

**Keeping the linchpin
in place:
Testing the multiple sources
of opposition
to residential integration***

*Lawrence Bobo***

* This paper was prepared while the author was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. The research was supported by National Science Foundation grant BNS87-00864 and by the Graduate School Research Committee of the University of Wisconsin.

** Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Abstract : Keeping the linchpin in place: Testing the multiple sources of opposition to residential integration.

Secondary analysis of data from the 1984 General Social Survey is undertaken to examine four major types of explanations of whites' opposition to residential integration. The results indicate that racism is the most important factor, though at least two forms of racism — old fashioned prejudice and a sense of racial group position — seem to have effects. Class based explanations have little explanatory power. Pragmatic objections, in this instance self-interested concerns, have small but equivocal effects. The value and ideological factors of political conservatism and individualism exert a modest influence on a person's attitudes on residential integration. Implications of the research for developing more synthetic theoretical ideas and understanding the social dynamics of race issues are discussed.

Key words : Residential segregation. Old-fashioned racism. Racial change.

Résumé : La pièce maîtresse est toujours en place. Une analyse empirique des origines de l'opposition à l'intégration dans l'habitat.

Les données de l'enquête nationale (General Social Survey) de 1984 ont été soumises à une analyse secondaire afin de mettre à l'épreuve quatre types d'explication visant à rendre compte de l'opposition des Blancs à l'intégration dans l'habitat. Les résultats montrent que le racisme est le facteur le plus important et que deux formes de racisme au moins: les vieux préjugés et une sensibilité à la position du groupe racial, semblent intervenir. Le facteur de classe n'a que peu de pouvoir explicatif. Les objections en termes de coût pragmatique, en l'occurrence les intérêts personnels, ont des effets faibles et quelque peu ambigus. Les valeurs et les composantes idéologiques du conservatisme politique et de l'individualisme ont une influence peu sensible sur les attitudes à l'égard de l'intégration résidentielle. On discute les conséquences de ces résultats pour l'élaboration d'idées théoriques plus synthétiques et pour la compréhension des problèmes posés par les relations raciales.

Mots-clés : Ségrégation dans l'habitat. Vieux racisme. Changement dans les relations raciales.

Keeping the linchpin in place: Testing the multiple sources of opposition to residential integration

Lawrence Bobo

Racial residential segregation has rightly been called the "structural linchpin" of American race relations. Segregation of schools and the need for a policy of school busing in order to achieve desegregation result from racially separate neighborhoods. The information, interpersonal networks, and ready access to areas of expanding employment opportunity essential to a smooth transition from schooling to adult work roles or to higher education are not as readily available to ghettoized black youth as compared to white suburban youth. Indifference to the loss of jobs and vitality in many major urban centers, made easy by the great distance between expanding suburbs and deteriorating inner cities, contributes to the difficulty of addressing the problem of black poverty. The still low rates of sustained intimate interaction among blacks and whites are also partly attributable to the persistence of segregated neighborhoods. Such interpersonal distance is a large factor in the failures of communication, suspicion and distrust that often characterizes black-white interaction over matters of race. In short, the impact of residential segregation on black-white relations is both central and diffuse.

Compared to research on white reactions to school busing, affirmative action, and to black candidates for political office, however, attitudes toward residential integration have received little attention. This paper examines the multiple bases of opposition to residential integration. I begin with a brief review of research on black and white attitudes on the subject, identifying important gaps in our knowledge. I then develop a basic classification of reasons for objecting to racial change among dominant group members based on the literatures on attitudes toward school busing, affirmative action, and voting for black political candidates. Indicators of each major type of objection are then used to predict attitude toward residential integration.

Background

Attitudes on residential integration

Pettigrew (1973), Taylor (1979), and Bobo, Schuman, and Steeh (1986) mapped trends in whites' attitudes toward residential integration. These studies showed trends toward more favorable attitudes toward residential integration among whites. Blacks and whites remained sharply divided on basic attitudes towards integration and government efforts to bring it about, with blacks expressing much higher support for these goals than whites. Furthermore, black and white images of the ideal integrated neighborhood were far apart. Blacks preferred neighborhoods that were half black and half white whereas most whites seemed open to a neighborhood with only a small number of black residents. The importance attached by whites to the number of blacks was underscored by Farley, Schuman and colleagues (1978) whose Detroit survey found that whites felt uncomfortable about the prospect of living in a neighborhood as much as one-third black and an overwhelming margin of whites reported that they would not consider moving into a one-third black neighborhood. The difficulty of accomplishing a level of integration acceptable to both blacks and whites is also suggested by the fact that many blacks expressed reluctance to be the first, or pioneer, black family in a traditionally all white neighborhood (Farley, Bianchi, and Colasanto 1979).

