Models of Likelihood of Support for Affirmative Action

A. Olu Oyinlade, PhD,*
Industrial/Organizational Sociologist
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Omaha, NE 68182
Email: aoyinlade@unomaha.edu

Abstract

Many studies exist on affirmative action (AA), but few have looked at the influences of the characteristics of interview respondents, interviewer characteristics and analysis of phily matches between interviewer and respondents in predicting support for AA in the same study. All these investigations were done in this study to determine the predictors of support for AA. Interviewees (N=491) responded to fully structured, closed-ended questions. Data analysis produced mixed results, but salient findings showed Blacks, women and gender of interviewer as predictors of support for the policy. Phily analysis also indicated that the Black men homophily was the strongest supporter of AA while, the White men homophily was the least supporter (or strongest opponent) of the policy. Overall, this study concludes that both race and gender of interviewer and respondent matter in the likelihood of support for AA, but race matters more than other interview categories.

KEYWORDS: Affirmative Action, Affirmative Action Support, Interviewer Effects, Interview Phily, Phily Analysis

1. Introduction

This study investigated the likelihood that public support for affirmative action (AA) among Blacks[1] and Whites[2] would be predicted by the characteristics of interview respondents, interviewer characteristics and interview phily conditions. Affirmative action (AA) as a government policy was designed as a measure to proactively curb discrimination against the minorities (racial-ethnic, White women, people with disabilities, the aged, etc.) in employment and educational opportunities (Pincus, 2003; Reskin, 1998). Despite the good intentions underpinning the policy, AA has been besieged by controversy and oppositions because many people framed the policy mainly as a violation of the principle of meritocracy (Peterson, 1994), reverse discrimination against themselves (Pincus, 2003) and hurtful to their success by depriving them ready access to societal resources (Harrison, et al., 2006;Kravitz, Blaudau & Klineberg, 2008; Shteynberg, Leslie, Knight & Mayer, 2011). The persistence of opposition to AA has led to its proscription in at least seven US states (Burns, 2011).

Despite significant opposition to AA, the policy does enjoy significant support by many Americans, especially the minorities. Such support seems to be especially high among Blacks and women (Pincus, 2003; Oyinlade, 2013; Oyinlade & Losen, 2014). Support for the policy by the minorities has been largely described as self-serving based on the assumption in literature that those who expect to benefit from the

policy would likely support it while those who framed the policy as detrimental to their interest would likely oppose it (Bell, Harrison & McLaughlin1997; Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Shteynberg, et al., 2011). This assumption has been particularly used to explain why Blacks and women tend to support AA more than Whites and men. The differential pattern of response to AA between Whites and minorities as well as men and women make support for the policy race and gender sensitive.

While studies abound on the role of race and gender on support for AA, fewer studies have focused on the influence of age and education of interview respondents on the likelihood of support for the policy. While recognizing the paucity of studies on age, available findings on the impact of this variable on support for AA appear to be mixed. Jacobson (1985), for example, discovered in two separate multivariate analyses that age was neither a correlate nor a predictor of attitude toward AA, however, he found age to moderate the value of old fashioned racism on attitude toward the policy. Similar inconsistence was also recently found in Oyinlade (2013) in which age was found as a significant correlate of AA support (albeit weak at r = .095), but not a predictor of support for the policy.

Like age, patterns of the influence of education on support for AA can also be described as inconsistent or mixed. Schuman, Steeh, Bobo and Krysan (1997), for example, found an inverse relationship between education and support for race-based AA, such that Whites with less than high school education supported the policy more than higher educated Whites. A recent study by Tuch and Hughes (2011) also found college educated Whites to be more opposed to race-based AA than their high school educated counterparts. Similarly, results in the study by Wodtke (2012) found both college and high school educated Whites to have very low levels of support for race-based AA.

Unlike the findings of the above-mentioned studies, other studies (Elizondo & Crosby, 2004; Oyinlade, 2013; Sidanius, Levin, van Laar &Sears, 2008)have reported a pattern of positive relationship between education and support for AA. Sidanius et al. (2008), for example, found White and Asian-American university students to increase their support for AA as they advanced from freshmen year to senior year. Elizondo and Crosby (2004) similarly observed upper level college students to be more supporting of AA than lower level students. And, among employees of a finance organization, Oyinlade (2013) found education to be the second (next to organizational tenure) strongest positive predictor of support for AA.

Support for, and opposition to, AA have been documented mainly through surveys and interviews which are subject to interviewer effects, and several studies have strongly established the pervasiveness of interviewer-effects on interview response (Davis, 1997a, 1997b; Ellison, McFarland & Krause, 2011; Krysan & Couper, 2003; Livens & Paepe, 2004; Oyinlade & Losen, 2014; Tabane & Bower, 2006). As explained by Tabane and Bower (2006), the power imbalance favoring the interviewer in the "I ask, you answer" and "You ask, I answer" relationship between the interviewer and the respondent, and the exchange of cues between the two, often produce an outcome in which the respondent adjusts his/her responses to satisfy the perceived expectations of the interviewer (Davis, 1997a). Interviewer effects, hence, appear inescapable as an outcome of the interactional process of unequal power relationship which favors the interviewer during survey interviews.

