

Spring 5-2017

The Influence of Values and Recipient Groups on Social Welfare Policy Opinion

Christopher Pulliam
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone



Part of the [Health Psychology Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pulliam, Christopher, "The Influence of Values and Recipient Groups on Social Welfare Policy Opinion" (2017). *Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects*. 1029.
https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone/1029

This Honors Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

© Christopher L. Pulliam

Abstract

The following paper examines how value-based considerations for social welfare policy opinion are affected by changes in the race of the program recipient. I propose a new model to understand social welfare policy opinion called the interactive model—where intrinsic considerations are tempered by extrinsic considerations. Through an original survey experiment, I find that humanitarianism and economic individualism do not have significant effects on social welfare policy opinion. However, egalitarianism is found to have a strong impact. When the race of the program recipient is changed from white to African-American, the impact of egalitarianism increases for views of Medicare. When the race of the program recipient is changed from white to African-American, the impact of egalitarianism decreases to zero for views of Medicaid. These results suggest that many Americans have flexible values that are influenced by outside factors when considering public policy.

Executive Summary

This project seeks to understand how values and racial resentment influence public opinion towards social welfare policy. Through an original survey experiment and regression analysis, a statistical test showing how much one variable influences another variable, this study examines three hypotheses:

- (1) The influence of humanitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is strongly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.
- (2) The influence of egalitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is unaffected when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.
- (3) The influence of economic individualism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is weakly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.

In the public opinion literature, values are a set of complementary ideas that have been found to influence individuals' views of politics and policy. Specifically, this paper deals with the values of humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism. In empirical political science, values are measured through question indices. A question index is a series of questions that when added together give the researcher a numerical value for where respondents score on a given idea. For example, a question index for the value of humanitarianism may ask respondents how much they think people should help each and how much they think people should be concerned about the well-being of their neighbor. Given the two answers provided, the researcher now has a number to represent how humanitarian a given respondent is. For

example, if there are two questions with five answer choices each, the researcher would assign the most humanitarian answer choice a value of five and the least humanitarian answer choice a value of one. If a respondent answered the choice corresponding to five on the first question, then the choice corresponding to one on the second question, then that person would score a six (five plus one) on a humanitarianism scale of ten (five plus five). In this paper, humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism are measured using indices based on the literature.

Racial resentment is also measured in this paper using an index based on the literature. Racial resentment is meant to measure subtle racial animosity expressed by whites. This index is meant to measure public sentiment exposed by George Wallace, Richard Nixon, and Ronald Reagan towards African Americans. This concept is trying to measure the sense that African Americans now live in a “color-blind” society and should just try harder and heave themselves to succeed.

Both values and racial resentment have been shown to influence social welfare policy. For this paper, social welfare policy includes Social Security, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Medicare, and Medicaid. This project measured views of social welfare policy through an original survey experiment. The survey was taken by over 500 people and measured respondents’ scores on humanitarianism, egalitarianism, economic individualism, and racial resentment. The survey also asked respondents a battery of policy opinion questions concerning social welfare policy, spending, and other policy topics. The experimental part of the survey asked respondents their view of either Medicare or Medicaid.

In survey methodology, experiments are used to isolate the effect of a single variable on another variable. Experiments are useful to determine what causes what, which is particularly hard to pin down in most social science research. A survey experiment gives each respondent

one of a set of questions at random. Each question in the randomized set is slightly different. In my study, respondents were given one of four questions at random. Respondents were asked about either Medicare with a white recipient, Medicare with an African-American recipient, Medicaid with a white recipient, or Medicaid with an African-American recipient. These four question varieties are meant to capture two things, the effect of race of the recipient on social welfare policy and the effect of age of the recipient on social welfare policy. A survey experiment is powerful because it can isolate each effect, so that they can be measured using rigorous statistical methods.

My results show that humanitarianism and economic individualism do not have significant impacts on social welfare policy; however, egalitarianism is shown to have strong impacts on social welfare policy. Notably, the influence of egalitarianism increases when the race of the program recipient is African-American and respondents are asked about Medicare. Further, the influence of egalitarianism decreases when the race of the program recipient is African-American and respondents are asked about Medicaid. These results suggest that Americans have flexible values.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Advice to Future Honors Students	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	3
Why Values?.....	3
Defining Values.....	4
Linking Values to Social Welfare Policy.....	5
Prosocial Orientations versus Norms: Humanitarianism as the Key	
Value in Explaining Social Welfare Policy Public Opinion.....	5
Racial Attitudes and Social Welfare Policy.....	8
Chapter 3: Theory.....	11
Defining Social Welfare Policy.....	11
An Interactive Model of Social Welfare Policy Opinion: Values and	
Race of the Recipient.....	11
Values: Prosocial Orientations versus Norms.....	12
Economic Individualism: Interaction with the “Lockean Liberal	
Bias”.....	13
Variables and Restatement of Hypotheses.....	14
Chapter 4: Methods.....	16
Justification of Survey Experimentation.....	16
Structure of the Survey Experiment.....	16
Values and Racial Resentment.....	19
Other Policy and Spending Questions.....	21
Survey Demographics.....	22
Regression Analysis and Variable-Coding.....	23
Experimental Sample.....	24
Regression Model.....	26
Interactive Model.....	26
Data and Results.....	27
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	34
Discussion of Hypotheses.....	34
Implications.....	34
Works Cited.....	37
Appendices.....	40

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Shana Gadarian, Professor Christopher Faricy, and Eric van der Vort for their invaluable thoughts and comments on early versions of this draft. This paper would be substantially worse without their helpful advice.

I would like to further thank Professor Gadarian for taking me on as her fourth senior thesis advisee. She helped me tremendously in the development and execution of this project. This paper would not exist without her guidance and assistance at all stages of the Capstone process.

I also received fantastic input from Professor Daniel McDowell and my fellow thesis seminar classmates. Thank you for your suggestions and encouragement. You all made this process much more enjoyable.

Thank you to the Renée Crown University Honors Program at Syracuse University. Their generous funding support enhanced this project immensely.

A heartfelt thank you also goes out to Professor Spencer Piston, who inspired my love for public opinion. Without his mentorship, I would not be the thinker and political scientist that I am today.

Many thanks are due to my support system at school, including Caitlin, Andrew, Paul, and Wyatt. Without their encouragement and jokes, I would have not completed this thesis and may have lost a small amount of my sanity.

Finally, thank you to Mom and Dad. Your love and support are endless and always greatly appreciated.

Advice to Future Honors Students

Do not be afraid.

To Robert Lane Lawson

Chapter 1

Introduction¹

What factors influence public opinion towards social welfare policy? The literature answers this question through several factors, including partisanship, ideology, values, groups, and still others. Indeed, this question has a rich scholarship, but the preexisting literature lacks a developed understanding of the influence of racial factors on value-based perspectives of public opinion toward social welfare policy. To add to the existing literature, I will focus on these two concepts: value-based explanations and racially-motivated explanations for public opinion towards social welfare policy and develop an interactive model.

Specifically, this project will draw on the work of Feldman and Steenbergen (2001), who use an index of humanitarianism to measure public opinion towards social welfare policy. This value-based measure serves as one of many indicators of social welfare policy opinion in the literature, including egalitarianism, and economic individualism.

