

Author(s): Markus, Gregory

Title: Measuring Popular Individualism

Date: February 1, 1990

Dataset(s): 1988 National Election Study, 1989 Pilot Study

Abstract

Markus describes the performance of the 1989 Pilot Study items designed to measure individualism on both abstract and domain-specific levels. Markus finds: (1) Bivariate correlation analysis and factor analysis uncover four dimensions of individualism -- personal autonomy, self-reliance, limited government, and laissez-faire capitalism. Scales constructed along these four dimensions are reliable and distinct from one another. (2) The individualism subscales correlate sensibly with measures of other political attitudes and orientations. (3) Correlation analysis indicates that the individualism scales are not equivalent to the NES political orientation scales. (4) The individualism subscales often outperform ideological self identification and party identification as predictors of political variables. (5) Contrary to expectation, pluralities -- and often majorities -- of respondents reject individualistic alternatives on both abstract and specific levels. Markus also prepared an addendum to his report in which he finds that: (1) The four individualism subscales are significant predictors of a wide range of policy preferences and feeling thermometer ratings, even when other values, ideological leanings, and partisanship orientations are taken into account. (2) The different components of individualism tend to come into play in distinct issue domains. Specifically, "limited government" is linked primarily to welfare spending items, "personal autonomy" to civil liberty issues, "self-reliance" to affirmative action policy preferences, and "laissez-faire" to business issues. (3) Within each of the policy domains examined by Markus, at least some of the individualism subscales are more potent than either ideological self-placement or party identification scales in predicting criterion variables. (4) Two of the four subscales -- self-reliance and limited government -- prove to be important predictors of vote choice in 1988.

February 1, 1990

MEMO TO: NES Pilot Study Committee
FROM: Greg Markus
SUBJECT: Measuring Popular Individualism

Introduction

Ever since Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States more than 150 years ago, political observers have been fascinated by the enduring centrality of individualistic values to the American ethos. The consensus among these observers, whether they be critics or celebrants, is that most Americans cleave to the ideals of self-reliance and liberation from the unwelcome constraints of formal governmental and economic institutions. Dolbeare and Metcalfe (1988) summed it up when they wrote: "Probably no country in the world has as deep a cultural commitment to individualism as the United States." And Garry Wills (1987) has argued forcefully that Ronald Reagan won two overwhelming electoral victories (and helped set up George Bush for a third) in part by making the "individualist fantasy" all the more believable by believing in it so thoroughly himself.

Despite--or perhaps because of--its robustness, individualism has been under attack on a number of fronts lately. Sociologists and clinicians decry the damage to American culture and mental health that has been inflicted by the materialistic and narcissistic excesses of the "Me Decade." Political theorists argue that a declining sense of community endangers collective action in pursuit of equality of legal rights and economic opportunity. Feminist scholars criticize what they interpret to be antifeminist strains beneath the surface of individualistic values. Others, most notably Robert N. Bellah and his co-authors of *Habits of the Heart* (1985), are deeply concerned that the eclipse of communitarian values by purely individualistic interests leaves Americans morally impoverished and, ultimately, unsatisfied.

These are important intellectual issues, ones that deserve to be informed by more systematic empirical study. My interest in the nature of American popular individualism is grounded in practical as well as purely academic concerns, however. Recently, a number of important public controversies have arisen that challenge some basic tenets of individualism, such as personal autonomy, limited government, and the natural superiority of free market economies. For example, state and local governments across the United States are considering--or have already enacted--legislation that will impose substantial new restrictions on the everyday actions of individuals and businesses in the name of environmental preservation. On another front, even leading U.S. business leaders and financial

journalists are raising doubts about the ability of the American "free enterprise system" to compete successfully within a new world economy that includes actors such as Japan and the European Economic Community that have less of a philosophical aversion to active governmental participation in the marketplace. And U.S. courts continue to grapple with such civil liberties issues as state regulation of abortions, the constitutionality of flag-burning as a means of political expression, and mandatory testing for AIDS among prison inmates and certain other high-risk populations.

As the pressures of economic, environmental, and demographic limits to growth increase in coming years, issues of this type will be raised more frequently--issues that oblige ordinary people to confront the trade-offs between individualism and the public good in ways that perhaps they have not had to thus far.

My goal in the the NES Pilot Study was to explore the possibility of bringing survey evidence to bear on some of the theoretical and applied questions surrounding American popular individualism. To that end, I obtained approval to include 22 forced-choice items in the Pilot Study. Twelve of the items were intended to refer to certain "abstract principles" of individualism, and 10 dealt dealt with various specific applications of those principles. Many of the items were borrowed or adapted from other surveys, although they had not necessarily been used to study popular individualism. The principal results of my investigation are:

- With the possible exception of a single item, all but a handful of respondents were willing and able to offer an opinion to any given individualism item (referring either to specific policies or to abstract ideals and beliefs) when it was put to them.

- Contrary to the common assertion that the overwhelming majority of Americans support individualistic principles (if not necessarily their programmatic application), there was a surprising amount of variation in responses to these items. Indeed, with regard to both abstract beliefs and specific policies, pluralities--and often clear majorities--of respondents chose cooperative, egalitarian or communitarian alternatives over individualistic ones.

- Largely as hypothesized in my previous memos, four (or, perhaps, three and a half) distinct dimensions of popular individualism were identified empirically.

- Variation across respondents in their replies to the individualism items reflected genuine differences of opinion or belief and not merely "non-attitudes" or measurement noise; the resulting individualism scales are reliable.

As measured here, popular individualism covaried in sensible ways with a variety of demographic and attitudinal variables that were gauged in the survey, yet it was not merely synonymous with other predispositions, either conceptually or empirically; the measures of individualism are valid.

Individual Items

Table 1 displays the marginals for the 12 "abstract principles" items contained in Wave 1 of the Pilot Study, and Table 2 shows the marginals for the 10 "applications" items from Wave 2. For each item, the response indicative of individualism is in bold-face. Two points to note in Tables 1 and 2 are that: (1) the proportion of respondents that declined to choose an alternative on any given item is typically small, and (2) it was not at all the case that respondents uniformly and overwhelmingly supported the "individualist myth"--or its application in specific policy domains.

For example, only 34% believed that government regulation of business does more harm than good, only 23% felt that the government should not try to ensure that all Americans have such things as jobs, health care and housing, and only 33% agreed with former-President Reagan's catch phrase "the less government the better." In the same vein, only 21% believed that the free market can handle today's complex economic problems without the government getting involved. With regard to the ideals of self-reliance and personal autonomy, only 22% thought that most poor people are poor because they don't work hard enough, and the majority of respondents believed that it was more important to be cooperative than it was to be a self-reliant person who could take care of oneself. Respondents were also about equally split between whether it was more important to teach children to be independent-minded or to teach them respect for authority. Indeed, in only three instances did respondents provide resounding support for individualistic norms: 82% thought it better to conduct oneself by one's own standards than to try to fit in, 61% believed that people should take care of themselves and their families and let others do the same rather than care less about their own success and more about the needs of society, and 59% supported the assertion that society is better off when businesses are free to make as much profit as they can.