Interviewer-effects have been widely studied on many interviewer factors such as interviewer attitude, education (Durant, Groves, Staetsky & Steele, 2010) and age (Collins & Butcher, 1983) on respondents' behaviors. The most commonly studied interviewer effects, however, have been race (e.g. Ellison, McFarland & Krause, 2011; Januszka, Lora,Wollard & Rocco, 2007; Krysan & Couper, 2003; Springman, Wherry & Notaro, 2006) and gender (Davis, Couper, Janz, Cladwell & Resnicow, 2010; Dykema, Diloreto, Price, White & Schaeffer, 2012; Flores-Macias & Lawson, 2008; Liu & Stainback, 2013; Weinreb, 2006).

Studies of race-of-interviewer effects have been predominant on Black(Davis, 1997a, 1997b; Ellison, McFarland & Krause, 2011; Lievens & De Paepe, 2004), and White respondents (Davis et al., 2010; Finkel, Guterbock, & Borg, 1991; Gong & Aadland, 2011; Krysan & Couper, 2003). As a pattern, results for these studies have shown that both Blacks and Whites responded to interviews with sensitivity to the race of their interviewers by acquiescing to the perceived position of the race of their interviewers (Davis et al., 2010; Ellison, McFarland & Krause, 2011; Finkel, et al., 1991; Gong & Aadland, 2011; Krysan & Couper, 2003). For example, Blacks denied racial discrimination against themselves when the interviewer was White, but not when the interviewer was a fellow Black (Krysan and Couper, 2003), and they (Blacks) indicated to White interviewers than to Black interviewers, that they (Blacks) lacked power to change things or make a political difference through voting (Davis, 1997a). Similarly, Whitesappear to give more liberal responses on race related questions when interviewed by Blacks than by Whites (Davis, 1997a). And, when interviewed by a fellow White rather than Black, Whites strongly expressed trust of all Whites and preference for an all-White community (Krysan & Couper, 2003).

Unlike the vast amount of studies on race-of-interviewer effects, gender-of-interviewer effects appear to have been less studied, and findings of available studies seem to be less consistent across studies, compared to findings on race-of-interviewer effects. Some studies found acquiescence to gender of the interviewer, while some do not. In Gong and Aadland (2011), for example, respondents demonstrated a higher willingness to pay for a curbside recycling program when interviewed by women than when interviewed by men. Weinreb (2006), however, failed to affirm gender-of-interviewer effects, except when women respondents gave different answers to women-insider interviewers than to other categories of interviewers. Inconsistence in gender-of-interviewer effects was also observed by Flores-Macias and Lawson (2008) who found in bivariate analysis in their Mexico City data that men acquiesced to women interviewers on issues like women's rights as a priority for the next president. The authors, however, also found in their Mexico national data that there were virtually no differences on attitudes towards abortion among male respondents by gender of interviewer. In another study, Liu and Stainback (2013) also found mixed results in their study of gender-of-interviewer effects. While they found respondents to be more pro-marriage when interviewed by women than by men in one model, they asserted inconsistence in gender-of-interviewer effects across their statistical models.

2. Objective

Given the established influence of interviewer effects on interview response, the objective of this study was to understand the extent to which support for AA among Blacks and Whites was shaped by the demographic characteristics of interview respondents, interviewer characteristics, and homo and heterophily interview conditions. Based on this objective, the goals of this study,were1)to determine in addition to race (Black and White) and gender, how age and education of interview respondents shaped support for AA, 2) to determine how interviewer race and gender might influence support for AA, 3) to determine if interview conditions of race and gender homophilies would support AA more than race and gender heterophilies respectively, 4) to determine if interview conditions of Black homophily and women homophily would support AA more than White homophily and men homophily respectively, and 5) to determine if support for AA will be higher under race/gender interview homophily than race/gender interview heterophily conditions (see table 1 for explanations of all interview conditions). Based on these goals, this study sought answers to six specific questions:

1. How did interviewer and respondent characteristics shape support for AA?
2. Would the race homophily produce higher support for AA than the race heterophily?
3. Would the gender homophily produce higher support for AA than the gender heterophily?

4. Would the Black homophily produce a greater level of AA support than the White homophily and the race heterophily?
5. Would the women homophily produce a greater level of AA support than the Men homophily and the gender heterophily?
6. Would the Black women and the Black men homophilies produce greater support for AA than the White women and the White men homophilies as well asthe race/gender interview heterophily respectively?

By investigating answers to these six questions which included age and education of respondents as independent variables (absent in recent similar study by Oyinlade and Losen, 2014) in analyses, this study was designed toadd to knowledge on the likelihood of support for AA, and more precisely on the various interview phily conditions that may produce different responses in support for, or opposition to, the policy among the public.

