Popular Attitudes toward Distributive Injustice: Beijing and Warsaw Compared

MARTIN KING WHYTE & CHUNPING HAN *

Popular reactions to the transition from centrally planned socialism to a market-based economy are explored through an examination of survey data on distributive justice and injustice attitudes in Beijing, China, in 2000, and in Warsaw, Poland, in 2001. In both capitals objective socioeconomic status characteristics of respondents have weaker and less consistent associations with distributive injustice attitudes than measures of subjective social status and self-reported trends in family standards of living. When objective and subjective respondent background characteristics are controlled for statistically, residents of democratic and enthusiastically capitalist Warsaw have stronger feelings of distributive injustice than respondents in undemocratic and only partially reformed Beijing. However, one exception to this pattern is that Beijing residents favor government redistribution to reduce income differences more than their Warsaw counterparts. Conjectures about the sources of these differences in distributive injustice attitudes are offered.

Key words: *inequality, distributive justice, market transition, Beijing, Warsaw*

For several decades in the middle of the twentieth century, during the height of the Cold War, about one-third of the world's population lived in centrally planned socialist societies that posed a challenge to the hegemony of market capitalism. Fifty years later, centrally planned socialism survives only in a few marginal backwaters, such as North Korea and Cuba, and even there timid experiments with market reforms are underway. Beginning in the late-1970s, one after another most socialist states (first China, then Vietnam, then Eastern Europe, and then the Soviet Union) rejected centrally planned socialism in favor of economic and distributive systems based primarily on markets.

How do the populations of post-socialist societies view the altered social order? How much acceptance and even enthusiasm is there for market distribution; how much nostalgia is there for bygone socialist patterns? The particular strategies and paths taken in the transition from centrally planned socialism to a market-based

* Martin King Whyte is Professor of Sociology at Harvard University. His recent research focuses on changing family patterns in contemporary China, China's distinctive economic development path, and popular attitudes toward distributive injustice issues. His recent publications include two edited volumes: *China's Revolutions and Intergenerational Relations* (University of Michigan Center for Chinese Studies) and *One Country, Two Societies? Rural-Urban Inequality in Contemporary China* (Harvard University Press, forthcoming). Chunping Han recently completed her PhD in Sociology at Harvard, with a doctoral thesis entitled, *Rural-Urban Cleavages in Perceptions of Inequality in Contemporary China*.

DOI 10.1007/s11366-008-9016-8

system have varied widely, but in no society has the change been easy or universally popular. Populations that for a generation or longer had been indoctrinated in the superiority of socialist principles and the evils of markets and capitalism, and who had learned to live by playing according to the "socialist rules of the game," found the social order and the ground rules for getting ahead shifting out from under them. Forms of behavior that had been the tickets to success under socialism (e.g., political loyalty, activism in class struggle, cultivating a Spartan life style) were devalued, while other kinds of behavior long denounced as "bourgeois" or even counter-revolutionary (e.g., seeking profits, competition, taking entrepreneurial risks, working for foreigners, conspicuous consumption) became accepted and even officially encouraged. Citizens who had grown accustomed to relying on the allocation of employment, housing, and other benefits from the bureaucratic agencies of paternalistic socialist states found they had to learn (or relearn) how to rely on themselves and compete in a rapidly changing and confusing marketplace.

In many of these societies (particularly in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union), the dismantling of the socialist economic system initially led to a severe economic depression, but even China's boisterous growth has produced many losers as well as winners. The new market systems make it possible for some individuals to acquire riches unimaginable in the planned socialist era, but they also leave many citizens vulnerable to hazards they didn't have to face in a planned economy—for example, unemployment, inflation, loss of medical insurance, and inability to afford higher education. A recent statement by a Polish miner conveys this unease: "We were freer under the Communists, because now you are worried that you are going to lose your job, and if you lose your job it's going to be very hard to get another."[1] After decades of living under the slogans and at least the partial reality of socialist egalitarianism, citizens in post-socialist societies find themselves living in social orders that are highly unequal and often becoming rapidly more so.[2] Does the reality of improved living standards and increased opportunities for upward mobility for many in at least the most successful post-socialist states offset popular uneasiness about the less savory aspects of their increasingly market-driven economies?

Research on popular reactions to the transition from socialist to market distribution has been underway for some time, focusing upon Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, particularly in the International Social Justice Project (hereafter ISJP).[3] Generally speaking, these East European surveys show mixed popular reactions, with considerable acceptance of some market ideas and little nostalgia for many features of socialism, but at the same time much criticism of the unfairness of current patterns of actual inequality. Until recently no comparable data were available from China, a society where the nature of the transition from centrally planned socialism to market distribution has proceeded very differently, and in many respects more smoothly and successfully. Survey research on this topic in China is now available, and the goal of the present analysis is to begin the

job of comparing and contrasting popular attitudes toward inequality and distributive justice issues in that country with an Eastern European counterpart. Specifically, we want to systematically compare popular attitudes toward distributive injustice in Beijing, China, in 2000, and in Warsaw, Poland, in 2001.

THE CONTEXT OF THE POST-SOCIALIST TRANSITION: POLAND VERSUS CHINA

Why might we expect popular attitudes toward distributive justice issues to differ between Warsaw and Beijing? Which capital city's citizens should be most accepting of current patterns of inequality in their society? The answers to these questions are not obvious, given the complexities of the socialist era experiences and of the post-socialist transitions in these two societies. Nonetheless, it is worth noting some important contrasts in the recent histories of Poland vis-à-vis China and considering whether their contrasting paths to a market-based economy might be expected to produce differences in popular views about contemporary patterns of inequality and distributive justice or injustice.

The discussion that follows involves Poland vis-à-vis China generally, not specifically the conditions of Warsaw vis-à-vis Beijing. Obviously citizens of both capital cities are not in any sense representative of the larger population in Poland or China, even if they have been affected by the same historical events. However, we are not aware of any factors that would make one capital city more atypical of its larger societal context than the other is, so we base our discussion here on the context of the post-socialist transitions of these two societies generally.

Poland, of course, did not have an indigenous socialist revolution, and socialist institutions were imposed on that country as a result of post-World War II occupation by the Soviet Union. However, political controls over society were never as tight as in other parts of Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union itself, with the Catholic Church remaining independent, and by the 1970s a vigorous protest movement had arisen that bluntly criticized the inefficiencies and shortages of Poland's version of planned socialism as well as the forced economic alliance with the USSR and the rupture of Poland's historic economic and cultural ties with Western societies. An alternative "civil society" grew despite the controls of the communist political system. By the end of the decade mass protests had coalesced into the Solidarity movement, which enjoyed widespread popular support. Although martial law and the banning of Solidarity in 1981 preserved the outward husk of Polish socialism until 1989, any remaining popular support for socialism evaporated. New rounds of strikes forced the leadership to re-legalize Solidarity in 1988, and in parliamentary elections the following year, Solidarity emerged triumphant, with Solidarity leader Lech Walesa becoming Poland's president in 1990. Thus the historic events leading up to the collapse of the regime in 1989 and the enthusiasm with which the reuniting of Poland with Western Europe has been greeted (Poland joined NATO in 1999 and was admitted to the European Union in 2004) might be expected to produce ready and widespread acceptance of market-

based inequalities and the pursuit of capitalist prosperity, and little nostalgia for socialism.

