

# College Spillover Effects: Reassessing Whites' Racial Beliefs and Policy Attitudes

By

Jerry Johnson

July 2018

Director of Thesis: Dr. Mamadi Corra

Department of Sociology

Abstract: College educated people hold distinct racial beliefs and policy attitudes from people who did not attend college. The current study examines “College Spillover Effects.” Specifically, does the effect of a college education on racial beliefs and policy attitudes also impact those dispositions in people who did not go to college but hold close social ties with a college graduate? While existing research on racial attitudes does not address college spillover effects, college educated Whites have been associated with decreased odds of holding racist beliefs, and with no such association to support for policies that would address racial inequality. Using cumulative data from the General Social Survey, I compare two groups of White high school graduates; (1) those married to White high school graduates, and (2) those married to White College graduates. Logistic and Ordered Logistic regression models reveal that there are college spillover effects in White couples with differing levels of education, net of relevant control variables. In general, White high school graduates married to college graduates exhibit decreased odds of holding racist beliefs and decreased odds of strongly opposing race-targeting policies than those married to other high school graduates. College spillover effects were not found in support for Affirmative action, though females exhibit decreased odds of strongly opposing these programs. Additionally, as age and income increases, so do the odds for strongly opposing preferential hiring of blacks. The idea of *When* and *Why* the effects that college has on racial beliefs and policy attitudes would spillover in social groups is discussed, and suggestions for future research are noted.



College Spillover Effects: Reassessing Whites' Racial Beliefs and Policy Attitudes

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Sociology

By

Jerry Johnson Jr.

July 2018

© (Jerry L. Johnson Jr., 2018)

College Spillover Effects: Reassessing Whites' Racial Beliefs and Policy Attitudes

by

Jerry Johnson

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF  
THESIS: \_\_\_\_\_

Mamadi Corra, Ph.D

COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Sitawa Kimuna, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Colin Campbell, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Anthony Papalas, Ph.D.

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT  
OF (Sociology): \_\_\_\_\_

Bob Edwards, Ph.D.

DEAN OF THE  
GRADUATE SCHOOL: \_\_\_\_\_

Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

### **Dedication**

To my 3 beautiful kids: Joy-Lynette Johnson (Age 4), Jalaya Johnson (Age 3), and Jerry Johnson III (Age 1).

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to especially thank my thesis committee chair, Dr. Mamadi Corra, for his remarkable mentorship and expertise in scholarship on race and race relations. Also, I would like to give thanks to the rest of my thesis committee: Dr. Colin Campbell, Dr. Sitawa Kimuna, and Dr. Anthony Papalas. You all have been instrumental in the completion of this thesis.

To my cohort, my family, and friends: I could not have completed this thesis without much support given by you all. At different times throughout this journey, you all have contributed to the motivation and dedication I put towards this study. Appreciation is also given to the department of Sociology at East Carolina University. Thank you all for your support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
COPYRIGHT PAGE.....	ii
SIGNATURE PAGE.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The current study.....	2
CHAPTER II. BACKGROUND.....	4
2.1 Scientific American Reports.....	5
CHAPTER III. THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS.....	6
3.1 Self-Interest Theories.....	7
3.2 Stratification Belief Theories.....	10
3.3 Racial Attitude Theories.....	12
Chapter IV. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION.....	13
4.1 Education as liberation.....	14
4.2 Education as Superficial Commitment.....	16
4.3 Research Question and Hypotheses.....	18
CHAPTER V. DATA, METHODS, AND SAMPLE DESCRIPTION.....	18
5.1 General Social Survey Dataset.....	19
5.2 Mode of Analysis.....	20
5.3 Observing College Spillover.....	22



CHAPTER VI. RESULTS.....	23
6.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	24
6.2 Results for Cross Tabulations.....	26
6.3 Results for Multivariate Analysis.....	28
CHAPTER VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	31
REFERENCES.....	35
TABLES.....	40
APPENDIX.....	48

## List of Tables

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of independent variables.....	40
Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of outcome variables.....	41
Table 3 Cross tabulations for spillover and racial belief measures.....	42
Table 4 Cross tabulations for spillover and racial policy attitude measures.....	43
Table 5 Cross tabulations for spillover and attitudes toward affirmative action.....	44
Table 6 Logistic regression models for College spillover and Racial Belief Measures.....	45
Table 7 Ordered logistic regression model for College spillover and racial policy attitude measures.....	46
Table 8 Ordered logistic regression model for College spillover and Attitudes toward affirmative action.....	47

## Chapter I. Introduction

“Dominant social groups routinely develop ideologies that legitimize and justify the status quo, and the well-educated members of these dominant groups are the most sophisticated practitioners of their group’s ideology. The well-educated are but one step ahead of their peers in developing a defense of their interests that rests on qualification, individualism, obfuscation, and symbolic concessions.”

-Jackman and Muha, *Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement?* (1984: 49)

The theoretical paradox in contemporary racial attitudes is characterized by the juxtaposition between a steady decline in whites’ negative racial beliefs and the stagnation in whites’ support for policies that would address racial inequality (Bobo and Kluegel 1997). According to Bobo and Kluegel (1997), this paradox of contemporary racial attitudes raises concerns about the nature of prejudice, the meaning behind the changes in racial attitudes, and the validity of existing measures of tolerance.

What is the role of education in shaping the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes? While negative racial attitudes are thought to come from a place of parochialism and reluctance to democratic norms, an advanced formal education is thought to enlighten individuals to adapt a more democratic sentiment (Bobo and Licari 1989). Past research has placed well-educated whites at decreased odds with having racist beliefs, but with no association between the well-educated and support for policies that address racial inequality (Jackman and Muha 1984; Bobo

and Kluegel 1997). Jackman and Muha (1984) suggested that education makes people more sophisticated in defending their interests, and not more racially liberal. Support for principles among the well-educated is hence superficial, since it did not spillover to support for putting those principles into effect. Moreover, the well-educated are routinely less supportive of preferential treatment in hiring and promotion than those who are less-educated (Schuman et al 1985; Stoker 1998; Tuch & Hughes 1996).

To further examine the role of education in shaping the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes, I examine possible “college spillover effects.” Specifically, does the effect of a college education on racial beliefs and policy attitudes also impact those dispositions in people who did not go to college but hold close social ties with a college graduate? According to Jacob (1957): “The impact of the college experience is...to socialize the individual, to refine, polish, or "shape up" his values so that he can fit comfortably into the ranks of American college alumni” (Jacob, *Changing Values in College* 1957:4).

My hypothesis is based largely on the notion of “ideological refinement” that was relayed from the effects of education in an earlier study (Jackman and Muha 1984). I hypothesize that in close social ties with differing levels of education, the well-educated take on the role as teachers of a dominant ideology while the less-educated take on the role of students. This study will look at the effect of education on less-educated whites who hold close social ties to well-educated whites, in reference to the effect on less-educated whites in close ties with other less-educated whites.

The discussion to immediately follow begins with a background and review of the literature on the racial attitudes of White Americans. From the beginning of systematic sample survey analysis on Whites’ racial attitudes, what is said to persist is the resistance to support

policies that would address racial inequality, namely “race-targeted policies”. The review of the literature on the racial attitudes of Whites is extended to also include what has been the role of education in shaping racial beliefs and race-targeted policy attitudes. To test my hypotheses, I analyze representative sample survey data and regress measures of racial beliefs and policy attitudes on groups of White high school graduates. The results of this thesis are discussed, and a conclusion is provided with limitations, theoretical considerations, and directions for future research also noted.