Table1. Explanations of phily concepts

Concepts	**Explanations**
Phily	Interview match between interviewer and respondent
Race Phily	The matching of interviewer and respondent on the basis of race
Gender Phily	The matching of interviewer and respondent on the basis of gender
Homophily	Any condition in which interviewer and respondent areclassified as belonging to the same category
Race Homophily	Both interview conditions in which both interviewer and respondent are in the same race; Blacks interviewing Blacks *plus* Whites interviewing Whites
Gender Homophily	Both interview conditions in which interviewer and respondent are in the same gender: men interviewing men *plus* women interviewing women
Black Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are Black
White Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are White
Men Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are men
Women Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are women
Black men Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are Black men
White men Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are White men
Black women Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are Black women
White women Homophily	Interviewer and respondent are White women
Race/Gender Homophily	All four conditions in which interviewer and respondent are of the same race and gender combination: Black men interviewing Black men *plus* White men interviewing White men, *plus* Black women interviewing Black women, *plus*White women interviewing White women.
Heterophily	Any condition in which interviewer and respondent are classified as belonging to different categories
Race Heterophily	Both conditions in which interviewer and respondent are of different races: Blacks interviewing Whites *plus* Whites interviewing Blacks
Gender Heterophily	Both conditions in which interviewer and respondent are of different genders: men interviewing women *plus* women interviewing men
Race/Gender Heterophily	All 12 conditions in which interviewer and respondent are of different race and gender combinations. Example: Black men interviewing Black women *plus* Black men interviewing White women, *plus* Black men interviewing White men, *plus* White women interviewing White men *plus* White women interviewing Black men, *plus* White women interviewing Black women, *plus* Black women interviewing White men, etc.

3. Method

3.1. Measures: Affirmative action was defined in this study consistently with the US government's definition as any effort beyond simple termination of a discriminatory practice, adopted to correct or compensate for past or present discrimination, or, to prevent discrimination from recurring in the future (Office of Federal Contracts Compliance programs [OFCCP], 2002; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). With the use of items (see table 2) adapted from Parra (1991), support for AA in this study was measured with a summated rating Likert-type scale with seven fully structured, closed-ended items, with response options ranging from 6 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Higher values indicated greater support for AA.

Reliability statistics for the scale of support for AA yielded Chronbach's alpha = .923. Factor analysis with principal component extraction method, showed a strong internal consistency under one component for all the items on the scale. Factor loading coefficients for all items ranged from .690 to .884 (see table 2). Other items on the questionnaire were questions on the race of respondent (*Black = 1, or White = 0*), gender of respondent (*woman =1, man = 0*), age of respondent in ratio value, and education of respondent in continuous ordinal values (*less than high school degree =1, high school degree = 2, some college, no degree = 3, two-year degree = 4, bachelor's degree = 5, post bachelor's degree =6*). Questionnaire items about interviewers were only race (*White = 1, Black = 0*) and gender (*women = 1, man = 0*).

Table 2. Item-by-item correlation matrix for scale of support for affirmative action

SCALE: Support for Affirmative Action								
	Item-by-item Correlation Matrix						**Factor Analysis**	
ITEMS	**Item 1**	**Item 2**	**Item3**	**Item 4**	**Item 5**	**Item 6**	**Component Matrix Component 1**	**Sampling Adequacy**
Item 1							.852	.909
Item 2	.478						.690	.941
Item 3	.773	.523					.880	.889
Item 4	.704	.557	.802				.884	.913
Item 5	.715	.495	.686	.690			.839	.927
Item 6	.543	.554	.626	.638	.544		.779	.921
Item 7	.688	.493	.700	.702	.708	.645	.856	.926

Item1. Affirmative action is good in general.
Item 2. Minority job applicants should be given special treatment in the hiring process.
Item 3. Businesses should use affirmative action to ensure fairness in employment.
Item 4. Affirmative action results in better utilization of human potentials in society.
Item 5. Affirmative action is good for addressing continuing discrimination against minorities.
Item 6. Affirmative action should be used to correct past injustices.
Item 7.Affirmative action is good for bridging the gap among all races.

3.2. Data: Twenty-nine university students [Whites = 62% (*n* = 18), Blacks = 38% (*n* = 11), Men = 55% (*n* = 16), Women = 45% (*n* = 13), (White men = 34% (*n* = 10),White women = 28 % (*n* = 8), Black men = 21% (*n* = 6), Black women = 17 % (*n* = 5)] served as survey interviewers for this research. All twenty-nine interviewers were juniors and seniors in academic class standing and ranged in age from twenty to twenty-four years. None of them had any interview experience prior to this study, but they all underwent a short training session in interviewing conducted by the study investigator. The training taught guidelines for politeness when requesting someone to be interviewed, and readily granting right of non-participation to anyone not willing to participate in the study. Interviewers were also instructed to promise anonymity to all willing participants. Anonymity was met by not requiring names and any personal identifying fact about respondents on the interview schedule. All completed questionnaires were also aggregated and shuffled in a box to further guarantee that no one questionnaire could be traced to any one particular respondent. During each interview, the interviewers were instructed to only read interview questions verbatim as structured on the questionnaire, and to record respondents' answers exactly as stated by respondents, and in conformity with the closed-ended response format of each question. Interviewers were instructed not to explain, interpret or discuss any questionnaire item to research participants. Interviewers could only repeat (reread) questions, if research participants requested further information on a questionnaire item.