However, as in much of Eastern Europe, the initial economic changes in Poland were traumatic. The new government, prodded by foreign advisors, launched a program of "shock therapy" in 1990 designed to achieve a rapid transition to a market economy. The result was sharply falling GDP, hyper-inflation, and rising unemployment. However, by 1992 Poland became the first economy in the region to resume growth, largely fueled by a booming private sector. Since the mid-1990s Poland has been regarded as a success story within Eastern Europe, with economic growth averaging about 5% a year and inflation eventually reduced to low levels. However, the unemployment rate has remained stubbornly high, generally over 15%. The inequality of family income distribution, while somewhat higher than in other countries of Eastern Europe (with a gini coefficient in 1998 estimated at .32, vis-à-vis levels in the .26-.29 range elsewhere in the region), is well below the current level in China (gini estimated at .44 in 2002).[4] Furthermore, Poland has not experienced the worsening over time of income inequality that many other East European societies have experienced.[5]

The political context is also important in the Polish case. Since 1989 Poland has had a democratic political system, with contested elections in which the stewardship of the economy is often a central issue, and with volatile political shifts. One symbol of changing political moods is that Lech Walesa received only 1% of the vote in the presidential elections of 2000, while the Solidarity movement he had led, which had swept the parliamentary election in 1989, failed to win any seats in the parliamentary elections of 2001. In 2005 the political tables turned once again, with the "post-communists" who had been dominant losing most of their parliamentary seats, and a center-right coalition taking over.[6] That coalition in turn lost its parliamentary majority in 2007. Not coincidentally, Poland also has a vibrant free press that is filled with critical opinions and attacks on official corruption and malfeasance.

The context of the post-socialist transition in China has been quite different. China had an indigenous revolution, rather than having socialism imposed by Soviet troops, and the leader of that revolution, Mao Zedong, arguably went further than any of his counterparts in the communist world in trying to limit the role of markets, denounce material incentives, and foster an egalitarian social ethic. During the Cultural Revolution in particular (1966-76), the use of material incentives and markets to stimulate labor and distribute resources was generally denounced as "bourgeois" and suppressed, and the Soviet Union was criticized as tantamount to a capitalist system for relying heavily on such devices.[7] The degree of Spartan uniformity in clothing, recreation, and life styles also went far beyond anything found in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. Rigid controls on ideology and communications prevented any "civil society" from emerging to voice criticism of socialist principles, such as had occurred in Poland.[8]

China's economic reforms also did not follow a collapse of the communist political system, which remains intact today. Rather, two years after Mao's death in 1976, a group of top Communist Party leaders led by Deng Xiaoping launched a program of market reforms from above, seeking to reinvigorate the economy and

bolster their political legitimacy after the chaos of the Cultural Revolution. While Poles see their market transformation as a way to rejoin Europe, for Chinese leaders and citizens the justification for market reforms is more as a way to stimulate rapid economic growth to allow China to catch up with other East Asian economies and to enable the nation to regain its rightful historic place as a major power in the world. The Chinese reform program was also indigenous, rather than following the advice of foreign experts.[9] Instead of "shock therapy" and a swift and full embrace of capitalist principles, there was a series of ad hoc reforms that resulted in a growing market-driven and even private and foreign-owned economy arising alongside remaining parts of the socialist economy.[10] So China's market reforms began before Poland's, but were implemented more gradually.

In most respects China's economic reforms have also been more successful than Poland's or those of any other formerly centrally planned economy. China was a poorer and more agricultural country than Poland at the time the reforms were launched in 1978. Rather than experiencing an initial economic collapse or later currency or other crises, China has enjoyed a sustained record of boisterous growth (averaging close to 10% since 1978, roughly twice the rate of growth of the post-rebound Polish economy), with major improvements in most economic indicators—income and consumption levels, exports, foreign investment, poverty reduction, etc. However, within this overall record of impressive improvements, there have been counter-trends that are in some ways the opposite of those experienced in Poland. The early years of the Chinese reforms saw rapid improvements in the economy that were widely shared, but since the late 1980s serious economic problems (e.g., rising inflation in the late 1980s, growing unemployment in the 1990s,[11] rising inequality since the mid-1980s, poverty rates that have crept back up since the late 1990s, growing outbursts of worker and peasant protests) have darkened the picture somewhat. So in China expectations were raised not by a dissident movement promoting a more liberal society reintegrated with the West, à la Solidarity in Poland, but by their own personal experiences in the early 1980s. The track record of the Chinese transformation has been one of boisterous growth accompanied by growing problems, rather than Poland's initial depression followed by fairly steady improvement.

Even though there has not been a political transformation in China to match the economic transformation, the political context has changed in basic ways since Mao's death in 1976. The Party has relaxed its controls on communications and public opinion to some degree, and Chinese citizens are much more free than they were under Mao to obtain ideas and information from outside official channels and to express sentiments that do not conform to the Party line. However, there are limits to this increased political tolerance. There are still no fully autonomous associations or mass media outlets in China, quite a contrast with the situation in Poland. So while quite angry criticism can now be voiced among friends without much fear, any effort to organize others to protest government actions (or inaction) or to publish or broadcast highly critical views can lead to serious penalties and

even arrest, incarceration, or exile. So China's mass media, while more lively and diverse than in the Mao era, are still more restricted and less critical than the mass media in Poland.

In sum, there are complex and conflicting indicators about how attitudes toward inequality and distributive injustice are likely to differ between Warsaw and Beijing. Insofar as long-standing popular resentment against socialism as an imposed system, cultural links and diffusion of ideas from the West, and outright championing of capitalism by the government are key factors, Warsaw citizens are likely to feel more positively about current inequalities than their counterparts in Beijing. However, insofar as the speed and sustained pace of economic growth and a continuing ability of the state to control the media and limit critical opinions are key factors, Beijing citizens are likely to accept current inequalities more than their Warsaw counterparts. We will use parallel survey data in the pages that follow to examine which of these competing speculations is more accurate.