## Chapter II. Background

Racial attitudes are fundamental to understanding the structure of black-white relations in the United States (Hyman and Sheatsley 1964). Racial attitudes may be defined as the beliefs and attitudes one holds towards race relations (Jordan 1968, p. viii). For scholars of American values, the attitudes of White Americans have been the highlight in research involving large-scale sample surveys. The lack of research concerning that of Black Americans may be in part due to the small numbers of Blacks in national survey samples. This imbalance may also be a reflection of assumptions shared by many scholars, but most defined as Myrdal's "American Dilemma": The contradiction between American democratic values and the actual discriminatory treatment of Blacks. This popular view posed the race relations in America as an issue fundamentally located in the minds of white Americans (Myrdal 1944), while the attitudes of Black Americans are seen as secondary reactions. Jaynes and Williams (1989) proposed that "in view of the economic and political power of the white majority, a change in some of their attitudes would be necessary if Blacks were to succeed in their struggle for civil rights and equality" (p. 116). The attitudinal record of white Americans reflect a transformation of basic racial norms in America (Schuman et al. 1985; Smith and Sheatsley 1984). The once majority acceptance of segregation and racial discrimination was replaced with the acceptance of desegregation and equal treatment.

Some of the earliest trend studies of change in racial attitudes relied heavily on data collected by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) and published in the *Scientific American Reports*. Hyman and Sheatsley (1956) first reported on change in the years between 1942 and 1956. This attitudinal analyses showed increasing support for desegregation of schools, housing, and public transportation. In these reports, there were also large differences between

North and South: support for desegregation was focused in the north, while support for segregation was focused in the south. Additionally, older people were more likely than younger people to oppose desegregation, and less-educated people were less open to desegregation than well-educated people. Hyman and Sheatsley (1964) suggested that attitudes are linked to actual social conditions. Accordingly, in areas of heavily enforced desegregation, attitudes were more supportive of desegregation than in areas where segregation was not challenged. For example, in southern communities, support for school desegregation ranged from a high of 54 percent in areas that enforced desegregation, to 38 percent in areas that were mildly introduced to desegregation, to 28 percent in areas where segregation prevailed (Hyman and Sheatsley 1964).

As reported by Jaynes and Williams (1989), some key patterns emerged from early trend studies on racial attitudes. First, Black Americans have supported principles of racial equality as far back as there are data. For whites, there has been a steady increase in support for principles of racial equality, but substantially less support for policies intended to implement those principles. Scholars have termed this as the “principle-implementation gap” (Carter et al. 2005). Secondly, whites’ support for openness to equal treatment also varies by the number or proportion of blacks likely to be involved. Where blacks remain a clear minority, the data indicate growing white acceptance of racial equality. Where blacks approach a majority, change is less frequent and overall levels of pro equal-treatment responses are low.

According to large scale sample survey research, the racial attitudes of White Americans have dramatically shifted over the past few decades. Initially, most White Americans supported segregation and racial discrimination. Over time, these attitudes were replaced with the acceptance of desegregation and equal treatment.

### **Chapter III. Theoretical Explanations**

With the sharp decline in traditional “Jim Crow” prejudice, the shift in emphasis from matters of principle to matters of practical social policy is thought to be the decisive change in racial issues in the 1970s (Jaynes and Williams 1989; Kluegel and Smith 1986; Schuman et al. 1985). Thus, scholarly attention has focused on theoretically explaining the stagnation in support for race-targeting policies- policies that would assist African-Americans. Three theoretical explanations for the stagnation in support for policies that would address racial inequality are theories of self-interest, stratification beliefs, and racial attitudes.

#### *Self-Interest*

The trending opposition to race-targeted policies by much of White America may be due to a self-interest of individuals or groups. Individual self-interest is characterized by an individual’s private interest in the objective losses or gains to oneself or immediate family (see Citrin and Green 1990 for a brief review). Accordingly, the effects of objective personal characteristics (e.g. income) on policy attitudes are said to reflect private interests. Amongst middle-income whites, for example, social welfare spending is thought to primarily benefit Blacks while negatively impacting Whites (Skocpol 1991). Additional research has found that, amongst whites, income is associated with a decrease in the support for social welfare spending (Gilliam and Whitby 1989; Bullock 1999; Wilson 2000).

Moreover, self-interest is also commonly defined at the broader group level. Membership to a group and the idea of a shared fate can lead to group-based assessments of self-interest. Group self-interest is evident through group differences in attitudes towards policies that offer benefits to subgroups of the population. For example, whites are often less supportive of race-



targeted and welfare policies than are blacks of the same socioeconomic status (Gilliam and Whitby 1989; Kluegel and Smith 1986).

Individual and group self-interest should not be assessed with great distinction, however. More often than not, individual self-interest is directly tied to group-based assessments. That is, the effects of individual self-interest on policy attitudes often reflect group self-interest, and vice-versa. For example, Self-identification of social class is strongly influenced by the objective personal characteristics of education, income, and employment (Jackman and Jackman 1983). Moreover, it has been found that group identification, such as socioeconomic status, can greatly shape individual self-interest (Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson 1989; Jackman and Jackman 1983).

William Julius Wilson (1987) forwarded the notion that race-targeted policies endure great opposition from people who do not benefit from them. On the basis of self-interest, even the little support for race-targeted policies are thought to become fragile during times of economic uncertainty. Thus the opposition to such policies heighten “when the national economy is in a period of little growth, or decline. Under such economic conditions, the more the public programs are perceived by members of the wider society as benefiting any certain groups, the less support those programs receive” (p. 118). For example, the welfare programs of the 1960s were eventually met with heavy backlash from middle-income whites. While regressive taxes were rising over the 1970s to support such programs, median family income declined by 16 percent with no apparent benefits. Skocpol (1991) interpreted these facts as having motivated the split between middle-class whites and the Democratic Party, which led to the election of Ronald Reagan.

Importantly, race in the United States categorizes people on the basis of their skin color. Category membership and identification into this racial divide has long been the bases for the

development of perceived interests (Bobo 1988b). The group self-interest hypothesis holds that blacks should be significantly more supportive of race-targeted policies than whites. But the self-interest approach is more specific, and predicts the policy attitudes of groups within the races (e.g. Class) as the policy goal transits from purely-economic to purely-racial. Whites who self-identify as being of high class, or otherwise high socio-economic status, have nothing to gain from either economic- or racial policy. By contrast, whites who self-identify as being of low class, or otherwise low socio-economic status, should be more supportive of economic policies than would be other whites. The transition from income-targeted to race-targeted policies should, therefore, lose support especially among low class whites.

### *Stratification Beliefs*

Attitudes toward race-targeted policies may be largely opposed by whites due to normative and existential beliefs about inequality in America. Normative beliefs about the stratification order in the United States are thought to predispose opposition to race-targeting, especially opposition to preferential policies that promote hiring or admissions quotas for blacks. Kluegel and Smith (1986) found that whites generally give greater support to “opportunity-enhancing” programs than to programs that generate “equal-outcomes”. For instance, whites give greater support for programs that offer job-training than to programs that offer a minimum income. Programs that promote equal outcomes are rejected, because they are said to violate a belief that economic rewards should be dispersed in accordance to individual efforts and talent. Following this notion, it is unfair to provide economic rewards based on group membership with no regard to individual qualifications. Opportunity-enhancing programs fail to challenge principles of equity, and are consistent with the norm of “helping others to help themselves”. Hence whites are generally more supportive of opportunity-enhancing programs (Kluegel and

Smith 1986). Reward on the basis of individual effort and talent is consistent with opportunity-enhancing programs that require beneficiaries make an effort to get skills needed for economic mobility.

At the existential level, whites are likely to disagree with government intervention to assist those who are disadvantaged due to beliefs about the causes of socioeconomic success or failure (e.g. personal ability or effort) and the belief that opportunity is accessible to everyone in America. However, another important dimension of beliefs about inequality are beliefs about social responsibility. Beliefs about social responsibility often correlate with policy preferences (Bobo 1991; Kluegel and Smith 1986). People who believe that socioeconomic inequality is due to class background and limited job opportunities, for example, often support social welfare policy (Bullock 1999).