This project seeks to better understand how values and racial attitudes that explain support and opposition for social welfare policy interact with the race of the social welfare recipient. Specifically, this paper employs experimental methods to test the effects of the race of the recipient on value-driven views of social welfare policy. This paper explores three hypotheses:

¹ This study was reviewed and approved for exemption status by the Internal Review Board of Syracuse University. Protocol number 17-068

- (1) The influence of humanitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is strongly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.
- (2) The influence of egalitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is unaffected when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.
- (3) The influence of economic individualism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is weakly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Why Values?

The political science literature has long sought to understand the underlying reasons for why individuals hold certain policy views. Converse (1964) provides perhaps the most noteworthy explanation: the public is largely non-ideological. In other words, Converse argues that the overwhelming majority of the public does not come to their policy opinions through a logically-constrained belief system.

If the public is largely devoid of coherent belief systems, then what guides public opinion? Feldman (1988) advocates for an examination of how core beliefs and values animate public opinion. Indeed, Feldman further says that a strong tradition of political analysis has contributed much of American politics to certain basic values and beliefs (1988). Some scholars have dealt with core beliefs, such as Lane (1962) and Lamb (1974), but these studies used in-depth interviews of a small number of people.

Feldman (1988) was the first to examine the idea of core beliefs animating public opinion using large-scale survey methods. He identifies three major values from the literature to examine: equality of opportunity, economic individualism, and support for the free enterprise system. He derives these three values from what Devine (1972) calls the “Lockean liberal basis of American public opinion” (Feldman, p. 419, 1988). Others have argued that these three

values are central to how people think about politics in the United States (see McClosky and Zaller, 1984; Lipset, 1979).

Defining Values

Economic individualism is defined as “the belief that people should get ahead on their own through hard work” (Feldman, p. 419, 1988). Feldman justifies this definition with a brief survey of American history, including European settlers bringing a commitment to work ethic to the New World and the powerful secular religion of work ethic in industrialized America. Further, mass opinion survey and in-depth interviews show strong evidence to support the claim that work ethic is a widespread belief in the American public (Sennet and Cobb, 1972; Lamb, 1974; Feagin, 1975; Lewis, 1978; Sniderman and Brody, 1977; Feldman, 1983; McClosky and Zaller, 1984).

Equality of opportunity is another value that Feldman considers (1988). He notes that the United States has a long tradition of valuing economic individualism and has not interpreted equality in terms of results (1988). Indeed, the value of equality of opportunity is deeply rooted in the American understanding of individualism (Devine, 1972).

Feldman also considers the value of the free enterprise system (1988). Indeed, Americans have always strongly supported this economic system (Lipset, 1979; Dobelstein, 1980; McClosky and Zaller, 1984). This strong support for the American economic system usually is coupled with distrust of government (Lipset, 1979; Devine, 1972). Additionally, it has been found that distrust of business is usually rooted in distrust of certain institutions, rather than the economic system as a whole (Lipset, 1979; Ladd and Lipset, 1980).

Feldman finds that these three values have varying levels of influence on a variety of public policy considerations. Specifically, equality of opportunity has the most significant

impact on the most issues. This value showed large influence on such policy concerns as jobs, welfare, social services, health and education, crime, and minority aid. Economic individualism also showed strong influence on many policies, but had a lesser impact than equality of opportunity. Economic individualism strongly influenced views on welfare, government action, and jobs. Free enterprise showed no significant impact on any policy tested (Feldman, 1988).

Linking Values to Social Welfare Policy

Where Feldman (1988) established the systematic large-scale measurement of values to gain insights on public opinion, Feldman and Zaller (1992) focused on the role of values in determining public opinion towards the welfare state. These scholars gave people open-ended questions to determine their views about social welfare policy questions. Most people were found to use values and principles, such as individualism, humanitarianism, and opposition to big government (Feldman and Zaller, 1992).

Other scholars have also studied the link between values and social welfare policy. Bobo finds that a sense of social responsibility is a powerful predictor of redistributive policy attitudes (1991). However, other scholars have found that self-interest also plays a role. Hansenfeld and Rafferty (1989) put forth a model where welfare support is a function of self-interest and identification with either work ethic or social equality.

Prosocial Orientations versus Norms: Humanitarianism as the Key Value in Explaining Social Welfare Policy Public Opinion

Notably, Feldman and Steenbergen (2001) depart from the past values literature by emphasizing the role of “prosocial orientations” to explain public support for social welfare policy (p. 659). Specifically, they focus on the role of humanitarianism— “the belief that people

have responsibilities toward their fellow human beings and should come to the assistance of others in need” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 659, 2001).

Feldman and Steenbergen give a good summary of the literature to support their claim that humanitarianism has long animated American history. These roots in humanitarianism reach as far back to the colonial period and were noticed by De Tocqueville. Indeed, humanitarianism explains the success of the abolition movement. Further, humanitarianism plays a special role in the American political ethos. Humanitarianism complements the idea of individualism. People should be able to work and provide on their own, but when they struggle and need help, it is okay to ask for help and morally right to aid when called on for help (see Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 660, 2001 for a discussion of American history and humanitarianism). Feldman and Steenbergen conclude that the history behind humanitarianism and the way it complements individualism make it an important component of American political life and that it does not conflict with other values (2001).

These scholars define humanitarianism as a prosocial orientation rather than a norm and rely on Staub’s definition of prosocial orientation: “a prosocial orientation consists of (a) a positive evaluation of human beings, (b) concern about their welfare, and (c) feelings of personal responsibility for people’s welfare” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 660, 2001). Further, Feldman and Steenbergen also use Eisenberg’s view that “caring, sympathetic concern, and vicarious responding to another’s emotions are frequently considered prosocial and altruistic responses” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 660, 2001). These definitions of prosocial orientation are consistent with descriptions of humanitarianism in the literature (Feldman and Steenbergen, 2001).

Feldman and Steenbergen contrast the prosocial orientation of humanitarianism with the norm of egalitarianism. “Norms or societal rules contain abstract prescriptions for the construction of social and political structures” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 661, 2001). They note that the fundamental difference between egalitarianism and humanitarianism is that caring for others does not have to be central to egalitarianism. For example, someone may be an egalitarian, but does not feel a great urge to become personally involved in helping others. The egalitarian’s views can come from abstract ideas and principles rather than empathy. Humanitarianism should thus have a strong emotional component, while egalitarianism should have more to do with cognitive processing and be closer to normative values (Feldman and Steenbergen, 2001).

These scholars measure egalitarianism through a typical set of questions to form an index based on previous work (Feldman 1988, 1999; Kluegel and Smith, 1986). The egalitarianism index can be found in Appendix I. The questions focus on a combination of equality of opportunity and equality of outcomes. Equal chances, wealth and income equality, and the justification of economic differences are all touched on in this index.

The authors use an original index for humanitarianism, with the aim of measuring “the core characteristics of prosocial orientations: (1) the belief that the well being of other people is important and (2) the belief that one bears a personal responsibility for this well being” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 663, 2001). The full list of the eight questions that make up the humanitarianism index can be found in Appendix I.

