

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 2, 1995

To: Participants, NES Meeting on Values and Predispositions

From: Jake Bowers, University of California-Berkeley, research assistant to Laura Stoker

Subject: NES Pilot Study Efforts to Measure Values and Predispositions

In order to facilitate discussion during the NES Values and Predispositions Conference, this document provides brief summaries of selected NES Pilot Study Reports concerned primarily or in part with measures of values and predispositions.

Authors	Title	Pilot Study	Concepts Measured
1. Stanley Feldman	Report on Values in the 1983 Pilot Study	1983	Equality, Economic Individualism, Support for Free Enterprise
2. David Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Lynitta Schaffer	NES Pilot Study of Values	1983	Equality, Individualism
3. Stanley Feldman	Evaluation of New Equality Items	1987	Equality
4. Greg Markus	Measuring Popular Individualism	1989	Several variants of Individualism
5. Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman	Morality Items on the 1985 Pilot Study	1985	Morality
6. Laura Stoker	Morality and Politics: Conduct and Control -- A Report on New Items in the 1987 National Election Pilot Study	1987	Moral Conservatism, Moral Autonomy
7. Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman	1985 Pilot Study Measures of Civic Obligation	1985	Civic Obligation
8. Donald Kinder and Lynn Sanders	Revitalizing the Measurement of White Americans' Racial Attitudes: A Report to the NES 1985 Pilot Study Committee and NES Board	1985	Symbolic Racism
9. Mark Peffley and Jon Hurwitz	Report on Foreign Policy Items	1987	Militarism, Anti-Communism, Isolationism
10. Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman	Measuring Patriotism and Nationalism	1987	Patriotism, Nationalism
11. Jack Citrin, Donald Green, Beth Reingold, and David Sears	A Report on Measures of American Identity and New "Ethnic" Issues in the 1991 NES Pilot Study	1991	Americanism

1. Report on Values in the 1983 Pilot Study

Stanley Feldman

October 19, 1983

The 1993 Pilot study included items meant to measure values concerning **equality**, **economic individualism**, and the **free enterprise system**. The scales constructed from these items displayed moderate reliability (alpha's between .47 and .63, see below) and, as demonstrated by a LISREL confirmatory factor analysis, the scaled items did tap distinct underlying concepts. The items forming the scales are listed below with asterisks marking those that, according to the analysis, most effectively measured the given concept.

Equality

- 1* If people were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems. (V2169, V3120)
- 2* Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed. (V2175, V3123)
- 3* One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance. (V2256, V3125)
- 4 We should give up on the goal of equality since people are so different to begin with. (V2172, V3122)
- 5 Some people are just better cut out than others for important positions in society. (V2178, V3121)
- 6 Some people are better at running things and should be allowed to do so. (V2250, V3124)
- 7 All kinds of people should have an equal say in running this country, not just those who are successful. (V2253, Not in Wave II)

Alpha Full Scale Wave 1 = .47, Wave 2 = .49

Alpha Three-Item Scale Wave 1[*] = .57, Wave 2[*] = .57

Alpha Six-Item Scale {Wave 1[*] + Wave 2[*]} = .72

Economic Individualism

- 1* Any person who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding. (V2170)
- 2* Hard work offers little guarantee of success. (V2173)
- 3* Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame. (V2176)
- 4* If people work hard they almost always get what they want. (V2254)
- 5* Even if people try hard they often cannot reach their goals. (V2257)
- 6 Even if people are ambitious they often cannot succeed. (V2251)

Alpha Full Scale = .62

Alpha Five-Item Scale [*] = .63

Free Enterprise

- 1* The less government gets involved with business and the economy, the better off this country will be. (V2171)
- 2* There should be no government interference with business and trade. (V2177)

- 3* Putting government regulations on business does not endanger personal freedom. (V2252)
- 4* Government intervention leads to too much red tape and too many problems. (V2255)
- 5 There are many goods and services that would never be available to ordinary people without government intervention. (V2174)
- 6 Contrary to what some people think, a free enterprise system is not necessary for our form of government to survive. (V2258)

Alpha Full Scale = .56

Alpha Four-Item Scale [*] = .62

Feldman pointed out that "[e]ach set of questions contains several that are quite good indicators of that value. As a whole, however, the indicators do not produce scales that are as reliable as we would like. Clearly, additional work on indicator construction would be useful" (4). The final scales were constructed from the items starred above (with the equality scale created from data from both waves). The resulting distributions tended to be skewed in the direction of "agree" responses.

In an exploration of the correlates of the three values, Feldman discovered the three scales to be relatively independent ($r = -.21$ between equality and individualism and virtually no correlation between free enterprise and the other two values). In general, egalitarianism was more highly correlated than were the other two values with liberal-conservative self-identification and party identification (r 's = $\sim .3$), group feeling thermometers (r 's = $\sim .2$) and demographic variables including age, education, gender, income, race, and church attendance (r 's ranged from .04 to .23). Responses to the general questions of equality and individualism, as scaled, tended to be quite highly correlated with responses to group-specific versions of the egalitarianism and individualism scales (based on questions asked about equality or individualism with respect to gender and ethnicity, specifically; r 's ranged from .27 to .48).¹

Feldman also explored the political impact of egalitarianism, individualism and support for free enterprise. The dependent variables used in the regression included the following: government spending on the environment, health, big cities, crime, drug addiction, education, unemployment compensation, the handicapped, welfare, defense; ratings of effort and resources spent by the government on goals related to social class, the status of blacks, and women; traditional seven point scales including minority aid, guaranteed jobs and living standards, women's equality, government services; and a series of additional items concerning the government's role in solving social and economic problems. The independent variables included party identification, liberal-conservative identification, income, education, gender, and race as well as the values of egalitarianism, individualism, and free enterprise. Referring to this wide-ranging set of analyses, Feldman noted that "the free enterprise scale does not appear as a significant predictor in any of the equations" and that "it seems as if economic individualism also has a very limited role in the prediction of issue preferences" (7). However, the equality scale showed much greater statistical power: "[the equality

¹ The contrast between general and group-specific values is the primary subject of the Sears, Huddy, and Schaffer Pilot Study Report, discussed below. Feldman notes that the "correlations between the abstract values and the group specific values are, in general, substantial. . . . The one exception is the relatively low correlation between individualism and black individualism" of $r = .27$. Feldman suggests that this low correlation, and the other non-perfect correlations between general and specific values show that "...expressions of equality for blacks or women are not identical to commitments to the general value of equality in society" (5).

scale] is very clearly the most consistent predictor of a wide variety of issues of the independent variables considered here”(7). By comparison, party identification had weak effects, while ideological identification had quite strong effects.

