

Appendix D

Place, Attitudes, and Action: The Geography of Public Opinion and Political Participation in Metropolitan Detroit

Contents:

- Summary of Regression Models
- Derivation and Coding of Independent Variables
- Derivation and Coding of Dependent Variables

Tables

Table D - 1: Political Participation Models

Table D - 2: Presidential Vote Models

Table D - 3: Party Identification Models

Table D - 4: Feeling Towards Political Figures Models

Table D - 5: Attitudes on Crime Models

Table D - 6: Racial Attitude Models

Table D - 7: Support for Affirmative Action Models

Table D - 8: Perception of Political Efficacy Models

Table D - 9: Marginal Probability Effects Estimates for Selected Detroit Area
Places

Table D - 10: Summary of Survey Responses by Place

- Addition of Cases to Primary Place Categories

Summary of Regression Models

Political Participation

Dependent Variables:

Voted in 1988 Presidential Election	-	-	-	logit
Gave Money to a Candidate, Party, or Group	-	-	-	logit
Attended Meetings on Community Issues	-	-	-	logit
Worked for a Candidate, Party, or Group	-	-	-	logit

Independent Variables:

Places - Distressed Urban	}	Standard Set
Places - Working Class Suburbs		
Places - Wealthy Suburbs		
Places - Other		
Log of Family Income		
Education		
Poverty		
Sex		
Race		
Age		
Union Membership		

Vote Choice

Dependent Variables

Voted for Bush	-	-	-	-	logit
Voted for Dukakis	-	-	-	-	logit

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Party Identification

Dependent Variables

Identify with a Party	-	-	-	Logit
Identify with the Democratic Party			-	Logit
Identify with the Republican Party			-	Logit
Identify or Lean Democratic	-		-	Logit
Identify or Lean Republican	-		-	Logit
Liberal or Conservative Orientation			-	OLS

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Feelings Towards Political Figures

Dependent Variables

Feeling Towards George H. W. Bush	-			OLS
Feeling Towards Michael Dukakis			-	OLS
Feeling Towards Jesse Jackson	-		-	OLS
Feeling Towards Ronald Reagan	-		-	OLS
Feeling Towards Coleman Young	-		-	OLS

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Attitudes About Crime

Dependent Variables:

To Reduce Crime, We Should:				
Create More Jobs	-	-	-	OLS
Give Tougher Jail Sentences	-	-	-	OLS
Expand Welfare	-	-	-	OLS
Pass Tougher Gun Control Laws	-	-	-	OLS
Use Capital Punishment	-	-	-	OLS
Perception that Crime is Serious	-	-	-	logit

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Plus: Respondent is a victim of a Violent Crime

Racial Attitudes

Dependent Variables:

Blacks are Disadvantaged	-	-	-	OLS
Blacks can Make it if They Try Harder	-	-	-	OLS
Blacks are Discriminated Against	-	-	-	OLS
Officials Pay Less Attention to Blacks	-	-	-	OLS
Blacks Should Work Like Ethnic Immigrants	-	-	-	OLS

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Attitudes on Affirmative Action

Dependent Variables:

Support for Government Help for Blacks	-	logit
Estimation of Progress for Blacks	- -	logit
Support for Affirmative Action	- -	logit

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Political Efficacy

Dependent Variables:

Can Influence Decisions Affecting Self	-	OLS
Can Influence Decisions Affecting Community	-	OLS
People can Influence Decisions Affecting Community		OLS

Independent Variables:

Standard Set

Derivation and Coding of Independent Variables

Key:
Substantive Variable
REGRESSION VARIABLE
Operation (ICPSR Variable(s)) "I CPSR VARIABLE NAME"
Derivation of REGRESSION VARIABLE from ICPSR Variable(s)

Income

LOG FAMILY INCOME

Log (V424) "INCOME BEFORE TAXES - R AND SPOUSE"

ICPSR Coded income from 1 - 24, representing 24 income ranges from 0 to \$90,000 and over. LOG FAMILY INCOME is coded as the natural log of the ICPSR codes.

Education

EDUCATION

(V 336) and **(V 338)** "EDUCATION: HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR COLLEGE" and "HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED"

- Code 0 if completed less than 9th grade (V 336 < 9).
- Code .2 if completed between 9, 10, or 11 years of school (V 336 = 9, 10, or 11).
- Code .4 if high school diploma is the highest degree earned (V 338 = 2).
- Code .6 if an associate's degree is the highest degree earned (V 338 = 3).
- Code .8 if a bachelor's degree is the highest degree earned (V 338 = 4).
- Code 1 if a graduate degree has been earned (V 338 = 5).

Poverty

POVERTY

(V 424) "INCOME BEFORE TAXES - R AND SPOUSE"

- Code 1 for poor if household (respondent and spouse) net income falls below \$10,000 (V 424 < / = 5).
- Code 0 for not poor if income is \$10,000 or higher (V 424 > 5).

Sex

SEX

(V 485) "IWER OBSERVATION: R' S SEX"

- Code 1 if respondent is observed to be female (V 485 = 1).
- Code 0 if respondent is observed to be male (V 485 = 5).

