

Assessing The NES Group  
Consciousness Measures

Arthur H. Miller  
The University of Iowa

Prepared for the NES sponsored conference on Groups and American  
Politics. January 16-17, 1987, Center for Advanced Study in the  
Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

## Assessing the NES Group Consciousness Measures

Arthur H. Miller  
The University of Iowa

Evaluating the instrumentation or operationalization of any concept requires first and foremost a statement of the concept. How is one to evaluate the instrument without first specifying the theory, model or concept that is presumably being measured? Surely one cannot.

Yet the task of evaluation differs for the secondary analyst and the primary investigator. Under the limitations of secondary analysis the researcher often has a concept in mind and then searches for measures to fit the concept. There are, however, many possible ways to measure any concept. One could imagine going through some comprehensive data set such as the National Election Survey, searching for the most valid measure of a complex concept such as group consciousness. Surely numerous possibilities could be found and evaluated by some acceptable criteria of validity. That is not, however, the task of this paper.

Rather, the focus of this paper is to evaluate the set of NES survey questions that were specifically designed to measure the theoretical components of group consciousness. The discussion will deal primarily with those survey items initially contributed by the Gurins and the author to the 1972 and 1976 NES surveys. These items were crafted with particular theoretical goals in mind. Assessment of these items, some of which were repeated in the 1980 and 1984 surveys, can thus proceed from theory to measurement.

Before turning to the measures, a brief review of the theoretical basis of group consciousness is presented. In addition, it will be helpful to briefly differentiate the concept of group consciousness from some other approaches to understanding intra- and intergroup behavior. The two other approaches dealt with here are labeled simple group membership and sympathetic group identification. Having spelled out the relevant theoretical concepts we turn to a discussion of the available indicators and ask if they provide an adequate representation of the concepts.

### Simple Group Membership

The traditional approach to the study of groups in society is to compare demographic collectives. The literature of the social sciences abounds with examples. The approach was useful prior to the invention of the mass survey. Since then it makes little theoretical sense to rely only on demographic categories to measure the concept of group. The reason why it no longer makes sense is because demographic differences were never meant to be interpreted literally. These demographic categories have always represented something broader-- status, class, power, shared socialization, a common outlook on life. In short, they reflected psychology and behavioral distinctions that

presumably could be tapped more directly in a survey. Nevertheless, even in the analysis of survey data, demographic differentiation has been the most prevalent approach to the concept of group.

Perhaps the popularity of using demographic categories to represent groups arises from the belief that what matters most are objective conditions. The poor vs. the wealthy, blue collar vs. white collar, young vs. old, all are pleasing distinctions. They are easy to understand. Even politicians can relate to such differences. Indeed, Karl Marx himself preferred such distinctions to subjectively defined group membership -- no problem with false consciousness here.

Despite considerable evidence that a subjective component is very critical to the concept of group, the social sciences continue to rely primarily on a model that is objective and demographic in approach. This model assumes that all individuals experience the objective conditions in the same way; that a group is no more than the sum of the individuals; that any individual is the equivalent of any other; and that no special bond among the individuals of a group arises out of simple membership in the category.

Yet, we know that not all individuals of a particular category, such as poor people, think or act alike. Indeed, not all of them even think of themselves as poor. Moreover, some people appear to deviate sharply from the behavior patterns that objective conditions would predict. Blacks, for example, participate in politics at higher levels than expected from their demographic conditions alone.

Perhaps one of the reasons for the continued prevalence of the simple group membership model is the individualistic orientation of the social sciences especially in the US. The individual qua individual is very much the norm. Surveys interview individuals, not collective units such as families or congregations or clubs or work groups. Without a general theory of groups, and a society that emphasizes individualism, it is not surprising that the prevalent model is one that stresses the individual or a collection of individuals.

