

TO: NES Board of Overseers

FROM: Pamela Johnston Conover and David Lowery
 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

RE: Pilot Study Questions on Welfare/poverty

This memo reports on ten questions included on the 1987 NES Pilot Study that pertain to welfare and poverty. Given the growing disparity in attitudes towards the poor and people on welfare (Sundquist, 1986; Smith, 1987), eight of these questions are part of a question framing experiment: one frame asks about poor people and the other about people on welfare. The four items for which this experiment were conducted were as follows: sympathy for the poor/welfare recipients, desired spending levels on the poor/welfare programs, which party best handles the problems of the poor/welfare, and what is the size of the poor/welfare population. The remaining two questions appeared on both forms and asked about whose responsibility it is to care for the poor.

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

Tables 1 through 4 present the frequency distributions for both the "poor" frame and the "welfare" frame for the four items--sympathy, spending, party handling, and size of population. For all four framing experiments, there are statistically significant differences in the aggregate distributions for the two frames. As suspected, it makes a great deal of difference whether one asks about the poor or about welfare recipients. Specifically, people are more sympathetic towards the poor than they are towards welfare recipients; over 50% of the respondents said they felt very or extremely sympathetic towards the poor while only 21% said the same about welfare recipients (see Table 1). Similarly, over 50% of those asked said the federal government was not spending enough on assistance to the poor while almost 50% reported that the government was spending too much on welfare programs (see Table 2). In terms of assessments of the parties' handling of the problems of the poor, there was a clear consensus (67.5%) that the Democrats did a better job. In contrast, assessments of the parties' management of welfare programs seemed more partisan; 48.8% thought the Democrats did a better job but 37.9% gave the Republicans the nod (see Table 3). Finally, people generally estimated the size of the population living under the poverty line to be larger than the population of welfare recipients (see Table 4).

In terms of assessing responsibility for handling the problems of the poor, almost half of the respondents (46.4%) felt that it was the government's responsibility while the remainder felt that others--such as churches, voluntary groups and the poor themselves--should help handle the problem or assume full responsibility for it (see Table 5). Finally, the study also included a more general question about the government's responsibility for the well-being of its citizens (see Table 6). On that question, there was a clear individualistic bent: over 60% of the respondents felt that individuals were responsible for their own well being while less than 25% felt that the government should assume primary responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. Of these two responsibility questions, the second, more general one

seemed to pose fewer problems to respondents.

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG POOR/WELFARE ITEMS

Presented in Table 7 are the intercorrelations among the four poverty items and the two responsibility questions. Overall, the four poverty items have an average intercorrelation of .21. In particular, sympathy for the poor is strongly related to spending on the poor, and both sympathy and spending are linked to perceptions of the size of the poor population. Moreover, these three variables--sympathy, spending, and size of the poor population--are only very weakly related to preferences for which party can best handle the problems of the poor.

In contrast, the average intercorrelation among the four welfare items is only .15. Sympathy for welfare recipients is related to spending on welfare programs, but it is only weakly related to perceptions of the size of the welfare population. And, unlike the case of the "poor" questions, spending on welfare programs is unrelated to perceptions of the size of the welfare population but moderately related to party perceptions. In effect, preferences on welfare spending seem to be a more partisan matter than are those for spending on the poor (see Table 8).

Finally, for both the poor and the welfare frame, sympathy and spending are moderately related to assessments of the government's responsibility. For the sympathy variables, the correlations are quite similar for the two frames and for the two responsibility questions. In contrast, spending on the poor is more strongly related to attributions of governmental responsibility than is spending on welfare programs suggesting perhaps that spending on the poor is more ideologically determined while spending on welfare is more a function of partisan preferences.

