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This research was designed to assess college students' attitudes toward affirmative action policies for non-whites and women. As suggested by a review of the literature, five hypotheses were posited as possible factors related to attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies. In addition, seven demographic variables were examined as control variables.

This study indicated that the majority of respondents were most in favor of equal opportunity and least in favor of discrimination-in-reverse. However, there were significant differences toward affirmative action based on the race and sex of the respondents. Non-whites overwhelmingly supported discrimination-in-reverse and did not favor equal opportunity. The converse was true for white respondents. Men favored discriminating against females whereas women respondents opposed female discrimination. These results were supportive of a theoretical construct of group conflict over values developed herein this dissertation. Additionally, three other factors were partially substantiated as being related to attitudes toward affirmative action. A respondent's awareness that dominant groups had received special treatment was found to be positively related to attitudes toward preferential treatment and discrimina-
tion-in-reverse.
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CHAPTER I

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

Race relations in the United States have undergone a series of unparalleled developments in the last three-and-a-half decades. While not intending to ignore the significant social changes that have occurred between slavery and the beginning of World War II, events since then have contributed to the emergence of a whole new pattern of race relations. This emergent pattern is in the process of coalescing into a new social system of human relations qualitatively different from that which existed before.

Numerous social change factors have been identified by social scientists as contributing significantly to this emerging social system. However, antiracial discrimination public policies have been paramount in initiating nationwide changes for the past thirty-four years. Other factors such as urbanization of blacks, changes in the economy and increased development of black ability and black power are instances of unintended and unpredicted catalysts of social change (Burkey, 1971, pp. 34-36). In contrast, antiracial discrimination public policies are deliberate attempts on the part of government at social intervention. As a result, these policies have continually been shrouded in controversy.

The controversy may stem from a value conflict between two somewhat heterogeneous parties over the constitutionality of such
policies. Moreover, both parties define the outcome of the conflict as having widespread ramifications affecting no less than the social stratification of American society. In recent years this conflict has been increasingly fought in the legal arena and within a few years the issue is likely to be decided by several Supreme Court decisions.

Therefore, an analysis of antiracial discrimination public policies is of great importance because of their pivotal role in influencing the emerging pattern of race relations. In this connection, then, it is the intention of this study to: 1) examine the historical, current and future significance of these policies within the context of American society, 2) analyze the value conflicts involved, and 3) empirically assess attitudes relevant to these policies.

**Historical Background**

**The Paradox of U.S. Race Relations.** The United States recently celebrated its bicentennial. Race relations in America has an even longer history and can be traced back to the original encounters between the indigenous inhabitants (American Indians) and Europeans, the first recorded immigrants. From its beginnings, race relations, in what is now the United States, followed no straight path. While numerous scholars have attempted to categorize American race relations into periods or attempted to identify trends, this effort has been complicated by seemingly incongruous events. On the one hand, this nation enslaved black people,
annihilated indigenous Indian populations, interned citizens of Japanese ancestry during World War II, and maintained a de facto segregated racial system in the North and an even harsher de jure system in the South. On the other hand, this same nation was the first to adopt a constitution recognizing the humanity and rights of all men, enfranchised blacks during Reconstruction and welcomed black men as congressmen and senators during this same period, and experienced and responded to both the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950-1960s and the Black Power Movement of the late 1960s.

It is no wonder, then, that scholars reviewing the same history come to different conclusions. Some scholars, including Dubois, Blauner, Daniels and Kitano, agree that racism is the overriding concept which defines the nature of intergroup relations in the United States - both past and present. Others, such as Nathan Glazer, see a historical trend in the United States towards ever-increasing equality with the outcome being "the first great nation that defines itself not in terms of ethnic origin but in terms of adherence to common rules of citizenship" (Glazer, 1975, p. 3).

Glazer maintains that the mid-1960s were characterized by a national consensus as to how the nation should respond to its racial problems. He asserts that the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Immigration Act of 1965 were three major pieces of legislation that marked this consensus (Glazer, 1975, p. 3). Taken as a whole, these acts represent to Glazer a reaffirmation of the position of no distinction on the grounds of "race, color, religion or national origin" (Glazer, 1975, p. 4).
While a primary goal is to eliminate race as an ascriptive criterion in determining one's life chances and opportunities, there is an ever-increasing emphasis placed on categorizing individuals based on race. Glazer aptly describes this paradox in the following statement.

Paradoxically, we then began an extensive effort to record the race, color, and (some) national origins of just about every student and employee and recipient of government benefits or services in the nation; to require public and private employers to undertake action to benefit given groups; and school systems to assign their children on the basis of their race, color, and (some) national origins. This monumental restructuring of public policy to take into account the race, color, and national origins of individuals, it is argued by Federal administrators and courts, is required to enforce the laws against discrimination on these very grounds (Glazer, 1975, p. 3).

If one examines these current and historical events within a framework of value conflict and controversy, they no longer appear nonsensical. It seems that a lack of consensus itself might be an integral part of American race relations and is the result of a continuing value conflict. Thus, what appears to be a paradox may actually be competing definitions of what ought to be, as well as conflict over what is. If this is the case, then, the existence of incongruous events may actually be the outcome of group conflict.

Value Conflicts as a Pattern of United States Race Relations. The first ten amendments of the U.S. Constitution are known collectively as the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights assures freedom of religion, speech and the press, security against un-
reasonable searches and seizures and excessive bail, jury trials in criminal prosecutions, and to guarantee life, liberty or property through due process of law. In a very real sense the Bill of Rights constitutes the foundation of the ideal values for this society. These values, through a process of interpretation, have become normative rules of conduct and provide the basis for behavior.

According to Gunnar Myrdal in his classic work, *An American Dilemma*, the United States has "the most explicitly expressed system of general ideals in reference to human interrelations" (Myrdal, 1962, p. 3). Almost all Americans have been made aware of these principles as there is a constant and intentional process of indoctrinating the American public. Myrdal observed that:

> The schools teach them, the churches preach them. The courts pronounce their judicial decisions in their terms. They permeate editorials with a pattern of idealism so ingrained that the writers could scarcely free themselves from it even if they tried... Even the stranger, when he has to appear before an American audience, feels this, if he is sensitive at all, and finds himself espousing the national Creed, as this is the only means by which a speaker can obtain human response from the people to whom he talks (Myrdal, 1962, p. 4).

However, while the majority of Americans are aware of the general values of the American creed, they are less sure of the specifics. Upon reviewing a number of studies on American opinions of civil liberties, Stuart Chase (1962, p. 167) concluded that:

> On balance, the polls show Americans favoring the principles of the Bill of Rights, often faltering in the specific application of these
principles, but gradually drawing closer to the ideal—significantly so in freedom of religion, reluctantly so in freedom and equality for the races.

Significantly, even nonwhites have internalized the American Creed in spite of the fact that they have been categorically denied these rights. Ralph Bunche noted that:

Every man in the street, white, black, red or yellow, knows that this is "the land of the free," the "land of opportunity," the "cradle of liberty" the "home of democracy," that the American flag symbolizes the "equality of all men" and guarantees to us all "the protection of life, liberty and property," freedom of speech, freedom of religion and racial tolerance (Chase, 1962, p. 167).

Not unlike other categories of Americans, while nonwhites have internalized the American Creed they are fully aware that the Creed does not apply evenly to them. Instead the American Creed has served to remind them of the discrepancy between what is prescribed versus what is actually practiced.

There is, intentionally or unintentionally, built into the Bill of Rights a potential for a clash in values. This clash centers around the issue of human rights versus individual rights, for both of these kinds of rights are represented in the first Ten Amendments. Myrdal noted that "the main norms of the American Creed as usually pronounced are centered in the belief in equality and in the rights to liberty. In the Declaration of Independence "...equality was given supreme rank and the rights to liberty are posited as derived from equality" (Chase, 1962, p. 9). But liberty is a vague ideal and has often been interpreted to mean in-
individual rights. Myrdal (1962) recognized this interpretation of liberty when he observed "in society liberty for one may mean the suppression of liberty for others." Moreover, "... liberty often provided an opportunity for the stronger to rob the weaker (Myrdal, 1962, p. 167).

Equality has at least three similar definitions which are relevant to this study. Equality has been equated with human rights. In this sense it refers to equal protection under the law. This is the definition of equality that is most pertinent at the level of value conflict between equality and liberty. However, groups in conflict over these values are more likely to interpret equality to mean sameness; that is, the consequences of equality would result in a sameness for everyone. The courts, in contrast, have recently been interpreting equality as "equality of opportunity."

While it can be convincingly argued that this potential conflict in values, an inherent aspect of the Bill of Rights, provides an effective check and balance between these two kinds of rights so that neither may dominate to the detriment of all other rights, it is my premise that this dualism is a basis for the paradox found throughout America's history of race relations. Myrdal's position is similar for he recognizes the inherent conflict between equality and liberty. According to Myrdal, the struggle between equality and liberty has been perpetual in the United States although conflict has been more evident in recent times as the open frontier and free land disappear. Therefore, as opportunity became bounded, open conflict became more frequent (Myrdal, 1962).
Alfred McClung Lee provides a conceptualization of culture that is useful for this discussion. In his classic work he identifies three levels of culture. At the highest or societal level of culture are morals. Morals or values are "traditional generalities concerning right, wrong, duties, rights, and taboos handed down in a society and frequently formalized into sets of commandments, codes of ethics, or canons of ethical principles" (Lee, 1945, p. 493).

The second or group level consists of folkways and mores which define the ways role and behavior "really work". Mores and folkways are group constructs and only take on meaning through group definition. In contrast, the lowest or individual level consists of habits and practices which are counterparts of the two previous levels "plus the results of peculiar individual experiences and somewhat unique or variant inferences" (Lee, 1945, p. 490). Thus individual behavior is ultimately the result of an interplay between these three levels of culture.

Lee's conceptualization is useful because it makes an important distinction between societal level morals or values and group level norms. More importantly, his discussion supports the idea that "morals have no necessary congruity with the mores of a society's constituent groups or with the habits of individuals" (Lee, 1945, p. 494). Therefore, not only is it possible to experience a discrepancy between a given group's mores and its corresponding societal moral principle, but group conflict over the moral propriety of societal values is potential. Given the American
situation where there are actually conflicting societal values or moral principles, group conflict is inherently built into the system.

Lee's theoretical construct was the forerunner of a theoretical perspective on conflict. Rubington and Weinberg posit a theoretical perspective, referred to as value conflict, which explains the dynamics of group conflict based on conflicting interpretations of societal values as well as group mores. According to these two scholars, value conflict is a theoretical perspective that recognizes "that there is morality in an individual's defense of his own interests against those persons, groups, creeds or norms that differ from his own" (Rubington, 1971, p. 81). Thus groups may have a value basis which finds them in conflict with other groups over what should be normative behavior.

Value conflict, as a theoretical perspective, is a heuristic tool for understanding a pattern of interaction that historically and currently characterizes American race relations. According to this perspective, value conflict is a root cause of social problems which emerge out of an objective condition and a subjective definition. While the objective condition such as poverty, crime or racial discrimination is the actual situation which precipitates a definition of a social problem, the causes of the objective condition are attributed to the values of the group (Manis, 1976, p. 11). The subjective definition refers to the awareness by people that a condition is "a threat to certain cherished values" (Fuller & Myers, 1941, p. 320). Thus it is an objective condition and a
corresponding subjective definition which creates a social problem.

Significantly, conflict must therefore be perceived as a legitimate endeavor by one or both clashing groups. This factor helps to explain not only the cyclical nature of racial conflict in the United States but also why there can be very little conflict between some racial groups which exist in a system of extreme racial inequality. Banton describes the traditional caste system in India as being one that moulded all participants to serve its values (Banton, 1967, p. 87). The caste system is a hierarchy based on the principle of inequality. Therefore, value conflict over "one's place" is not perceived to be legitimate. In contrast, Myrdal and others conceptualize American culture as based principally on a belief in equality (Myrdal, 1962, p. 4). Such a belief, then, legitimizes conflict for those who perceive a discrepancy between the value of equality and actual conditions.

In the United States racial conflict is cyclical as social problems related to race arise, proceed through their natural history and then subside. Fuller and Myers' (1941) conceptualized every social problem as having a natural history which consists of three stages: awareness, policy determination and reform. In the area of race relations it seems overly optimistic to think in terms of "reform" as a natural outcome of social problems. Rather, it seems that the outcome of every social problem in U.S. race relations has produced a change which has often been to the advantage of one group and to the detriment of the other. For example, the
period of Reconstruction was defined as a social problem by many southern whites. The eventual outcome of the conflict between southern whites on one side and freed slaves and their supporters on the other was more a reactionary change than a reform. What occurred was the establishment of a new quasi-slavery system for black people in the South as most of the rights granted to blacks after the Civil War were stripped away. What emerged toward the end of the 19th century was a new quasi-slavery system called Jim Crowism.

It is difficult to identify a single period where value conflict is not evident in race relations in the United States. Slavery is a notable period because the issue over the values of human rights versus individual rights played such an overtly important role. During slavery, the defined conflict was between abolitionists and those who were pro-slavery. The explosive issue of slavery divided the North and South. Conflict over the values of human rights versus individual rights surfaced in many forms. For example, many northern states passed "personal liberty" laws deliberately intended to hamper the recovery of runaway slaves. Such recourse was deemed necessary to counteract the provision in the Compromise of 1850 which required the return of fugitive slaves.

There are countless events which occurred during slavery which exemplified the struggle between groups over the dualistic values of individual rights versus human rights. The Dred Scott Case is illustrative of this situation. Dred Scott was a slave who had been taken by his master from Missouri to the free state of Illinois,
then to the Wisconsin territory and several years later back to the State of Missouri. Anti-slavery supporters of Dred Scott hoped to prove that his sojourn in free Illinois and in a territory where slavery was made illegal by the Missouri Compromise has made Scott a free man. Dred Scott lost his suit in the Missouri State Supreme Court but it was ultimately decided in the Federal Supreme Court where Scott again lost his case.

The Dred Scott Case is an ideal example of value conflict. Abolitionists hoped to redefine the boundaries of slavery in the direction towards greater human rights. What emerged was a resounding victory for the pro-slavery group. Chief Justice Taney drew from the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment ("No person shall be...deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law") to determine that the prohibition against taking slave property into the territory was a violation of this amendment (Hofstader, Miller, & Aaron, 1961, p. 348). As a further consequence, Congress had no right under the Constitution to exclude slavery from the territories. This decision convinced many that the Court had ruled in favor of "property rights" over "human rights".

The outcome of the Dred Scott Decision established new normative boundaries between the abolitionists and the pro-slavery group. An equilibrium, albeit temporarily, existed and grounds for a new battle were set in motion. A similar pattern of value conflict occurred again and again throughout the history of race relations in the United States. The outcome of each major conflict was generally
the establishment of a new social order, with each producing a redefinition of relationships between the races.

In summary, value conflict is endemic to American race relations. The seeds were planted by our founding fathers in the Bill of Rights which contains inherently conflicting values. Consequently, a pattern of conflict was firmly established by the drastic discrepancy among racial groups with regards to systemic means of fulfilling these values. This created a situation of value conflict as each group appealed to different fundamental values to either support or condemn the unequal relations between racial groups. Racial conflict will continue to be cyclical as social problems emerge, develop and result in social change. As long as there is an appreciable gap between racial groups with regards to their ability to fulfill societal values, value conflict will probably continue to be the characteristic pattern of American race relations.

Public Policies Against Racial Discrimination

The 1970s will probably be recorded as the period of antidiscrimination public policies in U.S. race relations. What delineates this period from preceding periods is the primary thrust on the part of American institutions and nonwhite Americans for the inclusion of nonwhites into these institutions and ultimately into the American mainstream of life. This is a process which has been dictated and planned through public policies. In no other period of American history has public policy played such a prominent nationwide role to influence the course of race relations in this
country. For the first time there is a national plan which has to a large extent superseded the prerogatives of states in this area.

Although the period of antidiscrimination public policies marks a new era for U.S. race relations, this period continues to be influenced by previously established patterns of race relations. Value conflict continues to occupy a prominent position. In fact, no period since slavery has placed such a preeminence on American ideals in an attempt to negotiate the structure and relations of America's racial groups. Before embarking on a discussion of the role of American values and antidiscrimination public policies, these policies will first be conceptually defined and secondly, their current prominence in American race relations will be described.

**Conceptual Definitions of Public Policies Against Racial Discrimination.** Burkey (1971) has identified three general kinds of public policies directly designed to reduce and/or eliminate racial discrimination and racial inequality. These policies have been termed "equal opportunity," "preferential treatment" or "affirmative action," and "discrimination-in-reverse." Equal opportunity "is concerned with guaranteeing the Civil Rights of minority groups by eliminating the restrictions that have historically been placed as barriers to the freedom of action of these groups" (Burkey, 1971, p. 38). This type of policy is based on the assumption that removal of illegitimate discrimination will eventually result in equality of races. Inherent in this idea is the supposition that once bar-
riers based on ascribed racial characteristics are eliminated, equality will be the natural outcome of competition based on achievement.

