

RACISM AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY¹

Paul M. Sniderman, Philip E. Tetlock, Randall S. Peterson *

Abstract An influential argument in social science today is that racism is an inevitable byproduct of liberal democracy in general and of democracy on the American model in particular. One strand of this argument, the new racism thesis, asserts that contemporary racism is rooted largely in the values of individualism (self-reliance, entrepreneurship, materialism) that are integral to the American tradition. A second strand of argument, the racial affect model, asserts that, given the minimal knowledge about and interest in politics that ordinary citizens display, they will inevitably tend to organize their reactions to issues of race merely on the basis of their feelings toward minority groups. Drawing on a series of representative national surveys of Americans in the 1980s, and on experiments embedded within those surveys, we show that both the new racism and racial affect models are at odds with key empirical results. We also advance an alternative model, issue pluralism theory, which better captures the American dilemma as it is experienced by the general public in the late twentieth century. Issue pluralism theory helps to explain why citizens' reactions to racial issues are variably intercorrelated - some strongly, other weakly - as well as the conditions under which it is reasonable to expect large correlations.

Once regarded as a vestige of an earlier and more primitive politics, sure to give ground through the education of citizens and the modernization of society, racial prejudice now seems to many to be a signal point of vulnerability for liberal democracies. The intensity of conflict over issues of prejudice and group status has raised

* Paul M. Sniderman, Department of Political Science, Stanford University, Survey Research Center and Institute of Personality and Social Research, University of California at Berkeley; Philip E. Tetlock, Department of Psychology and Institute of Personality and Social Research, University of California at Berkeley; Randall S. Peterson, Department of Psychology, University of California at Berkeley.

deep questions about the limits of citizenship in liberal democracy. Is it possible for the public as a whole, the ordinary mass of citizens, to commit themselves not merely to the honorific principle of racial equality, but to the costly and arduous effort required to achieve it? Or is there something built-in to liberal democracy itself that makes prejudice a natural, even predictable feature of the thinking of ordinary citizens about issues of race?

In this paper we want to consider the apparent entanglement of racism and liberal democracy, and in particular to try to unravel the threads of two lines of argument, both positing, albeit in different ways, that racist thinking is not an accidental but a natural feature of liberal democracy. One of these arguments focuses on a core set of values in liberal democracy - at any rate liberal democracy on the American model; the other, on the constraints in information processing characteristic of mass publics in democratic societies.

To get at the truth of these matters is a difficult enterprise. A public opinion survey, however scientific and systematic, reduces in the end to a conversation. All one has to work with are a person's words: but of course, in talking about issues of race, the whole question is whether we can take people at their word. For just this reason, we have introduced a new approach in survey research which combines the external validity advantages of the representative sample with the internal validity strengths of experimental design, through computer-assisted interviewing (Piazza, Sniderman, and Tetlock, 1989). We shall accordingly concentrate on a series of special studies introducing our approach, though for purposes of reference we shall also take account of the standard surveys.

Analytically, we shall explore two questions in particular: first, how do citizens link together their ideas about racial issues and second, is there a racial double standard, with white Americans honouring claims to public benefits if they are made in behalf of a white but not a black? The larger argument of this paper is woven around examination and contrast of three perspectives on racial politics - the "individualism" thesis, the Converse "racial affect" model, and the concept of "issue pluralism." The first and second theses represent arguments in behalf of an entanglement between racism and liberal democracy, the former centering on values central to liberal democracy - at any rate to liberal democracy on the American model - the latter on constraints in information processing characteristic of mass publics in liberal democracies. In contrast, the concept of issue pluralism underlines the complexity of the cleavages over issues of race that is the mark of the new politics of race. As we mean to show, the individualism thesis is not true, and likely never was; the racial affect model, although true a generation ago, is true no longer; while the issue pluralism model, although not true a generation ago, is true now.

The "Individualism" Thesis

The "individualism" thesis has been proposed by a school of researchers on contemporary racism (Sears and Kinder, 1971; McConahay, 1986; Kinder and Sears, 1981; Kinder, 1986; Sears, 1988). It would be wrong to suggest that the new racism researchers agree on all points - on the contrary, differences on points both methodological

and conceptual among them are now coming more clearly into view². Nonetheless, all of them have, for decades, taken the work of the others as confirming and buttressing their own and all have subscribed to a core argument which has defined their research program - the "individualism" thesis.

The pivotal idea, on which all agree, is that racism now consists in a "conjunction" or "blend" of antiblack affect and

"the kind of traditional American values embodied in the Protestant ethic" (Kinder and Sears, 1986, 416).

The phrase, "the kind of traditional American values embodied in the Protestant Ethic," although evocative, is far from scientifically precise, and it is not surprising, accordingly, that it can be used as a tent cover for a heterogeneous set of values, including:

"hard work, individualism, sexual repression, and delay of gratification, with large doses of patriotism and reverence for the past thrown in" (McConahay and Hough, 1976, 40, italics added).

It is by no means obvious that all of these elements fit into a coherent picture of individualism, and some of them seem more closely connected to conservatism of a familiar variety. In what sense, for example, is reverence for the past a traditional American value? Observers from Tocqueville through Bryce have emphasized, on the contrary, the American commitment to the future, not the past. Moreover, if some elements have been included as components of individualism that should have been excluded, others have been excluded that should surely have been included. As Bellah and his colleagues (1985) have made plain, the notion of individualism is a complex of strands, and if some are tied to ideas of self-reliance and hard work, others are tied to ideas of self-fulfilment, creativity, and individuality. It needs therefore to be emphasized that researchers on racism have focused on a narrow - albeit defensible - conception of individualism, centred on the themes of self-reliance and the work ethic.

There is, in their eyes, a natural fit between a dislike for blacks on the one side, and a celebration of the value of individualism on the other. Indeed, the connection between the two strikes the new racism researchers as so self-evident that they have never explicitly spelled it out. But it is not difficult to see that there is a pair of premises at work. Individualism seems naturally to blend with negative feelings toward blacks, in the first place, because the ethic of self-reliance provides a legitimate rationale for reacting negatively to blacks and to appeals to assist them with their problems. The value of individualism, after all, serves as an attributional heuristic for assigning responsibility, emphasizing that individuals deserve credit for their successes and, analogously, need to be held to account for their problems. Individualism, from this angle, emphasizes internal causal attributions and minimizes external ones, thus favouring the view that the problems blacks continue to have are fundamentally of their own making. Correlated with, but distinguishable from, the use of individualism as an attributional heuristic, is the affective tone associated with it. Individualism, particularly on the narrow conception of the new racism researchers, is bound up with notions like "people ought to stand on their own two feet" and "any one can get ahead if they only work hard enough". These phrases carry with them an

ungenerous affective tone and it follows - or seems to follow - that a person who believed in such ideas would tend to be less empathic, less likely to sympathize with blacks, more likely to be negative in their responses both to appeals to assist blacks and to blacks themselves. However, on either interpretation, attributional or affective, it must be underscored that the new racism researchers are not merely claiming that the value of individualism serves as a convenient screen, to disguise and legitimize an animus against blacks. Rather they are making the far more radical claim that individualism is a principal component of contemporary racism.

