Appendix A: Literature Review

Summary and Outline

This literature review supports The Opportunity Agenda's Opportunity Survey, a research project examining the motivators of public attitudes on equality, opportunity, and social justice issues. We examine existing work on the factors affecting these attitudes and related behaviors, including ideological[1] and psychological orientations associated with social justice.

The purpose of this review is to provide a framework for understanding social justice attitudes on which the Opportunity Survey builds. We focus on leading theories of how people think about equality in order to guide questionnaire design and data analysis in the current project. Although by no means an encyclopedic study, we have drawn on more than 100 papers, many of them cornerstone texts in the field.[2]

We open this review with a discussion, in Section I, of ideology and basic psychological orientations, including attitudes on equality and openness to change—key concepts in understanding the bases of social justice attitudes. Two theories in this work, Social Dominance Orientation and System Justification Theory, offer the greatest utility. Both have demonstrated relationships with outcomes of interest and well-validated scales[3] that, although not directly replicable in the Opportunity Study,[4] provide essential insights.

1. It is important to note that social psychologists do not conceive of ideology as one dimension reflecting political liberalism vs. conservatism, but instead as a multifaceted construct that reflects views of equality and change and stems from basic values and psychological needs that often form early in life. See Section I.

2. One note of caution is that most of the literature is based on convenience samples and therefore may have limited generalizability.

3. In psychology, the term "scale" is used to describe a series of questions that have been designed to measure a single construct.

4. Although validated social science scales can help inform our questionnaire design, they are not suitable for representative, random-sample survey research without major modifications. These scales are too lengthy for a survey instrument and often employ suboptimal and potentially biasing formats such as unbalanced question wording or response options, agree/disagree formats, and partially labeled response options.

Section II covers additional constructs that can inform social justice attitudes. This includes a discussion of beliefs that can affect whether or not an individual perceives inequity as unjust, as well as a review of variables—such as perceptions of deservingness—that may help to determine whether or not people wish to act to reduce perceived unfairness.

Section III summarizes research on prejudice and discrimination, with a focus on racial antipathy. Given the interest in experiences of historically disadvantaged groups, how members of such groups experience injustice and when they do or don't attribute it to discrimination also are briefly reviewed.

Section IV addresses attitudes toward policies—particularly affirmative action—and how they're influenced by the causal explanations individuals give for inequality. Section V covers determinants of social participation in various forms. Research suggests that people are more likely to try to change social conditions when they perceive injustice, feel that social action (particularly at the group level) would help bring about change, and strongly identify with the group on behalf of which they see action as desirable. These dimensions will be important to measure in order to determine propensity to act on social justice concerns.

Section VI undertakes a brief discussion of basic values, including Shalom Schwartz's work on personal values and Jonathan Haidt's research on moral foundations, which characterizes people's thinking about right and wrong. While less obviously relevant to the Opportunity Survey, values may provide the building blocks of individuals' basic orientations; their ideology; and, through them, their views on social justice policies. Haidt's theory, in particular, has been linked to ideology and the basic psychological orientations that underlie it—central, as noted, to views of social justice.

We close with implications for the Opportunity Survey, Section VII of this appendix.

I. Ideology and Basic Psychological Orientations

- **Ideology.** Probably the most researched and most proximal predictor of social justice attitudes is ideology. In social psychology, "ideology" encompasses more than an individual's liberal or conservative leaning. It reflects two core dimensions: acceptance of or opposition to inequality and openness or resistance to change (Jost, 2006; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003). Researchers in this tradition suggest that ideology stems from basic psychological orientations, fundamental needs, and core values that often form early in life, before political attitudes take shape. (Examples include tolerance of ambiguity, perceptions of societal instability, and openness to experience, among others.)

- When political ideologies (liberalism vs. conservatism) are formed, they tend to reflect these fundamental beliefs about equality and change and therefore align with the basic needs, orientations, and values that are thought to drive such views.

- Given this conceptualization, it's not surprising that liberals and conservatives have different views about the desirability of group equality, about who deserves help, and about the best ways to achieve parity. Indeed, these fundamental views likely drove people to view themselves as liberal or conservative in the first place.

Some basic psychological orientations are believed to contribute to ideology. Among them:

- **Social Dominance Orientation.** SDO taps people's general preference for equality versus hierarchy in intergroup relations (Federico & Sidanius, 2002; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993; 2001). According to this theory, societies are organized to minimize intergroup conflict by developing ideological belief structures that justify group hierarchies. Dominant groups rely on legitimizing myths, such as racial superiority and individualism, to reinforce group inequalities. Scores on the SDO scale reflect an individual's support for group-based social hierarchy. Such views correlate strongly with nationalism, anti-black racism, and sexism and predict opposition to affirmative action, racial equality, and gay and lesbian rights (Jost & Thompson, 2000; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle 1994).

- **System Justification Theory.** SJT (Jost, Pelham, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2004) argues that people support, defend, and bolster the status quo simply because it exists, even when the system is unfair in absolute terms. The core of the theory holds that the tendency for people to view the current system as fair and legitimate has the consequence of preserving inequality. Among members of advantaged groups, system justification is associated with increased self-esteem, well-being, and ingroup favoritism, but among members of disadvantaged groups it's associated with lower self-esteem, decreased ingroup favoritism, and more positive views of dominant outgroups (Jost et al., 2004; Jost & Thompson, 2000).

  - One of the key contributions of this theory is its potential to explain why members of low-status groups often support the status quo. These researchers maintain that motivation to justify and rationalize the system might be highest among those who are the most disadvantaged, because to believe otherwise (i.e., that their disadvantages stem from systemic unfairness outside of their control) would cause considerably more psychological distress than feeling instead that their current problems are justified (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; Jost, Pelham et al., 2003).

- For example, poor people who blame themselves for their poverty score higher on measures of well-being compared with those who blame others or society (Kluegel & Smith, 1986). But such attributions also can be detrimental to low-status groups, reducing what they think they deserve—a concept known as depressed entitlement (e.g., Pelham & Hetts, 2001).

- Moreover, evidence suggests that members of groups with low social status (e.g., low-income adults and ethnic minorities) may be more likely than others to believe that inequality is necessary because it motivates people to work hard (Jost et al., 2003).

○ Though recent research casts doubt on the idea that low-status groups are *more* likely than high-status groups to rationalize the system (Brandt, 2013), SJT still helps to explain why low-status groups support policies that appear to be against their best interest.

- *Belief in a Just World*, a theory that laid the foundation for SJT, is among the earlier attempts to explain why, despite widespread inequality, there often are only limited efforts to obtain redress. According to Lerner (1980), most people believe that an individual's outcomes are a direct result of his or her past actions (they "get what they deserve") because believing otherwise (i.e., that individuals may face outcomes they do not deserve) causes considerable distress, uncertainty, and fear. People want to believe that the world is just and fair and that if you work hard you can succeed; such beliefs offer meaning, coherence, stability, and order to the world. Indeed, research has shown that people who have a stronger belief in a just world tend to have stronger feelings of control and self-efficacy and better mental health (e.g., Furnham, 2003; Lipkus, Dalbert, & Siegler, 1996). However, belief in a just world leads to negative views of disadvantaged groups (who must have done something wrong to deserve their circumstances) and reinforces inequality and injustice.

○ For example, those who score highly on the Belief in a Just World scale (Rubin & Pelau, 1975) are more likely to "blame the victim" by derogating those who are poor, unlucky, unemployed, sick with cancer or HIV, or victims of abuse (Hafer & Begue, 2005). Recent research also finds that as U.S. income disparities increased from 1973 to 2006, commitment to just world beliefs also increased, presumably because of an increased need to justify inequalities (Malahy, Rubinlicht, & Kaiser, 2009).

- *Authoritarianism.* The original work on authoritarianism sought to understand the role of personality and developmental factors in the rise of fascism in Europe in the early 20th century (Adorno et al., 1950). This theory was updated by Altemeyer (1981; 1988;

The **Opportunity** Agenda

1996) in his conceptualization of right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), consisting of conventionalism (a preference for tradition), submission to authorities who are perceived as legitimate, and a general aggressiveness toward outgroups. RWA scores predict social, economic, and political conservatism; racial prejudice; homophobia; and opposition to abortion rights, aid to the homeless, and diversity, among other attitudes.

- *Regulatory Focus Theory.* This theory is less related to the current project. It suggests that people approach the world with two categories of goals: prevention and promotion (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Promotion goals imply a preference for change, whereas prevention goals favor safety, security, predictability, and stability.

  - Although the theory relates to the "openness to change" dimension of ideology, applications of this work in the political domain have been limited.[5] Most of this research has centered on pursuit of individual goals such as investment choices and decisions about economic reform, rather than group goals of equality or social justice (e.g., see Boldero & Higgins, 2011; Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001).