There are two explanations for predicting beliefs about the causes of inequality to influence attitudes differently depending on whether the policy is race-targeted or- income-targeted. (1) If individuals who deny structural causes and accept individual causes of inequality oppose income-targeted policies, they may be even more likely to oppose race-targeted policies. (2) The contravention between equity norms and race-targeted policies is more distinct than that between equity norms and income-targeted policies (Bobo and Kluegel 1997). Income-targeted policies may also be viewed as promoting individualism, as opposed to race-targeted policies. Therefore, equity norms should have a greater effect on attitudes toward race-targeted policies than on attitudes toward income-targeted policies.

The more a policy shifts toward promoting equal outcomes, the greater the violation to equity norms. Thus, the effects of stratification beliefs on attitudes toward policy should be greater toward race-targeted policies than income-targeted policies. Opportunity-enhancing,

income-targeted policies support the existing stratification order as being fair. Individual causes of inequality are attributions focused on individuals as being the “captain of their fate”.

Structural causes of inequality are attributions directed towards the social and political processes that resulted in the subordination of one or more groups. Individuals who oppose race-targeted policies also deny structural causes and accept individual causes of inequality (Kluegel and Smith 1982, 1986). Equal outcome, race-targeted policies challenge the system as being unfair with an admission to structural and individual setbacks.

### *Racial Attitudes*

According to existing survey data, whites who have negative attitudes toward blacks are more likely to oppose race-targeted policies (Kluegel and Smith 1986; Sears 1988). Negative attitudes towards blacks are associated with increased opposition to affirmative action (Kluegel and Smith 1986), and government programs aimed at helping blacks (Bobo 1988a; Kluegel 1990). The proposed study will consider two major approaches to racial attitudes.

One approach to racial attitudes is an emphasis on the salient black affect. Some scholars note the effects of “Traditional” prejudice and “Jim Crow” racism. For example, Weigel and Howes (1985) found that many whites were persistent in the belief that blacks were biologically inferior and supported racial segregation. Other scholars point to the effects of prejudice under new terms, such as “symbolic” or “modern” racism (Sears 1988). With this approach, negative racial attitudes are presented indirectly- hence whites agreeing with statements like, “the government pays too much attention to blacks,” or to “blacks who receive welfare could get along without it if they tried” (Sears 1988, p. 57). This approach disregards large opposition to statements of overt prejudice, because such statements are no longer tolerable.

Another approach to racial attitudes is an emphasis on the psychological dimension of racial attitudes. The psychological dimension focuses on the apparent beliefs about the causes of racial inequality in America (Apostle et al. 1983; Kluegel 1990; Sniderman and Hagen 1985; Carter, Corra and Carter 2011; Carter et al. 2014). Though white Americans may score low on traditional prejudice measures, they are still free to reject major structural causes to racial inequality, such as discrimination (Kluegel 1990). Since the regard of structural causes to racial inequality is a major dimension of racial attitudes, it is important to adhere to such measures in survey data. Kluegel (1990) found that the fall of traditional “Jim Crow” prejudice has not been met with the regard to structural explanations of inequality, such as discrimination.

Since whites may believe that they may benefit from income-targeted policies, opposition to race-targeting may strongly be based on negative attitudes towards blacks. However, since there is a prominent belief that blacks make up the largest recipient base for current government aid to the poor (Gilens 1991), the difference in the effect of negative attitudes towards blacks is open for discussion. Furthermore, the impact of negative attitudes towards blacks on income-targeted verses race-targeted policies is also open for discussion. Whites who are prejudice towards blacks may oppose equal outcome, race-targeting policies because such policies support blacks-who are thought to be biologically inferior and undeserving. On the other hand, opportunity-enhancing, income-targeted policies only benefit those who make viable efforts to receive such benefits. All things equal, whites who are prejudiced may support opportunity-enhancing, income-targeted policies because such policies disqualify “undeserving” blacks.

Resistance by much of White America towards race-targeting policies has been a static feature of racial attitudes in America. As reviewed above, theories of self-interest-stratification

beliefs-and racial attitudes govern research that attempt to theoretically explain the stagnation in support for race-targeting policies.

## **Chapter IV. The Role of Education**

What is the role of education in shaping the theoretical paradox of contemporary attitudes? Many researchers have argued in support for the liberalizing effects that an advanced formal education has on the dispositions of Whites, while others have argued that educational effects are superficial. I will briefly cover those arguments here.

### *Education as liberation*

In theory on democracy and prejudice, negative intergroup attitudes have been viewed as undemocratic. The rights of minority groups and their members has long been a focus in democratic theory (e.g., Dahl 1956; Downs 1957; Ranney and Kendall 1969). The importance of humbling majority dominance with minority rights is to prevent a “tyranny of the majority” (e.g., de Tocqueville [1850] 1969; Dahl 1956; Prothro and Grigg 1960). Students of prejudice and democracy have focused their attention on the establishment of such norms. Various attitudes towards outgroup members have been measured (men to women, nonpoor to poor), but I am solely focused on attitudes toward racial equality. Intergroup attitudinal measures have all been similar to include a “single continuum ranging from prejudiced/undemocratic to unprejudiced/tolerant/democratic” (Jackman and Muha 1984:752).

From this theoretical standpoint, scholars have viewed education as a process by which people “acquire knowledge, are exposed to values, and develop modes of thinking” (Selznick and Steinberg 1969: 93). Many scholars have promoted the centrality of this process in past studies of prejudice and tolerance (e.g., Stouffer 1955; Lipset 1960; Prothro and Grigg 1960; McClosky 1964; Converse 1964; Hyman and Sheatsley 1964; Selznick and Steinberg 1969). First, it is thought that individuals must be taught commitment to democratic norms, and second, that an advanced education reflects experience with democratic cues. With increasing education,

individuals become accustomed with diverse people and ideas and taught to tolerate conflicting ideas. Thus a college education is thought to render a heightened sense of democratic norms compared to a high school education.

Quinley and Glock (1979:188) pointed to three ways in which an advanced formal education may reduce racial prejudice:

(a) By giving individuals a history about the socio-political factors attributable to current day black-white differences; (b) By teaching about how to identify prejudice and reconcile with its dangers; and (c) by increasing cognitive sophistication, which increases the ability to detect and reject prejudice.

Similarly, it has been argued that education increases participation in social and political activities, and develops cognition that results in the reduction of prejudice (Lipset 1960). Lipset (1960) goes on to say that “acceptance of the norms of democracy *requires* a high level of sophistication and ego security”. An advanced education is also thought to teach norms of “democracy, equality, civil rights, civil liberties, and cultural tolerance” (Quinley and Glock 1979:188). The well-educated are thought to internalize these lessons more thoroughly than the less educated (Selznick and Steinberg 1969: 169). Education serves as a liberalizing agent in ways such as to increase tolerance to blacks, Jews, and other ideological “nonconformist groups” (e.g., Stouffer 1955; Converse 1964; Nunn et al. 1979; Davis 1975). Looking at the effect of education over time, past research has credited the well-educated as the first to report increasingly positive interracial attitudes (Hyman and Sheatsley 1964; Greeley and Sheatsley



1974; Taylor et al. 1978). In total, exposure to the formal education system has been cited with the profound liberalization of attitudes that allow individuals to reject the prejudice ideals of the uneducated and to show greater support for tolerance toward subordinate groups.