Race

RACE

(V 486) "IWER OBSERVATION - R' S RACE"

- Code 1 if respondent is observed to be black (V 486 = 2).
- Code 0 if respondent is observed to be other than black (V 486 ~= 2).

Age

AGE

(V 523) "AGE OF SELECTED R"

V 523 was coded as the exact year given by respondent. It was coded 99 when the respondent did not give age.

Code as an 8-category variable:

- 0.0 when V 523 = 0-19
- .14 when V 523 = 20-29
- .29 when V 523 = 30-39
- .43 when V 523 = 40-49
- .57 when V 523 = 50-59
- .71 when V 523 = 60-69
- .86 when V 523 = 70-79
- 1.0 when V 523 = 80-98

Union Membership

UNION MEMBERSHIP

(V 411) "R BELONGS TO LABOR UNION"

- V 411 is coded 1 if the respondent reported belonging to a union.
- Code 1 if respondent reported being a member of a union (V 411 = 1).
- Code 0 if respondent reported otherwise (V 411 ~= 1).

Places:*

Distressed Central Cities

PLACE 1

- Code as 1 if the respondent lives in a distressed central urban area; code as 0 otherwise.

Threatened Working Class Suburbs

PLACE 2

- Code as 1 if the respondent lives in a threatened inner-ring white working-class suburb; code as 0 otherwise.

Wealthy Suburbs

PLACE 4

- Code as 1 if the respondent lives in a wealthy suburb; code as 0 otherwise.

Other Places

PLACE 5

- Code as 1 if the respondent lives in a place not defined by the study's four primary place categories.

*Municipalities are all located within the Detroit "tri-county" region and are assigned amongst five exclusive and comprehensive place categories based on comparisons of 1980 and 1990 Census data on median household income, poverty, median specified owner occupied house value, and numbers of residents who are black.

*{PLACE 3, Middle Class Places, is used as a reference variable)

For analysis of attitudes on crime only:

Victim of Crime

CRIME VICTIM

(V 179) "VICTIM OF CRIME IN LAST 12 MOS"

V 179 asks respondents if they or a member of their family living with them have been the victim of a crime within the last year and is coded 1 if the answer is yes.

- Code 1 if V 179 = 1.
- Code 0 if V 179 \neq 1.

Derivation and Coding of Dependent Variables

Political Participation

Voted in 1988 Presidential Election

VOTED

(V 96) "R VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION"

V 96 coded 1 for voted in 1988 presidential election.

- Code 1 if V 96 = 1
- Code 0 if V 96 ~= 0

Attended Community Meetings

ATTEND MTGS

(107) "ATTENDED MEETINGS"

V 107 is coded 1 if the respondent reported having attended any meetings concerning community issues or problems during the previous 12 months.

- Code 1 if V 107 = 1
- Code 0 if V 107 ~= 1

Worked with a Party, Candidate, or Group

WORKED POLITICAL

(V 109) "WORKED FOR PARTY, CAND, OR GROUP"

V 109 is coded 1 if the respondent reported having worked for a candidate, party, or community group during the previous 12 months.

- Code 1 if V 109 = 1
- Code 0 if V 109 ~= 1

Contribute Money

GIVE MONEY

(V 110) "CONTRIBUTED MONEY"

V 110 is coded 1 if the respondent reported having given money to a candidate, party, or community group during the previous 12 months.

- Code 1 if V 110 = 1
- Code 0 if V 110 ~= 1

Vote Choice

Voted for Bush

VOTE BUSH

(V 97) "1988 PRESIDENTIAL VOTE"

V 97 coded 1 for voted for Dukakis, 2 for voted for Bush.

- Code 1 if V 97 = 2
- Code 0 if V 97~ = 2

Voted for Dukakis

VOTE DUKAKIS

(V 97) "1988 PRESIDENTIAL VOTE"

V 97 coded 1 for voted for Dukakis, 2 for voted for Bush.

- Code 1 if V 97 = 1
- Code 0 if V 97~ = 1

Party Identification

Party Identification

PARTY ID

(V 38) "PARTY IDENTIFICATION"

V 38 is coded 1 for Republican identification and 2 for Democratic identification.

- Code 1 if respondent identifies with a major party (V 38 = </= 2).
- Code 0 if respondent does not identify with a major party (V 38 > 2).

Democratic Identification

DEMOCRATIC ID

(V 38) "PARTY IDENTIFICATION"

V 38 is coded 1 for Republican identification and 2 for Democratic identification.

- Code 1 if respondent identifies with the Democratic Party (V 38 = 2).
- Code 0 if respondent does not identify with the Democratic Party (V 38 ~ = 2).

Republican Identification

REPUBLICAN ID

(V 38) "PARTY IDENTIFICATION"

V 38 is coded 1 for Republican identification and 2 for Democratic identification.

- Code 1 if respondent identifies with the Republican Party (V 38 = 1).
- Code 0 if respondent does not identify with the Republican Party (V 38 ~ = 1).

Identify or Lean Democratic

DEM ID AND LEANING

(V 40) "CLOSER TO DEMOCRAT OR REPUBLICAN"

V 40 is coded 1 for Republican leaning and 2 for Democratic leaning.