In contrast, preferential treatment is intended to compensate a minority group for past or present injustices by including group affiliation as one of the relevant criterion given positive weight in determining the allocation of services, opportunities and resources. Proponents of this type of policy argue that simply eliminating discriminatory barriers and restrictions is insufficient if greater equality of the races is desired (Burkey, 1971).

The third type of policy, discrimination-in-reverse, places primacy on group affiliation to the exclusion or subordination of technically relevant criteria for determining the allocation of services, opportunities and resources. Whereas discrimination once victimized minority groups, discrimination-in-reverse would give individuals of this category preference irrespective of qualification. It is worth noting that this type of policy has really never been as aspect of American governmental policy (Burkey, 1971).

Whereas group affiliation is not a relevant criterion of equal opportunity policies, it is of significance for both policies of preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse. Significantly, the two latter types of policies differ in the respective weight assigned to the values of indemnification and equality (Gilbert & Easton, 1970, p. 40). While both preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse acknowledge the intent of indemnification,
Quotas and special training are two important subtypes of anti-discrimination public policies which are only meaningful for preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse. Quota systems stipulate that a certain percentage or slots (i.e., for jobs, university admission, etc.) be available only to members of a designated group. As such, quota systems are ascriptive although they may contain an element of achievement.

Gilbert and Easton (1970, p. 40) describe two basic types of "benign" quotas, absolute and conditional.

An absolute quota supports the value of equity restoration; it stipulates, for example, that X number of jobs be awarded to members of a specified minority. A conditional quota supports two values, equity restoration and maintenance of standards. The stipulation here is that X number of jobs be awarded to minority applicants deemed qualified.

From their discussion, it would appear that quotas may be either preferential treatment or discrimination-in-reverse depending on whether the quota system requires that the preferred group meet the qualification requirements of that institution. If qualifications are required, the quota system contains both an achievement and ascriptive component and is a type of preferential treatment policy. If the quota system foregoes qualifications, it is a discrimination-in-reverse type of policy and the intent is to accept a fixed number of applicants from a specified group regardless of qualifications vis-à-vis other applicants who are not members of this group.

The distinction between these two types of quotas is important. The conditional quota maintains the requirement of standards whereas...
the absolute does not. Therefore, reaction to the latter is likely to be far more negative. For example, in 1969, Yale Law School admitted thirty-eight black students who did not meet the regular standards to the fall class. This admittance was to be followed by a new policy of the law school to admit blacks to ten percent of each entering class without regard to the regular qualification requirements (Fleming & Pollak, 1969, p. 45). Besides being considered a threat to the standards of this prestigious law school, the absolute quota system utilized by Yale was accused by Macklin Fleming, Justice of the Court of Appeal, State of California at Los Angeles, of perpetuating "the very ideas and prejudices it is designed to combat." Fleming (1969, p. 45) suggested that: "If in a given class the great majority of the black students are at the bottom of the class, this factor is bound to instill, unconsciously at least, some sense of intellectual inferiority among the black students."

On the other side of the argument, many feel that since admissions tests and academic records have been shown as not always the best indicator of achievement in medical and legal education and practice, such prejudgements of the performance of black students is at best a weak argument. One might also question the weight of unconscious intellectual inferiority as compared with a nearly total lack of opportunity blacks experience without affirmative action programs.

The preferential treatment form of quota system escapes the previous specific criticisms but shares a broader one. Both forms of quotas are accused by Fleming of logically leading to the demand
for quotas by majority groups. If such a broad quota policy were ever instituted, it would discriminate against those minority groups which have achieved disproportionate representation in a particular field. Oriental over-representation in certain engineering and technical schools is cited by Fleming as an example of a minority group which might ultimately be hurt by such a policy. The major thrust of this criticism is that "discrimination in favor of X is automatic discrimination against Y" (Fleming & Pollak, 1969, p. 45).

The "quota issue," as it is often called, has a prior history which muddles the current issue. In the 1930s and 1940s quotas were often maintained by institutions to keep out Jews and other minorities. In higher education this was especially true for most of the prestigious eastern establishment schools. But, as Robert Maynard effectively argues, these are the 1970s not the 1930s. Quotas of the 1970s "are not presumed to be limitations on the number of minorities who may be admitted." They are goals... "modest and not always met" (Maynard, 1977, p. 41). Moreover, those who supported quotas in the 1930s and 1940s are most likely to be against quotas today which is a reasonable indicator that these two issues are not equitable.

Similarly, special training may be either a type of preferential treatment policy or a discrimination-in-reverse policy depending on whether or not qualifications are an essential requirement. Special training is a form of preferential treatment to the extent that these practices require applicants to meet certain standards.
before being admitted or hired. In the cases where unqualified applicants are hired because of their minority status and then trained, these cases are more appropriately examples of discrimination-in-reverse. For example, when Pitney-Bowes, a Stanford, Connecticut manufacturer of postage and mailing equipment, met some of its employment needs "by hiring inexperienced Negroes and giving them special on-the-job training" (Hentoff, 1964, p. 110) this company was practicing discrimination-in-reverse.

Attempts to implement the antidiscrimination public policies described in this section has resulted in an escalation of value conflict. While this value conflict is evident in many sectors of American life, it is most notable in the legal system. As in the past, the courts are being called upon to judge the legality of practices which directly influence the relations of nonwhites and whites.

The Legality of Antidiscrimination Public Policies: A Challenge in the Courts. Recently the appropriateness of public policies to overcome discrimination has been challenged by various individuals and the legal system has been the arbitrator of these clashes. Probably the most important of these cases to date are the Defunis vs. Odegaard case, which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1974, and the Bakke vs. The University of California case, which was decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1978.

In the case of DeFunis vs. Odegaard, Marco DeFunis, a white student of Jewish ancestry, filed suit against Washington Univer-
sity President Charles Odegaard and others on the grounds that the school violated his rights under the 14th Amendment for equal protection of the laws (Blackstone, 1975, p. 225). DeFunis established that 36 minority students with lower college grades and Law School Admission Test scores had been admitted while his application was denied. In 1971, a Seattle trial court ruled in favor of DeFunis and ordered the school to enroll him. The university complied and admitted DeFunis but appealed the case to the State Supreme Court which upheld the school.

Essentially, the DeFunis Case evoked two overlapping issues: the legitimacy of quota systems and the legitimacy of objective standards. At times the two issues would seem to blend as one, but conceptually they are distinct. The issue concerning quotas rests on the questioned legitimacy of maintaining a given number of slots for nonwhite students. According to a brief in the DeFunis case, minority applicants at the University of Washington Law School and at virtually all accredited law schools are placed in a separate pool and judged only against each other for admission" (Peterson, 1974). "What the university did was admit two classes, not one," DeFunis's lawyer told the U.S. Supreme Court. Furthermore, DeFunis's attorneys raised the question of the legitimacy of quotas. Writing for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, professors Kurland and Bickel wrote a brief supporting DeFunis which stated:

The numerous clauses, the racial quota that is involved in this case is of particular concern to the Jewish minority in this country because of the long history of discrimination against Jews by the use of quotas . . . After only 30
or 40 years of open admissions, the universities which, for centuries, set the style in excluding or restricting Jewish students may again be able to do so (Newsweek, March, 1974, p. 62).

Many universities, especially at the graduate level, have some sort of quota system to insure that a certain proportion of those admitted are nonwhite. There is often harsh criticism of quotas because they categorically exclude certain groups from consideration and thus lessen one's opportunities for being selected in often extremely competitive professions such as law and medicine. At UCLA Law School when 73 out of 350 slots were set aside for nonwhite applicants, this left 278 "open" slots. And law school applications often run at more than 10 students for every available place (Peterson, 1974).

The second issue questions the legitimacy of placing prime importance on objective standards. In the DeFunis case Washington University argued that DeFunis was a marginal candidate. The University maintained that grades and tests were not the only criteria for admissions and, in fact, 29 whites with higher scores than DeFunis were rejected and 38 whites with lower test scores were admitted (Newsweek, March 11, 1974, p. 62). The heart of this issue is thought by many to be the universal practice of institutions of higher learning either weighing applications from minority students separately from those of the white majority, or at least considering minority status as a relevant criterion for admission. Those favoring this practice often argue that almost no minority students would be accepted at the more sought after schools if they were
held to the same standards as whites (Peterson, 1974). Minority students consistently score significantly lower on the whole range of standardized tests used by colleges and professional schools as a basis for admission.

Proponents point out that grades and test scores have never been the only criteria used to determine an applicant's qualifications for admission (Peterson, 1974). State schools give preference to state residents, private schools to a diversity of students, and sports-dominated colleges and universities to athletes. Some universities, especially in professions such as medicine and law, give preference to alumni. Moreover, most universities take into consideration recommendations, accomplishments, and the type of schools the applicant has attended.

Opponents, however, argue the necessity of maintaining established objective standards. The reasoning is often made that "If you don't have the skills for the examinations you don't have the skills for your profession" (Peterson, 1974). As proof of this assertion, opponents of preferential policies often cite variant bar exam scores for white and black law school graduates. Nationally, approximately 75 percent of all white graduates eventually pass the bar as opposed to less than half that figure for blacks (Newsweek, May 6, 1974, p. 50).

Essentially, what is at issue is a value conflict over the principles of individual right versus societal or social needs. In this society there is a strong value placed on individual merit. It is believed by many that status is and should be determined
principally on the basis of one's achievements and not on attributes that one has not earned. In the DeFunis case, opponents of preferential treatment are appealing to this American value of individual merit as grounds that DeFunis was treated unjustly. Whereas proponents of preferential treatment have attempted to show that, in actuality, achievement is not the sole criterion utilized in selection and that, in fact, a wholistic approach is used which takes into consideration both individual merit and the needs of society. Moreover, some theorists argue that individual merit should not be the basis for rewarding people differentially. The value conflict over individual merit versus social needs is a significant one and will be discussed more thoroughly in a later section of this chapter.

In the end, the U.S. Supreme Court decided the DeFunis case was "moot" because the events had run their course in such a way that there was nothing to decide. DeFunis had been admitted to law school and was graduating that very year. DeFunis had filed suit on the grounds that Washington University violated his rights under the 14th Amendment; since he was subsequently admitted, these grounds were no longer relevant.

In a similar but less publicized case, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal of a decision by a U.S. circuit court in the case of Associated General Contractors of Massachusetts vs. Altshuler. In this case the circuit court had held that contractors working on public projects must hire at least 20 percent minority workers. In effect, the circuit court in this case had sanctioned
the use of a quota for the benefit of racial minorities.

The U.S. Supreme Court's actions in both of the cases discussed above had not resolved the issue over the legality of anti-discrimination public policies. Instead, the outcome of the Supreme Court's decisions led to continued ambiguity as to the correct or just procedure in hiring practices or university admission, and concomitant government intervention in these two areas. An article in *Newsweek* (May 6, 1974, p. 50) astutely predicted:

> Another test on the issue is certain to come in the near future, but the Supreme Court has now given the institutions perhaps a year or so to refine their procedures. ("A Decision Not to Decide.")

A more recent and highly publicized test to date over the issue of anti-discrimination public policies is the Bakke case. In 1976 Allen Bakke, a 34 year old engineer of Jewish ancestry, filled suit against the University of California charging the university with reverse discrimination after he was twice denied admission to the medical school at Davis in 1973 and 1974. Bakke contended that his rejection was due to the admission of less qualified minority students (Maynard, 1977). It was the practice of the Davis Medical School to set aside 16 out of 100 admission spots each year for "disadvantaged students." Bakke's case rested on the strength of his academic record, largely based on the fact that he scored higher than many of the minority students on the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT). The California Supreme Court agreed with Bakke and ordered him to be admitted to the Medical School at Davis for
Fall, 1977. This decision was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court by the University of California in spite of the attempts made by many civil rights groups to dissuade the university from appealing (Newsweek, March 7, 1977, p. 66). These groups feared that the Bakke case was a particularly weak test for affirmative action and they would have preferred to confine the decision of reverse discrimination to California rather than have a Supreme Court decision jeopardize anti-discrimination public policies in all 50 states.

The University of California pursued the case, and on June 28, 1978, the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision. In years to come legal analysts will probably come to some kind of consensus as to the meaning and legal ramifications of this monumental decision, but for the present there is a great deal of confusion. What is obvious are the two rulings. First, by a vote of 5 to 4 the court held that quotas are unacceptable. Second, also by a vote of 5 to 4 the court determined that race may be considered as one factor in a university's admissions policy (Newsweek, July 10, 1978, p. 19).

Justice Lewis Powell held the pivotal position. In the first ruling he agreed with Justice's Stevens, Burger, Stewart and Renquist that the Davis Medical School's admissions program violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the second ruling he sided with Justice's Brennen, White, Marshall and Blackmun that some affirmative action programs intended to benefit applicants may properly be used in decisions on admitting students. Justice Powell wrote:
The experience of other university admission programs, which take race into account in achieving the educational diversity valued by the First Amendment, demonstrates that the assignment of a fixed number of places to a minority group is not a necessary means toward that end (San Francisco Examiner, June 28, 1978, p. 2).

The fatal flaw is in the program's "disregard of individual rights as guaranteed by the 14th Amendment" (San Francisco Examiner, 1978, p. 2).

Thus, according to Justice Brennan:

Government may take race into account when it acts not to demean or insult any racial group, but to remedy disadvantages cast on minorities by past racial prejudice, at least when appropriate findings have been made by judicial, legislative or administrative bodies with competence to act in this area (San Francisco Examiner, 1978, p. 2).

As an example of a workable affirmative action program, Justice Powell cited Harvard University's program which considered not only an applicant's ethnic and racial diversity but also geographic diversity and academic talents. Powell wrote:

In such an admissions program, race or ethnic background may be deemed a 'plus' in a particular applicant's file, yet it does not insulate the individual from comparison with all other candidates for the available seats (San Francisco Examiner, 1978, p. 2).

What is notable about the Harvard plan is that in 1977, 18.8 percent of its freshman class were minority students with eight percent of the class being black (Newsweek, July 10, 1978, p. 32).

The Supreme Court decision on the Bakke case is considered to be a "Solomonic" compromise rather than a definitive rule (San Francisco Examiner, 1978, p. 2); as a result, there is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding its possible interpretations. For example,
most of the impact of the Bakke case will depend on how both the
government and the public and private sector choose to deal with it.
Both proponents and antagonists of anti-discrimination public poli-
cies heralded the Bakke decision as a victory for their side.

Moreover, the Bakke case dealt only with school admissions.
How this decision transfers in relevance for the countless affirma-
tive action programs now in effect in government and private indus-
try is unclear. In fact, there are a number of other cases before
the U.S. Supreme Court involving affirmative action programs,
including the affirmative action plan imposed by a lower court on
the Los Angeles County Fire Department which requires that one black
and one Mexican American be hired for every three whites until the
percentage of minorities in the department matches the county's
population which is currently forty percent. Opponents of this plan
maintain that it constitutes the same kind of "reverse discrimina-
tion" against whites as the Davis Medical School's admission plan

Another significant affirmative action plan before the U.S.
Supreme Court is the one adopted voluntarily by the Kaiser Aluminum
and Chemical Corporation without proof of previous discrimination.
In this case Kaiser has agreed to a demand by the United Steel-
workers to set up an affirmative action program designed to place
more minorities in skilled jobs. Under the agreement one minority
would be hired for each white worker until the percentage of minori-
ties in skilled jobs roughly matched the minority population of
What appears to be at conflict in this case is the affirmative action practice required by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs and Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which bans employment discrimination based on race.

Two other important cases before the U.S. Supreme Court are the Kreps vs. Associated General Contractors of California which questions whether Congress acted constitutionally when it required that 10 percent of Federal money must be paid to subcontracting companies owned or controlled by minorities in the Public Works Act of 1977 and Communications Workers of America which questions the legality of A.T. and T.'s plan for goals and timetables for preferential hiring, promotions and transfers of minority workers. The A.T. and T. plan was the outcome of serious negotiations between A.T. and T., the Justice Department, the Labor Department, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Like the Bakke case, this case evokes the charge of reverse discrimination on the grounds that it violates the 14th Amendment. If the U.S. Supreme Court agrees to hear this case, the outcome could have far reaching consequences for affirmative action plans in the business sector.

All of the above cases, and others in the lower courts, could possibly clarify or extend the landmark ruling of the Bakke decision. Whatever the immediate outcome of the Bakke Decision, in the long run there is little doubt that this decision and others that follow will substantially affect the status of anti-discrimination public policies. Somewhat pessimistically, Robert Maynard (1977) argues that Bakke raises the same question raised by Brown in 1954.
The bottom line of Bakke's position is that Brown was enough: Once the courts declared black people officially equal, the government had to resort to a color-blind posture and permit citizens of equal rank to work out their relationships; (Maynard, 1977, p. 42).

