

INCENTIVES TO IDENTIFY:
RACIAL IDENTITY IN THE AGE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Francisca Antman and Brian Duncan

Supplemental Appendix

1. ROBUSTNESS

1.a. Interstate Movement

One question that might arise from our approach is whether the results in Tables 4 and 5 are driven by individuals moving in and out of states in response to changes in affirmative action policy. To address this, Tables A1 and A2 replicate the analysis on the population of children and working age adults who reside in their birth state. Table A1 shows that the magnitude of the results rise only slightly and are statistically significant only for children and young adults with multiracial Black ancestry (point estimates range from $-.165$ to $-.184$), the main groups of interest in Table 4. Similarly, Table A2 shows that the magnitudes are slightly higher for those with Asian ancestry with the highest point estimates again for those with multiracial ancestry around 17 percentage points. Thus, the results do not appear to be driven by selective migration.

1.b. Dropping the 1990 Sample and Testing for Pre-Existing Trends

As is well-known, difference-in-differences estimation relies on the assumption that in the absence of treatment, the treatment and comparison groups would have maintained parallel trends. Thus, any deviation from these trends can be attributed to the treatment, in this case the banning of affirmative action. While this assumption is ultimately untestable, we can lend credence to it by investigating whether there appeared to be any deviations in those trends prior

to the affirmative action bans. To do this, we introduce one- and two-year leads in the analysis that constitute indicators for the year before the affirmative action ban (ban_{st+1}) and two years before the affirmative action ban, (ban_{st+2}), where t indicates the year the ban went into effect:

$$\begin{aligned}
Identifies_{ist} = & \alpha + \pi_1(ban_{st} \times NoRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_2(ban_{s,t+1} \times NoRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_3(ban_{s,t+2} \times NoRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_4(ban_{st} \times MultiracialRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_5(ban_{s,t+1} \times MultiracialRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_6(ban_{s,t+2} \times MultiracialRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_7(ban_{st} \times OnlyRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_8(ban_{s,t+1} \times OnlyRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_9(ban_{s,t+2} \times OnlyRelevantAncestry_{ist}) \\
& + \pi_{10}MultiracialRelevantAncestry_{ist} + \pi_{11}OnlyRelevantAncestry_{ist} \\
& + \mathbf{X}_{ist}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mu_s + \delta_t + \theta_s t + \varepsilon_{ist}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Since this estimation requires data for the two years before the implementation of a ban, this necessitates limiting the investigation to the 2000-2011 period. Since this is a shorter period than the results reported above, we first re-estimate equation (1) for the 2000-2011 period to ensure that the results are comparable to the ones above. The results are reported in Tables A3 (Black identification) and A4 (Asian identification). While the response magnitudes appear to be slightly higher for individuals with multiracial Black ancestry and slightly lower for individuals with Asian ancestry, the pattern of results remains the same. The upshot of these tables is that

they not only constitute a baseline from which to compare the test of pre-existing trends to follow (Tables A5 and A6), but also serve as a robustness check to ensure that the results are not sensitive to the inclusion of the 1990 Census.¹

Finally, Tables A5 and A6 report the results from estimating equation (2) on the 2000-2011 sample to test for pre-existing trends, for Black and Asian identification respectively. Table A5 shows that the declines in Black self-identification rates for individuals with multiracial Black ancestry are generally not observed until the year the ban went into effect. This is consistent with the parallel trends assumption, since there appears to be no break in the trends prior to the implementation of the bans. As in Table A3, there still appear to be some changes in rates of self-identification for those with only Black ancestry, but the magnitudes are again small. Table A6 presents the results from estimating equation (2) with the indicator for Asian racial identification as the dependent variable. Again, the results support the parallel trend assumption by showing that the increases in rates of self-identification among individuals with Asian ancestry are occurring mainly once the ban is passed, as opposed to the year before or two years before.