BACKGROUND, BASIC POLITICAL, AND AFFECTIVE CORRELATES OF POOR/WELFARE ITEMS

Table 9 contains the background correlates for the poor/welfare items. Of the background variables, race and education tend to have the most consistent patterns of effect across items and frames. Blacks are more sympathetic towards the poor; they are more supportive of spending on both the poor and welfare; they are more likely to think that the Democrats do the best job in handling welfare; they tend to make larger estimates of the size of both the poor and welfare populations; and they are more likely to attribute to the government responsibility for the poor and the general well-being of citizens. In contrast, the better educated tend to attribute responsibility to the individual; they make lower estimates of the size of the welfare and poor populations; and they are less sympathetic towards welfare recipients.

The remaining background variables--age, sex and income--have a more sporadic effect on the items. Specifically, older people are more sympathetic towards both the poor and welfare recipients; but beyond those relationships age is unrelated to the poor/welfare items. Somewhat surprisingly, a gender gap appears on only a few items: like blacks, women tend to make larger

estimates of the size of both the poor and welfare populations, and they tend to favor higher levels of spending on the poor; but, women are no more sympathetic than men towards the poor or welfare recipients, and they have only a slight tendency to favor governmental responsibility. Finally, there is little evidence of the operation of self-interest in determining attitudes towards the poor/welfare recipients. Income is related to spending preferences on welfare, but beyond that it has no significant impact. In summary, then, none of the variables are so strongly correlated with a particular background measure so as to make their use redundant.

Table 10 presents the correlations of the poor/welfare items with variables tapping basic political and affective orientations. Sympathy for both the poor and welfare recipients is only modestly related to the political variables; but, as might be expected given that sympathy is an emotion, both sympathy variables are related to measures of pure affect (e.g. feeling thermometers) for the poor and welfare recipients with the relationships being noticeably stronger in the case of sympathy for the poor. At the same time, these results make clear that sympathy is not merely affect. Next, the two spending variables are related to both the political orientations and the affective measures with the relationships being stronger in the case of spending on welfare. Turning to the "best party" variables, as might be expected, we find that party identification strongly influences which party is perceived as best able to handle the problems of the poor/welfare recipients while pure affective reactions to the two groups have only weak relationships. Finally, estimates of both population sizes are, for the most part, only weakly related to the political variables and only somewhat related to the affective measures. In summary, several general points may be made. First, on the whole, the "welfare variables"--particularly spending and best party--appear to be more politicized than the comparable "poor" variables. And second, affective reactions to the poor and welfare recipients influence assessments of the best party, spending, and especially sympathy. But, even sympathy is distinct from affect.

Table 10 also presents the correlations of the two "responsibility" variables with these background and affective measures. In general, both variables are modestly related to the political measures with liberals and Democrats being more likely to attribute responsibility to the government. Somewhat surprisingly, government responsibility for the poor is unrelated to affective reactions towards the poor and welfare recipients, and responsibility for the well-being of citizens is only slightly related to these same affective reactions.

INTERCORRELATIONS WITH REAGAN EVALUATIONS AND SPENDING VARIABLES

Table 11 presents the correlations of the four "welfare" variables with a series of variables tapping evaluations of Reagan and spending on domestic programs. Table 12 provides the same set of correlations for the "poor" variables. Looking first at the two sympathy variables, we find that sympathy for welfare recipients is virtually unrelated to evaluations of Reagan; in contrast, sympathy for the poor is modestly related to general assessments of Reagan as well as certain trait (e.g. leader, cares, knowledgeable)

assessments. Both sympathy variables demonstrate consistent, moderate relationships with variables tapping spending preferences on a range of domestic programs.

Both spending variables are more closely related to the Reagan evaluations than were the sympathy variables. However, the correlations are, on average, only weak to moderate in size. Also, as might be expected, both spending variables are moderately to strongly related to spending preferences on specific programs. Moreover, of the two, spending on the poor demonstrates the strongest pattern of correlations. Specifically, the average correlation between the spending on the poor item and the eight spending items is .33; the average correlation for the spending on welfare item is .24.

Turning to the "best party" variable, we find a pattern of strong correlations between both variables and Reagan evaluations. The "best party for welfare" variable is especially related to assessments of Reagan suggesting, again, the more partisan nature of welfare attitudes. This interpretation is reinforced by the pattern of correlations on the spending items. There we find that the welfare frame of the "best party" question is more strongly related to spending preferences than the poor frame of the question, though neither one demonstrates a pattern of correlations as strong as those appearing for the spending on the poor/welfare variables.