Most notably, Feldman and Steenbergen show that these two scales are different and that they predict different attitudes about social welfare policy. For example, humanitarianism is much more likely to predict views of cash welfare to the poor, whereas egalitarianism is much

more likely to predict views of taxing the rich. They conclude that high levels of humanitarianism lead to support for programs that assist the disadvantaged, while high levels of egalitarianism predict support for a broader range of policies to promote social welfare, not just assistance to the needy (Feldman and Steenbergen, 2001).

While the aforementioned literature gives a strong picture of how values influence social welfare policy, another body of literature, focused on racial attitudes, gives another compelling link to social welfare policy attitudes.

Racial Attitudes and Social Welfare Policy

This body of literature shows how racial factors influence social welfare policy preferences. Gilens (1996) uses experimental methods and finds that racial attitudes are one of the strongest predictors of whites' welfare views. Racial influences on public opinion are not limited to views on social welfare policy. Racial factors also extend to the recipient of public policy. Nelson and Kinder find that public opinion on policy is group-centric and strongly influenced by the social group receiving the benefits of the policy. This finding holds across welfare policy, AIDS spending, and affirmative action (1996).

The most powerful determinant of white opinion on welfare, affirmative action, school desegregations, and failing inner cities is racial resentment (Kinder and Sanders, 1996). The racial resentment index is a series of questions that seeks to measure a new kind of subtle racial animosity expressed by whites. This index is meant to measure the public sentiment exposed by George Wallace, Richard Nixon, and Ronald Reagan toward African Americans. To be clear, this concept is not biological racism, rather it is trying to measure a sentiment based in the idea that if only blacks would try harder, then they would succeed. Racial resentment is meant to measure the sense that African Americans now live in a "color-blind" society and should just try

harder and behave themselves to succeed (Kinder and Sanders, 1996). This index is a battery of six questions. The full index can be found in Appendix I. The index of questions is meant to measure racial resentment, but other values are present within the battery of questions. For example, some people may answer questions based on their commitment to the individual work ethic or their commitment to equal treatment. However, Kinder and Sanders argue that the only theme that runs through all six questions is resentment of blacks. The authors present evidence that there is a high degree of association between these questions. Each pair of questions was measured using Pearson correlation coefficients. They find strong correlations, “ranging from .16 to .56, and averaging .36” (Kinder and Sanders, p. 110, 1996). Therefore, the authors assert that this diverse question set does not measure miscellaneous ideas, but rather a coherent outlook of resentment towards African Americans (Kinder and Sander, 1996).

Despite rich literatures in both value and racial explanations for public opinion towards social welfare policy, no work has been done to explore how the race of the recipient influences value-based public opinion towards social welfare policy. The values literature offers an intrinsic explanation to public opinion surrounding social welfare policy. Essentially, people put different weights to different values when deciding their opinion on public policy and many people come to their opinions on social welfare policy by considering a certain set of values. In contrast to the intrinsic approach, the racial attitudes literature suggests an extrinsic model of public opinion—people formulate their opinion of social welfare policy based on group evaluations.

These two ways to think about social welfare policy seem to be at odds with each other; one evaluates inner beliefs and applies them to views on public policy, while the other evaluates groups and decides public policy views based on those group evaluations. This paper connects

these two models of public opinion and offers an interactive model of views towards social welfare policy. This interactive model seeks to explain how values—*intrinsic considerations*—are influenced by group attitudes—*extrinsic considerations*. The following model suggests that values are influenced by outside groups, thus; value-based public opinion on social welfare policy changes when racial attitudes are considered.

Chapter 3

Theory

Defining Social Welfare Policy

Social welfare policy is a broad area of public policy that encompasses efforts at the federal, state, and local level. Public policies that fall under this umbrella often include education policy, cash welfare, in-kind welfare, and refundable tax credits, among many others. For this paper, social welfare policy is defined to include Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. These are all transfer programs that are either entirely at the federal level or have significant funding from the federal government. Further, these four programs are either cash or in-kind benefits, rather than a tax credit or a policy aimed to improve education outcomes.

An Interactive Model of Social Welfare Policy Opinion: Values and Race of the Recipient

Based on the values and racial attitudes literature on public opinion towards social welfare policy, there seems to be two major models for thinking about how people reach their views on social welfare policy. First, there is the intrinsic model, where individuals weigh internal considerations, such as values. Second, there is the extrinsic model, where individuals weigh their feelings about different groups to reach their policy opinions.

This paper proposes an interactive model for social welfare policy opinion. In this model, group considerations temper value-based considerations. In other words, the extrinsic model influences the intrinsic model. When policy considerations are being made, they do not

operate in a vacuum. Individuals' views on a given public policy can be influenced by a multitude of factors, where some are consistent, while others vary based on the situation, thus resulting in inconsistent policy preferences. For example, in the case of social welfare policy, it is reasonable to hypothesize that many individuals consistently draw upon one or a combination of values, such as humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism, to make their policy choices. However, it is also reasonable to hypothesize that how a policy is presented can affect how an individual weighs internal values to reach a policy preference. This paper models this interaction by using a survey experiment and regression analysis to test the impact of an outside factor (race of the recipient) on the weight placed on a given value (humanitarianism, egalitarianism, economic individualism).

Values: Prosocial Orientations versus Norms

An important distinction in the model is how prosocial orientations respond to outside factors and how norms respond to outside factors. Based on Feldman and Steenbergen's definition of both prosocial orientations and norms, I hypothesize that humanitarianism's positive impact on views towards social welfare policy will be diminished when interacted with a change in the race of the recipient from white to African-American. Further, I hypothesize that egalitarianism's positive impact on views towards social welfare policy will be unaffected when interacted with a change in the race of the recipient from white to African-American.

Since humanitarianism is a prosocial orientation; it comes from a place of emotion and empathy. Humanitarianism is driven by the desire to help others directly, rather than from a place of abstractions. If humanitarianism is rooted in emotion, then I expect that it would be more susceptible to be influenced by an outside factor that involves the race of the recipient.

Further, humanitarianism would be more vulnerable to factors that evoke views influenced by racial resentment or group-centric considerations.

In contrast, egalitarianism is a norm; it comes from a place of abstraction and ideas. Since egalitarianism is not rooted in the desire to directly help a fellow human being, then I expect that it is less susceptible to be influenced by an outside factor that involves the race of the recipient. Egalitarianism is removed and based on abstractions, thus it would be less susceptible to influence from group-centric attitudes or racial resentment. Egalitarianism is a principle and thus, at least in theory, should be applied universally regardless of the race of the program recipient.

Economic Individualism: Interaction with the “Lockean Liberal Bias”

This paper would be incomplete without an examination of how the interactive model would affect a value that is part of the “Lockean Liberal Bias” (Feldman, p. 419, 1988). Feldman outlines three such values, equality of opportunity, economic individualism, and the free enterprise system. The egalitarianism measure used to represent a value as a norm combines elements of equality of opportunity and equality of outcome (Feldman, 1988), so it would be problematic to test equality of opportunity as well. Additionally, the value of the free enterprise showed the weakest influence on policy considerations of the three (Feldman, 1988), which makes it a less desirable measure. With these considerations in mind, economic individualism is the most reasonable value to test in the interactive model to see how Lockean Liberal Bias is affected by a change in an outside factor.