### *Education as Superficial Commitment*

A challenge to the education as liberation argument is the idea that education increases the risk for education-related response biases. This line of reasoning holds that education determines different reactions from the well-educated and less-educated to question-wordings that may be “simplistic, categorical, or platitudinous—the use of terms that are socially ‘laden,’ and response options that are unbalanced” (Jackman and Muha 1989: 753). Amid studies that have shown response-bias effects, there remain positive educational effects that are not susceptible to these biases, and a line of argument attributed education with creating superficial change in attitudes. Jacob (1957) argued that college educated individuals do not actually internalize the values they significantly report on measures of tolerance. These individuals, instead, are socialized to “fit comfortably into the ranks of American college alumni” (Jacob 1957:4). Merelman (1980) argued that high school graduates have been poorly trained in democratic values. With the need for order in public schools and the juxtaposition of value and fact in social studies curriculums, “democratic values rarely become deeply rooted within students’ minds” (Merelman 1980: 330).

There is a cottage mill for research that gives support to the perspective that a college education provides a superficial commitment to racial equality. For example, Jackman (1978) showed that college educated whites were more likely to support race mixing but not willing to endorse policies that would increase racial heterogeneity in their neighborhood.

A study done by Sullivan et al. (1982) suggested that well-educated whites are no more likely to express intolerance for groups they politically object. Blacks were seen as politically objected by Whites as ‘self-named targets’ in this study, but there were no differences in tolerance between the less-educated and well-educated. When it comes to Blacks as ‘self-named targets’, education is not associated with tolerance (Sullivan et al. 1982). Lastly, Jackman and Muha (1984) suggested that education makes people more sophisticated in defending their political interest, and not more racially liberal.

### **Research Question and Hypotheses**

This study examines one key research question: Will the effect of a college education on racial beliefs and policy attitudes be apparent in high school graduates who are married to college graduates? I formulate hypotheses that address the perspectives of education as being a liberalizing agent or an agent for superficial commitment. These empirical expectations are straightforward.

H<sub>1</sub>: *College Spillover/Education-as-liberation*. White high school graduates married to college graduates will exhibit decreased odds of holding racist beliefs and decreased odds of strongly opposing race-targeting policies than high school graduates married to other high school graduates.

H<sub>2</sub>. *College Spillover/Education as Superficial-Commitment*. White high school graduates who are married to College graduates will exhibit support for some, but not all of the racial beliefs

and policy attitudinal measures. This view suggest that education improves Whites racial beliefs about inequality in America, but does not increase support for race-targeting policies. Hence, if a college education reflects a superficial commitment as proposed, high school graduates married to college graduates should show an improvement to racial beliefs, but not support for race-targeting policies.

## **Chapter V. Data and Methods**

To test these hypotheses, I draw on cumulative data from the General Social Survey (Smith et al., 2016). The cumulative dataset covers the years between 1972 and 2016. The survey was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago to a nationally representative sample of non-institutionalized adults. The GSS includes items on relevant respondent demographics such as race, marital status, and education level. Importantly, the GSS also includes items on racial beliefs and attitudes towards policies that would address racial inequality.

### *Dependent Variables*

The once majority acceptance of segregation and racial discrimination was replaced with the acceptance of desegregation and equal treatment (see Smith and Sheatsley, 1984). Hence, principles of racial equality are generally accepted by White Americans. Thus, questions on support for principles of racial equality will not be included in the analysis. With the consensus that majority of White Americans support principles of racial equality, the current study will focus solely on racial beliefs and policy attitudes. Racial beliefs may be defined as the beliefs one holds about the causes of black – white inequality (Jordan 1968; Carter and Corra 2016; Carter, Corra and Jenks 2016; Carter, Corra and Carter 2011; Carter and Corra 2012; Carter et al. 2014). Less-educated whites are more prone to attribute black-white inequality to blacks having less in-born ability to learn and having a lack of motivation or will, while well-educated whites are more likely to think black-white differences are due to discrimination and lack of education (Jackman and Muha 1984; Bobo and Kluegel 1997). This thesis also uses an aggregate of Racial Policy Attitudinal measures that tap into whites' attitudes towards both preferential and

compensatory programs that help the overall conditions of Blacks. The gap between education in support for policies that would address racial inequality is significant, but to a much lesser degree. (Schuman et al 1985, Stoker 1998, Tuch & Hughes 1996).

### *Racial Beliefs*

For this study, I include 4 measures of racial beliefs as it relates to the socioeconomic gap between whites and blacks. All of the questions begin with the following statement: “On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are... [question wording] [Question 1] Mainly due to discrimination? [Question 2] Because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have less in-born ability to learn? [Question 3] Because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) don’t have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty? , and [Question 4] Because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) just don’t have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty? In the GSS, all the Racial Belief measures were coded so that 1=yes and 0=no. For consistency, all of the Racial Belief measures were recoded so that 1=racist response and 0=non-racist response. The range of questioning covers items on the perceived discrimination against blacks, traditional “Jim Crow” racism, and non-racist items.

### *Racial Policy Attitudes*

3 questions on racial policy attitudes were included. The first of these questions tap into respondents’ attitudes toward affirmative action programs. And it reads, “Some people say that because of past discrimination, blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion.

Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?" (1=strongly support/2=support/3=oppose/4=strongly oppose). The second question ask whether the respondent believes that the government has a duty to help improve the living standards of African Americans. And it reads, "Some people think that (Blacks/Negroes/African-Americans) have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to (Blacks/Negroes/African-Americans). Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you made up your mind on this?" A scale that ranges from 1 (Government help blacks) to 5 (No special treatment) is allotted for this question's response. The last racial policy attitudinal measure is a question that taps into how the respondent feels about the allocation of resources being used on "improving the conditions of Blacks". And the question reads; "We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. [Interviewer] will name some of these problems, and for each, tell [Interviewer] whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount...Are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on Improving the conditions of Blacks?" The responses allotted for this question were 1=too little, 2=about right, and 3=too much.

### *Mode of Analysis*

Descriptive statistics were performed to examine the composition of the sample and variables used in this thesis (see Tables 1 and 2). My analytical strategy is straightforward: college spillover is expressed as a variable of spousal degree level (Bachelors and Graduate) and

each outcome variable is regressed on this variable. These estimates are provided in Tables 6, 7 and 8; where the constant reports the educational effect for high school graduates that are married to high school graduates and the remaining coefficients are deviations from that effect.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 provide estimates for a full test of the effects of college spillover, and controls for variables that may confound the effect: Sex, Income, class, and region. I used ordered logistics and logistics regression models for the observance of college spillover effects. Ordered logistic regression models were used on outcome variables with more than 2 question-response categories and are ordered. Logistic regression models were used for all dichotomous outcome variables. In the full analysis, each outcome variable is regressed on the main spillover variable, net of relevant control variables. If there are college spillover effects, respondents who did not go to college but have a spouse with a college degree will hold attitudes and beliefs that are distinct from respondents who did not attend college and have a spouse who also did not attend college.

### *College Spillover*

In the GSS, the variable that records respondent's degree level includes 'left high school', 'some college', 'bachelor's degree', and 'graduate degree'. These cases were excluded from the analyses. For this study, I limit the sample to White high school graduates that are married. Importantly, the GSS also includes spousal demographics such as spouse's degree level. For the examination of college spillover effects, I compare two main groups; (1) White high school graduates that are married to other White high school graduates, and (2) White high school graduates that are married to White college degree holders. The variable that records spousal's degree level includes 'left high school' and 'some college'. These cases were excluded from the

analyses. The variable that records spousal's degree level also includes 'bachelor's degree' and 'graduate degree'. These cases were combined to be simply considered 'college degree holder' for the examination of college spillover effects. The group of 'White high school graduates that are married to White college degree holders' include both, spouses with bachelor degrees and those with graduate degrees. For the observance of college spillover effects, the current study uses a dichotomous measure of spillover effects: 1= respondents who have a high school diploma and are married to a spouse with a college degree; and 0= respondents who have a high school diploma and are married to a spouse with a high school diploma.