Finally, we consider the two size of population variables. Of the two, estimates of the size of the poor population tend to be more strongly related to evaluations of Reagan than estimates of the size of the welfare population. In particular, the higher the perceived size of the poor population the less Reagan is perceived as caring, inspiring, and a strong leader. With respect to the spending variables, size of the poor population again demonstrates a more consistent, stronger pattern of correlations. In effect, spending preferences on domestic programs are more related to perceptions of the size of the need (i.e. poor population) than they are to perceptions of the size of current programs (i.e. welfare recipients).

In general, these two tables reinforce the findings presented earlier. To the extent welfare attitudes are related to evaluations of Reagan and domestic programs, those relationships are stronger for the two more partisan variables--spending on welfare and "best party" on welfare. Sympathy for welfare recipients and perceived size of the welfare population have considerably less effect. In contrast, sympathy for the poor and estimates of the size of the poor population are somewhat related to evaluations of Reagan, and strongly (and consistently) related to spending preferences on specific domestic programs. Both sets of variables, then, should prove useful for understanding evaluations of political figures and programs; but, their usefulness is likely to come on different sorts of dependent variables.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Finally, we can turn to a multivariate analysis that is useful in several respects. First, it helps us to sort out the differences in the effects of the two questions frames, poor vs. welfare. And second, it helps us to pinpoint which of each set of variables has the most immediate effect on

spending attitudes and evaluations of Reagan. For the "poor" and the "welfare" variables a series of regressions were run using as dependent variables the variables employed in Tables 11 and 12. Specifically, for both the "welfare" and "poor" variables four regressions were run for each dependent variable: one with only the sympathy measure, one with only the spending measure, one with only the size variable, and one with all three--sympathy, spending and size. In addition to the welfare/poor variables, the following variables were included in the analysis: a feeling thermometer for the poor or welfare recipients, party identification, liberal-conservative identification, age, education, sex, income and race. Obviously, all of these results cannot and need not be presented. Instead, we will summarize the pattern of findings that occurred when the poor/welfare variables were run one at a time, and we will present selected findings for the regressions where they were run as a set.

Turning first to the regressions run using only one poor/welfare variable at a time, the following generalizations can be made. First, neither size variable had significant effects on more than one or two of the dependent variables. Second, both sympathy variables had significant effects on the spending items though not quite as consistent an effect on the Reagan approval items; and of the two, sympathy for the poor tended to have the strongest effects particularly on the spending variables. Moreover, these significant effects appeared even when simple affect was controlled, thus reinforcing our earlier conclusion that sympathy is measuring more than just affect. Third, both spending variables had only a sporadic influence on evaluations of Reagan; but, both also had a fairly consistent impact on spending on specific domestic programs. Finally, when all three variables--size, sympathy and spending--were entered into the same regression it became clear that the spending variables tended to have the most direct effects while much of the influence of the sympathy variables was occurring indirectly through the spending variables. With that in mind, we turn to Table 13.

Table 13 illustrates two things: first, how the two frames--focus on the poor vs. focus on welfare--tap into different constructs in the minds of respondents; and second, how the effects of each frame are partitioned among the three variables--size, spending and sympathy. Specifically, Table 13 presents paired comparisons of the regressions for three dependent variables: Reagan approval, support for the government's responsibility to maintain jobs and a standard of living, and support for spending on Blacks.

As seen in the first column, attitudes and knowledge about the poor had little to do with Reagan approval. But, a somewhat different picture emerges when the focus of the questions shifts to welfare recipients, as seen in the results presented in the second column. While again not significant, sympathy for welfare recipients, as opposed to the positive association found for sympathy for the poor, is negatively related to Reagan approval. Moreover, while the coefficients for the welfare version of the spending and size of population variables are signed in the same manner as their poor counterparts, the latter are now significant at the .05 level.