Recently, Schuman and Bobo (1988) conducted survey-based experiments, finding antiblack prejudice, ideological objections to government coercion, and concern over differences in social class background to contribute to whites' opposition to residential integration. Thus antiblack prejudice was not the sole source of resistance to residential integration among whites. Some of their results, indeed, suggested the presence of a substantial number of whites both personally open to residential integration and supportive of laws prohibiting discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

Two major types of questions remain unanswered by previous research. First, we do not yet have clear guidance on the relative importance of the several types of factors that relate to attitudes toward residential integration. Knowledge of this sort can help in planning ways to encourage support for residential desegregation efforts. Is it more important to allay white fears about being isolated or displaced by an influx of blacks, to address and try to mollify an unreasoning prejudice against blacks, appeal to other value commitments that might serve as a justification for residential integration, or to assure that whites of all social class backgrounds bear the burdens of racial change equally? The answers to these questions reside partly in how large a part each of these factors plays in a person's attitudes on residential integration.

Second, we have little research that attempts to sort out whether the dynamics of these issues differs appreciably by geographical location of the respondent. The types of factors of importance for attitudes toward residential integration may differ in large urban areas, where the absolute

number and percentage of the population that is black are likely to be higher, from those factors that carry weight in smaller communities.

Objections to racial change

Although residential segregation raises somewhat different concerns than does school busing, affirmative action in employment and education, and black seeking of electoral office, each of the grounds for objecting to racial change in these other domains may carry over, though in differing degrees, to the residential integration issue. The research on these other prominent issues has pointed to four major types of reasons whites may have for objecting to racial change: (1) pragmatic costs and burdens of change; (2) social class competition; (3) value-based and ideological commitments; and (4) racism of the old, new, and group-interested types. The first three of these categories are typically viewed as "nonracial" bases of objections to racial change. All of them have at least some empirical validation, though a clear rank-ordering of importance seems to be emerging. I describe these types of factors in reverse order of apparent importance.

Pragmatic Costs and Burdens:

Objections to school busing plans frequently take the form of objections to the cost, time, or possible safety issues raised by pupil transportation. McClendon (1985) found that the expected costs (and rewards) of busing (e.g., hurt the education of white students, upset children, increase parent's worries about safety) made a strong contribution to busing attitudes net of old-fashioned prejudice and symbolic racism. Others have reported small or nonexistent effects for measures of a tangible personal stake in an issue such as school busing (Bobo 1983; Sears, Hensler, and Speer 1979). There is also some evidence that whites working in sectors of the economy with large concentrations of blacks express more negative racial attitudes (Cummings 1981) and are more likely to oppose affirmative action (Kluegel and Smith 1983). On the whole, however, evidence for the influence of pragmatic costs on racial attitudes suggests that such effects are rarely strong (Kinder and Sears 1985; Sears 1988).

Still, it seems plausible that home owners and people living in all white areas could be concerned about property values on the grounds that other whites would not consider moving into an integrated community even if they themselves were not prejudiced. A specific test of some of these ideas with regard to the issue of residential integration seems useful.

Social Class Competition:

Competing predictions can be derived about the impact of social class on attitudes toward residential integration. On the one hand, whites of working and lower class background face greater economic uncertainty in their daily lives and more direct competition for jobs, housing, and schools with blacks (Cummings 1981; Kluegel and Smith 1986; Rubin 1972). Lacking the economic and political resources of middle and upper class whites,

they are also more likely to have the burdens of racial change imposed on them by the political system (Rubin 1972; Hochschild 1984; Reider 1985). By this logic, lower and working class whites should be more likely to oppose efforts to desegregate residential communities than middle and upper class whites. On the other hand, middle and upper class whites may be more sensitive to class background cues and oppose black neighbors on the assumption that blacks were of lower socioeconomic status than themselves (Schuman and Bobo 1988).

Value and Ideological Objections:

Cluegel and Smith (1986) argued that beliefs about the level of discrimination and availability of opportunity in society contributed to the whites' opposition to affirmative action. Since many whites feel that American society provides ample educational and job opportunities, they doubt that racial discrimination significantly hinders blacks and oppose policies that would treat blacks preferentially. Thus, very basic American beliefs about the process of social stratification play a part in opposition to policies designed to benefit blacks.

The values deemed most likely to influence how whites react to policies to improve the status of blacks are individualism and egalitarianism (Bobo 1989; Feldman 1984; Kinder and Sanders 1987; Cluegel and Smith 1986; Sears 1988). To the extent that residential integration efforts are seen as ways to improve the status of blacks, then a person's beliefs about the rewards to hard work and the availability of economic opportunity (individualism) and beliefs about the importance of assuring equal participation in society's benefits (egalitarianism) should contribute to his/her attitudes toward residential integration.

Another longstanding American value involves belief in limiting the size and authority of government. As noted above, Schuman and Bobo (1988) found that objections to government coercion were a major source of white opposition to open housing laws. Specifically, they found that whites objected more to open housing laws when implemented at higher, presumably more coercive, levels of government (federal versus local); that opposition to a mandatory seat-belt-use law, a measure of attitude toward government authority to coerce, was associated with open housing attitudes, especially when the proposed open housing law was a federal one; and that whites were no more supportive of open housing laws to protect the rights of Japanese-Americans, or Jews than those of blacks. In sum, a principle of limited government authority and not merely objections to a specific group seemed to be operating.