#### Group Consciousness

Alternative theories of social interaction do exist. These theories do not deny the basic importance of objective social differences, rather they build on these distinctions by describing how social psychological processes contribute to social conflict arising from these differences. The alternative views give far more emphasis to groups both as meaningful social entities and as objects of individual perception. Social interaction, even when it occurs between individuals, according to this view, is heavily influenced by group considerations.

The particular precept from the group view of social interaction most relevant here is that of group consciousness. There are certainly differing notions of group consciousness in the literature. The one discussed here has evolved out of joint work with Pat and Jerry Gurin (see references for citations). It is based largely in the work of

Tajfel (see his 1981 book for the most complete statement of these ideas), thus it draws heavily on notions of social categorization, social identity, social comparison and attribution theory. In general it describes a process that explains a shift in the orientation of subordinate group members from one of resignation and social acceptance to engagement in political participation targeted at social change.

Tajfel's theory of intergroup relations combines cognitive, affective and behavioral elements. Social categorization represents a cognitive orientation to the world in which one thinks about society in terms of sharply drawn social categories and compares oneself with others in terms of these categories. Social identity involves that part of the individual's self-concept which derives from one's knowledge of membership in a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. Every individual strives for a positive self image. Members of groups with lower social status, however, are faced with a situation that fails to automatically engender positive assessments in comparison with other more fortunate groups. If these status differences are seen as irreconcilable and illegitimate, then the group members are motivated to engage in action aimed at changing their social situation.

The notion of group consciousness employed in designing many of the NES measures is similar to Tajfel's conceptualization of intergroup relations. The starting point is generally a categorical group -- women, blacks, poor, young, etc. -- defined by some socially relevant characteristic. Political categories, such as liberal or conservative could also be employed and were included in the measurement, although that was not the primary purpose. Identification with these various social categories is then ascertained in terms of shared interests. Individuals who do not think of themselves in categorical terms presumably will not indicate a sense of closeness or shared identity with others in these groups. Individuals closely identified with a particular group, however, can be expected to exhibit a social preference, as well as positive sentiment for members of their own group, but less positive affect toward those outside the group. Social comparison should also be evident in terms of perceived status and power differences between the groups. There is some theoretical controversy about the specification of a particular outgroup as a necessary component in the development of group consciousness. Perhaps it is sufficient for group members to identify with the ingroup and to share a sense of status dissatisfaction rather than having a specific outgroup that is used for comparison. Regardless of these specific questions concerning the target of the social comparison, group comparison remains a very important theoretical component of group consciousness.

Another important component of group consciousness involves the individual's explanation for these perceived status differences. Accepting status differentials as legitimate and attributing the lack of success to individual failure should theoretically produce a different behavioral response than seeing the group's subordinate status as illegitimate and a result of social barriers. The latter belief can be expected to foster a collective action orientation whereas the former should lead to resignation and withdrawal.

Previous work (see references) has investigated change over the past decade in the distribution of group identification and consciousness for groups defined by race, age, gender and class. It has also examined the impact of group consciousness on political participation and the vote. The concept of group consciousness inherently spells out a process that raises particular hypotheses and expectations about participation. The relationship between consciousness and the partisan direction of the vote, however, is not specified by the theory. Further assumptions about which party or candidate is perceived as most favorable for the group are necessary to specify this relationship. The theory does suggest, however, that this perception will have the greatest effect on the vote of those most strongly identified with the group. Indeed, viewing and reacting to the world of politics in group terms should generally be more prevalent for those with strong group consciousness.

Before moving on to a discussion of the particular questions used in the NES surveys to measure the components of group consciousness, it may be worth noting how the concept differs from some other group related ideas. One concept that needs to be distinguished is what may be called sympathetic group identification. An individual who is not a member of a categorical group (as defined by the social characteristics of the group), such as a wealthy person, can certainly identify with poor people in the sense of shared interests. Nonetheless, this is not the same type of identification as that expressed by a poor person. It is an ideological identification and it may lead to the same behavioral consequences but for very different reasons. In some sense it is the psychological equivalent of support for the subordinate group but from a dominant group member. This certainly is an important ideological orientation, which no doubt has played a major role in the real politics of race and poverty in this and every western democracy.