Another advantage of estimating equation (2) is that the leading ban indicators also coincide with the year the ban was passed (ban_{st+1}) and the year before the ban was passed, (ban_{st+2}). As a result, these tests also provide support for our interpretation that it was the affirmative action bans in particular that serve as the mechanism for the changes in racial self-identification that we observe. For instance, without this evidence one might question whether it was the political and social climate surrounding the affirmative action bans, in particular the ballot initiatives, which resulted in the changes in rates of self-identification among racial

¹ Concerns over the 1990 Census were discussed in the Data section of the main paper.

minorities. If this were the case, however, we would expect to see it affecting rates of self-identification in the years leading up to the implementation of the ban, when the actual legislation was passed and the media attention and debate surrounding it would have peaked. Instead, we see that the effect mainly changes rates of self-identification in the year that the ban went into effect, which makes sense only if individuals were still basing their choice of racial self-identification on the rules of affirmative action in the years leading up to the ban. Thus, the evidence presented in Tables A5 and A6 supports the parallel trends assumption as well as our interpretation of the mechanism driving the results.

2. EXTENSIONS

2.a. Effects by Poverty Status

One implication of our study is that banning affirmative action has an important impact on the perceived demographics of the United States. In effect, banning affirmative action results in a perceived loss in the number of African-Americans and gains in the number of Asian-Americans in the United States. Moreover, if the individuals that we are “losing” or “gaining” are more likely to be drawn from one end of the distribution of a specific trait, this racial attrition will skew our perceptions of racial progress and disparities. This is not unlike the findings from the research on immigrant assimilation which shows that perceived assimilation patterns are biased due to selective ethnic attrition (Duncan and Trejo 2011). Thus, another benefit of investigating which subgroups are driving the observed effects is that it sheds light on whether changes in rates of racial identification are likely to misrepresent the progress of racial minorities and bias the resulting estimates of racial disparities.

We begin to address this question by investigating whether the impact of affirmative action bans varies for groups above or below the poverty line. Table A7 presents the results for Black identification. As before, the responses for individuals with no Black ancestry and only Black ancestry are generally small in magnitude, so we will focus on the results for multiracial individuals. The results for these individuals that lie above the poverty line are statistically significant, with magnitudes very close to those from the results above (point estimate about -0.15). For those individuals below the poverty line, the magnitude of the effect appears to drop for adults over 25, but is not statistically significant. For younger groups, the estimates for those below the poverty line are not far from the estimates for those above the poverty line, but are not always statistically significant, perhaps due to the relatively smaller sample size. Thus, we cannot conclude that the impact of the affirmative action bans on Black identification is primarily driven by those above or below the poverty line.

The analogous results for Asian identification can be found in Table A8. As before, the point estimates for those with no Asian ancestry are especially small (in the range of -.0007 to -.004). For individuals with multiracial Asian ancestry, the point estimates for those above the poverty line hover around the point estimates for the group as a whole (around 0.15) while the point estimates for those below the poverty line are somewhat smaller for some Asian groups (around 0.10). As before, those with only Asian ancestry also display somewhat smaller effects (ranging from 0.05 to 0.09), but this appears to be largely independent of poverty status.

2.b. Effects by Parental Education

One reason we might expect the results to be somewhat weaker for those individuals below the poverty line, at least for children, is that it indicates parental resources which may be a

rough proxy for parental education. Underlying this idea is the notion that parents with higher education may be more likely to respond strategically to changes in affirmative action policies, particularly those in higher education. To determine whether there is evidence to support this, we ask whether the impact of affirmative action bans on racial identification varies based on parental education.

Table A9 shows the results for Black identification for children based on parents' highest level of education. Again, our focus here is on multiracial individuals with Black ancestry, as they appear to be the main group responding to the affirmative action bans. For the most part, the coefficient estimates are close in magnitude to the overall results, with little difference across groups based on parental education. Table A10 presents the analogous results for Asian identification. Here, the magnitudes of the point estimates appear to be somewhat higher for those individuals with parents with less than a college degree, but for the most part are still not far from the original point estimates.

Overall, these results suggest that the effects of affirmative action bans on racial identification are largely similar for individuals irrespective of poverty status or parental education. Thus, despite the fact that the main results imply a "loss" in the number of African-Americans and "gain" in the number of Asian-Americans in the U.S. population, we cannot conclude that there will be considerable misrepresentation of racial progress and racial disparities as a result.