A similar contrast develops when the two sets of coefficients for the support of the government's role in maintaining jobs and standard of living

measure are examined, as seen in columns three and four of Table 13. The two sets of coefficients are signed in the same manner. Sympathy for the poor or welfare recipients has a positive impact on support for guaranteed jobs and standard of living. Similarly, those desiring high levels of spending on the poor or welfare recipients and those who make large estimates of the size of the poor or welfare populations tend to support guaranteed jobs. But, while they are signed in the same manner, two of the welfare model coefficients--those for sympathy and spending--were significant, while none of the coefficients from the model using the poor form of the independent variables were.

Turning to the last set of contrasts, we see a near reversal of the pattern for support for a government role in maintaining jobs and a standard of living in the question on spending for blacks. In this case, it is the poor form of the independent variables that produced significant coefficients rather than the welfare versions of the questions. Attitudes toward and about the poor are much more strongly related to support for spending for blacks than are attitudes toward and about welfare.

What do these differences mean? While an exhaustive examination would take us beyond the present analysis, we believe these findings are suggestive. Taken together, these first two sets of contrasts seem to suggest that questions focusing on welfare have a much more partisan and political--political in the sense of government management--connotation than do questions focusing on the poor. This is important in terms of linking attitudes about public problems to both evaluations of candidates and officials, and evaluations about the general role of government. In summary, then, the striking contrasts evident in Table 13 clearly illustrate that question wording makes a difference.

We can gain some additional insight into the two question frames by examining regressions employing Reagan traits as dependent measures (see Table 14). In this case, quite opposite to what was seen in Table 13, the "poor" version of the spending measure evidences stronger effects than the welfare version. All four of the "poor" spending measures were significantly related to evaluations of Reagan traits, while only one the "welfare" coefficients (that for "compassionate") was significant. Again, this suggests that the "poor" and "welfare" versions are tapping different political meanings. Thus, both may play a role in understanding different aspects of politics and policies.

Finally, both Tables 13 and 14 suggest that the "spending" item has the most direct effects on spending preferences and Reagan evaluations. To some extent, this is clearly to be expected. After all, spending on the poor or welfare recipients might be interpreted as simply a more general extension of spending on specific programs. Consequently, such results should not be interpreted as meaning that the other poor/welfare items are unimportant. On the contrary, they are quite important for understanding the nature of the impact of the spending item on policy preferences. This is illustrated in Table 15 where spending on the poor and spending on welfare recipients are taken as the dependent variables. In both cases, sympathy and attributions of governmental responsibility are important for understanding the origins of

spending attitudes towards the poor and welfare recipients. Moreover, it is also important to note the differences in the origins of the two spending attitudes. Liberal-conservative identification and party identification have a significant impact on spending for welfare but not on spending for the poor. Again, this reinforces the point that the "welfare" frame is tapping a more partisan and political mindset (e.g. in a managerial/policy/institutional sense) than is the "poor" frame. In contrast, the "poor" frame seems to be tapping a more social and interpersonal interpretation of politics; note, for example, the significant impact of gender on spending for the poor but not welfare.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings we make the following recommendations:

- (1) Both the "poor" and the "welfare" spending items should be included together on future studies. This would afford us the opportunity to improve our understanding of attitudes on domestic policies.
- (2) Both the "poor" and the "welfare" sympathy items should be included together on future studies. This would afford us the opportunity to understand the origins of spending attitudes. Moreover, since some might think that the poor/welfare spending items are "too close" to the more specific items, the sympathy questions may also be useful in directly explaining spending attitudes towards specific programs.
- (3) The attributions of responsibility for citizen well-being question should be included on future studies. In combination with sympathy, this variable is likely to be quite important in understanding the nature of spending attitudes.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution of Level of Sympathy for Poor and Welfare Recipients

		Object of Sympathetic Feelings			
		POOR ¹		WELFARE RECIPIENTS ²	
		n	%	n	%
Feelings of Sympathy	EXTREMELY	43	19.5	15	6.6
	VERY	83	37.6	34	15.0
	SOMEWHAT	92	41.6	156	68.7
	NOT AT ALL	3	1.4	22	9.7
	MISSING	239	--	230	--
n		457	100.0	457	100.0

1. People sometimes feel sympathetic towards various groups in society. How sympathetic do you feel towards poor people? Would you say that you feel extremely sympathetic, very sympathetic, somewhat sympathetic, or not at all sympathetic?