This claim, if correct, would implicate liberal democracy in contemporary racism - certainly liberal democracy on the American model. For it is difficult to conceive of the political culture of a liberal democracy on the American model which does not have a strong streak of individualism, self-reliance and the work ethic. And if the individualism thesis is valid, there is an unavoidable entanglement of racism and liberal democracy. Indeed, the reemergence of racism - precisely at the moment old-fashioned bigotry had irretrievably lost ground - is to be laid at the door of the complex of cultural and historical values associated with the conjunction of capitalism and liberal democracy.

Is the claim that individualism is a primary component of modern racism in fact correct? The new racism researchers *assert* that modern racism is a conjunction of anti-black affect and individualism. But this assertion is treated as a conceptual stipulation, to be accepted as true by definition, not as an empirical hypothesis, to be subject to testing. Thus, Kinder states "we have tried to measure symbolic racism with questions that *deliberately mix* racist sentiments and traditional American values, particularly individualism" (Kinder, 1986, 156, *italics added*).³ But if the new racism is a conjunction of racism and individualism, then it follows necessarily the new racism and individualism are strongly and positively correlated.

It is hard to specify precisely what it means to say that the two should be "strongly" correlated. But it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the magnitude of a validity coefficient should be impressive - say, in excess of .6. Moreover, in order to guarantee that the test is a fair one, and in order specifically to assure that its results are binding on advocates as well as critics of the new racism thesis, we shall rely on measures of symbolic racism and individualism put together by new racism researchers.⁴

How tightly wrapped together is the new racism and individualism? In fact, they have little to do with one another: the correlation between the two, taking the 1986 National Election Survey as a point of reference, is only .21. How can the new racism be integrally bound up with individualism, as the new racism thesis maintains, if measures of the new racism and individualism, constructed exactly as the new racism researchers wish them, share less than five percent of the variance?

This result hints at a crucial ambiguity in the individualism thesis. This ambiguity is exposed when Kinder, restating their principal hypothesis, declares that symbolic or modern racism:

"represents a form of resistance to change in the racial status quo based on moral feelings that blacks violate such traditional American values as individualism and self-reliance, the work ethic, *obedience, and discipline*" (1981, 416, *italics added*).

This conception of the new racism, although it may seem straightforward at first, is surely on reflection odd. The ideas of individualism, self-reliance and the work ethic may fairly be labelled emblematic of the American ethos. But who has ever suggested that obedience and discipline are quintessentially American values? It is precisely lack of regimentation, spontaneity, openness to challenge that are trademarks of the American ethos; indeed, the openness, irregularity, and even unruliness of the American culture follow in the wake of individualism as a value. What Kinder and Sears have done, it would appear, is to run together two different sorts of concerns - the traditional American value of individualism and the conservative-authoritarian values of obedience and discipline. Conservative-authoritarian values constitute the traditional values in some societies but, in a liberal society, the distinction between traditional-individualistic and conservative-authoritarian values is crucial. Indeed, we shall show that perceptions of blacks as violating traditional American values spring not from traditional-individualistic values - for example, achievement and competition - but rather from conservative-authoritarian values, among them obedience and discipline.

For empirical guidance, we shall begin by taking advantage of a random-digit telephone sample of English-speaking adults in the five-county San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area. A total of 1,113 adults were interviewed by the Survey Research Centre at the University of California, Berkeley, the empirical analysis being restricted to whites only. The interview schedule was computer-driven, for reasons we shall make plain below, using the CASES system of computer-assisted telephone interviewing (Shanks, 1989). Table 1 reports the correlations between stereotypes of blacks as lazy and irresponsible on the one side⁵, and a variety of aspects of individualism as a value, including the importance that people attach to competing against others, to always being the best at what you do, to being accepted by other people, to doing what you yourself want to do whether it's convenient for others or not, even the importance of material success⁶.

Table 1: Correlation between stereotypes of blacks as violating the protestant ethic and aspects of individualism.

(whites only)

(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)

ASPECTS OF INDIVIDUALISM

Achievement	.01
Acceptance by others	.03
Competition	.03
Importance of material success	.08
Self-orientation	.05
Originality and individual differences	.02
Originality vs. authority	-.16

As a glance at Table 1 will show, no aspect of individualism is correlated at all closely with negative stereotypes of blacks as lazy: for example, the correlations between stereotypes of blacks failing to conform to the Protestant ethic and the importance attached to achievement, competition, and material success are .01, .03, and .08, respectively - all statistically insignificant or substantively trivial.

But if negative stereotypes of blacks are not bound up with the value of individualism, they are certainly tied up with authoritarian values. We sampled a number of these values, including insuring respect for authority; strengthening law and order; maintaining respect for America's power abroad⁷; promoting uniformity of beliefs and values; and instilling respect in children for authority⁸.

These conservative-authoritarian values and negative stereotypes of blacks as lazy and irresponsible are plainly connected, as Table 2 shows. The correlation between endorsing negative stereotypes of Blacks as lazy and irresponsible on the one side, and agreeing that "respect for authority is one of the most important things that children should learn" is .30, while the correlations between the index of stereotypes and emphasizing the importance of strengthening law and order, of promoting uniformity of belief, and of maintaining respect for America's power in the world are .36, .30, and .27, respectively.

Table 2: Correlation between stereotypes of blacks as violating the protestant ethic and aspects of authoritarian values.

(whites only)
(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)

ASPECTS OF AUTHORITARIAN VALUES

Instilling respect for authority in children	.30
Strengthening law and order	.36
Conformity	.30
Respect for America's power in the world	.27

Individualism is thus essentially unrelated to negative attitudes toward blacks; but it is nonetheless related to negative attitudes toward public policies designed to assist blacks. On this view, a person who values achievement, who believes in competition and autonomy, might very well be prone to take the position that blacks have to take responsibility for dealing with their own problems. Table 3 is laid out to test the racial policy (as opposed to racial stereotype) version of the individualism thesis, again contrasting the relative contribution of traditional-individualistic (Table 3A) and conservative-authoritarian (Table 3B) values. By way of considering the variety of racial policies on the contemporary public agenda, a trio have been selected for examination - whether the federal government has a responsibility to assure fair treatment in employment for blacks; whether government spending to assist blacks should be increased; and whether a racial quota should be applied to college admissions.