II. Other Factors in Views of Social Justice

Although ideology and basic orientations are central in understanding attitudes toward social justice issues, other beliefs and perceptions also may play a role. These beliefs may be strongly related to orientations and ideology but also can be influenced by situational factors—for example, the target group in question, the type of resource being allocated, or the process of policy formation involved.

One of the prerequisites of social action is the recognition of injustice. However, there are many competing factors that can contribute to whether or not an individual perceives injustice and even more variables that can determine whether or not they act to try to remedy it. Several such factors are reviewed here.

- *Distributive justice* refers to beliefs about how to allocate resources fairly and effectively. Equity Theory (e.g., Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978) suggests that people try to ensure that there's a proportional or "fair" relationship between how much they invest in a domain and their outcomes (e.g., training and salary).

  - When the ratio of inputs to outputs is viewed as disproportionate, people experience psychological distress that they try to reduce. Typically there are two ways people may seek to accomplish this goal. The first is by altering inputs or outputs (i.e., putting in less effort or seeking greater rewards). When an injustice is perceived to be due to

group membership, demand for greater equity in outputs may take the form of social action or support for social justice issues. The second way of reducing distress is to distort mental conceptions of the inputs or outputs to make them seem more equitable. This type of rationalizing likely reduces an individual's propensity to engage in social action to remedy injustice.

- ○ Despite considerable evidence supporting this theory, it has two limitations: First, a lack of specificity about what conditions or traits might cause an individual to pursue one strategy over the other, and second, a failure to explain why people may view some outcomes as fair even when they perceive the balance between inputs and outputs as disproportionate.

- *Procedural justice* has to do with the methods by which decisions are made, specifically focusing on the role of fairness and transparency in the process of determining resource allocation. This concept holds that when people feel as if they have a say in the decision-making process, they're far more apt to view the outcome of the decision as fair, regardless of how resources ultimately are allocated (e.g., Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Tyler & Smith, 1998). (Note the contradiction of Equity Theory.)

  - ○ This, too, has implications for attitudes toward social justice policies. For example, people are more likely to support distributive policies aimed at helping disadvantaged groups to the extent that they think the government agencies make these policies fairly (e.g., Ebreo, Linn, & Vinning, 1996; Smith & Tyler, 1996). This suggests that social justice policies created through a transparent process incorporating multiple viewpoints should have the best chance of gaining widespread public support.

- *Relative Deprivation and Social Comparison Theories* (Davies, 1962; Festinger, 1954; Tyler & Smith, 1998) suggest that judgments of equality or satisfaction with outcomes derive mainly from comparisons of one's outcomes relative to others'. More specifically, research has shown that relative deprivation at the group level (a perception that one's group is deprived of resources relative to other groups) is more important than that at the individual level in driving perceptions of injustice and motivating collective action (Leach, Iyer, & Pedersen, 2007; Walker & Smith, 2002).

  - ○ Despite its intuitive appeal, this approach does not explain the pervasive lack of action among disadvantaged groups. Other conditions, including perceptions of the status quo as illegitimate, a belief that group action can make a difference, and a rejection of legitimizing myths likely also are necessary to acknowledge injustice and motivate action.

- *Deservingness*, or the extent to which people feel that different groups deserve their outcomes, underlies attitudes about the fairness of the social, economic, and political system in Western societies. Many of the constructs reviewed earlier can influence attributions of deservingness. For example, as noted, those who strongly believe the world is just and fair are more apt to feel that lower status groups' negative outcomes are deserved. Similarly, researchers have investigated how endorsement of the Protestant work ethic (Katz & Hass, 1988) and views of personal control (Nisbett & Ross, 1980) can contribute to perceptions of deservingness and beliefs about the causes of injustice, prejudice, and discrimination. For example:

  ◦ A long line of research in this tradition finds that those who most strongly believe individuals are responsible for their life outcomes also are more apt to express prejudice toward disadvantaged groups, including blacks, the poor, and obese people (Crandall & Martinez, 1996; Nosek, Banaji & Jost, 2009).

  ◦ Research also suggests that people are more apt to support government policies to assist those in need when their need is perceived to be caused by circumstances beyond their control (e.g., Weiner, Osborne, & Rudolph, 2010).

  ◦ Attributions also are critical for how members of disadvantaged or low-status groups view themselves. Dozens of studies have shown that lower-status group members, such as women and people in low-paying jobs, often feel they deserve less than members of higher-status groups (e.g., Blanton, George, & Crocker, 2001; Major, 1994; Pelham & Hetts, 2001). When this internalization of inequality occurs, members of lower status groups may be content with unfair outcomes—meaning they'll be less apt to take action to rectify the injustice. (Scores on scales measuring Social Dominance Orientation and System Justification Theory both predict deservingness, which in turn predicts action vs. inaction.)

III. Prejudice and Perceived Discrimination

Race-based antipathy is the most commonly studied form of prejudice and discrimination in the United States. However, many of the issues identified in the racism literature, reviewed in the following, can be applied to other groups as well.

- *Overt vs. new racisms.* Overt prejudice is thought to reflect negative feelings toward blacks, including the belief that they are inferior. The civil rights movement and accompanying social taboos against bigotry have resulted in a considerable decline in this type of prejudice in the United States in the past few decades (although it is not nonexistent;

see Huddy & Feldman, 2009). Rather than truly having disappeared, many researchers suggest that racist views now manifest in subtler ways (Nelson, 2001), such as symbolic racism, implicit bias, modern racism, ambivalent racism, and racial resentment (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1986).

- The strong societal pressure against bigotry, coupled with the fact that such views can be nonconscious (i.e., automatic or implicit; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986), means that measuring "new" racism can be quite tricky. For example, aversive racists explicitly endorse egalitarian values and are unlikely to discriminate in situations where there are clear societal norms about what is right and wrong. However, when the situation is ambiguous—e.g., a job applicant with middling credentials—anti-black bias appears (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Ambiguous situations are thought to leave room for individuals to rationalize their decision as being based on nonracial factors (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000).

- Direct assessments of new racism rely on scales that focus on beliefs about blacks as overly demanding and undeserving of government assistance. However, some critics have suggested that these items may reflect ideological or policy preferences (e.g., the belief that no one at all should have government aid) rather than anti-black prejudice (Schuman, 2000).

- *Perceived discrimination.* Many of these theories of new racism regard denial that discrimination exists as an indicator of anti-black prejudice (Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1986). Believing that blacks no longer face discrimination corresponds strongly with racial resentment (defined as the belief that blacks do not try hard enough and receive too much government aid) and predicts attitudes on a range of racial policies (Feldman & Huddy, 2005).

- *Stigma or attributions to discrimination.* How members of stigmatized groups think about discrimination is important in understanding its effects. Research has suggested that members of stigmatized groups are vigilant about the possibility that they may be discriminated against and in controlled laboratory experiments are likely to blame negative outcomes on discrimination when they are aware their group status is known to evaluators (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; Dion, 1975). At the same time, although stigmatized group members recognize discrimination directed toward their group, they are far less likely to report having personally experienced such bias (Crosby, 1982; Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, & Lalonde, 1990).

◦ These seemingly inconsistent results may be due to the fact that attributing an unfair outcome to discrimination rather than personal failings involves not only a judgment that the individual was treated unjustly but also that the treatment resulted from that individual's group membership (Major et al., 2002). The ambiguity inherent in most situations and the difficulty of judgments of intent underscore the challenges of low-status individuals in acknowledging and reporting discrimination, particularly in its subtler forms.

◦ These perceptions have important consequences: When low-status group members are able to attribute negative events to prejudice rather than their own personal faults, their self-esteem may be protected (Major, Quinton, & Schmader, 2003) and, as noted, recognition of prejudice is a necessary first step to taking social action to rectify it.

IV. Policy Attitudes and Causal Explanations

Among different efforts to address discrimination, affirmative action has received the most research attention. This section reviews factors that have been shown to influence attitudes toward affirmative action and other similar social policies aimed at reducing inequality.

• *Function of the policy.* Typically, softer forms of affirmative action, such as outreach programs, are viewed more favorably than programs that use race or gender as a factor in hiring (e.g., Golden et al., 2001; Kravitz & Klineberg, 2004). Providing justifications for the policy increases support for it (Aberson, 2003). Further, affirmative action in employment may receive less opposition than in education (Downing et al., 2002).

• *Target of affirmative action.* The intended target of a policy influences the degree of that policy's support, perhaps because of perceptions of deservingness. Policies intended to help disabled adults receive more support than those targeting women or minorities, and assistance for women is more highly supported than assistance for blacks (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993).

• *Personality factors.* Women, minorities, Democrats, liberals, and those who have personal experience with discrimination are more likely to support a variety of affirmative action policies, whereas, as mentioned, those high in SDO, RWA, individualism, and conservatism are more likely to oppose it (for a review see Crosby, Iyer, & Sincharoen, 2006).