**Table A1: Robustness—Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification among
Individuals with and without Black Ancestry Who Reside in Their Birth State, by Age Group**

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
Ban × No black ancestry	.0005 (.0014)	-.0001 (.0012)	.001 (.001)	.0003 (.0013)	.0006 (.0012)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.165 ^{***} (.061)	-.181 ^{**} (.082)	-.184 [*] (.101)	-.164 (.124)	-.130 (.165)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.012 (.012)	.014 (.012)	.014 (.011)	.011 (.008)	.013 (.008)
Multiracial black ancestry	.471 ^{***} (.052)	.494 ^{***} (.073)	.525 ^{***} (.090)	.565 ^{***} (.111)	.601 ^{***} (.146)
Only black ancestry	.937 ^{***} (.005)	.944 ^{***} (.006)	.946 ^{***} (.006)	.956 ^{***} (.005)	.960 ^{***} (.005)
Sample size	5,632,806	4,255,379	3,223,228	3,344,004	9,080,139

*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 who reside the state in which they were born. 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 black ancestry, multiracial black ancestry, and only black ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.

**Table A2: Robustness—Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification among
Individuals with and without Asian Ancestry Who Reside in Their Birth State, by Age Group**

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.004** (.002)	-.003** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002* (.001)	-.001* (.001)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.164*** (.041)	.170*** (.043)	.179*** (.047)	.171*** (.044)	.163*** (.054)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.040*** (.015)	.057** (.024)	.079** (.031)	.113** (.043)	.183*** (.052)
Multiracial Asian ancestry	.574*** (.023)	.560*** (.027)	.543*** (.034)	.516*** (.036)	.485*** (.054)
Only Asian ancestry	.901*** (.016)	.891*** (.025)	.871*** (.032)	.828*** (.047)	.768*** (.056)
Sample size	5,632,806	4,255,379	3,223,228	3,344,004	9,080,139

*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 who reside the state in which they were born. 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 Asian ancestry, multiracial Asian ancestry, and only Asian ancestry are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories.

Table A3: Robustness—Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification in 2000-2011 among Individuals with and without Black Ancestry, by Age Group

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
Ban × No black ancestry	-.0029 (.0017)	-.0056* (.0031)	-.0004 (.0021)	-.0030 (.0026)	-.0010 (.0011)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.183*** (.066)	-.191** (.078)	-.186** (.087)	-.161* (.095)	-.131 (.116)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.008 (.013)	.007 (.013)	.011 (.010)	.004 (.007)	.010*** (.003)
Multiracial black ancestry	.489*** (.047)	.506*** (.061)	.532*** (.068)	.568*** (.077)	.627*** (.102)
Only black ancestry	.936*** (.005)	.944*** (.005)	.948*** (.004)	.961*** (.003)	.968*** (.003)
Sample size	4,741,706	4,018,095	3,247,871	3,489,592	11,628,380

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

Source: 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data (1990 Census data are not included in the sample).

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. 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 A4: Robustness—Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification in 2000-2011 among Individuals with and without Asian Ancestry, by Age Group

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.0015 (.0010)	-.0017** (.0008)	-.0013** (.0006)	-.0008 (.0008)	-.0002 (.0005)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.067** (.026)	.075** (.031)	.076** (.035)	.080** (.036)	.085 (.064)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.028* (.014)	.039** (.018)	.045*** (.015)	.058*** (.018)	.088*** (.018)
Multiracial Asian ancestry	.674*** (.012)	.654*** (.018)	.643*** (.025)	.620*** (.031)	.562*** (.059)
Only Asian ancestry	.914*** (.013)	.907*** (.017)	.903*** (.012)	.881*** (.014)	.854*** (.013)
Sample size	4,741,706	4,018,095	3,247,871	3,489,592	11,628,380

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

Source: 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data (1990 Census data are not included in the sample).