If Maynard is correct, "the notion that minorities as a class deserve special relief because of their condition may be on the brink of oblivion as a concept" (Maynard, 1977, p. 42).

Supporters and Opponents of Anti-discrimination Public Policies. Group conflict over values has played a significant role in creating the controversy surrounding anti-discrimination public policies. Since most of the conflict has occurred in the legal arena, a recounting of the major groups involved in the DeFunis and Bakke cases should be illuminating.

In the DeFunis case, supporters included the Anti-Defamation League whose constituency are primarily Jewish, The Joint Civic Action Committee of Italian-American, The Advocate Society (a Polish American lawyer's association), the AFL-CIO, The National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (Newsweek, March 11, 1974, p. 62).

DeFunis' support came from business owners and ethnic interest groups. It can be argued that these groups stand to lose the most from racial affirmative action programs. Business is probably one of the strongest bastions of unequal representation of racial minorities and women. As Martin Luther King, Jr. (1967, p. 7) concluded with rather timeless clarity:
Of employed Negroes, 75% hold menial jobs. Depressed living standards for Negroes... are a structural part of the economic system in the U.S. Certain industries and enterprises are based on a supply of low-paid, under-skilled and immobile non-white labor...(and) would suffer economic trauma, if not disaster, with a rise in wage scales.

Organized trade and industrial unions use a variety of means to exclude racial minorities from their unions and thus from various occupations. In 1963 the Pipefitters Union Local 638 of New York admitted that of its 4000 plus members none were black or Puerto Rican; moreover, since their apprentice training program takes five years any black or Puerto Rican accepted by the local would not be a Bonafide apprentice until 1972 (Hentoff, 1964, p. 105). Unfortunately, the preceding example is not unusual. Non-whites have been excluded from apprenticeship in the Plumbers Union, the Sheetmetal Workers Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Lather and Plasterers Union, the Boilermakers, the Structural Iron Workers Union and other important crafts unions operating in the construction industry (Hill, 1969, pp. 83-84). As Marshall (1972) has indicated, formal exclusion in union racial practices has been replaced by informal exclusion. The net effect is continued discrimination.

The current tight job market and the limited enrollment capabilities of most graduate schools both provide for a potentially threatening situation for whites who may be denied employment or admission to school in favor of a racial minorities or women. The DeFunis case seems to be a consequence of this perceived threat.
Among his ethnic supporters, Jews, probably more than Italians, Poles, or any other American ethnic group, stand to lose from affirmative action programs such as the one practiced by the University of Washington Law School, which, in effect, places whites and non-whites into two separate pools for consideration. While Jews in the United States comprise approximately three percent of the population, the proportion of Jewish Americans in graduate and professional schools is triple that for students in the general population (Newsweek, March, 1971). Significantly, syndicated columnist William Raspberry points out that historically Jews and blacks had been civil rights allies. According to Raspberry, the rift between the two groups intensified when the fight for equal rights moved from the hiring hall and government offices to the halls of academe (Kalamazoo Gazette, March 22, 1974, p. 4). "...when 'affirmative action' went to college, it suddenly dawned on Jews that it is not possible to cure one group's underrepresentation without affecting another's overrepresentation. And that, we are told, is 'reverse discrimination'".

Arguing on the other side of the DeFunis case were the University of Washington and its supporters: Archibald Cox; Louis Pollak, Erwin Griswold, former deans of Yale and Harvard respectively; the American Bar Association; the national associations of both law schools and medical schools and a host of other educational institutions (Newsweek, March 11, 1974, p. 62).

In the Bakke case similar lines were drawn. Over twenty friend of the court briefs were filed on behalf of Bakke. These include
briefs filed by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, American Jewish Commission, the Helenic Bas Association, the Italian American Foundation, Polish American Affairs Council, Ukranian Congress, Young Americans for Freedom, the Subcontractors Association of the U.S., the Chamber of Congress of the UNS, and the American Federation of Teachers.

Filing friend of the court briefs on behalf of U.C. Davis were numerous minority and civil rights organizations, state government agencies and officials, and public and private universities. The minority or civil rights organizations filing briefs include the ACLU, American Bar Association, N.A.A.C.P., Asian American Bar Association, Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Columbia, Harvard, Stanford and Pennsylvania University were the major universities filing on behalf of Davis; while the state entities or officials include the State Health Department and its director Jerome Lackner; Marie Obledo, secretary of Health and Welfare; the California Fair Employment Practices Commission; and Marion Woods, director of Benefit Payments (San Francisco Examiner, August 12, 1977, p. 6).

The preceding enumeration of supporters and opponents of anti-discrimination public policies helps to clarify several aspects of this issue. First, neither the opponents nor supporters constitutes a homogeneous grouping. Rather, each side consists of diverse groups who often share little in common other than their position on the issue of anti-discrimination public policies. Second, an overriding factor in determining support or opposition to these policies
is whether or not the group has a vested interest. Predictably, those groups whose members are likely to gain from these policies are supporters and those who would stand to lose would be opponents. Third, the major institutional organizations involved in the conflict (i.e. government agencies, universities) have overwhelmingly been supporters of anti-discrimination public policies. These institutions are often responsible for insuring that these policies are implemented.

American Values and Anti-discrimination Public Policies. Although the legal system has been the primary arena where conflict over anti-discrimination public policies has been fought, a review of the scholarly literature in the area indicates overwhelmingly that the substantive issue pertains to values. In fact, there is a dearth of empirical research published in journals on these policies. Many of the articles on affirmative action or other types of anti-discrimination public policies argue the pros and cons of these policies. There is little evidence of the impartial academician in these works, rather there is a clear moral position being expressed. Finding that the academic community approaches anti-discrimination public policies from a value perspective is an indicator of how controversial these policies are defined in respect to American ideals.

This section will be devoted to a succinct analysis of the major value arguments over anti-discrimination public policies. Two important issues concerning anti-discrimination public policies
emerge from the literature. One issue pertains to justice and is often termed the "reverse discrimination argument," and the second issue centers on social utility or needs.

The first issue concerning anti-discrimination public policies is referred to by Nickel (1972) as the "reverse discrimination argument." According to Nickel (1972, pp. 113-114):

This argument claims that to extend special considerations to a formerly oppressed group will be to persist in the mistake of treating a morally irrelevant characteristic as if it were relevant. For if we take a morally irrelevant characteristic (namely the characteristic which was the basis for the original discrimination) and use it as the basis for granting special considerations or reparations, we will be treating the morally irrelevant as if it were relevant and still engaging in discrimination, albeit reverse discrimination.

Nickel objects to this argument on the grounds that it assumes that the characteristic which was once the basis for the original discrimination is the same as the one which is used for now extending extra considerations. Nickel's reasoning is thus:

For if compensation in the form of extra opportunities is extended to a black man on the basis of past discrimination against blacks, the basis for this compensation is not that he is a black man, but that he was previously subject to unfair treatment because he was black. The former characteristic was and is morally irrelevant, but the latter characteristic is very relevant if it is assumed that it is desirable or obligatory to make compensation for past injustices (Nickel; 1972, p. 114).

Since the reverse discrimination argument has a false premise, Nickel maintains that "it does not succeed in showing that to avoid reverse discrimination we must extend no special considerations
cowen (1972) ostensibly accepts nickel's reasoning that being black is not the basis for compensation, rather previous discrimination is. but, by adding an additional dimension, cowen manages to turn nickel's argument upside down in the sense that he would limit compensation to individuals who have suffered injustice. thus:

the fallacy arises when rather than individuals it is the group which is intended, and individuals are regarded merely as members of that group rather than in their individuality.... except to the extent he or she as an individual has unjustly suffered or will unjustly suffer from this history which we as individuals have unjustly profited or will unjustly profit there can be no such obligation (cowen, 1972, p. 11).

by adding the dimension of individual claims as opposed to group claims, cowen logically concludes that blacks and other groups which have been treated unjustly should now as a group be treated like everyone else.

goldman (1975, pp. 289-306) follows a line of reasoning which is similar to cowen. first he begins by arguing that blacks do not constitute a formal group but rather a social category who share some things in common. since, according to goldman this is the case, compensation can only be owed to the injured individuals and not to the category as a whole. goldman then extends this argument to include who has a duty to compensate. "ideally, only those individuals (or institutions) who were responsible for the discrimination should bear the burden of compensation" (goldman, 1975, p. 294). in summary: "just as our notions regarding collective desert or rights do not seem to apply here...neither do our notions of collective..."
responsibility or guilt apply" (Goldman, 1975, p. 294).

The second issue of social utility is advocated by those who reject the concept of social justice. Nagel redefines the argument over anti-discrimination public policies by denying the relevancy of social justice. Like Cowen and Goldman, he agrees that compensatory measures can only be defended on grounds of justice to the extent that they compensate for specific disadvantages which have been unjustly caused by factors distinct from the meritocratic system. But, Nagel (1973) contends that there is no basis for rewarding individuals differentially which is the cornerstone of our meritocratic system. He argues that while equal treatment demands that people receive equal opportunities if they are equally qualified by talent or education to utilize those opportunities, there is no justice in rewarding people differentially for what certain characteristics enable them to do. Nagel asserts that:

Whatever explains the small number of women or blacks in the professions, it has the result that they have less of the financial and social benefits that accrue to members of the professions, and what accounts for those differences cannot justify them (Nagel, 1973, p. 357).

Thus ...

...the factors relevant to the distribution of intellectual opportunity are irrelevant to the distribution of those material benefits that go with it. This weakens the claim of someone who argues that by virtue of those qualities that make him likely to succeed in a certain position, he deserves to be selected for that position in preference to someone whose qualifications make it likely that he will succeed less well. He cannot claim that justice requires the allocation of positions on the basis of ability, because the result of such allocation, in the present...
system, is serious injustice of a different kind (Nagel, 1973, p. 359).

From this perspective, then, social injustice is inherent in the meritocratic system. Therefore, compensatory discrimination need not be seriously unjust. Moreover, compensatory discrimination may be warranted by considerations of social utility. While Nagel does not adequately expound on the notion of social utility other than to provide an example of a community need for more black doctors, other writers have elaborated on this notion.

Karst and Harowitz (1974) reject the social justice issue and support affirmative action on the grounds of social needs. Arguing legalistically, these two scholars maintain that the phrase "individual merit" is misleading in two dimensions.

First, it suggests that the claim to equality is an individual claim and not a claim made as a member of a group. Second, it suggests that "merit" is something quite different from the judicial perception of community needs (Karst & Harowitz, 1974, p. 956).

In the first place, Karst and Harowitz maintain that "Every lawsuit based on a claim for equal protection is, in spirit, a class action" (Karst & Harowitz, 1974, p. 959). Any claim based on a rule of law is a demand to be treated in the same manner as all other persons similarly treated. Therefore a claim to be treated on the basis of one's "individual attributes" is judicially illogical.

Secondly, the term "merit is defined in a number of ways to serve a number of perceived social needs" (Karst & Harowitz, 1974, p. 956). Therefore...
The principle that careers should be open to talents is not primarily based on the justice of rewarding the individual. It is above all, a principle based on a perception of social needs. It is expected that such a competitive principle will bring the most talented individuals to positions of power and responsibility, and that the competitors will produce social goods in the process of demonstrating that they merit power and responsibility (Karst & Harowitz, 1974, p. 962).

Likewise, in examining merit in the racial context the focus should also be on fulfilling social needs rather than on rewarding individuals. This purpose can be illustrated in the statement made by the U.S. Court of Appeals, "The purpose of racial integration is to benefit the community as a whole, not just certain of its members (Karst & Harowitz, 1974, p. 962).

This line of argument leads Karst and Harowitz to the conclusion that the overriding purpose of affirmative action is not to remedy yesterday's discrimination, but to serve today's social needs. Herein they deny the validity of justice as the focal issue regarding anti-discrimination public policies.

It might be argued that the two issues of "reverse discrimination" and "social utility" are variations of the original conflict between the values of equality and individual rights. The issue of "reverse discrimination" often centers on the problem of social justice. While recognizing that individuals have previously suffered injustices because of personal characteristics such as race or sex, the key argument is that to provide favoritism to these groups now would be unjust to everyone else; hence, the term "reverse discrimination." Implicit within this position is the value of
individual rights: if blacks or women as a group are the recipients of preferential treatment, then "I" am discriminated against. Both DeFunis and Bakke represent this position since both cases evoked the 14th Amendment's guarantee of individual rights.

The issue of "social utility or needs" appeals to the value of equality. Since equality is a major American principle, then the absence of equality for certain groups reflects a social or community need. According to this perspective, anti-discrimination public policies are necessary in order to equalize the social system and thus respond to the broad community needs of U.S. society.

If the current issues over anti-discrimination public policies are indeed variations of an inherent conflict between equality and individual rights, then, this finding supports the perspective that value conflict is a persistent pattern of U.S. race relations. Earlier in this chapter the origins of the inherent conflict between these two values was described and the role this conflict played in American race relations was examined. Thus value conflict provides a meaningful framework for analyzing the controversy over anti-discrimination public policies. This framework not only provides an historical referent but also a theoretical model useful for explaining the current controversy and predicting future outcomes.

Variations in Attitudes Toward the Different Types of Affirmative Action Policies. Empirical research indicates that less discriminatory preferential treatment policies are more acceptable to the public than are policies which advocate discrimination-in-
In 1967, a survey of approximately 6,000 respondents was conducted in six cities (San Francisco, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Dayton and Akron) to ascertain attitudes to the question: "In view of the fact that until recently many jobs were not open to Negroes, how many of these things, if any, would you favor?" (Gilbert & Easton, 1970, p. 40). The results are as follows:

Table 1
Survey Sample # 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Non-White (N=3023)</th>
<th>White (N=3027)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Seeing to it that Negroes and whites are given equal job opportunities.</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) On-the-job training by industry so Negroes not fully qualified can be hired</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Special government training programs for Negroes</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Giving Negroes a chance ahead of whites in promotion if they have the necessary ability</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Giving Negroes a chance ahead of whites in hiring for jobs they have not had in the past</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) None of these</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gilbert and Easton (1970) interpret these findings to mean that both majority and minority group members "show a readiness to
countenance some degree of favoratism." Moreover, both majority and minority respondents "were similar in their rank order of a set of alternate proposals" (Gilbert & Easton, 1970, p. 40). The policy of equal opportunity was most highly favored by both groups (item 1). This was followed by three kinds of preferential treatment which were accepted in the following order: preferential treatment through compensatory training by private industry (item 2), preferential treatment through compensatory training by the government (item 3) and preferential treatment through compensatory ratings (item 4). The least favored item was Number five which qualifies as a form of discrimination-in-reverse because it does not include the "necessary ability" clause.

A final finding of this study was that "there was a considerable difference in the proportion of white and non-white persons favoring each of these policy alternatives" (Gilbert & Easton, 1970, p. 41). As was expected, for all forms of affirmative action, non-white respondents were more likely that white respondents to favor the item in question. Moreover, as the items moved towards a greater degree of compensatory emphasis the discrepancy in attitudes between these two groups increased. While the percentage was small for both whites and non-whites who favored discrimination-in-reverse, non-whites were approximately four times as likely to favor this practice than were whites. In contrast, only about one-and-a-half times as many non-white respondents as opposed to white respondents, favored preferential treatment through compensatory training. Finally, whites and nonwhites were most similar in their
favorable attitudes towards equal opportunity (item 1).

More recently, a poll by George Gallup (1977) validates the 1967 study's results, and partially reinforces the perspective that group conflict plays a significant role with respect to differences in attitudes about compensatory programs (San Francisco Chronicle, May 2, 1977). In a choice between equal opportunity and preferential treatment, the following question was asked of a large sample:

Some people say that to make up for past discrimination, women and members of minority groups should be given preferential treatment in getting jobs and places in college. Others say that ability, as determined by test scores, should be the main consideration. Which point of view do you feel comes closest to how you feel on this matter?" (San Francisco Chronicle, May 2, 1977, p. 17).

The results were as follows:

Table 2
Survey Sample # 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, should be compensated</th>
<th>No, ability should be determinant</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-whites</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above findings show that the overwhelming majority of the groups polled felt ability (equal opportunity) should take precedence over preferential treatment in both jobs and education. Once again, non-whites were much more favorable toward a compensatory
policy than whites. The three-to-one difference was even higher than in the Gilbert and Easton study. Interestingly, college student's attitudes, and those of women, corresponded with the national average; more than eight-to-one in favor of equal opportunity.

Some aspects of students' attitudes about this subject were examined by Nosow (1972, p. 354). That study pertained to the differences in attitudes of different types of college students toward "open admissions," defined as "every college or university (being) forced to admit a certain proportion of minority group students." The results showed strong support to recognizing the role that personal threat plays in variations in attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies. Nosow (1972, p. 354) found that:

The pattern of responses and the implicit nature of each item make it clear that the more a practice interferes with the individual's institutionalized expectations for the universities—and, therefore, with the achievement of his life goals—the more hostile he becomes to that practice.