DISTRIBUTIVE INJUSTICE ATTITUDES: DATA, MEASUREMENT, AND MODELS

The analyses reported here are based upon replicated questions in surveys conducted in the capital cities of China and Poland. The 2000 Beijing survey was carried out as a module within the Beijing Area Study annual survey directed by Shen Mingming and his colleagues at the Research Center on Contemporary China at Beijing University. The survey consists of interviews completed with a probability sample of 757 adults in urban districts of Beijing in that year. The Beijing survey instrument was then translated and shared with colleagues in Poland. In 2001 Polish social scientists under the direction of Bogdan Cichomski incorporated many of the same questions into a module within a Warsaw Area Study survey, with a probability sample of 1004 adults in that city interviewed. (In the analyses that follow, we use only those Warsaw respondents between ages 18 and 65, in order to achieve comparability with the age limits of the Beijing sample, reducing the N for Warsaw to 857.) Many of the questions incorporated into the Beijing and Warsaw surveys were, in turn, replications of questions used in earlier comparative surveys of distributive injustice, particularly the International Social Justice Project surveys of 1991 and 1996.

Distributive injustice attitudes are, of course, a complicated conceptual terrain with multiple dimensions, including perceptions of how fair or unfair current inequalities are, what distributive principles should ideally be followed, what could and should be done to make society more fair, and how much hope or despair there is about things getting better—for individuals and for society as a whole. Within this complex terrain we focus on assessments of the equity versus inequity of current inequalities, attitudes toward government efforts to limit inequality, and views about the likelihood versus impossibility of achieving a more just society.

For current inequalities to be judged fair and even superior to the patterns under socialism, they have to be seen as operating equitably and providing rewards

that are proportional to merit factors, such as hard work and talent.[12] A society may be seen as inequitable for having too much equality (and thus not fairly rewarding such differences) as well as for having too much inequality or the wrong kind of inequality. Inequalities, if they are viewed as equitable, can contribute to the legitimacy of the social order, but if viewed as inequitable they will foster popular resentment against the status quo.[13] Perceptions of the sources of wealth versus poverty constitute an important basis for judging the equity versus inequity of the current system, for "the rich and the poor are visible manifestations of the abstract idea of distributive justice applied to society as a whole."[14] If individuals believe that the main things that distinguish the rich from the poor are their greater talent and hard work, then they will tend to view existing inequalities as fair. However, if they feel that differences in wealth are due mainly to external factors, such as unfair opportunities, discrimination, dishonesty, personal connections, and corruption, they will tend to view existing inequalities as unfair.

Efforts to tap such perceptions of the fairness versus unfairness of the current, market-based system explain the first two attitude scales employed in our analyses. These measures are based upon a broad set of questions used in the ISJP, with respondents asked to give their assessments of why some people in Beijing/Warsaw today are poor, and why some others are rich. The list included such factors as ability, effort, personal character, discrimination, dishonesty, and personal connections. Respondents were asked to rate whether each trait mentioned had a very large importance, large importance, some importance, small importance, or no importance at all in explaining why some people are poor, or why some people are rich. (Two sets of questions were used, one asking for explanations of why people are poor, and the other asking for explanations for why some people are rich, as was done in the ISJP surveys.)

The two scales created from some of these items are designed to tap merit-based explanations of poverty or wealth (the mean of four items: ability and effort as affecting poverty and the same traits as affecting wealth) and structural or non-merit-based explanations (the mean of six items: lack of equal opportunity and defects in the economic structure as explanations of poverty; and dishonesty, unequal opportunities, personal connections, and unfairness of the economic structure as explanations of wealth). The items were reversed, so that a high score indicates perceived importance of the included traits in explaining poverty or wealth. We refer to these as our "Meritocratic Attribution" and "Structural Attribution" (of inequality) scales.[15] As noted above, the presumption is that individuals who score high on Meritocratic Attribution think that generally acceptable individual merit reasons are the main things that distinguish the rich from the poor, and they will thus tend to see the current pattern of inequalities as fair. In contrast, those who score high on Structural Attribution feel that external features are the main sources of current inequalities, which are therefore likely to be seen as unjust.

If current patterns of inequality are judged unfair, citizens may wish the government to intervene to promote greater social equality. A preference for

government redistribution reflects a relative lack of faith in markets alone to produce a fair society as well as a relatively high faith in the government as a promoter of a more just society (rather than viewing the government as a primary source of the underlying unfairness). The third scale we use here is a summary measure designed to tap such views, derived from four questions about what role respondents think that the government should (or should not) play in reducing inequalities in their society. Each interviewee was asked to say whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the following statements: "The government should assure that every person is able to maintain a minimum standard of living," "the government should set a ceiling on the highest income an individual can receive," "the government should provide an opportunity to work for every person willing to work," and "the government has the responsibility to reduce the gap between people with high incomes and low incomes." These items were then reversed, so that a high score means support for an active role of the government in promoting social equality, with the resulting scale a mean of the four item scores. We refer to this as our "Government Redistribution" scale.[16] The presumption here is that those who score high on this measure think that active measures should be taken to reduce current inequalities and are willing to entrust the government with this role.

One might see those who favor government redistribution as critical but hopeful. They feel that current inequalities are unfair, but they retain some faith that the government could step in to promote a more fair pattern. An alternative reaction to perceived social inequity would be despair and cynicism—feelings that not much can be done to improve things, and that those in power don't care about distributive injustice in any case. The fourth scale used here is designed to tap such feelings of hopelessness about injustice. Three questions were used, again with respondents asked to give responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree for each statement: "Since we are unable to change the status quo, discussing social justice is meaningless;" "Looking at things as they are now, it is very difficult to say what is just and what is unjust;" and "Government officials don't care what common people like me think." Again we reversed these items, so that high scores indicate feelings of hopelessness and injustice, and then we computed a mean of the three scores to create the scale value. We refer to this as a "Feelings of Injustice" scale.[17]

These four measures (Meritocratic Attribution, Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice) constitute the attitude domains we will focus on here. Our expectation is that respondents who approve of the current, market-based system will score high on Meritocratic Attribution, but low on Structural Attribution, desire for Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice. In contrast, those who feel current inequalities are unjust should score low on Meritocratic Attribution, but high on Structural Attribution, desire for Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice.

This expectation is supported by an examination of the inter-correlations among the four attitude scales in each locale. As shown in Table 1, in both Beijing and Warsaw, scores on Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice scales are positively correlated, while scores on the Meritocratic Attribution scale are negatively correlated with each of the other scales, with all coefficients statistically significant except for the Meritocratic Attribution-Structural Attribution correlation in Beijing.