As inspection of Tables 3A and 3B shows, the pattern is precisely the same. On the one hand (Table 3A), the correlations between opposition to government policies to assist blacks and individualism, variously measured, are either statistically insignificant or substantively trivial. On the other hand (Table 3B), the correlations between opposition to racial policies devised to help blacks and conservative-authoritarian values are more pronounced.

Table 3A: Correlation between support for policies designed to assist blacks and aspects of individualism.

(whites only)
(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)

	fair jobs	govt help blacks	college quotas
ASPECTS OF INDIVIDUALISM			
Achievement	.06	.12	.10
Acceptance by others	.10	.11	.03
Competition	.01	.03	.05
Importance of material success	.07	.01	.11
Self-orientation	.03	.07	.02
Originality and individual differences	.06	.03	.01
Originality vs. authority	.13	.10	.04

Table 3B: Correlation between support for policies designed to assist blacks and aspects of authoritarian values

(whites only)
(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)

	fair jobs	govt help blacks	college quotas
ASPECTS OF AUTHORITARIAN VALUES			
Instilling respect for authority in children	.17	.18	.15
Strengthening law and order	.15	.20	.15
Conformity	.13	.16	.09
Respect for America's power in the world	.26	.30	.21

The pattern of results, applying both to attitudes toward blacks and toward public policies dealing with blacks, is thus consistent. Moreover, the greater potency of conservative-authoritarian (as compared to traditional-individualistic) values is

perfectly consistent with the findings of the classic study of prejudice, *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al., 1950). It is not support for individualism that shores up negative stereotypes of blacks as lazy and irresponsible but rather an emphasis on the importance of authority, of maintaining America's power, of strengthening law and order, of instilling in children respect for authority - values that are themselves highly intercorrelated⁹. These results thus expose where the thesis of individualism goes awry: it confounds traditional-individualistic values with conservative-authoritarian ones.

Constraints in Information Processing

A second line of argument also posits an entanglement of racism and liberal democracy - but an entanglement arising in consequence of the limited rationality of mass publics.

Consider the standard account of political thinking of mass publics in liberal democracies. Ordinary citizens, it has been shown, pay minimal interest in politics, possess minimal levels of knowledge about it, and in consequence have only a mazy idea of their positions on many issues. (Converse, 1964). Not surprisingly, then, the stands that the average citizen takes on the ordinary run of issues lack consistency, are arranged higgledy-piggledy.

But the politics of race are dramatically different. Race is an emotional symbol, Converse argues, triggering and organizing the public's reactions to issues of race. The person contemptuous of blacks has no need to understand the specifics of a racial policy to know where he stands: he need know only that the policy is designed to assist blacks or to lay a burden on blacks. Thus, people who have only the remotest idea about what a particular policy on race is intended, or likely, to accomplish can react as though they have a well worked out philosophy of government, or at any rate, an exceedingly consistent one. For it is not the particulars of the policy itself - its objective, its provenance, its mode of implementation - to which they are responding. Rather, as Converse (1964) has remarked, for the average citizen questions about different racial policies:

would tend to boil down for many respondents to the same single question: "Are you sympathetic to Negroes as a group, are you indifferent to them, or do you dislike them? The responses would be affected accordingly" (235).

The Converse "racial affect" model accordingly holds that people rely on affect toward blacks to overcome their customary informational shortfalls about politics. Ordinary citizens take the positions they do on racial policies, not because of specifically political convictions but in accord with their gut feelings toward blacks, voting thumbs down if they dislike them, thumbs up if they like them. And, from this follows the decisive claim of the "racial affect" model - namely, that ordinary citizens, being driven by their feelings toward blacks and not the details of any particular policy, take an across-the-board position on questions of race, systematically favouring or opposing a range of policies designed to assist blacks.

The "racial affect model" asserts that political consistency on issues of race - in contrast to the ordinary run of issues - is strikingly high. How high is high?

Qualitatively, it is claimed that the average citizen is even more likely to take consistent stands across the gamut of racial issues than are the politically sophisticated and active. This is a remarkable claim because the politically active and influential as a rule easily best the ordinary citizen in the consistency of the positions they take on issues of race. Quantitatively, what it means to say that the ordinary citizen is consistent on issues of race has been specified quite definitely. Drawing on data from the late 1950s and calculating consistency across a pair of racial issues, Converse computes a coefficient at .54, which defines well the neighbourhood, if not the exact value, of the levels of consistency to be observed in racial policy attitudes if the racism model holds.

How well does the Converse racial affect model fit the contemporary politics of race? How consistent are white Americans' positions on issues of race?

Table 4 assesses the thinking of Americans¹⁰ about racial issues drawing on an additional pair of surveys, to provide national points of reference to complement the Bay Area racial study. The pair, the National Elections Studies (NES) and the General Social Survey (GSS), were carried out on probability samples representative of the country as a whole¹¹. All three of the surveys were conducted in 1986, making them nicely comparable one to another, and each of them covered a range of racial issues, among them: government spending to assist blacks; open housing; affirmative action; set-asides; government assurances of fair treatment in employment for blacks; busing; and a readiness to vote for a black candidate for president.

If the Converse model holds, the size of the coefficient indexing the consistency of their racial policy preferences should be uniformly large, in the neighborhood of the high .40s, if not higher. But as a glance at Table 4 will show, if some coefficients are large, equalling .40 or more, many others are quite modest, being half the size or smaller still. In short, so far from the level of consistency being remarkably high, the outstanding feature of the results is the *variability* of the size of the coefficients.

This range of variation, which is evident in all three surveys, suggests a fundamental lesson about the nature of contemporary racial politics. It is not true, as the Converse "racial affect" model claims, that specific racial policies all reduce essentially to one, single issue. On the contrary, there is not one issue of race "singular," but a variety of racial issues "plural."

The idea of "issue pluralism" is central to our understanding of the contemporary politics of race, and what deserves consideration, therefore, is why certain issues of race go together in the minds of Americans, and others do not.

Issues as "Bundles of Considerations": Issue Framing and Issue Consistency

Citizens are presented with issues of public policy, not as they may have wished to define them, but as these issues have been packaged by political and quasi-political (e.g. media) elites. Political issues, in consequence, tend to involve *bundles* of considerations, and whether they are connected together in the minds of citizens depends upon the particular considerations they raise.

Racial issues are no exception: they, too, involve bundles of considerations. Moreover, and this is the point we want to stress, the diverse considerations bundled

Table 4: Constraint across racial policy attitudes.