Further, attitudes more favorable to open admissions corresponded with the lower socioeconomic classes (over higher), racial minorities (over caucasion), students with histories of low grades in secondary school (over high grades), and students whose parents were not high school graduates (over more formally educated parents) (Nosow, 1972).

The preceding empirical studies indicate that respondents do differentiate between the three major types of anti-discrimination
public policies. Those surveyed overwhelmingly supported equal opportunity policies with fewer supporting preferential treatment, and only a negligible number supported discrimination-in-reverse policies. A significant variation in attitudes exists between non-white and white respondents with non-whites being much more favorable towards compensatory policies than whites. Interestingly, in the Gallup survey, women's responses regarding compensatory policies were more similar to men's than were non-whites to whites. The Nosow study identified personal threat as a variable that seemed to influence individual's attitudes towards compensatory policies.

These studies point out the tremendous need for additional empirical research to not only verify their findings but to also identify additional significant variables that are related to attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies.

Research Hypotheses and Objectives

The preceding sections served to identify the sociological implications of anti-discrimination public policies. What emerged from our discussion was evidence that the issue over anti-discrimination public policies stems from a value conflict traceable to the Declaration of Independence. Gunnar Myrdal observed that Americans, more than other peoples, have internalized a belief in an overriding American Creed. Yet, while most Americans probably identify equality as the pillar of this American Creed, the principle of equality often stands juxtaposed to a second principle of liberty or
individual rights. Thus, there is an inherent strain between the principles of equality and liberty which has manifest itself in the issue of anti-discrimination public policies. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to assess and identify variations in attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies. The research objectives discussed in this section were designed to achieve this purpose.

College students were selected as the study population because much of the conflict surrounding anti-discrimination public policies has taken place in the university setting. For example, both the DeFunis and the Bakke cases pertained to affirmative action admission policies for disadvantaged students. Because of the focus on the university system as a testing grounds for anti-discrimination public policies, it seems safe to assume that college students are more likely to be aware of compensatory policies and to have an opinion about them.

The following hypotheses were derived from the sociological analysis of the issue over anti-discrimination public policies. The two major hypotheses are:

\[ H_1 \] Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary with the degree of favoritism advocated by the policy. The greater the favoritism, the less acceptance of the policy.

\[ H_2 \] Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to groups affected by these policies. Groups likely to gain from anti-discrimination public policies will respond more favorable than groups which stand to lose.
Hypothesis one is derived from the observation that most Americans have internalized the American Creed, with equality perceived to be the fundamental principle of this creed. Equality can be defined as equal opportunity. With this definition, respondents should be most in favor of equal opportunity and least in favor of discrimination-in-reverse.

Hypothesis two is derived from the perspective that group conflict is at the core of the issue over anti-discrimination public policies. Therefore, attitudes should vary according to the groups involved in the conflict, with groups being more favorable toward a policy if they stand to benefit as a group.

Hypothesis one predicts that individuals will be more favorable towards policies that advocate equality and less favorable of policies that advocate preferential treatment, irrespective of group membership. Hypothesis two predicts that there will be variations between groups regarding acceptance of favoritism policies.

In addition to the preceding two hypotheses, three hypotheses predicting factors which affect variations in attitudes regarding anti-discrimination public policies are posited. These hypotheses are:

\[ H_3 \] Attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to the degree that an individual feels personally threatened by these policies. Those who feel threatened will be less favorable than those who do not.

\[ H_4 \] Individuals who believe that compensatory policies have benefited other groups in the past will be more favorable towards these policies for non-whites.
H5 Individuals who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites.

Hypotheses three, four and five were derived from the conflict over the values of equality and liberty or individual rights. Hypothesis three was posited to assess the relationship between individual rights and attitudes toward affirmative action. It was assumed that perceived threat would be related to attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies because feeling personally threatened would be likely to elicit a value for individual rights. That is, those who felt personally threatened by affirmative action would feel that their individual rights were being threatened.

Hypotheses four and five were posited to assess the relationship between the value for equality and attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies. It was assumed that respondents who recognized that injustice was inherent in our system would be more accepting of favoritism policies to further a societal need for equality.

The theoretical underpinnings for these three hypotheses are derived from the literature. Earlier in this chapter a review of the literature pertinent to anti-discrimination policies highlighted that there is one substantive issue, a conflict over values. That is, proponents and opponents of these policies defend their position on the basis of moral values.

There are two major value arguments. One pertains to the question of justice and the other to social utility or needs. This
writer has argued that this current disagreement over values regarding anti-discrimination public policies is really a continuation of the perpetual conflict over the values of equality versus liberty inherent in our American system of democracy. Viewed in this light, the argument for justice is synonymous with the value of liberty or individual rights. In the controversy over anti-discrimination policies the notion of justice was invoked to protest favoritism policies on the grounds that only the individual who had been treated unjustly should be compensated and only by the individual who treated him/her unjustly. In effect, this argument reduces the conflict to the individual level.

In contrast, the argument for social needs is synonymous with the value for equality. Proponents of social needs reject the individualism of the social justice perspective. According to these scholars, social needs should be the overriding consideration. Social justice based on a meritocratic system may be just on one level but unjust on others. In such a system any criterion will result in differential treatment. Therefore, according to proponents of the social needs perspective, the criterion used to allocate resources and treatment should be the needs of society. And, in our society where equality is the fundamental value, allocation should be made to further equality. This is the social need.

Hypotheses three, four and five were thus formulated to assess the effect these conflicting values of equality and liberty have on respondents’ attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies.
In addition to testing the above hypotheses, this study will attempt to identify relevant demographic variables that are related to variations in attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies. The demographic variables that will be examined include: age, father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, parents' income and class level.

**Summary of Objectives.** Restated, the research objectives of this study are:

1. To assess the extent of adherence to the value of equal opportunity by all respondents vis-a-vis favoritism anti-discrimination public policies.
2. To assess the extent to which group membership plays a role in determining acceptance or non-acceptance of anti-discrimination public policies.
3. To assess the role that adherence to the values of equality and liberty or individual rights has on variations in attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies.
4. To identify relevant demographic variables that are related to attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies.

Meeting the above objectives will serve to clarify the role of group conflict over values in American race relations. Moreover, the findings of this study should add to the limited empirical research currently available on anti-discrimination public policies.
CHAPTER II

Methods

This chapter is presented in six parts. Section one describes the population and sampling procedures. Section two focuses on the instrumentation of the study variables. Section three outlines the method of data collection. In section four the data analysis procedures utilized by this study are explained. Section five presents the nine conceptual dimensions that emerged from factor analysis of the attitudinal questions included in the questionnaire, and the final section identifies the significant variables related to anti-discrimination public policies which emerged from multiple regression analysis.

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of college students. In the preceding chapter, an argument was presented for sampling college students' attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies since many of the conflicts over anti-discrimination public policies were related to college admission procedures.

The sample of college students was taken from students enrolled at Western Michigan University. This Midwestern University has a student body population of approximately 20,000 - 22,000 students. The university is located in Kalamazoo, Michigan, an industrialized urban area of approximately 80,000 persons; and it draws its students primarily from the southwestern and southeastern
sections of the state.

The sample used in this investigation consisted of 721 students, who comprised approximately four percent of the entire student body of this university. A purposive sample was utilized in order to obtain a specific proportion of cases from each stratum, particularly with regards to key demographic variables. Race was an important demographic variable in the selection of the sample for this study, especially since a major goal was to compare black and white attitudes. At Western Michigan University black students represent approximately 5.5 percent of the student body population. However, in order to insure an adequate sampling of black students, efforts were made to include a larger proportion of black students than their actual representation in the student body.

With regard to other major demographic characteristics, the sampling strategy was to obtain a group representation of the university population. Table 3 reveals that the demographic characteristics of the sample and population parameters of Western Michigan University are similar for the variable of class level.
Table 3

Student Body Characteristics of Western Michigan University and the Population Sample for Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>WMU Population*</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data obtained from Western Michigan University. Data on Students Enrolled Winter Semester 1974.

Instrumentation

Independent Variables. The theoretical model developed in this paper suggests several variables that may be important in predicting attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies. A principle research objective is to identify which of these variables are significant as predictors. These predictor variables fall into two categories, group membership and adherence to values of equality versus liberty or individual rights.

Group Membership. Chapter I documented the important role that group membership plays in the conflict over anti-discrimination public policies. Utilizing Robert Bierstedt's (1948) schema, a
social group is characterized by both a consciousness of kind and the existence of social relationship between individuals. In this respect the distinction between in-groups and out-groups is important. An "in-group or "we-group" is "a social unit of which an individual is a part or with which he identifies." In contrast, an out-group or "they-group" is "a social unit of which an individual is not a part or which he does not identify" (Vander Zanden, 1970, p. 183). In the case of the group conflict over anti-discrimination public policies, group membership is almost absolute in one sense since the issue is tied to ascribed group membership based on race or sex. Although the controversy surrounding anti-discrimination public policies has involved a diversity of groups, the principle issue centers around favoritism on the basis of racial or sexual group membership.

While this study is primarily concerned with anti-racial discrimination public policies, it would be remise not to focus on anti-sexist discrimination public policies. Therefore the two variables that this study examined within the category of group membership are race and sex, and Tables 4 and 5 contain their sample distribution.
Table 4
Sampling Distribution for the Variable of Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-white:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro American</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td><strong>605</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>721</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Sample Distribution for the Variable of Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>721</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions Related to Values of Equality Versus Individual Rights. This study is concerned with three aspects of students perceptions as they are related to values of equality versus individual rights. These aspects are: (1) personal threat, (2) awareness of
compensatory policies which have benefited other groups and (3) perception of historical and current inequality.

This study posits the idea that individuals who feel personally threatened by anti-discrimination public policies are more likely to oppose such policies. In this respect, threat can be seen as a threat to individual rights. The following questions were constructed to measure this.

Do you feel that a policy of preferring racial minorities and/or women, which some institutions have adopted, will hurt your chances of getting into the graduate college of your choice?

Do you feel that a policy of preferring racial minorities and/or women, which some institutions have adopted, will hurt your chances for the job which you eventually hope to obtain?

This study also advances the notion that if one is aware that compensatory policies have historically benefited specific groups then one will be more favorable towards compensatory policies for non-whites and/or women. Part of the controversy over anti-discrimination public policies stems from a false premise that these policies are antithetical to American values and practice. In reality not only has favoritism benefited the majority group (i.e. whites and males) but it has also been used to further equality for veterans, the disabled and others by often giving these groups favored status. The following questions were constructed to measure one's awareness of compensatory policies designed to benefit specific groups.

In your opinion which of the following groups, if any, have received special treatment com—
parable to what non-whites are receiving today in the United States:
whites
women
men
veterans
the Disabled

Perceptions of historical and current inequality are also noted as being related to variations in attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies. It is hypothesized that those individuals who perceive the United States, both past and present, to be a racist and sexist society will be more inclined to favor anti-discrimination public policies in order to overcome inequality for these two groups. The following questions were constructed to measure this.

The following are criticisms that have been made in recent years about aspects of American society. For each statement, could you indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or are undecided?

1) strongly 2) agree 3) undecided 4) disagree 5) strongly agree

Economic well-being in this country is unjustly and unfairly distributed.

Basically we are a racist nation.

The effort to end discrimination against non-whites has resulted in discrimination against whites.

This country has failed to eliminate discrimination against its non-white citizens.

Those non-whites who don't make it in American society have no one to blame but themselves.

Historically, the cruel treatment of black people in this country has been exaggerated.

Non-whites have always suffered oppression in this country.

Most women don't want equal opportunity.
Men are just naturally superior to women.

Which of the following views of American society and American life best reflects your own feelings (single answer)?

1) the American way of life is superior to that of any other country.
2) there are serious flaws in our society today but the system is flexible enough to solve them.
3) the American system is not flexible enough, radical change is needed.
4) the whole system ought to be replaced by an entirely new one; the existing structures are too rotten for repair.

Demographic Variables as Control Variables. In addition to the preceding independent variables, this study was concerned with the following demographic characteristics as control variables: age, mother's education, father's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, parents' income and class level (for items see Appendix A, Questions 2, 4-9).

Dependent Variables. The research strategy utilized to assess college students' attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies was to ask respondents a range of questions about these policies. For this purpose, questions concerning anti-discrimination public policies were divided into three sections: education, business and government.

In the section on education (for items, see Appendix A, Questions 12-44), respondents were asked about their feeling toward various types of admission and financial aid policies for non-whites. They were also asked their opinion about black students' academic preparedness for college and whether or not they felt
black students received more or less favorable treatment in school. In addition, two items in this section pertained to female discrimination in admissions and financial aid.

In the section on business (for items, see Appendix A, Questions 45-67), respondents were asked their opinion about discriminatory and anti-discriminatory racial public policies in hiring and promotion. Items regarding female discrimination in hiring and promotion were also included in the questions.

In the section on government (for items, see Appendix A, Questions 68-75), respondents were asked their opinion about government intervention into the hiring practices of private businesses to end discriminatory policies against non-whites and women. Moreover, attitudes were also assessed concerning anti-discrimination public policies for non-whites in government job training programs.

Pretest. A pretest was administered to a class of over one hundred students. The pretest was conducted in order to elicit comments from the respondents with regards to the clarity and meaningfulness of the questionnaire items. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the researcher discussed the questionnaire item-by-item with the respondents. On the basis of the comments the questionnaire format was slightly modified and an additional question was added.

Questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of ninety-nine items. The first eleven items elicited demographic data, followed by eighty-eight items which pertained to attitudes regarding anti-
discrimination public policies. The attitudes portion of the questionnaire was divided into five sections. Sections one through four were concerned with attitudes about affirmative action programs in education, business, government, and in general. Section five asked respondents questions about their perceptions regarding equality (see Appendix A for Questionnaire).

Data Collection

Collection of the data involved the administration of the questionnaire to college students at the end of the 1974 winter semester and at the beginning of the 1974 spring term. This questionnaire was administered to all students present during the regular class periods. Students were informed of the nature of the study and their cooperation was solicited. Students were told that the questionnaire was not mandatory and only a negligible number refused to participate.

The questionnaire was administered to students enrolled in classes in three different departments: Sociology, Political Science and General Studies. It seemed reasonable to assume that such a sampling strategy would procure students from all academic majors in the university because most of the classes utilized were required courses which fulfilled general education requirements.

Data Analysis Procedures

The computer at the University of California, Berkeley was utilized to analyze the data. The 6400 computer at the center had
available the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a nationally recognized system of computer programs for analyzing social science data. The principal statistical procedures performed on the data were factor analysis, multiple regression analysis and cross tabulations. Most of the items in the questionnaire had Likert-type response categories. The Likert scale was a necessary condition in order to compute the following statistical analyses.

Factor analysis was the technique used to identify the intercorrelations among the questionnaire items pertaining to anti-discrimination public policies. These items consisted of eighty-eight questions. Factor analysis was used because it is a useful technique when there is a large number of operational indices which can be reduced to a smaller number of conceptual variables. According to Blalock (1960), underlying the use of factor analysis is the assumption that we have a large number of indices which are intercorrelated, these interrelationships may be due to the presence of one or more underlying variables or factors which are related to the indices to varying degrees.

The key in factor analysis is to have as the outcome a smaller number of conceptual variables which are theoretically meaningful. When this occurs a contribution is made to conceptual clarification. If the use of factor analysis does not result in theoretically meaningful conceptual factors or variables, then the technique is not a suitable one for analyzing the data. Since factor analysis is
useful only if the clustering effect among indices warrants the use of a smaller number of conceptual variables, a crucial point for this study was whether or not the resulting factors were theoretically sound and congruent with the research hypothesis (Blalock, 1960). Fortunately, both conditions were met through factor analysis and the results will be discussed later in this chapter.

Another important consideration for the data analysis was sample size. Since the research sample was large, consisting of 721 respondents, factor analysis was a suitable statistical technique since it requires a large sample in order to minimize the effects of sampling errors.

The type of factor rotation analysis performed on the data was varimax. Varimax is the most widely used rotation in conjunction with factor analysis. Varimax rotation is performed in order to simplify the factor structure and to maximize the identification of the underlying conceptual variable for each factor.

Steps followed in the factor analysis sequence are explained in the following manner. The structure matrix was utilized to determine the conceptual variable for each significant factor. Only factors which had eigen values of greater than one were considered significant. Factor scores were computed for each subject based on a pattern matrix. In the process of computing factor scores for subjects, the scores for each factor were normalized, that is, for each factor a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one was ob-
tained. Thus, this procedure yielded nine significant factors which will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Multiple regression analysis was the statistical technique used to determine which predictor variables best accounted for responses on the dependent variables. The multiple regression model utilized was forward stepwise inclusion. With this form of regression analysis, independent variables are entered according to their respective contributions to explaining the variance in the dependent variable. The most highly correlated independent variables were entered first. Thus, the independent variables enter the multiple regression analysis in order of most important to least important. Finally, cross tabulations were constructed in order to portray the nature of the relationship between predictor variables and dependent variables.