• *Education.* In an absolute sense, greater education is associated with lower levels of prejudice. However, among those with higher levels of education, the relationship

between attitudes toward social justice policies (e.g., affirmative action and welfare) and racist views is particularly strong (Federico, 2004; Federico & Sidanius, 2002a). In other words, highly educated adults who have racist views or are high in Social Dominance Orientation (Fererico & Sidanius, 2002b) are more likely to oppose policies that would benefit racial minorities or increase equality. This may reflect the fact that highly educated adults are better at connecting their attitudes with their policy preferences.

- *Causal attributions.* Political ideology is strongly related to the causal attributions people make for various social problems. For example, whereas many conservatives blame poverty on self-indulgence, lack of effort, and weak morals, liberals are more apt to see the poor as victims of social structures (Skitka, Mullen, Griffin, Hutchison, & Chamberlin, 2002). On a variety of issues ranging from homelessness to obesity, liberals tend to focus on situational explanations, whereas conservatives emphasize personal ones.

  ◦ Common attributions for poverty include individual causes (alcohol abuse, laziness, poor money management skills), social causes (lack of opportunity, low wages, discrimination), and luck (Feagin, 1972; Weiner, Osborne, & Rudolph, 2010). Another taxonomy of causal attributions has to do with the locus (internal or external to the individual), stability, and controllability of the cause (Heider, 1958; Weiner et al., 2010).

  ◦ Causal attributions for negative circumstances often differ depending on the target group in question. For example, poverty among the elderly might be viewed as caused by illness, whereas among immigrants it could be seen as caused by lack of education and opportunity, and welfare recipients may be viewed as lazy. Similarly, poverty among men may be blamed on lack of effort, and among women it may be perceived as resulting from irresponsible childbearing (e.g., Henry, Reyna, & Weiner, 2004; Cozzarelli, Tagler, & Wilkinson, 2001).

V. Taking Action to Address Inequality

Research has identified several important factors that predict taking action to address inequality or to voice grievances. Action in this case refers to any type of social action, from signing petitions to participating in or organizing protests. These actions differ considerably in the investments they entail from their participants, their difficulty, and their perceived effectiveness. Nonetheless, certain factors emerge as important predictors of social action.

- *Perceived injustice.* Perceiving group-based inequality, and especially having an emotional response to such inequities, is an essential motivator of taking action (Frijda, 1986; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Mackie & Smith, 2002; van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach, 2004; see also Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). This is why examining the factors that influence assessments of injustice, reviewed earlier, is key to understanding the proclivity to act.

- *Perceived efficacy.* As with other theories of action, the expected outcome of any behavior factors into whether or not to undertake it (e.g., the Theory of Reasoned Action, Ajzen, 1991; Klandermans, 1984). Those who believe that taking action will make a difference for themselves and their group are, not surprisingly, much more apt to act.

- *Ingroup identity.* Among the most important theories of intergroup relations is Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), which argues that people derive positive identities from the groups to which they feel they belong and look for ways to differentiate their group positively from others. In the case of low-status groups this may be difficult or even impossible. In that case, SIT argues that people have a variety of options to pursue—if possible, they may leave their group physically or psychologically, compare themselves with groups that are even worse off, devalue dimensions that are unflattering to their groups, or engage in social change. Taking action is seen as more likely to the extent that the status differential between groups is illegitimate and unstable and alternatives are perceived to be possible. Thus, identification with a particular group and the belief that change is possible are together important for social action (van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008).

VI. Values and Moral Orientations

Personal values and morality, although less directly tied to policy views, are at the root of many of the constructs reviewed in this report. Haidt's work in particular suggests core building blocks that may indirectly relate to social justice attitudes and therefore serve as a useful means of differentiating groups during analysis.

- *Values.* Schwartz's work on values is widely considered to be among the seminal works in the field, establishing a core set of 10 values common across most cultures: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security (Schwartz, 2007; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; 1990).

- Despite many demonstrations of the importance of values to political attitudes, there is no clear evidence of how different values map onto political attitudes. Instead, research has focused on a small number of values (occasionally only one) to establish their relationships with political views (see Feldman, 2003).

- *Moral orientations.* Haidt and Graham (2007) proposed that there are five psychological foundations of morality, which to varying degrees are evident in all cultures: harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity. These distinct moral domains, also referred to as "ethics" and "foundations," describe rules and values about right and wrong, as well as appropriate and unacceptable behaviors. Violation of these rules leads to moral judgments of behaviors as wrong, whereas behaviors upholding these values are considered appropriate, virtuous, and right (Koleva, Graham, Ditto, Iyer, & Haidt, 2012). Each of these moral foundations has a specific evolutionary history, serves social functions, and leads to moral intuitions.

  - Haidt and his colleagues have shown that conservatives and liberals in the United States systematically vary in the importance they place on different moral foundations. Political liberals tend to prioritize dimensions of harm and fairness more than conservatives do, whereas conservatives tend to value all five of the dimensions more equally (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007).

  - Recent work suggests that these foundations also may be differentially related to the two key dimensions of ideology: equality, and openness to change. Harm/care and fairness/reciprocity align with preferences for equality vs. inequality, whereas ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity are associated with openness to change (Federico, Weber, Ergun, & Hunt, 2013).

VII. Implications for the Opportunity Study

As these studies illustrate, successfully identifying the determinants of social justice attitudes requires that we go beyond the popular concept of ideology as a political construct and measure its psychological bases. The main components of ideology in this sense—attitudes about social justice policies and issues and openness to change (for our purpose, willingness to take action on these issues)—are crucial outcome variables for the Opportunity Study to examine.

Concepts presented in this review as likely predictors of these outcomes include the following, each of which has been explored in questionnaire design and data analysis:

The **Opportunity** Agenda

- The importance placed on moral foundations including harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity, as well as views of other potentially important values such as tradition, conformity, and security.

- Perceptions of outgroups, submission to authorities, aggressiveness toward outgroups (RWA), preference for social hierarchy vs. an egalitarian society (SDO), support for the current system, desire to maintain the status quo (SJT), and belief that the world is just and fair (BJW).

- Causal attributions for personal, ingroup, and outgroup circumstances, as well as perceptions of deservingness.

- Levels and intensity of association with groups and causes; perceptions of the status of various target groups.

- Personal and group efficacy (believing that taking action will make a difference) as motivational forces.

- Perceived fairness and transparency in the creation of policies to address injustice.

- Perceptions of personal vs. group-level prejudice and discrimination, and comparisons of perceived injustice among groups.

- Perceived sources of injustice and rationalization of inequality; individual or group-level blame vs. systemic or institutional blame.

- Attitudes toward assistance vs. preference policies.

We note that several of these overlap with some of the items preliminarily identified by The Opportunity Agenda as potential dependent variables of interest. Those included the following:

1. Views of whether inequality is caused by individual or systematic factors

2. Extent and nature of perceived discrimination

3. Views on efforts to address discrimination

4. Optimism about solutions

5. Views on the nature of inherent human rights

Other than item 2, the literature suggests that these are among the most important independent variables predicting the ultimate outcomes of interest—attitudes toward social justice and openness to change/willingness to take action.

With this conceptual framework in mind, we developed questionnaire items drawing from Social Dominance Orientation, System Justification Theory, and other key constructs identified in the rich literature we reviewed, along with related variables of interest as identified by The Opportunity Agenda.

Appendix B: Topline Data Report

This appendix provides the complete question wording and topline results for data included in this report.

* = less than 0.5 percent. Items in all grid questions were presented in random order. Phrases shown in parentheses were rotated.

This survey is about the way people think about society, groups, values and public policy issues. We appreciate your time in answering our questions.

1. Please record your opinion about each item in the grid.

Summary Table—3/10/14		More positive			Less positive			
		NET	Is as good as it can be	Needs minor improvt.	NET	Needs major improvt.	Needs to be completely redesigned	No op.
a.	The criminal justice system in this country	31	4	27	69	50	19	*
b.	The public education system in this country	24	3	22	76	57	19	0
c.	The U.S. economic system	25	3	22	75	56	19	*
d.	The U.S. political system	19	3	16	81	52	29	*

2/2a. Thinking about the criminal justice system, in general do you think society would be better served by (stricter punishment for people convicted of crimes) or (greater effort to rehabilitate people convicted of crimes)? Do you feel strongly or somewhat that society is better served by [SELECTED ITEM]?

Punishment			Rehabilitation			
NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Somewhat	Strongly	No opinion
54	37	17	46	23	23	*

3/3a. On another subject, which of these is more important to you: (maintaining traditional ways of doing things) or (trying new ways of doing things)? Do you feel strongly or somewhat that [SELECTED ITEM] is more important?

Traditional ways			New ways			
NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Somewhat	Strongly	No opinion
29	13	16	71	39	32	*

4. Which of these is more important to you: (following traditional morality) or (developing your own moral standards)? Do you feel strongly or somewhat that [SELECTED ITEM] is more important?