(1986 National Election Survey) (whites only) part A (N=634)						
	FedS	EqO	Aid	AAJ	AAS	
Federal Spending	1.0					
Equal Opportunity	.24	1.0				
Aid Black	.40	.30	1.0			
Affirmative Action-Jobs	.29	.18	.23	1.0		
Affirmative Action-School	.23	.16	.27	.43	1.0	

(1986 National Election Survey) (whites only) part B (N=507)					
	Sci	Emp	EqO	Aid	AAJ
School Integration	1.0				
Guarantee Employment	.22	1.0			
Equal Opportunity	.26	.30	1.0		
Minority Aid	.26	.38	.46	1.0	
Affirmative Action-Jobs	.31	.22	.32	.32	1.0

(1986 General Social Survey) (whites only) (N=1,470)						
	SpBl	Bus	HlpB	Hous	IYC	BPres
Spend-Blacks	1.0					
Busing	.14	1.0				
Help Blacks	.34	.19	1.0			
Housing	.18	.22	.15	1.0		
Integrate Your Child	.18	.12	.14	.16	1.0	
Black President	.21	.08	.17	.21	.28	1.0

(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area) (whites only) (N=699)						
	HeB	Hou	Job	Con	AAC	Bus
Help Blacks	1.0					
Housing	.22	1.0				
Job Opportunity	.43	.24	1.0			
Minority Contracts	.28	.14	.23	1.0		
Affirmative Action-College	.30	.14	.21	.27	1.0	
Busing	.23	.15	.23	.24	.24	1.0

together in any specific racial issue often are heterogeneous: some are racial, having to do with blacks and how they should be treated, but others are not racial, having to do with government and how it should carry out its responsibilities.

What we want to suggest, consistent with the idea of issue pluralism, is that whether people connect together specific racial issues may well depend, not on *racial* but rather on *non-racial* considerations.

To determine if this is so, a new method of analysis was devised. For a specially designed survey of the general population of Indiana¹². Schematically, the method operates as follows. Frame an issue in alternative formulations, to accent different considerations. Then, taking advantage of computer-assisted interviewing, *doubly* randomize the questionnaire, randomizing not only across different versions of each issue - which the standard split-ballot design can manage, to a point - but also across different issues - which it cannot¹³. Having done this, calculate a 'consistency' matrix for all possible pairs of racial issues, for all possible combinations of alternative formulations of each issue. Then, one can identify the combination of considerations decisive in establishing connections across racial issues by identifying the combinations of formulations of issues showing the highest degree of consistency and the lowest.

Take the issues of black employment and open housing. Each issue can be framed in different ways, so as to accent alternative considerations. In the case of employment, the standard way of framing the issue is to put it in terms of spending money, with an unwillingness to pay more money to help blacks get more jobs being read as evidence of opposition to the goal of racial equality itself (c.f. Jackman, 1978, 1981). For some people, surely this is so, but others may take exception to this policy from a genuine desire to hold the line on government spending. Hence our decision to frame the issue in an alternative way, focusing more directly and centrally on the government's obligation to do more to achieve racial equality. The two versions ran as follows:

The "Spending" Frame:

"Some people think that the government in Washington should increase spending for programs to help blacks get more jobs. Others feel that blacks should take care of their own problems. Which makes more sense to you:

- the government should spend more

or

- blacks should take care of their own problems."

The "Anti-Discrimination" Frame:

"Some people think that the government in Washington should do more to make sure that blacks are not discriminated against in getting jobs. Others feel that blacks should take care of their own problems. Which makes more sense to you:

- the government should do more

or

- blacks should take care of their own problems."

Analogously, the issue of open housing was framed in three different ways - the standard frame, the "private property" frame, and consistent with the government effort against discrimination formulation of the employment issue, the "government action" frame. The three versions ran as follows:

The "Standard" Frame ¹⁴:

Shifting now to the subject of housing, suppose there is a community-wide vote on the general housing issue. There are two possible laws to vote on. One law says that a homeowner can decide for himself who to sell his house to, even if he prefers NOT to sell to blacks. The second law says that a homeowner cannot refuse to sell to someone because of their race or color. Which law would you vote for?

- homeowner can decide for themselves

or

- homeowners can NOT refuse to sell.

The "Private Property" Frame:

Shifting now to the subject of housing, some people believe that a homeowner should be free to decide for himself who to sell his house to, even if he prefers not sell it to blacks. For example, some people might say, "It isn't that I wouldn't sell my house to a black family. It's just that I don't like being told what I must do with my private property. I feel that since it's my property, I should have the right to sell to anyone I want to." How do you feel about this type of thinking? Should a homeowner be able to decide for himself who to sell his house to, even if he prefers not to sell to blacks?

- yes

or

- no

The "Government Action" Frame:

Shifting now to the subject of housing, one point of view nowadays is that the government should make an active effort to see that blacks can live anywhere they choose, including white neighbourhoods. Another viewpoint is that this is not the government's business, and it should stay out of it. How do you feel? Should the government make an active effort to see that blacks can live anywhere they choose, including white neighbourhoods, or should the government stay out of this issue?

- the government should make an active effort

or

- the government should stay out of the issue.

Consider the variations in consistency of reactions to this pair of issues, depending on their framing. As Table 5 shows, whites react very consistently to issues of race, explicitly framed in terms of fighting discrimination - in the case of employment by seeing that blacks were not denied jobs, in the case of housing by seeing that blacks were not denied homes, because of the color of their skin. Looking at Table 5, in the south-eastern corner, we see that the positions people take on fighting discrimination in employment and housing are correlated at .48. There are, in short, highly consistent reactions to issues of race when these issues are framed purely in terms of race and particularly of combatting racial discrimination, free of extraneous considerations.

Table 5: Correlation between attitudes on assistance for housing and employment policy depending on the framing of the issues.

		(Indiana) (whites only) (N=782)		
		HOUSING POLICY		
ISSUE FRAMING	EMPLOYMENT POLICY	Standard	Property	Government
FRAME A:				
Spend to help Blacks	r	.11	.22	.33
FRAME B:				
Special effort to help Blacks	r	.31	.14	.48

In practice, however, racial issues tend to be formulated as bundles of considerations, some of which are manifestly non-racial. Consider the issue of government assisting blacks to get more jobs. It was framed in two ways: in terms of increasing government spending and in terms of fighting racial discrimination in employment. Contrasting the two cells in the first column of Table 5, we see that the framing of the employment issue matters hugely in determining whether people see a connection to open housing. When employment is put in terms of fighting discrimination, the two issues begin to come together; when employment is framed in terms of spending government money, the two have barely anything to do with one another. The question of government spending is largely at right angles, the results demonstrate, to the question of fighting racial discrimination ¹⁵. Or to put the point positively, the issues of housing and employment can evidently be linked together not only on the basis of shared racial considerations, but on the basis of *non-racial* considerations, and in particular beliefs about the role that government should play seem to provide a strategic *non-racial* basis for connecting racial issues.