Table 1: Correlation among Distributive Injustice Scale Scores: Beijing and Warsaw Samples

	Meritocratic Attribution (1)	Structural Attribution (2)	Government Redistribution(3)	Feelings of Injustice (4)
1	--	-.033	-.135***	-.201***
2	-.133***	--	.254***	.283***
3	-.172***	.394***	--	.120**
4	-.110**	.306***	.364***	--

+=.05<=p<.1; *=.01<=p<.05; **=.001<=.p<.01; ***=p<.001
Note: Beijing sample above diagonal; Warsaw sample below diagonal.

We also expect, based upon past research, that those who are relatively successful and enjoy high status in both societies will tend to score high on Meritocratic Attribution but low on Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice, while those who have low status or who have suffered downward mobility will display the reverse pattern. The logic here is fairly simple and obvious—if you are doing well economically, it is very comforting to assume that this must be due to your own talent and hard work, rather than due to favoritism and unfair advantages. You are also unlikely to favor government redistributive efforts that might prevent you from doing even better or to feel hopeless about injustice. If you are doing poorly, in contrast, it is comforting to blame the unfairness of society rather than your own failings, and if so it is also likely that you will favor government efforts to reduce inequality and perhaps feel despair about the injustice of the current system.

Table 2 lists the means and standard deviations of the four attitudinal scales used in this study as well as providing information on the distributions of the basic background variables we will use as predictors of these distributive injustice attitudes. In the top portion of Table 2 we can see that on three of the four measures (Meritocratic Attribution, Structural Attribution, and Feelings of Injustice), it appears that Beijing residents approve of current inequalities more than do Warsaw residents. However, at the same time, Beijing residents are more, rather than less, in favor of government redistribution to reduce inequalities.[18]

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics on Attitude Scales and Predictor Variables: Beijing and Warsaw

Measure:		Mean/Percentage	Standard Deviation
Meritocratic Attribution	Beijing	3.58	.61
	Warsaw	3.36	.62
Structural Attribution	Beijing	3.34	.59
	Warsaw	4.12	.55
Government Redistribution	Beijing	4.01	.61
	Warsaw	3.66	.90
Feelings of Injustice	Beijing	3.12	.86
	Warsaw	3.64	.87
Female	Beijing	47.4%	--
	Warsaw	50.5%	--
Age	Beijing	41.69	11.80
	Warsaw	39.21	13.86
Education	Beijing	2.90	1.37
	Warsaw	3.64	1.52
Income (in local currency)	Beijing	1363.396	1880.989
	Warsaw	1012.88	1328.16
Unemployed	Beijing	11.2%	--
	Warsaw	6.4%	--
White-collar occupation	Beijing	42.3%	--
	Warsaw	52.2%	--
State-owned enterprise	Beijing	39.9%	--
	Warsaw	11.6%	--
5 year standard of living trend	Beijing	3.68	1.09
	Warsaw	2.83	1.25
Subjective status	Beijing	3.21 (in 7)	1.09
	Warsaw	5.29 (in 10)	1.66

N: Beijing 757; Warsaw 857

In the bottom portion of Table 2 we also see that that in some respects the background characteristics of residents of Beijing and Warsaw are different. For example, the educational levels of Warsaw residents are higher than Beijing residents, and more Warsaw respondents work in white-collar jobs, while more Beijing than Warsaw respondents work in state owned enterprises or are currently unemployed. We also note that a higher percentage of Beijing than Warsaw respondents report that their family's living standard has improved over the last five years, a difference that we presume might enhance the chances that Beijing residents have positive views about current inequalities.[19] Since these background characteristics may affect attitudes toward our four distributive injustice attitude scales, we must consider whether the overall differences in scale values between

Beijing and Warsaw displayed in the top portion of Table 2 mainly reflect such sample composition differences. We do this in two separate steps: first, we examine—separately in each city--the extent to which attitudes in these four distributive justice domains are shaped by the background characteristics of respondents. Subsequently we will merge the data from both cities together to see whether, net of the influence of available background predictors, there remain differences in distributive injustice attitudes between Beijing and Warsaw.

All explanatory variables (see the bottom portion of Table 2) were recoded so as to be as comparable as possible between the two cities. Gender is coded as 1 for females and 0 for males. Age is measured in years, and education is a measure based on seven educational levels that are roughly comparable for the two countries (less than full primary, primary, lower secondary or vocational, upper secondary or technical, some college, college graduation, and some graduate school or more). Respondents were asked about their monthly income in both cities, and the mean value is reported in Table 2. Whether a respondent is unemployed or not, has a white-collar job now or held one before retirement, and whether he or she works in a state-owned enterprise now or did before retirement are treated as dummy variables, with 1=yes and 0=no.

Past research reveals that self-reported standard of living changes and subjective social status are not necessarily highly correlated with objective status and exert an independent influence on attitudes toward inequality and distributive injustice.[20] Therefore, in addition to objective socioeconomic status traits, we test the influence of reported family standard of living changes, as measured by respondents' comparisons of their current standards of living with five years earlier (a five-point scale, ranging from much worse=1 to much better=5). We also include a measure of current self-reported subjective social status. This variable is measured by a seven-point scale in the Beijing survey (from 1=lowest to 7=highest) and by a 10-point scale in Warsaw.

In our conceptual scheme, our first two distributive injustice measures (Meritocratic and Structural Attribution) have a somewhat different role than the other two measures (Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice). As we see it, the first two scales involve perceptions or assessments of how fair or unfair current inequalities are, while the latter two scales reflect responses to or feelings about that fairness or unfairness (desires for the government to intervene to improve things, and despair about the prospects for any ameliorating changes occurring). To reflect this conceptual framework, we will be treating the Meritocratic and Structural Attribution scales as intervening variables in shaping attitudes toward Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice.

In line with this conceptual framework, both in the separate analyses of the two cities and in analyses using the merged Warsaw-Beijing samples that follow, in the first stage we regress all four distributive injustice attitude scales against the various objective background indicators and subjective mobility and social status measures. Then, for the Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice scales,

we employ two stage structural equation models, with the intervening effects of Meritocratic Attribution and Structural Attribution added to the objective and subjective status predictors in the second stage.[21] In the tables that follow we show only standardized regression coefficients throughout in order to focus on the relative explanatory power of the various predictors in the models used here.

RESULTS

Table 3 displays results from models predicting the four distributive injustice scales for Beijing and Warsaw considered separately. Note that in these models we employ the log of income rather than income as a predictor, in order to capture the non-linear effect we anticipate family income will have on the four attitudes under study.[22] In interpreting these results, we are primarily interested in looking for common patterns across types of explanatory variables versus divergent patterns. For this reason in reviewing these results, we will be focusing on general patterns, rather than discussing each specific coefficient.