Interview sites were public places with high foot traffic across all regions (North, South, East, and West) in the city of Omaha, Nebraska. These places included the four major city malls as well as strip malls, big departmental and drug stores, such as Wal-Mart, Target, Shopko, and Walgreens. Self-selected teams of three or four interviewers went to each location to conduct interviews with patrons to the stores. One anticipated benefit of having multiple interviewers at the same location, at the same time, was that the presence of other interviewers would increase the likelihood that each interviewer would perform as instructed during training. Each team conducted interviews at a minimum of two time periods (morning, afternoon or evening) in, at least, two different locations, during an eight-week period in the fall of 2010.

Consistently with the objective of this study, all 29 interviewers were either Black or White, and they interviewed mainly Black and White voluntary participants. Of 580 questionnaires distributed to the 29 interviewers, a total of 522 questionnaires (90 percent) were completed. Among the completed interviews, thirty-one (31) respondents identified themselves as neither Black nor White, and they were discarded for not being the target population for this study. This left a useful return rate of 85 percent (491 questionnaires). Sixty-nine percent (*n* =338) of the 491 useful interviews were completed by White interviewers, while Black interviewers completed 31 percent (*n*=153) of the interviews. Men and women interviewers completed 63 percent (*n* =310) and 37 percent (*n* =181) respectively, of the interviews. The mean age of all respondents was 34 years, median was 30 years and modal age was 27 years. Also, the average education of the respondents was the bachelor's degree, but both their median and modal educational completion was the two-year associate degree.

Counting by race-gender, White men, White women, Black men and Black women interviewers completed 43 percent (*n* = 209), 26 percent (*n* = 129), 21 percent (*n* = 101) and 11 percent (*n* =52), respectively, of useful interviews. Interview respondents were mainly White (68 percent, *n* =329) and Men (54 percent, *n* =261). White men constituted 35 percent of all respondents, while White women, Black men, and Black women constituted 34 percent, 19 percent, and 13 percent, respectively, of all 491 respondents.

4. Tests and Findings

4.1 Models: The first question regarding how interviewer and respondent characteristics shaped response to AA support was answered with the use of four regression models (see table 3) as follows:

Model I: In the first model, both race and gender of respondents were block-entered into the multiple regression equation and regressed on support for AA. This analysis established benchmark coefficients of support for AA by race and gender of respondents. Results established that Blacks supported AA more than Whites (Black = 1, β = .416, $\alpha \leq .000$) and women supported the policy more than men (Women = 1, β = .183, $\alpha \leq .000$). This finding also showed that while both race and gender of respondent predicted support for AA, race was a stronger predictor.

Model II: In model 2, both the age and education of respondents were added to the regression equation in addition to race and gender. This model measured the contributions of age and education of respondents to support for AA. Results showed that age inversely (β = -.108, $\alpha \leq .05$) predicted support for AA, but education failed as a significant predictor of support for the policy. The addition of these two variables, however, discounted the standardized beta value of both race (Black = 1, β = .399, $\alpha \leq .000$) and gender (women = 1, β =. 176, $\alpha \leq .000$) in predicting support for AA.

Model III: In model 3, interviewer race (White = 1) was added to the regression equation along with all respondent characteristics already in the equation. This model showed the race-of-interviewer effects on respondents' likelihood of support for AA. Results indicated that race-of-interviewer did not predict support for AA, but, relative to the benchmark coefficients of AA support in model 1, the addition of race of interviewer to the regression equation had a much larger discounting effect on respondents' race (Black = 1, β = .391, $\alpha \leq .000$) and age (β = .098, $\alpha \leq .05$), and a very slight increase effect of gender(Women = 1, β = .177, $\alpha \leq .000$) in predicting support for AA, than model 2.

Model IV: The other interviewer characteristic, gender (women = 1), was added to the regression equation along with all respondent characteristics and race of the interviewer (White = 1). This was the full model, as it comprised of all interviewer and respondent characteristics, thereby giving the final picture of the interactive effects of interviewer and respondent characteristics in predicting support for AA. The result of the model established that only race (Black = 1, β = .392, $\alpha \leq .000$) and gender (Women = 1, β = .190, $\alpha \leq .000$) of respondents, as well as gender (women = 1, β = -.155, $\alpha \leq .000$) of the interviewer significantly predicted support for AA. This result showed that while all respondents, in general, were likely to reduce their support for AA when the interviewer was a woman compared to a man, women respondents actually increased their support for the policy (relative to models 1,2, and 3), and Blacks slightly increased their support relative to model 3, but still had a much lesser support relative to their benchmark level of support in model 1.