Nevertheless, sympathetic identification is not the same as group consciousness. That these two concepts are distinct should not imply, however, that consciousness lacks applicability to dominant group members. On the contrary, among dominant group members, especially those who perceive threat from the subordinate group, the ideology of group consciousness justifies advantage, gives legitimacy to existing status differences, emphasizes individualism for social and economic success, and provokes action aimed at securing permanence for their position.

In some respects the notion of group consciousness as applied to dominant group members appears similar to aspects of a symbolic politics orientation to intergroup relations (see Sears 1986). The differences are that symbolic politics has been applied mainly in terms of race relations, symbolic racism, whereas group identification applies generally across all groups. Similarly, symbolic racism is applicable only to a dominant group. And symbolic racism or symbolic politics more broadly conceived, contains no specification of a social process or predicted behavior as does group consciousness. In short, while these two theories of intergroup relations are compatible, they clearly are not the same.

## Assessing The NES Measures of Group Consciousness

Having briefly defined the concept of group consciousness we can turn to an evaluation of the survey questions available for operationalizing the various components of the concept.

### Socio-demographic categories:

The approach that we have generally used in the measurement of these concepts starts with a demographically defined subset of the population. Except for changes that have occurred across the years in some of the survey items, such as occupation and income, these questions are standardized and require little comment. Perhaps the only point that needs to be made here is that consistency is a virtue.

### Group identification:

Indeed when working from theory, consistency is always a virtue. Unfortunately one of the most frustrating aspects of working with the NES group items in recent surveys is the lack of continuity. The questions tapping group identification are a prime example. In 1972 and 1976 the original items presented the respondent with a list of 16 categorical groups and asked them to indicate which ones they felt "close to" in terms of "ideas, interests and feelings". Next they were asked to indicate which one of these groups they felt "closest to". From these two questions a single index with three categories could then be constructed -- no identification, close and closest identifiers. In 1980 and again in 1984 various additions, deletions and changes were made to the list of categories, thus making it nearly impossible to determine if group identification had changed over time.

Improved instrumentality is desirable in survey research. Yet in this case it could have been accomplished while still maintaining the integrity of the old questions. This could have been done by first presenting the old list and then presenting a second list with the new group categories. The frequency of response to a number of the added category labels clearly indicate that they are not among the primary categories that people use when organizing their view of the world. At the same time, religious categories with which a larger number of people had identified in earlier years were unfortunately deleted.

Despite these problems, the operational indicators show a good deal of robustness and validity across time. Even with all the changes to the basic questions, the across-time trends in identification for certain theoretically relevant groups appear reasonable (see Miller et al. 1986). The pattern of correlations between group identity and other criterion variables also supports the validity of the measure. For example, group identity was significantly related with the other components of group consciousness in 1972 and 1976 (see Miller et al. 1978, p.40). Moreover in 1984, despite the paucity of measures for some of these components, the pattern of correlations between group identity and other theoretically relevant items is as expected (see Table 1).

Further validation of the group identification questions comes from the 1984 survey. In that study respondents were asked the open ended question "in economic matters what sorts of people do you feel closest to". A good deal of overlap is found when comparing the groups respondents felt closest to in terms of "economic matters" (variable 174) and those they felt closest to in terms of "ideas, interests and feelings" (variable 1102). Not unexpectedly, the question on economics evokes more class, income and occupational group responses but fewer references to women, men, whites, young people or ideological groups than does the fixed format question. Nevertheless, a large percentage of respondents mentioning blacks, elderly, poor, farmers, working and middle class on the fixed format item also indicated these groups on the open-ended question (the percentage of overlap in the two questions for each of these groups respectively was: 37, 54, 20, 60, 35 and 38). Despite this convergence in the categories people identified with when using the two questions, the overlap was not perfect.

