

A Comparative Study on the Determinants of Male Attitudes toward Gender Affirmative Action in Asian Countries : Using AsiaBarometer 2006 Data

Sociology of Korea University

Kim Ji Ae (course of master)

Yoo Tae Bum (course of master)

Abstract

By using AsiaBarometer 2006 data, this study aims to find the determinants of male attitudes toward gender affirmative action in 6 Asian countries, namely China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. For this purpose, this study explores three theories explaining causes of gender discrimination: two social psychological perspective including Realistic conflict theory, Relative deprivation theory, and Critical aspect of Feminism against Nationalism.

Regression analysis of the entire data showed that while relative deprivation theory has no explanatory power, realistic conflict and nationalism factors proved significant. Analyses on individual countries, however, showed that some factors of relative deprivation theory affected male attitudes. Especially satisfaction with social life such as 'Relationship', 'Socio-environment', and 'Political rights' turned out to be effective. These significant variables are likely to be categorized in social scope, compared with other ineffective ones such as 'Finance', 'Personal status' and 'Happiness' related with individual scope. In addition, 'Ethnocentrism' and 'Patriotism' among traits of nationalism had significance. Two of them are exclusive of out-groups more than 'Pride of being'. All in all it is revealed that each country has different determinants except China and Hong Kong.

In conclusion, we could say that factors on socio-culture level affect male attitude toward gender affirmative action more than individual level factors in 6 Asian countries.

I. Introduction

Affirmative action occurs whenever an organization devotes resources to make sure that people are not discriminated against on the basis of their gender or their ethnic identities (Crosby et al., 2006: 587). For example, in USA, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related legislation forbid discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability. Specifically, affirmative action¹ consists of actions taken to increase the numbers of an underrepresented demographic group in an organization. Affirmative action involves not only strict quotas or forcing the organization to hire or promote unqualified employees, but it may also involve consideration of demographic status in making employment decisions (Bennett-Alexander, 1990; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Turner, 1990). Moreover, demographic status may be weighted after competence is used for an initial screening (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987), and special training programs and recruitment are permitted (Bennett-Alexander, 1990; Turner, 1990).

Similar to Western countries, in many Asian countries, organizations are required to undertake affirmative action in an effort to reverse the effects of past discrimination on various demographic groups. In Korea, lots of Asian female have suffered social and economic discrimination. Hence, attempts have been made recently to decrease discrimination based on gender and to mitigate the effects of past discrimination. Also, quite a few researchers have been striving to make a legal basis for affirmative action and to provide political and administrative implications (e.g., Huh, 2010; Kim, 2005; Myung, 2006; Lee, 2004; Park, 2008).

However, there have been little studies about peoples' attitude toward gender-based affirmative action in Asia. It is surprising because a better understanding of why people support or oppose affirmative action would help legislators and organizations to develop policies that minimize social conflict (Kravitz et al., 2000: 1110). Actually, affirmative action has long been the focus of political, social, and interracial strife. Thus, it is essential to learn how people perceive and think about affirmative action. Moreover, there may

¹ Affirmative action has the same goal as equal opportunity, but differs from equal opportunity in being proactive (Burstein 1994). Equal opportunity is a passive policy that seeks to ensure that discrimination will not be tolerated once it is detected. In contrast, with affirmative action, organizations use established practices not only to subvert, but also to avert, discrimination (Crosby & Cordova, 1996).

be historical, structural, or political similarities and discrepancies in situations and procedures that have caused gender inequalities and also policies to mitigate these discriminations in Asian countries. Therefore, it is meaningful to compare diverse aspects in Asia in order to find a common denominator and factors that are responsible for the differences.

With this goal in mind, this study aims to find several factors that may affect male attitudes toward gender-based affirmative action. Our work focuses only on males. In our opinion, because males are more likely to think negatively of gender affirmative action than female, so the key point in making and practicing affirmative action successfully in each society is the support of males.²

Given the nature of affirmative action, it seems logical to assume that gender might affect people's attitudes toward this policy. In fact, gender has been consistent predictor of attitudes toward affirmative action in the United States (Bobo, 1998; Harrison, Kravitz, & Stahl, 2000; Steeh & Krysan, 1996). Males seem to feel threatened by the fact that they could lose their advantaged position in organizations, while affirmative action may give hope to females who – correctly or mistakenly – see themselves as talented but thwarted. Therefore, men are less enthusiastic about affirmative action than is any other group. Opinion surveys and laboratory studies both show this to be the case (Tougas and Beaton, 1993; Tougas and VeiUeux, 1991).

From above considerations, first we explore three theories that can explain these variations in attitudes toward affirmative action. Two of them are social psychological perspectives including realistic conflict theory, relative deprivation theory. The last one is aspect of feminism that criticizes nationalism.

We need to review some studies on attitudes toward affirmative action in the West before the actual analysis.

² But certainly, gender does not account for all the variance in people's attitudes to affirmative action. Between male and female, there are ranges of attitudes about affirmative action. Especially, sexist's beliefs are likely to influence attitudes about affirmative action. Research in this area has shown that in the last 20 years, these beliefs have undergone transformation (Dovidio et al., 1989; Gaertner and Dovidio, 1986; Kahn and Crosby, 1984; Jacobson, 1985; McConahay, 1986; Tougas et al., in press; Ward, 1985). Sexism still exists, but their expression has been modified to include current egalitarian values. As politically correct terms for prejudice change, the new sexists may couch their negative beliefs about women in the language of equality rather than the language of inferiority (Ward, 1985). Prejudice of this nature is embedded in egalitarian values, and as a result, more subtle and disguised than old-fashioned blatant prejudice (Kinder, 1986).