Traditional morality			Own standards			
NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Somewhat	Strongly	No opinion
47	30	17	52	19	33	*

5. Would you say American society offers equal opportunities for all groups, most groups, a good number of groups, just some groups or only a few groups?

More groups				Fewer groups			
NET	All	Most	A good number	NET	Just some	Only a few	No opinion
37	14	22	24	39	27	13	0

6. Each of the following items may be important. Please rank them, using a '1' for the item that is most important to you, a '2' for the second most important item, and so forth through '5'.

		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	No opinion
a.	Having compassion for people who are suffering	17	28	23	17	14	*
b.	Treating everyone equally	27	22	21	16	14	*
c.	Being loyal to your country	14	14	17	25	30	*
d.	Showing respect for authority	6	14	16	30	33	*
e.	Acting in an honorable way	35	22	22	12	9	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

7. Do you think (society functions better when there are some groups at the top and others at the bottom) or (society functions better when all groups have an equal chance in life)? Do you feel strongly or somewhat that [SELECTED ITEM]?

Groups at top/bottom			Equal chance			
NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Somewhat	Strongly	No opinion
15	5	10	85	28	57	*

8. In this country, how often do you think the best person in an organization rises to the top?

More often				Less often			
NET	Almost always	Often	Sometimes	NET	Rarely	Almost never	No opinion
23	4	20	59	18	15	3	0

9. If one group has more opportunities in society than other groups, do you feel that's entirely acceptable, mostly acceptable, somewhat acceptable, not so acceptable or not at all acceptable?

More acceptable				Less acceptable			
NET	Entirely	Mostly	Somewhat	NET	Not so	Not at all	No opinion
10	2	8	27	63	40	23	*

10. Political correctness aside, what do you think of the idea that some groups of people are smarter than other groups? Do you think this is definitely true, probably true, probably not true or definitely not true?

True			Not true			
NET	Definitely	Probably	NET	Probably	Definitely	No opinion
57	16	41	43	24	19	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

11. Do you think unequal treatment that disadvantages the groups listed below is a very serious problem in U.S. society, a somewhat serious problem, not so serious a problem or not a problem at all?

		More serious			Less serious			
		NET	Very	Somewhat	NET	Not so	Not at all	No opinion
a.	Poor people	75	35	40	25	17	8	*
b.	Latinos	52	16	36	48	34	14	*
c.	Women	52	17	35	48	32	15	*
d.	Undocumented immigrants	59	30	29	41	21	19	*
e.	Gays and lesbians	55	21	34	45	28	17	*
f.	Black men	57	21	36	43	29	14	*
g.	Black women	55	20	35	44	31	14	*
h.	Asian Americans	34	9	25	66	44	22	*
i.	Native Americans	56	22	34	44	30	14	*
j.	Whites	28	9	19	72	38	34	*
k.	People who have served a prison sentence	60	19	41	40	29	11	*

12. To the extent that each of these groups experiences inequality today, why do you think that is: entirely because of their own behavior, mostly because of their own behavior, equally because of their own behavior and conditions in society, mostly because of conditions in society or entirely because of conditions in society?

		Own behavior			Both equally	Social conditions			
		NET	Entirely	Mostly		NET	Mostly	Entirely	No opin.
a.	Poor people	15	4	10	35	50	33	17	*
b.	Latinos	20	7	13	36	43	32	11	*
c.	Women	13	5	7	30	57	40	16	1
d.	Undocumented immigrants	36	21	15	28	36	22	14	*
e.	Gays and lesbians	25	13	12	26	48	29	19	*
f.	Black men	27	10	17	35	37	27	10	1
g.	Black women	20	8	13	34	46	34	12	1
h.	Asian Americans	19	6	13	36	44	34	10	1
i.	Native Americans	13	5	9	29	57	39	18	*
j.	Whites	28	11	17	34	37	23	13	1
k.	People who have served a prison sentence	49	23	26	30	21	14	8	*

13. How often, if ever, have you personally felt that you were being treated unfairly because of your [ITEM]?

		More often			Less often			
		NET	Often	Sometimes	NET	Rarely	Never	No opinion
a.	Race or ethnicity	31	9	22	69	24	45	0
b.	Gender	32	7	25	68	25	43	*
c.	Financial situation or economic class	39	10	29	61	28	34	*
d.	Sexual orientation	11	3	8	89	13	75	0
e.	Religious beliefs	19	5	14	81	25	56	*
f.	Accent or level of fluency in English	15	4	11	85	15	70	*

14. To what extent, if at all, do you think people in these groups experience discrimination when trying to buy or rent a home or apartment?

		More discrimination				Less discrimination			
		NET	Great deal	Substantial amount	Just some	NET	Not so much	Not at all	No opin.
a.	Women	16	5	11	33	51	34	17	*
b.	Muslims	47	15	31	31	22	13	8	*
c.	Single parents	23	7	17	38	39	27	12	*
d.	Latinos	33	8	25	38	29	19	10	*
e.	Blacks	38	13	25	37	25	16	9	*
f.	Asian Americans	15	3	11	34	51	34	17	*
g.	Native Americans	26	6	19	36	39	26	12	*
h.	Undocumented immigrants	64	29	35	20	16	9	7	*
i.	Gay and lesbian couples	40	12	28	31	29	19	10	*
j.	People with disabilities	36	10	25	39	25	18	8	*
k.	People who have served a prison sentence	70	31	39	20	10	5	4	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

15. Now thinking about the things that most define you personally, how important would you say each of the following is to who you are and how you think about yourself? Is it an essential part of who you are, a very important part of who you are, a somewhat important part of who you are, a not so important part of who you are or not at all an important part of who you are?

| | | More important | | | Less important | | | |
		NET	Essential	Very	Somewhat	NET	Not so	Not at all	No opinion
a.	Your race	46	25	22	26	28	16	12	*
b.	Your ethnicity	44	23	21	26	29	16	13	*
c.	Your national origin	47	24	23	25	28	16	13	*
d.	Your gender	57	33	24	23	21	9	11	*
e.	Your sexual orientation	44	25	19	23	33	15	17	*
f.	Your financial situation or economic class	38	14	24	36	26	17	9	*
g.	Your religious beliefs	50	30	20	22	28	13	15	*
h.	Your political or ideological beliefs	37	15	22	33	31	19	12	*
i.	Being a parent	56	34	22	14	29	6	23	*

16. (IF SELECTED TWO OR MORE ITEMS AS "ESSENTIAL" IN Q15) Among the items you selected as an essential part of who you are [IF SELECTED BEING A PARENT: excluding being a parent], which one would you say is the single most important?

Your race	11
Your ethnicity	8
Your national origin	8
Your gender	19
Your sexual orientation	4
Your financial situation or economic class	8
Your religious beliefs	36
Your political or ideological beliefs	7

The **Opportunity** Agenda

17. Compared with other groups in this country, do you feel that the group you identify with most strongly has things much better, somewhat better, about the same, somewhat worse or much worse?

Better				Worse			
NET	Much	Somewhat	About the same	NET	Somewhat	Much	No opinion
41	12	29	44	15	11	4	*

18. What comes closer to your view: (each person is responsible for his or her own prosperity) or (the prosperity of each person is linked to the prosperity of all people)? Do you feel strongly or somewhat that [SELECTED ITEM]?

Responsible for own			Linked to others'			
NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Somewhat	Strongly	No opinion
67	42	25	32	19	14	*

19. Economically, would you describe yourself as poor, lower-income but not poor, lower-middle income, middle income, upper middle income or better off than that?

Lower income					Upper income			
NET	Poor	Lower income	Lower middle	Middle income	NET	Upper middle	Better off than that	No opinion
48	7	18	22	38	14	12	2	*

20. To what extent do you feel that you personally have the ability to help change things for the better on issues that are important to you? Do you think you can have a great deal of impact, a good amount of impact, some impact, a little impact or no impact?

More impact				Less impact			
NET	Great deal	Good amount	Some	NET	A little	No impact	No opinion
24	6	18	37	39	28	11	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

21. How much do you feel that each group below has the ability to help change things for the better on issues that are important to them? Do you feel that these groups can have a great deal of ability to change things, a good amount of ability to change things, some ability to change things, a little ability to change things or no ability to change things?

		More ability				Less ability			
		NET	Great deal	Good amount	Some ability	NET	A little	No ability	No op.
a.	Poor people	29	12	17	34	37	29	8	*
b.	Black people	53	20	34	33	13	9	4	*
c.	Women	61	24	37	29	9	7	3	*
d.	Undocumented immigrants	25	11	13	26	49	31	18	*
e.	Gays and lesbians	47	17	30	34	18	12	6	*

22. Say you were invited to take some action in support of an effort to improve opportunities for each of the groups listed below. For each group, how likely would you be to get involved, if at all? (If you already do any of these, just check that box.)

