

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Endogenous Variables

Authoritarianism: Constructed from responses to a series of three items (*au1*, *au4*, *au6*), as follows: “Our next qualities are about children. I’m going to read pairs of qualities that one might try to encourage in children. As I read each pair, please tell me which one you think is more important to encourage in a child. If you absolutely had to choose, would you say it is more important that a child obeys his parents, or that he is responsible for his own actions?”; “Is it more important that a child has respect for his elders, or that he thinks for himself?”; “Is it more important that a child follows his own conscience, or that he follows the rules?” (On each item, responses of “both equally important” and missing values were set to the midpoint). From these three items a simple additive scale was formed, summing the number of authoritarian choices (obeys parents, respect for elders, follows the rules) that the respondent made. Rescored to be of one-unit range, and then centered on a mean of ‘0’.

Political Conservatism: Formed from responses to the standard series of questions: “Generally speaking, would you consider yourself to be a liberal, a conservative, a moderate, or haven’t you thought much about this?” (*ideo*), followed by either “Do you think of yourself as a strong liberal/conservative or a not very strong liberal/conservative?” (*lib/cons*) or “Do you think of yourself as more like a liberal or more like a conservative?” (*ide2*), as appropriate. In constructing the final scale, great pains were taken to retain all respondents by imputing reasonable values for missing responses. Otherwise, one would lose nearly a third of the respondents (a critical deficit for such a complex experiment), and invite serious selection bias e.g. disproportionately retaining educated and knowledgeable respondents (attributes that are inversely related to authoritarianism). The end result was a nine-point scale ranging from ‘0’ (strong liberal) to ‘1’ (strong conservative), which was then centered on a mean of ‘0’. Further details available on request.

‘Right-Wing’ Party Identification: A seven-point scale ranging across “strong Democrat”, “not very strong Democrat”, “Independent, closer to Democrats”, “Independent”, “Independent, closer to Republicans” and “not very strong Republican” up to “strong Republican” (Republican scored high). The measure was formed from responses to the standard series of questions: “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?” (*pid*), followed by either (for self-reported partisans) “Would you call yourself a strong Democrat/Republican or a not very strong Democrat/Republican?” (*pid1/pid2*), or else (for those calling themselves “Independent”, or claiming no preference or some other preference) “Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or closer to the Republican Party?” (*pid3*). As with the measure of political ideology, great pains were taken to retain all respondents by inferring likely location on the partisanship scale when left with incomplete information. Thus the “not very strong” category includes those who claimed that affiliation but did not know or refused to say how strongly they held it. And the “Independent” category, which captures “pure” self-professed Independents as well as those who reported no preference or some other

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

preference, also includes those who did not know or refused to say how they thought of themselves. Final measure rescored to be of one-unit range.

Opposes Racial Quotas in University Admissions: A dummy variable scored '1' (otherwise '0') if respondent answered "against" to the item (*kg2a*): "Another controversial issue is the use of quotas to improve educational opportunities for minorities. Suppose the percentage of Blacks in the state university is far lower than the percentage of Blacks in the state. Would you be for or against establishing quotas to guarantee Blacks better representation in the school?"

Right to Keep Blacks Out of Neighborhood: Dichotomous variable constructed from "How much do you agree or disagree with this statement? White people have a right to keep Blacks out of their neighborhoods if they want to, and Blacks should respect that right. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly?" (*kn4*). Responses scored '0' if "disagree strongly", otherwise '1'.

Government Should Ban Speech: Dichotomous variable constructed from "There are always some people (with particular ideas/whose ideas are considered violent or dangerous by other people/whose ideas are unpopular among normal people). For instance, think about (a super-patriot militia type/a communist). If such a person wanted to make a speech in your community arguing (that we should do away with the federal government and have local civilian militia run the country/that we should do away with the capitalist system and have the government run the economy), should he be banned by the government from making a speech, or not?" (*kn2a*) and "Do you feel very strongly or somewhat strongly about that?" (*kn2b*). Responses scored '0' if "feel very strongly, should not be banned", otherwise '1'. Note that the analyses involving this dependent variable include a dummy independent variable distinguishing between the two different (randomly assigned) targets (militia type v. communist), which is then held at "militia" in all subsequent calculations.