- Code 1 if respondent identifies with or leans towards the Democratic Party (V 40 = 2 and/or V 38 = 2).
- Code 0 if otherwise.

Identify or Lean Republican

REP ID AND LEANING

(V 40) "CLOSER TO DEMOCRAT OR REPUBLICAN"

V 40 is coded 1 for Republican leaning and 2 for Democratic leaning.

- Code 1 if respondent identifies with or leans towards the Republican Party (V 40 = 1 and or V 38 = 1).
- Code 0 if otherwise.

Liberal or Conservative Orientation

LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

(V 213) "LIBERAL- CONSERVATIVE IDENTIFICATION"

V 213 is coded from 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative).

- Code 0 if V 213 = 1
- Code .17 if V 213 = 2
- Code .33 if V 213 = 3
- Code .50 if V 213 = 4
- Code .67 if V 213 = 5
- Code .83 if V 213 = 6
- Code 1 if V 213 = 7

Feelings Towards Political Figures

Feeling Towards George H. W. Bush
LIKE BUSH

(V 84) "THERMOMETER: GEORGE BUSH"

V 84 coded as a feeling thermometer 0-100.

- Code 0.1 if V-84 = 0-9
- Code 0.2 if V-84 = 10-19
- Code 0.3 if V-84 = 20-29
- Code 0.4 if V-84 = 30-39
- Code 0.5 if V-84 = 40-49
- Code 0.6 if V-84 = 50-59
- Code 0.7 if V-84 = 60-69
- Code 0.8 if V-84 = 70-79
- Code 0.9 if V-84 = 80-89
- Code 1.0 if V-84 = 90-100

Feeling Towards Dukakis
LIKE DUKAKIS

(V 85) "THERMOMETER: MICHAEL DUKAKIS"

code by recoding V 85 in the same manner as V-84 for LIKE BUSH

Feeling Towards Jackson
LIKE JACKSON

(V 86) "THERMOMETER: JESSE JACKSON"

code by recoding V 86 in the same manner as V-84 for LIKE BUSH

Feeling Towards Reagan
LIKE REAGAN

(V 87) "THERMOMETER: RONALD REAGAN"

code by recoding V 87 in the same manner as V-84 for LIKE BUSH

Feeling Towards Young
LIKE YOUNG

(V 88) "THERMOMETER: COLEMAN YOUNG"

code by recoding V 88 in the same manner as V-84 for LIKE BUSH

Attitudes About Crime

To Reduce Crime, We Should Create More Jobs

CRIME/MORE JOBS

(V 171) "CRIME: CREATE MORE JOBS"

V 171 asks respondents if they approve with the following statement, to reduce crime, we should "create more jobs." The variable is coded 1 for approve strongly, 2 for approve somewhat, 3 for disapprove somewhat, and 4 for disapprove strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 171 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 171 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 171 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 171 = 1

To Reduce Crime, We Should Give Tougher Jail Sentences

CRIME/MORE JAIL

(V 172) "CRIME: GIVE TOUGHER JAIL SENTENCES"

V 172 asks respondents if they approve with the following statement, to reduce crime, we should "give tougher jail sentences." The variable is coded 1 for approve strongly, 2 for approve somewhat, 3 for disapprove somewhat, and 4 for disapprove strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 172 = 1
- Code 0.33 if V 172 = 2
- Code 0.67 if V 172 = 3
- Code 1.0 if V 172 = 4

To Reduce Crime, We Should Expand Welfare

CRIME/MORE WELFARE

(V 173) "CRIME: EXPAND SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS"

V 173 asks respondents if they approve with the following statement, to reduce crime, we should "expand social welfare programs." The variable is coded 1 for approve strongly, 2 for approve somewhat, 3 for disapprove somewhat, and 4 for disapprove strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 173 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 173 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 173 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 173 = 1

To Reduce Crime, We Should Pass Tougher Gun Control Laws
CRIME/MORE GUN CONTROL

(V 174) "CRIME: PASS TOUGHER GUN CONTROL LAWS"

V 174 asks respondents if they approve with the following statement, to reduce crime, we should "pass tougher gun control laws." The variable is coded 1 for approve strongly, 2 for approve somewhat, 3 for disapprove somewhat, and 4 for disapprove strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 174 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 174 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 174 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 174 = 1

To Reduce Crime, We Should Use Capital Punishment
CRIME/MORE EXECUTIONS

(V 175) "CRIME: USE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT MORE OFTEN"

V 175 asks respondents if they approve with the following statement, to reduce crime, we should "use capital punishment more often." The variable is coded 1 for approve strongly, 2 for approve somewhat, 3 for disapprove somewhat, and 4 for disapprove strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 175 = 1
- Code 0.33 if V 175 = 2
- Code 0.67 if V 175 = 3
- Code 1.0 if V 175 = 4

Perception that Crime is Serious
CRIME IS SERIOUS

(V 176) "IS CRIME A SERIOUS PROB IN NEIGHBORHOOD"

V 176 asks respondents if crime is a serious problem in their neighborhood and is coded 1 if they answer yes.

- Code 1 if V 176 = 1
- Code 0 if V 176 ~≠1.