II. Studies on Attitudes toward Affirmative Action

Since the 1980s, some western (especially from the United States) social scientists have studied attitudes toward affirmative action. Above all, simple demographic characteristics of attitude-holders (e.g., gender, race, education) as well as general prejudice and political ideology turned out to be very important. Quite a few number of studies, across a variety of samples including students and workers, have compared female and male attitudes toward affirmative action. With some exceptions (e.g., Murrell et al. 1994), the vast majority of studies found that females endorse affirmative action much more strongly than males do (Aberson & Haag, 2003; Bell et al., 1997; Golden et al., 2001; Konrad & Linnehan, 1995b; Kravitz et al., 2000; Kravitz & Platania, 1993; Ozawa et al., 1996; Stout & Buffum, 1993; Summers, 1995; Truxillo & Bauer, 2000).

Some researchers (e.g., Golden et al., 2001) have found a positive relationship between education and approval of affirmative action, whereas others (e.g., Tuch & Hughes, 1996) have found no such relationship. Of special concern to researchers is the extent to which people's attitudes about affirmative action vary as a function of prejudice and political ideology. Across a substantial number of studies, researchers have found that opposition to affirmative action policies and practices is greatest among those who are the most sexist (Tougas et al., 1995a; 1995b; Tougas & Veilleux, 1990). Recent research has outlined some contingencies for the associations between prejudice and anti-affirmative action attitudes. Carmines & Layman's (1998) survey of Democrats and Republicans is illustrative.

Besides, affirmative action may take many forms varying in strength, from an increase in recruitment efforts to preferential treatment. The weaker approaches are favored by federal regulations and court decisions (Bennett-Alexander, 1990). Numerous studies have revealed that opposition to affirmative action increases with the relative weight given by the plan to group membership rather than to individual merit. This difference has been observed, for example, among adults in the United States (Sigelman & Welch, 1991) and New Zealand (Singer, 1996), French Canadian managers (Tougas & Veilleux, 1988, 1989), White and Hispanic undergraduates in the United States (Kravitz, 1995), and Canadian undergraduates (Nosworthy, Lea, & Lindsay, 1995). For the most part, anticipation of liked components was associated with positive attitudes, and anticipation of disliked components was associated with negative attitudes.

Consistent with the negativity bias often observed in human judgment (Ito, Larsen, Smith, & Cacioppo, 1998), the likelihood-attitude correlations were larger when they involved disliked than when they involved liked components.

There are number of theories from diverse disciplines and backgrounds that explain these variations in attitudes toward affirmative action. This research focuses mainly on social psychological and ideological perspectives. Some researchers have asserted variations in support for (or opposition to) affirmative action are best explained in terms of symbolic politics, intergroup conflict, self-interest, ideologically delimited cognitions, or principled objections. For example, Kinder and associates (Hughes, 1997; Kinder, 1998; Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Sears et al., 1997) argue for the symbolic politics point of view, which maintains that reactions to affirmative action are determined more by what race and race relations have come to symbolize for people, and less by what people stand to gain or lose personally from the policy. Bobo and colleagues (Bobo 1998, 2000; Bobo & Kluegel 1993; Bobo et al. 1997; Bobo & Smith 1994; Tolbert & Grummel 2003) have been the most forceful advocates of the view that battles over affirmative action reflect clashes over the interests of different social groups in America. Yet another perspective championed by Sidanius and associates (Federico & Sidanius, 2000a; 2000b; Sidanius et al., 1992; 1996) promotes the view that people's ideologies – and specifically their attachment to hierarchy (versus quality)—are the major determinants of reactions to affirmative action.

Examining the debates, Crosby (2004) observed that the moment might have come for accelerating the trend – visible in some of the recent contributions (e.g., Dawson, 2000; Hughes, 1997; Sidanius et al., 1992) – toward integrating the different theoretical approaches. There are several reasons why it no longer makes sense to attempt to explain attitudes toward affirmative action solely in terms of any one theory or approach. First, people may have different reasons for supporting different types of affirmative action (see Iyer et al. 2003). Second, it seems likely that many of the observed relationships among measured variables may be reconceptualized in terms of other measured or unmeasured variables. Thus, for example, one's political worldview (conceived in terms of hierarchy, political principles, or some other dimensions) may determine what one sees as being in the best interest of one's group or one's self and may determine how one judges merit.

III. Theoretical Background

Attitudes toward affirmative action can be derived from a number of theoretical assumptions. The first one in this study is realistic conflict theory on social psychological perspective. For Sumner (1906), the proposition derived from his structural functional theory of the origins of groups in the context of conflict over scarce natural resources. In an environment of scarcity, individuals needed to band together in groups to compete successfully with other groups for survival. Hence, the exigencies of warfare gave rise to both institutions that maintain in-group loyalty and cohesion and combativeness toward out-groups as “common products of the same situation.” In the absence of realistic conflict and scarcity, neither strong in-group attachment nor out-group hostility would be expected. Similar ideas were represented later in Sherif’s functional theory of intergroup behavior (Sherif, 1966; Sherif & Sherif, 1953), in which in-groups are presumed to be formed from positive interdependence in pursuit of common goals whereas intergroup relations are characterized by competition and negative interdependence.

In line with realistic conflict theory of intergroup relations (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif & Sherif, 1953), the reciprocal relationship between in-group cohesion and out-group hostility may be limited to conditions in which groups are in competition over physical resources or political power. Whether actual or imagined, the perception that an out-group constitutes a threat to in-group interests or survival creates a circumstance in which identification and interdependence with the in-group is directly associated with fear and hostility toward the threatening out-group and vice versa. To the extent that threat is a factor, members of disadvantaged or subordinate groups should show a stronger correlation between in-group identification and prejudice against the dominant out-group specifically. In accordance with this prediction, Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) found a substantial interrelationship between in-group identification and negative attitudes toward Afrikaners among Black Africans in South Africa. However, there was no correlation between in-group identification and attitudes toward English Whites or Whites in general. These findings led Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) to conclude that when intergroup attitudes are not conflict-based, attitudes toward the in-group and prejudice toward the out-group are essentially independent.