Feldman hypothesized that the weak effect of economic individualism might be due to an interaction between this value and that of egalitarianism. “It makes a big difference if a person is nonindividualistic and equalitarian or nonindividualistic and nonequalitarian ”(7). To evaluate this supposition, he ran a new series of regressions with a term that captured the interaction between individualism and egalitarianism. Noting that the magnitudes of the regression coefficients could not be accurately determined because of multicollinearity and high standard errors, Feldman concluded that some kind of equality-individualism interaction appeared to be present: “In most cases it appears that variations in individualism are particularly consequential among those low in equality”(8).

Feldman continued to probe for the political impact of these values through an examination of their effect on retrospective evaluations of government performance, specifically with regard to inflation, unemployment, taxes, nuclear arms, the environment, and the budget. The independent variables remained the same as in the analysis of issue positions. In these equations both egalitarianism and individualism showed significant effects. “These results strongly suggest that people use these two basic values as standards in their evaluation of government performance in a number of areas”(8). Feldman also demonstrated that people’s perceptions of the state of the national economy were related to their values, noting that “although the equation does not explain great deal of variance in these perceptions, equalitarianism, individualism, and party identification yield significant coefficients. Thus, Republicans, those who are most individualistic, and those who are less equalitarian are more likely to report that the economy has improved”(8-9).

Finally, Feldman analyzed the effects of equality, individualism and free enterprise on candidate evaluations, relying upon feeling thermometer scores and differences for Reagan, Glenn, Mondale, and Kennedy. The independent variables remained the same as in the previous two analyses. The results of these equations varied by party of the candidate to some extent.

Both equality and individualism have quite substantial effects on respondents’ evaluations of Reagan even holding party and ideological identifications constant. ... The impact of values on the evaluations of the Democrats is clearly more limited with only evaluations of Kennedy showing the effects of equality and free enterprise. (9)

In this context, Feldman also presented an analysis of the indirect effects of both values and party identification on overall evaluations of Reagan and judgments of Reagan’s traits (competence/leadership and integrity), using a full information maximum likelihood (LISREL) procedure. The results showed that equality and individualism have different kinds of indirect effects on evaluations of Reagan:

Equality is most important in evaluations of Reagan’s performance and in issue proximity -- it is very policy based. Individualism, on the other hand, is more influential in people’s perceptions of Reagan’s competence and integrity. This value seems to have more of a bearing on image than on policy. (11)

In light of the full set of results, Feldman recommended that measures of equality and economic individualism become a part of the standard NES instrument, while recognizing that the equality scale

was the more potent variable.

[T]here is good reason to include measures of equality and economic individualism on the forthcoming election study. . . . Using scales constructed from the items included in the pilot study, the accumulated evidence strongly suggests that equality and economic individualism have substantial effects on political opinion and candidate preference. This is reflected in peoples' preferences on public policy issues, their retrospective assessments of the performance of the President, and overall evaluations of the incumbent President and at least some challengers. (12)

If a choice need to be made between the two values, equality shows more consistent effects across a range of issues and evaluations. However, the results of the candidate evaluation equations demonstrated that individualism can be a most powerful determinant of evaluations of political candidates. Moreover, there is some evidence from the pilot study that there may be significant interaction effects between equality and individualism. (12)

At the same time, he recommended against carrying the free enterprise scale in light of the weak empirical findings for that measure:

The results for free enterprise are consistently negative, however. With only a few rare exceptions, there was no real evidence that support for the free enterprise system -- at least as measured here -- has a significant effect on political preferences or evaluations. (12)

2. **Pilot Study of Values**

David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, Lynitta Schaffer

Sears, Huddy, and Schaffer situate their work within the context of the debates over the organization of people's political beliefs and preferences.

Values hold considerable appeal in this quest for consistent explanatory constructs relevant to both the public and their observers, because they are thought of as relatively stable, and less subject to temporal fluctuations than either attitudes or beliefs. (Sears, Huddy, Schaffer, 2)

Focusing on egalitarianism and individualism, Sears, Huddy, and Schaffer draw a distinction between values at abstract levels (general socio-political levels) and values at the levels of specific policy domains (such as, race and gender). As they develop the idea, "[a] general belief in equality would be the most abstract level within an equality schema, lower levels of abstraction would incorporate beliefs in personal or political equality and at more specific levels this would become in beliefs in equality for various minority groups" (3). Correspondingly, "the relationship between any given level of the value schema and specific policy positions would depend on the basic level at which processing occurs" (4; emphasis original).

The authors began to measure the abstract value of equality with the following six Likert items, which were also analyzed by Feldman in the Report discussed above:

Equality (General Level)

- 1* If people were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems (V2169)
- 2* Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed. (V2175)
- 3* One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance. (V2256)
- 4 We should give up on the goal of equality since people are so different to begin with. (V2172)
- 5 Some people are just better cut out than others for important positions in society. (V2178)
- 6 Some people are better at running things and should be allowed to do so. (V2250)

Alpha = .44

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .55

Comparable scales were constructed based on group-specific versions of the abstract egalitarianism questions:

Equality (Specific Level – Gender)

- 1 If men and women were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems. (V3192)
- 2 Our society would do whatever is necessary to make sure that women's opportunities to succeed are equal to those of men. (V3196)
- 3 One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give women an equal chance. (V3220)
- 4 We should give up the goal of equality since men and women are so different to begin with. (V3194)
- 5 Men are just better cut out than women for important positions in society. (V3198)
- 6 Men are better than running things than women are and should be allowed to do so. (V3216)

Alpha = .71

Equality (Specific Level – Race)

- 1 If blacks and whites were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems. (V3200)
- 2 If blacks work hard they almost always get what they want. (V3204)
- 3 One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give blacks an equal chance. (V3226)
- 4 We should give up on the goal of equality since blacks and whites are so different to begin with. (V3202)
- 5 Whites are just better cut out than blacks for important positions in society. (V3206)
- 6 Whites are better at running things than blacks are and should be allowed to do so. (V3222)

Alpha = .64

Sears, Huddy, and Schaffer, like Feldman (above), found that the egalitarianism items referring to differences among people (V2172, V2178, V2250), which they describe as measures of "elitism," did not scale well with the others. They contend that "equality can be most reliably measured, for all levels of abstraction, by restricting its meaning to political equality of opportunity and equality of treatment" and recommended excluding measures of elitism -- which is "more contextually bound" than other (abstract and specific) values of equality and "should be explored as a distinct political value" (7).