As a value, economic individualism is deeply rooted in the history of the American political ethos, as previously discussed in the literature review. Since this value is based in the history and idea of what America is, I hypothesize that economic individualism will be

susceptible to influence from an outside factor of a change of the race of the recipient from white to African-American. Since, economic individualism does not neatly fit into the category of prosocial orientation or norm, I suspect that this interaction effect will be more modest than humanitarianism.

Variables and Restatement of Hypotheses

The independent variables are racial resentment, humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism. The dependent variable is support for social welfare policy. The intervening variable is race of the recipient. I also control for age of the recipient and the effect of means-tested programs versus universal programs.

This paper treats views on Medicare and Medicaid as the dependent variables that represent broader views of social welfare policy. The main independent variables are the values of humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism. Other independent variables are tested for robustness, including racial resentment and demographic characteristics, such as age, education level, race, and gender. The intervening variable is the race of the recipient with the control being a white recipient and the treatment being an African-American recipient.

An interactive model examines the effect of values and the race of the recipient on public opinion towards social welfare policy. The model tests the following hypotheses:

- (1) The influence of humanitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is strongly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.
- (2) The influence of egalitarianism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is unaffected when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.

- (3) The influence of economic individualism on individuals' view of social welfare policy is weakly reduced when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American.

Chapter 4

Methods

Justification of Survey Experimentation

I employ a survey experiment to test my hypotheses. Survey experiments are unique in their ability to isolate a causal mechanism. The key to my project is to properly isolate the effect that the race of the social welfare recipient has on value-driven and racially driven views of social welfare policy. Using a survey experiment, I can see how individuals who score similarly on racial resentment, humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism react to the exact same situation, but with the race of the survey respondent changed. This methodological structure allows me to examine the effect of the race of the recipient on value-driven and racially driven public opinion toward social welfare policy.

Structure of the Survey Experiment

Respondents are first shown a series of eight questions to gauge their values and level of racial resentment. Participants first answer two questions to measure their level of humanitarianism, then two questions measuring economic individualism, then two questions gauging egalitarianism, and finally two questions that measure their level of racial resentment. The order of these questions was meant to ease the participant into the survey. For example, answering questions about how often one should help people (humanitarianism) is much less jarring to most people than answering questions about why African Americans are, on average, worse off than whites (racial resentment).

Following the questions on values and racial resentment, respondents are given one of the four following experimental treatments:

Medicare

<u>Control</u>	<u>Treatment</u>
<p>Medicare is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 71-year-old Jacob Mueller. Medicare is a public health insurance program.</p> <p>What is your view of Medicare?</p>	<p>Medicare is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 71-year-old DeShawn Jackson. Medicare is a public health insurance program.</p> <p>What is your view of Medicare?</p>

Medicaid

<u>Control</u>	<u>Treatment</u>
<p>Medicaid is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 24-year-old Jacob Mueller. Medicaid is a public health insurance program.</p> <p>What is your view of Medicaid?</p>	<p>Medicaid is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 24-year-old DeShawn Jackson. Medicaid is a public health insurance program.</p> <p>What is your view of Medicaid?</p>

As shown in the tables above, respondents saw a brief paragraph on either Medicare or Medicaid explaining that the public program was soon to celebrate an anniversary. The brief paragraph also mentions that this program helps a fellow American and names this person. One treatment uses the name “Jacob Mueller” and the other uses “DeShawn Jackson.” The survey experiment controls for two factors, race of the recipient and the type of the program.

Respondents received one of four brief paragraphs about the anniversary of either Medicare or Medicaid and how that program helps a white person or an African American person. I employ both Medicaid and Medicare to test whether people respond based on the age of the recipient or the fact that Medicare is a universal program while Medicaid is means-tested.

These controls are meant to isolate the effects of the race of the recipient. The race of the recipient is indicated by a name change. Through a convenience pre-test, I decided to use “Jacob Mueller” to signal a white person and “DeShawn Jackson” to signal an African American person. I then ask respondents how much they support or oppose Medicare and Medicaid. Following the experiment, I also ask the respondents several policy questions, including their views on Social Security, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), same-sex marriage, and “boots on the ground” to fight the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Additionally, respondents were asked standard demographic questions, such as race, age, education level, partisan identification, and ideological identification. For full question wordings and structure of the survey experiment, please refer to Appendix II.

Values and Racial Resentment

The independent variables, racial resentment and values, were measured through standard survey indices established in the literature. I shortened the original racial resentment battery to two questions to keep respondents engaged throughout a long survey. Specifically, I was

worried that if the survey was too long, respondents would resort to satisfying, which would negatively affect my results. There is a clear trade-off here, sacrificing the integrity of a measure to ensure that respondents stay engaged and truthful throughout the survey experiment. To mitigate this trade-off, I ensured that the two questions I used from the racial resentment index went in different directions. In other words, if people answered, “strongly agree” to the first question, then that is an indication that they have low levels of racial resentment; answering “strongly agree” to the second question, then that is an indication that they have high levels of racial resentment. Additionally, the two questions I picked are tangentially related to different ideas. The first question engages with an individual’s view of how history influences the status of a group of people. The second question engages with individuals’ commitment to the principle of individuality and hard work. These aspects of the two questions I chose help to maintain the integrity of the original racial resentment measure because they are posed in separate directions and they engage with different ideas. Part of the value of the original racial resentment index is that it engages with multiple ideas, but only measures a coherent racial resentment. I attempted to keep this part of the original measure, just on a smaller scale.

The humanitarianism measure I used comes directly from Feldman and Steenbergen (2001). Their index is meant to measure the “core characteristics of prosocial orientations: (1) the belief that the well-being of other people is important and (2) the belief that one bears a personal responsibility for this well-being” (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 663, 2001). The index they used can be found in Appendix I. This measure of humanitarianism is statistically distinct from their egalitarianism index, which can also be found in Appendix I. Finally, I also employ questions based on the economic individualism index used by Feldman (1988), which can be found in the first appendix

Similar to the racial resentment questions I use, I had to limit the number of questions for each value index. I limited each index to two questions, but was sure to pick questions that went in opposite directions. Again, the tradeoff is to avoid satisficing at the cost of the robustness of the measures. I mitigate the measurement problem by ensuring that the two questions measure the intended values in opposite directions.