The second theory of this study is relative deprivation theory on social psychological perspective. Its

essential proposition is that a negative effect associated with judgments of one's own status is not simply a function of one's objective status. Instead, resentment, anger, dissatisfaction and other deprivation-related emotions vary with the subjective assessment of one's status (Bernstein & Crosby, 1980: 442). In this theory, relative deprivation is defined as an experience of being deprived of something to which one believes oneself to be entitled to have (Walker & Smith, 2001). In addition, relative deprivation refers to the discontent people feel when they compare their positions to others and realize that they have less than them (Bayertz, 1999: 144).

In the three decades since Stouffer's work, relative deprivation received attention across the spectrum of the social sciences. Within the field of psychology, relative deprivation theory (Crosby, 1976; Pettigrew, 1964; 1967; 1971) intersects with variety of other theories, including frustration-aggression hypothesis (Berkowitz, 1972; Dollard, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939), exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelly, 1959), equity theory (Adams, 1965; Berkowitz & Walster, 1976), and social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954; Suls & Miller, 1977). The concept has been utilized in a number of empirical literatures; it has been prominent in studies of worker satisfaction (Butler, 1976; Hill, 1974) and studies of black urban unrest (Abeles, 1976; Pettigrew, 1964).

The third theory can be found from studies concerning relationships between nationalism and feminism. Cynthia Enloe (1990: 45) observed that "nationalism has typically sprung from masculinized memory, masculinized humiliation and masculinized hope." She argues that women are relegated to minor, often symbolic, roles in nationalist movements and conflicts, either as icons of nationhood, to be elevated and defended, or as the booty or spoils of war, to be denigrated and disgraced. In either case, the real actors are men who are defending their freedom, their honor, their homeland and their women. By definition, nationalism is of political nature and is closely linked to the state and its institutions. Like the military, most state institutions have been historically and remain dominated by men. It is therefore no surprise that the culture and ideology of hegemonic masculinity go hand in hand with the culture and ideology of hegemonic nationalism. Masculinity and nationalism articulate well with one another, and the modern form of masculinity emerged at about the same time and place as modern nationalism.

Many theorists of nationalism have noted the tendency of nationalists to liken a nation to a family (McClintock 1991; Skurski 1994); it is a maleheaded household in which both men and women have

‘natural’ roles to play. While women may be subordinated politically in nationalist movements and politics, they occupy an important symbolic place as the mothers of the nation. As exalted ‘mothers in the fatherland’ (Koonz 1987), their purity must be impeccable, and so nationalists often have a special interest in the sexuality and sexual behavior of their women. While traditionalist men may be the defenders of the family and the nation, women are considered to embody family and national honor by traditionalists.

In Asia, Some feminists have argued Nationalism associated with Patriarchy from Confucian culture serves the role of a mechanism for suppressing women. According to Confucianism, the most important social institution is the family. And society is seen as comprising five relationships³, three of these relationships were within the sphere of the family and it was these relationships that conditioned the role of women. And the five relationships also stressed the hierarchical order of human society, which in turn meant that each person had to recognize his or her proper position in society. As far as women were concerned, this meant that the male had precedence over the female. The inferiority of women was seen as part of the law of nature, and social practice was developed on this basis (Kumari, 1986).

The other view, however, explains Nationalism has an intension to take care of females, because it regards females as symbol of nation or being for continuing a family line. Females are weaker than males, so males should protect and take care of females and it is all for male pride. That is, in this view females are not equal beings, but inferior to males.

From this point of view, we can infer that nationalism have been negatively associated with feminism. Particularly, considering the situations of high level of nationalism in Asian countries, nationalism in Asia could have functioned as an important constraint on various attempts at decreasing gender inequality. Consequently for this research, nationalism factor seems to highly influence people’s (especially male) attitudes toward affirmative action.

³ The characters of these five relationships were, ‘between father and son there should be affection, between ruler and minister there should be righteousness, between husband and wife there should be attention to their separate functions, between elder and younger brothers there should be order, between friends there should be good faith(Kumari, 1986: 170)’.

IV. Data

This study uses 2006 Asia Barometer Data collected in 6 Asian countries, namely China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan. Vietnam is in original data, but we didn't include it in our research because of lack of desired variables. The number of cases is 3502 including 1015 for China, Hong Kong 484, Japan 502, Singapore 475, South Korea 512 and Taiwan 514. Only male cases are selected. For analysis, multilevel regression analysis was conducted using SPSS 12.0.

Gender	China	Hong Kong	Japan	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Total
male	1015	484	502	475	512	514	3502

<Table 1> Number of male in each country

V. Hypothesis

This study draws its hypothesis from socio-psychological theories and feminism, and tries to explore which theory is more effective in finding determinants of male attitudes toward gender affirmative action in Asian countries.

1. Realistic conflict theory

This theory explains that when two groups struggle for realistic interests, a person in one group comes to discriminate or have prejudice against the other group. From that we can extract,

☛ ***Hypothesis A. Male who thinks female have more advantages in his country is more negative of Gender affirmative action.***

2. Relative deprivation theory

From this account, it is assumed that the more dissatisfied male feels in his life, the stronger exclusive attitude he has.

Also it is expected that satisfactions can be classified into diverse types according to objects of satisfaction. So we subdivide satisfaction into 6 categories, (1) personal relationship (2) personal finances (3) personal social status (4) social environment (5) psychological situation, and (6) political right. These are variables in subjective, individual scope. Our second hypothesis is,

☞ Hypothesis B. Male who is satisfied less with each dimension of his life has more negative attitude toward gender affirmative action.