For the most part in Table 3, the predictors of each of our outcome measures seem broadly similar between Beijing and Warsaw, although varying in the strength of the coefficients. However, there are a few cases, particularly among the demographic and objective status measures, of different patterns in the two capitals. The most striking difference involves education and Structural Attribution, with well educated Warsaw respondents following the expected pattern of being less likely than the poorly educated to attribute poverty and wealth to structural causes, but with well educated Beijing respondents significantly more likely to do so. Less striking contrasts include the fact that the unemployed in Beijing are less likely than the employed to see inequality in meritocratic terms, while in Warsaw unemployment does not make a difference; that women in Warsaw are more likely than men to stress structural causes of inequality, while the genders in Beijing do not differ significantly; and that white collar workers in Warsaw are, contrary to expectations, more likely than blue collar workers and all other respondents to explain inequality in structural terms, while occupational status does not make a difference in Beijing. Also notable are the contrasts in the demographic predictors of attitudes toward Government Redistribution, with women in Warsaw but not Beijing significantly more likely to favor such government activism, while older respondents in Beijing but not in Warsaw are significantly more likely to favor such redistribution.

From these comparisons emerges one common pattern specific to Warsaw. In that city, but not in Beijing, women appear to be more critical than men of current inequalities , with females scoring lower on Meritocratic Attribution and higher on Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice, although the coefficients for Feelings of Injustice are not statistically

Table 3: Multiple Regression Estimates of Distributive Justice Attitudes: Beijing versus Warsaw

(standardized coefficients)

	Meritocratic Attribution		Structural Attribution		Government Redistribution (Model 1)		Government Redistribution (Model 2)		Feelings of Injustice (Model 1)		Feelings of Injustice (Model 2)	
	Beijing	Warsaw	Beijing	Warsaw	Beijing	Warsaw	Beijing	Warsaw	Beijing	Warsaw	Beijing	Warsaw
Female	-.094**	-.079*	-.007	.080*	.059^{+}	.164***	.056	.134***	.016	.038	.005	.015
Age	-.081*	-.002	.048	.040	.184***	.062^{+}	.168***	.049	.026	.096**	.004	.086*
Education	.032	.130**	.091*	-.112**	-.077^{+}	-.209***	-.094*	-.165***	-.104*	-.172***	-.122**	-.141***
Log(income)	-.059	-.020	.056	.062	-.064	.047	-.080^{+}	.027	.025	.052	.004	.036
Unemployed	-.098*	.004	.089*	.063^{+}	.036	.068*	.010	.050	.037	.015	.003	-.003
White-collar occ.	.003	-.063	-.059	.087*	-.073^{+}	-.036	-.060	-.067^{+}	-.021	-.015	-.007	-.037
State owned ent.	-.062	.005	-.010	.010	.160***	.028	.158***	.025	-.006	-.042	-.012	-.043
5 year upward mobility	.138***	.146***	-.112**	-.185***	-.072^{+}	-.182***	-.039	-.115**	-.125**	-.150***	-.079*	-.101**
Subjective status	.133***	.107**	-.122**	-.064^{+}	-.146***	-.041	-.110**	-.015	-.197***	-.063^{+}	-.149***	-.048
Meritocr. Attribution							-.061^{+}	-.059^{+}			-.136***	-.019
Structural Attribution							.221***	.316***			.242***	.245***
R-Square	.081	.080	.053	.091	.116	.157	.166	.251	.105	.097	.177	.152

$^{+}$ =.05<=p<.1; *= .01<=p<.05; **= .001<=p<.01; ***= . p<.001

significant. The literature on both China and Poland portrays women as losers relative to men in the process of market reforms, but this tendency is reflected in our results mainly for Warsaw.[23]

Looking across Table 3, it is also apparent that objective social status predictors (education, income, unemployment, and white collar status) generally have fairly weak and inconsistent associations with the four distributive injustice scales. The clearest pattern appears in regard to education in Warsaw, with the well educated in that city, who should be beneficiaries of market reforms, having significantly higher scores on Meritocratic Attribution and significantly lower scores on Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice. Their well-educated counterparts in Beijing also have significantly lower scores on Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice, but they do not differ significantly on Meritocratic Attribution and, as already noted, they have significantly higher scores on Structural Attribution. For the remaining objective status measures the most notable pattern is that the unemployed in both cities are somewhat more likely than the employed to explain the difference between wealth and poverty in structural terms.

Another pattern in these results is that generally subjective predictors have stronger and more consistent associations with these distributive justice scales than do the demographic and objective social status measures we have just discussed. For both locales, those who report that their family's living standard has improved significantly over the last five years and those who report that they enjoy high social status show the expected tendency to score high on Meritocratic Attribution while scoring low on Structural Attribution, Government Redistribution, and Feelings of Injustice, although not all the coefficients are statistically significant. These subjective status and mobility measures are likely shaped by factors such as expectations, recent personal and family history, and the reference groups employed by respondents. As a consequence, these subjective measures have a strong influence upon popular attitudes toward distributive injustice, over and above whatever influence stems from the objective social status positions people occupy.

Finally, in Model 2 for Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice, we see that beliefs about why some people are rich while others are poor have the expected effect on these attitude scales. Those who score high on Meritocratic Attribution, and thus presumably regard the current distributive system as relatively fair, tend to score lower on both Government Redistribution and on Feelings of Injustice. Conversely, those who score high on Structural Attribution, and thus presumably feel the current distributive system is unfair, tend to score higher on both Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice. However, it is also striking that the coefficients between these final two scales and Meritocratic Attribution are quite weak, with three out of the four coefficients either not statistically significant or only marginally so. In contrast, scores on the Structural Attribution scale are very strong predictors of scores on the Government

Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice scales in both Beijing and Warsaw. One might summarize this finding by saying that in both locales perceptions that the current pattern of distribution is unfair (with inequality determined by external or structural factors, rather than by individual merit) are more important than other predictors used here in shaping attitudes about what the government should do to redress inequality and whether there is any prospect for improvement.

We now move on to the final stage of analysis, in which we merge the two samples and repeat our multivariate models in order to determine whether, once we control for a variety of background factors, the differences in distributive injustice attitudes between Beijing and Warsaw shown in Table 2 are reduced or eliminated. In performing this analysis we are, in effect, performing a hypothetical experiment—if these were two samples drawn from the same underlying population, would their distributive injustice scale score differences be too large to be attributable to chance? Table 4 presents findings from multivariate analyses of the four distributive injustice attitude scales for the merged sample of Beijing and Warsaw respondents. A dummy variable for locale (with Beijing=1, Warsaw=0) is included in the analysis of the merged sample in addition to the other predictor variables used earlier. In these tables we use standardized (Z) scores for the logged income and subjective social status predictors in order to achieve comparability, given the different metrics used in the original measures in the Beijing and Warsaw surveys.

