived to have the most financial resources when it comes to purchasing power (Zubrinsky & Bobo, 1996). Yet this can also position Asian Americans as close to Whites in terms of residential integration—thereby a threat to residential resources.

This chapter will provide a review of literature on residential segregation. This study examines racial attitudes towards Asian Americans in the residential domain. Specifically, this chapter examines whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans is present in this domain—if it is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans? These research questions will be explored through the following hypothesis and statistical analyses:

> H1: The mean for the residential experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

This hypothesis predicts that with the addition of the race item, the experimental group will have a significantly higher mean. As Whites are more comfortable with Asian neighbors as compared to other racial groups, this might position Asian American as a threat to Whites and other racial minorities in terms of spatial/residential integration.

> H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in residential experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on domains.

> H3: Group threat will be the strongest predictor of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes.

<div align="center">Literature</div>

White (1987) noted that people can be residentially segregated due to a variety of factors: age, socioeconomics, and most often times, race/ethnicity. Contrary to popular belief that housing segregation (often measured by the index of dissimilarity which ranges from 0 to 100,

with 100 being complete or total segregation based on census tract) is due solely to economics, scholars found that income alone does not account for the racially segregated neighborhoods (Dawkins, 2004; Farley, 2005; Iceland, Sharp, & Steinmetz 2003). Racial preferences along with practices in real-estate contribute significantly to residential racial segregation. For example, scholars note that residential segregation started in the 1920s as urban neighborhoods started to see an increase in African American populations (Farley, 2012; Massey & Denton, 1993; Massey, 2012). Further, African Americans remain segregated from Whites on a much higher scale compared to any other racial or ethnic minority group (Farley, 2012).

Between 1920 and 1940, Massey and Denton (1993) noted a huge increase in segregation in large urban cities. As Massey and Denton (1993) argued, this increase was a reaction by Whites to the growing black population and a competition for economic resources such as jobs. Further perpetuating segregation were practices that created barriers and limited black families from moving into white neighborhoods. For example, between 1934 and 1968, guidelines from the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) contributed to the fact that a majority of loans from the government to assist home buyers went to Whites (Mueller & Feagin, 2008). This also contributed to many acts of violence to keep Blacks out of white neighborhoods and also more institutionalized forms of racism (Farley, 2012; Loewen, 2005). Today, African Americans continue to be the minority group with the most social distance from Whites in regards to residential neighborhoods.

In a study on metropolitan segregation, Iceland (2004) that while Black-White residential segregation has decreased over the past decade, Blacks still remain the most segregated from Whites compared to Hispanics and Asians (Iceland et al., 2002). At the same time, however, as Iceland (2004) further notes, while Hispanics and Asians are less segregated than Blacks, have

98

remained about the same or increased slightly. Frey and Farley (1996) noted that Asians and Latinos are "buffer" group between neighborhoods that were initially Black or White— "resulting in less segregation between Blacks and other minority groups than between Blacks and Whites" (Iceland, 2004 p. 251). Iceland (2004, p. 269) found that "increasing diversity was actually associated with increases in segregation" between the 1980-2000 period. This was true for Asians, Whites, and Hispanic. For African Americans, however, "increasing diversity was associated with declining segregation among African Americans" (p. 269). Zubrinsky (2001) suggests that this could be due to housing affordability in different neighborhoods. Some scholars also suggest that people might simply prefer to live in neighborhoods when similar racial/ethnic make-up (Clark, 1992; Emerson et al., 2001; Zubrinsky, 2001).

As residential segregation between Asian American and Whites have remained about the same in the past decade (slightly increasing in certain metropolitan areas), the purpose of this study is to examine whether or not Asian Americans are perceived as a threat to residential neighborhoods. For example, are people threatened by an increasing proportion of Asian Americans in their neighborhood? This can be viewed as threat to residential space and affordability of housing. This study, therefore, examines attitudes towards Asian Americans in the residential domain.

<div align="center">Data and Sample</div>

The purpose of this study is to examine presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the residential domain. For example, what factors predicts presence of nger towards Asian Americans and is group threat one of these factors? If group threat is significant, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans in this domain?

<div align="center">99</div>

Data for this study was collected during the months of June 2015 to September 2015 through an online survey program, Qualtrics. The name of the survey was "Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study." A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. After list wise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four experimental group was N=1184. The final sample size for this experimental group on marriage was N=240. This chapter focuses on this one experimental group compared to the control.

The study was structured so that respondents in the control group were given four statements and asked how many of the statements angered them:

1) The federal government increasing the tax on gasoline

2) That it is legal for same-sex couples to marry

3) Professional athletes getting million-dollar contracts

4) Large corporations polluting the environment

The experimental group had one added statement on race:

5) An increasing number of Asian Americans moving into your residential neighborhood

Results

Table 15 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the sample in the experimental group for residential compared to the control group. Of the experimental group, 66.67% are female and 44.58% are white. Many are currently employed part-time at 43.33% followed by unemployed at 39.58%. Over half of the sample identified as a first generation student at 55.00%. The average age was approximately 21.54 years with an average of 3.49 on a conservative scale of 1-7, with 7 being extremely conservative. In terms of year in school, the sample consisted of about 21.25% freshmen, 14.58% sophomore, 26.67% junior, 30.42% senior,

and another 7.08% graduate students. Further, from this over all sample the average feeling of threat towards Asian Americans is 2.31 on a scale of 1-5 (5, high threat).

Table 15. Sample Characteristics of Control and Residential Experimental Group (Residential)

	Control Percent (%) N=225	Experiment Percent (%) N=240
Male	33.78	33.33
Race		
Whites	48.00	44.58
Hispanics	20.00	23.75
Blacks	19.11	18.33
Asians	6.67	7.50
Others	6.22	5.83
Employment Status		
Part-Time	39.11	43.33
Full-Time	16.44	17.08
Unemployed	44.44	39.58
Year in School		
Freshmen	22.22	21.25
Sophomore	12.44	14.58
Junior	29.33	26.67
Senior	26.22	30.42
Graduate	9.78	7.08
First Generation Student	52.89	55.00
	Control M(SD)	Experiment M (SD)
Age	23.25(8.23)	22.01(4.99)
Conservative [a]	3.46(1.22)	3.49(1.31)
Symbolic Racism[b]	2.29(0.55)	2.30(0.57)
Principled Objection[c]	1.89(0.90)	1.94(0.87)
Negative Stereotypes[d]	2.78(0.95)	2.72(0.94)
Group Threat[e]	2.34(0.56)	2.31(0.55)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H_1: The mean for the experiment group will be significantly higher than the control

group—indicating that the race evoked feelings of anger.