To see further the role of non-racial considerations as a basis of linkage, consider the connection between the "old" racial agenda and the "new". On the one hand, it is not obvious that the argument over affirmative action and quotas and reverse discrimination is the same argument, except in different words, as the argument over whether the government in Washington should spend more money to help blacks get jobs. On the other hand, as Table 4 showed, there is empirically a connection between, for example, a willingness to spend more money to help blacks get more jobs and a readiness to support racial quotas in education and in employment. The connection is by no means a strong one (with correlations ranging, depending on the study, from the low .20s to the mid .30s), but it is a statistically significant one all the same.

Accordingly, the question to ask is, not simply whether there is a connection between the stands people take on the "old" and the "new" racial agendas, but more fundamentally, in exactly what sense is the "new agenda" of quotas an outgrowth of the "old agenda" of government assistance of a more conventional kind.

To get leverage, the issue of affirmative action has been formulated in rival versions. One is put in terms of "preferential treatment," the other in terms of "special effort." Specifically, the two versions ran as follows:

Preferential Treatment Version:

Some people say that because of past discrimination qualified blacks should be given preference in hiring. Others say that such preference in hiring of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion?

- for preferential hiring and promotion of blacks

or

- against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks.

Special Effort Version:

Some people say that because of past discrimination, a special effort should be made to consider qualified blacks for jobs. Others feel that such a special effort is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion?

- for making a special effort

or

- against making a special effort.

Table 6 shows the extent to which positions on the issues of affirmative action of government employment policy for blacks hang together, for all combinations of alternative formulations of each policy.

The question we want address is, In what sense is affirmative action - in the form of preferential treatment - an outgrowth of support for more conventional forms of government assistance for blacks? Is it at bottom simply a stronger, more intense desire to see the lot of blacks improved that leads people to extend their support from conventional forms of assistance to more controversial means such as affirmative action and busing?

Evidently not, to judge by Table 6. The results of the crucial test of whether support for affirmative action primarily reflects a stronger desire to overcome discrimination against blacks is captured by the south-western cell of Table 6. This cell summarizes

the extent to which people are consistent in supporting affirmative action, framed in terms of preferential treatment, and reducing unemployment among blacks, framed in terms of the government making a more active effort to fight racial discrimination. This is a crucial cell to focus on, since if affirmative action is an outgrowth of the initial civil rights agenda then the correlation between support for government assistance for blacks in employment and for affirmative action should be highest when employment is put in terms purely of combatting racial discrimination, without the "distracting" consideration of spending being raised. But so far from the correlation being at its highest, it is precisely then that it is at its weakest. Indeed, the actual correlation equals .09, which is not even statistically significant. In short, what connects the new and the old racial agenda, inspection of Table 6 suggests, are elements of ideology and politics, not commitment to racial equality *per se*.

Table 6: Correlation between attitudes on affirmative action and employment policy, depending on the framing of the issues.

		(Indiana) (whites only) (N = 782)	
		AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	
ISSUE FRAMING EMPLOYMENT POLICY		Preference	Special Effort
FRAME A:			
Spend to help Blacks	r	.29	.40
FRAME B:			
Special effort to help Blacks	r	.09	.48

Ideology, Racial Policy Preferences and Racial Double Standards

The results we have surveyed suggest that ideology and politics, as well as prejudices and sympathies toward blacks, are engaged in public attitudes toward racial policy. But it is necessary to push the analysis further, to determine whether ideology is an element of importance in its own right, or merely a convenient screen, to disguise racism.

How can one determine whether conservatives oppose a racial policy because of their ideological point of view or an underlying animus against blacks? The crux of the issue is to determine not whether a conservative applies different standards to the judgment of public policy than a liberal - merely in virtue of being a conservative he

will be more likely to oppose government assistance in the form of standard social welfare policies. The issue is instead whether conservatives tend to apply the same standards in evaluating a public policy, or whether they practice a racial double standard, approving a claim to a public benefit made in behalf of a white but opposing it when made in behalf of a black.

A new methodology has been devised, to assess double standards in judgement. And we should like now to report the results of three separate experiments, designed to determine whether conservatives practice a racial double standard.

The first of these is the "laid-off worker" experiment. Very briefly, in the course of the interview, respondents were told that a near-by plant had laid off some workers. Then, one of the laid-off workers was described: randomly, the laid-off worker was described as a man or a woman; a black or a white; in his or her 20s, 30's or early 40s; married, married with children, a single parent, or single; and a dependable worker or not a dependable worker. Then, all respondents were asked the same question: How much help should the government give this person in finding a new job? A lot of help, some help, or no help at all.

A test of racial double standards is thus in hand. If more support for government help is evident for a white out-of-work than for a black, that is proof positive of discrimination; proof positive because, the characteristics of the laid-off worker being experimentally controlled, the only respect in which people without jobs differ is race and because, the assignment of characterizations to respondents being random, the only respect in which respondents differ is whether they are asked about a black or a white ¹⁶.

Table 7 shows the average level of government assistance respondents favor, first in the case of self-identified liberals, then in the case of conservatives, in both cases comparing their standards of what is fair for whites as compared to what is fair for blacks.

As Table 7 makes plain, it makes no difference whatever for liberals whether the person who is out-of-work is white or black in terms of the amount of help they think the government should afford them in finding a new job. Thus, the mean score for liberals in responding to a white who has been laid-off is 5.3; to a black, 5.4.

In contrast, the race of the claimant makes a significant difference to conservatives -- but in just the opposite way than is customarily supposed. Conservatives are significantly more likely to favour government assistance for a black who has lost his job than for a white, their mean score for the former being 5.1, for the latter 3.5.

Why does this reversal occur? The "laid-off worker" experiment was designed specifically to explore, not simply the impact of the race of a person advancing a claim to a public benefit, but more subtly, the interaction of race with a variety of markers of social status and responsibility. Consequently, in addition to the race of the claimant being experimentally varied, their work history was randomized as well, with the laid-off worker being alternately described as either "a dependable worker" or "NOT a dependable worker".

Table 8 makes plain the consequence of taking into account simultaneously the race and the work history of a claimant, the lesson to draw being twofold. First, conservatives are more likely to favour government assistance for a black if, and only if, the black is a hard worker, which is surely understandable since conservatives are more

likely than liberals to perceive blacks in general as not being dependable workers (Sniderman, Piazza, Tetlock and Kendrick, 1991). Second, conservatives are *not* more likely to oppose government help for a black than for a white under any circumstances.