2. People sometimes feel sympathetic towards various groups in society. How sympathetic do you feel towards welfare recipients? Would you say that you feel extremely sympathetic, very sympathetic, somewhat sympathetic, or not at all sympathetic?

Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Evaluation of Spending Levels for Poor and Welfare Recipients

Evaluation of Spending		Object of Spending			
		POOR ¹		WELFARE RECIPIENTS ²	
		n	%	n	%
Evaluation of Spending	TOO MUCH	26	12.4	104	48.4
	ABOUT RIGHT	70	33.5	63	29.3
	NOT ENOUGH	113	54.1	48	22.3
	MISSING	248	--	242	--
n		457	100.0	457	100.0

1. Generally speaking, do you think the federal government is spending too much money, not enough money, or just the right amount of money on assistance to the poor?

2. Generally speaking, do you think the federal government is spending too much money, not enough money, or just the right amount of money on assistance to the poor?

Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Evaluation of Party Handling of Problems of Poor and Welfare Recipients

		Object of Program			
		POOR ¹		WELFARE RECIPIENTS ²	
		n	%	n	%
Party	DEMOCRATS	135	67.5	103	48.8
Does	NEITHER/BOTH	15	7.5	28	13.3
Best Job	REPUBLICANS	50	25.0	80	37.9
	MISSING	257	--	246	--
n		457	100.0	457	100.0

1. Regardless of how you personally feel about the two parties, I'd like to you to tell me which one, the Republican or the Democratic Party, would do a better job of handling the problem of assisting the poor?

2. Regardless of how you personally feel about the two parties, I'd like to you to tell me which one, the Republican or the Democratic Party, would do a better job of handling the problem of managing welfare programs?

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of Estimated Size of Poor and Welfare Recipients Populations

		Subpopulation			
		POOR ¹		WELFARE RECIPIENTS ²	
		n	%	n	%
Percent of Population	< 10 %	4	2.0	16	8.0
	10 - 19%	36	17.6	49	24.5
	20 - 29%	39	19.0	32	16.0
	30 - 39%	28	13.7	42	21.0
	40 - 49%	44	21.5	29	14.5
	50 - 59%	16	7.8	12	6.0
	60 - 69%	11	5.4	9	4.5
	70 - 79%	19	9.3	7	3.5
	80 - 89%	4	2.0	1	.5
	> or = 90%	4	2.0	3	1.5
	MISSING	252	--	257	--
n		457	100.0	457	100.0

1. What percentage of Americans would you say are living below the poverty line today?

2. What percentage of Americans would you say are receiving welfare payments?

Table 5: Frequency Distribution on Beliefs About
Primary Responsibility for Helping Poor

		Primary Responsibility for Helping Poor ¹	
		n	%
Primary	GOVERNMENT	210	46.4
	GOV'T & OTHERS	81	17.9
	OTHERS	162	35.8
	MISSING	4	--
n		457	100.0

1. Who do you think should have the greatest responsibility for helping the poor: the government, the poor themselves, or voluntary groups such as churches and charities?

Table 6: Frequency Distributions on Beliefs on
Responsibility for Citizen Well-Being

		Primary Responsibility for Well-Being ¹	
		n	%
Primary Responsibility	GOVERNMENT-STRONGLY	87	19.2
	GOV'T-NOT STRONGLY	26	5.7
	NEITHER/BOTH	64	14.1
	INDIV.-NOT STRONGLY	55	12.1
	INDIVIDUAL-STRONGLY	222	48.9
	MISSING	3	--
n		457	100.0

1. Which of the two statements is closest to your own position: Government is responsible for the well-being of its citizens and has an obligation to take care of them; OR people are responsible for their own well-being and have an obligation to take care of themselves?