Clearly group identification does not rest solely on economic considerations. Indeed, the correlations in the first three columns of Table 1 suggest that the overlap in types of identity doesn't necessarily translate into a common perception of how well the group was doing economically. Only for women was group identity significantly related to the perception of how a group was doing economically. Unexpectedly, however, the group that strongly identified women were concerned about was the elderly, not women. Perhaps this result says something about the caring nature of women, as well as implying that economic self interest need not be the only basis for group solidarity.

By itself, however, group identity is not consistently or strongly associated with most political criterion variables. Under some historical circumstances and for some groups such as blacks, or women in 1984, these correlations do reach significance (Miller et al. 1986). Generally, group identity must be politicized before it is strongly related with political behavior. Indeed, the group consciousness measure (a combination of identity and support for a collective orientation) in Table 1 is generally more strongly related with other criterion variables than is group identity alone. The exception to this pattern of correlations is for blacks. Apparently, for blacks, group identification itself is far more politicized than it is for other groups.

While the available NES items work fairly well as indicators of group identity, they can be improved. In future studies a concern for continuity should be exercised with respect to the category labels. In addition, the measure can be improved by asking the respondents to also indicate which groups they feel "least close to". Perhaps a rank ordering of the three groups the respondent felt "least close to" could be obtained. This would help with the concept of "outgroup", as well as giving greater variance to the measure of group identification.

#### Group affect:

One of the major components of group consciousness involves affect towards the ingroup and the outgroup. In the past this concept has been

measured with the thermometer ratings of groups. These items have a long tradition in the NES series and should be continued. It should be noted, however, that the thermometers have an artificial bias toward positive ratings (see Weisberg and Miller 1982 NES Board report). People tend not to give negative ratings, thus producing positive correlations among all ratings even for opposing groups. The net result is that dimensional analysis (factor analysis, multidimensional scaling, etc.) of the items is rather tricky. For example, with the 1976 data we obtained a substantively more meaningful and technically better solution with dimensional analysis using questions of perceived group influence than with the group thermometers.

Despite these limitations the thermometers provide a valuable set of group measures. Given the lengthy time series for the thermometers, it is possible to compare the structure of group affect across the years. For example, a comparison of the factor solutions obtained with the 1976 and 1984 thermometers reveals that a fascinating shift in group politics occurred in the United States during that period. Briefly stated, the 1984 election witnessed a reduction in group fragmentation and an increase in the institutionalization of group politics. These changes are evident from the factor loadings presented in Tables 2 and 3. Greater group fragmentation is indicated in 1976 by the fact that six factors as compared with four in 1984 were required for a satisfactory solution (specified by eigenvalues less than 1). Increased institutionalization of group conflict is suggested by a change in the groups associated with the Democratic party.

In general, the major reduction in fragmentation that occurred in 1984 came about through a shift in the Democratic coalition. As of 1976 only labor unions were closely linked with the Democratic party (see loadings on factor 5). In 1984, however, in addition to labor unions a variety of activist and very liberal groups became associated with the Democratic party. Among these groups were the women's liberation movement and black militants, groups that had formed a separate factor in 1976. A comparison of the 1976 and 1984 results are very interesting as they reveal the shifting group basis of party support, as well as indicating how the public perceives the political parties in terms of groups at different points in time. The 1984 results are particularly pleasing as they provide empirical support for the popular belief that the Democrats have become the party of the liberal fringe, including gays and lesbians.

Considerably more on the substantive and political implications of the factor analysis results will appear in a forthcoming paper. For now it is sufficient to mention a couple of methodological problems with the results as they are reported here. Briefly, the problems arise from the lack of continuity in thermometer items across time. Certain groups appear in one year but not the other. Furthermore, the two surveys do not include the same opposing groups. Perhaps, therefore, these interesting results simply reflect the vagaries of which groups were included in each study.