But, it may be objected, the issue is not whether conservatives will practice a racial double standard if they come, as it were, face-to-face with a specific individual. Surely some people, who would not discriminate against a particular black known personally to them, may all the same acquiesce in the treatment of blacks as a group as second-class citizens. Partly to address this objection, the "government spending" experiment in the Indiana study was performed. As we remarked, the issue of what government should do to assist blacks in employment was framed in two different ways - in one version, the question was whether government should increase its spending; in the other, whether it should actively fight discrimination - respondents being assigned one or the other version entirely at random. The results are clear-cut: the likelihood of being conservative and of opposing government assistance for blacks when the issue is put in terms of spending more money are substantially related, the correlation between the two running at .31; however, when the issue is put in terms of fighting discrimination the relation between conservatism and opposition to government assistance for blacks dwindles to insignificance, the correlation between the two being barely .09.

A final experiment deserves comment. Our aim was to assess judgments of claims that groups may make on government, and in particular to assess claims made in the name of equal opportunity. So respondents were asked whether it was the government's responsibility to assure equal opportunity to succeed for blacks and minorities in one case, for women in the other. The wording of the question was identical in every respect except for referring to blacks one half of the time, and to women the other, and respondents were assigned one or the other version entirely at random. Since it is important to see what characteristics of individuals induce racial double standards, as well as what characteristics do not, Table 9 takes jointly into account the ideological orientation of respondents (whether liberal or conservative) and their level of education.

The results are striking. On the one side, among the better educated - that is, among those best equipped to understand an ideological perspective, whether liberal or conservative - it makes no difference in whose behalf a claim to government assurance of equal opportunity is made: among liberals, they overwhelmingly favour it, as being liberals they should, whether blacks or women are to benefit from it; and among conservatives, they overwhelmingly oppose it, as being conservatives they should, regardless of whether women or blacks are to benefit from it. On the other side, among the poorly educated - that is, among those least able to understand the principles of an ideological orientation whether liberal or conservative - it makes a great difference whether a claim to government assistance is made in behalf of blacks or women; and what is telling, the propensity to practice a double standard against blacks is as common among liberals as among conservatives. In short, the point is precisely that it is factors that inhibit the acquisition of political ideas, *whether on the right or on the left*, that foster racial double standards rather than the other way about.

Table 7: Mean scores for level of government assistance respondent favours for the laid-off worker depending on the race of the claimant and the ideology of the respondent.

(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)
(whites only)
(N=774)

RACE OF WORKER	RESPONDENT IDEOLOGY		
	Liberal	Middle	Conservative
White	mean 5.3 N (116)	4.0 (142)	3.5 (106)
Black	mean 5.4 N (128)	5.7 (139)	5.1 (103)

Note: Scale values 1 to 10, higher score = more deserving of government assistance.

Table 8: Mean scores for level of government assistance respondent favours for the laid-off worker depending on the race and work history of the claimant and the ideology of the respondent.

(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)
(whites only)
(N=450)

RACE OF WORKER	RESPONDENT IDEOLOGY	
	Liberal	Conservative
WHITE:		
Dependable	mean 5.4 N (70)	3.5 (63)
Undependable	mean 5.1 N (45)	3.5 (43)
BLACK:		
Dependable	mean 5.2 N (74)	6.0 (52)
Undependable	mean 5.6 N (54)	4.1 (48)

Note: Scale values 1 to 10, higher score = more deserving of government assistance.

Table 9: Mean scores for level of government responsibility to assure equal opportunity for groups depending on the education and ideology of the respondent.

(San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area)
(whites only)
(N=729)

RESPONDENT	GROUP	
	Blacks	Women
LIBERAL:		
HS Graduate	mean 3.6 N (19)	7.0 (26)
Some College	mean 5.8 N (44)	6.0 (41)
College Plus	mean 7.8 N (61)	8.4 (59)
MIDDLE:		
HS Graduate	mean 4.6 N (41)	5.6 (22)
Some College	mean 5.8 N (37)	6.0 (45)
College Plus	mean 6.2 N (61)	6.2 (74)
CONSERVATIVE:		
HS Graduate	mean 4.2 N (28)	6.4 (27)
Some College	mean 3.4 N (24)	5.2 (39)
College Plus	mean 5.0 N (44)	4.8 (37)

Note: Scale values 1 to 10, higher score = more government responsibility to assure equal opportunity.

The results of all three experiments thus support a common conclusion: although well-educated conservatives are without question more likely than liberals to oppose a number of government interventions in behalf of blacks, they do so not from racism but rather from political principle.

Pulling together now the many strands of specific results, running from the distinction between conservative-authoritarian and traditional-individualistic values through the diversity of reactions to different issues of race to the practice of racial double standards, what are the broader conclusions to draw about the politics of race in liberal democracy?

Issue Pluralism and the Structure of Conflict Over Race in Liberal Democracies

The image of racial conflict, most often assumed tacitly and scarcely ever challenged explicitly, is that disagreements over policies of race are driven, at bottom, by a deeper division among Americans over whether to accept blacks as equals.

It has come to be commonly asserted that racism is built-in to the popular culture of liberal democracy - or at any rate, liberal democracy on the American model. The suspicion that racism is not an historical or contingent but rather a regular and even predictable feature of democratic politics - even in an era distinguished by unprecedented opportunities for education of citizens on the one side, plus an unprecedented commitment of societal institutions to the pursuit of racial equality on the other - represents a radical critique of the limits of democratic citizenship.

This critique rests on more than one level, but two of the most commonly encountered are these: first, the new racism thesis which asserts that one of the mainsprings of modern racism is a set of values commonly regarded as emblematic of the American experience, namely individualism; and second, the racial affect model which asserts that, given the ordinary citizen's minimal levels of knowledge about and interest in politics, she will naturally tend to organize her actions to issues of race merely on the basis of her feelings toward blacks.

Both claims are at odds with the empirical results. Thus it is *not* true that negative images of blacks are fostered by individualism, variously construed: on the contrary, it is necessary to distinguish between traditional values like individualism and conservative values like respect for authority and order, for it is the latter, not the former, which are bound up with an array of negative stereotypes about blacks and opposition to policies designed to help blacks. In addition, it is also *not* true that the politics of race, in the minds of ordinary citizens, "boils down to a single question" - whether they are sympathetic to blacks or not.

Our findings, moreover, throw new light on the structure of conflict over race. So far from conflict over racial public policy boiling down to one single question, there is a plurality of them. And their politics can differ dramatically.

To be sure, a common thread runs through citizen's reactions to issues of race, but it is a thin thread - far thinner than has been commonly supposed. The ordinary citizen's views about legislation to ensure open housing have scarcely anything to do with his or her views on social welfare assistance for blacks.

This pattern of issue pluralism has far-reaching implications for the politics of race.

For it means the conventional image of racial conflict, with each line of cleavage about a particular racial policy coinciding with, and reinforcing, each other, is wrong. On the contrary, the line-up of opponents and proponents changes from one racial issue to another. This is most visibly true for the new agenda of race-conscious, affirmative action policies: they are rejected, by overwhelming majorities, in every part of the general society, excluding only politically sophisticated liberals (Sniderman, Tetlock, Carmines and Peterson, in press). But it holds also for issues like open housing, with the line-up of friend and foe of legislation to prohibit racial discrimination differing significantly from the patterns of support and opposition for government social welfare programs to assist blacks.