Individualism was measured with the questions about hard work and economic success. The items relevant to the abstract version of individualism again correspond to those analyzed by Feldman (above):

Individualism (General Level)

- 1 Any person who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding. (V2170)
- 2 Hard work offers little guarantee of success. (V2173)
- 3 Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame. (V2176)
- 4 If people work hard they almost always get what they want. (V2254)
- 5 Even if people try hard they often cannot reach their goals. (V2257)
- 6 Even if people are ambitious they often cannot succeed. (V2251)

Alpha = .66

Individualism (Specific Level -- Gender)

- 1 Any woman who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding. (V3221)
- 2 Hard work offers little guarantee of success for women. (V3219)
- 3 Most women who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame. (V3217)
- 4 If women work hard they almost always get what they want. (V3195)
- 5 Even if women try hard. They often cannot reach their goals. (V3193)
- 6 Even if women are ambitious they often cannot succeed. (V3197)

Alpha = .77

Individualism (Specific Level -- Race)

- 1 Any black who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding. (V3227)
- 2 Hard work offers little guarantee of success for blacks. (V3225)
- 3 Most blacks who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame. (V3223)
- 4 If blacks work hard they almost always get what they want. (V3203)
- 5 Even if blacks try hard they often cannot reach their goals. (V3201)
- 6 Even if blacks are ambitious they often cannot succeed. (V3205)

Alpha = .80

One item showed decidedly weaker interrelations with the other items when posed at the general level -- #6, that which refers to "ambition" rather than "hard work". The authors recommend that only items referring to "hard work" be included in future general socio-political individualism scales.

Upon analyzing the possible determinants of the value measures, the authors found that "neither demographic variables nor political predispositions (party identification or liberalism-conservatism) were able to account for any of the variance in the value scales. This suggests that both equality and individualism, regardless of the context in which they are measured, are independent to the liberal-conservative ideology dimension"(10).²

The authors ran a series of OLS regressions to test the effects of blocks of demographic variables, general values of equality and individuals, specific values of equality and individualism pertaining to race and gender, and feeling thermometers (toward women and blacks) on a series of policy preference scales:³ government aid to women (govt. set aside jobs, govt. improve women's position, govt. promote affirmative action, govt. ensure equal pay), women's collective action (women join together, women should protest), and racial policy preferences (govt. improve blacks' position, school integration, promote affirmative action, aid to minorities). The various regressions show that, when all blocks are included in the equation, both general and group-specific egalitarianism scales are significant predictors of policy preferences. The findings are much weaker with respect to individualism:

Results from Full Equation (all variables entered for both genders)

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Independent Variables Included:</u>	
	<u>Gender Scales</u>	<u>Race Scales</u>
Government Aid for Women	Significant effects for age, education, and the general equality scale	Significant effects for age, education, sex, and racial equality scale
Women's Collective Action	Significant effects for the gender equality scale	Significant effects for education, and the racial individualism scale
Racial Policy Preferences	Significant effects for age, income, general equality scale, and the gender equality scale	Significant effects for age, race, income, general equality scale, and the racial equality scale

² These results do not entirely agree with those presented by Feldman, but there are several differences between the two studies: Feldman's individualism scale used five of the six items whereas Sears' scale used all six; Feldman's equality scale was based on both waves of data on three items (six variables) whereas Sears' scale used only the three items in one wave; and Feldman examined first-order correlations while Sears examined coefficients from a multivariate regression analysis that included demographic variables in addition to party identification and liberal/conservative identification.

³ The authors proceeded by entering blocks of demographic, general value, specific value, and feeling thermometer variables into each equation. Furthermore, at any one time they either entered the specific value scales (equality and individualism) for gender or those for race, not both. Later, the authors also subdivided the sample by gender, running different equations for males and females. These complexities are ignored here.

3. Evaluation of New Equality Items

Stanley Feldman

September 29, 1987

Whereas Feldman's first exploration of equality focused on **equality of opportunity**, this study attempts to enrich the old measure with items that tap into the concept of **equality of outcomes**. He added four new items in the 1987 Pilot Study to the six equality scale items from the 1986 survey.

All ten of the items are listed below. The items #1-6 comprise the equality scale from 1986; items #7-10 were added in the 1987 pilot study.

Equality

- 1 Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed. (V701)
- 2 One of the big problems in the country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance. (V703)
- 3 If people were treated more equally in this country we should have many fewer problems. (V706)
- 4 We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country. (V702)
- 5 This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people [are]. (V704)
- 6 It is not really that big of a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others. (V705)
- 7 Personal income should not be determined just by one's worth. Rather, everyone should get what they need to provide a decent life for their family. (V2176)
- 8 It would be better for everyone if the distribution of wealth in this country were more equal. (V2179)
- 9 It is good for society as a whole when a few people do much better in life than most people. (V2177)
- 10 All in all, I think economic differences in this country are justified. (V2178)

Alpha full scale = .62

Alpha 1986 scale [V701-V706] = .66

Responses to all of the items demonstrated some degree of acquiescence bias. The first item (#1) was the most skewed, with 90% of the respondents in agreement.

