

Incentives to Identify: Ethnic and Racial Identification in the Age of Affirmative Action

Francisca Antman and Brian Duncan*

April 5, 2013

PRELIMINARY AND INCOMPLETE, NOT FOR CITATION

Almost universally, self-reported ethnicity and race are treated as exogenously given traits that are not subject to change. But in cases where ethnicity and race are subjective, does self-identification respond to economic incentives? This paper provides a first examination of this question by linking data on ethnic and racial self-identification with changes in state-level affirmative action policies in higher education, contracting, and employment. Consistent with a diminished incentive to identify as an ethnic and racial minority, we find evidence that individuals from underrepresented groups are less likely to identify once affirmative action policies have been banned. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate whether ethnic and racial self-identification responds to local economic and social conditions in the United States. As such, it has broad implications for understanding the impact of affirmative action policies and the emerging literature on the construction of race and ethnicity.

JEL Classification: J15, I28, Z13

*We are grateful to Peter Hinrichs for his input on the timing of statewide affirmative action bans in recent years. Peter Arcidiacono, Tania Barham, Howard Bodenhorn, Brian Cadena, William Darity, Robert Fairlie, Andrew Francis, Graciela Geyer, Tim Lohrentz, Craig McIntosh, Terra McKinnish, Samuel Myers, Stephen Trejo, and Jeffrey Zax offered helpful leads and motivating conversations.

Antman: Department of Economics, University of Colorado at Boulder. 256 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309. Francisca.Antman@colorado.edu. Duncan: Department of Economics, University of Colorado Denver, Campus Box 181, Denver, CO 80217-3364. Brian.Duncan@cudenver.edu

1. Introduction

Almost universally, self-reported ethnicity and race are treated as exogenously given traits that are not subject to change. But in cases where ethnicity and race are subjective, does individual self-identification respond to economic incentives? This paper provides a first examination of this question by linking data on ethnic and racial self-identification with changes in affirmative action policies in higher education, contracting, and employment. We investigate whether populations subject to exogenous changes in returns to ethnic and racial identity demonstrate changes in self-reported ethnic and racial identification.

As in Duncan and Trejo (2011), we take advantage of large-scale U.S. surveys that collect information on self-reported ethnic and racial identity as well as other measures of ethnicity and race such as ancestry and ethnic origin. This analysis produces rates of ethnic and racial attrition that vary across geographical areas and over time, which we then connect with variation in economic incentives to identify as racial or ethnic minorities. The latter come from changes in affirmative action policies across states over time as a wave of affirmative action bans were put into place beginning in the late 1990s. Hinrichs (2012) shows that these policy changes led to decreases in the enrollment of underrepresented minorities and increases in the enrollment of whites at selective colleges. We ask whether these changes can be partially explained by changes in self-reported ethnic and racial identification. Put simply, are individuals less likely to identify as racial or ethnic minorities once an affirmative action ban is put in place? Do differences in the rates of ethnic and racial attrition across states support this interpretation with a

more accelerated pattern of attrition in states where affirmative action policies have been struck down?

We find that individuals who report having Black or Mexican ancestry are less likely to identify with those groups once the state is barred from using affirmative action to remedy those groups' historic underrepresentation. In contrast, individuals reporting to have Asian ancestry are more likely to identify once a ban is put in place, consistent with the view in some circles that affirmative action policies coincided with limitations on the representation of Asians in higher education. Together these results are consistent with a model in which the goal of affirmative action policies is making institutions more representative of the population, and thus banning affirmative action decreases the incentives to identify for underrepresented groups and increases the incentives to identify for overrepresented groups.

This research has important implications for observed assimilation patterns of ethnic groups as well as the perceived level of diversity in institutions such as colleges and universities. While several studies have documented important effects of affirmative action policies in higher education (Arcidiacono, 2005), contracting, and employment (Fairlie and Marion 2012, Kurtulus 2012), to our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate whether ethnic and racial self-identification responds to local economic incentives and social conditions in the United States.¹ As such, it has broad implications for our understanding of the impact of affirmative action policies, the construction of race and ethnicity (Bodenhorn and Ruebeck, 2003; Golash-

¹ Outside the U.S., there is some evidence that individuals alter their identities in response to government programs. Francis and Tannuri-Pianto (forthcoming) show that Brazilians change their self-reported racial identities following the adoption of racial quotas in university admissions. Cassan (2011) shows evidence that individuals manipulated caste identities in response to land reforms in India.