Racial Attitudes

Blacks are Disadvantaged

BKS DISADVANTAGED

(V 163) "GENERATIONS OF SLAVERY & DISCRIMINATION"

V 163 asks respondents if they agree that "generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class." V 163 coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 163 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 163 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 163 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 163 = 1

Blacks can Make it if They Try Harder

BKS TRY HARDER

(V 166) "BLACKS BETTER OFF IF ONLY TRY HARDER"

V 166 asks respondents to consider the statement "if blacks would only try harder they would be just as well off as whites." V 166 coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 166 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 166 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 166 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 166 = 1

Blacks are Discriminated Against

BKS DISCRIMINATED

(V 167) "TODAY THERE'S A LOT OF DISCRIMINATION"

V 167 asks respondents whether they agree with the statement "today, there is a lot of discrimination against blacks."

V 167 coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 167 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 167 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 167 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 167 = 1

Officials Pay Less Attention to Blacks

IGNORE BKS

(V 168) "GOVT OFFICIALS PAY LESS ATTN TO BLACKS"

V 168 asks respondents whether they agree with the statement "government officials usually pay less attention to a request from a black person than from a white person." V coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 168 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 168 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 168 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 168 = 1

Blacks Should Work Like Ethnic Immigrants

BKS VS ETHNICS

(V 164) "NO SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR BLACKS"

V 164 asks respondents whether they agree with the statement "Irish, Italians, Jews, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special programs." V 164 coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 168 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 168 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 168 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 168 = 1

Attitudes on Affirmative Action

Dependent Variables:

Support for Government Help for Blacks

GOV HELP FOR BKS

(V 63)

V 64 is coded 1 for yes, "government should help improve the position of blacks."

- Code 1 if V 63 = 1
- Code 2 otherwise.

Estimation of Progress for Blacks

POSITION OF BKS

(V64)

V64 is coded 3 if respondent believes that the position of blacks has improved over the last five years.

- Code 1 if V63 = 3
- Code 0 otherwise

Support for Affirmative Action

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

(V 67)

V 67 is coded 3 if respondent is for affirmative action (preferential hiring) for blacks.

- Code 1 if V 76 = 3
- Code 0 if otherwise

Political Efficacy

Can Influence Decisions Affecting Self

INFLUENCE DECISIONS AFFECTING SELF

(V 322) "CONTROL OVER DECISIONS RE MY LIFE"

V 322 asks respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "I have control over the decisions that affect my life." It is coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, and 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 322 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 322 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 322 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 322 = 1

Can Influence Decisions Affecting Community

CAN INFLUENCE DECISIONS FOR COMMUNITY

(V 325) "INFLUENCE DECISIONS THAT AFFECT MY LIFE"

V 325 asks respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "I can influence decisions that affect my community." It is coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, and 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 325 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 325 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 325 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 325 = 1

People can Influence Decisions Affecting Community

PEOPLE INFLUENCE DECISIONS FOR COMMUNITY

(V 326) "PEOPLE CAN INFLUENCE COMMUNITY DECISIONS"

V 326 asks respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "By working together, people in my community can influence decisions that affect the community." It is coded 1 for agree strongly, 2 for agree somewhat, 3 for disagree somewhat, and 4 for disagree strongly.

- Code 0.0 if V 326 = 4
- Code 0.33 if V 326 = 3
- Code 0.67 if V 326 = 2
- Code 1.0 if V 326 = 1

Table D - 2

Presidential Vote Models

Independent Variables	Voted for Bush	Voted for Dukakis
Places - Distressed Urban	-1.026 [0.346] ****	0.502 [0.467]
Places - Working Class Suburbs	-0.855 [0.358] ****	0.717 [0.48] **
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	-0.579 [0.471]	-0.167 [0.648]
Places - Other	-1.102 [0.409] ****	0.912 [0.507] ***
Log of Family Income	0.231 [0.269]	0.289 [0.229]
Education	1.042 [0.428] ****	1.127 [0.395] ****
Poverty	0.283 [0.498]	0.328 [0.418]
Sex	-0.282 [0.208] *	0.386 [0.183] ****
Race	-2.099 [0.286] ****	1.338 [0.232] ****
Age	0.907 [0.397] ****	1.769 [0.35] ****
Union Membership	-0.699 [0.267] ****	0.712 [0.205] ****
Constant	-0.572 [0.834]	-4.193 [0.792] ****
N	740	740

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note, Entries are binary logistic (logit) estimates followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p 0.05, *** p 0.1, ** p 0.15, * p 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D - 3