Although there is some debate over the concept of opposing groups as measured by indicators of "polar affect" (like the ingroup - dislike



the outgroup), it is theoretically useful to have ratings of both the ingroup and the outgroup whenever possible. Which particular groups should the NES staff select for the thermometer ratings list? Past research and a good feel for the dominant cleavages in society should help determine the groups to include among the thermometer set to meet this criterion of rating opposing groups whenever possible.

The thermometers also provide an efficient way to measure support for the collective action element of a group, such as the gray panthers, NOW or the NAACP. Adding some of these organized extensions of particularly relevant and sizable categorical groups to the thermometer set would be a major improvement that would require little additional survey time.

#### Social comparison:

Group members can compare the situation of their group to that of others along a variety of dimensions. One of the most relevant dimensions is the degree of political and social influence the group is perceived to enjoy. The 1972 and 1976 NES surveys contained a set of questions asking respondents if various social groups had "too much, too little or just about the right amount of influence in American life and politics". Respondents in those studies were also asked about the influence of their "closest" group. These items were very useful in constructing a measure of polar power -- the influence of the ingroup relative to that of the outgroup. The concept has played a major role in previous work on group consciousness because of its strong relationship with political behavior and a collective orientation. In addition, the items reflect on the extent to which people perceive the political arena as permeable, an important concept in Tajfel's theory. In the aggregate and across time, therefore, these items indicate the rigidity in the structure of political power in America. Unfortunately the questions have not been repeated since 1976.

The 1984 survey, however, contained a set of items that asked in a more general way about equality (see variables 204, 206, 208, 251, 253). Indirectly these questions may tap the same attitudes as perceived group influence. Hypothetically, we can expect a person who believes that their group has too little influence to also feel that equality has not gone far enough. Indeed the 1984 data provide some support for this assumption. A larger percentage of subordinate group identifiers, such as blacks and women, said that equality had not gone far enough than did the "closest" members of dominant groups like men, whites and middle class (70, 57, 44, 42 and 38 percent, respectively). Moreover, the 1984 equality items are correlated with the group identification and consciousness measures of Table 1, thus suggesting that an important part of solidarity is a comparison of relative social standing. In general, the 1984 results lend credibility to the conclusion that the equality questions tap perceptions of relative group status rather than just individual comparisons.

While it might be argued that the 1984 items provide a reasonable surrogate for the group influence questions they are, nonetheless, limited as indicators of social comparison. The group reference must be

assumed rather than explicitly measured. For some individuals, therefore, the equality items may reflect social platitudes or general norms, while for others they tap dissatisfaction arising from perceived status differences between groups. Indeed, the 1972 survey, the only NES study to include both equality and influence items, provides some support for this assumption. In that study respondents were asked if they agreed with the statement that "equality had gone too far in this country". That item was significantly correlated with the perceived influence of selected groups such as women and blacks for the population as a whole (Pearson correlations of .18 and .34 respectively). Similar correlations also occurred among the relevant subgroups referenced by the influence items, thereby suggesting that they tap, at least partially, the same concept.

Despite evidence of some shared variance, the equality and influence items are not strongly enough correlated to conclude that one is a surrogate for the other. In fact further evidence from the 1972 study reveals a good deal of independence between the two measures. Group consciousness, for example, was significantly related with both measures in a multivariate analysis. For instance, among women the zero order correlation of consciousness with group influence ( $r=.25$ ) was stronger than with equality ( $r=.16$ ). The partial correlation for each item in a two variable equation was .22 and .13, revealing that both attitudes contributed to gender consciousness. Substantively this result makes good sense. It indicates that highly identified women believe that greater equality would be good for society in general, and that their own group unacceptably lacks influence.

In short, the 1984 equality measures are not an acceptable substitute for the earlier influence items as indicators for social comparison. The 1976 analysis suggests that both types of items would be useful. In an either/or situation the influence items should be given priority.