Other Policy and Spending Questions

While the core of this study and the survey revolve around the value measures and experimental questions, I also asked respondents about other social welfare policies. Since my hypotheses revolve around how values influence views of social welfare policy, it is important to get multiple estimates how much values influence certain social welfare policies. Since the experimental section only focuses on Medicare and Medicaid, the other policy questions asked about other social welfare policies and spending attitudes towards these policies. Specifically, I asked for their views of Social Security and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. I also asked for their views on overall government spending, federal spending on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and TANF. These policy and spending questions are meant to further gauge respondents' views of social welfare policy more generally. Specifically, these additional dependent variables are meant to give a fuller picture of how value measures influence views on social welfare policy. The policy questions capture both health and non-health based programs (Medicare and Medicaid versus Social Security and TANF). Additionally, the policy questions capture universal or near-universal coverage and means-tested coverage (Social Security and Medicare versus TANF and Medicaid). The spending questions are meant to be yet another measure of social welfare views. Asking respondents how they feel about overall government spending versus how they feel about federal spending on certain social welfare programs. These

spending questions gauge respondents' support for these programs with the overall government spending question as a backdrop for their view of spending generally.²

The additional policy questions, specifically the questions on same-sex marriage and “boots on the ground” to fight ISIS, are meant to gauge policy views completely unrelated from social welfare policy. The primary goal of these additional policy questions is to have some context for how the value measures act in different policy contexts. For example, racial resentment and economic individualism should have almost no bearing on opinion towards same-sex marriage and “boots on the ground.” Additionally, egalitarianism and humanitarianism should have very little impact on same-sex marriage and “boots on the ground.”³

Survey Demographics

I recruited 520 people to take the survey through Amazon's Mechanical Turk workplace. The sample collected was not random and is not representative of the United States. The sample collected is largely white (79.34%), almost evenly split between males and females, biased toward younger people (over 66% under the age of 40), highly educated (56% hold at least a bachelor's degree), leans liberal (56% scored on the “left” side of the scale), and leans Democrat (56% scored on the “left” side of the scale). This convenience sample is large enough to conduct

² For example, if an individual think government spending should cut drastically, but thinks federal spending on Social Security should be cut modestly, then that individual is relatively supportive of federal spending on Social Security. Without the overall government spending measure, there is no way to account for how bias people are towards spending.

³ Racial resentment may show larger than expected influence on same-sex marriage and “boots on the ground.” While racial resentment is meant to show how people feel towards African Americans, it may also capture parts of a more general view of ethnocentrism. A measure of ethnocentrism was developed by Kinder and Kam (2009). This measure shows how much individuals dislike people who are unlike them. Kinder and Kam show that their value of ethnocentrism influences nearly every aspect of public opinion towards public policy. Since homosexuals and ISIS may represent “the other” for people and these same people may also score highly on a racial resentment, then racial resentment may show some influence over these policy views.

statistical tests and regression analysis. When appropriate, measures will be accompanied with a p-value statistical test to show statistical significance. Convention prefers statistical significance at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 levels. This paper will follow these standards and note when they are not met.

Regression Analysis and Variable-Coding

This study employs several standard ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regressions to analyze the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. In this study, there are eleven dependent variables, thus there eleven multiple regression analyses. Each regression measures the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. This measure of covariance rescaled to correlation coefficients is a powerful statistical tool to show how much one variable influences the other. Since regression rescales covariance to correlation coefficients ranging from -1 to 1, it is easy to compare the impact of variables on other variables, regardless of scaling differences.

The independent variables in the regression analyses are race of the humanitarianism, egalitarianism, economic individualism, racial resentment, education level, age, race, gender, party identification, and ideological self-placement. The race of the recipient is the treatment and is coded as a dummy variable, such that a score of zero means that the respondent received the white name (Jacob Mueller) and a score of one means that the respondent received the African-American name (DeShawn Jackson).

Humanitarianism, Egalitarianism, Economic Individualism, and Racial Resentment are all scored on a scale of ten, which is based on two questions with five choices. A high score indicates that the respondent is highly humanitarian or highly racially resentful, for example. Education level is coded on a scale of five to reflect the question choices. Age is coded on a

scale of six to reflect the question choices. Race of the respondent is treated as a dummy variable with a score of zero indicating a response of “white” and a score of one indicating a response other than “white.” Gender is also coded as a dummy variable, with zero indicating male and one indicating female. Party identification and ideological self-placement are both coded on a seven-point scale reflective of the question choices.

The dependent variables are all treated as ordinal variables with the coding reflective of the question wording. These variables are expressed as a seven-point scale based on the question choices, except for the program-specific spending questions, which are coded on a three-point scale to reflect the question choices.

Experimental Sample

520 respondents participated in the survey experiment. 250 were given the Medicare treatment, with 123 shown the control (Jacob Mueller) and 127 shown the treatment (DeShawn Jackson). 270 were given the Medicaid treatment, with 132 shown the control (Jacob Mueller) and 138 shown the treatment (DeShawn Jackson).

The following two tables show differences in views of Medicare and Medicaid among the different scores of values and racial resentment as well as how support for Medicare and Medicaid changes between the two treatments. Notably, people generally support Medicare more than Medicaid at most scores of values and racial resentment, with a few exceptions. Similarly, Medicare is seen more favorably than Medicaid regardless of the race of the recipient. Most importantly, support for Medicaid decreases slightly when respondents were given an African American name (4.38 vs. 4.28), however; support for Medicare almost remains constant in the face of a name change (4.46 vs. 4.42).

Table 1

Average Support for Medicare/Medicaid by Values

Value Score	Humanitarianism		Egalitarianism		Economic Individualism		Racial Resentment	
	Medicare	Medicaid	Medicare	Medicaid	Medicare	Medicaid	Medicare	Medicaid
2	5.00	4.00	3.18	2.70	4.67	4.88	4.89	4.80
3	4.50	5.00	4.33	3.91	5.00	4.38	4.51	4.64
4	3.89	3.8	4.24	3.14	4.68	4.68	4.44	4.55
5	4.29	3.88	4.25	4.08	4.53	4.77	4.68	4.48
6	4.15	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.30	4.36	4.14	4.24
7	4.21	3.86	4.37	4.13	4.50	4.27	4.50	3.70
8	4.46	4.38	4.49	4.55	4.62	4.30	4.27	4.21
9	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.76	4.35	3.77	3.78	3.20
10	4.76	4.66	4.91	4.82	4.03	4.19	3.95	3.88
Total	4.44	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.44	4.33

Race of the Recipient	Medicare	Medicaid
White	4.46	4.38
African-American	4.42	4.28
Total	4.44	4.33

Regression Model

As expressed in the previous section, the models used in this study are standard OLS multiple regression models.⁴ The dependent variable is represented on the left side of the equals sign. Alpha (α) represents the y-intercept for the regression equation. The betas (β_n) show a correlation coefficient—the strength of covariance rescaled to a range of -1 to 1. The error term (U_1) is interpreted to account for all other factors not included in the model. The general model is shown below:

$$\text{Dependent Variable} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Independent Variable}_1 \dots + \beta_n \text{Independent Variable}_n + U_1$$

Interactive Model

This paper also employs six interactive models to test how the race of the recipient affects the impact of humanitarianism, egalitarianism, and economic individualism on social welfare policy views. See Appendix III for the formal regression models, but they all follow this basic mold:

$$\text{Dependent Variable} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Independent Variable}_1 \times \text{Independent Variable}_2) + U_1$$

⁴ See Appendix III for all regression models written formally.

Data and Results

Table 2 shows the results of a multiple regression model run through the statistical software STATA. This model estimates the effect that humanitarianism, egalitarianism, economic individualism, racial resentment, race of the recipient, education level, age, race, gender, partisan identification, and ideological self-placement has on a respondent's view of Medicare. The sample size for this part of the survey experiment was 244.