Still more fundamentally, our results bring to light a paradox of liberal democracy, which has much to do with the apparent entanglement of racism and democratic politics. Arguments over issues of race persist, and cut so deeply, in liberal democracies precisely because they are not solely, nor even primarily, about race: they are also, and as centrally, about competing ideas as to what is fair, what role government should play in a modern economy, indeed, what rights and responsibilities go along with citizenship itself. Issues of race cut deeply, and in more than one direction, because they go beyond race.

Notes

1. Data collection was supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant SES 850897). We want also to thank the Survey Research Center and the Institute for Personality and Social Research, both of the University of California, Berkeley, for invaluable assistance.

2. Though we shall take note of all their research, having reviewed the field once before (Sniderman and Tetlock, 1986a and 1986b), we shall give greater weight to publications since our initial assessment, stressing particularly the major subsequent publications of each of the three primary new racism researchers - Sears, 1988; Kinder et al., 1989; and McConahay, 1986.

3. This admission, from a measurement standpoint, is devastating: it means that, on Kinder's own account, the racism measures are "double-barreled." We are not aware of a precedent, a body of research where the principal investigators claimed, as a virtue of their primary measure, that it was systematically ambiguous.

4. We gratefully acknowledge the research of Lynn Saunders of the University of Michigan: the results are drawn from a presentation of hers to the Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

5. To measure these stereotypes, an additive index was constructed combining responses to two items: "If blacks would only try harder, they would be just as well off as whites." and "Most blacks who are on welfare programs could get a job if they really tried." The first item is formatted agree-disagree, the second (Likert-style)

agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly, with the two items so scored to be equally weighted.

6. Robert Bellah's *Habits of the Heart* (1985) was canvassed for this assortment of aspects of individualism. Each value item was identically formatted - very important, somewhat important, or not important to you.

7. These items, just like their predecessors, were formatted with three response categories: very important, somewhat important, and not important.

8. The latter two items were formatted dichotomously - "basically agree" and "basically disagree."

9. The mean inter-item correlation of the set is .38.

10. For the record, we analyze only the attitudes of white Americans, not because the opinions of blacks do not matter to us, but because our aim is to understand the roots of opposition to assistance for blacks.

11. The NES and GSS are the two standard national surveys, both funded by the National Science Foundation, the former conducted by Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the latter by the National Opinion Research Center, both made available to us through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research and the U.C. DATA Program.

12. Professor Edward G. Carmines was our collaborator on this study, and we gratefully acknowledge his assistance, plus the first-class work of the Indiana University Survey Research Center.

13. Technically, the Achilles heel of conventional survey research is randomization over questionnaire items: the standard split-ballot design, administered in paper-and-pencil format, faces severe constraints in accomplishing the first form of randomization - the number of physically distinct versions of the questionnaire quickly becomes unmanageable.

14. The standard version is taken from the General Social Survey.

15. We appreciate that there is another hypothesis: that people do not mean, or mean only superficially, what they say when they want to have government combat discrimination, and that what they really have in mind is exposed only when the question of possible spending is invoked.

16. The manipulation of each of the six characteristics of the laid-off worker was orthogonal to each of the others, permitting the independent estimation (based on a sufficiency of cases) of each of the characteristics taken singly and in pairs. Analyses of interactions of the second and higher orders showed no more complex concatenations of the beneficiary's, other than the "dependable black," being of any signifi-

cance. It should also be observed that the validity of the random number generator has been confirmed, insuring there is no correlation between respondents' characteristics and their assignment to experimental treatments, and also it has been established that no respondent characteristic (such as gender) is of any consequence in any of the experimental results reported.

References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Norton, New York.
- Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Bobo, L. (1983). White's opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or real-group conflict?. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1196-1210.
- Carmines, E.G. & Stimson, J.A. (1982). Racial issues and the structure of mass belief systems. In: *Journal of Politics*, 44, 2-20.
- Carmines, E.G. & Stimson, J.A. (1989). *Issue evolution: Race and the transformation of American politics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Converse, P.E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D.E. Apter (Ed.). *Ideology and discontent*. Free Press, New York.
- Jackman, M.R. (1978). General and applied tolerance: Does education increase commitment to racial integration? In: *American Journal of Political Science*, 22, 302-24.
- Jackman, M.R. (1981). Education and policy commitment to racial integration. In: *American Journal of Political Science*, 25, 256-69.
- Kinder, D.R. (1986). The continuing American dilemma: White resistance to change 40 years after Myrdal. In: *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 151-171.
- Kinder, D.R., Mendelberg, T., Dawson, M.C., Sanders, L.M., Rosenstone, S.J., Sargent, J., & Cohen, C. (1989). *Race and the 1988 American presidential elections*. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Kinder, D.R. & Sears, D.O. (1985). White opposition to busing: One conceptualization and operationalization of group conflict. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1141-1147.
- Kinder, D.R., & Sears, D.O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414-431.
- Luschi, C. (1991). *The true and only heaven: Progress and its critics*. W.W. Norton, New York.
- McConahay, J.M. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In: Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (Eds.). *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- McConahay, J.M. & Hough, J.C. (1976). Symbolic racism. In: *Journal of Social Issues*,

- 32(2), 23-45.
- Piazza, T., Sniderman, P.M. & Tetlock, P.E. (1990). Analysis of the dynamics of political reasoning: A general purpose computer-assisted methodology. In: Carmines, E.G. (Ed.). *Political Analysis*, vol. 1, 117-135. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1985). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Sears, D.O., & Kinder, D.R. (1971). Racial tensions and voting behavior in Los Angeles. In: W.Z. Hirsch (Ed.). *Los Angeles: Viability and prospects for metropolitan leadership*, 51-88. Praeger, New York.
- Sears, D.O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In: Katz, P.A., & Taylor, D.A. (Eds.). *Eliminating racism*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Shanks, J.M. (1989). Information technology and survey research: Where do we go from here? In: *Journal of Official Statistics*, 5 (1), 3-21.
- Sniderman, P.M., Tetlock, P.E., Carmines, E.G. & Peterson, R.S. (1993). The politics of the American dilemma. In: *Prejudice, politics, and the American dilemma*. Sniderman, P.M., Tetlock, P.E., & Carmines, E.G. (Eds.). Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Sniderman, P.M. & Tetlock, P.E. (1986a). Symbolic racism: Problems of political motive attribution. In: *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 129-150.
- Sniderman, P.M. & Tetlock, P.E. (1986b). Reflections of American racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 173-188.
- Sniderman, P.M., Piazza, T., Tetlock, P.E., & Kendrick, A. (1991). The new racism. In: *American Journal of Political Science*, 35, 423-447.
- Weigel, R.H. & Howes, P.W. (1985). Conceptions of prejudice: Symbolic racism reconsidered. In: *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 117-138.