#### Individual/system blame:

The 1972 and 1976 studies contained a series of questions designed to determine how people explain individual or group success and failure. The various explanations incorporated in the items juxtaposed both individual failings (lazy, less drive, born in poverty, the wrong values) and social barriers (lack of proper training, seniority system, social discrimination). The index constructed from a subset of these items was significantly associated with other group variables (see Miller et al. 1978 p.40). No subsequent NES survey has included any of these questions.

The 1984 study, however, has a series of items that on the surface appear to tap the same concept (see variables 205, 207, 209, 252, 254, 256). These questions place emphasis on hard work as the source of success, thus limiting the possible explanations for failure to laziness. The first question in the set appears somewhat broader however. It asks the respondent to agree or disagree with the statement "people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they have only themselves to blame".

On face value the 1984 items may seem to tap individual versus system explanations for status differences. They seem to suggest that success results from hard work. If that is generally perceived as true, then status differences between groups are legitimate as lower status groups simply don't work hard enough.

Despite the apparent face validity, these 1984 questions simply do not measure up empirically. First of all the items lack internal coherence. In a factor analysis only the two items that most blatantly connect hard work and success (vars. 209 and 254) load above .5 on the same factor. Also, when the distribution of responses to the items is examined across the various groups defined by the "closest" group measure, little meaningful variation is observed. As expected even poor people endorse the norm that hard work brings success. Further concern about the broader validity of these items springs from the fact that they are not related with group consciousness (see Table 1) or any other group measures. Nor are they related with age, education, income, sex or race. On the other hand the items are moderately (.15-.20) correlated with general economic outlook, how the country is doing, Reagan job approval and beliefs about whether or not Reagan is hard working.

In general the 1984 "hard work spells success" items are a poor substitute as measures for the individual versus system blame concept. These items are too narrowly focused on hard work to adequately measure the concept. Moreover, they are entirely focused on the dominant group ideology regarding explanations for lower status -- laziness. Most importantly, the items are not group specific. They do not ask the respondent to explain the social situation of blacks, the poor, the elderly or women. The concept of individual/system blame is important to theories of intergroup relations, yet recent studies have not adequately measured this concept.

#### Candidate-group linkage:

How does group consciousness or the perception of status differences between groups get translated into political behavior? Presumably through the public's perception that one party or candidate is more favorably disposed toward the groups with which they identify. Since 1976 three different approaches have been used to operationalize this link. In 1976 the respondents were presented with a list of groups and asked which candidate the group would be better off with as president. In 1980 the question asked which candidate would benefit their "closest" group. The 1984 study used a couple of questions asking if the candidates "cared about" or "understood" people like you.

Each approach has some advantages and some limitations. The 1976 items worked well and give group specific information (see Miller et al. 1978). The disadvantage is that relatively few groups can be included or the question becomes too lengthy. The problem with the 1980 approach is that it is asked about the respondents "closest" group only, thus it is impossible to determine if the opposing candidate is seen as benefiting the outgroup. Similarly this is a problem with the 1984 approach as it refers to "people like you". Without some additional

group variable it is difficult to determine what "people like you" actually means. However, in conjunction with the "closest" group measure, one does find across-category differences in assessments of the candidates that make theoretical sense. For example, respondents who felt closest to poor people and blacks were less likely to think Reagan cared about them than those closest to businessmen and the moral majority (the percentages are 28, 17, 60 and 81 respectively). Moreover, the evaluations of which candidates cared about or understood people "like you" were clearly related with group consciousness for women, blacks and the elderly in Table 1.

In summary, the 1984 results reveal an underlying group basis for questions referring to "people like you". Nevertheless, those questions are less useful to a group approach to political behavior than the type of question used in 1976 because they do not specifically ask about groups. The 1984 items tell us nothing about how the candidates reflect in the public's mind perceived group conflict. We only learn if the candidate is seen to benefit my group, whatever that is. But we do not learn if the candidate also benefits or works against some other groups.