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. 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 A5: Suggestive Evidence of Parallel Trends—Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification in 2000-2011 among Individuals with and without Black Ancestry, by Age Group

	Age 0-9	Age 10-17	Age 18-25	Age 26-34	Age 35-59
<u>Ban × No black ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	-.006** (.003)	-.009* (.005)	-.002 (.003)	-.004 (.003)	-.001 (.001)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	.005* (.003)	.007** (.003)	.004 (.003)	.003 (.002)	.0002 (.0008)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	-.004*** (.001)	-.004* (.002)	-.001 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	.0001 (.0010)
<u>Ban × Multiracial black ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	-.172*** (.05)	-.177*** (.05)	-.187*** (.06)	-.131** (.06)	-.123** (.06)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	-.016 (.067)	-.029 (.034)	-.036 (.069)	-.102* (.059)	-.070 (.080)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	.002 (.086)	.016 (.075)	.037 (.093)	.073 (.107)	.063 (.136)
<u>Ban × Only black ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	.034*** (.009)	.026*** (.008)	.023*** (.007)	.006 (.004)	.007*** (.001)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	-.038*** (.011)	-.032*** (.009)	-.026** (.011)	-.005 (.007)	-.006* (.004)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	.008 (.014)	.012 (.011)	.013 (.014)	.004 (.009)	.010* (.005)
Sample size	4,741,706	4,018,095	3,247,871	3,489,592	11,628,380

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

Source: 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data (1990 Census data are not included in the sample).

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 7 (see Table 7 notes for details).

Table A6: Suggestive Evidence of Parallel Trends—Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification in 2000-2011 among Individuals with and without Asian Ancestry, by Age Group

	Age 0-9	Age 10-17	Age 18-25	Age 26-34	Age 35-59
<u>Ban × No Asian ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	-.0017 (.0011)	-.0021** (.0010)	-.0012 (.0008)	-.0014 (.0008)	-.0005 (.0005)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	-.00001 (.0010)	.0013 (.0008)	-.0006 (.0005)	.0011 (.0009)	.0005 (.0004)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	-.0001 (.0014)	-.0002 (.0010)	-.0007 (.0006)	.0003 (.0005)	.0001 (.0004)
<u>Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	.104*** (.032)	.101** (.049)	.108*** (.039)	.116** (.044)	.171*** (.061)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	-.059 (.066)	-.099 (.071)	.00002 (.04179)	-.059 (.074)	-.105 (.086)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	.021 (.061)	.073 (.062)	-.034 (.049)	.023 (.080)	.017 (.106)
<u>Ban × Only Asian ancestry:</u>					
Ban in Effect (<i>t</i>)	.039*** (.010)	.045*** (.008)	.065*** (.013)	.092*** (.029)	.126*** (.034)
Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +1)	-.033*** (.012)	-.017 (.011)	-.036** (.017)	-.045 (.039)	-.084 (.050)
Year Before Ban Passed (<i>t</i> +2)	.022** (.010)	.011 (.012)	.014 (.013)	.011 (.032)	.045 (.055)
Sample size	4,741,706	4,018,095	3,247,871	3,489,592	11,628,380

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

Source: 2000 Census Data, 2001-2011 ACS data (1990 Census data are not included in the sample).

Notes: Standard errors clustered at the state level are shown in parentheses. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 8 (see Table 8 notes for details).

**Table A7: Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification among
Individuals with and without Black Ancestry, by Age Group and Poverty Status**

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
<u>Above Poverty Line:</u>					
Ban × No black ancestry	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.0004 (.0007)	.001 (.001)	.0005 (.0004)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.141*** (.051)	-.153** (.066)	-.156* (.083)	-.149* (.088)	-.135 (.115)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.004 (.009)	.006 (.009)	.005 (.008)	.005 (.004)	.008*** (.002)
Sample Size	5,258,404	4,476,438	3,351,665	4,489,924	13,568,868
<u>Below Poverty Line:</u>					
Ban × No black ancestry	-.016*** (.005)	-.015*** (.005)	.002 (.005)	-.0003 (.0059)	-.001 (.005)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.095 (.063)	-.126* (.070)	-.152** (.069)	-.051 (.059)	-.012 (.069)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.038* (.022)	.039* (.023)	.022* (.012)	.029** (.011)	.037*** (.009)
Sample size	1,198,423	801,613	1,134,403	619,859	1,284,446

*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. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 4 (see Table 4 notes for details).