Appendix I

APPENDIX OF QUESTION WORDING

TABLES 1 and 3 Race and Politics Survey

- Achievement*: How important is it to you to always be the best at what you do?
- Acceptance by others*: How about being accepted by other people, how important is that to you?
- Competition*: How important is it to you to compete against others to see how good you are?
- Importance of material success*: How important is it to you to have a lot of money?
- Self-orientation*: How important is it to you to do the things YOU want to do, even if it's not convenient for other people?
- Originality and individual differences*: Often the most interesting and stimulating people are those who don't mind being different and original (agree or disagree).
- Originality vs. authority*: How important is it to encourage original ideas, even if it means less respect for authority?

TABLES 2 and 3

Race and Politics Survey

- Instilling respect for authority in children*: Respect for authority is one of the most important things that children should learn (agree disagree).
- Strengthening law and order*: Given the way things are these days, how important is it to strengthen law and order?
- Conformity*: The sooner we all acquire similar values and ideals, the better off we'll be (agree disagree).
- Respect for America's power in the world*: Now, thinking of the country as a whole, how important is it to maintain respect for America's power in the world, even if that means spending a lot of money on the military?

TABLE 4

1986 National Election Survey part A

- Federal Spending*: (Are you in favour of) Programs that assist Blacks?
- Equal Opportunity*: Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement. Equal opportunity for Blacks and whites to succeed is important but it's not really the Government's job to guarantee it. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree or disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with that statement?
- Aid Black*: Some people feel the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of Blacks. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale at point number 1. Others feel the government should not make any special effort to help Blacks because they should help themselves. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about it?
- Affirmative Action-Jobs*: Some people say that because of past discrimination, Blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of Blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion - are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks.
- Affirmative Action-School*: Some people say that because of past discrimination it is sometimes necessary for colleges and universities to reserve openings for Black students. Others oppose quotas because they say quotas discriminate against whites. What about your opinion - are you for or against quotas to admit Black students?

1986 National Election Survey part B

- School Integration*: Some people say that the government in Washington should see to it that white and Black children go to the same schools. Other claim that this is not the government's business. Do you favour or oppose this?
- Guarantee Employment*: How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see

to it that Black people get fair treatment in jobs or is this not the federal government's business?

Equal Opportunity: Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement. Equal opportunity for Blacks and whites to succeed is important but it's not really the government's job to guarantee it. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with that statement?

Minority Aid: Some people feel the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of Blacks and other minority groups. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale at point number 1. Others feel the government should not make any special effort to help Blacks because they should help themselves. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about it?

Affirmative Action-Jobs: Some people say that because of past discrimination Blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of Blacks is wrong because it gives Blacks advantages they haven't earned. What about your opinion - are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks?

1986 General Social Survey

Spend-Blacks: We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount. ...Improving the conditions of Blacks.

Busing: In general, do you favour or oppose the busing of Black and white school children from one district to another?

Help Blacks: Some people think that Blacks have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to Blacks. Do you strongly agree the government is obligated to help Blacks, agree with both answers, or strongly agree that government shouldn't give special treatment (on a five point scale).

Housing: Suppose there is a community-wide vote on a general housing issue. There are two possible laws to vote on (READ CATEGORIES A & B). Which law would you vote for?

A) One law says that a homeowner can decide for himself whom to sell his house to, even if he prefers not to sell to Negroes/Blacks...

B) The second law says that a homeowner cannot refuse to sell to someone because of their race or color...

Integrate Your Child: Would you yourself have any objections to sending your children to a school where half of the children are Negroes/Blacks?

Black President: If your party nominated a Negro/Black for President, would you vote for him if he were qualified for the job?

Race and Politics Survey

Help Blacks: Now some statements about issues in society today. Some people think that the government in Washington should increase spending for programs to help Blacks. Others feel Blacks should rely on themselves. Which makes more sense to you?

Housing: Suppose there were a community-wide election on a general housing law and that you had to choose between two possible laws. One law says that homeowners can decide for themselves who to sell their houses to, even if they prefer not to sell to Blacks. The second law says that a homeowners are not allowed to refuse to sell to someone because of race or color. Which law would you vote for?

Job Opportunity: Some people feel that the government in Washington (or state or local government) ought to see to it that Blacks get fair treatment in jobs. Others feel that this is not the government's business and it should stay out of it. How do you feel?

Minority Contracts: The Congress of the United States - both the House of Representatives and the Senate - have passed laws (or sometimes you hear it said that there should be a law...) to ensure that a certain number of federal contracts go to minority contractors. We'd like to know what YOU think. Do you think that such a law is a good idea or a bad idea?

Affirmative Action-College: Some people say that because of past discrimination it is sometimes necessary for colleges and universities to reserve openings for Black students who don't meet the usual standards. Others are against such quotas. What's your opinion - are you for or against quotas to admit some Black students who don't meet the usual standards?

Busing: Some people think achieving racial integration of schools is so important that it justifies busing children to schools out of their own neighbourhoods. Others think letting children go to their neighbourhood schools is so important that they oppose busing. How about you - do you favour or oppose busing?

TABLE 5

Indiana

Black Jobs: Some people think the government in Washington should increase spending for programs to help Blacks get more jobs (or ...make sure that Blacks are not discriminated against in getting jobs...). Others feel that Blacks should take care of their own problems. Which makes more sense to you?

TABLE 6

Indiana

Black Jobs: Some people think the government in Washington should increase spending for programs to help Blacks get more jobs (or ...make sure that Blacks are not discriminated against in getting jobs...). Others feel that Blacks should take care of their own problems. Which makes more sense to you?

Affirmative Action: Some people say that because of past discrimination, qualified Blacks should be given preference in hiring (or...a special effort should be made to consider qualified Blacks for jobs...). Others say that such preference in hiring of Blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion?

Paul Sniderman, Philip Tetlock, Randall Peterson

Are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks?

TABLES 7 and 8

Race and Politics Survey

Laid-Off Worker Experiment: The next questions are about three different people who were laid off because the company where they worked had to reduce its staff. Think for a moment about each person and then tell me how much government help, if any, that person should receive while looking for a new job.

The first person is a [race] [sex] in his/her [age]. He/she is [marital-parental status] and [dependability].

How much help in finding a new job do you think the government should give this person - a lot, some, or none at all?

TABLE 9

Race and Politics Survey

Equal Opportunity For Groups: While equal opportunity for blacks and minorities (women) to succeed is important, it's not really the government's job to guarantee it (agree or disagree).