Table 3. Multiple Regression models of support for affirmative action

Variables	Model I			Model II			Model III			Model IV		
	β	Std. Error	t-value	β	Std. Error	t-value	β	Std. Error	t-value	β	Std. Error	t-value
Intercept	20.255	.537	35.333**	24.353	1.454	16.752**	24.824	1.495	16.605**	24.998	1.476	16.940**
Respondent Race (Black = 1	.416	.788	9.930**	.399	.793	9.408**	.391	.800	9.130**	.392	.790	9.291**
Respondent Gender (Women = 1)	.183	.736	4.366**	.176	.734	4.196**	.177	.734	4.221**	.190	.727	4.570**
Respondent Age				-.108	.027	-2.504*	-.098	.027	-2.235*	-.065	.028	-1.482
Respondent Education				-.062	.298	-1.457	-.059	.298	-1.382	-.058	.294	-1.367
Interviewer Race (White = 1)							-.057	.808	-1.331	-.057	.797	-1.338
Interviewer Gender (Women = 1)										-.155	.768	-3.672**
Main Effect	**DF = (2, 465) 467** **F = 55.292** **R = .438** **R^2 = .192** **P = <.0001**			**DF = (4, 455) 459** **F = 29.681** **R = .455** **R^2 = .207** **P = <.0001**			**DF= (5, 454) 459** **F = 24.140** **R = .458** **R^2 = .210** **P = <.0001**			**DF = (6, 453) 459** **F = 22.916** **R = .483** **R^2 = .233** **P = <.0001**		

** Significant at α =.000, *Significant at α =.05

The second research question was about whether or not the race interview homophily would produce a higher significant support for AA than the race heterophily. To answer this question, the data were recoded such that all race homophilies = 1 (that is, Blacks interviewing Blacks *plus* Whites interviewing Whites = 1) and all race heterophilies = 0 (that is, all Black/White *plus* all White/Black interviewer – respondent matches = 0). The coded dummy values were regressed on support for AA, and results (table 4) showed that the race homophily inversely predicted support for AA (β = -.159, p = .0005). That is, race homophily produced lesser support for AA that race heterophily. Using the formula: $Y = b_0-(b_0+b_1x_I)*100$, hence, support for AA = $b_0-(b_0+b_1\text{Homophily})*100$, the likelihood of support for AA in race homophily was 16 percent lesser than in race heterophily (or heterophily was 16 percent higher than homophily).

The third research question was to seek the likelihood that gender homophilies would produce higher support for AA than gender heterophily. For this question, the data were recoded such that all gender homophilies we recoded as =1 (that is, women interviewing women *plus* men interviewing men = 1) and all gender heterophilies = 0 (that is all men/women *plus* women/men interviewer – respondent matches = 0). The simple regression test was run, and obtained results (table 4) showed that the likelihood of support for AA between gender homo and heterophilies were not significantly different (homophilies =1, β = -.007, p = .8714).

The fourth research question concerned the likelihood that the Black homophily would produce a greater level of support for AA than the White homophily and the race (Black/White) heterophily interview conditions. For this analysis, all phily conditions were dummy coded using the G-1formula which states that "when a non-interval variable has G categories, use G-1 to represent it" (Lewis-Beck, 1980, p. 68). Hence 3-1 = 2 dummy variables were used in the regression formula: $Y = a_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$

Where:

Y = Support for AA

a_0= Constance or intercept

X_1 = Black Homophily = 1, others = 0

X_2 = White Homophily = 1, others = 0

Race heterophily (i.e. both Black/White plus White/Black interviewer-respondent matches) was coded 0 throughout the regression equation as comparison category for X_1 and X_2.

Results (table 4) showed that the Black homophily (β= .142, $\alpha\leq$ .005) positively predicted support for AA, while the White homophily (β= -.270, $\alpha \leq$ .0005) inversely predicted support for AA over gender heterophily. This showed that while the Black homophily positively supported AA, the White homophily opposed it more (or supported it less) than the gender heterophily matches. Also, additional analysis using post hoc comparisons (table 4) showed that the Black homophily significantly supported AA more than the White homophily (MD =8.334, P = .000) and the race heterophily (MD = 3.598, P = .003). Post hoc also found the White homophily to significantly support AA less than the race heterophily(MD = -4.737, P = .000).

The fifth research question was to investigate if women homophily would produce a greater level of support for AA than the men homophily and the gender heterophily. Similarly to the number of comparison categories involved in the race phily analysis (in question 4), both the multiple regression and post hoc tests were conducted for this question. Here, dummy coding were X_1 = Men Homophily =1, others = 0; X_2 = Women Homophily = 1, others = 0, and the gender heterophily = 0 throughout the regression equation as comparison category. Results of both tests showed no significant difference in the likelihood of support for AA among all gender categories compared (see table 4).

The sixth research question was to test for the likelihood that Black women and Black men homophilies would produce greater support for AA than the White women and White men homophilies and the

race/gender heterophily. Both the multiple regression and post hoc tests were, again, conducted using 4 (G-1= 5-1) dummy categories: X_1 = Black men Homophily = 1, others = 0; X_2 = Black women = 1, others = 0; X_3 = White men = 1, others = 0; X_4 = White women = 1, others = 0; Race/Gender Heterophily = 0 throughout the regression equation as comparison category. Regression results revealed that the Black men homophily produced the highest level of support for AA (β= .142, $\alpha \leq .005$), and the White men homophily produced the highest opposition (β=-.204, $\alpha \leq .0005$) to the policy relative to the race/gender heterophily. Both the Black women and the White women homophilies failed to significantly predict support for AA relative to the race/gender heterophily comparison category (see table 4).