Finally, a person's political ideology is a probable correlate of attitudes on residential integration. Conservative political ideology is often associated with ideas of status quo maintenance, traditionalism, and resistance to social change. Such ideas are particularly hostile to government efforts to modify individual behavior and preference on certain types of issues (i.e., freedom of association, no restraints on economic choices such as who to sell or rent a home to). In contrast, liberals tend to see social change as improving society and endorse a role for government in bringing about collective goals such as improved race relations.

Varieties of Racism:

Segregationist attitudes and social distance feelings, modern prejudice, and group conflict attitudes constitute three interrelated but distinguishable bases of explicitly racial objections to change beneficial to blacks. Of the three, support for segregation and objections to even superficial contact with blacks comes closest to tapping basic affective orientations and acceptance of ancient ideas of intrinsic and hierarchical differences between racial groups. These beliefs developed during a specific historical period (Bobo 1988b). According to several analysts biological racism and segregationist attitudes are diminishing in relevance in the contemporary period (Bobo 1988b; Kinder and Sears 1981; Sears 1988). Yet accumulating evidence shows that these types of attitudes have not vanished entirely and that they remain contributors to white opposition to racial policy change (Bobo 1988a; McClendon 1985).

A number of scholars contend that racial prejudice is becoming more subtle and sophisticated (Gaertner and Dovidio 1986; Kinder and Sears 1981; McConahay 1982; Pettigrew 1985; Sears 1988). Sear's theory of "symbolic racism" is at once the most widely examined and criticized variant of the new prejudice argument (Bobo 1983; Kinder 1986; Sniderman and Tetlock 1986a & b; Sears and Allen 1984; Weigel and Howes 1986). At the core of this theory is the idea that early learning of antiblack affect still occurs for many whites. These feelings become linked with other important and early learned values such as the work ethic. In a context where openly segregationist ideas have lost their force, putatively new ideas about black "pushiness", excessive reliance on welfare, and an undue degree of esteem and attention accorded blacks by government and the media form a powerful new type of antiblack resentment. This resentment, however, has no basis in the material needs or conditions of individual whites and no basis in an instrumental desire to preserve white-black status relationships.

Yet racism may also take more explicitly instrumental and group-interested form (Blumer 1958; Bobo 1988a; Smith 1981; Wellman 1977). At least two forms of such concerns have been examined. One form of concern attaches to the prospect of numerical dominance. Smith (1981) found that a person's age, level of education and region of the country influenced tolerance of school integration so long as black children were not in the majority. When asked about a majority black school the overall level of tolerance was much lower and the traditional correlates of prejudice (education and age especially), no longer differentiated among whites, suggesting a more "collective" response focused on maintaining status relationships. I have argued that there is a strong component of realistic political competition and conflict in whites' attitudes, with these concerns occurring with greatest force among whites in feelings of threat from black political activists and organizations (Bobo 1988a). I have attempted to show how the increasing political component to whites' hostility toward blacks — as observed by the symbolic racism researchers — is in fact a response to both concrete historical events such as the civil rights movement and the important political gains won by blacks and a desire to preserve the status inequalities that still exist between the races (Bobo 1988b).

A full test of each of the four major types of explanations is beyond the scope of this research. However, reasonable indicators for aspects of each

of the major types of objections are drawn upon below to assess the relative importance of pragmatic, social class, value-based, and racism explanations of opposition to residential integration.

Data and measures

For the main analyses the data come from the 1984 General Social Survey, with an additional supplementary analysis based on the 1983 GSS (Davis and Smith 1988). The GSS is an annual multistage probability sample of English speaking adults living in noninstitutionalized settings in the continental United States. In 1984 there were 1473 respondents and a response rate of 78.6%. The 1983 GSS had a response rate of 79.4% and a total of 1599 respondents. As a result of missing data, and some subgroup analyses the results are usually based on fewer cases.

Control variables:

A respondents level of education, age, region of residence (a dummy variable distinguishing nonsouth versus south), and size of place of residence are used as control variables¹. Better educated people, younger people, those living outside the South and in larger areas are typically found to express more liberal racial attitudes. In addition, I include respondent sex (a dummy variable scored 1 for males and 0 for females) since some research shows women to express more liberal racial attitudes.

Pragmatic Costs and Burdens:

Measures of whether a person owns a home, lives in an all-white neighborhood, or lives in an area he or she perceives to be changing to all black are used to tap personal susceptibility to possible pragmatic costs of expanded efforts toward residential integration².

1. People living in the states of Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, and the District of Columbia are treated as "the South". Those in other states are treated as "nonsouth".
2. The variable measuring home ownership distinguishes people living in detached single family houses from those living in other arrangements (i.e., apartments, duplexes, trailers, etc.). The 1984 GSS does not include a direct measure of home ownership. However, the 1987 GSS included a direct home ownership question and the type of dwelling unit question used here. The two are very strongly related ($\gamma = .85$), suggesting that the present measure, in the absence of a sharp change between 1984 and 1987 in home ownership, does a good job of identifying actual homeowners.