Conceptual Dimensions

The questionnaire included sixty-five questions as indicators of seven attitudinal study variables. In order to reduce these questions to a more manageable number, a factor analysis was performed to determine which of these questions were intercorrelated. Thirty-six of these questions had significant loadings on one of eight factors. These eight factors were significant dimensions that matched the seven study variables. These conceptual dimensions have been labeled: 1) discrimination-in-reverse, 2) preferential treatment, 3) equal opportunity, 4) female anti-discrimination public policies, 5) perceived personal threat, 6) special treatment for
other groups, and 7) the perception of the existence of past and present inequality. The following discussion will identify and describe each of these eight dimensions.

We should keep in mind, however, that the key variables in this research are types of anti-discrimination public policies. The three major types of anti-discrimination public policies described in Chapter I are: 1) equal opportunity, 2) preferential treatment, and 3) discrimination-in-reverse. Thirty-five items were included in the questionnaire to assess respondents' attitudes toward these three major types of anti-discrimination public policies. Factor analysis resulted in a dimension for each type of anti-discrimination public policy and these will be discussed first.

**Discrimination-in-Reverse.** The criteria for including or excluding an item on any of the factors were, 1) the strength of the loading of each item on that factor and, 2) whether or not it shared a conceptual dimension with other items which loaded high on that factor. Ideally, both of these criteria should be met in determining factor items, however, sometimes it was possible to meet only one criterion. A cutoff point of .42 was arbitrarily selected because it fits the data results and was reasonably high.
Table 6

Discrimination-in-Reverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, financial aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, business: hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, business: quota hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, business: promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>Preference for non-whites, necessary to end inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, necessary to end inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse, respondent support to end inequality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For factor one, as Table 6 indicates, seven items clustered together. Six of these items were constructed to measure discrimination-in-reverse. Item 85 was intended to measure preferential treatment but since it clustered with the other six items, it is probable that respondents interpreted it to be a type of discrimination-in-reverse. For this factor the lowest loading score was .49.

Preferential Treatment. For this factor, four items emerged with a high loading of .71 or greater. Notably, all four items have a loading between .71 and .79. Table 7 shows these items and their respective weights.
Table 7
Preferential Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Preferential treatment–College Admissions, minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Preferential treatment–College Admissions, women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Preferential treatment–business hiring, minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Preferential treatment–business hiring, women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferential treatment is the underlying dimension linking items in Table 7 together. Items loading high on this factor pertained to either preferential treatment in college admissions or business hiring for minorities or women. All the items that were not included on this factor had a loading of .27 or less.

Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that there was a high correlation between items pertaining to preferential treatment for minorities and women. This finding indicates that respondents perceived preferential treatment policies for minorities and women as being similar.

**Equal Opportunity.** Regarding the dimension of equal opportunity, seven items emerged with a factor loading of .45 or higher. These seven items and their factor loadings are presented in Table 8.
Table 8

Equal Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - College Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - College Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - Business hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - Business promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - Federal job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - necessary to end inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Equal opportunity - respondent support to end inequality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked their attitudes about equal opportunity policies in a number of settings and circumstances. The seven items that correlated highly on this factor pertain to equal opportunity in college, business, federal job training and equal opportunity as a policy to end inequality. Factors which were excluded had factor scores below .29.

Again it should be noted that the primary focus of this research is on racial anti-discrimination public policies, but in order to enlarge the scope of the hypotheses, items pertaining to female discrimination were included in the questionnaire. Predictably, a conceptual dimension emerged from the factor analysis which corresponded with the study variable female discrimination.
Female Discrimination Public Policies. The questionnaire included twelve items which focused on female discrimination. Six items were found with a factor score of .53 or greater. Items excluded had loadings of .47 or less. These items and their respective weights are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Female Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Female discriminatory, public policies, college admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Female discriminatory, public policies, financial aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Female discriminatory, public policies, hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Female discriminatory, public policies, employee quotas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Female discriminatory, public policies, promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Male superiority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female discrimination public policies is the underlying conceptual dimension linking together the items that loaded high on this factor. Five of the items were constructed to measure respondents' attitudes towards various forms of discrimination public policies directed at females. The sixth item (Question 98) was designed to measure whether or not respondents perceived men to be superior to women.
**Perceived Personal Threat.** Another study variable is perceived personal threat. Two questions were included in the questionnaire to measure this aspect and both loaded high on a factor. The two items pertaining to personal threat asked students whether they felt affirmative action policies for racial minorities and/or women would hurt their chances of: 1) obtaining a job or 2) being accepted to the graduate school of their choice. Table 10 shows these items and their loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Hurt chances of obtaining a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Hurt chances of getting into Graduate School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 10 indicates, the two items pertaining to perceived personal threat had loadings of .67 and .70. Items not included had scores of .16 or less.

**Special Treatment.** Special treatment is another study variable. The questionnaire included six questions designed to ascertain whether respondents perceive that groups other than non-whites have received special treatment. Respondents were asked to identify any groups that they felt received special treatment comparable to non-whites. The results factored out into two conceptual dimensions—dominant groups vis-a-vis non-dominant groups receiving
special treatment.

**Dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment.** With regards to the question concerning which groups have received special treatment, two groups - whites and men - correlated highly. In comparison to the other groups included in the questionnaire, the underlying dimension that conceptually links whites and men together is that they are both dominant groups. Table 11 identifies the items and their respective loadings. Items not included on this factor had factor scores of .38 or less. Groups that did not load high on factor six included women, the disabled and veterans, none of which occupies a dominant status in the United States.

**Table 11**
Dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nondominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment.** This factor includes two items which had a high factor loading. These items pertain to the disabled and veterans. Interestingly, while there was a high correlation between how respondents perceived the disabled and veterans, a low correlation was found to exist between these two groups and men and whites (two groups with high loadings on factor six). In order to distinguish this dimension from the
previous one, this dimension will be referred to as non-dominant
groups receiving special treatment. Findings on this dimension are
presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Non-dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 12 shows, veterans and the disabled had factor scores
of .73 and .77, respectively. Items not included had scores of .27
or less.

Perception of the Existence of Past and Present Inequality.

Ten questions were included in the questionnaire to measure the
variable dealing with perception of the existence of past and
present inequality. Of these ten questions, six had a high factor
loading. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed
with a set of statements about inequality and the American way of
life. Table 13 reveals the six items that correlated highly with
their factor loadings.
Table 13
Perception of the Existence of Past and Present Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>Economic well-being unjustly and unfairly distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>U.S. a racist nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>U.S. failed to eliminate discrimination against non-whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>Non-whites who don't succeed are at fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>Exaggerated mistreatment of black people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>Non-whites always suffered oppression in U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the items that had a high factor loading on this factor pertain to perceptions regarding the existence of past and present inequality. Two of the items had a minus score because they were phrased in the opposite directions of the other items. Items not included on this factor had scores of .37 or less.

In addition to the questions as indicators of the study variables, the questionnaire also included twenty-three attitudinal questions aimed at tapping respondents' attitudes towards aspects of affirmative action. Factor analysis performed on these questions resulted in one significant factor, conceptually entitled: groups receiving a disproportionate amount of financial aid. This conceptual dimension will be discussed below.
Groups Receiving a Disproportionate Amount of Financial Aid.

The respondents were asked to identify which groups they felt received a disproportionate amount of financial aid. Of the six groups listed on the questionnaire, four had a high loading on factor four.

As Table 14 indicates, two of the categories—non-whites and lower class—have a negative loading which means that those who stated that non-whites and lower-class individuals received disproportionate financial aid also said that whites and middle-class individuals did not. Items not included here had factor scores of .15 or less.

Table 14

Groups Receiving Disproportionate Amount of Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>Non-whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>Lower Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Factors Related to Anti-Discrimination Public Policies

Equal Opportunity. Chapter One identified fourteen predictor variables to be examined in relation to three types of anti-discrimination public policies - equal opportunity, preferential treat-
ment and discrimination-in-reverse. Six of the predictor variables are independent variables and the other nine are control variables. In order to determine which of these fourteen variables are related to anti-discrimination public policies, multiple regression analysis was run with the fourteen predictor variables and each of the three types of anti-discrimination public policies. Table 15 shows the results of multiple regression analysis with equal opportunity as the dependent variable.
Table 15
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis
Equal Opportunity by Eleven Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups receiving compensatory benefits</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past and Present Inequality</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Financial Aid</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Threat</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occupation</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**
*Variables were entered with greatest $r^2$ first.

** Income; Father's occupation; and special treatment, dominant groups, were not included in the analysis because their F level was insufficient for further computation.

As Table 15 indicates, two variables had a significance of .01 or greater. These two variables were race and class level.
**Preferential Treatment.** The results of multiple regression analysis with preferential treatment as the dependent variable and fourteen predictor variables are shown in Table 16.

**Table 16**

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis, Preferential Treatment by Fourteen Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-dominant groups receiving compensatory benefits</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Threat</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occupation</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past and Present Inequality</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occupation</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Financial Aid</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variables were entered with greatest $r^2$ first

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 16 shows that three variables - non-dominant groups receiving compensatory benefits, race, and class level - have a significance of .01 or greater.

**Discrimination-in-Reverse.** In Table 17, the results of multiple regression analysis with discrimination-in-reverse and fourteen predictor variables are shown.
Table 17

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis, Discrimination-in-Reverse by Fourteen Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>( r^2 ) Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past and Present Inequality</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occupation</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Financial Aid</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Threat</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**

*Variables were entered with greatest \( r^2 \) first

**Class level was not included in the analysis because the F level was insufficient for further analysis.

As Table 17 indicates, two variables (race and dominant group) are predictors of attitudes towards discrimination-in-reverse with a significance of .01 or greater.
Multiple regression analysis has served to identify significant predictor variables of attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies from the fourteen independent variables selected to be explored in this study. The relationship these predictor variables have to attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will be discussed in the next chapter.

**Female Discrimination.** In addition to examining fourteen predictor variables in relation to anti-discrimination public policies, this research also focused on these predictor variables in relation to female discrimination. Multiple regression analysis was run with the fourteen predictor variables and female discrimination. Table 18 shows the results of this analysis.
Table 18
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis, Female Discrimination by Fourteen Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$r^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past and Present Inequality</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dominant Groups Receiving Special Treatment</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate Financial Aid</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occupation</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Threat</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occupation</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**

*Variables were entered with greatest $r^2$ first

**Dominant groups receiving special treatment was not included in the analysis because the F level was insufficient for further computation.

As Table 18 indicates, three variables have a significance of .001 or better. These three variables are sex, race and past and present inequality. The relationships these predictor variables
have to attitudes toward female discrimination will be discussed in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III

Findings

This chapter presents the findings as they relate to the support or rejection of the five hypotheses discussed earlier in the dissertation. To refresh the reader's memory, the five hypotheses are:

$H_1$ Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary with the degree of favoratism advocated by the policy. The greater the favoritism, the less acceptance of the policy.

$H_2$ Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to groups effected by these policies. Groups likely to gain from anti-discrimination public policies will respond more favorably than groups which stand to lose.

$H_3$ Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to the degree that an individual feels personally threatened by these policies. Those individuals who feel threatened will be less favorable than those who do not.

$H_4$ Individuals who believe that compensatory policies have benefited other groups in the past will be more favorable towards these policies for non-whites.

$H_5$ Individuals who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites.
Chapter One highlighted a conflict over values which is inherent in our American system of democracy. The Bill of Rights includes both human rights and individual rights. Equality and liberty are profound ideals but when put into practice there is an inherent conflict between them. The process of insuring one's liberty or individual rights often runs counter to insuring the equality of others. Conversely, the process of securing equality for all often results in the restriction of individual rights for some.

In recent times there is probably no finer illustration of this value conflict than the conflict over anti-discrimination public policies. Disagreement over the values of equality versus liberty are at the heart of the conflict over anti-discrimination public policies. However, perhaps more than any other period, the inconsistency between these two values is becoming apparent. This inconsistency has led to the formulation of two seemingly contradictory hypotheses.

A review of the literature in Chapter One, however, supports the formulation of the following two hypotheses. On the one hand, it was hypothesized that the value for equality would result in a preference on the part of respondents for equality public policies and not for favoritism policies. On the other hand, however, it was hypothesized that within this pattern, groups likely to gain
from a favoritism policy would be more in favor of it than would a group which stood to lose. Thus, what has been predicted is an overall preference for public policies which support equality and not favoritism. But, when a group stands to gain from a favoritism policy this group would be more in favor of it than would the group which stands to lose. Table 19 shows the percentage of favorable responses to the three types of anti-discriminatory public policies.
### Table 19
Percentages of Favorable Attitudes Towards Three Types of Anti-Discriminatory Public Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Policies</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong>: 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferential Treatment</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong>: 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination-in-reverse</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong>: 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 19 indicates, respondents overwhelmingly favor equal opportunity. From this table, one can see that there is less support for preferential treatment and even lesser support for dis-
crimination-in-reverse policies. These results support the hypothe-
sis that respondents' attitudes toward anti-discriminatory policies
will vary with the degree of favoritism advocated by the policy.
Equal opportunity advocates the least favoritism and is most strongly
supported by respondents, while discrimination-in-reverse advocates
the most favoritism and is least acceptable to respondents.

Tables 20, 21, and 22 show the responses to equal opportunity,
preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse by race.

Table 20

College Students' Attitudes Towards
Equal Opportunity Policies by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Favorable</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Favorable</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(183)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Favorable</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(170)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>552</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \text{ sig.} .001 \\
\bar{c} = .17
\]
In Table 20 whites are slightly more in favor of equal opportunity public policies whereas non-whites are more opposed to these policies. Forty-six percent of the non-whites expressed opposition to these policies in comparison to thirty percent of the whites. In contrast, thirty-six percent of the whites favored equal opportunity policies while only twenty-four percent of the non-white respondents did. An almost equal percentage of whites and non-whites were either undecided or ambivalent toward equal opportunity policies. The preceding results were significant at the .001 level but had a coefficient of contingency of only .17.

Table 21

College Students' Attitudes Towards Preferential Treatment Policies by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$ sig .001

$C = .24$
Table 21 reveals the respondents' attitudes towards preferential treatment policies by race. In contrast to their attitudes on equal opportunity, white students were significantly more opposed to these policies than were non-white students. Thirty-seven percent of the white students expressed opposition in comparison to only twelve percent of the non-white students. Forty-four percent of the non-white respondents favored preferential treatment policies while only thirty-two percent of the white respondents held such an attitude. As in Table 20 a large percentage were neutral, thirty-one percent of the white students and an even larger (forty-four) percent of the non-whites. These results were also significant at the .001 level with a coefficient of contingency of .24.
Table 22

College Students' Attitudes Towards Discrimination-in-Reverse Policies by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination in Reverse</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Opposed</td>
<td>26% (146)</td>
<td>73% (74)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Opposed</td>
<td>36% (200)</td>
<td>16% (16)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Opposed</td>
<td>37% (206)</td>
<td>11% (11)</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 552 101 653

Chi² sig .001
C = .40

Table 22 shows the most marked differences in opinion towards anti-discrimination public policies. When students were asked their opinions about discrimination-in-reverse, non-whites overwhelmingly indicated they were in favor. Seventy-three percent of the non-white respondents were in favor whereas only twenty-six percent of the whites indicated such a position. In contrast, eleven percent of the non-white students expressed opposition whereas thirty-seven percent of the whites did. Interestingly, the percentage of whites who were neutral was much larger (thirty-six percent) than the per-
percentage of non-whites (sixteen percent). The results were significant at the .001 level with a coefficient of contingency of .40.

The results summarized in Tables 19, 20, 21 and 22 lend support to both hypothesis one and two. As predicted, respondents as a whole overwhelmingly favor equal opportunity with discrimination-in-reverse receiving the least amount of support. However, when respondents' attitudes toward the three types of anti-discrimination policies was reexamined within the context of race, differences in attitudes toward these policies emerged. As predicted, non-whites were more in favor than whites of anti-discrimination public policies which benefited them. Non-whites were the least in favor of equal opportunity and least opposed to discrimination-in-reverse.

These results are supportive of hypothesis two which predicts that groups standing to gain from a policy will be more in favor of it. While the results summarized in Tables 20, 21, and 22 were all significant at the .001 level, the coefficient of contingency indicates a high of .40 for discrimination-in-reverse and a low of .17 for equal opportunity. That discrimination-in-reverse had the strongest association with race is also supportive of the hypothesis. Discrimination-in-reverse public policies clearly advocate the most favoritism, therefore, predictably race has the strongest association with these policies and much less of an association with preferential treatment and equal opportunity policies which are much more ambiguous in their degree of favoritism.