Table 2

Population parameters	<u>Medicare</u> Regression coefficient	Standard error
Humanitarianism	0.015	0.030
Egalitarianism	0.139***	0.028
Economic Individualism	-0.002	0.025
Racial Resentment	-0.024	0.026
Race of the Recipient	-0.093	0.096
Education	-0.004	0.053
Age	0.109***	0.041
Race	0.008	0.110
Gender	0.356***	0.098
Party Identification	-0.003	0.037
Ideological Self-Placement	-0.004	0.044
Constant (α)	3.105***	0.437

Sample size = 244

Adjusted R-squared = 0.2489

*p < 0.1

**p < 0.05

***p < 0.01

Notably, humanitarianism, economic individualism, racial resentment, race of the recipient, and most demographic factors did not have a statistically significant impact on respondents' view of Medicare. Egalitarianism, age, and gender all had incredibly strong effects

on individuals' view of Medicare. Moving across the spectrum of egalitarianism raises support for Medicare by about 7%. Similarly, age increases support for Medicare by 5.5% and gender increase support by almost 18%.

These results are striking for multiple reasons. First, since racial resentment and race of the recipient do not have significant impacts on views towards Medicare, these results suggest that Medicare is not a racialized issue. Second, prosocial orientations (humanitarianism) and Liberal Lockean Bias (economic individualism) do not have an impact on the dependent variable, while norms (egalitarianism) does have a significant impact. These results suggest that views on Medicare are much more significantly determined based on principle and abstractions rather than empathy and values gained from the historical American ethos.

The significant influence of age is not surprising; since the elderly receive Medicare, older individuals will tend to support this government program more. The incredibly strong effect of gender is surprising. Perhaps women support Medicare more because traditionally women are seen as caretakers, thus they are more prone to be supportive of government healthcare.

Table 3

Population parameters	Medicaid	
	Regression coefficient	Standard error
Humanitarianism	0.039	0.038
Egalitarianism	0.180***	0.030
Economic Individualism	-0.017	0.028
Racial Resentment	-0.011	0.028
Race of the Recipient	-0.036	0.105
Education	-0.072	0.058
Age	0.044	0.046
Race	0.120	0.129
Gender	0.144	0.109
Party Identification	0.006	0.052
Ideological Self-Placement	-0.050	0.057
Constant (α)	3.068***	0.521

Sample size = 265

Adjusted R-squared = 0.3017

*p < 0.1

**p < 0.05

***p < 0.01

Table 3 shows the regression model for the dependent variable of views of Medicaid. The sample size for this part of the survey was 265. When compared to the Medicare model, similar results are seen in terms of racial attitudes and values, however; the strong effects of age and gender disappear.

In terms of racial attitudes, once again, racial resentment and race of the recipient do not have a significant impact on views of Medicaid. These results suggest that Medicaid is also not a racialized issue. Further, the values results are similar to Medicare. Prosocial orientations (humanitarianism) and Lockean Liberal Bias (Economic Individualism) do not appear to have significant influence on views of Medicaid, however; norms (egalitarianism) do appear to have a

significant impact. Indeed, egalitarianism account for 9% of support for Medicaid. These results suggest that support for Medicaid draws from principles, rather than emotion or values deeply rooted in the American political tradition. The slight increase in the effect of egalitarianism when comparing Medicare to Medicaid makes sense because Medicare is a universal program whereas Medicaid is means-tested. The egalitarianism index partly drives at equality of outcomes.

The effect of age disappears, which makes sense because Medicaid is means-tested, rather than given to everyone once they are elderly. The strong effect of gender also disappears. It is not clear why this effect would disappear.

Table 4 shows an interactive model to measure the effect of the race of the recipient interacted with values on views of Medicare. This model was run through the statistical software STATA and had a sample size of 250.

The interaction model with race of the recipient and humanitarianism did not show a strong impact on views of Medicare. The vast majority of results did not show a statistically significant impact of the interaction between race of the recipient and humanitarianism. These results suggest that there is no support for my first hypothesis, that prosocial orientations will be particularly susceptible to race of the recipient influences.

Table 4

Interactive Medicare Models					
	Regression Coefficients		Regression Coefficients		Regression Coefficients
Race of the Recipient Humanitarianism when recipient is white	-0.000	Race of the Recipient Egalitarianism when recipient is white	-1.464***	Race of the Recipient Economic Individualism when recipient is white	-0.500
3	-0.500	3	0.429	3	-0.000
4	-1.667*	4	0.558	4	-0.429
5	-0.625	5	0.429	5	-0.353
6	-0.833	6	-0.214	6	-0.591
7	-1.200	7	0.786**	7	-0.500
8	-0.321	8	1.016***	8	-0.353
9	-0.118	9	1.055***	9	-0.625
10	-0.240	10	1.219***	10	-1.059^
Race of the Recipient is African-American # Humanitarianism		Race of the Recipient is African-American # Egalitarianism		Race of the Recipient is African-American # Economic Individualism	
1 2	0 (empty)	1 3	1.921***	1 3	0.500
1 3	0 (empty)	1 4	1.358**	1 4	0.747
1 4	0.833	1 5	1.655***	1 5	0.253
1 5	-0.208	1 6	2.070***	1 6	0.273
1 6	-0.033**	1 7	1.237**	1 7	0.500
1 7	0.843	1 8	0.924*	1 8	0.453
1 8	-0.381	1 9	1.428***	1 9	0.458
1 9	-0.467	1 10	1.422***	1 10	0.676
1 10	0 (omitted)				
Constant (α)	5.000***		3.714***		5.000***

Sample size = 250

*p < 0.1

**p < 0.05

***p < 0.01

^p = 0.1

In contrast, the interaction model with race of the recipient and egalitarianism shows strong interactive influence. Most of the estimates in this model are statically significant at high

levels, especially when the race of the recipient is African-American and it is interacted with egalitarianism scores. These results are noteworthy not just because there is a strong interactive effect, but that this effect is *positive*. These strong positive interactive effects suggest that changing the race of the recipient from white to African-American *increases* the support for Medicare at all levels of egalitarianism. My second hypothesis, that norms (egalitarianism) will not be affected by a race of the recipient change, is not supported by the data.

Finally, the interaction between race of the recipient and economic individualism had similar results to the humanitarianism interactive model. There are almost no statistically significant effects in this model, which suggests that my third hypothesis, that Liberal Lockean Bias (economic individualism) will be moderately affected by a race of the recipient change, has no evidence to support it.

Table 5 shows the interactive models of race of the recipient and values on views on Medicaid, with a sample size of 270. These interactive models show a similar story to Medicare models. The humanitarianism and economic individualism models show almost no statistically significant effects on views of Medicaid, which is further evidence that my first and third hypotheses are incorrect.

Notably, the interactive Medicaid model for egalitarianism does *not* show a statistically significant impact of the interaction of race of the recipient and egalitarianism on views of Medicaid. This model shows that the positive effect of egalitarianism on views of Medicare *disappears* to zero. These results suggest that when the race of the recipient changes from white to African-American, the impact of egalitarianism on views on Medicaid is *reduced* to having no impact at all.