Social Class Competition:

Class status is measured with a person's family income, broad occupational category (i.e., upper nonmanual work, lower nonmanual work, upper manual work, and lower manual work) and subjective class identification (i.e., lower class, middle class, and upper class)³. High income people and those who identify with higher class background groups should feel less open to residential integration because of the greater likelihood that black neighbors would be of lower economic status. As one moves from lower manual occupations to upper manual, to lower nonmanual, to upper nonmanual occupations support for residential integration should increase because black-white competition should be most intense at the lower occupational levels because that is where blacks are concentrated. In addition, in order to tap a feeling of economic security (insecurity) the analysis includes a question on perceived relative personal economic standing (Personal Economic Security). Since some of the predictions based on socioeconomic status are contradictory the analysis reported below considers the possibility that whites of different class background oppose integration to a similar degree but for different reasons.

Values and Ideological Commitments:

To tap ideological beliefs about inequality I use a five item Inegalitarianism scale tapping belief in the fairness and necessity of socioeconomic inequality and a five item Societal Obligations scale tapping support for assuring everyone more equal participation in society's economic rewards (see Bobo 1989 for information on the reliability, validity and correlates of these scales). A person's general political ideology is assessed with a 7-point self-placement scale running from extremely liberal at one end to extremely conservative at the opposite end. I attempted to measure attitudes toward government authority/coercion with a question on attitudes toward requiring permits before buying a gun⁴.

Racism:

The old-fashioned Prejudice scale involves three questions concerning objections to a black dinner guest, support for laws prohibiting intermarriage, and a belief that blacks shouldn't push in where they are not wanted (average interitem correlation = .36, $\alpha = .63$). For the analysis of the

3. The upper nonmanual category includes professional and technical workers, and managers and administrators. The lower nonmanual category includes lower level managers, sales and clerical workers. The upper manual category includes craftsman and kindred workers. The lower manual category includes operatives, transport equipment workers, laborers, service workers, and farm laborers. These categories are treated as three dummy variables identifying the upper nonmanual, lower nonmanual, and upper manual categories with the lower manual workers as the omitted category.
4. The question is a weak indicator of attitude toward government authority since it raises a broader range of issues than the seat-belt law question used by Schuman and Bobo (1988).

1983 GSS data a different measure of prejudice is used (see discussion below).

Residential Segregation:

A question asking whether whites have the right to keep blacks out of their neighborhoods and a question on attitude towards a law prohibiting discrimination in the sale of housing tap attitudes on residential segregation. The two items are highly correlated ($r = .38, p < .001$). Both questions exhibit relationships to a respondents level of education, age, and region of residence in the expected direction. The Residential Segregation scale involves average scores on these two questions, resulting in a variable that runs from a score of 1 (support for residential integration) to 3.5 (opposition to residential integration).

Analysis and results

The Four Grounds of Objection to Change and the 1984 GSS Data.

Residential integration would be a subject of little controversy if blacks and whites both agreed that segregation was desirable. As Table 1 shows, blacks and whites differ considerably on the Residential Segregation scale. The gross white-black difference on the Residential Segregation scale is half a point, or just under two-thirds of a standard deviation unit (61% of a standard deviation). As panel C. of Table 1 shows, the white-black difference does not diminish after we introduce controls for the respondents age, education, family income, occupational type, region of the country, sex, and level or urbanicity. Also taking into account home ownership does not narrow the gap in the views of blacks and whites on residential segregation.

There is a large difference between the views of blacks and whites on the goal of achieving residential integration and this difference is not affected by a number of possible background differences between the races. Several tangible and psychological factors may affect the attitudes of members of both races. Fewer than 100 black respondents have valid information on the full set of pragmatic, social class, value based, and racism measures used in the tests below. Hence, the analysis emphasizes the data on whites while taking note of relevant patterns among blacks.

Table 2 provides some initial insight into which factors relate most closely to whites' attitudes on residential segregation. Two of the three pragmatic factors, home ownership and living in an all white neighborhood, correlate significantly with the Residential Segregation scale. Several of the social class variables and three of four value-based factors also show small significant correlations with a person's attitudes on residential segregation.

Table 1: Race and the Residential Segregation Scale

	Scale Mean	N
A. Total Sample standard deviation Race Differences	1.89 (.83)	1365
B. Unadjusted Race Effect [1] White Black Difference	1.95 1.45 .50***	1251 170
C. Adjusted for Background Variables [2] White Black Difference	1.95 1.46 .49***	1048 142
D. Adjusted for Background Variables and Home Ownership [3] White Black Difference	1.95 1.46 .49***	1048 142

[1] The difference was estimated in regression framework treating race as a dummy variable.

[2] The difference was estimated in a regression framework treating race as a dummy variable and controlling for age, education, sex, region, size of place, family income, and occupational type.

[3] The difference was estimated in a regression framework treating race as a dummy variable and controlling for age, education, sex, region, size of place, family income, occupational type, and home ownership.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Source: 1984 General Social Survey (Davis and Smith 1988).

None of these correlations, however, is very large. The picture is quite different for the antiblack Prejudice scale which is correlated at .55 ($p < .001$) with the Residential Segregation scale⁵.