Table 4. Regression models and post-hoc analyses of relations of phily matches with AA Support

	Regression Coefficients			**Main Effects**			
PHILY MODELS							
RACE PHILY	**β**	**SE**	**t-value**	**DF**	**R**	**R^2**	**F**
Intercept	28.11	.672	38.865***	(1,469)			12.242
Race Homophily =1,	-.159	.836	-3.499***	470	.16	.025	***
Race Heterophily =0							
Black/White Phily							
Intercept	26.11	.638	40.958***				
Black Homophily =1, others = 0	.142	1.198	3.004**	(2,468)	.35	.124	33.231
White Homophily = 1, others = 0	-.270	.832	-5.694***	470			***
Race Heterophily = 0							
GENDER PHILY							
Intercept	24.32	.609	39.949***	(1,469)			
Gender Homophily =1,	-.007	.815	-.169	470	.01	5.90E	3,010
Gender Heterophily =0							
Men/Women Phily	24.32	.609	39.909***	(2,468)	.01	1.65E	.039
Intercept	-.002	.906	-.048	470			
Men Homophily = 1, others = 0	-.014	1.105	-.272				
Women Homophily = 1, others = 0							
Gender Heterophily = 0							
RACE-GENDER PHILY							
Intercept	24.77	.492	50.326***				
Black men Homophily =1, others = 0	.142	1.623	3.141**	(4,463)	.28	.077	9.958
Black women Homophily = 1 , others = 0	.066	2.173	1.457	467			***
White men Homophily=1, others - 0	-.204	1.113	-4.462***				
White women Homophily = 1, others = 0	-.065	1.253	-1.428				
Race/gender Heterophily = 0							

Post Hoc Analysis

RACE PHILY	Mean Difference	Critical Difference	P-value
Black Homophily v White Homophily	8.334	2.252	.000
Black Homophily v Race Heterophily	3.598	2.354	.003
White Homophily v Race Heterophily	-4.736	1.634	.000
GENDER PHILY			
Men Homophily v Women Homophily	.257	2.239	.822
Men Homophily v Gender Heterophily	-.043	1.780	.962
Women Homophily v Gender Heterophily	-.300	2.171	.786
RACE-GENDER PHILY			
Black men Homophily v Black women Homophily	1.929	5.151	.462
Black men Homophily v White men Homophily	10.061	3.616	.000
Black men Homophily v White women Homophily	6.885	3.789	.000
Black men Homophily v Race-Gender Heterophily	5.096	3.188	.002
Black women Homophily v White men Homophily	8.132	4.599	.001
Black women Homophily v. White women Homophily	4.956	4.737	.040
Black women Homophily v Race-Gender Heterophily	3.167	4.271	.146
White men Homophily v White women Homophily	-3.176	2.996	.038
White men Homophily v Race-Gender Heterophily	-4.965	2.187	.000
White women Homophily v Race-Gender Heterophily	-1.789	2.462	.154

**p ≤ .005, ***P ≤ .0005, MN = Men, WN = Women, BK = Black, WT = White

Post hoc comparisons for the sixth question (table 4) showed that except for the Black men homophily v Black women homophily comparison that did not show significant difference, the Black men homophily showed a higher support for AA than any other race-gender phily comparison categories. Results showed that the Black men homophily significantly supported AA more that the White men homophily (MD = 10.061, p = .000), the White women homophily (MD = 6.885, p = .000) and the race/gender heterophily conditions (MD = 5.096, p = .002). Similar to the Black men homophily, the Black women homophilyalso supported AA more than the White men homophily (MD = 8.132, p = .001) and the White women homophily (MD = 4.956, p = .040) but not the race/gender heterophily (MD = 3.167, p = .146). Lastly, post hoc results showed that the White men homophily supported AA less than the White women homophily (MD = -3.176, p = .038) and the race/gender heterophily conditions (MD = -4.965, p= .000). See table 4 for detailed post hoc results.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Overall, this study found that both race and gender of interview respondents were predictors of support for AA, but race of respondent was a stronger and more persistent predictor than gender. While the race of respondent was consistent, gender of respondent produced mixed results across analyses. Similarly, mix results were observed for both race and gender-of-interviewer effects on support for AA. Specifically, findings showed that Blacks supported AA more than Whites and, Women more than men. This finding was consistent with previous recent findings (Oyinlade, 2013; Oyinlade & Losen, 2014; Shteynberg, et al., 2011) on racial and gender differences, as well as supported the "self-interest" perspective (Bell, Harrison & McLaughlin, 1997; Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Shteynberg, et al., 2011) on the likelihood of support for AA because both Blacks and woman are protected classes of people under the policy (Pincus, 2003; Reskins, 1998).The self-interest perspective, however, did not hold true for age of the respondent in the regression models. Infact, findings on age were mixed, as it significantly predicted support for AA, albeit inverse, in two models, but failed to be a significant predictor in the final regression model. This meant that in the models where age significantly predicted support for AA, older people who would be expected to support the policy for self-interest, asa protected class under the policy, supported the policy less than younger people. Reasons for such attitude by older people can only be speculated to include the likelihood of conservatism typically associated with older people, especially in a conservative state ("red state") like Nebraska. This is only a speculation because such reason was not directly investigated in this study.