Table 7: Intercorrelations of "Poor" Items

	ITEMS FOCUSING ON POOR					
	Sympathy	Spend	Party	Size	Resp. - Poor	Resp. - Well-Being
Sympathy for Poor	1.00					
Spending for Poor	-.40*	1.00				
Best Party for Poor	.12*	-.11	1.00			
Size of Poor Pop.	-.33*	.24*	-.08	1.00		
Gov't Responsibility for Poor	.26*	-.39*	.13*	-.25*	1.00	
Gov't Responsibility for Well-Being	.31*	-.42*	.00	-.21*	.34*	1.00

Table 8: Intercorrelations of "Welfare" Items

ITEMS FOCUSING ON WELFARE RECIPIENTS

	Sympathy	Spend	Party	Size	Resp. - Poor	Resp. - Well-Being
Sympathy for Welfare	1.00					
Spending for Welfare	-.33*	1.00				
Best Party for Welfare	.10	-.24*	1.00			
Size of Welfare Pop.	-.16*	.02	-.04	1.00		
Gov't Responsibility for Welfare	.26*	-.30*	.18*	-.05	1.00	
Gov't Responsibility for Well-Being	.35*	-.21*	.11	-.16*	.34*	1.00

Table 9: Background Correlates of Welfare/Poor Items

		Background Variables				
		AGE	RACE	SEX	INCOME	EDUCATION
SYMPATHY	Poor	-.20*	-.16*	-.01	.01	.11
	Welfare	-.18*	-.10	-.10	-.07	.12*
SPENDING	Poor	-.02	.19*	.17*	.08	-.15
	Welfare	.00	.12*	-.01	.18*	.06
BEST PARTY	Poor	-.06	-.10	.01	-.05	-.01
	Welfare	-.02	-.15*	-.03	-.06	-.19*
POP. SIZE	Poor	-.00	.27*	.33*	-.09	-.31*
	Welfare	.07	.21*	.26*	-.11	-.33*
GOV'T RES. FOR POOR		.05	-.13*	-.01	.05	.09*
GOV'T RES. FOR WELL-BEING		-.05	-.13*	-.08*	-.03	.14*

Table 10: Political Orientation Correlates of Welfare/Poor Items

		Political Orientation and Affective Variables				
		Party Id.	Liberal/ Conser. Id.	Morality	Feeling Therm.-Poor	Feeling Therm.-Wel.
SYMPATHY	Poor	.17*	.14*	.07	-.52*	-.40*
	Welfare	.13*	.07	.06	-.24*	-.31*
SPENDING	Poor	-.12*	-.13*	.05	.30*	.31*
	Welfare	-.22*	-.24*	.11*	.35	.39*
BEST PARTY	Poor	.47*	.14*	-.11	-.18*	-.13*
	Welfare	.52*	.34*	-.15*	-.14*	-.11
POP. SIZE	Poor	-.13*	-.06	-.00	.24*	.15*
	Welfare	-.12*	-.13	-.08	.08	.14*
GOV'T RES. FOR POOR		.24*	.22*	-.12*	.05	.00
GOV'T RES. FOR WELL-BEING		.09*	.13*	-.05	-.17*	-.17*