Boza and Darity, 2008) and the concept of identity itself (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000). The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the data on self-reported ethnic identity and ancestry/ethnic origin. Section 3 presents the empirical strategy relying on variation across states over time in affirmative action policies. Section 4 presents the results and Section 5 concludes.

2. Data

We wish to analyze the relationship between affirmative action bans and self-reported ethnic and racial identity of individuals. Information on the timing of affirmative action bans is drawn largely from Hinrichs (2012), Lohrentz (2007), and personal correspondence with Peter Hinrichs and Tim Lohrentz. Table 1 lists the years and states in which affirmative action bans in college admissions, public contracting, and hiring were passed and effectively implemented.

The data on self-reported ethnic and racial identity as well as ancestry come from the 5 percent public use samples of the 1990 and 2000 Census, as well as the 2001-2011 American Community Survey (ACS).² To allow for the possibility that the bans affected individuals differently based on their age, we split the samples into children (0-17 years of age), college-aged youth (18-25 years-old) and adults 35-59 years-old. The sample of college-aged youth is limited to individuals with a high school or GED degree, but not a bachelor's degree. The sample of adults 35-59 years old is limited to those individuals who are not in school. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded from all samples.

² These data are publicly available through the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) at <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>.

The Census and ACS questionnaires ask three questions pertinent to the current study. First, the surveys ask whether the person is “Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.” Within the same question, an affirmative response is decomposed further to determine whether the individual is “Mexican/Mexican Am., Chicano”, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or “other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino” in which case the respondent is asked to specify a characterization. In the results reported here, we focus on the subgroup of Mexicans as they are the largest group within the Hispanic classification. We view all individuals who respond to this question by indicating that they are “Mexican/Mexican Am., Chicano” as consistent with a self-reported Mexican identity.

In addition to the question on Hispanic identity, the Census and ACS also solicit information on racial identity. Here the respondent is presented with an array of options including White, Black/African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, several Asian backgrounds, as well as the option of writing in some other race.³ In the results reported below, we view all selections indicating an Asian race as consistent with a self-reported Asian identity and all selections indicating a Black/African American race as consistent with a self-reported Black identity. Finally, all respondents are independently asked to specify the individual’s “ancestry or ethnic origin” and allowed to list up to two ancestries. One of the examples given in the questionnaire explicitly includes “Mexican” and “African Am” as a possible response, but individuals must write in their own answer.

Tables 2 through 4 provide descriptive statistics of the sample used in the analysis, split into the three age groups indicated above. Each table breaks down the sample by self-reported

³ Note that the surveys do not include Hispanic backgrounds as possible responses to the race question.

ancestry and links the ancestry response with self-reported race and ethnicity. As expected, for all three age groups, the great majority of individuals who only report having Mexican ancestry identify themselves as Mexican, just as individuals who are only of Black/African-American descent by and large identify as Black/African-American. For instance, just over 99 percent of college-aged youth reporting Black ancestry self-identify racially as Black (Table 3). Similarly, about 94 percent of college-aged youth reporting only Mexican ancestry self-identify as Mexican and about 93 percent of college-aged youth only reporting Asian ancestry self-identify as Asian. More interestingly, a dramatically lower fraction of individuals reporting an additional ancestry (denoted here as multiracial or multiethnic) actually identify with the relevant minority race/ethnicity. Strikingly, only 48 percent of multiracial college-aged youth reporting Black ancestry self-identify as Black/African-American (Table 3). The analogous numbers for Mexicans and Asians are somewhat higher (74 and 65 percent, respectively), but still much lower than for those reporting to only have that race or ethnic ancestry. The research question raised here can in one sense be reframed as an investigation into why these numbers fall below one hundred percent. More specifically, we explore the extent to which economic incentives can explain why some individuals reporting a specific ancestry are not also identifying with that ethnic or racial group.