		More likely			Less Likely				
		NET	Very	Somewhat	NET	Not so	Not at all	Already do this	No opin.
a.	Poor people	59	18	40	34	19	15	7	1
b.	Latinos	39	9	30	58	30	28	2	1
c.	Women	58	20	37	37	21	17	5	*
d.	Undocumented immigrants	29	8	22	69	28	41	2	*
e.	Gays and lesbians	34	9	25	62	25	37	3	*
f.	Black men	38	10	28	59	30	29	3	1
g.	Black women	43	11	31	54	27	27	3	*
h.	Asian Americans	34	7	27	64	33	31	2	1
i.	Native Americans	45	11	34	52	29	23	2	*
j.	Whites	43	12	31	53	24	29	3	1
k.	People who have served a prison sentence	29	6	24	68	34	34	2	1

23. Thinking now about issues instead of groups, say you were invited to take some action in support of efforts focused on each of the following issues. For each issue, how likely would you be to get involved, if at all? (If you already do any of these, just check that box.)

		Likely			Unlikely				
		NET	Very	Smwt	NET	Not so	Not at all	Already do this	No op.
a.	Seeking fair treatment for minorities in the criminal justice system	46	16	31	52	29	23	2	*
b.	Providing a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. today	39	13	27	60	28	32	1	*
c.	Securing the U.S. border with Mexico	45	20	25	54	28	26	1	*
d.	Reducing poverty in the United States	67	26	41	30	18	12	3	*
e.	Encouraging equal opportunities for all groups	64	24	40	33	18	15	3	*

24. (IF VERY/SOMEWHAT LIKELY OR ALREADY DOING THIS FOR ANY GROUP IN Q22 OR ISSUE IN Q23) In taking action on behalf of any of the groups or issues we've mentioned, how likely are you to do each of the following items, if at all? (If you already do any of these, just check that box.)

		More likely			Less likely				
		NET	Very	Smwt	NET	Not so	Not at all	Already do this	No op.
a.	Contact an elected official	46	11	34	48	29	18	7	*
b.	Volunteer with community or political organizations	46	10	36	46	28	19	8	*
c.	Take part in a protest, march, or demonstration	28	6	23	69	36	32	3	*
d.	Write or post something online or in print to persuade or motivate others	36	9	27	58	32	26	5	*
e.	Donate money	46	9	37	43	26	17	11	*
f.	Sign a written or online petition	63	21	41	29	17	12	8	*
g.	Boycott products or vendors because of their practices and policies	53	16	38	40	24	17	6	*
h.	Talk with people you know about your views	67	21	46	24	15	8	9	*
i.	Participate in creative or artistic projects that bring attention to the issue	37	9	28	61	34	26	2	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

25. Not counting any work-related activities, in the last 12 months have you had a meal with a friend who is a member of any of the following groups, or not?

| | | Yes | | | | | |
	NET	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	No	Don't know	No opin.
a. Black	61	17	25	18	39	NA	*
b. White	85	52	24	9	15	'"	*
c. Latino	54	15	23	15	46	'"	*
d. Poor, as far as you know	58	15	26	18	32	10	O
e. Gay or lesbian, as far as you know	49	12	22	15	42	9	*
f. An undocumented immigrant as far as you know	19	4	7	7	66	15	O
g. Asian American	43	11	17	15	57	NA	*

26. Should each of these government programs be expanded, kept the same as it is now, or cut back?

	Expanded	Kept the same	Cut back	No opinion
a. Making interest payments on mortgages tax-deductible	43	46	10	1
b. Offering tax breaks to encourage developers to build more affordable housing	42	44	13	1

27. Do you feel that government programs that try to reduce discrimination are working very well, somewhat well, not so well or not well at all?

| Well | | | Less well | | | |
NET	Very	Somewhat	NET	Not so	Not at all	No opinion
41	4	37	59	43	16	*

28. Do you think laws designed to prevent discrimination in housing are too weak, about right or too strong?

Too weak	About right	Too strong	No opinion
31	59	9	1

The **Opportunity** Agenda

29. Thinking now about efforts to reduce poverty: What priority, if any, do you personally think each of these items should receive in attempts to reduce poverty in the United States—very high priority, high priority, moderate priority, low priority or not a priority?

		High				Low/none			
		NET	Very	High	Moderate	NET	Low	Not	No op.
a.	Increasing the minimum wage	52	28	24	27	21	12	9	*
b.	Improving public education	77	45	32	17	6	3	2	*
c.	Expanding gov't-funded job-training programs	45	18	28	36	19	12	7	*
d.	Cutting business taxes in an effort to encourage job creation	43	18	25	34	22	16	7	*
e.	Increasing spending on highways, bridges, and other public works projects in an effort to encourage job creation	44	17	27	39	16	12	5	*
f.	Avoiding cutbacks in Social Security	65	38	28	24	10	6	4	*
g.	Holding down interest rates on student loans	62	30	32	27	10	7	4	*

30. For each program listed below, should federal funding be increased, kept the same, or decreased?

		Increased	Kept the same	Decreased	No opinion
a.	Unemployment benefits	28	53	18	*
b.	School lunch programs for low-income students	44	48	8	*
c.	Food stamps for low-income families	31	47	22	*
d.	College loans for low-income students	47	43	10	*

31. Alternative sentencing programs for people who have been convicted of a non-violent offense can include probation, treatment, counseling and payment of damages instead of jail time. Do you think the use of these programs should be increased, kept about the same, or decreased?

Increased	Kept about the same	Decreased	No opinion
48	43	9	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

32. Thinking about employment opportunities for people who have served a prison sentence, would you support or oppose the following?

		Support	Oppose	No opinion
a.	Increased spending on job training and job placement programs for people who have served a prison sentence	67	33	1
b.	Tax incentives for employers to hire people who have served a prison sentence	55	44	1
c.	Laws restricting discrimination in hiring against people who have served a prison sentence	56	43	1

33/34. Do you think it should be legal or illegal to possess [ITEM] for personal use?

		Legal	Illegal	No opinion
a.	Marijuana	52	47	1
b.	Cocaine	8	92	*

33a/34a. (FOR EACH, IF ILLEGAL, Q33/Q34) Please check any items that should be considered as a penalty for people convicted of possessing [ITEM] for personal use. (MULTIPLE RESPONSE)

	Marijuana	Cocaine
Prison sentence	27	53
Fine	75	69
Drug treatment	58	73
Community service	66	56
Probation	46	47
No opinion	*	*

35. On another subject, how do you feel about police officers stopping and searching people solely because of their race or ethnicity? Do you think (this should be permitted), (individual officers who do this should be retrained) or (policies and system-wide training programs should be put in place to prevent this)?

	Should not be permitted			
Should be permitted	NET	Officers should be retrained	System-wide training should be enacted	No opinion
13	86	23	63	*

The **Opportunity** Agenda

36. Do you support or oppose a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants now living in the United States?

Support	Oppose	No opinion
56	43	1

37. (IF OPPOSE) What if undocumented immigrants were first required to pay a fine, pay back taxes, learn English and pass background checks—in that case would you support or oppose a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants now living in the United States?

Support	Oppose	No opinion
63	37	0

36/37 NET:

NET	At first	If conditions are met	Oppose	No opinion
83	56	27	16	1

38/39. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, independent, or another party? If Democrat/Republican, would you call yourself a strong [Democrat/Republican] or a not very strong [Democrat/Republican]?

Republican NET	25
Strong	13
Less strong	11
Democrat NET	35
Strong	21
Less strong	14
Independent NET	22
Other	1
No preference	17

The **Opportunity** Agenda

40. In general, do you think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate, middle of the road, slightly conservative, conservative or extremely conservative?

Liberal NET	32
Extremely	4
Liberal	18
Slightly	10
Moderate	35
Conservative NET	33
Extremely	11
Liberal	18
Slightly	4

41. Do you consider yourself to be heterosexual or straight, gay, lesbian, bisexual or other (please specify)?

Heterosexual	Not Heterosexual				
	NET	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual	Other
94	6	2	1	2	1

42/43. Do you actively participate in any of the following types of organizations or groups?

	Yes	No
Service club or fraternal organization	4	96
Veterans group	4	96
Religious group	20	80
Senior citizen's center or group	5	95
Women's group	5	95
Issue-oriented political organization	2	98
Non-partisan civic organization	3	97
School club or association	8	92
Hobby, sports team, or youth group	14	86
Neighborhood association or community group	9	91
Group representing racial/ethnic interests	2	98

The **Opportunity** Agenda

44. People may be involved in their communities in many different ways. In the past 12 months, have you...

	Yes	No
Attended a PTA/school group meeting	12	88
Attended a community group meeting	14	86
Donated blood	13	87
Given money to a charity	48	52
Worked for a charity or your church	24	76

45. People may also be involved in civic and political activities. In the past 12 months, have you...

	Yes	No
Attended a political protest or rally	4	96
Contacted a government official	14	86
Volunteered or worked for a presidential campaign	2	98
Volunteered or worked for another political candidate, issue, or cause	3	97
Given money to a presidential campaign	8	92
Given money to another political candidate, issue, or cause	7	93
Worked with others in your community to solve a problem	8	92
Served on a community board	3	97
Written a "letter to the editor"	3	97
Commented about politics on a message board or internet site	9	91
Held a publicly elected office	1	99

46. Do you actively participate in any of the following political movements?

	Yes	No
Tea Party Movement	3	97
Environmental Rights Movement	2	98
Women's Rights Movement	2	98
Racial Equality Movement	1	99
Right to Life Movement	3	97
Peace/Anti-War Movement	2	98
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights Movement	3	97
Occupy Movement	1	99

47. How often do you get information about politics from each of the following sources—every day, three times a week or more, almost every week, one to three times a month, less than once a month or never?