### *Control Variables*

In the first reports on racial attitudes, it was found that racial attitudes are associated with sex, age, region, and class (Hyman and Sheatsley 1956). To prevent spuriousness in the possible findings of college spillover effects, I controlled for such variables in the full analysis. Specifically, I controlled for sex (1=female, 0=male), a continuous measure of age, region of residence during adolescence (1=south, 0=northeast-midwest-west-foreign), a continuous measure of family income, a measure of subjective class identification (1=lower class, 2=working class, 3=middle class, 4=upper class), and controls for subsequent year effects. It is important to note that, although I controlled for much of the socioeconomic aspect of education, "education intrinsically reflects an element of socioeconomic standing that cannot be filtered out" (Jackman et al. 1984). Question-wording for all the GSS variables included in this thesis is available in the Appendix.



## Chapter VI. Results

A descriptive of the Whites extracted from the GSS is provided in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 provides the descriptive for the sample on all independent variables, while Table 2 provides a descriptive for the sample on all outcome variables. Majority of the respondents are female (56%) with an average age of about 45. The variable for college spillover has a mean of .1687 (or 16.87%), which translates to a majority of the sample consisting of White high school graduates that are married to other White high school graduates. Regionally, nearly 28% of my sample are from the South, where Civil Rights for Blacks were most challenged. Furthermore, the mean for the *Class* variable in Table 1 is 2.46, which means majority of respondents fell somewhere being between working and middle class (see Appendix for response coding). Table 2 also reveals the overall distribution of married White high school graduates on the racial beliefs and policy attitudinal variables included in this study. In general, White high school graduates do not support race-targeting policies and think that racial differences are not due to discrimination. The mean for the policy attitude variable titled, “favor preference in hiring blacks” is 3.54 which means majority of respondents for this question were more toward strongly opposing hiring preferences for Blacks (4=Strongly opposed). The policy attitude variable titled, “Should Government aid blacks” has a mean of 3.92, which means majority of the respondents for this question were between ‘agree with both’ and ‘no special treatment’ in aiding Blacks (1=Government help blacks, 3= Agree with both, 5= No Special Treatment). When asked about government spending towards improving the conditions of blacks, most of the sample believed that spending was ‘About right’ - as reflected by a mean of 1.99.

The racial belief measure that ask whether the respondent believes that black-white differences are due to ‘in-born disability’ has a mean of .1379 which says that most respondents

say that in-born disability is not the cause of black-white differences. The racial belief measure that ask whether the respondent believes that racial differences in America are due to discrimination has a mean of .7028, which means majority of the sample said ‘No’. Also, most of the sample (approximately 60%) expressed the belief that black-white differences in America are due to the lack of motivation or will from Blacks. Aside from the belief that Blacks have less in-born ability to learn, the sample was least racist towards the belief that black-white differences are due to educational opportunities. With a mean of .5838, almost half of the respondents believed that educational opportunities contribute to the socio-economic differences between Blacks and Whites. Descriptives reveal that the baseline of responses in this study are typically racist (with the exception of the question concerning ‘in-born disability’) and non-supportive of race-targeting policies. This is typical of less-educated whites who have been previously found to have negative beliefs towards blacks and strongly reject race-targeting policies (see also Bobo and Kluegel 1993). Descriptive statistics reveal that majority of the respondents answered similarly to the racial belief and policy attitudinal measures in this study, but do not give specific details about each group’s odds of responding racist or in opposition of race-targeting policies. Before running regression models to test those odds, I began by investigating the distribution of response percentages for each outcome variable.

Cross tabulations were computed for both groups of White high school graduates and all outcome variables (see Table 3, 4, and 5). There are small percentage differences for responses to the racial belief and policy attitudinal measures. In general, the two groups of White high school graduates are similar in their responses to these outcome variables. High school graduates who are married to other high school graduates and those married to college graduates responded similarly when asked about black-white differences being due to discrimination. Specifically,

both groups of high school graduates responded “No” to differences being due to discrimination at a rate of about 70 percent (see Table 3). When asked about differences being due to in-born disability, majority of both groups also responded “No”, but the distribution was not as similar. While about 85 percent of high school graduates married to high school graduates responded “No”, about 90 percent of high school graduates married to college graduates responded “No”. The responses for the racial belief question concerning “Differences due to lack of education” had a difference of about 8 percentage points between the groups of White high school graduates. The responses for the racial belief question concerning “Differences due to lack of will” had a difference of about 7 percentage points between the groups of White high school graduates, with a higher percentage of “Yes” for those married to high school graduates (about 61 percent) and a higher percentage of “No” for those married to college graduates (about 45 percent).

When asked about whether the government had a special obligation to tend to the problems of Blacks, white high school graduates mostly responded that the government should give ‘no special treatment’ to Blacks (see Table 4). About 40 percent of high school graduates married to high school graduates responded ‘no special treatment’, while a little over 50 percent fall somewhere between ‘agree with both’ and ‘no special treatment’. At the other end, high school graduates who are married to college graduates were at a rate of about 35 percent for the government giving ‘no special treatment’. A greater percentage of these high schoolers fell between ‘agree with both’ and ‘no special treatment’ (approximately 56%). The responses allotted for this question were ordered between ‘Government should help’ to ‘No special treatment’, where the middle is ‘agree with both’. Agreeing with both of these statements provides little insight into white’s actual attitude toward the policy question, and actually

suggests an example of education-related response bias. Furthermore, less than 4 percent of both high school groups responded that ‘Government should help blacks’. I also included a measure for attitudes toward spending on the conditions of Blacks (see Table 4). The two groups of high school graduates in this thesis are similar in their responses toward this policy question. About 50 percent of both groups responded that government spending on improving the conditions of blacks is ‘about right’. This response falls in between the categories ‘too little’ and ‘too much’. There is a small percentage difference between the two groups in responding ‘too little’ or ‘too much’. On each end of the question’s response, there is about a 5 percentage point difference between the groups of high school graduates in this study. High school graduates married to other high school graduates opted more for ‘too much’ (about 24 percent) while those married to college graduates opted more for ‘too little’ (about 29 percent).

When asked about preferences in hiring for Blacks, both groups were similar in their responses (see Table 5). About 4.6 percent of high school graduates married to other high school graduates ‘strongly supported’ affirmative action, and about 3.16 percent of those married to a college graduate ‘strongly supported’ affirmative action. Majority of both groups of high school graduates ‘strongly opposed’ hiring preferences for Blacks, with both responding at a rate of about 67 percent. With such small differences in responses on this question about affirmative action, college spillover may not exist in the full analysis. Cross tabulations give great detail about the response percentages for both groups of married White high school graduates and all of the outcome variables. However, these computations are not sufficient for testing college spillover in these groups of high school graduates.

Table 6 displays results from logistic regression models for college spillover and racial belief measures. The racial belief measures are coded as 1=racist response, and 0= non-racist

response. In the first column of each racial belief measure, estimates from a logistic regression is reported to show the effect of college spillover before the introduction of controls. In the second column of each racial belief measure, controls are added. College spillover has a significant association with three out of the four racial belief measures. Namely, the variables ‘Differences due to In-born disability’, ‘Differences due to Lack of education’ and ‘Differences due to Lack of will’ have significance before introducing controls. After including control variables, White high school graduates who are married to college graduates are still significantly different in their odds to respond with racist beliefs to these same outcome variables.

It is shown that college spillover effects are evident in the racial beliefs of white high school graduates who are married to college graduates. These high school graduates have .693 times odds of believing that socio-economic differences between Blacks and Whites are due to In-born disability. This is significant at the .01 level. These whites also have .806 times the odds of believing racial inequality is due to a lack of educational opportunities. This is significant at the .05 level. Also, White high school graduates who are married to college graduates have .818 times the odds of believing that racial differences in America are due to lack of will. This finding is significant at the .05 level. Whites who are married to college degree holders have less odds of responding with racist beliefs about the socio-economic gap between Blacks and Whites.