Feldman investigated the impact of various political variables on three different versions of the equality scale: the old, six-item scale; the six-item scale replacing #1 with #8; and this new six-item scale further replacing #6 with #10. (Of the old items, #1 and #6 had shown the most problematic measurement characteristics and, of the new items, #8 and #10 had shown the most promising measurement characteristics.) He found that, for evaluations of Reagan and Bush, "[t]he original six-item scale produces the conclusion that variations in commitment to equality have no effect on evaluations of these two Republicans"(2), whereas the two new scales showed moderate effects, stronger for the second modified version than the first. In contrast, the old version of the scale was more strongly related to the seven-point scale concerning the social and economic conditions of blacks. Feldman speculates that this pattern of findings results from the substantive difference between equality of opportunities and equality of outcomes. Further analysis showed that "[a]cross

most of the other dependent variables the pattern is for the new measures to either do marginally better than the old (with a slight advantage to the second variant), or for there to be no difference (3).

Despite the reservation that the two types of equality (opportunity and outcome) may have empirical distinctions that have not yet been explored, Feldman concludes that the second variant of the modified scale (with #8 and #10 replacing #1 and #6) "[i]s both a somewhat improved measure from an empirical perspective and defines the measure more clearly from a conceptual point of view. The one item that was badly skewed is eliminated and all of the questions have good distributions and consistent item characteristics"(3).

4. **Measuring Popular Individualism**

Greg Markus

February 1 & May 22, 1990

Markus argues that the NES ought to include measures of **popular individualism** in its survey. He divides the overarching concept of individualism into four strands: **Personal Autonomy, Self-Reliance, Limited Government, and Laissez-Faire Capitalism**. Markus refers to **personal autonomy** as "the notion that an individual's thoughts and actions should be determined not by agents or causes outside of one's control but rather as a result of individual reflection and tastes"; **self-reliance** is "the idea that individuals should take care of their own well-being -- not only economic, but even emotional or psychological"; **limited government** refers to "the belief that, as opposed to pursuing some ephemeral conception of the 'public interest', the purpose of government is strictly to protect life, liberty and property, and thereby provide a framework within which individuals may pursue their narrow self-interests"; and **laissez-faire capitalism** is "a belief in the efficiency and desirability of an economic system characterized by minimum governmental interference, voluntary market transaction, and private ownership of the means of production"(Report 1: 2).

The following items comprise the four individualism scales:

Personal Autonomy

- 1 ONE, when raising children it is more important to teach them to be independent-minded and think for themselves, or TWO it is more important to teach them obedience and respect for authorities? (V7368)
- 2 ONE, is it better to fit in with the people around you or, TWO, is it better to conduct yourself according to your own standards, even if that makes you stand out? (V7366)
- 3 ONE, it is more important to be a cooperative person who works well with others or, TWO, it is more important to be a self-reliant person able to take care of oneself? (V7504)

Alpha = .35

Self-Reliance

- 1 ONE, people should take care of themselves and their families and let others do the same, or, TWO, people should care less about their own success and more about the needs of society? (V7367)
- 2 ONE, most poor people are poor because they don't work hard enough, or TWO, they are poor because of circumstances beyond their control? (V7369)

Alpha = .31

Limited Government

- 1 ONE, the less government the better or TWO, there are more things that government should be doing? (V7502)
- 2 ONE, the government should try to ensure that all Americans have such things as jobs, health care, and housing, or Two, the government should not be involved in this? (V7365)
- 3 ONE, the main reason that government has gotten bigger over the years is because it has gotten involved in things that people should do for themselves or TWO government has gotten bigger because the problems we face have gotten bigger? (V7506)
- 4 ONE, we need a strong government to handle today's complex economic problems or, TWO, the free market can handle these problems without government being involved? (V7501)

Alpha = .66

Laissez-Faire Capitalism

- 1 ONE, government regulation of big businesses and corporations is necessary to protect the public, or TWO, that government regulation does more harm than good? (V7364)
- 2 ONE, society is better off when businesses are free to make as much profit as they can or, TWO, businesses should be prohibited from earning excessive profits? (V7505)

Alpha = .35

The intercorrelations among the four scales ranged from .07 to .30. As Markus demonstrated, the four scales had different demographic correlates, and were related in sensible ways to attitude items concerning racial equality, social welfare, civil liberties, and private enterprise. They were weakly to moderately related to other values and predispositions, including egalitarianism (r's from .02 to .33), ideological self-identification (r's from .01 to .29), and party identification (r's from .11 to .33). Multivariate analysis demonstrated that, after controlling for egalitarianism, moral traditionalism, patriotism, ideological identification, and party identification, "the four individualism subscales are both statistically and substantively significant predictors of a wide range of policy preferences and feeling thermometer ratings" (Report 2: 4). With respect to their effect on policy preferences, the limited government subscale was particularly powerful, especially regarding welfare-related issues, though the other subscales tended to be important in specific issue domains -- for personal autonomy, civil liberties issues; for self-reliance, opinions on affirmative action; and for laissez-faire, issues concerning business. The pattern was reversed when it came to predicting candidate feeling thermometer scores (Reagan, Bush, and Jesse Jackson) -- limited government exerted no direct effects, whereas all of the other subscales were influential in at least one of the equations. Markus points out that the limited government subscale "in all likelihood exerts indirect influence via other included variables (especially, partisanship and ideological leaning)" (Report 2: 5). In a Logit analysis of vote choice, limited government again emerged as quite influential.

In concluding, Markus recommended that the NES include the popular individualism subscales in the 1990 survey: "That is 12 items in all (7364-7369, 7501-7506)...at a minimum I recommend the inclusion of the four limited government items (7502, 7365, 7506, 7501), the three personal autonomy items (7504, 7368, 7366) and the two self-reliance items (7367, 7369)" (Report 2: 5).

5. **Morality Items on the 1985 Pilot Study** **Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman**

In the 1985 NES Pilot Study, Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman constructed a measure aiming to capture the concept of morality, or moral values:

[O]ur goal in developing the set of morality items for the pilot study was to construct a measure reflecting people's positions on a general dimension of traditional (conservative) to modern (liberal) moral values. (Conover & Feldman, 1).

They tested 10 Likert items addressing concerns ranging from divorce, "loose living," and the traditional family, as listed below. Starred items indicate those questions which were included in the final eight item scale.