Party Identification Models

Independent Variables	Identify with a Party	Identify with Democratic Party	Identify with Republican Party	Identify or Lean Democratic	Identify or Lean Republican	Liberal / Conservative
Places - Distressed Urban	0.293 [0.331]	0.403 [0.385]	0.1 [0.36]	0.455 [0.37]	-0.405 [0.34]	0.01802 [0.035]
Places - Working Class Suburbs	0.36 [0.352]	0.535 [0.4] *	-0.01 [0.375]	0.602 [0.385] **	-0.731 [0.358] ****	0.02191 [0.037]
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	0.751 [0.5] **	-0.186 [0.561]	0.836 [0.473] ***	0.004 [0.527]	0.109 [0.473]	0.02822 [0.048]
Places - Other	0.284 [0.395]	0.227 [0.447]	0.216 [0.415]	0.093 [0.436]	-0.186 [0.399]	0.01789 [0.041]
Log of Family Income	0.425 [0.217] ****	0.343 [0.223] **	0.221 [0.304]	0.419 [0.232] ***	0.101 [0.269]	0.0676 [0.022] ****
Education	-0.307 [0.372]	-1.056 [0.397] ****	0.789 [0.461] ***	-1.208 [0.406] ****	1.024 [0.429] ****	0.03305 [0.037]
Poverty	0.471 [0.409]	0.453 [0.413]	0.055 [0.566]	0.651 [0.433] **	-0.083 [0.504]	0.06955 [0.041] ***
Sex	0.284 [0.171] ***	0.586 [0.18] ****	-0.366 [0.228] **	0.69 [0.186] ****	-0.613 [0.207] ****	-0.02349 [0.017] *
Race	0.537 [0.211] ****	1.671 [0.215] ****	-2.823 [0.402] ****	1.93 [0.222] ****	-2.385 [0.288] ****	-0.06387 [0.021] ****
Age	1.545 [0.348] ****	1.36 [0.342] ****	0.185 [0.44]	1.176 [0.355] ****	0.175 [0.398]	0.0583 [0.033] ***
Union Membership	0.222 [0.211]	0.688 [0.211] ****	-0.786 [0.307] ****	0.688 [0.223] ****	-0.692 [0.263] ****	-0.0318 [0.02] **
Constant	-1.528 [0.683] ****	-2.728 [0.727] ****	-1.421 [0.938] **	-2.682 [0.745] ****	-0.074 [0.83]	0.337 [0.069] ****
N	740	740	740	740	740	687

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note. Entries are binary logistic (logit) estimates except for those in last column, which are unstandardized estimates derived using ordinary least squares, followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p 0.05, *** p 0.1, ** p 0.15, * p 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Table D - 4

Feeling Towards Political Figures Models

Independent Variables	Feeling Towards Bush	Feeling Towards Dukakis	Feeling Towards Jackson	Feeling Towards Reagan	Feeling Towards Young
Places - Distressed Urban	-0.02723 [0.036]	-0.01946 [0.04]	0.04478 [0.035]	-0.0445 [0.042]	0.06297 [0.042] **
Places - Working Class Suburbs	-0.05022 [0.038] *	0.01662 [0.042]	0.00684 [0.037]	-0.07274 [0.044] ***	0.02747 [0.044]
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	-0.02721 [0.05]	-0.04656 [0.056]	-0.02879 [0.049]	0.03376 [0.058]	0.03088 [0.059]
Places - Other	-0.03029 [0.042]	-0.01007 [0.047]	-0.04208 [0.041]	-0.0181 [0.049]	-0.03397 [0.049]
Log of Family Income	0.02735 [0.022]	-0.009053 [0.024]	0.02856 [0.022] *	0.01035 [0.026]	0.02373 [0.026]
Education	-0.001312 [0.038]	-0.007269 [0.042]	-0.0139 [0.037]	-0.08585 [0.044] ***	-0.03104 [0.044]
Poverty	0.03076 [0.041]	0.05392 [0.045]	0.0531 [0.04] *	-0.0259 [0.048]	0.06646 [0.048] *
Sex	-0.04774 [0.018] ****	0.05233 [0.019] ****	0.004254 [0.017]	-0.0663 [0.021] ****	-0.01688 [0.02]
Race	-0.166 [0.022] ****	0.03794 [0.024] **	0.317 [0.021] ****	-0.337 [0.025] ****	0.346 [0.025] ****
Age	0.117 [0.034] ****	0.04743 [0.038]	-0.04707 [0.033] *	-0.05373 [0.04] *	0.153 [0.039] ****
Union Membership	-0.02915 [0.021] *	0.06108 [0.023] ****	0.02642 [0.02] *	-0.05547 [0.024] ****	-0.0001785 [0.024]
Constant	0.68 [0.07] ****	0.52 [0.078] ****	0.435 [0.069] ****	0.803 [0.082] ****	0.252 [0.082] ****
N	728	728	722	722	722

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note, Entries are unstandardized estimates derived using ordinary least squares, followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.1, ** p < 0.15, * p < 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D - 5