In addition, I find the responses to some of the specific policy items in Table 2 to be of particular interest in their own right, quite apart from any utility they may have for a study of popular individualism. We found, for example, that 64% supported mandatory seatbelt and motorcycle helmet laws, 89% favored mandatory recycling, 56% thought that government limits on rents and home prices is a good idea, and 55% agreed to the concept of requiring some form of national service for all young adults. I was personally surprised to find that a quarter-century after the passage of the Civil Rights Acts, a majority of respondents

continue to believe that a person should have the right to refuse to sell his house to members of a certain racial or ethnic group.

Scale Construction

As discussed in my previous memo to the NES Board (April 27, 1989), I considered it useful to distinguish at least four identifiable strands within the larger concept of popular individualism: Personal Autonomy, Self-reliance, Limited Government, and Laissez-faire Capitalism. Very briefly, "Personal Autonomy" refers to the notion that an individual's thoughts and actions should be determined not by agents or causes outside of one's control but rather as a result of individual reflection and tastes. "Self-reliance" is a nineteenth century term popularized by Ralph Waldo Emerson, but it is commonly understood today. It refers to the idea that individuals should take care of their own well-being--not only economic, but even emotional or psychological. By "Limited Government," I am evoking the belief that, as opposed to pursuing some ephemeral conception of the "public interest," the purpose of government is strictly to protect life, liberty and property, and thereby provide a framework within which individuals may pursue their narrow self-interests. Finally, "Laissez-faire Capitalism" refers to a belief in the efficiency and desirability of an economic system characterized by minimum governmental interference, voluntary market transactions, and private ownership of the means of production.

I hypothesized that variables 7366, 7368 and 7503 should tap personal autonomy, variables 7367, 7369 and 7504 refer to self-reliance, variables 7365, 7502 and 7506 gauge support for the idea of limited government, and variables 7364, 7501 and 7505 measure belief in laissez-faire capitalism.

An examination of the bivariate correlations among the 12 "abstract principles" items indicated that V7503 ("too little respect" versus "too much freedom") failed to correlate appreciably with other items, and it was dropped from subsequent analysis. Table 3 reports gamma coefficients for the relationships among the remaining 11 abstract principles items. Gamma is a "weak association" measure that yields values similar to the tetrachoric r (for details, see Weisberg, 1974). Weak association measures are often preferred when exploring the scalability of binary items with skewed marginals or that are presumed to conform to a particular scaling model, e.g., Guttman or Rasch scales (see Andrich, 1988). Pearson correlation coefficients (a "strong association" measure) were also computed and examined. Although specific numerical results varied somewhat depending upon which measure of association was employed, the qualitative conclusions of the analysis of item dimensionality were identical. [1]

A visual inspection of the matrix in Table 3 indicates that the first six items (V7502, V7365, V7506, V7501, V7364 and V7505)

correlate fairly highly with one another, with some separation between the first four and the remaining two. Two "self-reliance" items, V7367 and V7369, form a close pair, while the other "self-reliance" item (V7504) correlates highly with the (remaining) two "personal autonomy" items, V7366 and V7368.

Principal components analysis of the Pearson r correlation matrix indicated four dimensions, and an obliquely-rotated principal factor analysis solution (see Table 4) yielded results that coincided with the interpretation of the gamma matrix provided above. The first dimension shown in Table 4 is "Limited Government" and includes the three items intended to tap that component of popular individualism plus one item (V7501--"need for a strong government" versus "free market") from the hypothesized "Laissez-faire Capitalism" set. The second dimension, which I label "Personal Autonomy," includes the two items intended to tap that component together with one of the intended "Self-reliance" items, V7504 ("be cooperative" versus "take care of yourself"). The remaining two "Self-reliance" items load highly on a third ("Self-reliance") dimension. Finally, the two remaining items intended to tap support for laissez-faire capitalism (V7364 and V7505) load most highly on dimension four. As indicated at the bottom of Table 4, the four dimensions are all positively correlated with one another, but not so highly as to be nondistinct.

I replicated this analysis using only respondents from the two highest quintiles as defined by the Political Information Index and obtained the same pattern of results, although with reassuringly higher loadings for variables on their respective primary dimensions.

Next, I created scales for each of the four dimensions of popular individualism, computing for each respondent his or her mean score for the relevant items (with the "nonindividualistic" response coded "1" and the "individualistic response coded "5"). To maximize the number of respondents possessing valid scale scores while simultaneously minimizing measurement noise in the resulting scores, a respondent was permitted to have missing data on one of the four items forming the limited government scale and on one of the three items forming the personal autonomy scale.[2] Complete data were required on the two two-item scales, self-reliance and laissez-faire capitalism. The distributions of respondents on the four scales and the intercorrelations of scale scores are displayed in Table 5.

The four-item limited government scale has a coefficient-alpha value of .66. This is a respectable value for a scale composed of so few items. Moreover, alpha is a lower-bound estimate of a scale's reliability. In the present case, the Pearson r correlations (upon which the alpha calculation is based) substantially understate the degree of "Rasch-type" association among the items: for the four items, the mean r = .33, while the mean gamma = .66.

The nominal coefficient-alpha value for the three-item personal autonomy scale equals .35, which again almost certainly understates the scale's reliability. The mean Pearson correlation for the three items is .15, whereas the mean gamma equals .34. If the latter value were used to calculate alpha, the resulting reliability estimate would be .61.

Coefficient-alpha equals only .31 for the two-item self-reliance scale, although the gamma correlation between the two items equals a fairly substantial .48, as compared with a .18 Pearson r value. We have one other indicator of reliability for the self-reliance scale, because one item from that scale ("poor people don't work hard enough" versus "circumstances beyond their control") was (inadvertently?) asked on both waves of the Pilot Study. The test-retest correlation for that item equals .55. If one is willing to assume that the other item on the self-reliance scale is roughly comparable in terms of test-retest reliability, the resulting two-item scale would have an estimated reliability of .71(!) rather than .31.

Finally, coefficient-alpha equals .35 for the two-item Laissez-faire Capitalism scale. Here, too, I suspect that this value substantially underestimates the scale's true reliability, since the gamma correlation between the two items is .44, as compared with a Pearson r value of .21.

Demographic Correlates of Individualism Subscales

Table 6 displays the correlations between the individualism subscales and five background variables: age, education, income, sex, and race. No significant relationships appear between beliefs in either self-reliance or laissez-faire capitalism and any of the demographic variables. That is, the poor and the less-educated support these norms with about the same intensity as do the well-off and the highly-educated. In contrast, the analysis reveals significant differences in mean scores on the personal autonomy subscale as a function of education, income, and race; and support for the concept of limited government varies significantly with respect to all five demographic variables.

This analysis underscores the distinctiveness of the four strands of popular individualism. For example, while younger respondents (aged 18-39) have the lowest average scores of any age groups on the limited government scale, they have the highest average scores with regard to personal autonomy. Similarly, respondents with less than a high school education possess the lowest average scores on the limited government and personal autonomy scales yet have the highest mean scores on the self-reliance and laissez-faire capitalism measures. White respondents score significantly higher than black respondents on the limited government and personal autonomy scales, but the two racial groups are virtually indistinguishable with regard to

support for the principles of self-reliance and laissez-faire capitalism. And so on.

Exploring the Validity of Individualism Subscales

If the popular individualism subscales are valid measures, they should correlate sensibly with measures of other political attitudes and orientations. To determine this, I correlated respondents' scores on the four subscales with measures of a variety of policy preferences, party identification, ideological self-identification, and egalitarianism. Those correlations are reported below.