**Table A8: Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification among
Individuals with and without Asian Ancestry, by Age Group and Poverty Status**

	<u>Age 0-9</u>	<u>Age 10-17</u>	<u>Age 18-25</u>	<u>Age 26-34</u>	<u>Age 35-59</u>
<u>Above Poverty Line:</u>					
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.004** (.002)	-.003*** (.001)	-.003*** (.001)	-.002** (.001)	-.0007** (.0004)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.148*** (.038)	.152*** (.040)	.147*** (.044)	.152*** (.039)	.112* (.062)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.032*** (.011)	.045*** (.014)	.061*** (.014)	.062*** (.012)	.072*** (.010)
Sample size	5,258,404	4,476,438	3,351,665	4,489,924	13,568,868
<u>Below Poverty Line:</u>					
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.002 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	.0001 (.0008)	-.0002 (.0003)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.157*** (.035)	.103*** (.038)	.108*** (.035)	.090* (.046)	.146** (.072)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.048*** (.016)	.062** (.023)	.040*** (.011)	.096*** (.018)	.095*** (.030)
Sample size	1,198,423	801,613	1,134,403	619,859	1,284,446

*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. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 5 (see Table 5 notes for details).

**Table A9: Affirmative Action Bans and Black Identification among
Individuals with and without Black Ancestry, by Age Group and Parents' Education**

	Parents' Highest Level of Education				
	No High School	High School	Some College	College Degree	Unknown
<u>Children Aged 0-9:</u>					
Ban × No black ancestry	-.005 (.004)	-.004** (.001)	.002 (.002)	.004*** (.001)	-.019** (.007)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.151* (.086)	-.117 (.078)	-.124** (.055)	-.134*** (.039)	-.101 (.068)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.039** (.018)	.012 (.018)	.005 (.011)	-.0005 (.0048)	.060** (.022)
Sample Size	599,310	1,565,167	1,998,892	2,069,388	224,070
<u>Children Aged 10-17:</u>					
Ban × No black ancestry	-.011*** (.003)	-.0002 (.0018)	.001 (.001)	.002** (.001)	-.012* (.006)
Ban × Multiracial black ancestry	-.265*** (.071)	-.138 (.092)	-.144** (.070)	-.162*** (.051)	-.060 (.095)
Ban × Only black ancestry	.031 (.031)	.014 (.017)	.006 (.009)	-.002 (.005)	.038** (.017)
Sample size	423,085	1,319,359	1,694,528	1,575,319	265,760

*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. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 4 (see Table 4 notes for details). High school means completed 12 grade, high school graduate or GED.

**Table A10: Affirmative Action Bans and Asian Identification among
Individuals with and without Asian Ancestry, by Age Group and Parents' Education**

	Parents' Highest Level of Education				
	No High School	High School	Some College	College Degree	Unknown
<u>Children Aged 0-9:</u>					
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.003*** (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.003** (.001)	-.006** (.002)	-.003 (.002)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.203*** (.039)	.192*** (.053)	.166*** (.042)	.119*** (.030)	.105** (.045)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.038*** (.011)	.069*** (.023)	.066*** (.014)	.003 (.006)	.103*** (.034)
Sample size	599,310	1,565,167	1,998,892	2,069,388	224,070
<u>Children Aged 10-17:</u>					
Ban × No Asian ancestry	-.0005 (.0013)	-.003** (.001)	-.003*** (.001)	-.004*** (.001)	.0001 (.0014)
Ban × Multiracial Asian ancestry	.164*** (.038)	.169*** (.046)	.164*** (.041)	.126*** (.037)	.160*** (.040)
Ban × Only Asian ancestry	.043*** (.013)	.077*** (.028)	.085*** (.018)	.017** (.008)	.092** (.034)
Sample size	423,085	1,319,359	1,694,528	1,575,319	265,760

*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. Regressions include same sample and controls reported in Table 5 (see Table 5 notes for details). High school means completed 12 grade, high school graduate or GED.