		More than 1/wk			1/wk or less				
		NET	Daily	3+/wk	NET	Wkly	1–3/mo	<1/mo	Never
a.	Radio	34	20	14	43	16	13	15	23
b.	Internet news sites	33	21	12	40	16	11	13	26
c.	Print newspapers	30	19	10	46	17	12	16	25
d.	Television	56	38	18	35	17	11	8	9
e.	Magazines	8	3	5	55	12	18	25	37
f.	Internet blogs	10	5	4	31	8	9	14	60
g.	Social media websites	17	9	8	34	12	10	13	49

Appendix C: Methodology

The Opportunity Survey was conducted Feb. 4–March 10, 2014, among a random national sample of 2,055 respondents, including oversamples for a total of 500 black men, 200 adults with annual incomes less than 50 percent of the federal poverty level, and 100 Asian Americans.

The survey's results have a theoretical margin of sampling error of plus or minus 2.5 percentage points for the full sample, with oversamples weighted to their correct proportions of the national population, including a design effect of 1.27.

Questionnaire design, project oversight, and data analysis were produced by Langer Research Associates of New York, N.Y., which wrote this report.

Field work, data tabulation, and weighting were carried out by the GfK Group, with interviews conducted via GfK's KnowledgePanel®, a panel of Americans randomly recruited via address-based sampling to take surveys via the internet. (Random telephone sampling was used until 2009.) Respondents who agree to participate are provided with internet access and a netbook computer, if needed, and may be enrolled in prize raffles. GfK seeks to assign panelists no more than one survey per week.

A total of 3,499 panelists were sampled for the Opportunity Survey, with standard e-mail reminders sent Feb. 8, 9, and 10, 2014, and custom reminders sent Feb. 20 and March 2. Of the initial sample, 2,160 panelists (62 percent) completed the survey; 2,054 of these were retained after quality-control review. Median completion time was 23 minutes.

Weighting

Sample weighting procedures included the GfK panel's base weight to correct for known deviations from a pure equal-probability-of-selection sample design; a Spanish-language base weight incorporating selection and language adjustments for Spanish-speaking respondents; and a demographic post-stratification weight to correct for departures from known population values because of noncoverage and nonresponse, with weighting targets for sex, age, race/Hispanic ethnicity, education, Census region, household income, home ownership, metropolitan area status, internet access, and primary language by Census region.

Study-specific post-stratification weights were constructed to adjust for the study's specific design. The total sample of 2,054 respondents was weighted to correct for the oversampling of black men, low-income adults, and Asian Americans. Separate weights also were produced for the 1,500 general population respondents and for each oversampled population. Results reported were computed using the total sample weight.

Quality control

Quality-control analysis was performed using preliminary survey data based on 1,651 interviews.

Variables examined included:

- Interview duration, flagging the 132 respondents (8 percent of the sample) who completed the survey in less than 50 percent of the median interview time.

- Item refusal, in which 36 respondents (2.2 percent) were flagged for having refused more than one-third of all survey items presented.

- Straight-lining, meaning respondents who entered the same response for all items on the same grid in at least six of 11 grid questions (Q11, Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q21, Q22, Q23, Q24, Q25, and Q30). This resulted in 379 flags, or 23 percent of respondents.

GfK created a composite score in which each respondent received one point for each measure on which he or she was flagged. No points were assigned to 1,216 respondents (73.7 percent), 1 point to 350 (21.2 percent), 2 points to 58 (3.5 percent), and 3 points to 27 (1.6 percent). After an evaluation of impacts on sample diversity, respondents scoring 2 or 3 points were removed from the dataset. This ultimately totaled 106 of the full complement of completed questionnaires.

Response rate

As noted, 62 percent of invited panelists completed the survey. However, there are additional stages of nonresponse in the survey design, including noncontact and nonparticipation in the initial recruitment study, not agreeing to join or not actually joining the panel, or nonresponse to GfK's survey of panelists' demographic profiles. Adding contact and cooperation rates across all stages, GfK computes a response rate of 5.5 percent using the AAPOR RR3 definitions produced by the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Appendix D: Statistical Modeling

Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis is a method of grouping people based on specific sets of characteristics. Often used in marketing and communication, its goal is to identify people who are very similar to each other, but very dissimilar from others, in terms of those characteristics. Clustering algorithms (in this case, k-means clustering) use an iterative procedure to assign people into clusters, measuring within- and between-cluster variation at each step and changing cluster membership until the best solution is reached.

Selecting characteristics is a central component of identifying a meaningful set of clusters. The variables should measure distinct dimensions (i.e., attitudes or behaviors) and should have robust variation in the full sample. Highly correlated variables should be avoided because they wouldn't add unique information in forming clusters. Therefore, an in-depth evaluation of the properties and interrelationships of variables is paramount before clustering can begin. The selection of the variables used in this analysis reflects such a process. The eight variables selected are:

- An index measuring the extent to which respondents think unfair treatment that disadvantages various groups is a serious problem, based on averaged responses to Q11a-k, excluding[5] item j "whites")

- An index measuring respondents' likelihood to take action to improve opportunities for various groups (Q22 a-k, excluding item j "whites")

- An index measuring the extent to which respondents say they'd be likely to undertake different actions (e.g., volunteering, donating money, signing petitions) to support groups or issues that are important to them (Q24a-i)

- An index measuring the extent to which respondents think inequality faced by groups is attributable to their own behaviors rather than social conditions (Q12a-k)

- An index measuring perceived efficacy of groups to be able to take action to change things that are important to them (as an index or single items, Q21a-e)

---

5. Item exclusions were done on the basis of conceptual and psychometric grounds, e.g., when an item's removal improved the psychometric properties of an index substantially.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

- An index measuring the frequency of personal contact (i.e., meals shared outside of a work context) with members of different groups (Q25a-g)

- An index measuring the frequency of personal experiences with discrimination because of group memberships (e.g., race, gender, or religious beliefs) (Q13a-f)

- An index measuring the extent to which respondents feel various personal characteristics associated with their group memberships (e.g., their race, gender, or sexual orientation) are important elements of their own identity (Q15a-h)

Regression modeling

The statistical models included in this report were conducted using linear regression, which measures the relationships among attitudinal and demographic variables, and predicted outcomes such as perceived seriousness of unfair treatment against groups. A regression measures the independent strength of the relationship between each predictor with the posited outcome, known as the dependent or outcome variable.

Although they do not establish causality, such models reveal the strength of the relationship between each predictor and the dependent variable, with other predictors held constant. They therefore illustrate what variables explain the most unique variation in the dependent variable.

To conduct the modeling, key questions were recoded as continuous variables where possible (e.g., 1 = not acceptable at all, 2 = not so acceptable, 3 = somewhat acceptable, 4 = mostly acceptable, and 5 = entirely acceptable). Categorical or dichotomous variables, including many demographic measures, were recoded as binary variables (e.g., 0 = female, 1 = male).

The dependent variables modeled include:

1. An index measuring the extent to which respondents think unfair treatment that disadvantages various groups is a serious problem (Q11a-k, excluding item j).

2. An index measuring respondents' views on the extent of housing discrimination faced by various groups (Q12a-k).

3. An index measuring the extent to which respondents say a variety of measures to address poverty should be prioritized or funding for poverty-related measures should be increased. The index is made up of standardized responses to items Q29a-g and Q30a-d.

4. An index measuring support for alternative sentencing programs and policies aimed to increase employment opportunities for people who have been incarcerated, as well as a preference for rehabilitation over strict punishment. The index is based on standardized responses to five items from Q2a, Q31, and Q32a-c.

5. Respondents' support for a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Responses to Q36 and Q37 are coded into a three-point response scale ("support without conditions," "support with conditions," and "oppose").

6. An index measuring respondents' likelihood to take action to improve opportunities for various groups (Q22 a-k, excluding item j).

7. An index measuring respondents' likelihood to take action in support of various issues (Q23a-e, excluding item c).

8. An index measuring the extent to which respondents say they'd be likely to undertake different actions (e.g., volunteering, donating money, or signing petitions) to support groups or issues that are important to them (Q24a-i).