Table 16 illustrates the difference in means estimator between the control and

experimental group through one-way analysis of variance. Results indicate that the control and

experimental group are not statistically different from each other. This suggests that the race item

on residential neighborhood evoked little to no feelings of anger when no other variables are

controlled for. This first hypothesis, therefore, can be rejected.

Difference-in-Means Estimator

Table 16. Estimated Mean Presence of Anger

	Sample Size (*N*)	Mean (SD)
Control Group	225	1.99 (0.86)
Experimental: Marriage	240	1.98 (0.96)

One-Way ANOVA Comparing Experimental Means to Control

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.03	1	0.31	0.04
Within Groups	383.89	463	0.83	
Total	383.92	464	0.83	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H_2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger in the residential

experimental group—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger

towards Asian Americans based on the residential domain.

Table 17 illustrates the ANOVA results for residential experimental group by race. Once

again, the results indicate no significant racial differences in presence of anger. Even the

pairwise comparison of means using the tukey test indicated no significant racial different

differences in presence of anger across the racial groups. This third hypothesis, therefore, can be

rejected.

Table 17. One Way ANOVA of Control and Residential Experimental Group by Race

Categories	Control			Experimental		
	Mean	*SD*	*Freq.*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*
Whites	1.92	0.86	108	2.11	0.92	107
Hispanics	2.02	0.75	45	1.82	0.97	57
Blacks	2.23	0.95	43	1.72	0.97	44
Asians	1.73	0.96	15	2.28	0.89	18
Others	1.92	0.73	14	2.00	1.04	14
Total	2.00	0.86	225	1.98	0.96	240

Source	Control				Experimental			
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*
Between Groups	4	3.94	0.98	1.34	4	7.66	1.91	2.13
Within Groups	220	161.06	0.73		235	211.23	0.90	
Total	224	165.00	0.74		239			

Testing: H₃: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the residential domain.

According to Table 18, OLS regression predicting presence of anger towards the race item in the residential domain, only two variable were significant in predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain: sex and conservativeness. Males have 0.24 units less in presence of anger as compared to females ($p<0.01$). As conservativeness increases by one unit, presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain also increases by 0.13 units ($p<0.001$) holding everything else constant. Of these two, conservativeness has the strongest effect on presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain. The overall model is significant at $p<0.001$ and explains seven percent of the variation in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this domain.

Table 18. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race Item in Residential Domain N=465

	B	Robust SE B	B
Experimental Group	-0.02	0.08	-0.01
Male	-0.24**	0.09	-0.13
Race			
Hispanics	-0.18	0.11	-0.08
Blacks	-0.05	0.13	-0.02
Asians	0.04	0.17	0.01
Others	-0.08	0.16	-0.02
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.05
Employment			
Part Time	0.08	0.09	0.04
Full Time	0.001	0.14	0.001
Income	-0.001	0.002	-0.02
Conservativeness[a]	0.13***	0.03	0.18
Symbolic Racism	0.04	0.12	0.03
Principled Objection	-0.06	0.06	-0.06
Negative Stereotypes	0.04	0.05	0.04
Group Threat	0.15	0.11	0.09
R^2		0.07	
F		2.71***	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

<div align="center">Discussion</div>

This study contributed to existing literature in several ways. First, conservativeness was once again significant in both the control and experimental group—indicating that as conservativeness increases, so does presence of anger. This was also evident in the last three experimental groups in the education, job, and marriage domain. Second, consistent to studies in survey research that suggests males and females tend to respond differently to surveys depending on the topic (De Vaus, 2013), the OLS regression model suggests that the difference between men and women's presence of anger are statistically significant for this experimental group at $p<0.05$. Males, similar to the other experimental groups, have a statistically significant lower mean presence of ager compared to females. Below is an in-depth summary of the three hypothesis and a discussion of the results.

> H1: The mean for the residential experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race item in this domain evoked anger towards Asian Americans.

This hypothesis was rejected. Respondents in this experimental group did not differ in their level of anger compared to respondents in the control group. This indicates that the addition of the race statement on Asian Americans and residential neighborhood did not affect presence of anger towards Asian Americans.

> H2: There are significant racial differences in the presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the residential experimental group.

As indicated in the result section, this study did not find any significant racial differences in presence of anger. Similar to the other domains, there might be several reasons as to why the study did not find significant racial differences. For instance, the convenience sample and mall

<div align="center">107</div>

sample size. It is important to further note that this particular section was approaching $p < 0.05$ level of significance. Therefore, with a greater sample size, this hypothesis might not be rejected.

H3: Controlling for demographic variables along with symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes, group threat will emerge as the strongest predictor of presence of anger towards Asian American in the job domain.

In this experimental group, group threat did not emerge as the strongest predictor out of symbolic racism, principled objection, and negative stereotypes. While level of conservativeness and sex remained significant in this experimental group and all the others, none of the theoretical frameworks were actually significant in this model. This probably suggests that overall, respondents were not threatened by Asian Americans in this domain. Further, there is no animus towards Asian Americans in this domain. This could be due to the convenience sample of college students. For example, many students probably live at home (close to campus) or on campus— where they are not as concerned about the racial makeup of their residential neighborhood. Therefore, they are probably exposed to more racial diversity in their current residential neighborhood.

CHAPTER 9: EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS COMBINED

Introduction

This chapter combines all the previous experimental groups into one and compares them with the control group. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to increase the overall sample size and by combining the experimental groups. In this way then, the chapter does not focus on any one particular domain (like previous four chapters). Rather, this study examines what happens to presence of anger towards Asian Americans in with the presence of a race-related statement? The study seeks to further examine if feelings of threat is present towards Asian Americans overall. If feelings of threat towards Asian Americans is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans overall? These research questions will be explored through the following hypotheses:

H1: The mean for the combined experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race items overall evoked feelings of anger towards Asian Americans.

H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in all experimental groups—indicating that racial groups might have different presence of anger towards Asian Americans based on domains.

H3: Controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism, principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat will each have independent effects on presence of anger towards Asian Americans.

H4: Out of symbolic racism, principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat, group threat will have the strongest effect on presence of anger towards Asian Americans.

<div align="center">Data and Sample</div>

The purpose of this study is to examine anger towards Asian Americans. For example, what factors predict presence of anger towards Asian Americans overall? Further, the study aims to explore whether or not feelings of group threat towards Asian Americans are present overall—if group threat is present, is it the strongest predictor of animus towards Asian Americans overall? This section, therefore, combines all the experimental group into one.

Data for this study was collected during the months of June 2015 to September 2015 through an online survey program, Qualtrics. This was an experimental list survey named "Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study." A total of 1455 respondent responses to the survey were collected. After list wise deletion, the final sample size for the whole study consisting of one control and four experimental group was N=1158.