Another interesting phenomenon documented in Tables 2 through 4 is the fact that a small proportion of individuals who report no relevant ancestry actually self-identify with that racial or ethnic group. For example, just over one percent of college-age individuals who do not report any Mexican ancestry actually identify as Mexican (Table 3). We hypothesize that this may be due to the fact that these individuals actually do have some tie to the relevant ancestry,

but this tie may not be as strong as for those individuals reporting the relevant ancestry. For the analysis here, the important point is that those individuals who report no relevant ancestral tie to the ethnic or racial group may well respond to affirmative action policies, but perhaps in a different way from those individuals with stronger ties. For this reason, we will also consider the impact of affirmative action bans on individuals without any reported ancestral tie to the relevant group, but wish to separate that effect from the response of individuals who do report ancestral ties to the relevant group. At the same time, it is important to note that this group is extremely small relative to those reporting a relevant ancestry, and thus our focus will remain on the results for the latter group. Finally, we note that summary statistics on gender and age look roughly similar across all ancestry groups. For the college-aged youths described in Table 3, the average age is around 21 years-old, and roughly half are women.

3. Empirical Strategy

We examine the relationship between affirmative action bans and the self-reported ethnic and racial identity of individuals with and without a relevant ancestry. A relevant ancestry is one that is consistent with the ethnicity or race under consideration. For example, for Mexican-Americans, the relevant ancestry is Mexico. We follow Hinrichs (2012) by using a difference-in-difference research design that compares states with and without affirmative action bans, before and after those bans were implemented. In recognition of the fact that individuals may self-identify with the relevant group despite the fact that they report no relevant ancestry, we consider the impact of the bans on those who report no relevant ancestry as well as those who report a relevant ancestry. To investigate whether the bans had a greater impact on multiracial or

multiethnic individuals, we break down the latter category into a group who only reports a relevant ancestry and those who also report a non-relevant ancestry, denoted here as multiracial/multiethnic.

The main specification links these policy changes occurring at the state level over time with the self-reported ethnic or racial identity of individuals:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Identifies_{ist} = & \alpha + \pi_1(ban_{st} \times NoRelevantAnc_{ist}) \\
 & + \pi_2(ban_{st} \times MultiracialRelevantAnc_{ist}) \\
 & + \pi_3(ban_{st} \times OnlyRelevantAnc_{ist}) \\
 & + \pi_4MultiracialRelevantAncestry_{ist} + \pi_5OnlyRelevantAncestry_{ist} \\
 & + \mathbf{X}_{ist}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mu_s + \delta_t + \theta_st + \varepsilon_{ist}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $Identifies_{ist}$ is a dummy variable equal to one if person i in state s and year t reportedly identified with that ethnic or racial identity (e.g. Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano) and ban_{st} is a dummy variable equal to one if state s has an affirmative action ban in year t . The dummy variables $NoRelevantAnc_{ist}$, $MultiracialRelevantAnc_{ist}$, and $OnlyRelevantAnc_{ist}$ are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories for no relevant ancestry reported, one relevant ancestry and one non-relevant ancestry reported, and only relevant ancestry reported, respectively.

All regressions also include state fixed effects (μ_s), year fixed effects (δ_t), and state specific linear time trends (θ_st). \mathbf{X}_{ist} includes controls for age and gender, the fraction of the state population that is foreign born, and the fraction of the state population that is Black, Hispanic, and Asian. Standard errors are clustered at the state level. The interpretation of π_1 and π_2 is the association between an affirmative action ban and the ethnic or racial identity of those with varying ties to the relevant ancestry.

4. Results

Table 5 presents the results from the regression above with the dependent variable equal to 1 if the individual identifies as Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano. Each column indicates a separate regression, so that the impact of the bans can be seen for various age groups. The clear pattern of negative coefficients on the interaction terms indicates that affirmative action bans are associated with a decreased likelihood that individuals will self-identify as Mexican. This is true for individuals who are multiracial, those who only report a Mexican ancestry and those who report no Mexican ancestry. The magnitudes of the coefficients suggest that for those children reported to only have Mexican ancestry, banning affirmative action reduces the likelihood of identifying him or her as Mexican by about 4 percentage points. This is consistent with a diminished economic incentive to identify, in particular for children, whose ethnic identities may be more responsive compared with adults.

Table 6 presents the results from an analogous model with the dependent variable equal to 1 if the individual identifies as Black/African-American. Here, the statistically significant results are most clearly linked with the multiracial group of African-Americans that are 25 or younger. For these individuals who report a Black and non-Black ancestry, affirmative action bans are associated with a decline in the probability of identifying as Black. For college-aged multiracial individuals with Black ancestry, the estimates indicate that banning affirmative action is associated with a 15.6 percentage point drop in the likelihood of identifying with the Black racial group.