Attitudes on Crime Models

Independent Variables	More Jobs to Reduce Crime	More Jail to Reduce Crime	More Welfare to Reduce Crime	More Gun Control to Reduce Crime	More Executions to Reduce Crime	Crime is a Serious Problem
Places - Distressed Urban	0.119 [0.031] ****	-0.04722 [0.033] *	0.03067 [0.053]	0.009047 [0.051]	-0.04804 [0.06]	3.007 [0.744] ****
Places - Working Class Suburbs	0.03642 [0.033]	-0.03378 [0.035]	0.01038 [0.056]	0.01925 [0.054]	-0.01389 [0.064]	2.584 [0.754] ****
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	-0.007213 [0.043]	-0.008907 [0.045]	-0.05381 [0.075]	-0.0919 [0.071] *	-0.03521 [0.084]	0.966 [0.95]
Places - Other	0.04528 [0.037]	-0.07935 [0.039] ****	0.03184 [0.063]	-0.0412 [0.06]	-0.02493 [0.071]	1.914 [0.795] ****
Log of Family Income	-0.03304 [0.019] ***	0.00574 [0.02]	-0.06864 [0.032] ****	-0.009193 [0.031]	0.003786 [0.037]	-0.414 [0.218] ***
Education	-0.05411 [0.033] ***	-0.04385 [0.034]	-0.07779 [0.056] *	0.01065 [0.053]	0.008603 [0.063]	-0.173 [0.4]
Poverty	-0.04254 [0.035]	-0.02696 [0.037]	-0.006878 [0.06]	-0.05614 [0.058]	-0.02406 [0.068]	-0.411 [0.396]
Sex	0.03435 [0.015] ****	0.0497 [0.016] ****	0.0214 [0.026]	0.165 [0.025] ****	-0.001436 [0.029]	-0.218 [0.177]
Race	0.0447 [0.019] ****	0.01294 [0.02]	0.0439 [0.032] *	0.01143 [0.03]	-0.113 [0.036] ****	0.582 [0.201] ****
Age	-0.005274 [0.029]	-0.004195 [0.031]	-0.08996 [0.05] ***	-0.03784 [0.048]	-0.136 [0.057] ****	-0.364 [0.332]
Union Membership	-0.02199 [0.018]	0.009787 [0.019]	0.001123 [0.031]	0.03261 [0.029]	-0.03941 [0.035]	-0.185 [0.205]
Victim of a Crime	-0.007885 [0.018]	0.04143 [0.019] ****	-0.004816 [0.031]	-0.01443 [0.03]	-0.02298 [0.035]	1.036 [0.214] ****
Constant	0.856 [0.061] ****	0.909 [0.064] ****	0.644 [0.103] ****	0.714 [0.099] ****	0.797 [0.117] ****	-2.028 [0.946] ****
N	722	720	723	723	715	740

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note. Entries are unstandardized estimates derived using ordinary least squares, followed by standard errors in brackets except for coefficients for the last dependent variable, perception that crime is serious. Here, Coefficients are binary logistic (logit) estimates.

**** p 0.05, *** p 0.1, ** p 0.15, * p 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D - 6

Racial Attitude Models

Independent Variables	Blacks are Disadvantaged	Blacks Should Try Harder	Blacks are Discriminated Against	Officials Ignore Blacks	Blacks Should Work Like Ethnic Immigrants
Places - Distressed Urban	0.007912 [0.053]	0.008992 [0.052]	-0.03032 [0.042]	0.005119 [0.048]	-0.01664 [0.051]
Places - Working Class Suburbs	-0.03611 [0.056]	0.06379 [0.055]	-0.01376 [0.045]	0.05299 [0.051]	0.05242 [0.054]
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	-0.0427 [0.073]	-0.06299 [0.074]	-0.02926 [0.06]	-0.04824 [0.067]	-0.0000841 [0.071]
Places - Other	0.04372 [0.062]	-0.02896 [0.061]	-0.01846 [0.05]	0.08694 [0.057] **	-0.04316 [0.061]
Log of Family Income	-0.02197 [0.032]	-0.05506 [0.032] ***	-0.006639 [0.026]	0.005009 [0.029]	-0.01645 [0.032]
Education	0.0869 [0.056] **	-0.195 [0.055] ****	0.142 [0.045] ****	0.027 [0.05]	-0.205 [0.054] ****
Poverty	0.05453 [0.06]	-0.02321 [0.059]	0.03188 [0.048]	0.09554 [0.054] ***	-0.03959 [0.059]
Sex	-0.001218 [0.026]	0.004562 [0.025]	-0.01659 [0.021]	-0.02051 [0.023]	0.008443 [0.025]
Race	0.234 [0.032] ****	-0.229 [0.031] ****	0.301 [0.025] ****	0.393 [0.028] ****	-0.253 [0.031] ****
Age	0.05649 [0.05]	0.001067 [0.049]	0.003323 [0.04]	0.08044 [0.045] ***	0.02449 [0.049]
Union Membership	0.003305 [0.031]	-0.05482 [0.03] ***	-0.005247 [0.025]	-0.005539 [0.027]	-0.05005 [0.03] ***
Constant	0.426 [0.103] ****	0.832 [0.101] ****	0.56 [0.083] ****	0.287 [0.092] ****	0.813 [0.1] ****
N	722	709	721	702	718

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note, Entries are unstandardized estimates derived using ordinary least squares, followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p 0.05, *** p 0.1, ** p 0.15, * p 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D - 7