3. Nationalism

In this paper, we try to verify the idea, 'Nationalism regard female as being of the weaker nature'.

☞ Hypothesis C. Male who has more traits of Nationalism is more supportive of gender affirmative action.

Compared with the former hypothesis B focusing on individual feeling or thought, Hypothesis C can be taken as a perspective in the social context.

VI. Variables

1. Independent Variables

Independent variables are shown by <table2>.

1-1. Gender inequality

Realistic conflict theory is testified by 'gender inequality'. Q22 "Do you think that on the whole men and women are treated equally in your country?" is used. This is 5 point scale, from 'men are treated more' to 'women are treated more', coded 1 to 5.

Theory	Variables
Realistic conflict	Gender inequality
Relative deprivation	Relationship Finance Status Socio-environment Happiness Political rights
Nationalism	Pride of being
	Ethnocentrism
	Patriotism
Demographic factor	Age

<Table 2> List of independent variables

1-2. Relative deprivation (Satisfaction)

Variables for verifying Relative deprivation theory is derived from Q7 “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with (some) aspects of your life”. 5 point scale, from ‘very satisfied’ to ‘very dissatisfied’, coded 1 to 5. As a result of factor analysis, we got four suitable factors. Those are ‘Relationship’, ‘Finance’, ‘Status’, and ‘Social environment or system’. <Table3> shows the result of factor analysis.

1) Relationship

Satisfaction with relationship is composed of ‘Neighbor (Q7b)’, ‘Friendship (Q7i)’, and ‘Family life (Q7n)’. Reliability is Cronbach α .601.

2) Finance

‘Standard of living (Q7d)’ and ‘Household income (Q7e)’ represent his satisfaction with finance situation. Cronbach α is .818.

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Satisfaction - Public safety	.846			
Satisfaction - The condition of the environment	.775			
Satisfaction - Social welfare system	.713			
Satisfaction - Standard of living		.828		
Satisfaction - Household income		.819		
Satisfaction - Neighbors			.787	
Satisfaction - Friendships			.700	
Satisfaction - Family life			.538	
Satisfaction - Education				.833
Satisfaction - Job				.719
Initial Eigenvalues (% of Variance)	41.649	11.894	9.512	6.991

<Table 3> Result of factor analysis (Q7)

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

3) Status

Status is measured by 'Education (Q7g)' and 'Job (Q7h)'. Academic career and Job are one of determinants of his social status in most societies. Cronbach α .632.

4) Socio-environment

'Public safety (Q7j)', 'The condition of the environment (Q7k)', and 'Social welfare system (Q7l)' are entered in this factor. It expresses how he is satisfied or dissatisfied about social condition as place he lives now'. Cronbach α is .754.

5) Happiness

Also Q4 "All things considered, would you say that you are happy these days?" is used for measuring subjective happiness. It is scaled 5 point from 1 'very happy' to 5 'very unhappy'.

6) Political right

For testifying subjective satisfaction with political aspect, Q39 may be suitable. "How satisfied are you with the current scope of the following rights in [your country]?", 4 point scale, from very satisfied to very dissatisfied, coded 1 to 4. Q39 includes 5 sub-questions, 'The right to vote(a)', 'The right to participate in any kind of organization(b)', 'The right to gather and demonstrate(c)', 'The right to be informed about the work and functions of government(d)', and 'The right to criticize the government(e)'.

We added all of them to make variable 'satisfaction with political rights'. As a result of factor analysis on Q39, 1 component was extracted. Cronbach α is .801.

1-3. Nationalism

In this study, we consider three dimensions as traits of Nationalism, 'Pride of being', 'Ethnocentrism', and 'Patriotism'.

1) Pride of being

'Pride of being' is measured by Q18 "How proud are you of being [your country's people]?" It is 5 point scale, from 1 'very proud' to 5 'Not proud at all'.

2) Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is counted by Q34h "How much you agree or disagree with [your country's] traditional culture is superior to that of other country". This is scaled 5 point, from 1 'strongly agree' to 5 'strongly disagree'.

3) Patriotism:

Q34i is related with Patriotism. “[your country’s] government should emphasize patriotic education to breed patriotism.”. 5 point scale, from 1 ‘strongly agree’ to 5 ‘strongly disagree’.

1-4. Demographic factor

We use variable ‘age(F2)’ in addition to theoretical ones. ‘gender (F1)’ is only selected male (male=1, female=0).

Age group	Number of Male
20-29	733
30-39	886
40-49	835
50-59	641
60-69	407
Total	3502

<Table 4> Count of age group (male)

2. Dependent Variable

Q32j is asking what answerers think of their government spending for improvement of the social status of women. It is assumed to represent ‘male attitude toward gender affirmative action’ as a dependent variable. 5 scale point, from 1 ‘spend much more’ to 5 ‘spend much less’.

Country	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
China	2.4449	1007	.86728
Hong Kong	2.8577	478	.63167
Japan	2.7259	478	.68082
Singapore	2.7948	458	.86597
South Korea	2.6554	502	.73054
Taiwan	2.8557	506	.76620
Total	2.6798	3429	.79534

<Table 5> Report of dependent variable 'gender affirmative action'

Yamamoto(2005) picked Q32j, Q36b from AsiaBarometer 2006 data to compose gender issue scale. Also Shigeto(2009) used Q32j from the same data to measure degree of supporting gender equality policy.

VII. Result of analysis

First, <Table6> shows the list of significant variables as a result of regression including all 6 countries.

Theory	Variables	China
Realistic conflict	Gender inequality	**
Relative deprivation	Relationship	ns
	Finance	ns
	Personal status	ns
	Socio-environment	ns
	Happiness	ns
	Political rights	ns
Nationalism	Pride of being	**
	Ethnocentrism	**
	Patriotism	**
Demographic	Age	ns
Adjusted R square		.054

<Table 6> List of significant variables (All countries, male)

Note) **: $p < .05$, ns: Not significant.