Prayer in Public Schools: Dichotomous variable constructed from "How do you (feel about/feel about local government requiring) prayer in public schools? Do you approve strongly, approve somewhat, disapprove somewhat, or disapprove strongly?" (*kn3*). Responses scored '1' if "approve strongly", otherwise '0'. Note that the analyses involving this dependent variable include a dummy independent variable distinguishing between the two different (randomly assigned) question versions (mere approval v. requirement of school prayer), which is then held at "require" in all subsequent calculations.

Racial intolerance/ethnocentrism: A scale reflecting overall racial intolerance/ethnocentrism, constructed by averaging across whichever of the following three variables were measured for the respondent, and re-scoring the result to range from '0' to '1':

- (i) Right To Keep Blacks Out: as described earlier.
- (ii) Prefers the Ku Klux Klan/Nazis: A dummy variable (1/0) indicating that respondent chose "Gay Rights Activists" or "Communists" in response to the query: "Now I'm going to read a list of groups in politics. After I read the list, please tell me which group you like the least: The Ku Klux Klan; Nazis; Gay Rights Activists; Communists" (*llka/llkc*). Note that (since these groups are arrayed in order of their expected repugnance to Americans, based upon prior experience), if

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

respondents selected more than one group from the list and couldn't choose between them, the interviewers were instructed in the next item (*llkb/llkd*) to 'assign' them (in order to have a single group to consider for the tolerance judgments that would follow) to whichever of their disliked groups appears first in the foregoing list (see question wording above). Likewise, if respondents refused to answer, or didn't know which group they liked least, they were 'assigned' to the Ku Klux Klan. Thus, respondents would only score '1' on my dummy variable if they actively selected either Gays Rights Activists or Communists, or both, as their least liked group(s), presumably finding them, then, more abhorrent than both Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan.

(iii) Being an American: A dummy variable (1/0) indicating that in response to the query "How important is being an American to you, where '0' is not at all important and '10' is the most important thing in your life?" (*wr2a*), the respondent placed him/herself at the scale maximum, professing it to be "the most important thing" in his/her life. (Note that non-Americans are missing values on this item).

Political Intolerance: A scale reflecting overall political intolerance, constructed by averaging across whichever of the following three variables were measured for the respondent, and re-scoring the result to range from '0' to '1':

(i) Government Should Ban Speech: as described earlier.

(ii) Not Allowed to Make Speech: The extent (strongly/somewhat) of respondent's agreement/disagreement with the statement "X should be allowed to make a speech in your city to protest against the government" (*jh1*), where the interviewer (by random assignment) substitutes for X either "people like you", "people", or the name of the respondent's least liked group (see protocol for the least-liked group, above). Responses arrayed along a five-point scale from '0' to '1', with intolerance scoring high, and 'don't know'/'refuse' responses at the mid-point.

(iii) Not Allowed to Hold Rally: Follows the item above with the same format and scoring, but this time asking whether "X should be allowed to hold public rallies in your city to protest against the government" (*jh2*).

Moral Intolerance: A scale reflecting overall moral intolerance, constructed by averaging across whichever of the following three variables were measured for the respondent, and re-scoring the result to range from '0' to '1':

(i) Prayer in Public Schools: as described earlier.

(ii) Encourage Belief in God: Constructed from respondent's choice between "How about encouraging belief in God or a modern scientific outlook?" (*pg6a*), and response to the follow-up, "Would you say that (insert their choice) is much more important, somewhat more important, or only a little more important than (insert alternative)?" (*pg6b*). A seven-point scale ranging from '0' to '1' was formed from responses to these two questions, with "belief in God" scored high, and 'don't know'/'refuse' responses at the mid-point.

(iii) Opposition to Partner Insurance: A measure constructed from the two items, "Some people say that if the federal government and many businesses provide health insurance to unmarried domestic partners, it would encourage a lack of respect for marriage. What do you think? Do you agree or disagree with the idea that this kind of policy would encourage a lack of respect for marriage?" (*dc4d*), and "Are you in favor of or opposed to the federal government and many businesses providing health insurance benefits to the unmarried domestic partners of their

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

employees?” (*dc4f*). For each item responses indicating opposition to partner insurance were coded ‘1’, expressions of support were coded ‘0’, and responses of ‘don’t know’/‘refuse’ were coded ‘.5’. The two items were then summed and the result re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Punitiveness: A scale reflecting overall punitiveness, constructed by averaging across whichever of the following three variables were measured for the respondent, and re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’:

(i) Do What It Takes To Stop Crime: Constructed from a single item (*ps3a*) in which respondents were asked to indicate how much (strongly/somewhat) they agreed or disagreed with (by random assignment) one of the following two statements: ‘In dealing with the problem of street crime, it is important for police to protect the rights of those accused of committing a crime, even if this gets in the way of stopping these crimes’, or ‘In dealing with the problem of street crime, it is important for police to do what it takes to stop these crimes, even if this violates the rights of those accused of committing a crime’. Taking account of the question version to which a respondent had been assigned responses were arrayed across five points, where strong agreement with the priority of protecting the accused (or alternately, strong disagreement with the priority of stopping crime) scored the scale minimum of ‘0’, some agreement with protecting the accused (or some disagreement with the priority of stopping crime) scored ‘.25’, responses of ‘don’t know’ or ‘refuse to say’ scored ‘.5’, some disagreement with protecting the accused (or some agreement with stopping crime) scored ‘.75’, and strong disagreement with protecting the accused (or strong agreement with stopping crime) scored the scale maximum of ‘1’.

(ii) More Important When Dealing With Crime: Constructed from responses to two items, “Which would you say is more important when it comes to dealing with the problem of street crime -- for the police to do what it takes to stop these crimes, or to protect the rights of those accused of committing a crime?” (*ps3b*), followed up by “Would you say that (insert their choice) is much more important, somewhat more important, or only a little more important than (insert alternative)?” (*ps3d/psd3*). Weighting respondents’ priorities by their professed importance yielded a seven-point scale ranging from a low of ‘0’ (“much more important” to “protect the accused”) to a high of ‘1’ (“much more important” to “do what it takes”), with those who couldn’t choose, didn’t know or wouldn’t reveal their priorities scoring ‘.5’.

(iii) Law and Order v. Individual Freedom: Constructed from respondent’s choice between ‘How about guaranteeing law and order in society or guaranteeing individual freedom?’ (*pg2a*), and response to the follow-up, “Would you say that (insert their choice) is much more important, somewhat more important, or only a little more important than (insert alternative)?” (*pg2b*). A seven-point scale (scored ‘0’ to ‘1’) was formed from responses to these two questions, with priority on ‘law and order’ scored high, and responses of ‘don’t know’/‘refuse’ at the mid-point.

General Intolerance: A scale reflecting general intolerance, constructed by averaging across whichever of the 12 intolerance variables (described immediately above) were measured for the respondent, and re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Explanatory Variables

Negative/Positive Arousal: A scale indicating the direction and intensity of emotional reactions to my experimental stimulus stories, constructed from responses to: ‘Now I’m going to read a list

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

of words. After I've read them, please tell me which one best describes how (you/that news story makes you) feel about the country. Proud, angry, hopeful, worried, excited, afraid" (*st2a*) then "Do you feel very (insert emotion) or somewhat (insert emotion)?" (*st2b*). (Note that respondents in the control condition were asked simply how they feel about the country, since they were not exposed to any news story). From responses to these two questions a five-point scale was formed, ranging from '0' for "very proud/hopeful/excited" up to '1' for "very angry/worried/afraid", with neutral responses at the mid-point. The scale was then centered on a mean of '0'.

Political Knowledge: The number of correct responses to seven political knowledge items (*inf1-inf7*), specifically: "Which party has the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington?"; "How much of a majority is required for the U.S. Senate and Ho use of Representatives to override a presidential veto – one-half plus one vote, three-fifths, two-thirds, or three quarters?"; "In general, thinking about the political parties in Washington, would you say Democrats are more conservative than Republicans, or Republicans are more conservative than Democrats?"; "Whose responsibility is it to determine if a law is constitutional or not – is it the President, Congress, or the Supreme Court?"; "How many four year terms can the President of the United States serve?"; "How many members of the U.S. Supreme Court are there?"; and "What political office is now held by Al Gore?". Rescored to range from '0' to '1'.

Education level: Respondents assigned by interviewer to the categories 'eighth grade or lower', 'some high school', 'high school graduate (or GED)', 'some college', 'college graduate', 'some graduate work or graduate degree', based on responses to the question: "What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?" (*educ*). Used in the analysis as an ordinal six-point scale ranging from '0' to '1', with missing values imputed (predicted) using a set of 16 exogenous variables.