It was also unclear why respondents' education did not predict support for AA in this study, as found in some previous ones (such as Elizondo and Crosby, 2004; Oyinlade, 2013; Sidanius et al., 2008).The finding in this study appeared to contradict the assumption that education typically produced a liberalizing effect on social issues (Coenders & Scheeper, 2003) which could increase the likelihood of support for AA. The non-significance of education in this study might signal inconsistence in the relations of education with support for AA. Such inconsistence was reflected in contradictory findings in some studies on the role of education in predicting support for AA. For examples, some studies (Kane & Kyyro, 2001; Wodtke, 2012) debunked the liberalizing effects of education on support for AA by indicating that while education was found to increase awareness of discrimination and structural hindrance to minority success, such effect had not reliably predicted support for AA. In addition, other studies had also found education to not predict support for race-based (Williams et al. 1999) and gender-based (Baunach, 2002) AA policies.

Results pertaining to relations of interviewer effects to predicting support for AA showed that while gender of interviewer (women = 1) was a significant predictor of support for AA (table 3), gender phily failed to predict support for the policy (table 4). It was surprising that the women homophily did not support AA more that the men homophily or the gender heterophily. This was because since women were found to support AA more than men, it was logical to expect women to support the policy more, when interviewed by other women, than when men interviewed men, given that men were found to support the policy less than women.

The most salient findings of phily analysis boiled down to three major facts: 1. Black men and Black women homophilies, respectively, were the strongest supporters of AA. 2) While White women and White men homophilies opposed AA, the White men homophily opposed it more. 3). The White-men homophily was the only category that significantly supported the policy less than the race/gender heterophily match. This meant that acquiescence to race/gender heterophily was most likely by White men relative to other race/gender interview homophilies. And, given that White men had the highest opposition (least support) to AA, acquiescence by White men meant a tempered opposition to AA in race/gender interview heterophily matches.

The greater support of the Black, Black men and Black women homophilies might have potentially reflected the self-interest perspective mentionedand cited earlier. It might also, however, be possible, that both Black and White interviewers exerted latent pressure on respondents of their respective racial categories to heighten a sense of racial solidarity, or to favor causes (or sentiments) perceived common to their categorical experiences (see Krysan & Couper, 2003). Referring to Blacks in particular, Davis (1997a) claimed that the desire to show race solidarity and avoidance of being perceived as a sell-out or non-commitant to the Black struggle might pressure Blacks to respond to Black interviewers differently (mainly with a heightened response) than to White interviewers. For Whites, the pressure to oppose AA may stem from a sentiment of collective relative deprivation (CRD) which indicates that Whites, as a collective, perceive the policy as depriving them access to societal resources vis-à-vis minorities(Harrison et al., 2006; Lowery et al., 2006). Such perception may induce individual Whites to become susceptible to opposing AA, thereby possibly inducing the pressure to oppose AA in interview homophilies involving Whites.

6. Limitations

Despite the large data sample used for this study, in that the data were collected in one city through availability sampling, this study does not claim representativeness of data over the entire state of Nebraska or the US. It is therefore safest to limit the scope of generalization from this study only to the study participants, and great caution is suggested for any attempt to generalize beyond the specified scope.

Note: [1, 2]Black and White with capital letters B and W are used in this study to denote racial classifications rather than the colors black and white.

7. References

Baunach, D. M. (2002). Progress, Opportunity, and Backlash: Explaining Attitudes Toward Gender-Based Affirmative Action.*Sociological Focus* 35, 345-62.

Bell, M. P., Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin M. E. (1997). Asian American attitudes toward affirmative action in employment: Implications for the model minority myth. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33,* 356-377.

Bobo, L., & Kluegel, J. R. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: Self-interests, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes? *American Sociological Review, 58,*443-464.

Burns, M. (2011). Affirmative action bans: Who gets hurt? *Pacific Standard, January 10.* http://www.psmag.com/education/affirmative-action-bans-who-gets-hurt-26955/ (Accessed July 12, 2012).

Collins, M., & Butcher, B. (1983). Interviewer and clustering effects in an attitude survey. *Journal of the Market Research Society,* 25, 39-58.

Coenders, M., & Scheeper, P. (2003). The effects of education on nationalism and ethnic exclusionism: An international comparison. *Political Psychology*, *24*, 313-343

Davis, D. W. (1997a). The direction of race of interviewer effects among African-Americans: donning the black mask. *American Journal of Political Science,* 41, 309-22.

_____ (1997b). Nonrandom measurement error and race of interviewer effects among African Americans. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 61, 183-207.

Davis, R. E., Couper, M. P., Janz, N. K., Caldwell, C. H., & Resnicow, K. (2010). Interviewer effects in public health surveys. *Health Education Research,* 25, 14-26.

Dykema, J., Diloreto, K., White, E., & Schaeffer, N. C. (2012). ACASI gender-of-interviewer voice effects on reports to questions about sensitive behaviors among young adults. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 76, 311-325.

Elizondo, E., & Crosby, F. (2004). Attitudes towards affirmative action as a function of the strength of ethnic identity among Latino college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 1773-1796.

Ellison, C. G., McFarland, M. J., & Krause, N. (2011). Measuring religiousness among African Americans: Exploring race-of-interviewer effects. *Review of Religious Research,* 53, 65-84.