Morality

- 1* We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if they are different from our own. (V7101)
- 2* There is too much sexual freedom and loose living today. (V7102)
- 3* Changes in lifestyles, such as divorce and men and women living together without being married, are signs of increasing moral decay. (V7103)
- 4* The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society. (V8101)
- 5* The world is always changing and we should accommodate our view of moral behavior to those changes. (V8102)
- 6* There will always be some people who think and act differently, and there is nothing wrong with that. (V8103)
- 7* Society should be more accepting of people whose appearance or values are very different from most. (V8104)
- 8* This country would be better off if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties. (V8105)
- 9 It's good for children to be exposed to a number of different sets of values so that they can develop their own standards. (V7104)
- 10 People who don't care if they have a steady job are either lazy, spoiled, or don't want to work. (V7105)

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .74

Conover and Feldman reported finding some acquiescence response bias in the results and noted that the importance of balancing agree and disagree questions.

An OLS analysis of the determinants of morality (measured by the eight item scale) showed the strongest relationships between religious variables (church attendance, fundamentalist beliefs), age and income. Measures of childhood socialization (mother's employment, small town upbringing, education) had relatively little impact in the equation. The authors note that any use of the morality scale as an independent variable must control for religious variables -- as well as age and income. However, the authors also stress that morality is not just a product of religious beliefs.

Is this morality scale a good predictor of political preferences and evaluations? The authors ran many

OLS analyses including 12 other independent variables and 37 dependent variables drawn from the NES feeling thermometers, and issue preference variables. The independent variables included the morality scale, a measure of equality and economic individualism, a measure of religious belief, measures of party identification and ideological self-identification, church attendance, membership in a fundamentalist Protestant church, gender, race, age, education, and income. Even with these many controls, the morality scale performed well in predicting dependent variables representing, social group evaluations, social issues, domestic and foreign policy issues, racial evaluations, racial issues, and candidate evaluations.

The authors recommended that NES include some version of the morality scale in future surveys:

Given the quality of the measure and the apparent widespread influence of moral values on political preferences and evaluations we strongly recommend that a six or eight item version of this scale be included on forthcoming election studies. (17)

6. **Morality and Politics: Conduct and Control -- A Report on New Items in the 1987 National Election Pilot Study**
Laura Stoker
September 1987

Stoker responds to the previous investigations of morality with reservations about what the **moral traditionalism** index is measuring. She argues that "moral traditionalism, as an 'ism', cannot be seen as an underlying attitude that generates the observed constraint among responses to these items; the items reflect at least two conceptually distinct underlying positions: support for traditional family values, and tolerance for moral diversity" (1). Her position is that "the moral traditionalism items capture complaints about contemporary society that are found in the rhetoric of the 'New Right', but that the moral traditionalism concept and measurement leaves us with no firm conceptual ground to either discuss the relationships we find or the processes generating those relationships" (1). Instead of the moral traditionalism scale, she proposes two new scales, **moral conservatism** -- made up of judgments regarding "modes of conduct that threaten the traditional family" and that indicates "support for the ideal of the traditional family" (2, 20), and **moral autonomy** -- which indicates "support for the authority of the individual in moral matters" (15). The moral conservatism and moral autonomy items follow:

Moral Conservatism

- 1 Premarital sex is immoral. OR There is nothing necessarily immoral about premarital sex. (V2220)
- 2 Having children without being married is immoral. OR There is nothing necessarily immoral about having children without being married. (V2221)
- 3 Homosexuality is immoral. OR There is nothing necessarily immoral about homosexuality. (V2222, V5226)
- 4 Divorce is immoral. OR There is nothing necessarily immoral about divorce. (V2224, V5227)
- 5 Abortion is immoral. OR There is nothing necessarily immoral about abortion. (V2226, V5228)

Tetrachoric intercorrelations among items ranged from .61 to .90, averaging .68.

Moral Autonomy

- 1 We must respect people's own view of what is right and wrong, no matter what we think. (V5180)
- 2 People have to decide for themselves what is right and wrong. (V5182)
- 3 If we've decided something is morally wrong, it is wrong for everyone. (V5181)
- 4 On most questions of right and wrong, it doesn't make sense to think of each person determining the answers for themselves. (V5183)

Alpha = .36

Stoker demonstrates that the moral conservatism index is more strongly related to the three moral traditionalism items that referred to "loose living," "moral decay," and "newer lifestyles," than to the three items that concern tolerance for moral diversity, whereas the pattern of relationships reverses with respect to the moral autonomy index -- evidence in support of her contention that the moral traditionalism index was capturing separable orientations. Nevertheless, the moral traditionalism and moral conservatism scales were highly intercorrelated ($r = .67$), and for the most part, bear similar relationships to a wide variety of demographic and attitudinal variables. Exceptions included the fact that moral conservatism was more strongly related to degree of religious involvement and level of political information than was moral traditionalism, and moral traditionalism had a stronger estimated effect on evaluations of the women's movement and feminists than did moral conservatism. Stoker also demonstrated that, despite the poor scaling properties of the moral autonomy index, it proved to be a significant predictor of policy preferences concerning abortion and homosexuality and feelings toward Christian fundamentalists and the women's movement.

Stoker recommended that the moral conservatism scale, with the addition of another item (concerning adultery), replace the moral traditionalism scale in future surveys, and that NES consider giving the concept of moral autonomy a "chance at better measurement" (38).

7. Pilot Study Measures of Civic Obligation

Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman

In the 1985 NES Pilot Study, Conover and Feldman explored measures of civic obligation, which they describe as "a general sense of responsibility to carry out the obligations associated with citizenship"(1). The Pilot Study carried civic obligation items that used two different response formats, each carried in one split-half, as indicated below.