In addition, if the measures of individualism are to be substantively useful, we will want some indication that relationships between those scales and measures of other political attitudes and beliefs are not "spurious," i.e., that they persist when other control variables are taken into account. Such multivariate analysis will enable a determination of whether popular individualism is a distinct construct or whether it is instead simply another name (or set of names) for other, already measured, constructs--such as liberalism/conservatism or partisanship. Toward this end, the results of a series of multiple regressions between policy preferences and the individualism subscales controlling for partisanship, ideological self-identification, and demographic factors are also reported below.

Bivariate Correlations. Table 7 displays the bivariate (Pearson) correlations between the four popular individualism subscales and 38 items that tap respondents' attitudes with respect to four broad policy domains: racial equality, social welfare, civil liberties, and private enterprise. These 38 items include the 10 "applications" items that I asked to have included in Wave 2 of the Pilot Study plus 28 other items taken from the 1988 NES and from elsewhere in the Pilot Study. To maximize sample size, only items were put to at least half of the Pilot sample (and in the same format) have been included.[3]

As shown in Table 7, support for the idea of limited government is systematically and significantly correlated with opposition to government policies--especially affirmative action policies--that favor Blacks. Belief in limited government is also strongly correlated with opposition to a broad array of governmental social welfare programs and proposals. In the domain of civil liberties, the higher one scores on the limited government subscale, the less likely one is to favor governmental activity to promote women's rights. Finally, persons who most strongly favor limits on the scope of government extend those sentiments into the economic sphere as well, as indicated by the significant correlations between scores on the limited government subscale and positions on the private enterprise items in Section IV of Table 7.

Support for the norm of personal autonomy is found to be correlated principally with attitudes regarding a range of civil liberties issues, including women's rights, abortion, school prayer, and mandatory drug testing. Scores on the self-reliance subscale correlate significantly with at least some items in all four policy domains, but the correlations are largest and most systematic with regard to policies intended to assist Blacks and, unsurprisingly, in the area of social welfare policy. Finally, scores on the laissez-faire capitalism subscale also correlate significantly with a variety of specific policy attitudes spanning all four major domains.

It may be useful to describe in more detail a few representative correlations from Table 7 so that the reader may better appreciate how substantively impressive many of those relationships are. This is accomplished in Table 8.

Table 9 displays the correlations of the individualism subscales with four political orientations: egalitarianism, tolerance, ideological self-identification, and party identification. The correlations are often statistically and substantively significant, and the significant relationships are in the directions one would expect. The correlations are not so large as to suggest that the individualism scales are equivalent to the other political orientations, however.

Multivariate Analyses. Lastly, Tables 10-14 display the results of a series of multiple regression analyses intended to determine the extent to which the measures of political individualism account for observed variation in policy attitudes even when other basic political orientations and background characteristics are taken into account. The dependent variables in Tables 10-13 are scores based on the first component from each of a series of principal components analyses of sets of variables from Table 7. The dependent variable in Table 14 is the Egalitarianism index, as described in Table 9. Without going into detail, the message of these tables is that the individualism subscales are important predictors of the various dependent variables even when other factors are taken into account. In particular, these subscales often outperform ideological self-identification and party identification as predictors; it should also be borne in mind that substantially more individuals can be placed on the individualism scales than can be placed on the ideological self-placement measure, since it is not unusual to find one-quarter to one-third of a survey sample declining to identify themselves ideologically at all.

Conclusions

I will go into more detail when we meet. For the moment, my conclusions are that popular individualism is an important object of study from both theoretical and practical perspectives, it is capable of being studied empirically using measures of the sort described here, and indeed it may well be at least as important

as other concepts that we have studied for decades in terms of its relevance to popular political thinking. Undoubtedly, the scales used here can be improved. I have some suggestions for wording changes and alternative/additional items for the subscales. The bottom line, however, is that I strongly recommend that the Board devote time and resources to pursuing this project.

Footnotes

1. Initially, I included both the volunteered "both, depends" and the "don't know" responses as valid codes located between the two stated alternatives for each item. Inspection of the cross-tabulations between pairs of items indicated that some systematic departures from monotonicity occurred when items were scored in that fashion. I therefore chose to treat all failures to select one of the supplied choices for an item as missing data.
2. For respondents with missing data on one item of a scale, their resulting means were rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. A handful of criterion items included in Table 7 were asked in slightly different formats to subsets of the sample. For those variables, I conducted preliminary analyses to determine whether the different formats had any appreciable effect on the correlation values. In no instances were the correlations significantly different as a function of item wording; in the few instances where the item format made any appreciable difference at all, I have indicated in Table 7 the subsamples upon which the correlations are based.

Table 1. Marginals for the Abstract Principles Items (Wave 1).

I am going to read two statements. Please tell me which one is closer to your own view.

(V7364) ONE, government regulation of big businesses and corporations is necessary to protect the public or, TWO, that government regulation does more harm than good?

Necessary to protect	59%	(357)
Both, depends (volunteered)	3	(16)
More harm than good	34	(207)
DK	5	(29)

(V7365) ONE, the government should try to ensure that all Americans have such things as jobs, health care, and housing or, TWO, the government should not be involved in this?

Government ensure things	74%	(449)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(8)
Government not involved	23	(142)
DK	2	(11)

(V7366) ONE, is it better to fit in with the people around you or, TWO, is it better to conduct yourself according to your own standards, even if that makes you stand out?

Fit in	17%	(101)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(4)
Own standards	82	(499)
DK	1	(6)

(V7367) ONE, people should take care of themselves and their families and let others do the same or, TWO, people should care less about their own success and more about the needs of society?

Take care of self	61%	(373)
Both, depends (volunteered)	7	(44)
Care more about society	31	(186)
DK	1	(6)

(V7368) ONE, when raising children it is more important to teach them to be independent-minded and think for themselves or, TWO, it is more important to teach them obedience and respect for authorities?

Independent-minded	44%	(266)
Both, depends (volunteered)	13	(80)
Obedience	43	(260)
DK	*	(2)

Table 2. Marginals for the Specific Applications Items (Wave 2).

Now, here are some questions about how much say the government should have in regulating things that individuals and businesses do.

(V8519) In the interests of public safety, should the government require the use of seatbelts in automobiles or helmets for motorcycle riders OR should those decisions be left up to individuals?

Government require	64	(314)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2	(11)
Left to individuals	33	(161)
DK	1	(7)

(V8520) Would you say that the American free enterprise system is OR is not a match for a centrally coordinated economy like Japan's?

Is a match	42	(207)
Both, depends (volunteered)	*	(1)
Is not a match	37	(182)
DK	21	(101)

(V8521) When it comes to making decisions in industry, should workers have more say than they do now OR do they have enough say already?

Have more say	62	(303)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2	(10)
Have enough say now	32	(160)
DK	4	(20)

(V8522) Generally speaking, are government limits on rents and home prices a bad idea or a good idea?

Bad idea	37	(182)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(7)
Good idea	56	(274)
DK	6	(29)

(V8523) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring school children to recite the Pledge of Allegiance daily?

Favor	69	(337)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(4)
Oppose	28	(138)
DK	2	(11)

(V8524) If a person refuses to sell his house to members of a certain racial or ethnic group, should he have that right OR should that be illegal?

Have that right	55	(269)
Both, depends (volunteered)	*	(1)
Should be illegal	42	(209)
DK	3	(14)

(V8525) Do you think it would be a good idea or a bad idea if the government owned the airlines in the United States as is done in many other countries?