Finkel, S. E., Guterbock, T. M., & Marian J, Borg, M. J. (1991). Race-of-interviewer effects in a pre-election poll: Virginia 1989. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 55, 313-30.

Flores-Macias, F. & Lawson, C. (2008). Effects of interviewer gender on survey responses: Findings from a household survey in Mexico. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 20, 100-110.*

Gong, M. & Aadland, D. (2011). Interview effects in an environment valuation telephone survey. *Environmental and Resource Economics,* 49, 47-64.

Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., Mayer, D. M., Leslie, L. M., & Lev-Arey, D. (2006). Understanding attitudes towards affirmative action in programs in employment: Summary and meta-analysis of 35 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology,91,* 1012-1036.

Jacobson, C. K.. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *29*, 306-329.

Januszka, C., Lora, A., Wollard, K., & Rocco, T. (2007). Investigating race and ethnicity on data collection and analysis. In S. M. Nielsen & M. S. Plakhotnik (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual College of Education Research Conference: Urban and International Education Section* (pp.36-42).

Kane, Emily W. and Else K. Kyyro. 2001. For Whom Does Education Enlighten? Race, Gender, Education, and Beliefs about Social Inequality. *Gender & Society* 15, 710-33.

Kravitz, D. A., Blaudau, T., & Klineberg, S. L. (2008). The impact of anticipated consequences, respondent group, and strength of affirmative action plan on affirmative action attitudes. *Group and Organization Management, 33,* 361-391.

Krysan, M., & Couper, M.P. (2003). Race in the live and the virtual interview: Racial deference, social desirability, and activation effects in attitude surveys. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 66, 364-83.

Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied Regression.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lievens, F., & De Paepe, A. (2004). An empirical investigation of interviewer-related factors that discourage the use of high structure interviews. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 25, 29-46.

Liu, M. & Stainback, K. (2013). Interviewer gender effects on survey responses to marriage-related question. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 77, 606-618.

Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Goff, P. A. (2006). Concern for the in-group and opposition to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 961-974.

Office of Federal Contracts Compliance Programs (OFCCP). (2002). Facts on Executive Order 11246 - Affirmative Action. *U. S. Department of Labor*. http://www.dol.gov/esa/regs/compliance/ofccp/aa.htm (Accessed January 7, 2008).

Oyinlade, A. O. (2013). Affirmative action support in an organization: A test of three demographic models. *Sage Open,* 3: 1-12, http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/3/4/2158244013516156.full-text.pdf+html (Retrieved March 26, 2014)

Oyinlade, A. O. & Losen, A. (2014). Extraneous effects of race, gender, and race-gender homo-and heterophily conditions on data quality, *SAGE Open,* 4:1-13,

http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/1/2158244014525418.full-text.pdf+html (Accessed March 26, 2014)

Parra, L. F. (1991). *Development of an Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action Scale*. M A Thesis, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green University, Ohio.

Peterson, R. (1994). The Role of values in predicting fairness, judgment and support of affirmative action. *The Journal of Social Issues*, *50*, 95-115.

Pincus, F. L. (2003). *Reverse Discrimination*. Boulder, CO: Reinner Publishers

Reskin, B. (1998). *The Realities of Affirmative Action in Employment*. Washington, DC: The American Sociological association.

Schuman, H. & Converse. J. M. (1971). The effects of black and white interviewers on black responses in 1968. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 35, 44-68.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L.,& Maria Krysan. (1997). *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shteynberg, G., Leslie, L. M., Knight, A. P., & Mayer, D. M. (2011). But affirmative action hurts *us*! Race-related beliefs shape perceptions of white disadvantage and policy unfairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 115, 1-12.*

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sears, D.O. (2008). *The Diversity Challenge*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Springman, R., Wherry, J., & Notaro, P. C. (2006). The effects of interviewer race and child race on sexual abuse disclosures in forensic interviews. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 15, 99-116.*

Tabane, R. J., & Bouwer, C. (2006). The influence of cross-cultural interviewing on the generation of data. *South African Journal of Education* 26, 553-64.

Tuch, S. A. & Hughes, M. (2011). "White's Racial Policy Attitudes in the Twentieth Century: The Continuing Significance of Racial Resentment." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science634, 1,* 134-52.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1977). *Statement on Affirmative Action.* Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Weinreb, A. (2006). The limitations of stranger-interviews in rural Kenya. *American Sociological Review* 71, 1014-1039.

Williams, D. R., Jackson, J.S., Brown, T. N., Torres, M., Forman, T.A., &Brown, K. (1999). "Traditional and Contemporary Prejudice and Urban Whites' Support for Affirmative Action and Government Help." *Social Problems* 46: 4: 503-27.

Wodtke, G. T. (2012). "The Impact of Education on Intergroup Attitudes: A Multiracial Analysis." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 75: 1: 80-106.

AUTHOR'S BIONOTE:

A. Olu Oyinlade, PhD.,is an Industrial/Organizational Sociologist and Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska, Omaha. His research and consulting activities are in organizational behavior and development with special focus on organizational structural and systems analysis, employee performance improvement, change management, leadership assessment, program evaluation, and diversity planning and management.