Table 5

<u>Interactive Medicaid Models</u>					
	Regression Coefficients		Regression Coefficients		Regression Coefficients
Race of the Recipient	0.207	Race of the Recipient	-0.0833	Race of the Recipient	0.200
Humanitarianism when race of the recipient is white		Egalitarianism when race of the recipient is white		Economic Individualism when race of the recipient is white	
3	1.000	3	1.750***	3	-0.300
4	-0.667	4	0.327	4	-0.217
5	0.143	5	1.917***	5	0.141
6	0.455	6	1.583***	6	-0.443
7	-0.167	7	1.450***	7	-0.185
8	0.286	8	1.673***	8	-0.600
9	0.833	9	1.917***	9	-0.853**
10	0.563	10	2.083***	10	-0.633
Race of the Recipient is African-American #		Race of the Recipient is African-American #		Race of the Recipient is African-American #	
Humanitarianism		Egalitarianism		Economic Individualism	
1 2	0 (empty)	1 3	-0.845	1 3	-0.450
1 3	0 (empty)	1 4	0.229	1 4	0.017
1 4	0.960	1 5	-1.083	1 5	-0.570
1 5	-0.650	1 6	-0.400	1 6	-0.194
1 6	-0.889**	1 7	-0.040	1 7	-0.765
1 7	-0.165	1 8	0.382	1 8	-0.013
1 8	-0.022	1 9	0.262	1 9	-0.585
1 9	-0.440	1 10	0.054	1 10	-0.144
1 10	0 (omitted)		0.054		
Constant (α)	4.000***		2.750***		4.800***

Sample size = 270

*p < 0.1

**p < 0.05

***p < 0.01

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Discussion of Hypotheses

The data do not support my first hypothesis that race of the recipient will strongly reduce the effect of humanitarianism on social welfare policy. This result holds across Medicare and Medicaid. Further, the data do not support my third hypothesis that race of the recipient will weakly reduce the effect of economic individualism on social welfare policy. This result also holds across Medicare and Medicaid.

Notably, the data also do not support my second hypothesis that race of the recipient will have no effect on the influence of egalitarianism on social welfare policy. In fact, for Medicare, changing the race of the recipient from white to African-American *increases* the positive influence of egalitarianism. For Medicaid however, changing the race of the recipient from white to African-American *reduced* the positive influence of egalitarianism to zero.

Implications

The data suggest that the impact of outside factors, such as race of the recipient, do not influence prosocial orientations. Further, these results suggest that an intrinsic model of public opinion that focuses on prosocial orientations is not affected by considerations in the extrinsic model.

Similarly, the data suggest that the impact of outside factors do not influence the Liberal Lockean Bias of American public opinion. The intrinsic model that focuses on this type of value also is not affected by considerations in the extrinsic model.

Most notably, the positive influence of norms (egalitarianism) increases when individuals are shown an African-American recipient when asked about Medicare, however; this positive influence is reduced to zero when respondents are asked about Medicaid. This result implies that intrinsic models of public opinion that focus on norms should seriously consider factors considered in extrinsic models. In fact, my results show that the interactive effects change based on which policy respondents are asked about.

Medicare shows a positive racial impact, while Medicaid shows a negative racial impact. This result is puzzling when one considers the extensive literature on racial attitudes and public opinion on social welfare policy. The fact that an African-American recipient increases the positive influence of egalitarianism suggests that people are especially in favor of pursuing egalitarian ends if all individuals gain from it, white and African-American, and the recipient in question is African-American. The Medicaid model suggests that people put egalitarian influences aside when the government program does not help everyone. This selective egalitarianism is noteworthy because it suggests two opposite effects depending on the nature of the program. Views on universal programs are further driven by egalitarian ideas when the recipient is African-American, while views on means-tested programs are not driven at all by egalitarian ideas when the recipient is African-American.

In terms of policy implications, my results are counterintuitive. If my results are taken at face-value, then policymakers and advocates who want to increase support for Medicare should use images of African-American individuals fortify the positive impact of egalitarianism. Further, if support for Medicaid needs to be increased, then images of white individuals should be used. If African-American people are associated with Medicaid then the positive influence of egalitarianism would be reduced to zero.

These results also imply the presence of flexible values. In theory, values should be applied universally; however, this project clearly shows that the strength of value-considerations bend to outside factors when people come to their opinions on social welfare policy. This idea of flexible values calls for further research on which values are most flexible in what circumstances and which public policies are most susceptible to influence from these flexible values.

Works Cited

- Bobo, Lawrence. 1991. "Social Responsibility, Individualism, and Redistributive Policies." *Sociological Forum* 6 (1):71-92.
- Convers, Philip E. 1964. *The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics*. In David Apter, ed., *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: Free Press
- Devine, Donald J. 1972. *The Political Culture of the United States*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Dobelstein, Andrew W. 1980. *Politics, Economics, and Public Welfare*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Feagin, Joe R. 1975. *Subordinating the Poor*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Feldman, Stanley. 1983. Economic Individualism and American Public Opinion. *American Politics Quarterly*. 11:3-30.
- Feldman, Stanley. 1988. "Structure and Consistency in Public Opinion: The Role of Core Beliefs and Values." *American Journal of Political Science* 32 (2):416-40.
- Feldman, Stanley. 1999. "Economic Values and Inequality." In *Measures of Political Attitudes*, ed. John P. Robinson, Philip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman. New York: Academic Press.
- Feldman, Stanley, and Marco R. Steenbergen. 2001. "The Humanitarian Foundation of Public Support for Social Welfare." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (3):658-77.
- Feldman, Stanley, and John Zaller. 1992. "The Political Culture of Ambivalence: Ideological Responses to the Welfare State." *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (1):268-307.
- Gilens, Martin. 1996. "'Race Coding' and White Opposition to Welfare." *The American Political Science Review* 90 (3):593-604.

- Hasenfeld, Yeheskel, and Jane A. Rafferty. 1989. "The Determinants of Public Attitudes Toward the Welfare State." *Social Forces* 67 (4):1027-48.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Cindy D. Kam. 2009. *Us Against them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kluegel, James R., and Elliot R. Smith. 1986. *Beliefs About Inequality: Americans' Views of What Is and What Ought to Be*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Ladd, Everett Carl, and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1980. "Public Opinion and Public Policy." In Peter Duignan and Alvin Rabushka, eds., *The United States in the 1980s*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution.
- Lamb, Karl A. 1974. *As Orange Goes*. New York: Norton.
- Lane, Robert E. 1962. *Political Ideology*. New York: Free Press.
- Lewis, Michael, 1978. *The Culture of Inequality*. New York: Meridian.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1979. *The First New Nation*. New York: Norton.
- McClosky, Herbert, and John Zaller. 1984. *The American Ethos*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nelson, Thomas E., and Donald R. Kinder. 1996. "Issue Frames and Group-Centrism in American Public Opinion." *The Journal of Politics* 58 (4):1055-78.
- Peffley, Mark, and Jon Hurwitz. 2007. "Persuasion and Resistance: Race and the Death Penalty in America." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (4):996-1012.
- Sennet, Richard, and Jonathan Cobb. 1972. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Random House.

Sniderman, Paul M., and Richard A. Brody. 1977. "Coping: The Ethic of Self-Reliance." *American Journal of Political Science*. 63:501-523.

Appendix I

Racial Resentment

Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.

Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.

Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.

Most blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried.

Government officials usually pay less attention to a request or complaint from a black person than from a white person (Kinder and Sanders, p. 106, 1996).