Good idea	23	(112)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Bad idea	68	(337)
DK	9	(43)

(V8526) If people want to smoke marijuana in their own homes, is that basically their business OR should it be illegal?

Basically their business	32	(158)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(5)
Should be illegal	66	(323)
DK	1	(6)

(V8527) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring that all young adults serve their country by spending some time in the military, the Peace Corps, or in some other kind of national service?

Favor	55	(269)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Oppose	43	(213)
DK	2	(9)

(V8528) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring people to recycle newspaper, glass, and other recyclable waste in order to reduce the trash problem?

Favor	89	(438)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Oppose	10	(52)
DK	1	(3)

* Less than 1%.

Table 3. Bivariate Relations among 11 "Abstract Principles" Items (Gamma Coefficients).*

LG 7502										
LG 7365	<u>.69</u>									
LG 7506	<u>.63</u>	<u>.57</u>								
LF 7501	<u>.77</u>	<u>.59</u>	<u>.68</u>							
LF 7364	<u>.38</u>	<u>.38</u>	<u>.23</u>	<u>.59</u>						
LF 7505	.23	.23	<u>.35</u>	<u>.42</u>	<u>.44</u>					
SR 7367	.25	<u>.35</u>	.28	<u>.33</u>	.29	.25				
SR 7369	.28	<u>.35</u>	<u>.33</u>	<u>.34</u>	.11	.09	<u>.48</u>			
SR 7504	.22	.20	.14	.25	.23	.14	.12	.08		
PA 7366	<u>.31</u>	.21	.24	.28	-.17	-.03	.00	.14	<u>.30</u>	
PA 7368	.09	.11	.07	.18	.10	.13	.02	.22	<u>.42</u>	<u>.31</u>
	7502	7365	7506	7501	7364	7505	7367	7369	7504	7366
	Variable Number									

*Items have been reflected when necessary so that all are coded in the same direction. Coefficients of .30 and larger are underlined; values larger than approximately .10 are statistically significant.

Table 4. Obliquely-rotated Principal Axis Factor Analysis Solution for the "Abstract Principles" Items.*

Variable	Communality	Limited Gov't.	Personal Autonomy	Self-Reliance	Laissez-Faire
LG 7502	.44	<u>.65</u>	.03	-.05	.10
LG 7365	.24	<u>.48</u>	.02	.06	.07
LG 7506	.28	<u>.53</u>	-.00	.05	.06
LF 7501	.35	<u>.55</u>	.03	.01	.22
LF 7364	.37	.16	-.04	-.04	<u>.58</u>
LF 7505	.14	.10	.01	.02	<u>.36</u>
SR 7367	.26	-.01	-.08	<u>.45</u>	.23
SR 7369	.69	.13	.05	<u>.75</u>	-.34
SR 7504	.31	-.03	<u>.50</u>	-.05	.23
PA 7368	.48	-.19	<u>.65</u>	.12	.05
PA 7366	.30	.25	<u>.38</u>	-.09	-.30

Correlations between factors:

I				
II	.19			
III	.23	.10		
IV	.16	.12	.29	
	I	II	III	IV

*Items have been reflected when necessary so that all are coded in the same direction. The largest loading for each variable is underlined.

Table 5. Marginal Distributions for and Intercorrelations of Scores on the Four "Popular Individualism" Subscales.

Scale	Scale Score					(N)
	(Low) 1	2	3	4	(High) 5	
Limited Government	43%	28	11	9	8	(583)
Personal Autonomy	10%	25	8	32	26	(574)
Self-Reliance	29%		51		20	(504)
Laissez-Faire	28%		44		28	(539)

Scale Intercorrelations:

Limited Government				
Personal Autonomy	.14			
Self-Reliance	.23	.07		
Laissez-Faire	.30	.07	.13	
	Limited Gov't	Personal Autonomy	Self-Reliance	Laissez-Faire

Table 6. Relationship between Popular Individualism Subscales and Demographic Variables.

Mean subscale score, by:	Subscale			
	Limited Gov't	Personal Autonomy	Self- Reliance	Laissez Faire
<u>Age</u>				
18-29	1.91	3.53	2.92	2.98
30-39	1.86	3.53	2.63	2.91
40-49	2.35	3.50	2.87	3.25
50-59	2.35	3.30	2.91	3.00
60-69	2.15	3.12	2.86	2.70
70 up	2.48	3.09	2.82	3.19
Eta	.19*	.13	.09	.11
<u>Education</u>				
Less than high school	1.96	2.79	3.00	3.23
High school	2.04	3.18	2.79	2.95
Some college	2.07	3.69	2.90	2.89
College degree	2.43	3.95	2.66	3.06
Eta	.13*	.30*	.08	.08
<u>Income</u>				
Less than \$10,000	1.77	2.85	2.85	2.97
\$10-14,999	2.00	2.91	2.46	2.73
\$15-19,999	2.19	3.39	2.78	3.32
\$20-29,999	1.90	3.38	2.70	2.79
\$30-39,999	2.19	3.40	2.98	2.89
\$40-49,999	2.11	3.67	2.81	2.90
\$50,000 up	2.55	3.92	2.95	3.37
Eta	.19*	.26*	.12	.15
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	2.47	3.49	2.95	3.13
Female	1.89	3.34	2.73	2.90
Eta	.22*	.06	.08	.07
<u>Race</u>				
White	2.19	3.46	2.82	3.03
Black	1.49	2.84	2.84	2.79
Eta	.16*	.14*	.00	.05

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 7. Correlations between Criterion Variables and Popular Individualism Subscales.*

Criterion Variable	Subscale			
	Limited Gov't	Personal Autonomy	Self-Reliance	Laissez Faire
I. Racial Attitudes				
(720) Cut Black program budget	.28	.06	.21	.07
(5821) Govt not see to job fairns	.24	.01	.18	.15
(5826) Oppose university quotas	.26	.12	.13	.13
(6011) Expect no favors [disagr]	-.11	.06	-.26	-.04
(7311) Oppose affirm hiring [A,B]	.22	.00	.22	.14
(7425) Govt not help Blacks [A,C]	.19	.01	.25	.25
(8524) Illegal to refuse to sell	-.16	.10	-.17	-.03
II. Social Welfare				
(8502) More services	-.46	-.05	-.30	-.30
(8506) Each get ahead on own	.36	-.10	.22	.14
(8510) Private health insurance	.29	-.06	.15	.31
(8448) Private help homeless[dis]	-.23	.13	-.16	-.12
(8449) Govt guar. earnings [dis.]	.29	.05	.13	.09
(8632) People help selves [dis.]	-.17	-.01	-.22	-.10
(8636) Govt see to 3 meals [dis.]	.34	.07	.22	.10
(8634) Able-bodied shld work[dis]	-.06	.10	-.16	-.12
(7326) Affordable childcare [dis.]	.38	.07	.03	.12
Cut budget for:				
(7315) Social security	.34	.12	.07	.14
(7316) Food stamps	.25	-.01	.24	.09
(7317) Elderly care	.35	.04	.07	.19
(7318) Spending on unemployed	.30	.10	.14	.15
(7321) Care for homeless	.42	.08	.27	.12
III. Civil Liberties				
(726) Women's place in home	.11	-.22	.04	.05
(734) Pro-choice on abortion	-.02	.29	-.01	-.03
(7325) Oppose ERA	.25	.03	.02	.13
(7328) Lay off women first [Dis.]	.00	.25	.01	.00
(7329) Govt help to women [Dis.]	.27	.08	.04	.15
(7330) Women's place in home[Dis]	-.15	.24	-.06	-.04
(5822) Favor school prayer	-.04	-.20	-.02	.01
(7420) Opp. mand. drug testing[C]	-.10	.29	-.21	-.14
(8519) Opp. mandatory seat belts	.20	.01	.05	.06
(8523) Opp. mandatory Pledge	.05	.14	-.05	-.09
(8526) Marijuana shld be illegal	-.07	-.10	.03	.01
(8527) Opp. mand. nat'l service	-.12	.06	-.02	-.01
(7347) Favor gun control	-.10	-.12	-.16	-.13
IV. Private Enterprise				
(8520) Free-enter. no match Japan	-.13	-.19	-.09	-.17
(8521) Workers have enough say	.20	.05	.13	.10
(8522) Favor rent control	-.30	-.14	-.09	-.18
(8524) Favor govt own airlines	-.16	.10	-.17	-.04