First, a difference-in-means estimator was use to examine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between this experimental group and the control group (Table 2). Second, bivariate analyses were conducted to examine racial differences in presence of anger towards the race item in this experimental group. Finally, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was conducted to examine increased in presence of anger towards the race items—in other words, increased irritation when the race item was present. Traditionally, only the difference-in-means estimator was used in the past to illustrate differences between the experimental group and control in experimental surveys. However, more recently, scholars have developed complex ways to run multivariate analyses (Blair & Imai, 2012; Janus, 2010). In this

study, to compare between the control and the experimental groups combined, the original scales of both group was standardized and betas are reported.

<div align="center">Results</div>

Table 19 illustrates the sample characteristics of all the experimental groups combined with the control group. As the table indicates, 34.94 percent of the same in the experimental group are male, 48.23 percent are White, and 42.23 percent are employed part-time. In terms of year in school 28.02 percent identified as juniors, followed by 25.19 percent seniors, 24.76 percent freshmen, 13.08 percent sophomore, and 8.90 percent graduate. Approximately 45.44 percent are first generation students. The average age is 22.08 years, the average on the conservative scale is 3.48 (on a scale of 1-7, with 7 being extremely conservative). The average for symbolic racism is 2.33 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being high symbolic racism) and the average for principled objection is 1.96 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being high principled objection). The average for group threat towards Asian Americans in this experimental group 2.32 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being high group threat.

Table 19. Sample Characteristics of Control and All Experimental Group

	Control Percent (%) N=225	Experiment Percent (%) N=933
Male	33.78	34.94
Race		
Whites	48.00	48.23
Hispanics	20.00	23.37
Blacks	19.11	15.65
Asians	6.67	6.65
Others	6.22	6.11
Employment Status		
Part-Time	39.11	42.23
Full-Time	16.44	16.40
Unemployed	44.44	41.37
Year in School		
Freshmen	22.22	24.76
Sophomore	12.44	13.08
Junior	29.33	28.08
Senior	26.22	25.19
Graduate	9.78	8.90
First Generation Student	52.89	45.55
	Control M(SD)	Experiment M(SD)
Age	23.25(8.23)	22.08(5.43)
Conservative [a]	3.46(1.22)	3.48(1.25)
Symbolic Racism[b]	2.29(0.55)	2.33(0.54)
Principled Objection[c]	1.89(0.90)	1.96(0.90)
Negative Stereotypes[d]	2.78(0.95)	2.72(0.93)
Group Threat[e]	2.34(0.56)	2.32(0.54)

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]Range: 1-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H1: The mean for the combined experimental group is significantly higher than the control group—indicating that the race items overall increased presence of anger.

Table 20 is the difference-in-means estimator between all the experimental groups compared to the control. As the table suggests, the difference in means between the control and the combined experimental groups are not statistically significant. This indicates that, overall, the addition of the race item on Asian Americans did not significantly affect the presence of anger. As the table illustrates, the mean presence of anger for the control group is 2.00 and the mean for the combined experimental group is 2.01. This hypothesis, therefore, is rejected.

Difference-in-Means Estimator

Table 20. Estimated Mean Presence of Anger over All Experimental Groups Combined

	Sample Size (N)	**Mean (SD)**
Control Group	225	2.00 (0.86)
All Experimental Groups	933	2.01 (0.97)

One-Way ANOVA Comparing Experimental Means to Control

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.04	1	0.04	0.05
Within Groups	1042.89	1156	0.90	
Total	1042.93	1157	0.90	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H2: There are significant racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans in the combined experimental group.

Table 21 illustrates the one-way ANOVA results by racial category to test for racial differences in presence of anger towards Asian Americans. The results indicate that Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics are not affected by the addition of the race item in the experimental group. This hypothesis, therefore, is rejected.

Table 21. One Way ANOVA of Control and All Experimental Groups by Race

	Control			All Experimental Groups		
Categories	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Freq.*
Whites	1.92	0.86	108	2.04	0.92	558
Hispanics	2.02	0.75	45	2.02	0.94	263
Blacks	2.23	0.95	43	1.97	1.05	189
Asians	1.73	0.96	15	1.78	0.95	77
Others	1.92	0.73	14	2.00	0.89	71
Total	2.00	0.86	225			

One-Way ANOVA

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	4.94	4	1.23	1.37
Within Groups	1037.99	1153	0.90	
Total	1042.93	1157	0.90	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015)

Testing: H3: Controlling for demographic variables, symbolic racism, principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat will each have independent effects on presence of anger towards Asian Americans.

Modeling the analyses of Janus (2010), this study utilizes OLS regression to examine anger/irritation when the race item is present. The following regression model was estimated to calculate anger towards the race item:

(5)

$$Y_i = B_o + B_1 T_i + BX_i + e_i$$

In this study, the final OLS model controls for the group that respondent is assigned to (experimental or control), sex, race, employment, age, income, conservativeness, and group threat. Due to minor issues of normality and heteroscedasticity, a robust regression model was estimated (Stata version 13.1). Variance inflation factors indicated no issues with multicollinearity as all vifs were below 5. A linktest and ovtest were also used to examine model specification error. The linktest result indicated no specification error.

Table 22 and 23 illustrates the independent effects of symbolic racism, principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat on attitudes (presence of anger) towards Asian Americans overall. Model 1 illustrates that symbolic racism did not have a significant independent effect on presence of anger. In this model, males have 0.25 units less in presence of anger as compared to females, holding everything else constant (p<0.001). Also, as presence of conservativeness increases by one unit, level of anger increase 0.11 units (p<0.05). Model 1 overall predicted four percent of the variation in presence of anger towards Asian Americans and is significant at p<0.001.

Model 2 examines the independent effect of principled objection on presence of anger towards Asian Americans. As the model suggests, principled object has a significant independent effect on level of anger towards Asian Americans. For every unit increase in principled objection, level of anger towards Asia Americans decrease by 0.09 units holding everything else constant (p<0.05). Further, sex and level of conservativeness are also significant in predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans in this model. Males have 0.25 units less in presence of anger as compared to females (p<0.001) and as conservativeness increase by one unit, level of anger increases by 0.14 units holding everything else constant (p<0.001). Model 2, overall, predicted five percent of the variation in level of anger towards Asian Americans.