Finally, Table 7 reports the results for Asian self-identification. In contrast with the previous results, individuals reporting any Asian ancestry are more likely to identify as Asian once affirmative action policies are banned. This is true for those reporting only Asian ancestry as well as multiracial Asians, but the magnitudes are much higher for those who report a non-Asian ancestry in addition to their Asian ancestry. In particular, multiracial college-aged youths reporting Asian ancestry are about 13 percentage points more likely to identify as Asian when affirmative action policies are banned. While the estimates for individuals reporting no Asian ancestry are statistically significant and negative in sign, the magnitudes are very small, suggesting essentially no change in these individuals' likelihood of identifying as Asian in response to the affirmative action bans.

Given the popular emphasis of affirmative action bans on admissions to public colleges, Table 8 explores whether results for college-age individuals differ based on whether individuals are currently enrolled in college. For individuals reporting Asian and Mexican ancestry, the results look largely similar irrespective of college attendance. For African-Americans, however, the results suggest that the striking decline in the probability multiracial individuals identify as Black is driven by individuals enrolled in college. These individuals demonstrate a decreased probability of identifying as Black of about 19 percentage points in response to the affirmative action ban.

5. Conclusion

Rather than being born into a fixed ethnic or racial identity, the evidence presented in this paper suggests that individuals may shift their self-reported identities in response to economic

incentives. Consistent with a diminished incentive to identify as an ethnic or racial minority, we find that Mexican- and African-Americans that report any relevant ancestry are less likely to self-identify with those groups once affirmative action policies are banned. In contrast, individuals with Asian ancestry are more likely to self-identify as Asian once the bans are implemented. We argue that these seemingly paradoxical results can be reconciled with a model in which affirmative action policies are designed to make the racial and ethnic composition of institutions more closely resemble their populations. Consequently, only those individuals from under-represented minority groups will face a diminished economic incentive to self-identify when affirmative action policies are banned.

References

- Akerlof, George A. and Rachel E. Kranton. 2000. "Economics and Identity." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3): 715-53.
- Arcidiacono, Peter. 2005. "Affirmative Action in Higher Education: How Do Admission and Financial Aid Rules Affect Future Earnings?" *Econometrica*, 73(5): 1477-1524.
- Cassan, Guilhem. 2011. "Law and Identity Manipulation: Evidence from Colonial Punjab." Unpublished Manuscript, Paris School of Economics.
- Bodenhorn, Howard and Christopher S. Ruebeck. 2003. "The Economics of Identity and the Endogeneity of Race." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 9962.
- Duncan, Brian and Stephen J. Trejo. 2011. "Who Remains Mexican? Selective Ethnic Attrition and the Intergenerational Progress of Mexican Americans" in David L. Leal and Stephen J. Trejo, eds., *Latinos and the Economy: Integration and Impact in Schools, Labor Markets, and*, New York: Springer, p. 285-320.
- Fairlie, Robert and Justin Marion. 2012. "Affirmative Action Programs and Business Ownership among Minorities and Women." *Small Business Economics*, 39(2): 319–339.
- Francis, Andrew and Maria Tannuri-Pianto. Forthcoming. "Endogenous Race in Brazil: Affirmative Action and the Construction of Racial Identity Among Young Adults." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*.

- Golash-Boza, Tanya and William Darity Jr. 2008. "Latino Racial Choices: The Effects of Skin Colour and Discrimination on Latinos' and Latinas' Racial Self-Identifications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(5): 899-934.
- Hinrichs, Peter L. 2012. "The Effects of Affirmative Action Bans on College Enrollment, Educational Attainment and the Demographic Composition of Universities." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94(3): 712-22.
- Kurtulus, Fidan Ana. 2012. "The Impact of Affirmative Action on the Employment of Minorities and Women Over Three Decades: 1973-2003." Mimeo, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Lohrentz, Tim. 2007. "State Policies and Programs for Minority- and Women-Business Development." Insight Center for Community Economic Development.

Table 1: State Affirmative Bans in Government Hiring, Contracting and Admission to Public Universities

| State | Date Passed | Years Effective |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Texas ¹ | 1996 - 2003 | 1997 - 2004 |
| California | November 1996 | 1998 - |
| Washington | November 1998 | 1999 - |
| Florida | 1999 | 2001 - |
| Michigan | November 2006 | 2007 - 2011 |
| Nebraska | November 2008 | 2009 - |
| Arizona | November 2010 | 2011 - |
| New Hampshire ^{1,2} | 2011 | 2012 - |
| Oklahoma ² | November 2012 | 2013 - |

¹Affirmative action ban applies only to college admissions.