*Correlations greater than approximately .10 are statistically significant.

Table 8. Relationships between Individualism Subscales and Selected Variables from Table 7.

Limited Govt Score	% Favoring Blacks	Increased Social Security	Budget for Stamp	for: Food Elderly Care	Unem- ployed	Home- less	%Favor Govt help to women	%Favor Rent Contrl
1	31	72	28	92	34	83	88	71
2	17	56	13	86	25	66	85	67
3	14	41	17	77	26	68	76	55
4	11	39	0	63	12	43	69	39
5	4	22	4	48	4	18	40	22

Personal Autonomy Score	%Pro-choice on Abortion	%Favor Mandatory Pledge	%Favor Organized School Prayer
1	21	88	57
2	23	77	35
3	24	61	26
4	44	68	29
5	49	64	24

Self-Reliance Score	%Black should expect no favors	%Govt see to three meals/day	%Increase Homeless Budget	%Cut Food Stamps Budget	%Favor More Gun Control
1	59	63	82	16	74
3	75	49	68	26	69
5	89	30	45	47	57

Laissez-faire Score	%Favor Private Med. Insur.	%Favor Rent Control	%Believe US no match for Japan
1	20	68	61
3	30	65	44
5	60	44	39

Table 9. Correlations between Political Orientations and Popular Individualism Subscales.*

Political Orientation	Subscale			
	Limited Gov't	Personal Autonomy	Self- Reliance	Laissez- Faire
Egalitarianism**	-.33	.02	-.23	-.13
(6002) Tolerant of diffs. [dis.]	.13	-.11	.06	-.06
(415) Ideol. Self-ID [Lib-Con]	.29	-.01	.24	.13
(504) Party ID [Dem-Rep]	.33	.11	.14	.15

*Correlations greater than approximately .10 are statistically significant.

**Scale constructed from V5927 through V5932.

Table 10. Racial Conservatism as a Function of Individualism Components and Control Variables.*

Independent Variable	Initial		Revised	
	Coeff.	t-Ratio	Coeff.	t-Ratio
Limited Govt	.20	2.79	.22	3.44
Autonomy	-.06	.99	--	
Self-reliance	.20	3.07	.17	2.95
Laissez-faire	.03	.55	--	

Ideol. identif.	.07	1.08	.10	1.54
Party identif.	.14	2.12	.14	2.25
Age	.10	1.69	.09	1.53
Education	-.09	1.48	-.14	2.47
Income	.03	.48	--	
Sex	.04	.68	--	
Race	-.17	2.62	-.15	2.64
<hr/>				
R-square	.31		.31	
N	216		242	

*Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

Table 11. Social Welfare Conservatism as a Function of Individualism Components and Control Variables.*

Independent Variable	Initial		Revised	
	Coeff.	t-Ratio	Coeff.	t-Ratio
Limited Govt	.40	7.13	.42	7.91
Autonomy	-.06	1.31	--	
Self-reliance	.10	1.99	.10	2.04
Laissez-faire	.15	3.09	.14	2.86

Ideol. identif.	.11	2.13	.11	2.21
Party identif.	.14	2.50	.13	2.48
Age	.02	.33	--	
Education	.03	.65	--	
Income	.10	1.94	.11	2.43
Sex	-.04	.86	--	
Race	-.13	2.70	-.14	2.91
<hr/>				
R-square	.49		.50	
N	251		259	

*Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

Table 12. Civil Liberties Conservatism as a Function of Individualism Components and Control Variables.*

Independent Variable	Initial		Revised	
	Coeff.	t-Ratio	Coeff.	t-Ratio
Limited Govt	.00	.06	--	
Autonomy	-.25	4.06	-.26	4.68
Self-reliance	-.07	1.08	--	
Laissez-faire	.13	2.02	.10	1.85

Ideol. identif.	.24	3.54	.23	3.78
Party identif.	.11	1.61	.12	1.95
Age	.07	1.06	--	
Education	-.18	2.80	-.21	3.82
Income	-.12	1.82	--	
Sex	-.02	.35	--	
Race	-.02	.26	--	
<hr/>				
R-square		.27		.23
N		220		268

*Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

Table 13. Free Enterprise Support as a Function of Individualism Components and Control Variables.*

Independent Variable	Initial		Revised	
	Coeff.	t-Ratio	Coeff.	t-Ratio
Limited Govt	.11	1.46	.14	2.39
Autonomy	.09	1.51	.09	1.67
Self-reliance	.08	1.16	.09	1.63
Laissez-faire	.10	1.60	.08	1.39

Ideol. identif.	-.01	.13	--	
Party identif.	.18	2.59	.17	3.08
Age	.21	3.40	.20	3.74
Education	-.02	.24	--	
Income	.02	.29	--	
Sex	-.33	4.90	-.29	5.28
Race	-.02	.29	--	
<hr/>				
R-square		.33		.29
N		193		271

*Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

Table 14. Egalitarianism as a Function of Individualism Components and Control Variables.*

Independent Variable	Initial		Revised	
	Coeff.	t-Ratio	Coeff.	t-Ratio
Limited Govt	-.22	3.81	-.26	5.03
Autonomy	.09	1.64	--	
Self-reliance	-.19	3.64	-.19	3.80
Laissez-faire	-.07	1.25	--	

Ideol. identif.	-.15	2.61	-.16	3.23
Party identif.	-.06	1.06	--	
Age	.04	.69	--	
Education	.10	1.84	.13	2.80
Income	.01	.13	--	
Sex	-.09	1.75	-.09	1.86
Race	.20	3.83	.23	4.72
<hr/>				
R-square	.29		.28	
N	296		333	

*Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

May 22, 1990

MEMO TO: NES Pilot Study Committee
FROM: Greg Markus
SUBJECT: Popular Individualism

Introduction

I have argued in two previous memos that the NES Board should include measures of "popular individualism" in the 1990 survey instrument. My argument is two-pronged, and I regard the two parts to be of equal importance.