Control variables also reveal interesting statistics about the nature of racial beliefs amongst married white high school graduates. For example, among these married white high school graduates, females have less odds (.753) of believing that black-white differences are not due to discrimination. This is significant at the .001 level. In fact, for all of the racial belief measures, females are at decreased odds of holding racist beliefs. Additionally, those from Southern states are at higher odds (1.56) than those from other states to believe black-white

differences are not due to discrimination (see Table 4). This is significant at the .001 level. Those from the South are at increased odds of holding racist beliefs for all of the racial belief measures in this study. Lastly, with every 10,000 dollar increase in income, high school graduates who are married to college degree holders are at increased odds of believing discrimination and lack of education are not the cause for Black-White differences.

Table 7 illustrates estimates from an ordered regression model for college spillover and racial policy attitudinal measures. In the first column of each racial policy attitudinal measure, estimates are reported to show the effect of college spillover before the introduction of controls. In the second column of each racial policy attitude measure, controls are added. The estimates are presented in Table 7 as odds ratios. Similar to the racial belief measures, all of the initial significances found withstand the introduction of controls. In general, it is found that White high school graduates who are married to college degree holders are at decreased odds of supporting race-targeting policies. It appears that having a college educated spouse negatively influences attitudes towards government spending towards the conditions of Blacks.

White high school graduates who are married to college degree holders have .7889 times the odds of thinking Government should give aid to Blacks. This is significant at the .05 level. Also, if they are married to college graduates, white high school graduates have .7880 times the odds of thinking government spending on improving the conditions of blacks is 'About Right'. This is significant at the .05 level. These findings are interesting and support the hypothesis that a college education can affect those who do not attend college but hold social ties with a college graduate. These high school graduates are at decreased odds of believing that Government should give no special treatment to blacks and that spending on the conditions of Blacks is about

right. The effects found in this study are significant but small, and should be assessed with great caution when discussing actual attitudinal change in White Americans.

In Table 8, ordered logistic regression models show that attitudes toward affirmative action is not associated with college spillover. White high school graduates who are married to college graduates are just as likely to not support preferences in hiring blacks as those White high school graduates who are married to other high school graduates. The variables that are controlled in Table 8 reveal interesting statistics about the nature of affirmative action attitudes amongst white high school graduates who are married to college graduates. For example, among these married white high school graduates, females have less odds (.7906) of strongly opposing affirmative action programs. This is significant at the .01 level. With every year increase in age, these White high school graduates are at increased odds of strongly opposing preferential hiring of Blacks (1.008). This is significant at the .01 level. With every 10,000 dollar increase in income, these Whites have increased odds of strongly opposing affirmative action's programs (1.036). This is significant at the .01 level. These findings shed light on some of the socioeconomic and demographic determinants of racial attitudes in white high school graduates who are married to college graduates.

## Chapter VII. Discussion and Conclusion

Will the effect that a college education has on racial beliefs and policy attitudes be apparent in high school graduates who are married to college graduates? I addressed this question by analyzing representative sample survey data, and testing specific hypotheses. Logistic and Ordered logistic regression models show that college spillover effects exist in White high school graduates that are married to college graduates. Majority of the outcome variables in this thesis found college spillover effects, which gives the appearance of support for the hypothesis that education is a liberalizing agent. However, the size and direction of these effects give greater support to the hypotheses that education reflects a superficial commitment.

H<sub>2</sub>. *College Spillover/Education as Superficial-Commitment*. White high school graduates who are married to College graduates will exhibit support for some, but not all of the racial beliefs and policy attitudinal measures. This view suggest that education improves Whites racial beliefs about inequality in America, but does not increase support for race-targeting policies. Hence, if a college education reflects a superficial commitment as proposed, high school graduates married to college graduates should show an improvement to racial beliefs, but not support for race-targeting policies.

Majority of the outcome variables included in this thesis found significant effects of college spillover in high school graduates married to college graduates. A closer look into these effects show that the education-as-liberation hypotheses is not supported in this thesis. Rather, the findings of college spillover effects in this study are consistent with the argument that a college education provides a superficial commitment to racial equality. First, R squared statistics for all of the outcome variables account for but a small percentage of variance within the sample



of White high school graduates. Nevertheless, there are college spillover effects in marriages with differing levels of education. Secondly, the direction and magnitude of the effect sizes found are trivial to the idea that education is a liberalizing agent. To be a liberalizing agent, education in the form of college spillover must show an improvement in racial beliefs and the support for race-targeting policies. Instead, college spillover significantly improves some racial beliefs but does not associate with support for race-targeting policies. With such small effects sizes found in this study coupled with the subtle direction towards non-racist responses and support for race-targeting policies, it is hard to declare actual attitudinal change within these whites as a result of college spillover.

Whites who are married to college degree holders have less odds of responding with racist beliefs about the socio-economic gap between Blacks and Whites, but the baseline for these estimates are initiated by racist responses. The estimate of interest for this thesis is the main spillover variable- which represents the effect for White high school graduates married to college graduates. The notion of “college spillover effects” suggest that the effects of college on racial belief and policy attitudes will be shown in White high school graduates that are married to college graduates. With the rendition of college spillover effects, less-educated whites in close ties with well-educated whites are at odds of giving a racist response to questions concerning the socioeconomic gap between Blacks and Whites, but not necessarily less racist in their actual beliefs. Less-educated whites are still in disbelief that discrimination is a cause of the racial inequality in America. Also, less-educated whites still believe that a lack of motivation or will is a cause for Black-White differences in America. Though White high school graduates married to college graduates are at decreased odds of giving a racist response to a racial belief measure, they are not far behind their White high school graduate counterparts.

My findings suggest that having a college educated spouse is associated with attitudes towards race-targeting policies in these White high school graduates. In general, it is found that White high school graduates who are married to college degree holders are at decreased odds of supporting race-targeting policies than White high school graduates who are married to other White high school graduates. Apparently, education decreases the odds of support for policies that would address racial inequality. This finding is the polar opposite of the idea that education is a liberalizing agent to racial attitudinal change, and could be utilized to support the idea of ‘ideological refinement’.

The effects found in this study support Jackman and Muha’s (1984) notion of ideological refinement where college educated whites further perpetuated what has been known as the ‘principle-implementation gap’, or the paradox in contemporary racial attitudes. With the direct effect of a college experience, college-educated whites were associated with having non-racist beliefs but did not support policies that would address racial inequality. In that study, the college effects found in the racial beliefs of the college educated were superficial since it did not reflect support for race-targeting policies. Here, high school graduates who are married to college graduates appear to be more skilled at responding to sample surveys concerning racial attitudes. “Dominant social groups routinely develop ideologies that legitimize and justify the status quo, and the well-educated members of these dominant groups are the most sophisticated practitioners of their group’s ideology. The well-educated are but one step ahead of their peers in developing a defense of their interests that rests on qualification, individualism, obfuscation, and symbolic concessions” (Jackman and Muha 1984:49).

Using this theoretical perspective, it appears that some White high school graduates are better socialized in responding to questions about their group’s dominant position. These high

school graduates are more defensive than others in defending their group's position, depending on their association with a college graduate. If the high school graduate is married to a college graduate, they are at decreased odds of thinking that government spending on improving the conditions of blacks is about right. This study also finds that these high school graduates are at decreased odds of thinking that the government should give no special treatment to Blacks. The odds of responding negatively to these policy attitudinal questions are very slim and gives little insight into actual attitudinal change. Ideological refinement is not about actual attitude change in sample survey data, but the subtle change in responses due to increases in education.