Any college degree: coldg

Income: Self-reported 1997 before-tax household income, in thousands of dollars (missing values re-scored to the median). Generated by the author from an ordinal variable (*isum*) supplied by the administrators of the *MIS99*, itself formed from responses to a series of questions asking whether household income was "above or below" a certain amount.

Full-time in the workforce: fullt

Age: Age in years, generated from "How old were you on your last birthday?" (*age*), with missing values re-scored to the median.

Male: Dummy variable scored '1' for males, '0' for females (*sex*).

Urban / Suburban / Rural: A set of dummy variables (scored 1/0) formed from responses to "Which of the following best describes the area you live in – urban, rural, or suburban?" (*urbn*), with missing values included in the modal category 'suburban'.

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Resides in the South: South

Homeowner: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent answers ‘yes’ to “ Do you own your own home (or are you buying it)?” (*dc5f*), otherwise ‘0’.

Number of children in residence: Self-reported number of “people, age 17 or younger” living with respondent (*hh2*).

Single parent: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent reports both that he/she is the only adult in residence (*hha*), and that one or more children live with the respondent (*hh2*), otherwise ‘0’.

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Table B.1: Univariate Statistics

Endogenous Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.35)	-.67 -- .33
Political conservatism (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.29)	-.63 -- .37
'Right-wing' party identification (<i>Republican high</i>)	.51(.33)	0 -- 1
Racial intolerance/ethnocentrism	.34(.32)	0 – 1
Political intolerance	.36(.35)	0 – 1
Moral intolerance	.64(.34)	0 – 1
Punitiveness	.58(.29)	0 – 1
General intolerance of difference	.47(.21)	0 – 1
<i>Categorical Variables</i>	<i>% in category</i>	
Opposes Racial Quotas in University Admissions	66.0%	
Objects to Blacks in neighborhood (<i>N=427</i>)	27.87%	
Government should ban speech (<i>N=427</i>)	56.21%	
	62.67% if 'militia'	
	49.52% if ' communist'	
Prayer in public schools (<i>N=413</i>)	36.56%	
	27.86% if 'required'	
	44.81% if ' approve'	
Explanatory Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.17)	-.44 -- .56
Political conservatism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.17)	-.48 -- .52
Negative/positive arousal	.00(.32)	-.46 -- .54
*Political knowledge	.66(.24)	0 – 1
Education level	.60(.24)	0 – 1
Income (<i>1000s</i>)	51.74(30.94)	5 – 112.5
Age (<i>years</i>)	46.62(16.64)	18 – 85
*Number of children in residence	.58(1.00)	0 – 6
<i>Categorical Variables</i>	<i>% in category</i>	
Male	46.21%	
Urban / Suburban / Rural	28.55% / 38.98% / 32.46%	
resides in the South	29.62%	
Homeowner	74.05%	
*Single parent	4.86%	
any college degree	33.65%	
full-time in the workforce	62.91%	

Source: *MIS99*, Whites only; N=844 unless otherwise indicated.

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Table B.2: Determinants of Authoritarianism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, adding threats/reassurances
Political Conservatism (<i>instrument</i>) _a		.33(.14)**	.35(.14)**
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Political knowledge	-.19(.05)**	-.15(.05)**	-.14(.05)**
Education level	-.29(.06)**	-.16(.08)**	-.19(.08)**
Income (1000s)	-.0009(.0004)**	-.0006(.0004)*	-.0006(.0004)*
Age (years)	.0051(.0007)**	.0043(.0008)**	.0044(.0008)**
Male	.08(.02)**	.05(.03)**	.05(.03)**
Urban v. rural	-.05(.03)**	-.02(.03)	-.02(.03)
Suburban v. rural	-.06(.03)**	-.05(.03)**	-.05(.03)**
Homeowner	.06(.03)**	--	--
Number of children in residence	.0150(.0122)	--	--
Single parent	.02(.05)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
<i>Experimental Threat/Reassurance Conditions_b</i>			
Belief diversity			--
Belief consensus			-.07(.06)
Stable diversity			-.03(.05)
Changing together			.12(.03)**
Bad leadership			--
Good leadership			--
Economic decline			--
Economic growth			--
Blacks gaining			--
Whites gaining			--
<i>Political Conservatism_a*Threat/Reassurance_b</i>			
Conservatism*belief diversity			--
Conservatism*belief consensus			--
Conservatism*stable diversity			-.43(.23)**
Conservatism*changing together			-.63(.22)**
Conservatism*bad leadership			--
Conservatism*good leadership			--
Conservatism*economic decline			--
Conservatism*economic growth			--
Conservatism*Blacks gaining			--
Conservatism*Whites gaining			--
Constant	.05(.05)	.03(.05)	.04(.05)
R ²	.20	.20	.21