Affirmative Action Models

Independent Variables	Government Should Help Blacks	Position of Blacks has Improved	Support Affirmative Action
Places - Distressed Urban	0.189 [0.392]	-0.359 [0.329]	1.048 [0.565] ***
Places - Working Class Suburbs	-0.006 [0.421]	-0.132 [0.348]	0.422 [0.616]
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	0.564 [0.527]	-0.233 [0.456]	0.681 [0.755]
Places - Other	0.042 [0.471]	-0.127 [0.389]	0.865 [0.642] *
Log of Family Income	-0.145 [0.21]	0.018 [0.208]	-0.078 [0.235]
Education	-0.907 [0.388] ****	-0.415 [0.357]	-0.336 [0.421]
Poverty	0.185 [0.388]	-0.045 [0.386]	0.59 [0.429] *
Sex	0.085 [0.171]	-0.007 [0.165]	-0.388 [0.190] ****
Race	1.032 [0.208] ****	-1.082 [0.199] ****	1.835 [0.227] ****
Age	-0.178 [0.327]	0.722 [0.318] ****	-0.816 [0.369] ****
Union Membership	0.285 [0.200] *	0.043 [0.197]	0.111 [0.218]
Constant	-0.715 [0.689]	0.37 [0.658]	-1.84 [0.844] ****
N	740	740	240

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note, Entries are binary logistic (Logit) estimates followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.1, ** p < 0.15, * p < 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D- 8

Perception of Political Efficacy Models

Independent Variables	Can Influence Decisions Affecting Self	Can Influence Decisions Affecting Community	People Can Influence Decisions Affecting Community
Places - Distressed Urban	-0.009762 [0.038]	0.0203 [0.045]	0.0369 [0.033]
Places - Working Class Suburbs	-0.05673 [0.04] *	-0.08641 [0.047] ***	-0.03359 [0.035]
Places - Wealthy Suburbs	-0.08209 [0.053] **	0.01289 [0.062]	0.05003 [0.046]
Places - Other	-0.03102 [0.045]	-0.03657 [0.053]	-0.01927 [0.039]
Log of Family Income	-0.04616 [0.024] ****	0.005031 [0.027]	-0.02212 [0.021]
Education	0.117 [0.04] ****	0.14 [0.047] ****	0.101 [0.035] ****
Poverty	-0.08197 [0.043] ***	-0.04288 [0.051]	-0.07123 [0.038] ***
Sex	0.008014 [0.019]	0.05029 [0.022] ****	0.01238 [0.016]
Race	0.06024 [0.023] ****	-0.001463 [0.027]	0.03194 [0.02] **
Age	0.02871 [0.036]	0.03294 [0.042]	0.01698 [0.032]
Union Membership	0.001571 [0.022]	0.02343 [0.026]	-0.01819 [0.019]
Constant	0.872 [0.075] ****	0.424 [0.087] ****	0.783 [0.065] ****
N	723	714	722

Data Source: Detroit Area Study 1989

Note, Entries are unstandardized estimates derived using ordinary least squares, followed by standard errors in brackets.

**** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.1, ** p < 0.15, * p < 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Rich Sauerzopf 2001

Table D - 9

Marginal Probability Effect Estimates for Selected Detroit Area Places

	Respondent lives in a Central City	Respondent lives in a Working Class Suburb	Respondent lives in a Wealthy Suburb	Respondent is a Black Person	Respondent is a Union Member	Respon- dent is Poor
Voted in 1988 Presidential Race	-22.4 ****	-25.4 **	-22.3 ***	9.6 ****	4.7 *	
Gave Money to a Candidate, Party, Group			-16.0 ****	11.8 ****		
Attended Meetings on Community Issues				10.4 ****		
Worked for a Candidate Party or Group				6.4 ****		
Voted for Bush	-25.0 ****	-44.5 ****		-46.8 ****	-16.9 ****	
Voted for Dukakis		88.1 **		16.9 ****	7.1 ****	
Identify with a Party			18.1 **	13.2 ****		
Identify with Democratic Party		53.2 *		33.1 ****	10.8 ****	
Identify with Republican Party			20.4 ***	-32.4 ****	-15.5 ****	
Identify or Lean Democratic		62.9 **		40.6 ****	11.4 ****	3.6 **
Identify or Lean Republican		12.4 ****		-49.8 ****	-16.9 ****	
Crime is a Serious Problem	42.4 ****	24.6 ****		3.0 ****		
Government Should Help Blacks				21.0 ****	4.9 *	
Position of Blacks has Improved				-26.4 ****		
Support Affirmative Action	11.7 ***			26.9 ****		-6.2 *

Data source 1989 Detroit Area Study. Figures estimate the effect that specified places have on the % probability of given survey responses. Marginal probability effect estimates are calculated by comparing converted probabilities for non-poor, non-minority males with sample average incomes, ages, and educations living in specified places to probabilities for the same cases absent residence in specified places. Converted probability estimates are based on binary logistic (logit) regression estimates. For a good discussion of various methods of interpreting logit and other probability models see Tim Futing Liao's *Interpreting Probability Models*. Middle-class suburbs were used as the reference category for place.

**** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.1, ** p < 0.15, * p < 0.2 (one tailed tests)

Table D - 10

Summary of Selected Survey Responses By Place

Central Cities

Place 1

Total N = 602

	Number	Percent
VOTED	392	65.12
VOTE DUKAKIS	226	37.54
VOTE BUSH	80	13.29
PARTY ID	417	69.27
DEMOCRATIC ID	358	59.47
REPUBLICAN ID	59	9.80
DEM ID AND LEANING	403	66.94
REP ID AND LEANING	147	24.42
RACE	436	72.43
DUKAKIS % PARTY VOTE		73.86
BUSH % PARTY VOTE		26.14

Middle Class Suburbs

Place 3

Total N = 74

	Number	Percent
VOTED	55	74.32
VOTE DUKAKIS	8	10.81
VOTE BUSH	45	60.81
PARTY ID	38	51.35
DEMOCRATIC ID	13	17.57
REPUBLICAN ID	25	33.78
DEM ID AND LEANING	18	24.32
REP ID AND LEANING	41	55.41
RACE	0	0.00
DUKAKIS % PARTY VOTE		15.09
BUSH % PARTY VOTE		84.91

Working Class Suburbs

Place 2

Total N = 125

	Number	Percent
VOTED	87	69.60
VOTE DUKAKIS	29	23.20
VOTE BUSH	50	40.00
PARTY ID	81	64.80
DEMOCRATIC ID	44	35.20
REPUBLICAN ID	37	29.60
DEM ID AND LEANING	51	40.80
REP ID AND LEANING	44	35.20
RACE	5	4.00
DUKAKIS % PARTY VOTE		36.71
BUSH % PARTY VOTE		63.29

Wealthy Suburbs

Place 4

Total N = 48

	Number	Percent
VOTED	34	70.83
VOTE DUKAKIS	6	12.50
VOTE BUSH	27	56.25
PARTY ID	35	72.92
DEMOCRATIC ID	8	16.67
REPUBLICAN ID	27	56.25
DEM ID AND LEANING	10	20.83
REP ID AND LEANING	30	62.50
RACE	1	2.08
DUKAKIS % PARTY VOTE		18.18
BUSH % PARTY VOTE		81.82

Addition of Cases to Primary Place Categories

The 1989 Detroit Area Study over-sampled residents of the City of Detroit. Unfortunately, for my purposes, suburban respondents were somewhat under-represented in the survey sample. This resulted in low numbers of respondents for each of the three primary categories of suburbs that I used in my election study. This is a problem since I want to test the ability of these places to predict their residents' responses to a number of survey questions.

In an effort to increase the numbers of suburban respondents included in this analysis, I took a second look at localities that were not included in the original place categories that I used in the election study. I did this in an effort to find places that might not have met the strict criteria of inclusion used in the previous study, but that could reasonably be included in one of the suburban categories for this analysis. Adding suburbs this way would increase the numbers of survey respondents included in one or more of the suburban samples.

For the election study, I categorized area municipalities by a variety of economic and demographic indicators published in the 1980 and 1990 Census of Population and Housing Metropolitan Data Books. Limiting my samples of localities allowed me to define places with precision owing to the variety and quality of information available within these books. But this was not the only advantage of limiting my selection of places to those included in the Metropolitan Data Books.

No places included in these books had populations of less than 10,000. This provided me with a convenient means of excluding suburbs that are essentially rural or are little more than urban enclaves. I am not interested in the former because they are so removed from the metropolitan political structure. The latter are just as problematic because their constituencies are more likely to exhibit idiosyncratic voting patterns that could distort our image of the region's electoral geography.

Such aggregate idiosyncrasies are not a problem for this portion of the study however. This is the case because the level of analysis here has been reduced from the suburban constituency to the randomly selected survey respondent.

The real obstacle to including the smaller or developing suburbs in this portion of the study is missing Census data. I had no data for places that were not included in either the 1980 or 1990 Metropolitan Data Books. I therefore rejected all of these places even when observation and other sources of data would have been enough to categorize them with considerable surety. However, there were a number of developing outer suburbs that were not included in the 1980 Metropolitan Data Books but which had grown sufficiently by 1990 to be included in that year's Data Books. I included these suburbs in my attitudinal analysis when the 1990 data for these places were consistent with the standards used to define one of the suburban categories that I used for the election study.

The disadvantage of this approach is that it precludes the use of "tracking measures," such as changes in property values, which I have argued are important to understanding the effects of places on their residents' political interests and preferences. However, my observations of these places along with my informal review of a variety of non-Census data on changing area economic and demographic conditions indicate that the relevant socioeconomic trends for these places are consistent with my categorization schema.

My review of municipalities resulted in the addition to this study of cases from three outer suburbs. These additions increased Ns slightly for my middle-class and wealthy suburbs.

The addition of respondents from these places to the study may facilitate finding valid place effects but is not likely to exaggerate them. This is because respondents from these places are more likely to be newer residents than are those from the older middle-class and wealthy suburbs.

Because these suburbs are relatively recent additions to metropolitan Detroit, I did not go back and include them in the aggregate election study, which tracks national election returns for area municipalities from the 1960 election on.

Places included here, but not in the election study, are:

Place Added:		Added to:		Cases
Bloomfield Hills Township	-	Wealthy Suburb	- -	6
Northville Township	- -	Wealthy Suburb	- -	6
Waterford Township	- -	Middle-Class Suburb	-	7