First, individualist values comprise an important and worthwhile object of inquiry in and of themselves. That is, quite apart from whether or not measures of individualism may help us predict citizens' preferences with regard to the particular issues or candidates of an election year, the extent to which individualist values help define Americans' basic orientations toward their government, its processes and its outcomes has been the focus of intellectual study ever since Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States more than 150 years ago. The prevailing wisdom—which is based upon surprisingly little hard evidence—is that most Americans cleave to the ideals of self-reliance and liberation from the unwelcome constraints of formal governmental and economic institutions. Dolbear and Metcalfe (1988) summed it up when they wrote: "Probably no country in the world has as deep a cultural commitment to individualism as the United States." With reference to contemporary politics, Garry Wills (1987) has argued forcefully that Ronald Reagan won two overwhelming electoral victories (and helped set up George Bush for a third) in part by making the "individualist fantasy" all the more believable by believing in it so thoroughly himself.

Steven Lukes, Michael Sandel, Christopher Lasch, Herbert Gans, and others have specified some theoretically distinguishable strands to the cord of individualism that presumably binds Americans together. I label those strands: Autonomy, Self-Reliance, Limited Government, and Laissez-Faire Capitalism. Their distinctness should not be overemphasized. Empirically at least, they have grown fuzzy and matted over time. And there may be other strands hidden.

Very briefly, Autonomy refers to the notion that an individual's thoughts and actions should be determined not by agents or causes outside of one's control but rather as a result of individual reflection and tastes. Self-reliance is a nineteenth century term popularized by Ralph Waldo Emerson, but it is commonly understood today. It refers to the idea that individuals should take care of their own well-being—not only economic, but even emotional or psychological. By Limited Government, I am evoking the belief that, as opposed to pursuing some ephemeral conception of the "public interest," the purpose of government is strictly to protect life, liberty, and property, and thereby provide a framework within which individuals may pursue their narrow self-interests. Finally, Laissez-faire Capitalism refers to a belief in the efficiency and desirability of an economic system characterized by minimum governmental interference, voluntary market transactions, and private ownership of the means of production.

The popular rendition of individualism presumably espoused by most Americans is probably neither the sophisticated, analytic individualism of the libertarian nor is it identical to the economic individualism of the capitalist entrepreneur. Instead, Gans, in particular, has argued that popular individualism embodies a simple desire for: personal control over an increasingly complex and threatening social and economic environment; maximum freedom to make private choices, even on potentially public matters such as transportation, housing, education, conservation, and so on; security, both economic and physical, for one's self and family; and an antipathy toward formal political institutions and obligations. Not surprisingly, home ownership figures prominently in this vision.

Within the commodious boundaries of this version of individualism, it is perfectly acceptable for citizens simultaneously to desire lower taxes *and* to support federal programs that help promote their economic security, subsidize their educational costs, guarantee them a comfortable retirement, and protect their health and safety. In this regard, popular individualists value self-reliance and the work ethic, but they are also painfully aware that hard work alone is no guarantee of success in a world in which plant closings, unemployment, and economic recession are increasingly the result of (literally) strange and distant forces beyond individual comprehension, let alone control. Also, theirs is not the brand of individualism that necessarily cherishes originality and distinctiveness, especially if a little (voluntary) conformity enhances one's sense of security.

Despite--or perhaps because of--its robustness, individualism has been under attack on a number of fronts lately. Sociologists and clinicians decry the damage to American culture and mental health that has been inflicted by the materialistic and narcissistic excesses of the "Me Decade." Political theorists argue that a declining sense of community endangers collective action in pursuit of equality of legal rights and economic opportunity. Feminist scholars criticize what they interpret to be antifeminist strains beneath the surface of individualistic values. Others, most notably Robert N. Bellah and his co-authors of *Habits of the Heart* (1985), are deeply concerned that the eclipse of communitarian values by purely individualistic interests leaves Americans morally impoverished and, ultimately, unsatisfied.

These are important intellectual issues, ones that deserve to be informed by more systematic empirical study. My interest in the nature of American popular individualism is grounded in practical as well as purely academic concerns, however, and this motivates the second part of my argument to the Board: citizens' beliefs and attitudes with regard to both long-standing policy disputes and critical issues of the coming decade are, or will be, influenced by individualist values.

For example, a number of important public controversies have arisen recently that challenge some basic tenets of individualism. State and local governments across the United States are considering--or have already enacted--legislation that will impose substantial new restrictions on the everyday actions of individuals and businesses in the name of environmental preservation. On another front, even leading U.S. business leaders and financial journalists are raising doubts about the ability of the American "free enterprise system" to compete successfully within a new world economy against actors, such as Japan and the European Economic Community, that have less of a philosophical aversion to active governmental participation in the marketplace. And U.S. courts continue to grapple with such civil liberties issues as state regulation of abortions, the constitutionality of flag-burning as a means of political expression, and mandatory testing for AIDS among prison inmates and certain other high-risk populations. As the pressures of economic, environmental, and demographic limits to growth increase in coming years, issues of this type will be raised more frequently--issues that oblige ordinary people to confront the trade-offs between individualism and the public good in ways that perhaps they have not had to thus far.

Review of empirical results from the Pilot Study

My goal in the the NES Pilot Study was to explore the possibility of bringing survey evidence to bear on some of the theoretical and empirical questions surrounding American popular individualism. To that end, 22 forced-choice items were included in the Pilot Study. Twelve of the items were intended to refer to certain "abstract principles" of individualism (see Table 1), and 10 dealt with various specific applications of those principles (see Table 2). Many of the items were borrowed or adapted from other surveys, although they had not necessarily been used to study popular individualism. The principal results of my investigation, which is described fully in my memo of February 1, 1990, were:

- With the possible exception of a single item, all but a handful of respondents were willing and able to offer an opinion to any given individualism item (referring either to specific policies or to abstract ideals and beliefs) when it was put to them.

- Contrary to the common assertion that the overwhelming majority of Americans support individualistic principles (if not necessarily their programmatic application), there was a surprising amount of variation in responses to these items. Indeed, with regard to both abstract beliefs and specific policies, pluralities--and often clear majorities--of respondents chose cooperative, egalitarian or communitarian alternatives over individualistic ones.

- Largely as hypothesized, four distinct dimensions of popular individualism were identified empirically. An obliquely-rotated principal factor analysis solution yielded results that coincided closely with the hypothesized factor structure. (A separate LISREL confirmatory factor analysis that included the items for three of the four hypothesized components of individualism, excluding the laissez-faire items, was provided to me by Steve Rosenstone. That analysis also provided strong support for my own conclusions. The LISREL goodness of fit coefficient associated with the pattern I reported in my memo was .994.)

- Variation across respondents in their replies to the individualism items reflected genuine differences of opinion or belief and not merely "non-attitudes" or measurement noise: the resulting individualism scales were reliable, as indicated by estimated alpha-coefficients, mean gamma coefficients (compatible with Rasch-type scaling), and the one available instance of a test-retest coefficient.

- As measured in the Pilot Study, popular individualism covaried in sensible ways with a variety of demographic and attitudinal variables, yet it was not merely synonymous with other predispositions, either conceptually or empirically: the measures of individualism were valid. This phase of the analysis yielded three main sets of findings:

- 1) Demographic analysis underscored the distinctiveness of the four strands of popular individualism. For example, while younger respondents (aged 18-39) had the lowest average scores of any age groups on the limited government scale, they had the highest average scores with regard to personal autonomy. Similarly, respondents with less than a high school education possessed the lowest average scores on the limited government and personal autonomy scales yet had the highest mean scores on the self-reliance and laissez-faire capitalism measures. White respondents scored significantly higher than black respondents on the limited government and personal autonomy scales, but the two racial groups were virtually indistinguishable with regard to support for the principles of self-reliance and laissez-faire capitalism.