For the most part the pattern of associations in Table 4 is similar to Table 2 and will not be discussed further here. The new finding shown at the bottom of Table 4 involves the net difference in these merged data between respondents in the Beijing and Warsaw surveys, once we control for sample composition effects. These results show that, even when controlling for the available background factors and the attitude scale predictors, the differences in responses between Beijing and Warsaw respondents shown in Table 2 still hold up. In regard to three of our four distributive injustice attitude scales—Meritocratic Attribution, Structural Attribution, and Feelings of Injustice—these differences indicate that Warsaw residents have significantly stronger feelings of distributive injustice than do their Beijing counterparts. However, as in Table 2, we see here that in regard to our fourth scale, preferences for Government Redistribution, Beijing residents are significantly <u>less</u> likely than their counterparts in Warsaw to simply put their trust in individual efforts and the working of markets, and are instead <u>more</u> likely to favor government intervention to hold inequality in check. Furthermore, in three out of the four cases (all except Feelings of Injustice) the size of the coefficients for locale also indicates that being a resident of Beijing versus Warsaw has a stronger effect on distributive injustice attitudes than any of the other predictors considered. The contrast is particularly striking in the case of Structural Attribution, with Beijing residents having so much less of a tendency to interpret why people are rich or poor in terms of factors such as unequal opportunities, an unfair economic structure, personal connections, and dishonesty,

Table 4: Multiple Regression Estimates of Distributive Justice Attitudes: Merged Sample

(standardized coefficients)

	Meritocratic Attribution	Structural Attribution	Government Redistribution (Model 1)	Government Redistribution (Model 2)	Feelings of Injustice (Model 1)	Feelings of Injustice (Model 2)
Female	-.084***	.031	.118***	.103***	.024	.008
Age	-.021	.024	.078**	.068**	.050*	.041^{+}
Education	.089**	-.005	-.162***	-.155***	-.122***	-.114***
Z score of log(income)	-.047	.048^{+}	.013	-.005	.039	.023
Unemployed	-.042	.067**	.046^{+}	.022	.026	.003
White-collar occ.	-.024	.011	-.043	-.048^{+}	-.023	-.027
State owned enterprise	-.022	.004	.090***	.087***	-.023	-.025
5 year upward mobility	.151***	-.135***	-.148***	-.095***	-.142***	-.092**
Z score of subjective status	.118***	-.088***	-.088***	-.051*	-.129***	-.096***
Meritocratic Attribution				-.063**		-.072**
Structural Attribution				.327***		.281***
Beijing	.154***	-.526***	.191***	.373***	-.264***	-.106**
R-Square	.105	.362	.171	.243	.167	.222

$^{+}$=.05<=p<.1; *= .01<=p<.05; **= .001<=p<.01; ***= . p<.001

that the coefficient for city completely swamps the other predictor variables and largely accounts for the much higher proportion of variance explained for this particular scale (R^2=.362 versus .243, .222, and .105).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

What are we to make of these findings? We cannot be sure, of course, that merging the data from two such disparate cities and including our limited set of predictor variables has enabled us to fully eliminate the possibility that compositional differences between the samples of respondents in Beijing and Warsaw can explain the patterns of city differences shown in Table 4. Perhaps some of these net differences in distributive injustice attitudes between Beijing and Warsaw could be explained at least in part by the operation of other compositional effects not included among our predictors or by the subtle differences in question translation and interpretation that are inevitable in any such internationally replicated survey. Nonetheless, given the size of the differences in responses and their ability to withstand our attempt to explain them away statistically, we propose a tentative conclusion: There appear to be sizable differences in the prevailing attitudes toward inequality and distributive injustice in these two capital cities, and thus perhaps in China and Poland generally. In many respects Warsaw residents have stronger feelings of distributive injustice than their Beijing counterparts, but with one important exception to this pattern. Beijing residents are more likely than Warsaw residents, not less likely, to favor government redistribution designed to limit inequality.

Assuming that these contrasts between Beijing and Warsaw attitudes are genuine and potentially important, how are we to explain the differences? At this point we leave the relatively solid ground of comparative survey statistics for informed conjectures, since our survey data do not enable us to definitively test explanations of differences involving only two cases. What other factors might explain why Warsaw residents are more critical of current inequalities than their Beijing counterparts?[24] In trying to speculate about the sources of these differences, we focus particularly on the Beijing-Warsaw differences in scores on the Structural Attribution scale. As shown in Tables 2 and 4, the gross and net differences in scale scores between the Beijing and Warsaw samples on Structural Attribution are larger than for any of the other three distributive injustice attitude scales, and Table 3 reveals that scores on this scale have a strong association with responses to the Government Redistribution and Feelings of Injustice scales. In this sense the tendency for Warsaw residents to score higher than their Beijing counterparts on Structural Attribution seems central to the rest of our findings. Why are Warsaw residents so much more likely than Beijing residents to explain why some people are rich and others are poor by reference to unequal opportunities, unfairness in the economic structure, dishonesty, and personal connections?

Of course, some might propose that perhaps this is an accurate perception, with the chances for escaping poverty and becoming rich more determined by

structural factors and unfair treatment in Warsaw than in Beijing. We have no way of testing whether this is the case. However, the broad public grumbling in China about the prominence of corruption, personal connections, and the special privileges of the powerful makes us skeptical of this explanation. In any case, our data do not show that most Beijing respondents deny the importance of structural attribution while Warsaw residents affirm it. Rather, the average Beijing respondent ranks structural attribution in between being of "of some importance" and "of large importance" in shaping inequality, while the average Warsaw respondent rates structural factors slightly higher than "of large importance" (but not at the highest level of "of very large importance"—see Table 2). So residents of both capitals recognize the role that structural factors play in influencing who is rich and who is poor, but Warsaw respondents stress this factor more strongly.

If we can discount the possibility that these differences are due to Warsaw or Poland being a genuinely more unfair society than Beijing and China generally, what other factors might explain the attitude differences revealed in our study? Two factors come to mind. One involves contrasts in the process of spreading and legitimating ideas about the superiority of market forces in these two societies, while the other involves basic differences in their current political institutions.

In Poland, as noted earlier, socialist ideas and institutions had already been discredited in the popular mind prior to the collapse of communist rule in 1989. Awareness of the prosperity and freedoms enjoyed in Western Europe and advocacy by Solidarity of democracy and market distribution combined to produce a highly idealized picture of the wonderful benefits that market transition would produce—a society characterized by freedom, the rule of law, empowerment of ordinary citizens, truth, and justice, not to mention improved living standards.[25] Once the transition occurred, the experience of life in post-transition Poland could not come close to matching these lofty hopes. Even after recovery from the economic crisis of the early 1990s, the experiences of many Polish citizens with unemployment, corruption cases, deteriorating social services, squabbling politicians, and other mundane realities have fed strong feelings of disappointed expectations.