Civic Obligation -- Form A

- 1* I feel strongly that I have a duty to vote in every election even if I'm busy or not very interested. (V7401)
- 2* Like a lot of other people, I look for ways to avoid paying taxes even if I'm not sure it's legal. (V7402)
- 3* Sometimes I disobey minor laws such as speeding and parking regulations. (V7403)
- 4 I am willing to make personal sacrifices for the good of the country as a whole. (V7404)
- 5 I would ask to be excused from jury duty if I thought it would take more than a day or two of my time. (V7405)

- 6* With all the elections there are, I'm often not interested enough or don't have the time to vote. (V8314)
- 7 The ideals of America, such as freedom and equality, are very important to me personally. (V8315)
- 8* I'm really not concerned whether my actions benefit or help the country as a whole. (V8316)
- 9 If the United States went to war, I would volunteer to help in the war effort in whatever way I possibly could. (V8318)
- 10* Though I would never commit a real crime, sometimes I do break minor laws such as traffic regulations. (V8317)

Alpha = .55

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .58

Civic Obligation -- Form B

- 1* How strong is your duty to vote in every election even when you're busy or not interested...extremely strong, very strong, somewhat strong, or not very strong? (V7406)
- 2 Like a lot of people, would you say that you look for ways to avoid paying taxes almost always, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly ever? (V7407)
- 3 Do you obey minor laws, such as speeding and parking regulations, almost always, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly ever? (V7408)
- 4* How willing are you to make personal sacrifices for the good of the country as a whole...extremely willing, very willing, somewhat willing, or not very willing? (V7409)
- 5 How likely is it that you would ask to be excused from jury duty if you thought that it would take more than a day or two of your time...extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, or not very likely? (V7410)
- 6* With all the elections there are, would you say that you vote almost always, some of the time, only now and then or hardly ever? (V8324)
- 7* How important to you personally are the ideals of America such as freedom and equality -- extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not very important? (V8325)
- 8* How important is it to you that your actions benefit or help the country as a whole -- extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not very important? (V8326)
- 9* If the United States went to war, how likely is it that you would volunteer to help in the war effort in whatever way you could -- extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, or not very likely? (V8328)
- 10 Although you wouldn't commit a real crime, would you say you break minor laws such as traffic regulations almost always, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly ever? (V8327)

Alpha = .53

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .65

Conover and Feldman discovered that both response formats generated responses that were clearly tilted in the "civic-minded" direction. They also found that, regardless of form, the items were poorly intercorrelated (Form A, average intercorrelation = .12, Form B, average intercorrelation = .11), leading them to suggest that perhaps Americans do not have a general sense of

civic obligation:

Such patterns in the correlations suggest that people may not have a general sense of civic obligation that binds together more specific obligations. Instead they appear to compartmentalize their obligations. . . . [I]t may be difficult to devise a highly reliable scale tapping a wide range of civic obligations. (2)

Correlations between the six-item scales (*d items) and other variables varied from $r = .00$ to $r = .33$ in absolute value. Each scale was fairly highly correlated with age, sex, political interest, political efficacy, registered to vote, voted in '84, and a campaign activity index. The Form B version alone was significantly related to evaluations of Reagan, involvement in working with others to solve social problems, party identification, and education. The Form A version was related to a non-electoral political activities index, income and social class. The authors explain these differences as due to the composition of the different scales: As constructed, "Form A deals more with specific obligations while the Form B scale contains more of the general items"(3-4).⁴

Moreover, and more importantly, many of these observed relationships dwindled or disappeared when the two voting items were removed from the six item indices. In particular, analysis showed that "without the voting items both forms of the scale are virtually unrelated to political participation"(5). Form A only retained relationships with political efficacy and registration. In the case of Form B, the relationship with performance evaluations of candidates actually increases, which brings it "[C]loser to becoming some sort of measure of patriotism"(5).

In light of these results, the authors recommended against the inclusion of the full civic obligation scales in the 1986 NES, although noting in closing that: "Several of the voting items might be used as the basis for developing an explicitly more political type of measure. Or, the four items in the revised Form B scale might be considered as a basis for a different approach to measuring patriotism"(5).

8. Revitalizing the Measurement of White Americans' Racial Attitudes: A Report to the NES 1985 Pilot Study Committee and NES Board

Donald R. Kinder and Lynn Sanders
May 1986

Kinder and Sanders use data from the 1985 NES study to describe the current state of opinions on racial issues among white Americans, to explore the antecedents for racial opinions, and to discuss the implications of their findings for future NES surveys. This summary focuses on their measure of the predisposition of **symbolic racism** which they define from Kinder and Sears, 1981 as, "...a blend of anti-black affect and the kind of traditional American moral values embodies in the Protestant ethic" (416).

Kinder and Sanders identify six different theoretical antecedents of racial opinion, one of which concerns symbolic racism:

⁴ Notice that while the 10 items were initially written to be comparable across forms, the two six-item scales did not include comparable items.

Alternative Theoretical Perspectives
(Reproduced from their Table 20 on Page 36)

<u>Theoretical Perspective</u>	<u>Central Motive</u>	<u>Key Variables</u>
1. Instrumental	Advancing self-interest	Personal racial threat
2. Group Conflict	Protecting group privilege	Tangible threats to group
3. Symbolic Racism	Affirming core values <u>and</u> ventilating racist sentiments	Moralistic resentments
4. Ideological	Ideological deduction	Views of government
5. Cognitive	Preserving Theory	Explanations for racial differences
6. Cultural	Affirming core values	Individualism, egalitarianism

The items comprising the symbolic racism scale follow:

Symbolic Racism

- 1* Most blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried. (V8222)
- 2* Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve. (V8224)
- 3* Government officials usually pay less attention to a request or complaint from a black person than from a white person. (V8225)
- 4* Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors. (V8226)
- 5* How much discrimination against blacks do you feel there is in the United States today, limiting their chances to get ahead? Would you say a lot, some, just a little, or none at all? (V8219)
- 6 Blacks shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted. (V8223)

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .62

A brief exploration of the antecedents of symbolic racism and group conflict showed that the two concerns play very different roles in peoples' systems of beliefs.

Symbolic racism is rooted primarily in what could be called ideology. It is tightly bound up with broad ideas about society -- about equality, individualism, and poverty -- and has relatively little to do with the realism provided by every-day experience, as represented by self-interest. In contrast, group conflict appears to be deeply rooted in self-interest -- those who feel vulnerable to the intrusions of affirmative action programs themselves also see racial conflict as pervasive -- but not tied much to large ideas about government and society (48-50).