A fuller picture of the relative importance of these factors to attitudes on residential integration can be seen in the regression models reported in Table 3. The results indicate the powerful effects of prejudice, modest

5. It might be argued that the Residential Segregation scale, because it involves an "old-fashioned" prejudice item on whites' right to exclude blacks from their neighborhood, unfairly builds in a strong relation to the Prejudice scale. First, the theoretical interest here is in correlates of opposition to residential integration, not merely opposition to specific governmental policies that might lead to further integration. It is important to know if attitudes toward residential integration, broadly conceived, are related to a basic desire to preserve social distance from blacks as indicated by the Prejudice scale. Second, as already noted, there is a strong correlation between the two items included in the Residential Segregation scale. If the results of Table 2 were restricted to the open housing law item the magnitude of the relationships diminish marginally but in no way alter the main substantive conclusions.

Table 2: Zero-Order Correlations of Predictor Variables with the Residential Segregation Scale (Whites Only)

	Pearson's R
<i>Pragmatic Costs and Burdens</i>	
Own Home	.08*
All White Neighborhood	.13***
Neighborhood Become all Black	.05
<i>Social Class</i>	
Family Income	-.09*
Occupational Type	
Upper nonmanual	-.07*
Lower nonmanual	-.06
Upper manual	.04
Class Identification	-.02
Personal Economic Security	-.10**
<i>Values and Ideology</i>	
Societal Obligations	.10**
Inegalitarianism	.19***
Political Conservatism	.18***
Oppose Gun Law	.06
<i>Racism</i>	
Prejudice (1984)	.55***
N	779

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Source: 1984 General Social Survey (Davis and Smith 1988).

effects for value and ideology factors, and a small but durable effect for one of the pragmatic costs measures. The social class factors had no impact on residential segregation attitudes.

I first estimated a "Baseline" model that included a person's age, level of education, sex, size of place of residence, and region (nonsouth versus south). By themselves these background factors explained 16% of the variance in attitudes on residential segregation, with each variable having effects in the predicted direction with the exception of sex which had no effect. To evaluate the relative importance of each major type of objection to residential integration, columns 2 through 5 of Table 3 report tests of the increment to variance explained for each set of variables (e.g., the pragmatic costs and burdens indicators) and tests for significant effects of each measure within a set (home ownership, all white neighborhood, likelihood of becoming an all black neighborhood). Three of the four variable sets — pragmatic factors, value and ideological factors, and racism — produce a significant increment to the amount of variance explained by the Baseline model (1%, 4%, and 18%, respectively). The single strongest effect is that for prejudice ($\beta = .46$, $p < .001$). This is followed by the pragmatic factor of living in an all white neighborhood ($\beta = .09$, $p < .01$). Importantly, living in an all white neighborhood does not appear to be a surrogate for prejudice since it has only a trivial relation to the Prejudice

Table 3: Regression Models Predicting Residential Segregation Attitudes (Whites Only)

	Full Model	Pragmatics	Social Class	Values	Racism
Constant	.53*	1.60***	1.92***	1.87***	.69***
<i>Pragmatics</i>					
Own Home	.02 (.01)	.05 (.03)	—	—	—
All White Neighborhood	.16** (.09)	.16** (.09)	—	—	—
Neighborhood Become Black	.09 (.01)	.29 (.04)	—	—	—
<i>Social Class</i>					
Family Income	-.00 (-.00)	—	.00 (.00)	—	—
Occupational Type					
Upper nonmanual	-.01 (-.00)	—	-.10 (-.04)	—	—
Lower nonmanual	.03 (.02)	—	-.02 (-.01)	—	—
Upper manual	.05 (.02)	—	.05 (.02)	—	—
Class Identification	.02 (.01)	—	-.00 (-.00)	—	—
Personal Economic Security	-.04 (-.04)	—	-.04 (-.03)	—	—
<i>Values and Ideology</i>					
Societal Obligation	.01 (.05)	—	—	.02** (.09)	—
Inegalitarianism	.02* (.07)	—	—	.03*** (.11)	—
Political Conservatism	.05* (.07)	—	—	.08*** (.12)	—
Oppose Gun Law	.00 (.00)	—	—	.04 (.02)	—
<i>Racism</i>					
Prejudice (1984)	.24*** (.46)	—	—	—	.25*** (.49)
Baseline Model R^2	.16***	.16***	.16***	.16***	.16***
Increment of model	.19***	.01*	.00	.04***	.18***
Cumulative R^2 (adj.)	.35***	.17***	.15***	.19***	.34***

Note: The N for all models is 779. Cell entries are raw regression coefficients and figures in parentheses are standardized regression coefficients. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Source: 1984 General Social Survey (Davis and Smith 1988).

scale ($r = .03$, n.s.). People holding inegalitarian beliefs and who identify as conservatives are also more likely to oppose residential integration⁶.

I also estimated the full model separately by size of place, distinguishing people living in large or medium sized central cities or in a suburb of a large central city (large urban communities) from people living in other suburban areas, small towns and cities, and rural areas (smaller communities) (Blacks are heavily concentrated in the large urban communities)⁷. Prejudice is the strongest determinant of residential segregation attitudes in large urban communities ($\beta = .42$, $p < .001$) and in smaller communities ($\beta = .50$, $p < .001$). Prejudice, however, is the only significant predictor — other than the background factor of age — among whites living in smaller communities and the impact of prejudice is a bit larger in these communities as well. In the larger urban areas, living in an all white neighborhood, political conservatism and inegalitarianism also influence residential segregation attitudes. Perhaps because whites living in larger urban areas more often consider the prospect of actually having black neighbors, and presumably do so with more concrete experiences around them, their attitudes have more complex and somewhat less prejudice-based roots than those living in smaller communities.