²Affirmative action ban passed after our sample period.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Children Ages 0-17, by Reported Ancestry

| Race/Ethnicity | Black Ancestry | | | Mexican Ancestry | | | Asian Ancestry | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | None | Multiracial | Only | None | Multiethnic | Only | None | Multiracial | Only |
| Black | 3.20 | 44.80 | 99.06 | 14.87 | 7.05 | .60 | 14.17 | 8.34 | .97 |
| Hispanic | 15.25 | 17.64 | .58 | 6.15 | 83.17 | 98.22 | 14.05 | 18.83 | 1.41 |
| Mexican | 10.57 | 8.64 | .26 | 1.87 | 72.63 | 95.13 | 9.72 | 10.73 | .40 |
| Asian | 3.71 | 38.14 | .35 | 4.01 | 6.41 | .20 | .55 | 65.68 | 94.05 |
| White | 87.18 | 49.58 | 2.80 | 79.54 | 73.82 | 57.46 | 79.80 | 71.79 | 14.34 |
| Non-Hispanic white only | 76.43 | 13.52 | 0.52 | 73.66 | 14.22 | 1.43 | 69.93 | 26.89 | 4.94 |
| Age | 8.57 (.002) | 7.73 (.014) | 8.74 (.005) | 8.65 (.002) | 7.67 (.014) | 7.81 (.006) | 8.61 (.002) | 7.61 (.016) | 7.89 (.009) |
| Female | 48.73 | 48.99 | 49.32 | 48.78 | 48.93 | 49.04 | 48.80 | 49.28 | 48.60 |
| Sample size | 10,363,581 | 140,650 | 1,230,647 | 10,744,598 | 144,115 | 846,165 | 11,300,547 | 101,699 | 332,632 |

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data. The samples include U.S.-born individuals aged 0-17 with the indicated reported ancestry. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded.

Notes: All numbers are percentages except for age. Standard errors are shown in parentheses. Race/Ethnicity categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of College-Aged Youth (Age 18-25), by Reported Ancestry

| Race/Ethnicity | Black Ancestry | | | Mexican Ancestry | | | Asian Ancestry | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| | None | Multiracial | Only | None | Multiethnic | Only | None | Multiracial | Only |
| Black | 2.45 | 48.01 | 99.30 | 13.14 | 4.74 | .46 | 12.77 | 7.76 | .98 |
| Hispanic | 9.84 | 14.23 | .40 | 4.11 | 83.63 | 97.95 | 9.03 | 17.34 | 1.65 |
| Mexican | 6.50 | 6.38 | .16 | 1.13 | 74.19 | 94.21 | 5.95 | 9.30 | .39 |
| Asian | 2.48 | 36.69 | .25 | 2.62 | 5.54 | .27 | .34 | 64.98 | 93.33 |
| White | 90.76 | 38.92 | 1.44 | 82.64 | 74.63 | 56.30 | 82.82 | 67.99 | 15.09 |
| Non-Hispanic white only | 83.80 | 12.32 | .42 | 78.83 | 14.24 | 1.69 | 76.55 | 27.36 | 5.70 |
| Age | 21.29 | 21.06 | 21.42 | 21.30 | 21.14 | 21.31 | 21.31 | 20.97 | 20.74 |
| | (.001) | (.013) | (.004) | (.001) | (.014) | (.006) | (.001) | (.016) | (.008) |
| Female | 49.93 | 51.56 | 54.58 | 50.36 | 51.11 | 51.43 | 50.44 | 50.81 | 48.73 |
| Sample size | 2,838,995 | 26,868 | 317,920 | 3,016,477 | 24,852 | 142,454 | 3,102,876 | 18,167 | 62,740 |

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data. The samples include U.S.-born individuals aged 0-17 with the indicated reported ancestry. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded.