Model 5 examines the independent effect of negative stereotypes on level of anger towards Asian Americans. As the model suggests, negative stereotypes has no significant independent effect on presence of anger towards Asian Americans controlling for all the same variables as the other models. Once again, male and conservativeness are significant. Males have 0.28 units less in presence of anger towards Asian Americans as compared to females (p<0.001). Further, as levels of conservativeness increases, presence of anger increases by 0.12 units (p<0.001). In this model race is also significant. Asians have a 0.23 units less in presence of anger as compared to Whites (p<0.05) when controlling for everything else. The overall model is significant at p<0.001 and predicts four percent of the variation in presence of anger.

Model 6 examines the independent effect of group threat on presence of anger towards Asian Americans. As the model illustrates, group threat significantly predicts presence of anger towards Asian Americans when controlling for everything else in the model. For every unit increase in group threat, presence of anger towards Asian Americans increase by 0.11 units (p<0.05). Like all the other models, males and conservativeness are also significant in predicting

116

presence of anger towards Asian Americans. Males have 0.28 units less in presence of anger towards Asian Americans as compared to females (p<0.001) and as level of conservativeness increases by one unit, presence of anger towards Asian Americans increase by 0.11 units (p<0.01) when holding everything else constant. Finally, race is also significant in the model in that those who are Asian have 0.21 unit less in presence of anger as compared to Whites. The overall model is significant at p<0.001 and predicts 5 percent of the variation in presence of anger. Therefore, overall, principled objection and group threat have significant independent effects on presence of anger towards Asian Americans when controlling for other demographic variables. Symbolic racism and negative stereotypes did not have independent effects on presence of anger towards Asian Americans. This hypothesis, therefore, is partially rejected.

Table 22. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race Item Overall N= 1158

	Model 1: Symbolic Racism				Model 2: Principled Objection	
	B	Robust SE B	*B*	B	Robust SE B	*B*
All Experimental Group	0.01	0.06		0.004	0.02	0.06	0.01
Male	-0.2***	0.06		-0.14	-0.25***	0.06	-0.13
Race							
Hispanics	-0.03	0.07		-0.01	-0.05	0.07	-0.02
Blacks	-0.05	0.09		-0.02	-0.08	0.09	-0.03
Asians	-0.23	0.11		-0.06	-0.26	0.11	-0.07
Others	-0.03	0.11		-0.01	-0.07	0.11	-0.02
Age	-0.003	0.05		-0.02	-0.003	0.004	-0.02
Employment							
Part Time	-0.03	0.06		-0.01	-0.02	0.06	-0.01
Full Time	0.02	0.09		0.008	0.03	0.09	0.01
Income	-0.001	0.001		-0.02	-0.001	0.001	-0.02
Conservativeness[a]	0.11*	0.02		0.15	0.14***	0.02	0.18
Symbolic Racism	0.05	0.06		0.03	-	-	-
Principled Objection	-	-		-	-0.09*	0.04	-0.09
Negative Stereotypes	-	-		-	-	-	-
Group Threat	-	-		-	-	-	-
R^2		0.04				0.05	
F		4.70***				5.08***	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Table 23. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race Item Overall N= 1158

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Robust SE B	*B*	B	Robust SE B	*B*
All Experimental Group	0.02	0.06	0.01	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-	0.02	0.09	0.01
Marriage	-	-	-	-0.07	0.08	-0.03
Jobs	-	-	-	0.16*	0.08	0.07
Residential	-	-	-	-0.01	0.08	-0.004
Male	-0.24***	0.06	-0.12	-0.24***	0.06	-0.12
Race						
Hispanics	-0.05	0.07	-0.02	-0.04	0.07	-0.02
Blacks	-0.11	0.09	-0.04	-0.09	0.09	-0.04
Asians	-0.24	0.11	-0.06	-0.23	0.11	-0.06
Others	-0.07	0.11	-0.02	-0.07	0.11	-0.02
Age	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	-0.003	0.004	-0.02
Employment						
Part Time	-0.02	0.06	-0.13	-0.02	0.06	-0.01
Full Time	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.004
Income	-0.001	0.001	-0.02	-0.001	0.001	-0.02
Conservativeness[a]	0.12***	0.02	0.16	0.13***	0.02	0.17
Symbolic Racism	-001	0.08	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	-0.01
Principled Objection	-0.11**	0.04	-0.10	-0.11**	0.04	-0.10
Negative Stereotypes	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02
Group Threat	0.15*	0.07	0.08	0.14*	0.07	0.07

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Robust SE B	*B*	B	Robust SE B	*B*
R^2		0.06			0.06	
F		4.60***			4.26***	

Note: Data comes from Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study (2015); [a]Range: 1-7, 7 (Extremely Conservative); [b]Range: 1-5, (5=High Symbolic Racism); [c]Range: 1-5, (5=High Principled Objection); [d]-7 (7=High Negative Stereotypes); [e]Range: 1-5 (5=High Threat)

Testing: H_4: Out of symbolic racism, principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat, group threat will have the strongest effect on presence of anger towards Asian Americans.

Table 24 are the regression results for two very similar models. In Model 1, all the experimental groups are dummy coded as 0 (Reference) = Control, 1=Experimental. Model 2 is categorically coded with reference group as the control group, and all the other experimental groups as their own categories: education, marriage, jobs, residential. The purpose of showing the OLS regression results this way is to first illustrate how all the experimental groups together compare to the control group. Second, Model 2 summarizes how each of the experimental groups compare to the control group. By combining the experimental groups versus control into one measure in both models, the full sample size of N=1158 can be analyzed.

Table 24 Model 1 shows that when all the experimental groups are combined into one and compared with the control, the experimental group does not significantly differ from the control group in predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans overall. Males have a 0.24 units lower in level of anger as compared to females (p<0.001). As level of conservativeness increases by one unit, level of anger towards Asian Americans overall increases by 0.12 units. As principled objection increases by one unit, presence of anger towards Asian Americans decrease by 0.11 units (p<0.01), holding everything else constant. Finally, as group threat increase by one unit, presence of anger towards Asian Americans overall increases by 0.15 units. The overall model is significant at p<0.001. These numbers were all pretty consistent with Model 2. However, Model 2 illustrates that the only experimental group that was significant in predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans is the job domain. This finding was present in Chapter 6, when the job domain was examined on its own.

Overall, these two models in Table 24 indicate that out of the theoretical frameworks: principled objection, negative stereotypes, and group threat, principled objection emerged as the strongest factor predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans overall. This hypothesis, therefore, can be rejected.