#### Conclusion

The factor analysis of the 1984 group thermometers presented above and other data reported elsewhere suggest that an increased institutionalization of group conflict occurred in 1984 (see Weisberg, 1985; Miller, Hildreth and Simmons, 1986). An important question is whether this trend will continue into the future. In recent years we have heard repeatedly of growing concerns about increased racial and inter-group tensions in the US. The beating of several blacks by whites in Howard Beach, New York at the end of 1986 certainly underscores this apparent tension. The potential group conflict arising from this underlying tension can either spill out on to the streets or it can be dealt with through normal political channels.

One important element for confining group conflict to the conventional political arena is representation. If group members feel that their interests are represented by the political parties and leaders, they are more likely to seek redress for their grievances through established political channels. The post 1984 election attempt by the Democratic party to distance itself from various minority elements in the population may potentially add to a renewed group fragmentation in the future. Given the seeming increase in group tension and the desire of Democrats to shed their new image as the party of special interests, the 1988 election promises to be very important from the perspective of group politics. For social scientists to understand the changing impact of groups on electoral and partisan politics, it is essential for the NES to maintain a substantively diverse set of measures tapping group attitudes.

Previous work on group consciousness leads to the following specific recommendations. Maintain the group identification items. Use the earlier studies as a guide to which groups to include in the question. Continuity of the group categories should be emphasized. Add a question on the "least closest groups". Repeat the 1976 questions on

perceived group influence. If general "equality" questions are to be asked, use only two items from the 1984 survey (vars. 206,251). Repeat all group thermometers, again giving emphasis to continuity and the inclusion of opposing groups.

Recommendations on individual versus system blame questions are more difficult to make. The 1984 "hard work brings success" items do not work and need not be repeated. What to replace them with is more difficult. The 1972 and 1976 items also have some problems but provide a starting point. A committee could be commissioned to review these items and recommend a subset for use in future studies, or to produce a revised set focused on particular subordinate groups. This set could then be supplemented with new items that reflect a more general, that is, not group specific, "individual versus system barriers" orientation. In any event, the questions should involve explanations for the status of subordinate groups as the primary focus, rather than success among dominant groups.

Finally, greater attention should be given to the connection between group attitudes and political behavior. Necessary for meeting this goal are questions focused on perceived candidate/group links and collective orientation. The 1976 approach to candidate/group linkages reviewed above is superior to those used in 1980 or 1984 but is less efficient. The "people like you" approach of 1984 used in conjunction with group identification is better than the "closest group" approach of 1980. Collective orientation could be measured as it was in 1976 with a question on whether people should organize in groups or work as individuals to improve their social status. In addition, it would be very useful to ask if the respondent belongs to any organizations or receives any magazines that reflect the interests of their closest group. On these questions it would be best to obtain the actual names of the organizations and magazines.

Table 1: Correlations of Group Identification and  
Consciousness With Criterion Variables for Women,  
Blacks and Elderly Using 1984 NES

Criterion Variables (Var. #)	Id.	Consc.	Id.	Consc.	Id.	Consc.
Economy Women (199)	.02	.08	.01	.02	.07	.18
Economy Blacks (200)	.07	.13	.05	.14	.01	.07
Economy Elderly (201)	.12	.15	.01	.05	.05	.13
Turnout (783)	.04	.10	.10	.15	-.09	-.07
Vote (788)	.11	.25	.13	.16	.10	.18
Individualism (205)	.09	.11	.09	.06	-.03	.07
Hard work (254)	.07	.08	.03	.05	-.05	-.04
Equality (206)	.15	.28	.20	.21	.08	.13
Men More Important (210)	.19	.24	.12	.10	-.09	-.01
National Economy Worse (227)	.03	.04	.02	.01	-.10	-.11
Women's Role (250)	.18	.27	.14	.16	-.02	-.01
Reagan Cares (329)	.06	.17	.13	.17	.02	.10
Mondale Cares (345)	-.05	-.16	-.15	-.13	-.13	-.18
Ferraro Cares (366)	-.12	-.27	-.13	-.21	-.08	-.17
Minority Aid (382)	.07	.14	.12	.10	.09	.16
Economy Status Women (401)	.13	.25	.04	.09	-.02	.01
Thermometer Women (762)	.17	.29	.16	.28	-.07	.10
Thermometer Blacks (763)	.13	.23	.22	.31	.01	.16