Future research may attend to the ideas of *when* and *why* college spillover may exist. One idea is that college spillover is dependent on years married. However, the GSS does not include a variable that allows the control for years married. Sociologist may benefit from these findings for a more cautionary tone when describing the effects that education has on attitudes. Social Psychologist may contribute to this literature by examining the effects of group size and composition of degree levels on the racial attitudes of less-educated Whites. My study examined marriages between Whites with different levels of educational degrees. Increasing group size and/or composition of degree levels may lend greater interpretation of the observed college spillover effect.

These findings shed light on previous studies of the classic educational effect on democratic values, such as positive intergroup attitudes. In addition to the effect that education has on racial beliefs and policy attitudes, a socialization of these attitudes are experienced in marriages with differing levels of education. Specifically, White high school graduates who are married to college graduates are at odds with the racial beliefs and policy attitudes of those

White high school graduates married to other high school graduates. To date, this is the first finding of such socialization of racial attitudes.

My thesis supports the idea that racial attitudes in White Americans are significantly affected by education. The paradox of contemporary racial attitudes persist. If a White high school graduate is married to a college graduate, College spillover puts them at decreased odds of holding racist beliefs and at decreased odds of strongly opposing race-targeting policies. The contribution of education in this study has been a heightened sensitivity to questions about racial beliefs and policy attitudes. It is theorized that these White high school graduates are part of an ideological refinement that attempts to defend and rectify the social dominance of White Americans. Furthermore, attitudinal change over time may be the result of ideological refinement as exemplified by the findings of this study. Attitudinal change can occur from experiences outside of the college experience. By looking at two groups of high school graduates, I attempted to isolate the effect that college has outside of the brick and mortar experience. It is suggested that White high school graduates who marry college graduates are exposed to experiences and/or ideas that render changes in their reported beliefs about racial inequality and reported attitudes toward policies that would address racial inequality.

## References

- Apostle, Richard, Charles Y. Glock, Thomas Piazza, and Marijean Suezle. 1983. *The Anatomy of Racial Attitudes*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bobo, Lawrence and James R. Kluegel. 1997. *Status, ideology, and dimensions of whites' racial beliefs and attitudes: progress and stagnation*. In *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, Tuch & Martin 1997, pp. 93-12.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Frederick C. Lacari. 1989. *Education and Political Tolerance: testing the effects of cognitive sophistication and target group affect*. Chicago. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Vol.53, No.3.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1988b. *Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes*. In *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, ed. PA Katz, DA Taylor, pp. 85-114. New York: Plenum.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1991. *Social responsibility, individualism, and redistributive policies*. *Soc. Forum* 6(1):71-92.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1988a. *Attitudes toward the black political movement: trends, meaning and effects on racial policy preferences*. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 51(4):287-302.
- Bullock, K. 1999. "Attributions for poverty: A comparison of middle-class and welfare recipients' attitudes." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 29:2059-2082.
- Carter, J. Scott and Mamadi Corra. 2012. "Beliefs about the Causes of Racial Inequality: The Persisting Impact of Urban and Suburban Locations?." *Urban Studies Research*: 1-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. "Racial Resentment and Attitudes Toward the Use of Force by Police: An Over-Time Trend Analysis." *Sociological Inquiry* 86 (4): 496-511.

- Carter, J. Scott, Mamadi Corra and Shannon K. Carter. 2011. "Southern Intolerance Revisited: Political Conservatism and Justification for the Racial Status Quo." *Southern Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the South* 18 (2): 27-48.
- Carter, J. Scott, Mamadi Corra, Shannon K. Carter and Rachel McCrosky. 2014. "The Impact of Place? A Reassessment of the importance of the South in Affecting Beliefs about Racial Inequality." *Social Science Journal* 51: 12-20.
- Carter, J. Scott, Mamadi Corra and David Jenks. 2016. "In the Shadows of Ferguson: The Role of Racial Resentment on White Attitudes Toward the Use of Force by Police." *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences* 11 (2): 114-131.
- Citrin, Jack and Donald Philip Green. 1990. "The Self-Interest Motive in American Public Opinion." *Research in Micropolitics* 3:1-28.
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The nature of belief systems in mass public." Pp. 206-61 in David E. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1956. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1850. *Democracy in America*. New York: 1969 Doubleday.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gilliam, Franklin D. and Kenney J. Whitby. 1989. "Race, Class and Attitudes toward Social Welfare Spending: An Ethclass Interpretation." *Social Science Quarterly* 70:88-100.
- Gurin, Patricia, Shirley Hatchett, and James S. Jackson. 1989. *Hope and Independence: Blacks; Response to Electoral and Party Politics*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gilens, Martin I. 1991. "Racial Attitudes and Opposition to the American Welfare State." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, 16-19 May, Phoenix, AZ.

Hyman, Herbert H., and Paul Sheatsley

1956 Attitudes towards desegregation. *Scientific American* 195 (December): 35-39.

1964 Attitudes towards desegregation. *Scientific American* 211 (1) [July]: 16-23.

Jacob, Philip E. 1957. *Changing values in college*. Harper.

Jackman, Mary R. and Robert W. Jackman. 1983. *Class Awareness in the United States*.

Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Jackman, Mary R. and Michael J. Muha. 1984. Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement.

*American Sociological Review*. Vol. 49, No. 6, pp.751-769.

Jaynes, Gerald D. and Robin M. Williams. 1989. *A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Winthrop D. 1968. *White over black: American attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. UNC Press Books, Second Edition, 2013.

Kluegel, James. 1990. Trends in whites' explanations of the black-white gap in socioeconomic status, 1977-1989. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 55:512-25.

Kluegel, J. R., and E. R. Smith. 1986. *Beliefs About Equality: American's Views of What Is and What Ought to Be*. Hawthorne, N.Y. Aldine de Gruyter.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1960. *Political Man*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor

McClosky, Herbert. 1964. "Consensus and ideology in American politics." *American Political Science Review* 58:361-82

Merelman, Richard M. 1980 "Democratic politics and the culture of American education." *American Political Science Review* 74:317-32.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1944. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers.

- Nunn, Clyde Z., Harry J. Crockett and J. Allen Williams 1978 *Tolerance for Nonconformity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Prothro, James W. and Charles M. Grigg. 1960. "Fundamental principles of democracy: bases of agreement and disagreement." *Journal of Politics*- 22:276-94.
- Quinley, Harold E. and Charles Y. Glock 1979 *Anti-Semitism in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Ranney, Austin and Willmoore Kendall. 1969. "Basic principles for a model of democracy." In Charles F. Cnudde and Deane E. Neubauer (eds.), *Empirical Democratic Theory*. Chicago: Markham.
- Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh and Lawrence Bobo. 1985. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. Rev. ed.
- Sears, David O. 1988. "Symbolic Racism." Pp. 53-84 in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*. edited by P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York: Plenum.
- Selznick, Gertrude J. and Stephen Steinberg. 1969. *The Tenacity of Prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1991. "Targeting Within Universalism: Politically Viable Policies to Combat Poverty in the United States." Pp. 411-36 in *The Urban Underclass* edited by C. Jencks and P. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Sniderman, Paul M. and Michael Gray Hagen. 1985. *Race and Inequality*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham Press.
- Smith, Tom W., and Paul B. Sheatsley. 1984. American attitudes toward race relations. *Public Opinion* 6 (October/November): 14-15, 50-53.
- Smith, Tom W., Peter Marsden, Michael Hout, and Jibum Kim. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2014* [machine-readable data file]. Principal Investigator, Smith, Tom W.; Co-Principal Investigators, Peter V. Marsden and Michael Hout; Sponsored by National Science Foundation. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago (Producer); Storrs, CT: The Roper



Center of Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut (distributor). Data accessed from  
gssdataexplorer.norc.org

Stoker, Laura. 1998. *Understanding whites' resistance to affirmative action: the role of principled commitments and racial prejudice*. In *Perception and Prejudice: Race and Politics in the United States*, ed. J Hurwitz, M Peffley, pp. 135-170. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.