Notes: All numbers are percentages except for age. Standard errors are shown in parentheses. Race/Ethnicity categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Adults Aged 35-59, by Reported Ancestry

| Race/Ethnicity | Black Ancestry | | | Mexican Ancestry | | | Asian Ancestry | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | None | Multiracial | Only | None | Multiethnic | Only | None | Multiracial | Only |
| Black | 1.43 | 58.66 | 99.47 | 9.98 | 2.52 | .27 | 9.85 | 5.62 | 0.70 |
| Hispanic | 3.93 | 7.57 | .20 | 1.63 | 79.75 | 97.83 | 3.63 | 14.88 | 1.58 |
| Mexican | 2.64 | 3.09 | .10 | .50 | 73.01 | 93.12 | 2.43 | 7.37 | .31 |
| Asian | .76 | 27.77 | .08 | .80 | 4.15 | .22 | .09 | 58.82 | 93.22 |
| White | 95.68 | 27.24 | .58 | 88.04 | 76.98 | 62.35 | 88.04 | 70.18 | 14.22 |
| Non-Hispanic white only | 92.45 | 11.16 | .35 | 86.27 | 17.84 | 1.80 | 85.11 | 33.89 | 5.92 |
| Age | 46.70 (.002) | 45.77 (.031) | 46.29 (.006) | 46.69 (.002) | 44.63 (.036) | 45.47 (.014) | 46.67 (.002) | 44.54 (.042) | 45.63 (.023) |
| Female | 50.41 | 53.83 | 54.75 | 50.77 | 52.16 | 51.10 | 50.79 | 52.05 | 50.12 |
| Sample size | 13,012,339 | 52,128 | 1,182,449 | 13,943,032 | 35,644 | 268,240 | 14,128,874 | 25,581 | 92,461 |

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data. The samples include U.S.-born individuals aged 0-17 with the indicated reported ancestry. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded.

Notes: All numbers are percentages except for age. Standard errors are shown in parentheses. Race/Ethnicity categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 5: Affirmative Action Bans and Mexican Identification Among Individuals with and Without Mexican Ancestry, by Age Group

| | <u>Age 0-4</u> | <u>Age 5-9</u> | <u>Age 10-13</u> | <u>Age 14-17</u> | <u>Age 18-25</u> | <u>Age 35-59</u> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ban × No Mexican ancestry | .0002 (.0021) | -.004 (.003) | -.010*** (.003) | -.013*** (.004) | -.012*** (.003) | -.007*** (.002) |
| Ban × Multiethnic Mexican ancestry | -.022 (.021) | -.027* (.014) | -.029* (.017) | -.022 (.017) | -.009 (.017) | .020 (.027) |
| Ban × Only Mexican ancestry | -.043*** (.014) | -.044*** (.013) | -.041*** (.012) | -.041*** (.014) | -.031 (.021) | -.029 (.032) |
| Multiethnic Mexican ancestry | .675*** (.007) | .681*** (.007) | .682*** (.008) | .690*** (.008) | .705*** (.007) | .702*** (.018) |
| Only Mexican ancestry | .902*** (.009) | .907*** (.010) | .907*** (.010) | .906*** (.009) | .908*** (.008) | .920*** (.008) |
| Sample size | 3,172,576 | 3,284,251 | 2,648,289 | 2,629,762 | 3,183,783 | 14,246,916 |

*Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data.

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. The samples include U.S.-born individuals in the indicated age range. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded. The sample of individuals aged 18-25 is limited to those with a high school or GED degree, but not a bachelor's degree. The sample of individuals aged 35-59 is limited to those not in school. All regressions include controls for age and gender, the fraction of the state population that is foreign born, the fraction of the state population that is Black, Hispanic, and Asian, state and year fixed effects, and state specific linear time trends. No Mexican ancestry, multiethnic Mexican ancestry and only Mexican ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.

Table 6: Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification Among Individuals with and Without Black Ancestry, by Age Group

| | <u>Age 0-4</u> | <u>Age 5-9</u> | <u>Age 10-13</u> | <u>Age 14-17</u> | <u>Age 18-25</u> | <u>Age 35-59</u> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ban × No black ancestry | .002 (.002) | -.001 (.001) | -.001 (.001) | .001 (.002) | .002* (.001) | .001 (.001) |
| Ban × Multiracial black ancestry | -.153*** (.054) | -.146** (.059) | -.155** (.067) | -.163** (.072) | -.156* (.083) | -.122 (.114) |
| Ban × Only black ancestry | .010 (.012) | .010 (.011) | .011 (.011) | .011 (.012) | .009 (.009) | .011*** (.003) |
| Multiracial black ancestry | .456*** (.042) | .462*** (.049) | .472*** (.056) | .490*** (.060) | .506*** (.070) | .609*** (.102) |
| Only black ancestry | .935*** (.005) | .941*** (.005) | .944*** (.005) | .947*** (.005) | .955*** (.004) | .969*** (.003) |
| Sample size | 3,172,576 | 3,284,251 | 2,648,289 | 2,629,762 | 3,183,783 | 14,246,916 |

*Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data.