Table 2: FACTOR ANALYSIS OF GROUP THERMOMETERS 1976

<u>GROUP THERMOMETER</u>	<u>FACTOR LOADINGS</u>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Whites	.84					
Men	.83					
Middle Class	.76					
Workingmen	.73					
Protestants	.61					
Young People	.52					
Catholics	.38			.33		
Black Militants		.75				
Radical Students		.72				
Marijuana Users		.66				
Women's Liberation Movement		.53				
Civil Rights Leaders		.52		.49		
Liberals		.49			.31	
Big Business			.67			
Republicans			.67			
Conservatives			.63			
Business Men			.62			
Military			.42		.38	
Policemen	.31		.41			
Chicanos				.67		
Blacks				.62		
Jews				.58		
People on Welfare				.39	.38	
Southerners				.30	.30	
Democrats					.56	
Labor Unions		.27			.48	
Older People						.54
Women	.46					.49
Poor					.37	.40

Generalized Least Squares  
 Varimax Rotation  
 Factors Generated Via Eigenvalues GE1  
 Percent Variance Explained = 61%

Table 3: FACTOR ANALYSIS OF GROUP THERMOMETERS 1984

<u>GROUP THERMOMETER</u>	<u>FACTOR LOADINGS</u>			
	1	2	3	4
Old People	.79			
Whites	.78			
Poor People	.71			
Middle Class	.71			
Catholics	.38		.35	
Democrats		.65		
Black Militants		.60		
Liberals		.58		
Labor Unions		.58		
Women's Liberation Movement		.54		
People on Welfare		.48		
Gays and Lesbians		.37	.36	
Blacks			.73	
Hispanics			.72	
Women	.51		.52	
Civil Rights Leaders			.51	
Evangelical/Moral Majority				.71
Big Business				.61
Republicans				.57
Conservatives				.54
The Military				.51
Anti-Abortionists				.42

Generalized Least Squares.  
 Varimax Rotation  
 Factors Generated via Eigenvalues GE 1  
 Percent Variance Explained = 58%





## REFERENCES

- Gurin, Patricia, Arthur H. Miller and Gerald Gurin. 1980. Stratum Identification and Consciousness. Social Psychology Quarterly, 43:38-47.
- Gurin, Patricia. 1985. Women's Gender Consciousness. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49:143-163.
- Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin and Gerald Gurin. 1978. Electoral Implications of Group Identification and Consciousness: The Reintroduction of a Concept. Presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, New York.
- Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin and Oksana Malanchuk. 1981. Group Consciousness and Political Participation. American Journal of Political Science, 25:494-511.
- Miller, Arthur H., Anne Hildreth and Grace Simmons. 1986. The Political Implications of Gender Group Consciousness. Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Meetings, Chicago.
- Miller, Arthur H., Grace Simmons and Anne Hildreth. 1986. Group Influence, Solidarity and Electoral Outcomes. Presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C.
- Sears, David O. 1986. Symbolic Racism. In Phyllis Katz and Helmer Taylor (eds.), Towards the Elimination of Racism. Plenum Publishers.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1981. Human Groups and Social Categories. Cambridge University Press.
- Weisberg, Herbert and Arthur H. Miller. 1979. Evaluation of the Feeling Thermometers. A report to the National Election Study Board.