Table 11: Intercorrelations of Welfare Items
and Items on Reagan and Spending

	Sympathy	Spend	Party	Size
Reagan				
Approval	.05	-.24*	.36*	-.09*
Traits-Intelligent	.07	.11*	-.16*	-.11
Traits-Compassionate	-.09	.25*	-.31*	.08
Traits-Moral	-.10	.15*	-.28*	.12*
Traits-Inspiring	.05	.10	-.30*	.05
Traits-Leader	-.03	.08	-.26*	.03
Traits-Decent	.03	.12*	-.25*	.02
Traits-Cares	-.01	.14*	-.38*	.03
Traits-Knowlegable	-.04	.18*	-.24*	-.22*
Emotions-Angry	.06	.05	-.22*	-.00
Emotions-Hopeful	-.07	-.08	.08	-.13*
Emotions-Afraid	-.07	.16*	-.22*	-.00
Emotions-Proud	-.14*	-.20*	.29*	-.09
Spending				
On College	.15*	-.18*	.11*	-.03
On Social Security	.05	-.03	.09	-.21*
On Food Stamps	.26*	-.43*	.21*	-.11
On Unemployment	.27*	-.28*	.24*	-.20*
On Blacks	.21*	-.16*	.19*	.01
Spending & Services	-.03	.22*	-.27*	.24*
Jobs & St. of Living	.26*	-.24*	.20*	-.13
Aid to Blacks	.33*	-.37*	.12*	-.00

Table 12: Intercorrelations of Poor Items
and Items on Reagan and Spending

	Sympathy	Spend	Party	Size
Reagan				
Approval	.20*	-.16*	.27*	-.16*
Traits-Intelligent	-.06	.13*	-.20*	-.00
Traits-Compassionate	-.00	.22*	-.22*	.06
Traits-Moral	-.00	.14*	-.12*	.09
Traits-Inspiring	-.11	.08	-.20*	.17*
Traits-Leader	-.11*	.20*	-.18*	.08*
Traits-Decent	-.02	.17*	-.12*	-.03
Traits-Cares	-.15*	.23*	-.29*	.18*
Traits-Knowledgeable	-.14*	.18*	-.19*	-.08
Emotions-Angry	-.05	.24*	-.09	-.09
Emotions-Hopeful	.09	-.13*	.12*	-.04
Emotions-Afraid	-.02	.09	-.09	-.06
Emotions-Proud	.03	-.08	.12*	-.11*
Spending				
On College	.18*	-.26*	.08	-.25*
On Social Security	.12*	-.34*	.10	-.25*
On Food Stamps	.35*	-.50*	.16*	-.24
On Unemployment	.35*	-.41*	.14*	-.30*
On Blacks	.34*	-.36*	.11	-.29*
Spending & Services	-.18*	.54*	-.20*	.27*
Jobs & St. of Living	.14*	-.17*	.09	-.13*
Aid to Blacks	.20*	-.08	.05	-.16*

Table 13: Selective Regression Results Using Alternative Question Forms

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable					
	REAGAN APPROVAL [v5297]		JOBS & STAND. LIVING [v2269]		SPEND FOR BLACKS [v626]	
	Form		Form		Form	
	Poor	Welfare	Poor	Welfare	Poor	Welfare
SYMPATHY	.074 ¹ (.102)	-.113 (.086)	.096 (.250)	.393** (.160)	.187*** (.062)	.036 (.055)
SPENDING	-.070 (.102)	-.171** (.086)	-.331 (.252)	-.309* (.160)	-.166*** (.062)	-.047 (.055)
PERCENT-POP	-.003 (.004)	-.003 (.004)	-.006 (.009)	-.004 (.007)	-.004* (.002)	.002 (.002)
Lib/Con	.050 (.040)	.103** (.040)	.198* (.109)	.135* (.076)	-.013 (.027)	.036 (.026)
PartyID	.181*** (.034)	.142*** (.033)	-.077 (.084)	.040 (.061)	.031 (.021)	.018 (.021)
FT-Poor or FT-Welfare	-.000 (.000)	.002 (.004)	-.020* (.010)	-.008 (.007)	.002 (.002)	-.005* (.003)
Race	-.152 (.208)	.099 (.182)	.189 (.512)	-1.140*** (.341)	-.611*** (.127)	-.414*** (.118)
Age	.000 (.004)	-.004 (.004)	.020** (.010)	.006 (.007)	.005** (.002)	.004 (.002)
Education	-.022 (.028)	-.005 (.023)	.049 (.068)	.069 (.043)	-.035** (.017)	.004 (.015)
Income	-.005 (.013)	.012 (.013)	.039 (.031)	.012 (.024)	-.012 (.008)	.010 (.008)
Gender	.081 (.140)	-.102 (.126)	.177 (.346)	.056 (.235)	-.092 (.086)	.157* (.081)
Constant	2.258	2.642	4.007	1.941	2.264	1.709
R ²	.204	.197	.100	.188	.324	.165
N	222	235	222	235	222	235

* = p < .10; ** = p < .05; *** = p < .01

1. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.