Correlation analysis run on the relationships between three
types of anti-discrimination public policies and race resulted in a $r^2$ ranging from .03 to .20. All three were significant at the .01 level. These results are shown in Table 23.

Table 23
Race Correlated by Three Types of Anti-Discrimination Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Policy</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination-in-reverse</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 23 indicate that race explains the greatest variance for discrimination-in-reverse policies and much less of the variance for either equal opportunity or preferential treatment policies. These results affirm the usefulness of examining control variables to obtain a more complete picture of the relationship between race and anti-discrimination policies.

Control Variables Related to Equal Opportunity. Previously, multiple regression analysis identified two variables (race and class level) as significantly related to attitudes concerning equal opportunity public policies. As an independent variable, the relationship between race and equal opportunity has already been examined. Using class level as a control variable, Table 24 shows the relationship between race and equal opportunity when controlling
for race.

Table 24
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity by Race Controlling for Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Chi² = N.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman-Sophomores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N 114</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N 12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juniors-Seniors
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Chi² = N.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N 84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 96</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results summarized in Table 24 suggest that class level and not race may be the predictor of attitudes toward equal opportunity.
For both whites and non-whites, as class level increases support for equal opportunity diminishes. A closer examination of the relationship between class level and attitudes toward equal opportunity might help to clarify this relationship. Table 25 shows the results of cross-tabulating class level by attitudes toward equal opportunity.

Table 25
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity by Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Fresh-Soph</th>
<th>Jr-Sen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 \text{ sig} .001 \]
\[ C = .23 \]

The results shown in Table 25 suggest that class level may be a predictor of attitudes toward equal opportunity. Table 26 shows the relationships between class level and equal opportunity when controlling for race.
Table 26
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity by Class Level Controlling for Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Whites Equal Opportunity</th>
<th>Non-Whites Equal Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>N 87</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore/</td>
<td>N 115</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>% 42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 202</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi² sig</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - .19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results summarized in Table 26 further suggest that it may be class level and not race that is related to attitudes toward equal opportunity. For both white and non-white respondents attitudes toward equal opportunity decrease as class level increases.
However, the results were not significant for non-white respondents.

**Control Variables Related to Preferential Treatment.** Multiple regression analysis previously discussed identified three variables as being significantly related to attitudes toward preferential treatment. These three variables are race, class level and "other groups receiving compensatory benefits". Earlier in this section, the relationship between race and attitudes toward preferential treatment was examined. The following discussion will focus on re-examining this relationship while controlling for social class. Table 27 shows the relationship between race and attitudes toward preferential treatment while controlling for class level.
Table 27

College Students' Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment, by Race Controlling for Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Freshman-Sophomore</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N 67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N 12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi² sig .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C = .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Junior-Senior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N 106</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N 32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 138</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | Chi² sig .01       |        |         |        |         |
|                | C = .08            |        |         |        |         |

The results shown in Table 27 do suggest that class level may be an independent predictor of attitudes toward preferential treatment.
Overall, for both whites and non-whites, as class level advances, attitudes toward preferential treatment become generally more favorable. However, in general, non-whites are more in favor of preferential treatment than are white students. An examination of the original relationship between class level and attitudes toward preferential treatment might shed further light on this relationship. Table 28 shows the results of cross tabulating class level with attitudes toward preferential treatment.

Table 28

College Students' Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment by Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferential Treatment</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>N 67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>N 73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>N 42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 219</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² sig .001

C = .14

As Table 28 indicates, class level is directly related to attitudes toward preferential treatment. That is, as class level
advances, attitudes toward preferential treatment become more favorable. Freshmen are least favorable toward preferential treatment. While those in favor increase with each advance in class level, those in favor reach a high at the junior level with forty-two percent being in favor. The percentage of seniors who are in favor is a close forty-one percent. The percentage who are neutral is in the mid-thirties for freshmen and sophomore and dips to the mid-twenties for juniors. The results are significant at the .001 level with a coefficient of contingency of .19. These findings seem to suggest that the junior year is a crucial period for the transformation in attitudes towards preferential treatment. In the junior year there is a dramatic shift in the percentage of respondents who are in favor of preferential treatment.

The preceding results provide evidence that race and class level are two independent predictors of attitudes of preferential treatment. Each of these predictor variables has been found to be related to attitudes toward preferential treatment independently of the other.

Although sex had a significance of slightly less than .01, using multiple regression analysis, it is still a key research variable and will be examined in relation to attitudes toward preferential treatment. Table 29 shows the results of cross-tabulating sex with attitudes toward preferential treatment.
According to Table 29, sex is related to respondents' attitudes toward preferential treatment. Females are more likely to favor preferential treatment than are males. The results are significant at the .01 level with a coefficient of contingency of .41. In order to obtain a clearer understanding of this relationship, sex is again cross tabulated with attitudes toward preferential treatment. Race, however, is interjected as a control factor (See Table 30).

### Table 29

**College Students' Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment, by Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferential Treatment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi\(^2\) sig .01**

**C = .41**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferential Treatment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>White Male</th>
<th>White Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Chi² sig</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-White Male | Non-White Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferential Treatment</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Non-White Male</th>
<th>Non-White Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Chi² = N.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As Table 30 shows, when examining attitudes toward preferential treatment by sex while controlling for race, the original relationship holds for white respondents but not for non-white. Among the white respondents, females favor preferential treatment public policies more than males. The results are significant at the .01 level. In contrast, both male and female non-white respondents favor preferential treatment public policies. These results suggest that race and sex are interacting predictors of attitudes toward preferential treatment.

The interaction of race and sex on attitudes toward preferential treatment lends further support for the hypothesis concerned with group gain. Both females and non-whites stand to gain from preferential treatment public policies. And, it is precisely these two groups that favor these policies.

Control Variables Related to Discrimination-in-Reverse. Previously, multiple regression analysis was used to identify three variables that were significantly related to attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse. These three variables are race, age and "groups receiving special treatment." Two of these variables (race and "dominant groups receiving special treatment") are independent variables. In this section, the relationship between race and discrimination-in-reverse, while controlling for age, will be discussed. Table 31 shows this relationship.
TABLE 31
College Students' Attitudes Toward Discrimination-in-Reverse, by Race Controlling for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Discrimination-in-Reverse</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 Years Old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N  69</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N  36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi² sig .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{C} ) = .52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Years Old and Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N  73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>N  34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi² sig .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{C} ) = .47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of cross-tabulating race with attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse while controlling for age.
The results indicate that the original relationship between race and discrimination-in-reverse holds. For every age category non-whites are much more in favor of discrimination-in-reverse than are whites. However, the results also suggest an interaction between race and age. For white respondents, attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse become more favorable with age. For non-whites, attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse remains fairly constant with age. The results were significant at the .001 level with a coefficient of contingency of .52 and .47 respectively.

Factors Related to Female Discrimination. Findings discussed earlier in this section strongly suggest that group gain supercedes support for equal opportunity among non-whites. A second test of the significance of group gain can be assessed by examining the factors related to female discrimination. Multiple regression analysis identified three variables (sex, race, and past and present inequality) as being significantly related to attitudes toward female discrimination.

Respondents were asked their opinions regarding public policies which discriminated against females. Table 32 shows the results of cross-tabulating respondents by sex.
Table 32
College Students' Attitudes Toward Public Policies which Discriminate Against Females, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>18% (63)</td>
<td>53% (159)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policies</td>
<td>32% (114)</td>
<td>34% (102)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>50% (174)</td>
<td>14% (41)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi^2 sig .01
\[ C = .48 \]

Fifty-three percent of the male respondents were in favor of sexually discriminatory public policies whereas only eighteen percent of the female respondents held such an attitude. Fifty percent of the females were opposed to these policies in contrast to only fourteen percent of the males. An almost equal percentage of the male and female respondents were neutral. What is especially notable about these results is that, unlike attitudes toward anti-discriminatory public policies, this finding focuses on discriminatory policies. That so large a percentage of males are in favor of sexually discriminatory policies for their own gain, adds further support for the hypothesis that group gain is an important factor.
related to attitudes towards anti-discriminatory policies. These results were significant at the .01 level with a coefficient of contingency of .48.

Correlation analysis of the relationship between sex and attitudes concerning sexually discriminatory policies resulted in an $r^2$ of .198, with a significance of .01. Thus, sex alone explains approximately twenty percent of the variance.

Since race was also identified through multiple regression analysis as being significantly related to attitudes toward discriminating against females, cross-tabulations were computed for the relationship between sex and discrimination against females, while controlling for race. Table 33 shows the results of this analysis.
Table 33

College Students’ Attitudes Toward Public Policies Which Discriminate Against Females, by Sex Controlling for Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Female</th>
<th>White Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposed</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chi^2 sig</strong></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White Female</th>
<th>Non-White Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposed</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chi^2 sig</strong></td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 33 indicates, for both white and non-white respondents, males were much more in favor of discriminating against females than were female respondents. For white respondents these results were significant at the .01 level with a coefficient of contingency of .50, and for non-white respondents the significance was at the .0001 level, with a coefficient of contingency of .48. This pattern mirrors the original relationship between sex and attitudes toward sexually discriminatory public policies. For non-whites, however, regardless of sex, there is greater support for discriminating against females than there is among white respondents. Therefore, this relationship warrants closer examination. Table 34 shows the relationship between race and attitudes toward sexually discriminatory public policies.
Table 34

College Students' Attitudes Toward Public Policies Which Discriminate Against Females, by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Race</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White Race</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² sig .01
C = .17

As Table 34 suggests, race is also related to attitudes toward discriminating against females. Non-whites are more in favor of discriminating against females. Forty-seven percent of the non-white respondents indicated that they favor discriminatory policies against females whereas only thirty-one percent of the whites did. Conversely, thirty-five percent of the white respondents oppose female discrimination whereas only twenty-three percent of the non-whites did. Although these results are significant at the .01 level, their coefficient of contingency is only .17.

A low association here clearly suggests that race is most meaningful as a predictor in conjunction with sex. This is because
non-white males, of all categories tested, are the most in favor of discriminating against females. Thus, it appears to be the non-white males who are accounting for much of the difference in responses between whites and non-whites regarding attitudes toward public policies which discriminate against females.

To conclude, the results summarized in Tables 32, 33, and 34 indicate that sex and race are interacting predictors of attitudes toward policies which discriminate against females. Tersely, males more than females and non-whites more than whites favor these policies. These results are highly supportive of the hypothesis that group gain is a significant factor related to attitudes toward anti-discrimination policies. Both males and non-whites favored discriminating against females and it is these two groups which stand to gain from such policies.

A third variable identified through multiple regression analysis as significantly related to attitudes toward female discrimination was an awareness of past and present inequality. The relationship between these two variables, however, will be examined later in this chapter when hypothesis five is discussed.

**Personal Threat As It Relates to Attitudes Toward Anti-Discrimination Public Policies**

In this study it was hypothesized that individuals who felt personally threatened by anti-discrimination public policies would be less favorable toward these policies than those who did not feel threatened. This hypothesis was derived from the American principle
of individual rights. A basic principle in the United States is the principle of liberty or individual rights. This principle purports to maintain the freedom of the individual in American society. Therefore, by logical extension, a public policy which is perceived to be personally threatening is likely to be rejected as a violation of one’s liberty or freedom.

In Tables 35, 36, and 37 the relationships between perceived threat and the three major types of anti-discrimination public policies are shown.

Table 35

College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity, by Perceived Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Threat</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>N 79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>N 66</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>N 78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 223</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Chi}^2 = \text{N.S.}\]
Table 36

College Students' Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment, by Perceived Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Threat</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = N.S.
Table 37
College Students’ Attitudes Toward Discrimination-in-Reverse, by Perceived Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Threat</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in Reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = N.S.

The three previous tables indicate that there is no significant relationship between perceived threat and attitudes toward equal opportunity, preferential treatment or discrimination-in-reverse. Attitudes toward the three types of anti-discrimination policies did not vary in relation to whether or not respondents perceived these policies to be threatening to them personally. These results do not lend support for the third hypothesis that individuals who feel personally threatened by anti-discrimination public policies would be less favorable toward these policies than those who do not feel threatened.
Awareness that Compensatory Policies Have Benefited Other Groups and Attitudes Towards Anti-Discriminatory Public Policies

Hypothesis four predicts that individuals who are aware that compensatory policies have benefited other groups will be more favorable towards these policies for non-whites. Hypothesis four is posited on the assumption that persons who recognize that special treatment is a historical and current reality for special groups in the United States will be more accepting of favoritism policies for non-whites. Factor analysis resulted in two groups that respondents identified as having received compensatory policies. These two groups have been labeled "dominant group" and "non-dominant group." Tables 38, 39, and 40 indicate the relationships between the awareness that the dominant group has benefited from compensatory policies and attitudes towards the three major types of anti-discriminatory public policies.
Table 38
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity, by Awareness of Compensatory Policies Benefiting Dominant Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Dominant Group Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>36% (78)</td>
<td>32% (69)</td>
<td>35% (78)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Neutral</td>
<td>29% (63)</td>
<td>34% (74)</td>
<td>35% (78)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>35% (77)</td>
<td>34% (74)</td>
<td>30% (68)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = \text{N.S.}$
Table 39
College Students’ Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment, by Awareness of Compensatory Policies Benefiting Dominant Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Dominant Group Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (86)</td>
<td>30% (65)</td>
<td>31% (70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% (67)</td>
<td>41% (89)</td>
<td>27% (60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% (64)</td>
<td>28% (60)</td>
<td>40% (92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .135
P < .001
Table 40
College Students' Attitudes Toward Discrimination-in-Reverse, by Awareness of Compensatory Policies Benefiting Dominant Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Dominant Group Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in Reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .178 \]
\[ P < .001 \]

The three previous tables show that awareness of dominant groups receiving compensatory policies is significantly related to two types of anti-discriminatory public policies - preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse. Thus, respondents who indicated that they were aware that compensatory policies had benefited the dominant group were more favorable toward preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse policies than were those who were not aware. However, the relationship was not a particularly strong one for preferential treatment as the percentage differences was less
than ten percent.

These results are consistent with hypothesis four. As predicted, respondents who were aware that others had benefited from compensatory policies were more favorable toward compensatory policies for non-whites. Importantly, there was no relationship between awareness that dominant groups had benefited from equal opportunity. Equal opportunity is not a compensatory policy; therefore no relationship here tends to confirm the hypothesis.

Tables 41, 42, and 43 indicate the relationship between the awareness that non-dominant groups have benefited from compensatory policies and attitudes towards the three major types of anti-discriminatory public policies.
Table 41
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity, by Awareness of Compensatory Policies Benefiting Non-Dominant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Non-Dominant Groups Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = \text{N.S.} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Non-Dominant Groups Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>57% (126)</td>
<td>31% (67)</td>
<td>14% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34% (76)</td>
<td>43% (92)</td>
<td>23% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>9% (21)</td>
<td>26% (57)</td>
<td>64% (140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
P < .001 \\
G = .61
\]
Table 43
College Students' Attitudes Toward Discrimination-in-Reverse, by Awareness of Compensatory Policies Benefiting Non-Dominant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Non-Dominant Groups Receiving Compensatory Benefits</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>35% (79)</td>
<td>37% (80)</td>
<td>28% (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in Reverse</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34% (76)</td>
<td>33% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>31% (68)</td>
<td>30% (64)</td>
<td>39% (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \text{N.S.} \]

As shown in Tables 41, 42, and 43, awareness that non-dominant groups receiving compensatory benefits is associated with attitudes toward preferential treatment but not attitudes toward equal opportunity or discrimination-in-reverse. As indicated in Table 42, students who are aware that non-dominant groups have received compensatory benefits are more favorable toward preferential treatment policies for non-whites than are those students who are not aware (fifty-seven percent as opposed to fourteen percent). These results are significant at the .01 level. In contrast, as indicated in Tables 41 and 43, there is no relationship between awareness of non-
dominant groups receiving compensatory benefits and attitudes toward equal opportunity and discrimination-in-reverse.

These findings are only partially consistent with hypothesis four. As predicted, preferential treatment is associated with awareness of other groups receiving special treatment. But, although the results of cross-tabulating awareness of other groups receiving special treatment with discrimination-in-reverse is in the predicted direction, the results are not significant.

In summary, the results discussed in this section tend to partially confirm hypothesis four. As predicted, awareness that the dominant group has benefited from compensatory policies is significantly related to attitudes toward preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse. Moreover, awareness that other groups have benefited from compensatory policies is also significantly related to preferential treatment but, unexpectedly, not discrimination-in-reverse. Predictably, neither awareness of dominant or other groups receiving compensatory benefits was related to attitudes toward equal opportunity since equal opportunity is not a form of compensatory policy.

Perception of Inequality as it Relates to Attitudes Toward Anti-Discrimination Public Policies.

Hypothesis five predicts that those who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites and women. Hypothesis five is predicated on the assumption that respondents who perceive the U. S.
to be historically and currently a nation of inequality are more likely to favor anti-discrimination public policies which attempt to further equality for those previously denied groups. Tables 44, 45, and 46 show the results of cross-tabulating respondents' perceptions as to the existence of inequality with their attitudes toward the three types of anti-discriminatory public policies for non-whites.