Table 24. OLS Regression Predicting Presence of Anger towards Race Item Overall N= 1158

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Robust SE B	*B*	B	Robust SE B	*B*
All Experimental Group	0.02	0.06	0.01	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-	0.02	0.09	0.01
Marriage	-	-	-	-0.07	0.08	-0.03
Jobs	-	-	-	0.16*	0.08	0.07
Residential	-	-	-	-0.01	0.08	-0.004
Male	-0.24***	0.06	-0.12	-0.24***	0.06	-0.12
Race						
Hispanics	-0.05	0.07	-0.02	-0.04	0.07	-0.02
Blacks	-0.11	0.09	-0.04	-0.09	0.09	-0.04
Asians	-0.24	0.11	-0.06	-0.23	0.11	-0.06
Others	-0.07	0.11	-0.02	-0.07	0.11	-0.02
Age	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	-0.003	0.004	-0.02
Employment						
Part Time	-0.02	0.06	-0.13	-0.02	0.06	-0.01
Full Time	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.004
Income	-0.001	0.001	-0.02	-0.001	0.001	-0.02
Conservativeness[a]	0.12***	0.02	0.16	0.13***	0.02	0.17
Symbolic Racism	-001	0.08	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	-0.01
Principled Objection	-0.11**	0.04	-0.10	-0.11**	0.04	-0.10
Negative Stereotypes	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02
Group Threat	0.15*	0.07	0.08	0.14*	0.07	0.07
R^2		0.06			0.06	
F		4.60***			4.26***	

<u>Discussion</u>

This study contributed to existing literature in several ways. First, this study illustrates that males and conservativeness play a significant role in predicting presence of anger towards Asian Americans overall. Males, overall, had significantly lower presence of anger as compared to females holding all the other variables constant. Further, as evident in other analysis chapters, as conservativeness increases, level of anger towards Asian Americans overall also significantly increases. Second, this study illustrated that group threat and principled objection have independent effects on level of anger towards Asian Americans. These two theoretical frameworks are different and have different relationships with level of anger towards Asian Americans. Third, when all these different theoretical frameworks are put into one model, principled objection and group threat remain significant. As principle objection increases, level of anger towards Asian Americans decreases. Yet, as group threat increases, level of anger towards Asian Americans also increases.

Principled objection scholars focus on aspects of individualism and opportunity in a merit-based society (Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Sniderman & Carmines, 1997). It is interesting to note that in this study, as principled objection increases, feelings of anger towards Asian Americans decreased. There could be several explanations for this. First, this theoretical framework has been examined in literature revolving Whites' attitudes towards race-targeted policies like Affirmative Action and focused on the Black-White binary. Therefore, it has not been used often outside of this framework. Second, as mentioned in the literature sections of previous chapters, Asian Americans are associated with the model minority stereotype—they are the representation of ideological American dream. In this way, then, Asian Americans are the

ideal representation of individualism and hard work in a merit-based society. Therefore, principle objection, overall, would have an inverse relationship with animus towards Asian Americans. This relationship was a stronger relationship than group threat.

Group threat was the only other theoretical framework that was significant in the multiple regression models in this study. Group threat was also the strongest predictor in the final model. Blumer (1958) theorized that at the heart of racism are feelings of group threat. Blumer (1958) noted the four feelings that form racial prejudice: feeling of natural superiority, feeling that the other group is alien or different, feelings of ownership over valued resources, and feelings that the out group threatens those resources (p. 3). The first two types of feeling illustrate the importance of stereotype sin separating outgroups. The model minority stereotype places Asian Americans away from Whites but also other minority groups. Through this stereotype, Asian American are sometimes perceived to not be "minorities" but at the same "not white." The last two types of feelings illustrate a threat to valued resources that the groups are competing for. In this study, as feelings of group threat increased, feelings of anger towards Asian Americans increased. This indicates that respondents felt a significant sense of group threat—feeling that Asian Americans are taking away valued resources. Below is an in-depth summary of the three hypothesis and a discussion of the results.

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

This chapter first provides an overall summary of this dissertation project. Next the chapter will discuss limitations of the study. Finally, the chapter will end with areas for future research.

Summary

Many people argue that the U.S. is moving towards a more liberal attitude towards race—to the extent that some argue of the existence of a post-racial era. Yet, as Whites support racial equality, they oppose race-targeted policies aimed to address racial inequality. This is known as the principle-policy gap in attitudinal study. This principle-policy gap is further rooted in racial resentment. Yet, while racial resentment still exists, some argue that Asian Americans do not experience racism. After all, the model minority stereotype positions Asian Americans as the successful minority group.

This study explored what predicts anger towards Asian Americas and whether or not resentment is based on feeling of group threat. The purpose of this study, therefore, is twofold:

1) Assess feelings of anger toward advancements of Asian Americans in four domains: education, workplace, marriage, and residential.

2) Assess whether threat (those who feel threat) predict the presence of anger toward Asian Americans in these domains.

Blumer (1958) argues that four types of feelings are shared by the dominant group that are present in racial prejudice: "(1) a feeling of superiority, (2) a feeling that the subordinate race is intrinsically different and alien, (3) a feeling of proprietary claim to certain areas of privilege and advantage, and (4) a fear and suspicion that the subordinate race harbors designs on the prerogatives of the dominant race" (p. 4). Through this theoretical framework, threat is at the

heart of racism and racial prejudice. Bobo and Tuan (2006) further argue that not everything stimulates group threat—certain resources might not be as valued as others. Through a group threat framework, which argues that racial resentment occurs when there exists a threat to valued resources, this dissertation research examines racial attitudes towards Asian American in four domains: education, jobs, marriage, and residential integration. Given the label of model minority and the successes made by many Asian Americans, the project assesses whether there continues to be underlying racial resentment toward them by Whites and whether the racial resentment is based in feelings of threat to valued resources

Consistent with this theoretical framework, this study found that group threat was only significant in predicting anger towards Asian Americans in the job domain. As Asian Americans have higher educational attainment and socioeconomic status, they are viewed as the model minority. In some instances, Asian Americans are perceived to be similar to if not outperforming Whites. This, therefore, can position Asian Americans as a threat to certain valued resources. With the convenience sample of college students, this threat was felt in the job domain— suggesting also that feelings of threat vary by domain.

The four domains in this study were: education, jobs, marriage, and residential. Group threat was not significant in three of the domains: education, marriage, and residential. First, this could be due to the fact that college students have already secured a position in an institution of higher education and might not be threatened by Asian Americans in this domain. Second, with the age distribution of the sample, marriage might not be a priority in their minds. With the increasing rates of interracial marriages (especially between Asian Americans and Whites), interracial marriage may not stimulate threat and resentment like it used to.

128

In terms of the residential domain, many studies suggests that a college campus is where university students encounter a more racially diverse group of peers. Many students might live on campus or close to campus. The racial makeup of their residential neighborhood might not be of concern if they currently live in dorms or with other college students. At the same time, studies in the past suggests that Asian Americans are least residentially segregated from Whites (Farley & Frey, 1992; O'Hare, 1992; Glaeser & Vigdor, 2001; Logan, 2001; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Schuman et al., 1997). Yet, this overall sample was threatened in the job domain because they viewed it as a valued resource—a resource that they are all competing for.