To assess the power of the symbolic racism scale, the authors included it as an independent variable in a series of OLS regression equations modeling opinion about the following dependent variables: Federal Assistance -- "opinion about the proper role of the federal government in providing opportunities and assistance to blacks"; Equal Opportunity -- "opinion about the government's obligations to guarantee equal opportunity in the particular domains of education, employment and

housing”; Affirmative Action -- “opinion on affirmative action policies in employment and college admission decisions”(20); Domestic Welfare -- opinion about government involvement in providing jobs, healthcare and services; Social Issues -- combines answers on questions about government assistance to women, legality of abortion, and prayer in schools; External Threat -- opinion about US military and intervention in world affairs (59). The independent variables in this equation also included measures of the different theoretical perspectives on racial opinion, as well as measures of the “core values” of equality and individualism.

The symbolic racism scale proved to be an especially significant predictor of Federal Assistance and Equal Opportunity opinions.

Symbolic racism registers especially heavily in opinions about federal assistance to blacks and the government’s obligations to assure equal opportunity. Indeed, the effects associated with symbolic racism are the largest in both equations(47).

The authors also split the survey sample into two groups according to the framing of the affirmative action questions: reverse discrimination or undeserved advantage. They discovered that when questions about affirmative action are asked with the reverse discrimination frame, symbolic racism lost all explanatory power in the equation ($b=.077$, $se=.113$). However, the undeserved advantage frame brought symbolic racism to the top as the most powerful predictor ($b=-.212$, $se=.111$) save for the group conflict scale.

Egalitarianism also proved to be a powerful predictor of the equation -- showing significant effects for all equations except that regarding Affirmative Action. In contrast, individualism did not show any significant effect in any equation. In interpreting these results the authors suggest that “Perhaps the impact of individualism has already been registered..., carried by symbolic racism and individualistic explanations of racial differences”(48), while going on to say that “[i]n the collision over race policy between the two values that have run prominently through the American political tradition, equality appears to carry the greater weight” (48).

The authors concluded that white Americans’ opinions on racial policy are primarily the result of three factors:

- (1) perceptions of conflict between blacks and whites (group conflict);
- (2) moralistic resentments that mix racial prejudice and traditional American values (symbolic racism); and
- (3) commitment to equality as a general social principle (48).

Finally, the authors detailed the questions that they recommend be included in future surveys to measure Federal Assistance, Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity, Group Conflict, Symbolic Racism, Equality and Local Control⁵. Referring specifically to measures of Symbolic Racism, they recommended the inclusion of the five items marked with stars in the above list.

⁵ Local Control -- “In general, people getting together in their own communities can solve their problems better than the government in Washington can.”

9. Foreign Policy Items

John Hurwitz and Mark Peffley

March 11, 1988

Hurwitz and Peffley explored three general postures toward foreign policy: **Militarism** -- "a general predisposition to support militaristic solutions to international problems" (Report 1:2), **Anti-Communism** -- a tendency to "view communism, and its primary practitioner (the USSR), with a great deal of apprehensiveness because of its perceived threatening nature" (Report 2:6), and **Isolationism** -- "a general desire that the government avoid any ties or entanglements with other nations, regardless of the nature of the relationship" (Report 2: 7). The items that make up each scale are listed below.

Militarism

- 1* Some people feel that in dealing with other nations our govt. should be strong and tough. Others feel that our govt. should be understanding and flexible. (V5229)
- 2* Which do you think is the best way for us to keep the peace -- by having a very strong military so other countries won't attack us, or by working out our disagreements at the bargaining table? (V5232)
- 3* The US should maintain its position as the world's most powerful nation, even going to the brink of war if necessary. (V5249)
- 4* The only way to settle disputes with our adversaries is to negotiate with them, not by using our military force. (V5250)
- 5* How important is it for the US to have a very strong military force to get our way with our adversaries -- extremely, very, somewhat, or not important? (V2245)
- 6 When dealing with our adversaries, the US. should use its military force only as a last resort. (V5235)

Alpha = .61

Stars indicate items that remained after validity and reliability checks, alpha [*] = .63

The final items are underlined.

Anti-Communism

- 1 The United States should do everything it can to prevent the spread of Communism to any other part of the world. (V5251)
- 2 The US. should not worry so much about trying to stop the spread of Soviet influence everywhere in the world. (V5252)
- 3 Any time a country goes Communist, it should be considered a threat to the vital interests and security of the United States (V5253)
- 4 Some people believe we should be much more cooperative with the Soviet Union, while others feel we should be much tougher in our dealing with the Soviets. (V5235)
- 5 How much of a threat do you think Russia is to the vital interests and security of the United States? (V5238)

Alpha = .69

The final items are underlined.

Isolationism

- 1 This country would be much better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world. (V5254)
- 2 We shouldn't risk our happiness and well-being by getting involved with other nations. (V5255)

Pearson's $r = .67$

The final item is underlined.

Despite the fact that the Militarism and Anti-Communism scales were highly correlated ($r = .52$), the authors showed that these two scales represent different concepts through a series of regression analyses. The different scales performed as expected in predicting a series of foreign policy attitudes. "...It can be seen that they function quite differently as predictors of policy positions. More importantly, they function in ways which are fully expected and, indeed, theoretically plausible" (Report 1:1-2).

The authors recommend that the Militarism and Anti-Communism scales be regularly included into the survey. "... we would much prefer shorter postural scales than merging the Militarism and Anti-Communism scales" (Report 1:9).

10. Measuring Patriotism and Nationalism

Pamela Johnston Conover and Stanley Feldman

Conover and Feldman set out to study measures of patriotism and nationalism in the 1987 NES Pilot Study. They define patriotism as "a deeply felt affective attachment to the nation". Nationalism involves "feelings of the superiority of one's own country vis-à-vis other countries"(1). They note that these two concepts may exist together or independently in the same person. "So defined, a person may feel patriotic without necessarily feeling nationalistic"(1). The items composing the scales are listed below.