Coefficients are attached in the end of paper.

Interestingly, the only variables from Realistic conflict theory and Nationalism were significant. Variables from Relative deprivation theory explained nothing. Age also was not effective.

With this result, we could say that male in six Asian countries have tendency to decide his attitude according to how much they recognize conflict with female, or how much they have traits of Nationalism. But individual feelings, namely satisfaction with life or society, don't affect their attitudes toward gender affirmative action. That is, Hypothesis A and C turned out to be significant, but not B.

However, Does ‘Satisfaction’ really have no relation with male attitudes toward gender action? Let us check that with analysis by country.

Dimension	Variables	China	Hong Kong	Japan	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan
Realistic conflict	Gender inequality	**	**	**	ns	ns	**
Relative deprivation	Relationship	ns	ns	**	**	ns	ns
	Finance	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Personal status	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Socio-environment	**	**	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Happiness	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Political rights	ns	ns	ns	**	ns	ns
Nationalism	Pride of being	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Ethnocentrism	ns	**	ns	ns	**	ns
	Patriotism	**	ns	ns	**	ns	ns
Demographic	Age	ns	ns	(-)**	ns	ns	ns
Adjusted R square		.067	.030	.039	.088	.026	.045

<Table 7> List of significant variables (Each country, male)

Note) **: $p < .05$, ns: Not significant.

Significant variables in each country are shown by <table 7>.

China, Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan can be explained by Hypothesis A ‘realistic conflict’. In Singapore and South Korea, meanwhile, male recognition of conflict with female is not related with their opinions toward gender affirmative action.

Verilfication of hypothesis B is impressive. As a result of analysis by each country, three variables from hypothesis B were proved to be significant in four countries. There are 6 variables from Relative

deprivation theory, but only Socio-environment, Relationship, and Political right have significance. Note that the others such as Finance, Status, and Happiness are variables representing satisfaction with level of individual area. The effective ones, however, are related with social life, namely welfare system, public safety, and relationship with others (Relationship can not exist alone).

All variables in Hypothesis B measure subjective and individual feeling, but they can be classified into two groups according to 'feeling about what'. And that would be 'satisfaction with individual scope', and 'satisfaction with social scope'. Therefore, we can say 'Satisfaction with social scope' affect gender affirmative action more than 'Satisfaction with individual scope'.

In Hypothesis C, 'Ethnocentrism' was effective in Hong Kong and South Korea, and 'Patriotism' in China, Singapore. 'National Pride of being' did not affect any country.

The stronger traits of Ethnocentrism and Patriotism male have, the more he supports gender affirmative action. It is expected that Ethnocentrism and Patriotism are apt to come to be exclusive against out-group or Minorities in society, because two ideas put a stress on 'Us' or 'Our nation' more than 'Pride of being'.

Age is effective only in Japan (-). Older Japanese males are more supportive of gender affirmative action than younger ones. Explaining these result is beyond this study, but we can guess the reason why. Younger Japanese males might come to stop considering female as being they should protect and care. They are likely to be free to Confucian Patriarchy compared to their father generation. All in all, unemployment among young people is one of serious social problems in Japan as well as other countries.⁴ With the competition in the job market intensifying, younger Japanese males are apt to take a stance against the policies or viewpoints supporting only females. This view seems plausible when we consider Variable 'Gender inequality' is significant in Japan.

⁴ The unemployment rate of 15 to 24 year olds fell to 7.7% in Japan in 2007, down from 9.9% in 2002 and well below the OECD average of 13.4%, according to Jobs for Youth: Japan. Resources: OECD Homepage, newsroom '*Japan could do more to help young people find stable jobs*', 18.12.2008.

VIII. Discussion & Conclusion

It was revealed that Realistic conflict theory and Nationalism are more suitable to understand male attitude toward gender affirmative action than Relative deprivation theory. The latter gives psychological explanations on individual level, but formers are likely to take a view on social context. Even though we discovered some significant variables in Relative deprivation theory after analysis by each country, they were variables related with social area.

China and Hong Kong show similar result. Singapore is explained by individual, psychological factors better than other countries. As you see, each country has different significant variables. We think that it is because Gender issues as well as Cultural, Social situation, etc. are different in each country.

It is interesting that Nationalism helps understand gender issue well in Asian countries. View of Nationalism toward female in Asia seems similar with Benevolent-Sexism. So if analyzing interaction between Nationalism and Satisfaction, we might come to get another result.

In South Korea, it was unveiled Ethnocentrism is the sole effective variable. Surely Ethnocentrism seems one of the key factors in understanding gender issues in Korea. We can confirm that from difference of attitudes toward between married female immigrants and foreign female worker in Korea.

Married female immigrants are the main and most popular subjects when we discuss the Multiculturalism in Korea society. And efforts such as government policy, civil attentions are likely to aim to make them become more like Koreans. Their logic is that we should help and pay attention to married female immigrants because now they are our family. Their children will also be Korean, so we should treat them as a member of our society. On the other hand, a large number of foreign female workers come to Korea every year, but there is very little or no attention given to them. They are categorized into 'foreign worker', not female.

From this difference, it is assumed that support for female or generous attitudes toward them are only for females who are considered as a member of us. And we think Ethnocentrism would affect not only male attitudes but also that of females in Korea.

Finally, this study revealed that even those are same psychological perspective, factors on socio-culture level are more effective in explaining male attitude toward gender affirmative action than factors

on individual level in 6 Asia countries. So we can say that if males in 6 countries have negative opinion on gender affirmative action, it might be a result conceived in social context such as ideology, culture or realistic problems, not in his thoughts or feelings.

