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.

The **Opportunity** Agenda

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;

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 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.