In order to assure that the dynamics of opposition to residential segregation do not differ by class background I also estimated the full model among class specific subgroups (whites with lower manual and upper manual occupations were one subgroup and those with lower nonmanual and upper nonmanual occupations were the other group⁸). This analysis also allows for a test of whether a feeling of economic insecurity (Personal Economic Security) varies by social class in its effect on attitudes toward residential integration. Prejudice retains its place as the strongest predictor for both class groups and Personal Economic Security does not affect attitudes among either group. But, there is some evidence that attitudes among people of higher class background have more complex roots than those among people performing manual occupations. Prejudice and living in an all white neighborhood, along with age and southern residence, increased opposition to residential integration among whites with manual occupations. Attitudes of those in nonmanual occupations were related to political conservatism, and the background factors of age, southern residence, and size of place of residence. Living in an all white neighborhood had a borderline effect for this group ($\beta = .08$, $p = .0583$).

6. A parallel analysis was carried out for blacks, but because of the small number of cases ($N = 88$) it is less reliable. The strongest factor among blacks was a fear that a neighborhood would become all black ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$). Also, home ownership had a comparable though borderline effect ($\beta = .24$, $p = .0527$). It might be inferred that some blacks oppose residential integration efforts because they are mainly concerned about property values if a neighborhood becomes all black. However, prejudice ($\beta = .23$, $p < .05$) and political conservatism ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$) also influenced blacks' attitudes on residential integration.

7. These models omit the size of place measure from the analysis.

8. These models omit the occupational type variables from the analysis.

Testing the Group Position Hypothesis with the 1983 GSS Data

The 1984 GSS did not include measures tapping a numerical (Smith 1981) or politicized (Bobo 1988a) sense of group position. The 1983 GSS survey contained a question on whether respondents would object to sending their child to a school where "more than half" of the children were black (Oppose Majority Black School). That is, the question poses the issue of numerical dominance rather than mere contact and hence taps one form of a sense of group position. Analyzing the 1983 GSS data, however, introduces other complexities since the set of value and ideology factors are not included (split-ballot experiments made it impossible to use the Political Conservatism and Class Identification measures and the other value measures were not included in the survey), a different measure of "old-fashioned prejudice" must also be used, and only one (Open Housing Law) of the two items in the Residential Segregation scale is available. Enough overlap in the content of the prejudice measures and the other sets of factors exists, however, to carry out a useful test. Prejudice was measured with a two-item scale (Prejudice-1983)⁹. The conceptual distinction between prejudice and the sense of group position measure (Oppose Majority Black School) is borne out by the weaker relation of the latter to a person's age, education, and region of residence¹⁰.

Table 4 presents the full model regression results predicting Opposition to Open Housing using the pragmatic, social class, and racism measures. Again, not shown are coefficients for a Baseline model which included education, age, sex, region, and size of place. Only the two racism measures have significant effects, with Prejudice ($\beta = .18$, $p < .001$) having a larger impact than the sense of group position measure (β for Oppose Majority Black School = $.12$, $p < .001$). Living in an all white neighborhood does have a significant zero-order correlation with the open housing question ($r = .11$, $p < .001$). But it does not have a significant effect in the context of the full model. This is probably attributable to a stronger connection between the Prejudice-1983 scale and living in an all white neighborhood ($r = .08$, $p < .01$) than was observed with the 1984 measures.

9. The questions concern willingness to allow one's children to attend a school where a few of the children are black and willingness to vote for a qualified black presidential candidate who has been nominated by one's own party ($r = .20$, $p < .001$). Both questions invoke the general principle of discriminatory versus nondiscriminatory treatment of blacks. Fortunately, the questions used in the Prejudice-1984 and Prejudice-1983 scales all appear in the 1982 GSS so it is possible to examine the relationship between the two scales. The two scales are highly correlated ($r = .47$, $p < .001$).

10. Again the 1982 GSS data provide some leverage on validating the sense of group position measure and the prejudice measure. Prejudice-1983 is significantly correlated with age measure and the prejudice measure. Prejudice-1983 is significantly correlated with age measure ($.16$, $p < .001$), education ($r = -.24$, $p < .001$), and the region dummy variable ($r = .19$, $p < .001$). The Oppose Majority Black School item is not related to age ($r = .04$, n.s.) or to education ($-.01$, n.s.), but has some relation — though weaker than that for Prejudice-1983 — to region ($r = .11$, $p < .001$). In addition, the correlation of Oppose Majority Black School with the Prejudice-1984 scale is lower ($.30$, $p < .001$) than the correlation of the two prejudice scales ($.47$, $p < .001$).