We could also explore female attitudes toward gender affirmative action. There are views that consider females as not of single unity. Collins(1990) explains difference between experience of black women with that of white women using concept of 'intersectionality'. The main idea behind intersectionality is that differing forms of oppression, based on race, gender, class, citizenship, sexuality and so on, all interact together to create an overlapping system of oppression. So it is expected that female attitudes could come to be different according to their characteristics. For conducting that work, it would need different hypothesis from males; because female can be out-group for male, but certain group in female would not see each other as in-out groups.

References

- Abeles, R. D. 1976. "Relative deprivation, rising expectations and black militancy." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 32(2), pp. 119-137.
- Aberson, CL, & SC Haag. 2003. "Beliefs about Affirmative Action and Diversity and Their Relationship to Support for Hiring Policies." *Anal. Soc. Iss. Public Policy*. Vol. 3, pp. 121-138.
- Bayertz, Kurt. 1999. *Solidarity*, Springer.
- Bell, MP, DA Harrison, & ME McLaughlin. 1997. "Asian American Attitudes toward Affirmative Action in Employment: Implications for the Model Minority Myth." *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.* Vol. 33, pp. 356-377.
- Bennett-Alexander, DD. 1990. "The state of affirmative action in employment: A *post-Stotts* retrospective." *American Business Law Journal*, Vol. 27, pp: 565-597.
- Berkowitz, L. 1972. "Frustration, comparisons, and other sources of emotional arousal as contributors to social unrest." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 28, pp. 77-91.
- Berkowitz, L., & Walster, E. 1976. (Eds.). *Equity theory: Toward a general theory of social interaction. Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9). New York: Academic Press.
- Bernstein, M, & Crosby, F. 1980. "An empirical examination of relative deprivation theory." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 16, pp: 442-456.
- Bobo, L. 1998. "Race, Interests, and Beliefs about Affirmative Action: Unanswered Questions and New Directions." *Am. Behav. Sci.* Vol. 41, pp. 985-1003.
- _____. 2000. "Race and Beliefs about Affirmative Action: Assessing the Effects of Interest, Group Threats, Ideology, and Racism." In *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*, ed. DO Sears, J Sidanius, & L Bobo, pp. 137-164. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Bobo, L, & JR Kluegel. 1993. "Opposition to Race-targeting: Self-interest, Stratification Ideology, or Racial Attitudes?" *Am. Sociol. Rev.* Vol. 58, pp. 443-464.
- Bobo, L, JR Kluegel, & RA Smith. 1997. "Laissezfaire Racism: the Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Anti-black Ideology." In *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, ed. SA Tuch, & JK Martin, pp. 15-42. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bobo, L, Smith RA. 1994. "Antipoverty Policy, Affirmative Action, and Racial Attitudes." In *Confronting Poverty: Prescriptions for Change*, ed. SH Danziger, GD Sandefu, & DH Weinberg, pp. 365-395. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Butler, R. J. 1976. "Relative deprivation and power: A switched replication design using time series data of strike rates in American and British coal mining." *Human Relations*, Vol. 29, pp. 623-641.
- Carmines, EG, & GC Layman. 1998. "When Prejudice Matters: the Impact of Racial Stereotypes on the Racial Policy Preferences of Democrats and Republicans." In *Perceptions and Prejudice: Race and Politics in the United States*, ed. J Hurwitz, M Peffley, pp. 100-134. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Crosby, F. 1976. "A model of egoistical relative deprivation." *Psychological Review*, Vol. 83, pp: 85-113. Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press.
- Crosby FJ. 2004. *Affirmative Action is Dead; Long Live Affirmative Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Crosby, Faye J., Aarti Iyer, & Sirinda Sincharoen. 2006. "Understanding Affirmative Action." *Annual Review of*

- Psychology*. Vol. 57, pp. 585-611.
- Dawson MC. 2000. "Slowly coming to grips with the effects of the American racial order on American policy preferences." In *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*, ed. DO Sears, J Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer.
- Dovidio, J. F., Mann, J., & Gaertner, S. L. 1989. "Resistance to affirmative action: The implications of aversive racism." In Blanchard, F. A., and Crosby, F. J. (eds.), *Affirmative Action in Perspective*, Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 83-102.
- Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. 1998. "Group identification and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis in South Africa." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 80-85.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 1990. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Federico CM, & J Sidanius. 2002a. "Racism, Ideology, and Affirmative Action Revisited: the Antecedents and Consequences of "Principled Objections" to Affirmative Action." *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 82, pp. 488-502.
- _____. 2002b. "Sophistication and the Antecedents of Whites' Racial Policy Attitudes: Racism, Ideology, and Affirmative Action in America." *Public Opin. Q.* Vol. 66, pp. 145-176.
- Festinger, L. A. 1954. "A theory of social comparison processes." *Human Relations*, Vol. 7, pp. 117-140.
- Gaertner, S. L, and Dovidio, J. F. 1986. "The aversive form of racism." In Dovidio, J. F., and Gaertner, S. L. (eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*, Academic Press, Orlando, FL, pp. 61-89.
- Golden, H, S Hinkle, & FJ Crosby. 2001. "Reactions to Affirmative Action: Substance and Semantics." *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 31, pp. 73-88.
- Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., & Stahl, A. 2000. "Individual differences in reactions to affirmative action programs: A theory-driven meta-analysis." Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.
- Hill, R. C. 1974. "Unionization and racial income equality in the metropolis." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 39, pp. 507-522.
- Hughes, M. 1997. "Symbolic Racism, Old-fashioned Racism, and Whites' Opposition to Affirmative Action." In *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, ed. SA Tuch, JK Martin, pp. 45-75. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Huh, Ra-Keum. 2010. "Re-conceptualization of 'Affirmative Action' for a Transformative Strategy of Gender-mainstreaming." *Journal of Korean Women's Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 99-125. 21, No. 2, pp. 255-287.
- Ito, T. A., Larsen, J. T., Smith, N. K., & Cacioppo, J. T. 1998. "Negative information weighs more heavily on the brain: The negativity bias in evaluative categorizations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 75, pp: 887-900.
- Iyer A, Leach CW, Crosby FJ. 2003. "White guilt and racial compensation: the benefits and limits of self-focus." *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* Vol. 29, pp. 117-129.
- Jacobson, C. K. 1985. "Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism?" *J. Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 29, pp. 306-329.
- Kahn, W., and Crosby, F. 1985. "Discriminating between attitudes and discriminatory behavior: Change and