All models include the following demographic variables: age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, region, employment status, household income, marital status, presence of children in the household, religion, religious service attendance, citizenship status, and sexual orientation. Ideology and political party identification also served as controls.

Attitudinal predictors included System Justification Index (Q1a-d); preference for tradition in general (Q3) and for moral tradition (Q4); acceptability of group inequalities (a measure of social dominance orientation, Q9); prioritizing the three moral foundations associated with conservatism (Q6, c-e; loyalty, authority, honor); personal experience with discrimination index (Q13a-f); importance of group identifications index (Q15a-i); and linked fate (Q18).

Other attitudinal variables were included depending on the specific outcome variable. These include respondents' perceptions of seriousness of unfair treatment against groups (as an index or as single items as appropriate, Q11a-k); the extent to which respondents think inequality faced by groups is attributable to their own behaviors rather than social conditions (as an index or single items, Q12a-k); respondents' perceived income class (Q19);

The **Opportunity** Agenda

personal efficacy (Q20); group-level efficacy (as an index or single items, Q21a-e); frequency of personal contact with members of different groups (Q25a-g); and perceived effectiveness of government programs designed to reduce discrimination (Q27).

Models for each of the dependent variables are presented in the following tables.

Model 1: Predicting perceptions of seriousness of unequal treatment of different groups as a problem

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Conservatism	–0.19	7.90***
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	–0.14	7.13***
Linked fate	0.13	6.32***
Personal experience with unfair treatment	0.11	5.29***
Education	0.1	4.29***
Preference for tradition in general	–0.08	4.00***
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.08	3.33***
System Justification Index	–0.07	3.63***
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.07	3.58***
Children in household	–0.07	3.19***
PID: Democrat	0.07	3.18**
Age	0.07	3.00**
Race: Black	0.06	2.95**
Morality: Prioritizing loyalty, authority, or honor	–0.06	2.88**
Gender: Men	–0.05	2.52*
Preference for traditional morality	–0.05	2.46*
Employed	–0.05	2.22*

Model R^2 = .31, p < .001

Here and below: ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05

Model 2: Predicting perceived extent of discrimination in housing against different groups

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Personal experience with unfair treatment	0.21	9.58***
Conservatism	-0.17	6.86***
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.16	7.89***
Preference for traditional morality	-0.11	4.93***
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	-0.1	4.64***
System Justification Index	-0.07	3.57***
PID: Democrat	0.07	3.21**
Linked fate	0.06	2.95**
Race: Asian American	-0.06	2.85**
Children in household	-0.06	2.67**
Preference for tradition in general	-0.05	2.60**
Age	0.06	2.49*
Frequency of religious service attendance	0.06	2.47**
Morality: Prioritizing loyalty, authority, or honor	-0.05	2.21*

Model R^2 = .27, p < .001

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Model 3: Predicting prioritizing social policies and increasing funding for poverty–related measures

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Seriousness of unequal treatment of poor people	0.25	11.18***
Conservatism	–0.15	6.42***
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.12	6.12***
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	–0.1	5.37***
Age	0.1	4.58***
Frequency of personal contact with members of diff. groups	0.09	4.64***
Behavioral attributions for poor people's inequality	–0.09	4.40***
Gov't programs to reduce discrimination work well	0.07	3.55***
PID: Democrat	0.07	3.47***
Perceived income class of respondent	–0.07	3.15**
Religion: Catholic	0.07	2.83**
Preference for traditional morality	–0.06	2.93**
Citizenship status: Citizen	–0.06	2.76**
Religion: Protestant	0.06	2.39*
Perceived ability of poor people to change things	0.05	2.77**
Race: Asian American	–0.05	2.63**
Morality: Prioritizing loyalty, authority, or honor	–0.05	2.57*
Linked fate	0.05	2.42*
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.05	2.18*
Income	–0.05	2.03*
System Justification Index	–0.04	2.31*
Preference for tradition in general	–0.04	2.24*

Model R2 = .40, p < .001

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Model 4: Predicting support for alternative sentencing programs and measures to increase employment opportunities for people who have served a prison sentence

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Seriousness of unequal treatment of people who have been to prison	0.23	10.75***
Behavioral attributions for inequality faced by people who have been to prison	–0.18	8.75***
Linked fate	0.12	5.55***
Morality: Prioritizing loyalty, authority, or honor	–0.1	4.88***
Education	0.09	4.11***
Conservatism	–0.08	3.21**
Gov't programs to reduce discrimination work well	0.07	3.57***
Preference for tradition in general	–0.07	3.55***
Age	0.07	2.76**
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	–0.06	2.96**
Frequency of religious service attendance	0.06	2.51*
Religion: None	0.06	2.45*
Religion: Catholic	0.06	2.19*
PID: Republican	–0.05	2.30*
Race: Asian American	–0.04	1.73+

Model R2 = .30, p < .001

Model 5: Support for path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Behavioral attributions for inequality of undocumented immig.	–0.2	7.71***
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.12	3.96***
Linked fate	0.09	4.01***
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	–0.09	3.74***
Education	0.09	3.71***
PID: Democrat	0.09	3.70***
Frequency of religious service attendance	0.08	2.91**
Gov't programs to reduce discrimination work well	0.07	3.33***
Behavioral attributions for Latinos' inequality	–0.07	2.72**
Frequency of personal contact with undocumented immigrants	0.07	2.45*
Preference for tradition in general	–0.06	2.74**
PID: Republican	–0.06	2.45*
Frequency of personal contact with Latinos	0.06	2.15*
SJT index	0.05	2.40*
Morality: Prioritizing loyalty, authority, or honor	–0.04	1.71+

Model R2 = .28, p < .001

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Model 6: Predicting respondents' intentions to take action to improve opportunities for different groups

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Frequency of personal contact with members of diff. groups	0.22	10.27***
Seriousness of unequal treatment of different groups	0.17	6.87***
Personal efficacy	0.12	5.78***
Perceived ability of diff. groups to change things	0.11	5.35***
Behavioral attributions for group inequalities	−0.11	4.60***
Linked fate	0.08	3.52***
Frequency of religious service attendance	0.08	3.44***
Race: Black	0.08	3.34**
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.06	3.07**
Income	−0.06	2.42*
Age	0.06	2.39*
Citizenship status: Citizen	−0.05	2.50*
PID: Democrat	0.05	2.41*
Education	−0.05	2.19*
Region: South	0.05	2.06*
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.05	1.93+
Children in household	0.04	2.13*
System Justification Index	0.04	1.85+
PID: Republican	−0.04	1.70+
Preference for tradition in general	−0.03	1.67+

Model R^2 = .33, $p < .001$

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Model 7: Predicting respondents' intentions to take action to support different issues

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Frequency of personal contact with members of diff. groups	0.2	9.31***
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.11	5.20***
Linked fate	0.11	5.05***
Seriousness of unequal treatment of different groups	0.11	4.50***
Behavioral attributions for group inequalities	-0.11	4.47***
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	-0.1	4.83***
Ethnicity: Hispanic	0.1	4.00***
Perceived ability of diff. groups to change things	0.09	4.18***
Personal efficacy	0.08	4.04***
Preference for tradition in general	-0.08	3.61***
PID: Republican	-0.07	2.82**
Citizenship status: Citizen	-0.06	2.70**
PID: Democrat	0.06	2.45*
Religion: None	-0.05	1.75+
Education	-0.04	1.86+
Frequency of religious service attendance	0.04	1.82+
Religion: Catholic	0.04	1.75+
Race: Black	0.04	1.75+

Model R2 = .31, p < .001

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Model 8: Predicting respondents' intentions to engage in a variety of specific actions on behalf of issues or groups

	Standardized coefficient ( )	Significance test (t)
Frequency of personal contact with members of diff. groups	0.23	9.80***
Personal efficacy	0.12	5.15***
Importance of different group identification dimensions	0.11	4.82**
Linked fate	0.1	4.48***
Religion: Catholic	0.08	3.06**
Acceptability of inequality of opportunity among groups	-0.07	3.10**
Personal experience with unfair treatment	0.07	3.03**
Gender: Male	-0.06	2.92**
Perceived ability of diff. groups to change things	0.06	2.57*
Seriousness of unequal treatment of different groups	0.06	2.25*
Preference for tradition in general	-0.05	2.44*
Race: Asian American	-0.05	2.12*
Age	0.05	2.07*
PID: Republican	-0.05	2.05*
Race: Black	-0.05	2.00*
Sexual orientation: non-heterosexual	0.04	2.11*
Relative group deprivation	0.04	1.72+

Model R2 = .21, p < .001

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Appendix E: References

The following references were consulted in preparation of the Opportunity Survey.

Aberson, C.L. (2003). Support for race-based affirmative action: Self-interest and procedural justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 1212-1225.

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes, 50,* 179-211.