Table 4 : Regression Model of Opposition to Open Housing Laws (Whites Only)

	Regression Coefficients
Constant	-.02
<i>Pragmatics</i>	
Own home	-.01 (-.01)
All White Neighborhood	.08 (.04)
Neighborhood Become Black	-.20 (-.02)
<i>Social Class</i>	
Family Income	.01 (.04)
Occ. Type	
Upper nonmanual	.00 (.00)
Lower nonmanual	-.00 (-.00)
Upper manual	.13 (.04)
Personal Economic Security	.04 (.03)
<i>Racism</i>	
Prejudice (1983)	.41 (.18)***
Oppose Majority Black School	.26 (.12)***
Baseline Model R ²	.07***
Increment due to model	.07***
Cumulative R ² (adj.)	.13***
N	1035

Note : Cell entries are raw regression coefficients and figures in parentheses are standardized regression coefficients.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Source : 1983 General Social Survey (Davis and Smith 1988).

Discussion and conclusions

Black and white Americans are far apart in their views of the goal of residential integration. Moreover, not all grounds of objecting to residential integration carry equal weight for white Americans. Opposition to residential integration was consistently and powerfully influenced by racism of old-fashioned and group-interested types. The value and ideological commitments of inegalitarianism and political conservatism modestly increased opposition to residential integration. Living in an all white neighborhood was the one pragmatic factor to influence whites attitudes on residential integration. But the effect of this pragmatic factor was not entirely consistent and may reflect certain types of racial attitudes. Social class factors had no direct impact on attitudes toward residential integration. There is some indication that a larger array of concerns beyond prejudice influences the attitudes of higher status whites and those living in large urban areas as compared to lower status whites and those living in smaller communities

for whom prejudice was the overarching factor (though prejudice is the strongest factor for each group).

The main patterns in the data emphasized above are clear and reasonably robust. Still, these results must be treated as provisional. As is often the case in secondary data analysis, the data collection effort does not serve the analysts interests in all ways (Hyman 1972). Measures of two important types were unavailable: measures of new or symbolic racism (Sears 1988) and measures of the full set of group conflict attitudes identified in recent papers of mine (Bobo 1988 a & b). And in the case of objections to government coercion only a weak indicator of this construct was available. Final answers to the question of which types of factors influence attitudes toward residential segregation await data sets that include adequate measures of all of the relevant constructs.

Future research, however, must do more than measure all of the important theoretical concepts and assess their significance in a correlational vein as pursued here and by many others. As our understanding of the key concepts and relationships among them improves our emphasis should, first, shift to better understanding how individuals reason through policy positions. For example, it would be useful to identify distinctive types of people whose positions reflect coherent clusters of beliefs. In that way we could gain leverage on the likely interpersonal and structural factors that shape fundamental modes of thinking about race relations. Second, research designs should place greater emphasis on behavior and the dynamics of attitudes in specific social contexts (Taylor 1986; Weatherford 1980). With the exception of studies of voting and a handful of studies directed at antibusing movements, most research focuses on the correlates of racial policy attitudes. The part those attitudes play in other behaviors is seldom addressed. Studies linking these two concerns will improve our understanding of how individual attitudes and behavior both reflect and influence social structure (Turner 1988).

Social psychologists must continue to study the nature and correlates of racial attitudes, but we should also show the intrinsic relevance of this work to concrete social and policy change (Pettigrew 1980). Taking a broad view, we know that white and black Americans are mutually interdependent people. This is true economically, politically, and in terms of substantial value congruence. Black-white interdependence is more an abstract property of the American social system, however, than a vividly experienced day-to-day reality for most black and white Americans because of the persistent high levels of racial residential segregation.

In addition, residential segregation is tangibly linked to most, if not all, of the problems confronting black America. As scholars examine whether the situation of blacks is better served by race specific policies or economic strategies designed to help all people suffering socioeconomic hardships (Oliver and Glick 1982; Wilson 1987), racial residential segregation will stand as an unambiguously race specific problem hard to address or resolve in any other terms. Recent experiences in several cities (e.g., Yonkers, New York) suggests that legal and political strategies to compel government to act to bring about residential integration are becoming more effective. More, not less, political conflict and dispute on these matters is likely in the future. Understanding the complex bases of public opinion and

behavior on residential integration loom, likewise, as matters of increasing importance.