In China, in contrast, socialist ideas and institutions had not been thoroughly discredited prior to the launching of reforms in 1978, and strict political controls during the Mao era had kept Chinese citizens ignorant of the fact that people in neighboring societies lived freer and more prosperous lives. Despite the political chaos of the Cultural Revolution, there was no general yearning for or idealization of market distribution. As noted earlier, China's reforms were launched primarily from above, and in a piece-meal fashion, with China's leaders maintaining that they were not repudiating socialism, but simply making it work better. In addition, the specific Chinese reforms that led to general increases in freedom and prosperity, such as letting farmers dismantle communes, resume family farming, and migrate to the city in search of jobs, were introduced first in the early 1980s, with more divisive reforms (such as mass layoffs from state-owned enterprises) delayed until

much later (after the mid-1990s, in the case of layoffs). So in China, in contrast with Poland, support for market ideas and institutions was built gradually and primarily through the demonstration effect of the improvements that markets could provide, rather than through the spread of idealized views about the superiority of a market-based system in advance of any actual system changes. In the Chinese case there was not the level of prior idealization of markets that existed in Poland, and thus not so much likelihood of disappointment with the actual workings of China as a market-transition society. Perhaps Beijing residents accept market-based inequalities more than their Warsaw counterparts because exposure to the new patterns developed gradually and primarily through actual experience, rather than through years of romantic but unrealistic yearning at a distance.

The differences in the political systems of the two countries may also help explain our puzzle. Poland experienced a sudden and complete democratic political transition in 1989, while China continues to be ruled by the Chinese Communist Party (hereafter CCP). In Poland, the media are independent and highly critical of economic and political elites, and their success in drawing attention to economic mismanagement and the malfeasance of the powerful has contributed to the volatility of Polish politics mentioned earlier, with enormously popular new governing groups unceremoniously voted out of office a few years later in favor of their ardent critics, who in turn cannot hope to retain public favor for long. In this atmosphere, there seems to be very little willingness in Poland to look to the government to intervene and correct social injustice. Instead, a jaundiced view of political elites and the government in general appears to be all too typical. One journalistic account that addresses the puzzle of why Poles feel so bad when things are going so well economically uses the term "hypochondria" to refer to the general malaise.[26]

The CCP, in contrast, continues to use its very considerable political power and control over the mass media to constantly sing the praises of market reforms, to trumpet economic improvements, and to draw attention to "rags to riches" examples of upward mobility of the formerly downtrodden. Despite market reforms, China's leaders miss no chances to draw attention to their wise stewardship of the economy, and when popular anger erupts over mismanagement and abuses of power in local areas, protesters almost invariably appeal to higher level officials to intervene and put things right. Muckraking journalists or others who would cast doubt on such official messages, or who would draw attention to the many instances in which riches stem not from the creativity and entrepreneurship of ordinary people, but from the special advantages of the well connected and powerful, do so at their peril, risking exile or imprisonment.

We are suggesting, then, that a somewhat paradoxical situation helps explain the contrasting views on distributive injustice in Warsaw and Beijing. We normally expect that democracy and market reforms go together, with political freedoms and free markets reinforcing one another. However, in the Polish case to date, it would appear that political freedoms help to sustain critical views about contemporary

Poland as an unjust society, while in China remaining political controls help to promote support for market-based inequalities while muffling critical voices. Perhaps nowhere in our data is this contrast more starkly illustrated than in responses to one of the items included in our Feelings of Injustice scale. When presented with the statement, "Government officials don't care what common people like me think," 49.9% of respondents in the capital of democratic Poland said they strongly agreed, and another 31.3% said they agreed. In contrast, only 11.7% of respondents in the capital of quite undemocratic China said they strongly agreed, while another 34.5% said they agreed.

These contrasts may also help explain the one exception to our general conclusion that Beijing residents accept current inequalities more than do Warsaw residents—the fact that Beijing citizens more strongly favor government redistribution to limit inequality. The nature of the post-1989 transition in Poland undermined popular faith in relying on the state to manage the economy and solve the problems of society, with other actors (businesses, the Catholic Church, civic associations, the media) seen as more worthy of public trust in these realms. In China, in contrast, the Leninist actions of the CCP have helped to limit the growth of other civic actors, while China's leaders have worked ceaselessly to spread the message that reform-era economic gains are not the result of the impersonal workings of market forces, but are instead the products of wise government stewardship of the reformed economy. Even as they work hard to foster popular support for market distribution, China's leaders do not want to encourage people to see markets as operating according to Adam Smith's "invisible hand." China's failure to undergo a fundamental political transition may help explain why many Chinese citizens still retain more faith than their Polish counterparts in the role of the government to manage society's affairs.[27]

To sum up, Beijing residents have learned to accept current inequalities while continuing also to have a fair amount of trust in their government, while Warsaw residents are less likely to do either, despite living in a more fully market-oriented and democratic society. Warsaw citizens seem to have more distrust of the market transition they once hungered for than their Beijing counterparts, who despite not sharing a history of disdain for socialism, seem more willing today to embrace their state-managed form of capitalism.

Notes

[1] Richard Bernstein, "Coal Tells of a Hard History, but the Future is Here, Too," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 2006, p. A4.

[2]In many respects, and particularly in regard to political power, state socialist societies were not all that egalitarian. For a classic critique, see Milovan Djilas, *The New Class* (New York: Praeger, 1957). However, the distribution of incomes in state socialist societies was generally more equal than in capitalist societies. With market reforms, income becomes more important in determining

standard of living (relative to bureaucratic position), and the distribution of incomes has generally become more unequal.

[3] See J. Kluegel, D. Mason and B. Wegener, eds., *Social Justice and Political Change* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1995); "Special Issue on International Social Justice Project Surveys on Distributive Justice Attitudes in Post-Communist Societies of Eastern Europe," *Social Justice Research*, 2000, 13: 2; and D. Mason and J. Kluegel, eds., *Marketing Democracy: Changing Opinion about Inequality and Politics in East Central Europe* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

[4] Polish economic trend and comparative figures come from the on-line version of *The World Factbook* compiled by the Central Intelligence Agency (www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/pl.html#Econ). China's income distribution comparison comes from A. Khan and C. Riskin, "China's Household Income Distribution, 1995 and 2002," *China Quarterly*, 182: 356-84, 2005. (The years used in these estimates don't coincide because the best estimates for China come from the China Household Income Project surveys, which were only conducted in 1988, 1995, and 2002.)

[5] See G. W. Kolodko, "Incomes Policy, Equity Issues, and Poverty Reduction in Transition Economies," *Finance and Development*, 36: 3, 1999.

[6] Timothy Garton Ash, "The Twins' New Poland," *New York Review of Books,* Feb. 9, 2006, pp. 22-25.