Patriotism

- 1 How strong is the respect you have for the United States these days? (V5151)
- 2 How angry does it make you feel when you hear someone criticizing the United States? (V5152)
- 3 How proud are you to be an American? (V5153)
- 4 How angry does it make you when people burn the American flag in protest? (V5154)
- 5 How good does it make you feel when you see the American flag flying? (V5155)
- 6 How strong is your love for your country? (V5156)
- 7 How mad do people who sell government secrets make you feel? (V5157)
- 8 How proud do you feel when you hear the national anthem? (V5158)

Alpha = .86

Nationalism

- 1 Generally, the more influence America has on other nations, the better off those nations are. (V2172)
- 2 Other countries should try to make their governments as much like ours as possible.

(V2173)

- 3 The important thing for the US. foreign aid program should be to make sure that the US. gains a political advantage in world affairs. (V2174)
- 4 In view of America's moral and material superiority, it is only right that we should have the biggest say in deciding United Nations policies. (V2175)

Alpha = .70

The authors point out that the patriotism scale received responses mostly skewed in the more patriotic direction." This seems to be the case where the concept being measured, patriotism, is so laden with social desirability that it is very difficult to design questions that do not produce a skewed distribution"(1). The distribution of the nationalism scale appeared much more even. The correlation between the two scales is .3.

In examining the basic demographic correlates of the scales, the authors discovered that patriotism had much stronger associations than does nationalism. Patriotism was significantly related to race, age, and education while nationalism only shared significant variation with education. Patriotism also was strongly related to five other basic political variables studied: party identification ($r = .12$), liberal-conservative identification ($r = .27$), moral traditionalism ($r = -.23$), militarism ($r = .3$), and more weakly egalitarianism ($r = -.09$). Nationalism showed weak yet significant relationships with liberal-conservative identification ($r = .12$), and moral traditionalism ($r = -.09$).

The scales also showed moderate and significant relationships to items measuring foreign policy issue positions, and less consistent relationships with evaluations of Reagan's performance and character. ".Those scoring high on the patriotism and nationalism scales tend to favor a more militaristic foreign affairs posture and a more interventionist role in world politics" The two scales diverged in relationship to specific foreign policy attitudes -- specifically, "patriotism is more strongly related to spending on military programs than is nationalism. And patriotism is more strongly related to assessments of Reagan's performance and character than is nationalism"(3).

Finally, the authors ran a series of regressions attempting to predict the following dependent variables: the sense that soviets pose a threat, willingness to intervene in central America, desire to fund star wars research, Reagan approval, high feeling thermometer ratings of conservatives, from the following independent variables: patriotism, militarism, nationalism, party identification, liberal-conservative identification, age, race, sex and income. Militarism showed significant effects across all the equations while patriotism only showed significant effects for perception of the soviet threat, star wars, and Reagan approval, and nationalism only had significant impact for opinion on central America. The authors explain that, ".the questions composing the militarism measures are 'closer' in content to the specific issue questions than are the questions composing the measures of nationalism and especially patriotism" Also, they note that even with the strong effects of militarism, that patriotism ".still proves to be a valuable predictor of both foreign policy attitudes and evaluations of Reagan" (4).

The authors recommend that "future NES studies carry the patriotism measure either in its entirety or some abbreviated form. This recommendation is made on the basis of the strength of patriotism's performance as a predictor, even if it does come in 'second' to militarism. In particular, though it does not do quite as well as the militarism measure it is also a much more general measure than the militarism one. And, thus it merits further consideration"(4).

11. A Report on Measures of American Identity and New "Ethnic" Issues in the 1991 NES Pilot Study

Jack Citrin, Donald Green, Beth Reingold, David Sears

January 1992

Citrin, Green, Reingold and Sears define the concept of **Americanism**, or **American National Identity**, as an "enduring symbolic predisposition" ... the emotional attachment to symbols and values that constitute acceptance of a "political creed"(4). They postulate three main types of Americanism: 1) **Liberal** -- "the dominant, ideological definition ... referring to the values of social equality, political tolerance, self-reliance and civic participation respectively"; 2) **Civic Republican** -- "a conception of Americanism rooted in the philosophy of civic republicanism"; 3) **Ethnocultural** -- "nativists" who fall under this type of Americanism "could endorse liberal political ideals as inherently American and simultaneously maintain that only some races, religions, or cultures produced the moral or intellectual qualities required for democratic citizenship"(5-6).

The items which the authors use to explore conceptions of American Identity scale are given below:

American Identity

(lead-in) Some people say that there are certain qualities that make a person a true American. Others say that there isn't anything that makes one person more American than another.....

- 1 (Vote) Is voting in elections extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not at all important in making someone a true American? (V2601)
- 2 (Believe in God) How about believing in God? (V2602)
- 3 (Get Ahead on Own) Trying to get ahead on your own effort? (V2603)
- 4 (Treat All Equally) Treating people of all races and backgrounds equally? (V2604)
- 5 (Speak English) Speaking English? (V2605)
- 6 (Respect Others' Speech) Respecting people's freedom to say what they want no matter how much you disagree? (V2606)

The inter-correlations between the items suggested the existence of response bias toward rating any given norm as "important in defining the 'true' American"(10). The authors suggest, however, that this response bias may in fact be a substantive finding -- that some respondents believe in a "true" American Identity while others do not. That is, "those who accept the general idea of a distinctive national identity would tend to assign more importance to each of these norms, regardless of internal inconsistencies among them"(11). A confirmatory factor analysis supported their ideas about three central variants of Americanism or American identity.

The authors classified people into one of several American identity categories based on their responses to these items: liberals (30%), civic republicans (26%), nativists (17%), ritualists (11%), and other (17%). The classification scheme was based on the individual's pattern of responses across the items. For example, people were classified as liberals if they ranked "respecting others' speech" highest and "believing in God" lowest. "Ritualists" assigned equal weight to the six criteria above. Analysis demonstrated that people with different conceptions of American identity tended to hold different opinions on a variety of issues, and to have different demographic profiles.

Citrin, Green, Reingold, and Sears recommend that the American identity items be carried in future surveys, while recommending various modifications and additions as well (15-16):

1. Ask respondents directly whether or not they accept the idea of a "true American;
2. Eliminate the Equal Treatment item and substitute an egalitarianism item that has more variance;
3. Ask respondents to indicate which of the attributes of Americanism they believe is most important and which is least important, if time constraints require, this can be done in conjunction with reduction of the number of items to four.
4. Retain the response options employed in the 1991 Pilot Study.