- 2) A series of bivariate analyses demonstrated that the four individualism scales were significantly correlated with an array of items tapping policy preferences in the domains of social welfare, civil liberties, racial affirmative action and equal rights, and free enterprise. Some illustrative relationships (reproduced from the February 1 memo) are shown in Table 3.

- 3) Correlations of the individualism subscales with four political orientations--egalitarianism, tolerance, ideological self-identification, and party identification--were often statistically and substantively significant, and the significant relationships were in the directions one would expect. The correlations were not so large as to suggest that the individualism scales are equivalent to the other political orientations, however.

- Lastly, a series of multiple regression analyses demonstrated that the individualism subscales were significant predictors of composite indexes of policy preferences in the four domains cited above, even when other predictors were taken into account. In particular, the

individualism subscales often outperformed ideological self-identification and party identification as predictors.

New empirical results

When I presented my findings to the Pilot Study Subcommittee in February, members of that committee suggested some additional analyses. These suggested analyses were aimed at answering the following question: Given NES's history of investigating various "values," such as egalitarianism, moral traditionalism, and patriotism, is individualism (as measured here) empirically superior to other "values" measures in accounting for explicitly political outcome variables, such as policy preferences, feelings towards political candidates, or vote choice?

My inclination was to re-emphasize that, on its face, the bulk of scholarly attention devoted to the role of individualism within the American experience easily justifies empirical attention to the subject, and that it is better--at least initially--to investigate individualism using admittedly imperfect measures rather than not at all. I still believe that. Nevertheless, I executed the analysis suggested by my colleagues, and the results are quite encouraging--sufficiently so, I believe, to cinch the case.

Table 4 displays the results of a series of multiple regressions in which representative policy items from the four policy domains of social welfare, civil liberties, race, and free enterprise were regressed on the four individualism subscales, three other "values" scales from the 1988 NES (egalitarianism, moral traditionalism, and patriotism), liberal-conservative self-placement, and party identification. Race was also entered as a control variable in the regressions for race issue attitudes. Comparable multiple regressions were estimated using the four composite policy preference indexes that were constructed from a larger number of issue items contained in the NES surveys, as described in my previous memo. Third, feeling thermometer scores for George Bush, Ronald Reagan, and Jesse Jackson were utilized as the criterion variables.

To facilitate comparisons of estimated coefficients, all independent variables were rescaled to the 0,1 interval. Each regression equation was estimated once (by ordinary least squares), the utterly nonsignificant regressors were deleted from the equation, and the revised equation was re-estimated. To reduce visual clutter, Table 4 displays the coefficients that were statistically significant at the nominal .05 level and which were deemed also to be of substantive significance, i.e., to have an estimated maximum direct effect equal to at least .5 points for a 7-point criterion variable--or of comparable magnitude for criterion variables having other ranges.

Several features of Table 4 merit attention. First, note that the four individualism subscales are both statistically and substantively significant predictors of a wide range of policy preferences and feeling thermometer ratings even when other values, ideological leaning, and partisanship are taken into account.

Second, the different components of individualism tend to come into play in distinct issue domains: "limited government" is linked principally to welfare spending items, "personal autonomy" to civil liberties issues, "self-reliance" to affirmative action policy preferences, and "laissez-faire" to business issues.

Third, within each of the four policy domains, at least some of the individualism subscales are more potent than either ideological self-placement or party identification in predicting the criterion variables.

Fourth, the "limited government" scale outperforms all other values scales overall in predicting citizen preferences on social welfare items, and shows up in equations in the race and business domains, as well. Across all 15 issue-related criterion variables, "limited government" is second only to "egalitarianism" as an explanatory factor--and recall the the egalitarianism scale is

based on six items, whereas the limited government scale is formed from four items, the autonomy scale from three items, and the self-reliance and laissez faire scales from only two each.

Fifth, three of the four individualism subscales exert significant direct effects upon feelings toward Bush, Reagan, or Jackson; the fourth subscale (limited government) in all likelihood exerts indirect influence via other included variables (especially, partisanship and ideological leaning).

The final analysis to be presented here uses vote choice as the dependent variable in a logit estimation employing the same nine predictors used in the multiple regressions displayed in Table 4. As before, the full model was estimated, utterly nonsignificant predictors deleted, and the revised equation was re-estimated. The results are shown in Table 5. Two of the four individualism subscales are found to be related to vote choice in 1988--self-reliance and (especially) limited government. Patriotism and egalitarianism are also important predictors, as, of course, is party identification.

Conclusion

I conclude that on grounds of both theoretical interest and demonstrated empirical power the items comprising the popular individualism subscales should be included in the 1990 survey. That is 12 items in all (7364-7369, and 7501-7506), including the one that didn't pan out in the Pilot but could still be salvaged with a little word-doctoring. The items are fairly brief, respondents appear to be able to supply replies without undue agony, and they form a neat bundle that can be dropped into the instrument almost anywhere.

I also think that at least some of the "applied" individualism items are of substantive interest in their own right in light of recent political developments and cover subjects that have been overlooked in previous NES surveys. Consider, e.g., 8520 (America an economic match for Japan?), 8524 (sell house to minorities?), 8527 (mandatory national service), and 8528 (mandatory recycling).

If you can't do that, at a minimum I recommend the inclusion of the four limited government items (7502, 7365, 7506, 7501), the three personal autonomy items (7504, 7368, 7366), and the two self-reliance items (7367, 7369). I'd also like the national service and recycling items--these tap important issue themes, mark my words.

Table 1. Marginals for the Abstract Principles Items (Wave 1).

I am going to read two statements. Please tell me which one is closer to your own view.

(V7364) ONE, government regulation of big businesses and corporations is necessary to protect the public or, TWO, that government regulation does more harm than good?

Necessary to protect	59% (357)
Both, depends (volunteered)	3 (16)
More harm than good	34 (207)
DK	5 (29)

(V7365) ONE, the government should try to ensure that all Americans have such things as jobs, health care, and housing or, TWO, the government should not be involved in this?

Government ensure things	74% (449)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1 (8)
Government not involved	23 (142)
DK	2 (11)

(V7366) ONE, is it better to fit in with the people around you or, TWO, is it better to conduct yourself according to your own standards, even if that makes you stand out?

Fit in	17% (101)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1 (4)
Own standards	82 (499)
DK	1 (6)

(V7367) ONE, people should take care of themselves and their families and let others do the same or, TWO, people should care less about their own success and more about the needs of society?

Take care of self	61% (373)
Both, depends (volunteered)	7 (44)
Care more about society	31 (186)
DK	1 (6)

(V7368) ONE, when raising children it is more important to teach them to be independent-minded and think for themselves or, TWO, it is more important to teach them obedience and respect for authorities?

Independent-minded	44% (266)
Both, depends (volunteered)	13 (80)
Obedience	43 (260)
DK	* (2)

(V7369) ONE, most poor people are poor because they don't work hard enough or, TWO, they are poor because of circumstances beyond their control?

Don't work hard	22% (134)
Both, depends (volunteered)	7 (43)
Beyond their control	68 (410)
DK	3 (18)

(V7501) ONE, we need a strong government to handle today's complex economic problems or, TWO, the free market can handle these problems without government being involved?