The small sample size in each of the four domains could have also contributed to group threat being significant in only the job domain. Experimental designs require large sample sizes. This is further illustrated when all the experimental groups were combined—group threat emerged as one of the strongest predictors of anger towards Asian Americans overall. As Bobo and Zubrinski (1997) noted a perceived racial hierarchy in different domains, this study contributed to this literature by suggesting that not every domain stimulates group threat. For example, while past studies suggests that Whites are less likely to purchase or live in a home as the proportion of Blacks increase and less likely to marry someone who is black (Samson and Bobo 2014), this study suggests that group threat was not present towards Asian Americans in these same domains. This study, therefore, contributed to literature in the following ways:

1) Very limited studies have addressed attitudes towards Asian Americans.
2) While some studies suggest that racial resentment and principled objection are the root cause of racial prejudice, this study found that group threat plays a significant role in anger towards Asian Americans.

3) This study utilized an experimental survey design that addresses social desirability bias in traditional survey designs.

Limitations

Several limitations exist in this current project. First of all, because of the experimental survey design, a large sample size is needed. With four experimental groups and one control group, each group has a relatively small sample size. Further, as each experimental group is compared to the control group, a larger sample size for the control group overall will reduce standard errors. Despite the random assignment of participants into one of the five groups by Qualtrics, the initial sample is still a convenience sample of university students. If the same study was conducted to a more general population, the domains that stimulate threat might be very different.

Another limitation of this study is also oriented around the sample and measures. The measures for symbolic racism, principled objection, and group threat have not been used to measure attitudes towards Asian Americans. They have typically been used to measure White's attitudes towards Blacks. However, Bobo and Tuan (2006) used these measures to examine prejudice towards Chippewa Indians. Second, these measures have not been used in a college student sample. Therefore, they may not fully reflect or measures college student attitudes towards a racial group. Yet, these limitations can be addressed with future studies.

Future Research

In the past, conducting an experimental survey design can be expensive—as surveys were distributed in paper format. With technological advances, experimental survey design can now be done online through programs like Qualtrics. This study, for example, found that an

experimental list survey design can yield interesting results—that not everything stimulates

feelings of group threat. There are several direction for future research using this survey design.

Further, this study also suggests that the sample affects when group threat is present. A sample of

university students might not feel threatened in the education or marriage domain, but felt

threated in the job domain. In a general sample, this might be different.

To continue examining racial attitudes through a multiracial and sociological perspective,

future studies can switch out the target group to compare across groups. For example, the

experimental statement "An increasing number of Asian Americans moving into your residential

neighborhood" can actually be multiple experimental group alone by switching out the racial

category i.e. "An increasing number of Hispanics moving into your residential neighborhood" or

"An increasing number of African Americans moving into your neighborhood." This way, each

experimental group can compared to the control group and feelings of group threat across racial

categories can be examined. As Bobo and Zubrinski (1997) noted a perceived racial hierarchy in

feelings of threat by domain, a future experimental list survey will be able to assess this

perceived racial hierarchy while limited social desirability bias.

Future studies can also use this experimental design to address many areas of policy and

research on race/ethnicity as this method. If more studies find that group threat significantly

predicts attitudes towards different racial groups, then the way that policies are written might be

contributing to the principle-policy gap—especially policies that can be perceived as "taking

away" resources to give to another group, or a redistribution of resources. This might contribute

to negative feelings or animus towards the out-group. Affirmative action is one area of policy

that can be examined using this method. Affirmative action program at educational institution

aim to increase minority/underrepresented groups. This can be perceived as a threat to a valued

resource. More studies can use the experimental design to examine the perceived racial hierarchy

and policy implications.

APPENDIX: IRB APPROVAL LETTER

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
            FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Jenny Nguyen**

Date: **June 04, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 06/04/2015, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	Group Positioning: An Attitudinal Study
Investigator:	Jenny Nguyen
IRB Number:	SBE-15-11307
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Kanielle Chay

IRB Coordinator

Page 1 of 1

REFERENCES

Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal Consciousness of Undocumented Latinos: Fear and Stigma as

    Barriers to Claims-Making for First- and 1.5-Generation Immigrants. *Law & Society*

    Review, 45(2), 337-370. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00435.x

Ayers, J. W., Hofstetter, C. R., Schnakenberg, K., & Kolody, B. (2009). Is Immigration a Racial

    Issue? Anglo Attitudes on Immigration Policies in a Border County*. *Social Science*

    Quarterly, 90(3), 593-610. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00633.x

Bell, M. P., Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (1997). Asian American Attitudes toward

    Affirmative Action in Employment Implications for the Model Minority Myth. *The*

    Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33(3), 356-377.

Blanton, H., & Jaccard, J. (2008). Unconscious Racism: A Concept in Pursuit of a Measure.

    Annual Review of Sociology, 34(1), 277-297. doi:

    doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131632

Blumer, H. (1958). Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *The Pacific Sociological*

    Review, 1(1), 3-7. doi: 10.2307/1388607

Bobo, L. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict?

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45(6), 1196-1210. doi: 10.1037/0022-

    3514.45.6.1196

Bobo, L. (1998). Race, Interests, and Beliefs About Affirmative Action Unanswered Questions

    and New Directions. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(7), 985-1003.

Bobo, L., & Gilliam, F. D., Jr. (1990). Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black

    Empowerment. *The American Political Science Review, 84*(2), 377-393. doi:

10.2307/1963525

Bobo, L., & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending

   Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context. *American*

   Sociological Review, 61(6), 951-972. doi: 10.2307/2096302

Bobo, L., & Kluegel, J. R. (1993). Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest, Stratification

   Ideology, or Racial Attitudes? *American Sociological Review, 58*(4), 443-464. doi:

   10.2307/2096070

Bobo, L., Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, R. A. (1997). Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a

   kinder, gentler, antiblack ideology. *Racial attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and change,*

   15, 23-25.

Bobo, L., & Zubrinsky, C. L. (1996). Attitudes on residential integration: Perceived status

   differences, mere in-group preference, or racial prejudice? *Social Forces, 74*(3), 883-909.

Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach

   to Racism and Race Relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 445-472. doi:

   10.1111/0022-4537.00127

Bobo, L. D., & Charles, C. Z. (2009). Race in the American mind: From the Moynihan report to

   the Obama candidacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social*

   Science, 621(1), 243-259.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial

   stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(6), 931-950.