Humanitarianism

- (1) One should always find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
- (2) It is better not to be too kind to people, because kindness will only be abused.
- (3) The dignity and welfare of people should be the most important concern in any society.
- (4) People tend to pay more attention to the well-being of others than they should
- (5) All people who are unable to provide for their basic needs should be helped by others.
- (6) One of the problems of today's society is that we are often too kind to people who don't deserve it.
- (7) A person should always be concerned about the well-being of others.
- (8) I believe it is best not to get involved taking care of other people's needs. (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 664, 2001)

Egalitarianism

- (1) One of the biggest problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance.
- (2) If wealth were more equal in this country we would have many fewer problems.
- (3) We have gone too far in pushing equality in this country.

- (4) All in all, I think economic differences in this country are justified.
- (5) More equality of income would allow most people to live better.
- (6) Incomes should be more equal because every family's needs for food, housing, and so on, are the same.
- (7) This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are.
- (8) Incomes cannot be made more equal since people's abilities and talents are unequal. (Feldman and Steenbergen, p. 663 2001).

Economic Individualism

1. Any person who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
2. Hard work offers little guarantee of success.
3. Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame.
4. Even if people are ambitious, they often cannot succeed.
5. If people work hard, they almost always get what they want.
6. Even if people try hard, they often cannot reach their goals. (Feldman, p. 421, 1988)

Appendix II

Survey Questions

1. One should always find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree

2. It is better not to be too kind to people, because kindness will only be abused.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree

3. Any person who is willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree

4. Hard work offers little guarantee of success.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree
5. If wealth were more equal in this country, we would have many fewer problems.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree
6. This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree
7. Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree
8. It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree somewhat
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree somewhat
 - Strongly disagree

Please read the following passage about the anniversary of Medicare.⁵

9. Medicare is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 71-year-old Jacob Mueller. Medicare is a public health insurance program.

What is your view of Medicare?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

⁵ Respondents were randomly assigned to answer one question from questions nine through twelve. This randomized section is meant to isolate the effects of the race of the recipient group on individuals' view of Medicare or Medicaid. Respondents answered a question about either Medicare or Medicaid and regarding Jacob Mueller or DeShawn Jackson.

Please read the following passage about the anniversary of Medicare.

10. Medicare is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 71-year-old DeShawn Jackson. Medicare is a public health insurance program.

What is your view of Medicare?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

Please read the following passage about the anniversary of Medicaid.

11. Medicaid is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 24-year-old Jacob Mueller. Medicaid is a public health insurance program.

What is your view of Medicaid?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

Please read the following passage about the anniversary of Medicaid.

12. Medicaid is celebrating its 52nd anniversary in 2017. This program provides millions of Americans with health insurance every year, such as 24-year-old DeShawn Jackson. Medicaid is a public health insurance program.

What is your view of Medicaid?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

13. What is your view of Social Security?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

14. What is your view of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

15. Overall, do you support or oppose allowing gays and lesbians to marry legally?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

16. Would you support or oppose the U.S. sending ground troops to fight ISIS in Iraq and Syria?

- Strongly support
- Support somewhat
- Neither support nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

17. Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending.

Where would you place yourself on this scale?

- 1 (Cut Services/Spending)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- 6
 - 7 (More Services/Spending)
18. Should federal spending on Medicare be increased, decreased or kept about the same?
- Increased
 - Kept about the same
 - Decreased
19. Should federal spending on Medicaid be increased, decreased or kept about the same?
- Increased
 - Kept about the same
 - Decreased
20. Should federal spending on Social Security be increased, decreased or kept about the same?
- Increased
 - Kept about the same
 - Decreased
21. Should federal spending on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) be increased, decreased or kept about the same?
- Increased
 - Kept about the same
 - Decreased
22. Which given racial or ethnic group(s) do you identify closest with? (Check all that apply)
- White

- Black or African-American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic/Latino
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Other

23. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

24. What is your age?

- 18-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61-70
- 70+

25. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- Some high school
- High school graduate or equivalent
- Some college or associates degree

- Bachelor's degree
- Graduate/professional degree

26. Where would you place yourself on the following ideological scale?

- Extremely liberal
- Liberal
- Slightly liberal
- Moderate; middle of the road
- Slightly conservative
- Conservative
- Extremely conservative

27. Where would you place yourself on the following partisan scale?

- Strong Democrat
- Not very strong Democrat
- Independent who leans Democrat
- Independent
- Independent who leans Republican
- Not very strong Republican
- Strong Republican

Appendix III

Regression Models

Experimental—Medicare and Medicaid

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Medicare} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{Egalitarianism} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{Race of the Recipient} + \beta_6 \\ & \text{Education Level} + \beta_7 \text{Age} + \beta_8 \text{Race} + \beta_9 \text{Gender} + \beta_{10} \text{Party Identification} + \beta_{11} \\ & \text{Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Medicaid} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{Egalitarianism} + \beta_3 \text{Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{Racial} \\ & \text{Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{Race of the Recipient} + \beta_6 \text{Education Level} + \beta_7 \text{Age} + \beta_8 \text{Race} + \beta_9 \\ & \text{Gender} + \beta_{10} \text{Party Identification} + \beta_{11} \text{Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

Interactions

$$\text{Medicare} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Humanitarianism}) + U_1$$

$$\text{Medicare} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Egalitarianism}) + U_1$$

$$\text{Medicare} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Economic Individualism}) + U_1$$

$$\text{Medicaid} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Humanitarianism}) + U_1$$

$$\text{Medicaid} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Egalitarianism}) + U_1$$

$$\text{Medicaid} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{Race of the Recipient} \times \text{Economic Individualism}) + U_1$$

Social Welfare Policy Views—Social Security and TANF

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Social Security} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \\ & \text{Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party} \\ & \text{Identification} + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Temporary Assistance for Needy Families} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{ Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} \\ & + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party Identification} + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

Other Policy Views—ISIS and Marriage

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ISIS or Boots on the Ground} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{ Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} \\ & + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party Identification} + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Marriage} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{ Racial} \\ & \text{Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party Identification} \\ & + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

Spending

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Spending} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{ Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} \\ & + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party Identification} + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Medicare Spending} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{ Economic Individualism} + \beta_4 \text{ Racial Resentment} + \beta_5 \text{ Education Level} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} \\ & + \beta_7 \text{ Race} + \beta_8 \text{ Gender} + \beta_9 \text{ Party Identification} + \beta_{10} \text{ Ideological Self-Placement} + U_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Medicaid Spending} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Humanitarianism} + \beta_2 \text{ Egalitarianism}$$

+ β_3 Economic Individualism + β_4 Racial Resentment + β_5 Education Level + β_6 Age
 + β_7 Race + β_8 Gender + β_9 Party Identification + β_{10} Ideological Self-Placement + U_1

Social Security Spending = α + β_1 Humanitarianism + β_2 Egalitarianism + β_3 Economic
 Individualism + β_4 Racial Resentment + β_5 Education Level + β_6 Age + β_7 Race + β_8
 Gender + β_9 Party Identification + β_{10} Ideological Self-Placement + U_1

TANF Spending = α + β_1 Humanitarianism + β_2 Egalitarianism + β_3 Economic Individualism
 + β_4 Racial Resentment + β_5 Education Level + β_6 Age + β_7 Race + β_8 Gender + β_9 Party
 Identification + β_{10} Ideological Self-Placement + U_1