Strong government	73% (444)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2 (13)
Free market	21 (125)
DK	4 (25)

(V7502) ONE, the less government the better or, TWO, there are more things that government should be doing?

Less government	33% (199)
Both, depends (volunteered)	5 (29)
More things government should do	60 (366)
DK	2 (15)

(V7503) ONE, there is too little respect for traditional authorities, such as religious leaders and government officials, or, TWO, there is too much restriction and regulation of personal opinion and behavior?

Lack of respect	60% (365)
Both, depends (volunteered)	4 (21)
Too much restriction	32 (191)
DK	4 (27)

(V7504) ONE, it is more important to be a cooperative person who works well with others or, TWO, it is more important to be a self-reliant person able to take care of oneself?

Cooperative person	51% (310)
Both, depends (volunteered)	9 (56)
Self-reliant	40 (243)
DK	1 (3)

(V7505) ONE, society is better off when businesses are free to make as much profit as they can or, TWO, businesses should be prohibited from earning excessive profits?

Make as much profit as can	59% (362)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2 (13)
Prohibit excessive profits	36 (217)
DK	3 (17)

(V7506) ONE, the main reason that government has gotten bigger over the years is because it has gotten involved in things that people should do for themselves or, TWO, government has gotten bigger because the problems we face have gotten bigger?

Gotten involved in things	31% (187)
Both, depends (volunteered)	3 (16)
Problems we face are bigger	66 (401)
DK	1 (5)

* Less than 1%.

Table 2. Marginals for the Specific Applications Items (Wave 2).

Now, here are some questions about how much say the government should have in regulating things that individuals and businesses do.

(V8519) In the interests of public safety, should the government require the use of seatbelts in automobiles or helmets for motorcycle riders OR should those decisions be left up to individuals?

Government require	64% (314)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2 (11)
Left to individuals	33 (161)
DK	1 (7)

(V8520) Would you say that the American free enterprise system is OR is not a match for a centrally coordinated economy like Japan's?

Is a match	42% (207)
Both, depends (volunteered)	* (1)
Is not a match	37 (182)
DK	21 (101)

(V8521) When it comes to making decisions in industry, should workers have more say than they do now OR do they have enough say already?

Have more say	62% (303)
Both, depends (volunteered)	2 (10)
Have enough say now	32 (160)
DK	4 (20)

(V8522) Generally speaking, are government limits on rents and home prices a bad idea or a good idea?

Bad idea	37% (182)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1 (7)
Good idea	56 (274)
DK	6 (29)

(V8523) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring school children to recite the Pledge of Allegiance daily?

Favor	69% (337)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1 (4)
Oppose	28 (138)
DK	2 (11)

(V8524) If a person refuses to sell his house to members of a certain racial or ethnic group, should he have that right OR should that be illegal?

Have that right	55% (269)
Both, depends (volunteered)	* (1)
Should be illegal	42 (209)
DK	3 (14)

(V8525) Do you think it would be a good idea or a bad idea if the government owned the airlines in the United States as is done in many other countries?

Good idea	23%	(112)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Bad idea	68	(337)
DK	9	(43)

(V8526) If people want to smoke marijuana in their own homes, is that basically their business OR should it be illegal?

Basically their business	32%	(158)
Both, depends (volunteered)	1	(5)
Should be illegal	66	(323)
DK	1	(6)

(V8527) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring that all young adults serve their country by spending some time in the military, the Peace Corps, or in some other kind of national service?

Favor	55%	(269)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Oppose	43	(213)
DK	2	(9)

(V8528) Would you favor or oppose a law requiring people to recycle newspaper, glass, and other recyclable waste in order to reduce the trash problem?

Favor	89%	(438)
Both, depends (volunteered)	0	(0)
Oppose	10	(52)
DK	1	(3)

* Less than 1%.

Table 3. Relationships between Individualism Subscales and Policy Preferences.

Limited Govt. Score	Aid to Blacks	% Favoring Increased Budget for:					% Favor Govt help to women	% Favor Rent Control
		Social Security	Food Stamps	Elderly Care	Unem- ployed	Home- less		
1	31	72	28	92	34	83	88	71
2	17	56	13	86	25	66	85	67
3	14	41	7	77	26	68	76	55
4	11	39	0	63	12	43	69	39
5	4	22	4	48	4	18	40	22

Personal Autonomy Score	% Pro-choice on Abortion	% Favor Mandatory Pledge	% Favor Organized School Prayer
2	23	77	35
3	24	61	26
4	44	68	29
5	49	64	24

Self- Reliance Score	% Black should expect no favors	% Govt see to three meals/day	% Increase Homeless Budget	% Cut Food Stamps Budget	% Favor More Gun Control
1	59	63	82	16	74
3	75	49	68	26	69
5	89	30	45	47	57

Laissez- faire Score	% Favor Private Medical Insur.	% Favor Rent Control	% Believe US no match for Japan
1	20	68	61
3	30	65	44
5	60	44	39

Table 4. Multiple regression estimates of policy preferences and feelings towards candidates as a function of "values" scales, ideological self-placement, and party identification.

Var #	Dependent Variable Name	Range	Pers. Auton	Self-Relian	Limited Govt	Laissez Faire	Egali-tarian	Moral Tradit.	Patriot-ism	Lib-Cons	PartyID	R-sq.	N
601	More govt svcs	1-7			-1.33					-1.08	-.74	.24	380
622	Get ahead on own	1-7			.74		-2.34	-.82			.66	.23	363
7315	Soc Sec \$ cut	1-3			.49						.22	.13	574
7321	Homeless \$ cut	1-3		.29	.70		-.49					.23	478
	SocWelfare Index	1-10			2.08		-1.83			.86	.69	.47	342
726	Women in home	1-7	-1.08				-1.41	1.97				.13	540
734	Pro-abortion	1-4	.78				.43	-1.53				.18	555
7420	No drug testing	1-4	.69					-1.19		-.63		.14	398
	Civil Lib Index	1-6	1.02				.97	-2.09				.25	395
720	Black aid \$ cut	1-3		.29			-.91			.46	.42	.22**	347
7427	Govt not help Bl.	1-5		.61			-2.30					.26**	304
5826	No college quotas	1-5			.55		-2.63					.22**	526
	Race Issue Index	1-6		.52	.62		-2.66					.36**	330
8522	Favor rent control	1-5			-1.65	-.47						.11	409
	Free-enter. Index	1-5	.42		.88			-.87			.39	.17	317
228	Geo. Bush F-T	0-100	-6.19			7.89	-16.0		5.36		38.2	.39	508
232	R. Reagan F-T	0-100	-10.2	10.1				-13.1	11.7	19.5	41.6	.47	338
236	Jesse Jackson F-T	0-100		-6.34			42.3				-14.3	.25**	470

**Includes race as a control variable.

Table 5. Estimates of logistic equation for voting for Dukakis (rather than Bush) in 1988.

Model:	Marginal	Full	Diff		
-2log(Likelihood)	479.47	242.46	237.01	df=5	sig=0.
Fraction explained	.5001	.7044	.2043		

N=346

Full model estimates	Coeff	Std Err	Ratio
CONSTANT	3.99	1.41	-2.82
SELF RELIANCE	-.697	.490	-1.42
LIMITED GOVT	-1.87	.604	-3.09
PATRIOTISM	-.770	.305	-2.53
EGALITAR	2.83	1.09	2.60
PARTY ID	-5.10	.553	-9.21