- stasis." In Larwood, L, Gutek, B. A., and Stromberg, A. H. (eds.), *Women and Work, An Annual Review*, Vol. 1, Sage, Beverly Hills, pp. 215-238.
- Kim, Kyoung-Hee. 2005. "A Study for Reconstructing the Perspective on Women's Policies: Focusing on Development Approaches and Gender Mainstreaming Strategy." *Journal of Korean Women's Studies*, Vol.
- Kinder, DR. 1998. "Attitudes and Action in the Realm of Politics." In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. DT Gilbert, ST Fiske, & G Lindzey, pp. 778-867. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. 4th ed.
- Kinder, DR, & L Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Konrad, AM, & F Linnehan. 1995b. "Race and Sex Differences in Line Managers' Reactions to Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Interventions." *Group Organ. Manage.* Vol. 20, pp. 409-439.
- Koonz, Claudia. 1987. *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family, and Nazi Politics*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Kravitz, DA, & SL Klineberg. 2000. "Reactions to Two Versions of Affirmative Action among Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics." *J. Appl. Psychol.* Vol. 85, pp. 597-611.
- Kravitz, DA, & J Platania. 1993. "Attitudes and Beliefs about Affirmative Action: Effects of Target and of Respondent Sex and Ethnicity." *J. Appl. Psychol.* Vol. 78, pp. 928-938.
- Kumari Jayawardena. 1986. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*, London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Lee, Joo-Hee. 2004. "Affirmative Action and Its Effects on Women in the Labor Market." *Journal of Korean Women's Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 139-170.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. 1972. *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- McClintock, Anne. 1991. "'No longer in a future Heaven': woman and nationalism in South Africa." *Transition*, Vol. 51, pp. 104-123.
- McConahay, J. B. 1986. "Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale." In Dovidio, J. F., and Gaertner, S. L. (eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism*, Academic Press, Orlando, FL, pp. 91-125.
- Murrell, AJ, BL Dietz-Uhler, JF Dovidio, SL Gaertner, & C Drout. 1994. "Aversive Racism and Resistance to Affirmative Action: Perceptions of Justice are not Necessarily Color Blind." *Basic Appl. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 15, pp. 71-86.
- Myung, Jae-Jin. 2006. "Gender Affirmative Action in Field of Employment." *Public Law Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 277-329.
- Nosworthy, G. J., Lea, J. A., & Lindsay, R. C. 1995. "Opposition to affirmative action: Racial affect and traditional value predictors across four programs." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 25(3), pp. 314-337.
- Ozawa, K, M Crosby, & FJ Crosby. 1996. "Individualism and Resistance to Affirmative Action: A Comparison of Japanese and American Samples." *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 26, pp. 1138-1152.
- Patricia H. Collins. 1990, *Black Feminist Thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Unwin Hyman.
- Park, Kyung-Soon. 2008. "The Study of Affirmative Action for Women." *Sogang Law Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1,

pp. 117-150.

- Pettigrew, T. 1964. *A profile of the Negro American*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.
- Pettigrew, TE, & J Martin. 1987. "Shaping the organizational context for Black American inclusion." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 43(1), pp: 41 -78.
- Sears, DO, C Van Laar, M Carrillo, & R Kosterman. 1997. "Is it Really Racism? The Origins of White Americans' Opposition to Race-targeted Policies." *Public Opin. Q.* Vol. 61, pp. 16-53.
- Sherif, M. 1966. *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. 1953. *Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies on intergroup relations*. New York: Harper.
- Shigeto Sonoda. 2009, "New Middle Classes in East Asia: Myth and Reality", AsiaBarometer 2009 Workshop.
- Sigelman, L., & S Welch. 1991. *Black Americans' views of racial inequality: The dream deferred*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, M. 1996. "'Merit,' 'preferential,' or 'diversity-based' selection: Effect of information frame and informant gender on the public's views on preferential treatment in selection." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 4, pp: 1-11.
- Sidanius J, E Devereux, & F Pratto. 1992. "A Comparison of Symbolic Racism Theory and Social Dominance Theory as Explanations for Racial Policy Attitudes." *J. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 132, pp. 377-395.
- Sidanius J, F Pratto, & L Bobo. 1996. "Racism, Conservatism, Affirmative Action, and Intellectual Sophistication: A Matter of Principled Conservatism or Group Dominance?" *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 70, pp. 476-490.
- Skurski, Julie. 1994. "The ambiguities of authenticity: Dona Barbara and the construction of national identity." *Poetics Today*, Vol. 15, pp. 605-642.
- Steeh, C., & Krysan, M. 1996. "Affirmative action and the public, 1970-1995." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 60, pp. 128-158.
- Stout, KD, & WE Buffum. 1993. "The Commitment of Social Workers to Affirmative Action." *J. Sociol. Soc. Welfare*. Vol. 20, pp. 123-135.
- Suls, J. M., & Miller, R. L. 1977. (Eds.). *Social comparison processes*. New York: Wiley.
- Summers, RJ. 1995. "Attitudes toward Different Methods of Affirmative Action." *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 25, pp. 1090-1104.
- Sumner, W. G. 1906. *Folkways*. New York: Ginn.
- Tolbert CJ, & JA Grummel. 2003. "Revisiting the Racial Threat Hypothesis: White Voter Support for California's Proposition 209." *State Polit. Policy Q.* Vol. 3, pp. 183-202.
- Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. H. 1959. *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Tougas, F, R Brown, AM Beaton, & S Joly. 1995a. "Neosexism: Plus ca Change, Plus C'est Pareil." *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* Vol. 21, pp. 842-849.
- Tougas, F, FJ Crosby, S Joly, & D Pelchat. 1995b. "Men's Attitudes toward Affirmative Action: Justice and Intergroup Relations at the Crossroads." *Soc. Justice Res.* Vol. 8, pp. 57-71.
- Tougas, F, & F Veilleux. 1990. "The Response of Men to Affirmative Action Strategies for Women: the Study