Altemeyer, R.A. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, R.A. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, R.A. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ambrose, M.L., & Arnaud, A. (2005). Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct? In J. Greenberg & J.A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 59-84). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 1-45). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blanton, H., George, G., & Crocker, J. (2001). Contexts of system justification and system evaluation: Exploring the social comparison strategies of the (not yet) contented female worker. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 4,* 126-137.

Boldero, J.M., & Higgins, E.T. (2011). Regulatory focus and political decision making: When people favor reform over the status quo. *Political Psychology, 32,* 399-418.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Brandt, M.J. (2013). Do the disadvantaged legitimize the social system? A large-scale test of the status-legitimacy hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 765-785.

Cottrell, C.A., & Neuberg, S.L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to "prejudice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 770-789.

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A.V., & Tagler, M.J. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 207-227.

Crandall, C.S., & Martinez, R. (1996). Culture, ideology, and antifat attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 1165-1176.

Crocker, J., Voelkl, K., Testa, M., & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 218-228.

Crosby, F. (1982). *Relative deprivation and working women*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crosby, F.J., Iyer, A., & Sincharoen, S. (2006). Understanding affirmative action. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 585-611.

Dion, K.L. (1975). Women's reactions to discrimination from members of the same or opposite sex. *Journal of Research in Personality, 9*, 294-306.

Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1986). *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. New York: Academic Press.

Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999 *Psychological Science, 11*, 315-319.

Downing, R., Lubensky, M.E., Sincharoen, S., Gurin, P., Crosby, F.J., Queirolo, S., & Franoc, J. (2002). Affirmative action in higher education. *Diversity Factor, 10*, 15-20.

Drury, J., & Reicher, S.D. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 395*, 35-38.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Ebreo, A., Linn, N., & Vining, J. (1996). The impact of procedural justice on opinions of public policy: Solid waste management as an example. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 1259-1285.

Falomir-Pichastor, J.J., Mugny, G., Quiamzade, A., & Gabarrot, F. (2008). Motivations underlying attitudes: Regulatory focus and majority versus minority support. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 587-600.

Feagin, J.R. (1972). We still believe that God helps those who help themselves. *Psychology Today, 6*, 101-109.

Federico, C.M. (2004). When do welfare attitudes become racialized? The paradoxical effects of education. *American Journal of Political Science, 48,* 374-391.

Federico, C.M., & Sidanius, J. (2002a). Sophistication and the antecedents of whites' racial policy attitudes: Racism, ideology, and affirmative action in America. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*, 145-176.

Federico, C.M., & Sidanius, J. (2002b). Racism, ideology, and affirmative action, revisited: The antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 488-502.

Federico, C.M., Weber, C. R., Ergun, D., & Hunt, C. (2013). Mapping the connections between politics and morality: The multiple sociopolitical orientations involved in moral intuition. *Political Psychology, 34*, 589-610.

Feldman, S. (2003). Values, ideology, and the structure of political attitudes. In D.O. Sears, L. Huddy, & E. Robert (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (pp. 477-508). New York: Oxford University Press.

Feldman, S., & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and white opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice? *American Journal of Political Science, 49*, 168-183.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7*, 117-140.

Frijda, N.H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 577-583.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Golden, H., Hinkle, S., & Crosby, F. J. (2001). Reactions to affirmative action: Substance and semantics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 73–88.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. (2009). Liberals and conservatives use different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 1029-1046.

Hafer, C.L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from a modified Stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 165-173.

Hafer, C.L., & Begue, L. (2005). Experimental research on just-world theory: Problems, developments and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin, 131,* 128-167.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20,* 98-116.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: John Wiley.

Henry, P.J., Reyna, C., & Weiner, B. (2004). Hate welfare but help the poor: How the attributional content of stereotypes explains the paradox of reactions to the destitute in America. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29,* 943-959.

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1280-1300.

Higgins, E.T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30,* 1-45.

Higgins, E.T., Friedman, R.S., Harlow, R.E., Idson, L.C., Ayduk, O.N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31,* 2-23.

Homans, G.C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. Oxford: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (Original work published in 1961.)

Huddy, L., & Feldman, S. (2009). On assessing the political effects of racial prejudice. *Annual Review of Political Science, 12,* 423-447.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Jost, J.T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist, 61*, 651-670.

Jost, J.T., Banaji, M.R., & Nosek, B.A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*, 881-920.

Jost, J.T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W., & Sulloway, F.J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 339-375.

Jost, J.T., & Huynyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology, 13*, 111-153.

Jost, J.T., Pelham, B.W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 13-36.

Jost, J.T., & Thompson, E.P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 209-232.

Katz, I., & Hass, R.G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 18-35.

Kay, A.C., & Jost, J.T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of "poor but happy" and "poor but honest" stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 823-837.

Kinder, D.R., & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Individualism reconsidered. In D.O. Sears, J. Sidanius, & L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized politics: The debate about racism in America* (pp. 44-74). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kinder, D.R., & Sanders, L.M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kinder, D.R., & Sears, D.O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 414-431.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 583-600.

Kluegel, J.R., & Smith, E.R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Koleva, S. P., Graham, J., Ditto, P., Iyer, R., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially Purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*, 184-194.

Kravitz, D.A., & Klineberg, S.L. (2000). Reactions to versions of affirmative action among whites, blacks, and Hispanics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 597-611.

Kravitz, D.A., & Klineberg, S.L. (2004). Predicting affirmative action attitudes: Interactions of the effects of individual differences with the strength of the affirmative action plan. In N. DiTomaso, & C. Post (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of work: Diversity in the work force*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Leach, C.W., Iyer, A., & Pedersen, A. (2007). Angry opposition to government redress: When the structurally advantaged perceive themselves as relatively deprived. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 191-204.

Lerner, M.J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: Pleanum Press.

Lipkus, I.M., Dalbert, C., & Siegler, I.C. (1996). The importance of distinguishing the belief in a just world for self versus for others: Implications for psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 666-677.

Mackie, D.M., Devos, T., & Smith, E.R. (2000). Inter-group emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an inter-group context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 602-616.

Mackie, D.M., & Smith, E.R. (2002). *From prejudice to inter-group emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. New York: Psychology Press.

Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 26, pp. 293-355).

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Major, B., Gramzow, R.H., McCoy, S.K., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 269-282.

Major, B., Quinton, W.J., & Schmader, T. (2003). Attributions to discrimination and self-esteem. Impact of group identification and situational ambiguity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 220-231.

Malahy, L.W., Rubinlicht, M.A., & Kaiser, C.R. (2009). Justifying inequality: A cross-temporal investigation of U.S. income disparities and just-world beliefs from 1973 to 2006. *Social Justice Research, 22*, 369-383.

McConahay, J.B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Nelson, T.D. (2001). *The psychology of prejudice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nosek, B.A., Banaji, M.R., & Jost, J.T. (2009). The politics of intergroup attitudes. In J.T. Jost, A.C. Kay, & H. Thorisdottier (Eds.), *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification* (pp. 480-506). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pancer, S.M. (1998). Salience of appeal and avoidance of helping situations. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 20*, 133-139.

Pelham, B.W., & Hetts, J.J. (2001). Underworked and overpaid: Elevated entitlement in men's self-pay. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 93-103.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*, 65-89.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Schuman, H. (2000). The perils of correlation, the lure of labels, and the beauty of negative results. In D.O. Sears, J. Sidanius, & L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized politics: The debate about racism in America* (pp. 302-323). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz, S. (2007). *Report to the National Election Studies Board Based on the 2006 NES Pilot Study*. Retrieved from http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011882.pdf

Schwartz, S.H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.

Schwartz, S.H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 878-891.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamic of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar & W.J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Skitka, L.J., Mullen, E., Griffin, T., Hutchison, S., & Chamberlin, B. (2002). Dispositions, scripts, or motivated correction? Understanding ideological differences in explanations for social problems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 470-487.

Smith, H.J., & Tyler, T.R. (1996). Justice and power. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 171-200.

Sniderman, P.M., & Piazza, T. (1993). *The scar of race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Swim, J.K., Scott, E.D., Sechrist, G.B., Campbell, B., & Stagnor, C. (2003). The role of harm and intent in judgments of prejudice and discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 944-959.

Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of inter-group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 77-100). London: Academic Press.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

Tajfel, H., & Utner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, F. M., & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself, to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16*, 254–262.

Tyler, T.R. (1999). Why people cooperate in organizations: An identity-based perspective. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 21*, 201-246.

Tyler, T.R. (2000). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology, 35*, 117-125.

Tyler, T.R., & Smith, H.J. (1998). Social justice movements. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 595-629). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*, 504-535.

Van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A.H., & Leach, C.W. (2004). Put your money where your mouth is!: Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 649-664.

Walker, I., Smith, H.J. (Eds.). (2002). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Walster, E., Walster, W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Weiner, B., Osborne, D., & Rudolph, U. (2010). An attributional analysis of reactions to poverty: The political ideology of the giver and the perceived morality of the receiver. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 20*, 1-15.