Table 14: Reagan Trait Regression Results Using Alternative Question Forms

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable: Reagan Traits							
	COMPASSIONATE ¹		KNOWLEDGEABLE ²		CARING ³		LEADERSHIP ⁴	
	Form Poor	Form Welfare	Form Poor	Form Welfare	Form Poor	Form Welfare	Form Poor	Form Welfare
SYMPATHY	.153* (.082) ⁵	.013 (.086)	-.063 (.081)	.008 (.090)	.009 (.082)	.090 (.094)	-.021 (.081)	.047 (.092)
SPENDING	.257*** (.089)	.152** (.077)	.186** (.088)	.109 (.081)	.186* (.088)	.029 (.085)	.156* (.088)	-.006 (.088)
PERCENT-POP	-.002 (.003)	.004 (.003)	-.005* (.003)	-.009*** (.003)	.003 (.003)	.003 (.004)	-.001 (.003)	-.002 (.003)
Lib/Con	-.119*** (.039)	-.110*** (.037)	-.063 (.038)	-.046 (.038)	-.107*** (.038)	-.119*** (.041)	-.075* (.038)	-.020 (.040)
PartyID	-.086*** (.030)	-.088*** (.030)	-.097*** (.030)	-.083*** (.031)	-.166*** (.030)	-.134*** (.033)	-.108*** (.029)	-.117*** (.032)
Race	.289 (.181)	.272* (.163)	-.017 (.179)	-.086 (.172)	-.017 (.179)	.094 (.180)	.038 (.178)	.224 (.177)
Age	-.003 (.003)	.000 (.003)	.003 (.003)	.004 (.003)	-.002 (.003)	.001 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	.002 (.003)
Income	-.011 (.011)	.007 (.011)	.009 (.011)	.031** (.011)	-.006 (.010)	.028** (.013)	.008 (.011)	.021* (.012)
Gender	.136 (.122)	-.160 (.114)	-.204* (.121)	-.101 (.120)	.094 (.121)	-.163 (.126)	.147 (.120)	.290** (.124)
Constant	2.121	2.808	3.000	2.765	2.934	3.233	2.734	2.050
R ²	.196	.194	.152	.150	.262	.190	.148	.133
N	222	235	222	235	222	235	222	235

* = p < .10; ** = p < .05; *** = p < .01

1. COMPASSIONATE = V2185

2. KNOWLEDGEABLE = V2191

3. COMPASSIONATE = V2185

4. LEADERSHIP = V2188

5. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.

Table 15: The Determinants of Evaluations of Spending Levels for the Poor and Welfare Recipients

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	
	Spending for the Poor	Spending for Welfare Recipients
Sympathy for Poor or Sympathy for Welfare Rec.	-.263 ^{***} (.059)	-.147 ^{**} (.068)
% of Population-Poor or % of Population-Welfare Rec.	.000 (.002)	.001 (.003)
Income	.015 [*] (.008)	.025 ^{**} (.010)
Gov't Responsibility for Well-Being	-.117 ^{***} (.027)	-.066 ^{**} (.033)
Lib/Con	-.017 (.029)	-.063 [*] (.033)
PartyID	-.014 (.022)	-.053 ^{**} (.026)
Gender	.159 [*] (.090)	-.044 (.101)
Race	.079 (.134)	.124 (.146)
Age	-.004 (.003)	-.000 (.003)
Education	-.019 (.017)	.019 (.019)
Constant	3.761	2.456
R ²	.288	.150
N	222	235

* = p < .10; ** = p < .05; *** = p < .01

1. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.