Table 44
College Students' Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity, by Perception of Past and Present Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Inequality</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = N.S.
Table 45

College Students' Attitudes Toward Preferential Treatment, by Perceptions of Past and Present Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Inequality</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = \text{N.S.}$
Table 46

College Students' Attitudes Toward Discrimination-in-Reverse, by Perceptions of Past and Present Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Inequality</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in Reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 \text{ sig .001} \]
\[ G = .16 \]

As shown in Table 46, analysis of the data relating to perceptions as to the existence of past and present inequality reveals that one type of anti-discriminatory policy (discrimination-in-reverse) is significantly affected by respondents' perceptions of inequality in the United States. That is, students did differ significantly in their support for discrimination-in-reverse when grouped according to their perceptions of past and present inequality.

Those students who perceived the existence of inequality in the United States were more likely to be in favor of discrimination-in-reverse public policies than were those who did not perceive the existence of inequality. In comparison, as shown in Tables 44 and 45.
perceptions as to the existence of past and present inequality did not significantly affect respondents' support for either equal opportunity or preferential treatment public policies.

The above results do support the research hypothesis that respondents who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites than those who did not perceive the existence of past and present inequality. Of the three anti-discriminatory public policies, discrimination-in-reverse espouses the most favoritism while equal opportunity espouses the least. Importantly, although the results were not significant, respondents who perceived the existence of past and present inequality were also more favorable toward preferential treatment public policies than those who did not perceive the existence of past and present inequality. There was no relationship, however, between perception of inequality and attitudes toward equal opportunity public policies. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis.

When respondents' perceptions regarding the existence of past and present inequality are cross-tabulated with attitudes toward discriminating against females, significant results also emerged. Table 47 shows the results of these tabulations.
Table 47

College Students' Attitudes Toward Female Discrimination, by Perceptions of Past and Present Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Inequality</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² sig .001
G = .21
P < .001

As can be seen in Table 47 it is apparent that respondents' perceptions of past and present inequality influences their attitudes regarding discriminatory public policies against females. Students who perceived the existence of past and present inequality were more likely to be opposed to discriminatory public policies affecting females whereas those who did not perceive the existence of inequality were more likely to be in favor of such policies. These results were statistically significant and supported hypothesis five.

The data discussed above do seem to indicate that perceptions of the existence of past and present inequality are related to attitudes.
toward anti-discrimination public policies. Hypothesis five predicts that those respondents who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites and women. The data indicate this relationship and the results were statistically significant. Importantly, the data also show that as public policies decrease in their degree of favoritism, so does the strength of the relationship between these policies and the perception of the existence of past and present inequality. Thus, while the relationship between the perception of past and present inequality and discrimination-in-reverse is significant, it is not for preferential treatment; and, for equal opportunity there is no relationship at all.
CHAPTER IV

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to empirically assess college student's attitudes relevant to racial anti-discrimination public policies, i.e., policies designed to reduce or eliminate racial inequities. During the past thirty-five years, broad and fundamental social changes have occurred in the structure of race relations in this country. A principal force behind these changes has been anti-discriminatory public policies. In no other period has public policy played such an influential and far-reaching role in the history of American race relations.

The utilization of public policy, however, to end racial discrimination has been extremely controversial. This controversy stems from a value conflict over the moral rightness of such policies. One basis for such conflict is traceable to values as articulated in the Declaration of Independence.

The Bill of Rights contains both human rights and individual rights. But, as Myrdal and others have maintained, there is a potential for conflict inherent in these two kinds of rights. For instance, an appeal to one kind of right may be interpreted as a denial of the other. Hence, the controversy over anti-discrimination public policies is based on conflicting groups perceiving these policies as either denying or supporting their rights.

Recently, certain groups, concerned about the legitimacy of
anti-discrimination public policies, have appealed to the courts to settle their grievances. *DeFunis vs. Odegaard* and *Bakke vs. The University of California*, two of the most widely publicized cases, were decided in the United States Supreme Court. The decisions of these and of other cases have led to a curtailment in the application of anti-discrimination policies. It is speculated by some minority spokespersons that, within a few years, the era of anti-racial discrimination public policies will probably come to an end.

For all of its impact on American race relations, there is still a dearth of empirical research on attitudes toward these policies. Most of the academic work in the area is philosophical and/or impressionistic in nature. Thus, a wealth of polemical material, both for and against these policies, can be found. Such arguments usually focus on a central question: are these policies justifiable and are they necessary? While these arguments are important in that they help define the value conflict surrounding anti-discrimination policies, empirical research on attitudes is also useful as a barometer of how the general public feels about these policies. Hence, this study's main thrust was to empirically assess attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies in order to learn what these attitudes are as well as to identify any significant correlates.

College students were selected as a target population because much of the controversy surrounding anti-discrimination public policies has focused on the application of these policies in the university setting. It was assumed that college students would not only be
aware of but would be more likely to have an opinion of these policies than many other groups.

This study concentrated on three general types of attitudes toward anti-discrimination policies: 1) attitudes toward equal opportunity, 2) preferential treatment, and 3) discrimination-in-reverse. Policies regarding equal opportunity, preferential treatment, and discrimination-in-reverse vary in the degree to which they advocate achievement vs. ascriptive criteria as the basis for determining selection. On a continuum, equal opportunity emphasizes achievement whereas discrimination-in-reverse emphasizes ascription with preferential treatment falling between the two.

Attitudes were assessed regarding the three types of anti-discrimination public policies in three institutional settings—the university, business, and government. While the focus of this study was on anti-discrimination public policies for non-whites, consideration was also given to the application of these policies for women. This dual focus provided a comparison regarding two major issues in society today: racial and sexual inequality.

Five hypotheses were derived from the theoretical and empirical literature.

(1) Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary with the degree of favoritism advocated by the policy. The greater the favoritism, the less acceptance of the policy.

(2) Attitudes towards anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to groups effected by these policies. Groups likely to gain from anti-discrimination public policies will respond more favorably than groups which stand to lose.
(3) Attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies will vary according to the degree that an individual feels personally threatened by these policies. Those who feel threatened will be less favorable than those who do not.

(4) Individuals who believe that compensatory policies have benefited other groups in the past will be more favorable towards these policies for non-whites.

(5) Individuals who perceive the existence of past and present inequality will be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites.

In order to assess the validity of these hypotheses under conditions which are suggested in the literature to be relevant, seven demographic variables were included as control variables. They were: age, father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, parents' income and class level.

The procedures for this investigation involved the gathering of questionnaire data from 721 students in what is taken to be a typical, large mid-western state university. A purposive sample was utilized to obtain a certain representation of cases from each stratum, particularly with regards to key demographic variables. The sampling strategy was to ensure an adequate representation of black respondents and to obtain a sample representative of the university population. To this end, the percentage of black respondents was similar to the percentage of black persons in the United States and the student sample was similar to the larger student body on the dimension of class composition. The questionnaires were administered to students during the Winter and Spring terms of 1974.
Summary of Major Findings

It was predicted that the greater the degree of favoritism advocated by an anti-discrimination public policy the less the acceptance of that policy. The findings clearly support this prediction. Respondents were least favorable toward discrimination-in-reverse, the policy with the greatest degree of favoritism, and most favorable toward equal opportunity which allows for the least favoritism. These results lend support to the first hypothesis and also substantiate the findings of previous studies.

The second hypothesis stated that attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies would vary according to groups effected by these policies. Groups likely to gain from anti-discrimination policies were predicted to respond more favorably toward them than were groups likely to be handicapped by such policies. Group membership, on the basis of race and sex, was examined in relation to attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies. As predicted, group membership was found to be related to attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies, in that, non-whites were more in favor of preferential treatment and most in favor of discrimination-in-reverse public policies. While both of the two preceding types of policies would benefit non-whites, discrimination-in-reverse policies are viewed as most advantageous to this group. In contrast, white respondents were most favorable toward equal opportunity policies. Of the three types of anti-discrimination policies, equal opportunity policies are the least disadvantageous for whites because they ad-
vocate the least amount of favoritism to non-whites.

In a similar vein, men were more favorable than women toward policies which discriminated against women. Perhaps it should be noted, however, that attitudes were assessed toward sexually discriminating public policies rather than public policies against sexual discrimination. Nonetheless, the results clearly indicate that the group which would gain from sexually discriminating policies, i.e., men, are more in favor of these policies than are women—the group which stands to lose.

It was also hypothesized that individuals who believe that compensatory policies have benefited other groups in the past would be more favorable toward these policies for non-whites. Factor analysis identified two categories that respondents felt were conceptually distinct. One category, referred to as "dominant groups," consisted of whites and men, while the second category consisted of veterans and the disabled or "non-dominant groups."

Analysis of the data revealed that an awareness that dominant groups had received special treatment was related to attitudes toward compensatory policies for non-whites. Those respondents who were aware that dominant groups had previously received special treatment were more favorable toward preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse public policies than were those who were not aware. Moreover, regarding equal opportunity, there was no significant difference between those who were aware and those who were not aware of dominant groups receiving special treatment. Here, the finding of no significant difference is consistent with the hypothesis because equal
opportunity is not a compensatory policy; therefore, whether or not one was aware that dominant groups had received special treatment should not have had any significant effect on their attitudes toward equal opportunity.

Awareness of non-dominant groups receiving special treatment was found to be significantly related to only attitudes toward preferential treatment. Although not significant, those who were aware of other groups receiving special treatment were also more likely to favor discrimination-in-reverse.

While the results regarding the awareness of non-dominant groups receiving special treatment was not as strong as the results regarding the awareness of dominant groups receiving special treatment, this difference may be due to the nature of the categories "non-dominant" versus "dominant." The category "dominant" groups consists of men and whites, and members of this category have received special treatment that was discriminatory towards non-members solely because they were "outsiders." In contrast, special treatment sometimes accorded veterans and the handicapped who comprise the category "non-dominant" is best categorized as preferential treatment and awarded as compensation. Persons not included in the category "non-dominant" have not had the status as "outsiders." Therefore, it seems plausible that respondents equated the treatment they perceived non-dominant groups to receive with the treatment they felt non-whites should receive and also the same for dominant groups vis-a-vis non-whites. This line of reasoning would account for the significant relationship found
between dominant groups and discrimination-in-reverse and preferential treatment policies, and non-dominant groups and only preferential treatment policies.

It was hypothesized that individuals who perceive the existence of past and present inequality would be more favorable toward favoritism policies for non-whites. The results of this research tend to confirm this hypothesis. Respondents who were aware of past and present inequality were more likely to favor discrimination-in-reverse policies for non-whites. Moreover, those who were aware of past and present inequality were also less likely to be in favor of discriminating against females. Both of these results were statistically significant and are supportive of the hypothesis.

However, there was no statistically significant association between awareness of the past and present inequality and support for preferential treatment policies for non-whites. This finding may be interpreted in the same way as the results regarding dominant and non-dominant groups, that is, preferential treatment policies may not have been perceived by respondents as compensatory enough, given the extent of past and present inequality for non-whites and women vis-a-vis whites and men. Congruent with this interpretation is the fact that no statistically significant relationship was found between awareness of past and present inequality and support for equal opportunity policies. Perhaps those who are aware of past and present inequality feel that equal opportunity and preferential treatment are inadequate to end discrimination.
Class level was also found to be associated with attitudes toward preferential treatment policies. As a student advances in college, irrespective of race, attitudes toward preferential treatment become more favorable. While it is possible to speculate as to the many qualities within class level that influence attitudes toward equal opportunity and preferential treatment policies, there is evidence that age is not one of them. As a control variable, age was not found to be associated with preferential treatment anti-discrimination public policies.

While chronological age may not be important, maturation seems to be an important factor within class level. Attending college is an educational process which is designed to provide not only knowledge but also a wide range of experiences. Feldman (1969) in his review of research on the impact of college on students concluded that:

Most investigators find that seniors typically have increased awareness of their emotions and increased freedom of expression in words or behavior as indicated by increases on such instruments as the Impulse Expression Scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI). This can be interpreted as indicative of increasing maturity and development (Feldman, 1969, p. 214).

In this vein, some theorists also see college as shaping "students toward statuses and roles for which they have never been eligible" (Wallace, 1964, p. 303). In this process of taking on new roles, students usually break from family and their local community and develop "an independence of spirit that is useful in our highly mobile society" (Feldman, 1969, p. 215). It seems highly probable that
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some of these factors found to impact students as they advance through college might also have contributed to the differences in opinions toward anti-discrimination public policies found to exist by class level in this study.

As a demographic variable, sex was found to be significantly associated with attitudes toward preferential treatment. However, when sex was used as a control variable between the relationship of sex and attitudes toward preferential treatment, only white men and women differed in their attitudes. White women were more likely to favor preferential treatment than were white men. In contrast, there was no difference in the responses of non-white men and women toward preferential treatment. Importantly, these results are congruent with the hypothesis that group gain is a significant factor in influencing attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies. Both non-whites and women stand to gain from these policies whereas white men stand to lose.

Age was found to be an interacting variable with race in influencing attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse public policies. For white respondents, attitudes toward discrimination-in-reverse become more favorable with age. For non-whites, there is consistently high support for discrimination-in-reverse policies, irrespective of age.

Class level was found to be a predictor of attitudes toward equal opportunity. For both non-white and white respondents attitudes toward equal opportunity became less favorable as class level
increased. These results suggest that class level, rather than race, may be an important predictor of attitudes toward equal opportunity.

Finally, the hypothesis that predicted that attitudes toward anti-discrimination public policies would vary according to the extent to which a respondent felt personally threatened by a policy was not supported in this study. No significant difference was found between those who felt threatened and those who did not with regards to attitudes toward favoritism policies.

Implications

The data for this study were collected in 1974, yet the findings appear to be as relevant today as they were then. In the 1970s, a major thrust in American society was to implement affirmative action policies in government, education and industry for racial minorities and women. And, to a large extent, the initiator of this thrust was the federal government. While there was some awareness of opposition to affirmative action policies, especially as conflict emerged around court cases including DeFunis vs. Odegaard and Bakke vs. The University of California, the true extent of opposition among the general population was never revealed. In a real sense, affirmative action was being implemented irrespective of the varying opinions held by the general public.

It was not until the mid-to-late 1970s that widespread opposition to affirmative action became an issue. In line with public sentiment, a major conclusion of this study is that widespread sup-
port for compensatory policies for non-whites was not present among white students but rather there was either opposition or ambivalence as indicated by the large numbers of respondents who were neutral. However, there was overwhelming support for equal opportunity public policies. If these findings could be generalized to the broader white population, they suggest that there is a large amount of support for equal opportunity but that the compensatory policies—preferential treatment and discrimination-in-reverse—do not have the broad based support necessary to implement them for any lengthy period of time. In a sense, the results of this study may be an indicator of the coming demise of compensatory policies in the 1980s.

A practical implication of these findings is that, although compensatory policies are not supported by the general public, there seems to be wide acceptance of equal opportunity for non-whites. Regarding the latter, twenty years ago one would not expect to uncover such a finding. Today, these results tend to be overshadowed by the controversy over favoritism public policies. Nonetheless, their importance should not be overlooked. That the great majority widely accepts equal opportunity for non-whites is not only indicative of the progress non-whites have made toward achieving equality, it may also be instructive as to what non-whites must do in the future.

While equality for non-whites is still not a reality, the majority of Americans show a favorableness toward the inclusion of non-whites into the American mainstream. What will be crucial in the coming years is whether this attitude is translated into policy.
The demise of compensatory policies need not mean the end to affirmative action. The Bakke Case has shown that the Supreme Court is amenable to affirmative action if race is only one consideration along with other factors, and a comparison among competing individuals is made. Given these circumstances, it is possible for affirmative action to survive in a modified form. Affirmative action under these conditions would be much less compensatory and more equal opportunity. A modified form appears to be congruent with the wishes of the American public and, if implemented, would continue the progress toward equality for non-whites albeit at a much slower pace and probably without the current high level of controversy.

The pervasive nature and role of group conflict was revealed by the findings of this study. In Chapter One a theoretical construct was developed which viewed conflict over values as being responsible for the current status of intergroup relations in this country. Significantly, the results of this study are in line with the theoretical construct of value conflict.

The strongest predictor variable of attitudes toward affirmative action was group status. Parenthetically, men, women, whites and non-whites were the principal status groups involved. The pervasiveness of the role group conflict plays is especially illustrated in one important finding. Throughout the study there was no significant difference between the attitudes of non-white men and women. This result indicates a cohesive group position. However, on only one item did non-white men and women disagree.
Overwhelmingly, non-white men supported discriminating against females (75 percent in favor, 3 percent opposed) while non-white women were ambivalent (32 percent favor to 32 percent opposed). It might be argued that, in this situation, that non-white women experienced competing group loyalties as non-whites and as women, while non-white men are in direct competition with women over the allocation of favoritism policies. Therefore, while the strong support that non-white men have for discriminating against women may appear as an anomaly at first, these results are consistent with the theoretical construct of conflict developed in this paper.