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. The samples include U.S.-born individuals in the indicated age range. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded. The sample of individuals aged 18-25 is limited to those with a high school or GED degree, but not a bachelor's degree. The sample of individuals aged 35-59 is limited to those not in school. All regressions include controls for age and gender, the fraction of the state population that is foreign born, the fraction of the state population that is Black, Hispanic, and Asian, state and year fixed effects, and state specific linear time trends. No black ancestry, multiracial black ancestry, and only black ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.

Table 7: Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification Among Individuals with and Without Asian Ancestry, by Age Group

| | <u>Age 0-4</u> | <u>Age 5-9</u> | <u>Age 10-13</u> | <u>Age 14-17</u> | <u>Age 18-25</u> | <u>Age 35-59</u> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ban × No Asian ancestry | -.004** (.002) | -.004** (.002) | -.003*** (.001) | -.002*** (.001) | -.002*** (.000) | -.001* (.0003) |
| Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry | .152*** (.039) | .148*** (.037) | .150*** (.042) | .147*** (.037) | .132*** (.042) | .113* (.063) |
| Ban × Only Asian ancestry | .034*** (.010) | .036*** (.012) | .045*** (.014) | .050*** (.017) | .057*** (.012) | .076*** (.011) |
| Multiracial Asian ancestry | .593*** (.020) | .582*** (.021) | .576*** (.022) | .585*** (.023) | .586*** (.028) | .531*** (.058) |
| Only Asian ancestry | .904*** (.011) | .905*** (.013) | .898*** (.014) | .896*** (.017) | .887*** (.011) | .865*** (.014) |
| Sample size | 3,172,576 | 3,284,251 | 2,648,289 | 2,629,762 | 3,183,783 | 14,246,916 |

*Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data.

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. The samples include U.S.-born individuals in the indicated age range. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded. The sample of individuals aged 18-25 is limited to those with a high school or GED degree, but not a bachelor's degree. The sample of individuals aged 35-59 is limited to those not in school. All regressions include controls for age and gender, the fraction of the state population that is foreign born, the fraction of the state population that is Black, Hispanic, and Asian, state and year fixed effects, and state specific linear time trends. No Asian ancestry, multiracial Asian ancestry, and only Asian ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.

Table 8: Affirmative Action Bans and Race/Ethnic Identification Among Individuals Aged 18-25, by College Enrollment

| | Mexican Ancestry | | Black Ancestry | | Asian Ancestry | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Not in College | In College | Not in College | In College | Not in College | In College |
| Ban × No relevant ancestry | -.010 ^{***} (.003) | -.012 ^{***} (.003) | -.0002 (.0014) | .004 ^{***} (.001) | -.001 ^{**} (.001) | -.003 ^{***} (.001) |
| Ban × Multiracial relevant ancestry | -.016 (.022) | -.007 (.013) | -.093 (.101) | -.193 ^{***} (.066) | .134 ^{**} (.052) | .124 ^{***} (.036) |
| Ban × Only relevant ancestry | -.039 [*] (.023) | -.025 (.017) | .008 (.008) | .009 (.010) | .095 ^{***} (.016) | .034 ^{***} (.010) |
| Multiracial relevant ancestry | .696 ^{***} (.010) | .716 ^{***} (.008) | .521 ^{***} (.090) | .492 ^{***} (.054) | .543 ^{***} (.041) | .616 ^{***} (.021) |
| Only relevant ancestry | .903 ^{***} (.009) | .916 ^{***} (.008) | .953 ^{***} (.004) | .957 ^{***} (.004) | .818 ^{***} (.011) | .917 ^{***} (.010) |
| Sample size | 1,717,251 | 1,466,532 | 1,717,251 | 1,466,532 | 1,717,251 | 1,466,532 |

*Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data.

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. The samples include U.S.-born individuals aged 18-25 with a high school or GED degree, but not a bachelor's degree. Individuals with an allocated race or Hispanic origin are excluded. All regressions include controls for age and gender, the fraction of the state population that is foreign born, the fraction of the state population that is Black, Hispanic, and Asian, state and year fixed effects, and state specific linear time trends. No relevant ancestry, multiracial relevant ancestry, and only relevant ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.