References

- BLUMER, H. (1958). Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3-7.
- BOBO, L. (1983). Whites' Opposition to Busing: Symbolic Racism or Realistic Group Conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1196-1210.
- BOBO, L. (1988a). Attitudes Toward the Black Political Movement: Trends, Meaning, and Effects on Racial Policy Preferences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 287-302.
- BOBO, L. (1988b). Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes. In P. A. KATZ and D. A. TAYLOR (Eds.), *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy* (pp. 85-116). New York: Plenum.
- BOBO, L. (1989). Societal Obligations and Inegalitarianism: The Effects of Stratification Beliefs on Support for Racial Change and Social Welfare Policies (unpublished manuscript).
- BOBO, L. SCHUMAN, H. and STEEH, Ch. (1986). Changing Racial Attitudes Toward Residential Integration. In J. M. GOERING (Ed.) *Housing Desegregation, Race, and Federal Policies* (pp. 152-169). Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.
- CUMMINGS, S. (1981). White Ethnics, Racial Prejudice, and Labor Market Segmentation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85, 938-958.
- DAVIS, J. A. and SMITH, T. W. (1988). *General Social Survey, 1972-1988, Cumulative Codebook*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- FARLEY, R. BIANCHI, S. and COLASANTO, D. (1979). Barriers to Racial Integration of Neighborhoods: The Detroit Case. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 441, 97-113.
- FARLEY, R. SCHUMAN, H. BIANCHI, S. COLASANTO, D. and HATCHETT, S. (1978). Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs: Will the Trend Toward Racially Separate Communities Continue? *Social Science Quarterly*, 7, 319-344.
- FELDMAN, S. (1984). Economy Individualism and Mass Belief Systems. *American Politics Quarterly*, 11, 3-29.
- GAERTNER, S. and J. F. DOVIDIO (1986). The Aversive Form of Racism. In J. F. DOVIDIO and S. L. GAERTNER (Eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism* (pp. 61-90). New York: Academic Press.
- HOCHSCHILD, J. L. (1984). *The New American Dilemma: Liberal Democracy and School Desegregation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- HYMAN, H. H. (1972). *Secondary Analysis of Sample Surveys: Principles, Procedures, and Potentialities*. New York: John Wiley.
- KINDER, D. R. (1986). The Continuing American Dilemma: White Resistance to Racial Change 40 Years After Myrdal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 151-172.
- KINDER, D. R. and SANDERS, L. M. (1987). *Pluralistic Foundations of American Opinion of Race*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, The Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, September 3-6, 1987.
- KINDER, D. R. and 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.
- KINDER, D. R. and SEARS, D. O. (1985). Public Opinion and Political Action. pp. 659-742 In G. LINDZEY and E. ARONSON (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3rd Ed. (pp. 659-742). New York: Random House.
- KLUEGEL, J. R. and SMITH, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs About Inequality: Americans Views of What is and What Ought to Be*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- MCCLENDON, McKEE, J. (1985). Racism, Rational Choice, and White Opposition to Racial Change: A Case Study. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 49, 214-233.
- MCCONAHAY, J. B. (1982). Self-Interest versus Racial Attitudes as Correlates of Antibusing Attitudes in Louisville: Is it the Buses or the Blacks? *Journal of Politics*, 44, 692-720.
- OLIVER, M. and GLICK, M. (1982). An Analysis of the New Orthodoxy on Black Mobility. *Social Problems*, 29, 511-523.
- PETTIGREW, T. F. (1973). Attitudes on Race and Housing: A Social Psychological View. In A. H. HAWLEY and V. P. ROCK (Eds.), *Segregation in Residential Areas*, (pp. 43-58). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences Press.
- PETTIGREW, T. F. (1980). Social Psychology's Potential Contributions to an Understanding of Poverty, in V. T. COVELLO (Ed.), *Poverty and Public Policy: An Evaluation of Social Science Research*, (pp. 189-233). Cambridge: Schenkman.
- PETTIGREW, T. F. (1985). New Black-White Patterns: How Best to Conceptualize Them? *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 329-346.
- REIDER, J. (1985). *Canarsie: The Jews and Italians of Brooklyn Against Liberalism*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- RUBIN, Lillian (1972). *Busing and Backlash*. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press.
- SCHUMAN, H. and L. BOBO (1988). Survey-Based Experiments on White Attitudes Toward Residential Integration. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 273-299.
- SEARS, D. O. (1988). Symbolic Racism. In P. A. KATZ and D. A. TAYLOR (Eds.), *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum.
- SEARS, D. O. and ALLENS, H. M. 1984. The Trajectory of Local Desegregation Controversies and Whites' Opposition to Busing. In N. MILLER and M. B. BREWER (Eds.), *Groups in Contact*, (pp. 123-151). New York: Academic Press.
- SEARS, D. O., HENSLEY, C. P., and SPEER, L. K. (1979). Whites' Opposition to Busing: Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics? *American Political Science Review*, 73, 369-384.
- SMITH, A. W. (1981). Racial Tolerance as a Function of Group Position. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 205-225.
- SNIDERMAN, P. M. and TETLOCK, P. E. (1986a). Symbolic Racism: Problems of Motive Attribution in Political Analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 129-150.
- SNIDERMAN, P. M. and TETLOCK, P. E. (1986b). Reflections on American Racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 173-187.
- TAYLOR, D. G. (1979). Housing, Neighborhoods and Race Relations: Recent Survey Evidence. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 441, 26-40.
- TAYLOR, D. G. (1986). *Public Opinion and Collective Action: The Boston School Desegregation Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- TURNER, R. H. (1988). Personality in Society: Social Psychology's Contribution to Sociology. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 1-10.
- WEATHERFORD, S. (1980). The Politics of Schools Busing: Contextual Effects and Community Polarization. *Journal of Politics*, 42, 747-765.
- WEIGEL, R. H. and P. W. HOWES (1985). Conceptions of Racial Prejudice: Symbolic Racism reconsidered. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 117-138.
- WELLMAN, D. T. (1977). *Portraits of White Racism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- WILSON, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.