Group conflict is also very much evident in the dichotomy between attitudes of non-whites and whites toward the three types of anti-discrimination public policies. Non-whites clearly favor compensatory policies for themselves while whites support equal opportunity. These results are not consistent with previous research and strongly suggest not only a shift in attitudes among non-whites away from equal opportunity but also a coalescing of group sentiment among non-whites. According to previous studies, non-whites responded similarly to whites on questions concerning equal opportunity and their mutual responses inferred an "American sentiment." The results of this study, however, indicate group positions based on race and sex. Thus, a theoretical implication of this study is that group conflict over values is, indeed, the pattern of race relations in the United States.

In Chapter One, a case was made for the existence of a paradox
in American race relations based on value conflict over what ought to be. This paradox has led to seemingly incongruent events as competing groups strive to institutionalize their values. Most scholars, however, will agree that Myrdal's conceptualization of an American Creed has existed as a shared set of value. And, although the American Creed has existed in reality to the exclusion of some, it was precisely these outgroups who aspired for full inclusion.

The Bill of Rights is often credited as being at the roots of the institutionalization of the conflict over values. Tersely, two kinds of rights are represented in the Ten Amendments: human rights and individual rights. Equality is viewed by many to be synonymous with human rights. Equality in a very general sense refers to equal protection under the law. However, how and for whom equality is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights has varied throughout American history. When the Declaration of Independence was written, equality did not exist for slaves, women, and a large percentage of the male population (Frankel, 1974). More recently, equality has been interpreted by the courts, executive branch and the Congress to mean equality of opportunity. Vernon Jordon calls this era of equal opportunity the Second Reconstruction. According to Jordon (1977, p. 15):

The Second Reconstruction swept away laws and practices that denied civil rights to blacks and other minorities, extended the right to vote, enabled access to schools and housing to those denied them, and provided for Federal programs for health, housing, education and
economic security designed to assist groups disad­
advantaged in those areas.

In contrast, the value for liberty or freedom is usually synony­
mous with individual rights. These rights are often seen as pro­
tecting the individual against the state. However, too often through­
out American history individual rights have been interpreted for the "haves" to the detriment of the "have nots." As Herbert Gans (1973) cogently argues, "... liberty has become the ideology of the more fortunate to be free as they were in the past to keep the less fortunate in their place." Continuing this line of reasoning, Gans (1973, p. 27) proposes that "those who ask for more equality are not opposed to liberty per se; in fact, they want more liberty for themselves. Thus they need sufficient equality so that they too can enjoy the liberty now virtually monopolized by the haves."

Historically, proponents of full inclusion for minority groups in the United States have appealed to the value for equality whereas opponents of full inclusion have relied on the value of liberty to deny equality to others. However, the era of compensatory public policies has turned this pattern topsy-turvy. Proponents of compensatory policies for minority groups are still appealing to a goal of human rights but their means are clearly particularistic. Compensatory policies may have as an end result greater equality, but the policies themselves are exclusionary. In turn, opponents of compensatory policies have found themselves in a position of defending equality; a position with which many would have previously been uncomfortable.
This situation has created a great deal of ambiguity. The findings of this study indicate firm group positions based on race and sex with regards to compensatory policies. There are practical implications for this finding. At a time when the white majority is most in favor of equal opportunity and the courts are picking away at favoritism anti-discrimination policies, it is all too easy to ignore the dynamics of group conflict over values. Indeed, in the last two years there has been a marked decline in emphasis on the part of the media on racial conflict, in general, and specifically on value conflict over anti-discrimination policies. Lack of public attention belies the reality that non-whites have a group position and that an understanding of race relations in the 1980s will require a critical examination of the position and tactics non-whites take in pursuit of equality. However, this examination becomes complicated as racial conflict goes unrecognized and other issues in society take preeminence.

In this vein, there are at least two research implications to the findings of this study. First, a replication would be useful to determine the nature of group conflict over values at this point in time. The data for this study were collected in 1974; it is plausible that attitudes might have shifted. Second, a complex analysis of the individual variables in this study might identify information that was lost in the process of hypotheses testing. This analysis could be done on the original results as well as through a replication study.
During the 1970s, the major push in American race relations was to improve the economic status of non-whites and women and to facilitate their greater participation in American institutions. The early 1980s will probably focus on an accounting of these efforts. However, this research serves to point out the need to also take account of the more implicit factors of values and attitudes. Is the American Creed still a shared ideal of most Americans or has a group position replaced it? An answer to this question could provide the key to predicting race relations in the 1980s.
Footnotes

1 Friend of the Court briefs are submitted by individuals or groups who either feel they will be directly affected by the court decision or can offer insight or information not available from parties to the suit.

2 In all instances, attempts were made to include as much data as possible, subjects were omitted when missing data did not permit inclusion in the analysis.

3 Kaiser and others maintain that only factors having eigen values of greater than one can be meaningfully interpreted.

4 The relationship between "other groups receiving compensatory benefits" and attitudes toward preferential treatment will be examined in a later section.

5 The two groups that comprise this category are veterans and the disabled.

Dear Student:

This study is concerned with assessing college student attitudes towards compensatory or affirmative action programs. During the last few years compensatory or affirmative action programs have been adopted by numerous business, educational and government organizations. Yet there is very little information on peoples attitudes towards these programs. This study is intended to provide badly needed information on this subject.

The results of this study will be made available to the university administration and all academic departments in the university. Therefore it is very important that you answer the following questions as honestly as possible; the results of this study may influence future policies concerning compensatory or affirmative action programs. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and important for the success of this study.

Your answers are confidential. All questionnaires are anonymous. The information you provide will be coded onto IBM cards and will be reported only as statistical summaries for groups.

Thank you for your help.
GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please select the answer for each question which best explains your feelings. Record this answer on the answer sheet starting with question 1.

First we would like to ask you some general questions about yourself so that we will know something about those students who participated in this study.

1. 1) Female 2) Male

2. My age is:
   1) 17 years old 5) 23-25 years old
   2) 18 years old 6) 26-29 years old
   3) 19-20 years old 7) 30-35 years old
   4) 21-22 years old 8) Other

3. My race or ethnicity is:
   1) American Indian 5) Jewish American
   2) Asian American 6) Mexican American
   3) Afro-American 7) Foreign student
   4) European American 8) Other

4. Father's education:
   1) less than high school graduate 4) college graduate
   2) high school graduate 5) post-graduate
   3) some college

5. Mother's education:
   1) less than high school graduate 4) college graduate
   2) high school graduate 5) post-graduate
   3) some college

6. Father's occupation:
   1) professional/executive/managerial
   2) white collar/salesman/accountant
   3) craftsman/technician
   4) clerical/salesclerk
   5) blue collar/manual laborer
   6) farmer

7. Mother's occupation:
   1) professional/executive/managerial
   2) white collar/salesman/accountant
   3) craftsman/technician
   4) blue collar/manual laborer
   5) farmer
   6) housewife
8. Parent's combined income:
1) under $3,000 per year  
2) $3,000-$4,999 per year  
3) $5,000-$9,999 per year  
4) $10,000-$14,999 per year  
5) $15,000-$19,999 per year  
6) $20,000-$29,999 per year  
7) $30,000-$49,999 per year  
8) $50,000 or more per year

9. Class level:
1) Freshman  
2) Sophomore  
3) Junior  
4) Senior  
5) Graduate student  
6) Unclassified

10. Are you planning to attend graduate school?
1) yes  
2) no  
3) undecided

11. Academic major:
1) business—accounting, marketing, finance, insurance, real estate  
2) education—counseling, elementary education, home economics, nursing  
3) creative arts—drama, music, industrial arts, radio-TV films  
4) health and recreation—physical education, health and safety education  
5) humanities—literature, philosophy, journalism, foreign language  
6) natural sciences—biology, chemistry, engineering, geology, math  
7) social sciences—anthropology, economics, history, political science, sociology  
8) undecided

Now we would like to ask you about your feelings towards compensatory or affirmative action programs in education.

12. Some colleges and universities have a predominately white student body and prefer to keep it that way. Is it alright for these schools to maintain this policy?
1) strongly agree  
2) agree  
3) undecided  
4) disagree  
5) strongly disagree
13. It is the practice of certain colleges and universities to consider applicants on the basis of achievement without regard to race. Do you agree or disagree with these policies.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

14. If a college or university has a disproportionate number of white students and few racial minority students, should this university give preference to qualified minority applicants?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

Which of the following groups, if any, do you feel should be given preference if they are under-represented?
   1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) undecided 4) disagree 5) strongly disagree

15. Afro-Americans
16. American Indians
17. Asian Americans
18. European Americans
19. Mexican Americans
20. Women
21. Men

22. In considering admission to college, some colleges and universities require female applicants to have a higher grade point average than male applicants. These universities pursue this policy in order to maintain an equal ratio of male to female enrollment. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
23. Since a large number of racial minority students have been denied an adequate elementary and secondary education, these students are sometimes admitted to college without regard to admission requirements. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

24. Racial minority students are sometimes admitted to a college or university without meeting the admission requirements. How many universities in the United States would you guess practice this policy?
   1) most
   2) about half
   3) about one-third
   4) about one-tenth
   5) none

   Of the following groups, in your opinion, what proportion of the students representing each group enrolled at your university have not met the admission requirements?
   1) most
   2) about half
   3) about one-third
   4) about one-tenth
   5) none

25. Afro-Americans

26. American Indians

27. Asian Americans

28. European Americans

29. Mexican Americans

30. Do you feel that financial aid should be distributed without regard to an applicant's race?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

31. Do you feel that a college or university should provide financial aid on the basis of need rather than scholarship?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
32. In administering financial aid, some colleges and universities give preference to students who are members of racial minorities. What is your opinion of this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

33. Certain financial aid programs are only available to students who are members of specific racial minorities. What is your opinion?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

34. In considering applicants for financial aid, some universities limit the number of female applicants to a given percentage. This policy is pursued in order that both sexes are equally benefited. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

35. Do you feel that financial aid programs favor certain groups of students to the detriment of other students?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

Which groups, if any, do you feel receive a disproportionate amount of financial aid?
   1) strongly 2) agree 3) undecided 4) disagree 5) strongly agree

36. Whites
37. Nonwhites
38. Men
39. Women
40. Middle class
41. Lower class

42. From your experience as a college student, do you feel that black students are given more favorable, equal or less favorable treatment by instructors?
   1) more favorable
   2) equal
   3) less favorable

43. Generally, do you feel that black students are as academically prepared for college as white students?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

44. Do you feel that black students are given more favorable, equal or less favorable treatment in the department which you are a major in?
   1) more favorable
   2) equal
   3) less favorable

Now we would like to ask you about your feelings towards compensatory or affirmative action programs in business.

45. Do you think that businesses and industries should consider applicants for jobs on the basis of qualifications without regard to race?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

46. If a particular business or industry has a limited representation of minority employees, should this business give preference to qualified minority applicants?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

Which of the following groups, if any, should be given preference if they are under-represented?
   1) strongly 2) agree 3) undecided 4) disagree 5) strongly agree

47. American Indians
48. Afro-Americans

49. Asian Americans

50. European Americans

51. Mexican Americans

52. Women

53. Men

54. Racial minority applicants are sometimes hired by a business without regard to the requirements for the job. This policy is pursued in order to integrate the firm. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

55. Although qualified females have applied, a business prefers to hire a man for a certain position. How do you feel about this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

56. Some businesses prefer to hire white employees. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

57. In order to insure that their firm is integrated, some businesses and industries plan, in advance, to hire a certain percentage of qualified nonwhite employees. What do you think of this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
58. In order to insure that their firm is integrated, some businesses and industries try to hire a certain number of non-whites without regard to requirements. What do you think of this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

59. Some businesses and industries limit the number of female employees in order to maintain a high ratio of male employees to female employees. What do you think of this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

60. Do you feel that a business or industry should award promotions without regard to race?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

61. If two equally qualified employees are up for promotion, it is the policy of some companies to select the nonwhite employee for promotion if there are only a few or no non-white employees who currently hold that position. How do you feel about this policy?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

62. Racial minority employees are sometimes promoted by a business or industry because these firms have an insignificant number of higher ranking nonwhite employees. How do you feel about this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
63. If two equally qualified employees are up for promotion, some companies prefer to award it to the male employee. Do you approve or disapprove of this practice?
1) strongly approve
2) approve
3) undecided
4) disapprove
5) strongly disapprove

64. Nonwhite applicants are sometimes given preference over white applicants for jobs. How many businesses would you guess practice this policy?
1) most
2) about half
3) about one-third
4) about one-tenth
5) none

65. How many businesses would you guess give preference to white applicants for jobs?
1) most
2) about half
3) about one-third
4) about one-tenth
5) none

66. Do you feel that hiring policies which favor nonwhites are necessary to counter-balance hiring policies which favor whites?
1) strongly agree
2) disagree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

67. Do you feel that nonwhite applicants who are given preference in hiring are as qualified as white applicants?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

Now we would like to ask you about your feelings towards compensatory or affirmative action programs provided by government.
68. Some people feel that it is not the job of the Federal government to interfere with the hiring practices of private businesses. Do you agree or disagree with this opinion?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

69. Do you feel that it is the job of the Federal government to insure that American citizens are considered on the basis of qualifications without regard to race by private businesses in hiring and promotions?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

70. In order to open up opportunities for nonwhites, the Federal government sometimes encourages firms which handle government contracts to hire qualified nonwhites. Do you agree or disagree with this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

71. In order to keep a government contract, firms are occasionally required by the Federal government to hire a certain percentage of nonwhites. The Federal government may demand this of firms that are not integrated. Do you agree or disagree with this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

72. Recently women are suing firms that practice sexual discrimination. Do you feel that it is the job of the Federal government to end this practice?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
73. The Federal government provides job training programs for the unemployed. Do you feel that applicants for these programs should be selected without regard to race?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

74. Since the percentage of nonwhite unemployment is greater than white unemployment, should job training programs give preference to nonwhite applicants?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

75. Since the percentage of nonwhite unemployment is greater than white unemployment, should the Federal government have special job training programs for nonwhites?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

We would now like to ask you about your general feelings towards compensatory or affirmative action policies.

76. Do you feel that a policy of preferring racial minorities and/or women which some institutions have adopted will hurt your chances for the job which you eventually hope to obtain?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

77. Do you feel that a policy of preferring racial minorities and/or women which some institutions have adopted will hurt your chances of getting into the graduate college of your choice?
1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) undecided
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree
6) does not apply, I am not planning to go to graduate school
78. In your opinion, have any groups received special treatment comparable to what nonwhites are receiving today?
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

In your opinion which of the following groups, if any, have received special treatment comparable to what nonwhites are receiving today in the United States.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

79. Whites

80. Women

81. Men

82. Veterans

83. The Disabled

Which of the following do you think will be necessary to end inequality among whites and nonwhites in the United States?

84. Whites and nonwhites considered on the basis of achievement without regard to race.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

85. Qualified nonwhites given preference over whites until the racial imbalance between the two groups is eliminated.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

86. Nonwhites without regard to qualifications are given preference until the racial imbalance between the two groups is eliminated.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree
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In order to end inequality between whites and nonwhites, which of the following policies would you support.

87. Whites and nonwhites considered on the basis of achievement without regard to race.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

88. Qualified nonwhites given preference over whites until the racial imbalance between the two groups is eliminated.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

89. Nonwhites, without regard to qualifications, are given preference until the racial imbalance between the two groups is eliminated.
   1) strongly agree
   2) agree
   3) undecided
   4) disagree
   5) strongly disagree

Finally, we would like to ask you a few questions about your current assessment of American society so that we can more clearly understand your feelings about compensatory or affirmative action programs.

The following are criticisms that have been amde in recent years about aspects of American society. For each statement, could you indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or are undecided.
   1) strongly  2) agree  3) undecided  4) disagree  5) strongly agree

90. Economic well-being in this country is unjustly and unfairly distributed.

91. Basically we are a racist nation.

92. The effort to end discrimination against nonwhites has resulted in discrimination against whites.

93. This country has failed to eliminate discrimination against its nonwhite citizens.
94. Those nonwhites who don't make it in American society have no one to blame but themselves.

95. Historically, the cruel treatment of black people in this country has been exaggerated.

96. Nonwhites have always suffered oppression in this country.

97. Most women don't want equal opportunity.

98. Men are just naturally superior to women.

99. Which of the following views of American society and American life best reflects your own feelings (single answer).

1) the American way of life is superior to that of any other country.
2) there are serious flaws in our society today but the system is flexible enough to solve them.
3) the American system is not flexible enough, radical change is needed.
4) the whole system ought to be replaced by an entirely new one; the existing structures are too rotten for repair.
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