- of a Predictive Model.” *Canadian J. Behav. Sci.* Vol. 22, pp. 424-432.
- Truxillo, DM, & TN Bauer. 2000. “The Roles of Gender and Affirmative Action Attitude in Reactions to Test Score Use Method.” *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 30, pp. 1812-1828.
- Tuch, SA, & M Hughes. 1996. “Whites’ Racial Policy Attitudes.” *Soc. Sci. Q.* Vol. 77, pp. 723-745.
- Turner, R. 1990. *The past and future of affirmative action*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Walker, Iain, & Heather J. Smith. 2001. *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration*, Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, D. 1985. “Generations and the expression of symbolic racism.” *Polit. Psychol.* Vol. 6, pp. 1-18.
- 山本和也(2005)、“グローバリズムの中のベトナム：アイデンティティ、対外イメージ、グローバルな問題への関心”、『AsiaBarometer Project Series 6 七つの東アジア社会におけるアイデンティティ・価値観・政治志向』

Coefficients

Country		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
China	(Constant)	.905	.225		4.021	.000
	Gender inequality	.226	.044	.175	5.152	.000
	relationship	.014	.019	.031	.741	.459
	finance	.016	.025	.028	.616	.538
	status	-.015	.023	-.028	-.645	.519
	Socio-environment	.031	.016	.084	2.007	.045
	happiness	.036	.039	.038	.937	.349
	Political rights	.015	.008	.069	1.892	.059
	Pride of being	.039	.040	.036	.980	.327
	ethnocentrism	.027	.034	.029	.809	.419
	patriotism	.134	.041	.116	3.256	.001
age	.001	.002	.019	.561	.575	
Hong Kong	(Constant)	2.273	.304		7.473	.000
	Gender inequality	.079	.050	.074	1.560	.120
	relationship	-.011	.030	-.022	-.351	.726
	finance	-.011	.030	-.023	-.387	.699
	status	.005	.032	.008	.142	.887
	Socio-environment	.045	.023	.112	2.009	.045
	happiness	.016	.048	.018	.340	.734
	Political rights	-.019	.013	-.072	-1.522	.129
	Pride of being	-.039	.045	-.043	-.872	.384
	ethnocentrism	.114	.036	.151	3.128	.002
	patriotism	-.005	.037	-.007	-.145	.884
age	.003	.002	.068	1.413	.158	
Japan	(Constant)	2.598	.287		9.068	.000
	Gender inequality	.113	.058	.103	1.949	.052
	relationship	.065	.027	.161	2.412	.016
	finance	-.031	.025	-.081	-1.235	.218
	status	.019	.032	.041	.598	.550
	Socio-environment	-.025	.019	-.081	-1.327	.185
	happiness	.014	.049	.017	.286	.775
	Political rights	.007	.012	.031	.554	.580
	Pride of being	-.031	.050	-.036	-.615	.539
	ethnocentrism	-.032	.046	-.040	-.707	.480
	patriotism	.028	.037	.041	.750	.454
age	-.006	.003	-.112	-2.075	.039	
Singapore	(Constant)	1.010	.424		2.380	.018
	Gender inequality	.157	.085	.106	1.855	.065
	relationship	.142	.040	.245	3.585	.000
	finance	-.051	.045	-.080	-1.136	.257
	status	-.012	.045	-.019	-.256	.798
	Socio-environment	.049	.028	.112	1.750	.081
	happiness	-.071	.070	-.067	-1.015	.311
	Political rights	.064	.018	.208	3.605	.000
	Pride of being	-.085	.085	-.061	-.991	.323
	ethnocentrism	-.045	.058	-.047	-.781	.435
	patriotism	.155	.059	.155	2.629	.009
age	-.005	.004	-.067	-1.173	.242	
South Korea	(Constant)	1.839	.270		6.809	.000

	Gender inequality	.082	.046	.087	1.772	.077
	relationship	-.011	.027	-.026	-.421	.674
	finance	-.015	.031	-.032	-.468	.640
	status	.001	.030	.001	.021	.984
	Socio-environment	.012	.019	.033	.610	.542
	happiness	.082	.045	.102	1.817	.070
	Political rights	.017	.013	.065	1.328	.185
	Pride of being	.036	.051	.036	.704	.482
	ethnocentrism	.115	.045	.132	2.543	.011
	patriotism	-.012	.045	-.014	-.274	.784
	age	.001	.003	.013	.259	.795
Taiwan	(Constant)	2.341	.306		7.639	.000
	Gender inequality	.238	.058	.201	4.135	.000
	relationship	-.023	.026	-.048	-.874	.383
	finance	.003	.035	.006	.095	.924
	status	.027	.034	.047	.777	.438
	Socio-environment	.003	.020	.008	.146	.884
	happiness	-.003	.040	-.004	-.084	.933
	Political rights	-.017	.012	-.072	-1.453	.147
	Pride of being	.009	.044	.010	.197	.844
	ethnocentrism	.065	.042	.079	1.566	.118
	patriotism	.079	.047	.083	1.670	.096
	age	-.002	.003	-.029	-.609	.543

a Dependent Variable: gender affirmative action