Sullivan, John L., James Piereson and George E. Marcus 1982 *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Taylor, D. Garth, Paul B. Sheatsley and Andrew M. Greeley 1978 "Attitudes toward racial integration." *Scientific American* 238:42-49.

Tuch, Steven and Michael Hughes. 1996. *Whites' racial policy attitudes*. *Soc. Sci. Q.* 77(4):723-45.

Wilson, George. 2000. "Race, class, and support for egalitarian statism among the African-American middle class." *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*. 37: 75-91.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Weigel, Russell H. and Paul W. Howes. 1985. "Conceptions of Racial Prejudice: Symbolic Racism Reconsidered." *Journal of Social Issues* 41:117-38.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for independent variables

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Spillover	0	1	0.1687	-
Sex (female=1)	0	1	0.5612	-
Age	18	89	45.59	15.311
Social Class	2	4	2.46	0.578
Region (South=1)	0	1	0.2782	-
Income (\$10,000)	0.04	18.04	5.28	3.1607

N=10189

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables (Unweighted)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Racial Beliefs*</b>				
Due to discrimination	0	1	0.7028	-
Due to inborn disability	0	1	0.1379	-
Due to education	0	1	0.5838	-
Due to lack of motivation	0	1	0.6042	-
Valid N (listwise)	4229			
<i>*Racist Responses=1</i>				
<b>Racial Policy Attitudes</b>				
Should gov't aid blacks?	1	5	3.92	1.086
Improving the conditions of blacks	1	3	1.99	0.687
Valid N (listwise)	2445			
<b>Attitudes toward Affirmative Action</b>				
Favor preference in hiring blacks	1	4	3.54	0.768
Valid N (listwise)	2537			

Table 3. Cross Tabulations for Spillover and Racial Belief Measures

		High School /High School		High School/College
Due to discrimination	No	70.62%	No	68.54%
	Yes	29.37%	Yes	31.46%
Due to inborn disability	No	85.38%	No	90.3%
	Yes	14.61%	Yes	9.7%
Due to lack of education	No	59.68%	No	51.96%
	Yes	40.32%	Yes	48.03%
Due to lack of Will	No	38.56%	No	44.66%
	Yes	61.44%	Yes	55.34%

n=4229

Table 4. Cross Tabulations for Spillover and Racial Policy Attitudes

	<b>Should Gov't Aid Blacks?</b>				
	Gov't Help	-	Agree w/ both	-	No Special Treatment
High School/High School	3.45%	4.78%	26.14%	25.50%	40.12%
High School/College	3.86%	7.72%	28.74%	24.40%	35.27%
	<b>Improving the Conditions of Blacks</b>				
	Too Little		About Right		Too Much
High School/ High School	23.19%		53.17%		23.63%
High School/College	29.23%		50.72%		20.04%

n=2445

Table 5. Cross tabulations for Spillover and Attitudes toward Affirmative Action

	Favor Preference in Hiring Blacks			
	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
High School/High School	4.60%	3.59%	25.25%	66.55%
High School/College	3.16%	6.12%	24.47%	66.24%

n=2537

Table 6. Logistic regression models for College spillover and Racial Belief Measures

Variable	Racial Beliefs							
	Differences due to Discrimination		Differences due to Inborn Disability		Differences due to lack of education		Differences due to lack of Will	
Spillover	0.871	0.896	0.653**	0.693**	0.695***	0.806*	0.804**	0.818*
Controls								
Sex (Female=1)		0.753***		0.805*		0.835**		0.734***
Age		1.005**		1.019***		0.999		1.01***
Social Class		0.88**		1.164		0.760***		1.032
Region (South=1)		1.560***		1.434***		1.967***		1.507***
Income (\$10,000)		1.045***		0.948***		1.010		0.990
Constant	1.693***	2.128***	0.262***	0.065***	1.197	2.596***	2.229***	1.057
R Squared	0.023	0.016	0.041	0.022	0.02	0.031	0.018	0.021

Note: Odds ratios presented. All models also include controls for year GSS was administered.  
 \*p<.05. \*\*p<.01. \*\*\*p<.001. N=4229.

Table 7 Ordered logistic regression model for College spillover and Racial policy attitude measures

Variable	Racial Policy Attitudes			
	Should Gov't Aid Blacks?		Improving the conditions of Blacks	
Spillover	0.7937**	0.7889*	0.7695*	0.7780*
Controls				
Sex (female=1)		0.8746*		0.8073**
Age		1.002		1.008**
Social Class		1.1107		1.014
Region (South=1)		1.2725**		1.377***
Income (\$10,000)		1.001		1.012
Cut point	0.0275***	0.03893	0.4524***	0.6737
Cut point	0.073***	0.1033	5.002***	7.6293***
Cut point	0.4214	0.6005		
Cut point	1.2116	1.7349		

Note: Odds ratios presented. All models also include controls for year GSS was administered.  
 \*p<.05. \*\*p<.01. \*\*\*p<.001. N=2445.



Table 8 Ordered logistic regression model for College spillover and Attitudes toward affirmative action

Variable	Favor Preference in Hiring Blacks	
Spillover	0.995	0.9792
Controls		
Sex (Female=1)		0.7906**
Age		1.008**
Social Class		0.8807
Region (South=1)		1.206*
Income (\$10,000)		1.036**
Cut point	0.0429***	0.0478***
Cut point	0.0856***	0.0972***
Cut point	0.4743***	0.5449*

Note: Odds ratios presented. All models also include controls for year GSS was administered.  
 \*p<.05. \*\*p<.01. \*\*\*p<.001. N=2537.

## APPENDIX

### Coding and description for all GSS variables

#### Dependent Variables

##### *Racial Belief Measures*

1. (Racdif1) Differences due to discrimination - “On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are mainly due to discrimination?” 0-No 1-Yes
2. (Racdif2) Differences due to In-born disability-“On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have less in-born ability to learn?”0-No 1-Yes
3. (Racdif3) Differences due to Lack of education -“On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) don’t have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty?” 0-No 1-Yes
4. (Racdif4) Differences due to Lack of will- “On the average (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are because most (Negroes/Blacks/African-Americans) just don’t have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?” 0-No 1-Yes.

*Racial Policy Attitudinal Measures*

5. (Affrmact) Favor preference in hiring blacks- “Some people say that because of past discrimination, blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates against whites. What about your opinion- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?” (strongly support/support/oppose/strongly oppose).
6. (Helpblk) Should govt aid blacks- “Some people think that (Blacks/Negroes/African-Americans) have been discriminated against for so long that the government has a special obligation to help improve their living standards. Others believe that the government should not be giving special treatment to (Blacks/Negroes/African-Americans). Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you made up your mind on this?” A scale that ranges from 1 (Government help blacks) to 5 (No special treatment) is allotted for this question’s response.
7. (Natrace) Improving the conditions of blacks- “We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. [Interviewer] will name some of these problems, and for each, tell [Interviewer] whether you think we’re spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount...Are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on Improving the conditions of Blacks?” The responses allotted for this questions were too little, about right, too much, and don’t know.

## **Independent Variables**

### *College Spillover Variable*

1. (Spdeg) Spouses Highest Degree- Recoded 0=High School, 1=Bachelor and Graduate Degree.
2. (Degree) Respondents Highest Degree- All cases excluded except for 'High School'.

### *Control Variables*

3. (Sex)- Respondent's Sex Recoded 0-Male 1-Female
4. (Age)- Age of respondent
5. (Reg16) Region- Region of residence at age 16 Recoded 0=northeast-midwest-west-foreign 1=south
6. (Class)- Subjective class identification- If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: the lower class, the working class, the middle class, or the upper class? 1- Lower class 2-working class 3- middle class 4- upper class.
7. (Coninc)- Respondents family income. Recoded as income divided by 10,000.
8. Year- GSS year for this respondent.