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Dietrich, D. (2011). The Sweet Enchantment of Color-Blind Racism in

   Obamerica. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,*

634(1), 190-206. doi: 10.1177/0002716210389702

Brader, T., Valentino, N. A., & Suhay, E. (2008). What triggers public opposition to

immigration? Anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political*

Science, 52(4), 959-978.

Burns, P., & Gimpel, J. G. (2000). Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public

Opinion on Immigration Policy. *Political Science Quarterly (Academy of Political*

Science), 115(2), 201.

Carter, J. S. (2008). A cosmopolitan way of life for all? A reassessment of the impact of urban

and region on racial attitudes from 1972 to 2006. *Journal of Black Studies*.

Carter, J. S., & Borch, C. A. (2005). Assessing the Effects of Urbanism and Regionalism on

Gender-Role Attitudes, 1974–1998*. *Sociological Inquiry*,*75*(4), 548-563.

Carter, J. S., & Carter, S. K. (2014). Place matters: The impact of place of residency on racial

attitudes among regional and urban migrants. *Social Science Research, 47*, 165-177. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.04.001

Carter, J. S., Corra, M., Carter, S. K., & McCrosky, R. (2014). The impact of place? A

reassessment of the importance of the South in affecting beliefs about racial

inequality. *The Social Science Journal*, *51*(1), 12-20.

Case, C. E., & Greeley, A. M. (1990). Attitudes toward racial equality. *Humboldt Journal of*

Social Relations, 67-94.

Cashmore, E. (2008). Tiger Woods and the new racial order. *Current Sociology, 56*(4), 621-634.

Ceobanu, A. M., & Escandell, X. (2010). Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward

immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and

research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 36*, 309-328.

Cheng, L., & Espiritu, Y. (1989). Korean Businesses in Black and Hispanic Neighborhoods: A

Study of Intergroup Relations. *Sociological Perspectives, 32*(4), 521-534. doi:

10.2307/1389136

Cheryan, S., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). When positive stereotypes threaten intellectual

performance: The psychological hazards of "model minority" status. *Psychological*

Science, 11(5), 399-402.

Chun, K.-T. (1980). The Myth of Asian American Success and Its Educational Ramifications.

IRCD Bulletin, 15, n1-2.

Citrin, J., Green, D. P., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (1997). Public Opinion Toward Immigration

Reform: The Role of Economic Motivations. *The Journal of Politics, 59*(3), 858-881. doi:

10.2307/2998640

DeCuir, J.T., and Adrienne D.D. (2004). "" So When It Comes Out, They Aren't That Surprised

That It Is There": Using Critical Race Theory as a Tool of Analysis of Race and Racism

in Education." *Educational Researcher*, 26-31.

Dixon, J. C., & Rosenbaum, M. S. (2004). Nice to Know You? Testing Contact, Cultural, and

Group Threat Theories of Anti-Black and Anti-Hispanic Stereotypes*. *Social Science*

Quarterly, 85(2), 257-280. doi: 10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.08502003.x

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup Competition and Attitudes

Toward Immigrants and Immigration: An Instrumental Model of Group Conflict. *Journal*

of Social Issues, 54(4), 699-724. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01244.x

Fossett, M. A., & Kiecolt, K. J. (1989). The Relative Size of Minority Populations and White

Racial Attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly, 70*(4), 820-835.

Frank, R., Akresh, I. R., & Lu, B. (2010). Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order. *American Sociological Review, 75*(3), 378-401. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122410372216

Galindo, R., & Vigil, J. (2006). Are Anti-Immigrant Statements Racist or Nativist? What Difference Does it Make? *Latino Studies, 4*(4), 419-447. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600224

Giles, M. W., & Evans, A. (1986). The Power Approach to Intergroup Hostility. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 30*(3), 469-486. doi: 10.2307/173964

Giles, M. W., & Evans, A. S. (1985). External Threat, Percieved Threat, and Group Identity *Social Science Quarterly (University of Texas Press), 66*(1), 50-66.

Hainmueller, J., & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science, 17*.

Hartlep, N. D., & Lowinger, R. J. (2014). An Exploratory Study of Undergraduates' Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action Policies for Asian Americans in College. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(3), 370-384. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2014.933694

Haubert, J., & Fussell, E. (2006). Explaining Pro-Immigrant Sentiment in the U.S.: Social Class, Cosmopolitanism, and Perceptions of Immigrants. *International Migration Review, 40*(3), 489-507.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political Psychology, 23*(2), 253-283. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00281

Ho, C., & Jackson, J. W. (2001). Attitude Toward Asian Americans: Theory and Measurement.

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31(8), 1553-1581. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-
1816.2001.tb02742.x

Hochschild, J. L., & Lang, C. (2011). Including Oneself and Including Others: Who Belongs in
My Country? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1),
78-97. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716210388990

Houvouras, S. K. (2001). The effects of demographic variables, ethnic prejudice, and attitudes
toward immigration on opposition to bilingual education. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral
Sciences*, *23*(2), 136-152.

Huddy, L., & Feldman, S. (2009). On assessing the political effects of racial prejudice. *Annual
Review of Political Science, 12*, 423-447.

Hughey, M. W. (2012). Show Me Your Papers! Obama's Birth and the Whiteness of Belonging.
Qualitative Sociology, 35(2), 163-181. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11133-012-9224-6

Hunt, M. O. (2007). African American, Hispanic, and White Beliefs about Black/White
Inequality, 1977-2004. *American Sociological Review, 72*(3), 390-415.

Hunt, M. O., & Wilson, D. C. (2009). Race/Ethnicity, Perceived Discrimination, and Beliefs
about the Meaning of an Obama Presidency. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research
on Race, 6*(1), 173-191. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X09090055

Hurh, W. M., & Kim, K. C. (1989). The "Success" Image of Asian Americans: Its Validity, and
Its Practical and Theoretical Implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 12*(4), 512-538.

Hutchings, V. L., & Valentino, N. A. (2004). The Centrality of Race in American Politics.
Annual Review of Political Science, 7, 383-408. doi:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104859

Jackman, M. R. (1977). Prejudice, tolerance, and attitudes toward ethnic groups. *Social Science Research, 6*(2), 145-169.

Jackman, M. R. (1978). General and Applied Tolerance: Does Education Increase Commitment to Racial Integration? *American Journal of Political Science, 22*(2), 302-324.

Jaret, C. (1999). Troubled by Newcomers: Anti-Immigrant Attitudes and Action during Two Eras of Mass Immigration to the United States. *Journal of American Ethnic History, 18*(3), 9-39.

Kawai, Y. (2005). Stereotyping Asian Americans: The Dialectic of the Model Minority and the Yellow Peril. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 16*(2), 109-130. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10646170590948974

Kim, C. J. (1999). The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics and Society, 27*(1), 105-138.