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table B.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table B.3, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for political conservatism.

_b Note that here the dichotomous variables indicating threat/reassurance experimental conditions naturally score '1' only if respondent is subjected to that condition *and* has his/her authoritarianism measured subsequently (post- rather than pre-threat/reassurance), otherwise '0'.

Source: MIS99, Whites only; N=844.

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Table B.3: Determinants of Political Conservatism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, adding threats/reassurances
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>) _a		.67(.10)**	.65(.11)**
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Political knowledge	-.06(.05)	.07(.05)	.07(.05)
Education level	-.23(.05)**	--	--
Income (1000s)	-.0005(.0004)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
Age (years)	.0014(.0007)**	-.0022(.0009)**	-.0023(.0010)**
Male	.06(.02)**	--	--
Urban v. rural	-.06(.03)**	--	--
Suburban v. rural	-.03(.02)*	--	--
Homeowner	.09(.03)**	.05(.02)**	.05(.02)**
Number of children in residence	.0282(.0093)**	.0193(.0094)**	.0177(.0094)*
Single parent	-.07(.04)**	-.09(.05)**	-.10(.05)**
<i>Experimental Threat/Reassurance Conditions</i>			
Belief diversity			-.03(.03)
Belief consensus			--
Stable diversity			-.08(.03)**
Changing together			-.05(.03)
Bad leadership			-.08(.04)**
Good leadership			--
Economic decline			-.05(.03)
Economic growth			-.06(.04)
Blacks gaining			--
Whites gaining			--
<i>Authoritarianism_a*Threat/Reassurance</i>			
Authoritarianism*belief diversity			.35(.15)**
Authoritarianism*belief consensus			--
Authoritarianism*stable diversity			--
Authoritarianism*changing together			-.29(.23)*
Authoritarianism*bad leadership			.24(.17)*
Authoritarianism*good leadership			--
Authoritarianism*economic decline			--
Authoritarianism*economic growth			--
Authoritarianism*Blacks gaining			--
Authoritarianism*Whites gaining			--
Constant	.06(.05)	.01(.04)	.05(.04)
R ²	.11	.11	.13

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table B.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table B.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism.

Source: MIS99, Whites only, N=844.

Appendix B: Multi-Investigator Study 1999

Table B.4: The Interaction of Authoritarianism and Political Conservatism on 'Right-Wing' Party Identification and Opposition to Affirmative Action

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	'Right-Wing' Party Identification	Opposes Racial Quotas in Univ. Admissions _c
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>) _a	-.60(.14)**	-1.85(.96)**
Political Conservatism (<i>instrument</i>) _b	.52(.13)**	2.50(1.17)**
Authoritarianism _a *Conservatism _b	-.82(.30)**	-4.20(2.28)*
constant	.53(.01)**	.94(.17)**
(Pseudo-)R ² (with conservatism only)	.00	.04
(Pseudo-)R ² (adding authoritarianism)	.03	.04
Log likelihood (with conservatism only)		-521.26
Log likelihood (adding authoritarianism)		-517.07
% correctly predicted (with conservatism only)		67.30%
% correctly predicted (adding authoritarianism)		67.42%
Improved prediction cf. naive model (cons. only)		+1.97%
Improved prediction cf. naive model (adds auth.)		+2.15%

Note: Cell entries are (column 2) unstandardized regression coefficients, and (column 3) logit coefficients, from multivariate analyses (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). See Table B.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table B.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism.

_b See Table B.3, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for political conservatism.

_c This analysis also tested and, where necessary, controlled for any effects upon the dependent variable of experimental manipulations within this section and those that preceded it. Full details available from author upon request.

Source: MIS99, Whites only, N=844.