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*(3), 414-431. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.40.3.414

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1982). Whites' Beliefs about Blacks' Opportunity. *American Sociological Review, 47*(4), 518-532.

Krysan, M. (2000). Prejudice, Politics, and Public Opinion: Understanding the Sources of Racial Policy Attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 135-168.

Kuklinski, J. H., Cobb, M. D., & Gilens, M. (1997). Racial Attitudes and the "New South". *The Journal of Politics, 59*(2), 323-349. doi: 10.2307/2998167

Larsen, K. S., Krumov, K., Van Le, H., Ommundsen, R., & van der Veer, K. (2009). Threat

perception and attitudes toward documented and undocumented immigrants in the United

States: Framing the debate and conflict resolution. *European Journal of Social Sciences,*
7(4), 115-134.

López, I. F. H. (2010). Post-racial racism: Racial stratification and mass incarceration in the age

of Obama. *California Law Review*, 1023-1074.

Lu, L., & Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2010). Reassessing the impact of Hispanic stereotypes on white

Americans' immigration preferences. *Social science quarterly, 91*(5), 1312-1328. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00733.x

Lyman, S. M. (2000). The "Yellow Peril" Mystique: Origins and Vicissitudes of a Racist

Discourse. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society, 13*(4), 683-747.

Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., Cuddy, A. J., & Polifroni, M. (2008). When being a model

minority is good... and bad: Realistic threat explains negativity toward Asian Americans.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34(1), 74-89.

Martin, M. J., McCarthy, B., Conger, R. D., Gibbons, F. X., Simons, R. L., Cutrona, C. E., &

Brody, G. H. (2011). The Enduring Significance of Racism: Discrimination and

Delinquency Among Black American Youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(3),

662-676. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00699.x

McClain, P. D., Carter, N. M., Soto, V. M. D., Lyle, M. L., Grynaviski, J. D., Nunnally, S. C., . .

. Cotton, K. D. (2006). Racial Distancing in a Southern City: Latino Immigrants' Views

of Black Americans. *The Journal of Politics, 68*(3), 571-584. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-

2508.2006.00446.x

McClendon, M. J. (1985). Racism, Rational Choice, and White Opposition to Racial Change: A

Case Study of Busing. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 49*(2), 214.

McDermott, M. (2011). Racial attitudes in city, neighborhood, and situational contexts. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 153-173.

O'Brien, L. T., Garcia, D., Crandall, C. S., & Kordys, J. (2010). White Americans' opposition to affirmative action: Group interest and the harm to beneficiaries objection. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(4), 895-903. doi: 10.1348/014466610X518062

Omi, M., & Takagi, D. Y. (1996). Situating Asian Americans in the Political Discourse on Affirmative Action. *Representations*(55), 155-162. doi: 10.2307/3043744

Okazaki, S. (2009). "Impact of racism on ethnic minority mental health." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4(1), 103-107.

Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual review of sociology, 34*, 181.

Palmer, D. L. (1996). Determinants of Canadian attitudes toward immigration: More than just racism? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 28*(3), 180-192. doi: 10.1037/0008-400X.28.3.180

Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American sociological review*, 586-611.

Quillian, L. (1996). Group Threat and Regional Change in Attitudes Toward African-Americans, 816.

Quillian, L. (2006). New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination

(English). *Nouvelles approches pour comprendre le préjudice et la discrimination raciale (French), 32*, 299-328.

Quillirn, L. (2008). Does Unconscious Racism Exist? (English). *Social psychology quarterly, 71*(1), 6-11.

Rocha, R. R., & Espino, R. (2009). Racial threat, residential segregation, and the policy attitudes of Anglos. *Political Research Quarterly, 62*(2), 415-426.

Ruddell, R., & Urbina, M. G. (2004). Minority threat and punishment: A cross-national analysis. *Justice Quarterly, 21*(4), 903-931.

Sanders, M.G. (1997). "Overcoming obstacles: Academic achievement as a response to racism and discrimination." *Journal of Negro Education*, 83-93.

Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2003). The origins of symbolic racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(2), 259-275. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.259

Sears, D. O., Hensler, C. P., & Speer, L. K. (1979). Whites' Opposition to "Busing": Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics? *The American Political Science Review, 73*(2), 369-384. doi: 10.2307/1954885

Smith, R. M., & King, D. S. (2009). Barack Obama and the future of American racial politics. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 6*(01), 25-35.

Steeh, C., & Schuman, H. (1992). Young White Adults: Did Racial Attitudes Change in the 1980s?*, 340.*

Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(1), 1-19.

Sue, S., & Kitano, H. H. (1973). Stereotypes as a measure of success. *Journal of Social Issues, 29*(2), 83-98.

Suzuki, B. H. (1989). Asian Americans as the: 'Model Minority': Outdoing Whites? Or Media Hype?*, 12.

Taylor, D. G. (1978). Attitudes toward racial integration. *with biographical sketches, 238*, 17-49.

Taylor, M. C. (1998). How White Attitudes Vary with the Racial Composition of Local Populations: Numbers Count. *American Sociological Review, 63*(4), 512-535. doi: 10.2307/2657265

Tuch, S. A., & Hughes, M. (2011). Whites' racial policy attitudes in the twenty-first century: The continuing significance of racial resentment. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 134-152.

Wang, X. (2012). UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS AS PERCEIVED CRIMINAL THREAT: A TEST OF THE MINORITY THREAT PERSPECTIVE*. *Criminology, 50*(3), 743-776.

Wang, X., & Mears, D. (2010). A Multilevel Test of Minority Threat Effects on Sentencing. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*(2), 191-215. doi: 10.1007/s10940-009-9076-8

Welch, S., & Sigelman, L. (2011). The "Obama effect" and White racial attitudes. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 634*(1), 207-220.

Wiecek, W. M. (2011). Structural Racism and the Law in America Today: An Introduction. *Ky. LJ, 100*, 1.

Wilson, G., & Nielsen, A. L. (2011). "Color Coding" and Support for Social Policy Spending: Assessing the Parameters among Whites. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of*

Political and Social Science, 634(1), 174-189.

Wilson, T. C. (2001). AMERICANS' VIEWS ON IMMIGRATION POLICY: TESTING THE

ROLE OF THREATENED GROUP INTERESTS. *Sociological Perspectives, 44*(4), 485-

501. doi: 10.1525/sop.2001.44.4.485

Zarate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived

realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social*

Psychology, 40(1), 99-105.

Zubrinsky, C. L., & Bobo, L. (1996). Prismatic metropolis: Race and residential segregation in

the city of the angels. *Social Science Research, 25*(4), 335-374.