[7] See the discussion in Martin K. Whyte, "Destratification and Restratification in China," in G. Berreman, ed., *Social Inequality: Comparative and Developmental Approaches* (New York: Academic Press, 1981).

[8] Protests of various kinds did erupt repeatedly within China during the period of Mao's rule, but they were generally suppressed quickly and were unable to coalesce and grow, unlike what occurred in Poland in the 1970s and 1980s.

[9] China was able to plot its own reform course in part because Chinese socialism did not produce the major indebtedness to Western banks and governments that characterized most of Eastern Europe. To be sure, China has received assistance in its reforms from the World Bank, Western governments, and NGOs, but none of these foreign actors have had the leverage that they had in Eastern Europe.

[10] There was a corresponding gradual reduction in the role of central planning and state-owned enterprises in the Chinese economy. This Chinese approach has been contrary to the advice of most Western experts, who argue that a "big bang" sudden transformation to market principles and full private property rights is necessary to minimize economic distortions and corruption. See J. McMillan and B. Naughton, "How to Reform a Planned Economy: Lessons from China," *Oxford Review of Economics*, 8:132-41, 1991; T. Rawski, "Reforming China's Economy: What Have We Learned?" *China Journal*, 41:139-56, 1999. Thus far China still has not implemented full privatization of state-owned enterprises and agricultural land.

[11] There is considerable debate about unemployment estimates in China, and thus it is difficult to compare the unemployment rate in China and Poland. Chinese official sources in recent years have claimed that the number of "registered" urban employed is between 4 and 5%, but most analysts contend that the actual urban unemployment rate is at least double that (the Central Intelligence Agency *World Factbook* estimates an urban unemployment rate of 9.8% in 2004). That would still place Chinese unemployment rates below Polish levels of 15+% in recent years (19.5% in 2004 according to the CIA). However, even these higher estimates for China are subject to considerable uncertainty. See Dorothy Solinger, "Why We Cannot Count the 'Unemployed,'" *China Quarterly*, 167:671-88, 2001.

[12] See the discussion in Robert Lane, "Market Justice, Political Justice," *American Political Science Review*, 80:832-402, 1986.

[13] See the discussion in I. R. Della Fave, "The Meek Shall Not Inherit the Earth: Self-Evaluation and the Legitimacy of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 45: 955-71, 1980.

[14] Kluegel, Mason, and Wegener, *Social Justice and Political Change*, op. cit. p 253; see also J. Kluegel and M. Miyano, "Justice Beliefs and Support for the Welfare State in Advanced Capitalism," in Kluegel, Mason, and Wegener.

[15] The reliability (Chronbach's α) coefficients for these scales are .61 and .69 for Beijing and .47 and .69 for Warsaw. Although the reliability coefficient for the Warsaw Meritocratic Attribution scale is somewhat marginal, we retain this measure in our analysis in order to maintain our comparative design, and also because of the centrality of meritocratic distribution perceptions in our conceptual scheme. Don't know responses were recoded as response category 3 (of some importance) on the assumption that this response indicated difficulty in choosing between maximal and minimal response categories.

[16] The Government Redistribution scale has a reliability of α=.56 in Beijing and .72 in Warsaw. For this scale and the one that follows, responses of "don't know" were treated as equivalent to "neutral" responses rather than missing values, on the assumption that such answers reflected a lack of a clear preference between agreement and disagreement with the statement read to respondents.

[17] The Feelings of Injustice scale has a reliability of α=.65 in Beijing and .61 in Warsaw. Note that none of these three questions specifically refers to distributive injustice. However, we presume that the general focus in both surveys on inequality and distributive injustice issues would predispose most respondents to answer these questions with distributive issues in mind.

[18] All four differences in mean values shown in the top portion of Table 2 are large enough that they would be statistically significant beyond the .001 level (based on one-way ANOVA tests of the mean scale scores) if the normal assumptions of such tests were met.

[19] To elaborate, 21.1% of Beijing respondents said their family's standard of living was much better than five years earlier, 47.6% said it was better, 14.9% said it was the same, 10.9% said it was worse, and 5.3% said it was much worse. The corresponding figures from Warsaw were 10%, 24.6%, 22.7%, 23.4%, and 19.4%. In other words, more than 2/3 of Beijing respondents reported improvement in their standard of living, compared to little more than 1/3 among Warsaw respondents, with self-reported declines in standard of living slightly more common than improvements in the latter locale.

[20] See, for example, J. Kluegel, "Economic Problems and Socioeconomic Beliefs and Attitudes," *Research on Social Stratification and Mobility*, 7: 273-302, 1988; Kluegel, Mason, and Wegener, op. cit.; M. Kreidl, "Perceptions of Poverty and Wealth in Western and Post-Communist Countries," *Social Justice Research*, 13:151-76, 2000.

[21] We perform these analyses using Amos, a statistical program that is designed for structural equation models. Simple one-stage regressions can also be performed with Amos, as we do for all four outcome scales here. Amos has the advantage compared to most OLS regression programs of computing full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimates that are efficient and consistent when samples have missing data that can be assumed to be missing at random. We also examined OLS regression analyses of our scales and achieved similar results, but with slightly lower R-squared coefficients.

[22] For example, the effect of an increase in income from $100 to $200 is assumed to be greater than for an increase from $10,100 to $10,200. Respondents who reported no personal income and those who were not working at the time of the interview and reported no other income were recoded as having a personal income of 1 yuan or zloty, since the log of zero is undefined. (The value of the log of 1 is of course 0.)

[23] For China, see Emily Honig and Gail Hershatter, *Personal Voices*, Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1988; for Poland consult R. Siemienska, "Winners and Losers: Gender Contracts in the New Political and Economic Situation," *International Journal of Sociology*, 35:3-39, 2004.

[24] One possible explanation of these contrasts can be at least partially discounted. They cannot be due to the fact that more Beijing than Warsaw respondents report that they have experienced improvements in their standard of living in the last five years (69% versus 35%, as noted earlier),

since this variable has been controlled for statistically in our multivariate models. However, we recognize that this factor might still operate at the community level, with the greater preponderance of improvements in standards of living in the aggregate in Beijing compared to Warsaw creating an atmosphere conducive to optimism and acceptance of the current system, regardless of what has happened to a respondent's own standard of living.

[25] See the discussion in J. Reykowski, "Unexpected Traps of the Democratic Transformation," *International Journal of Sociology*, 34:35-47, 2004.

[26] R. Bernstein, "Glum Days in Poland: Graft, Russophobia, and Worse," *New York Times*, January 26, 2005, p. A4. See also J. Reykowski, op. cit.

[27] Research by others qualifies the generalizations offered here. Many Chinese have precious little trust in their local governments, which they often view as incompetent and corrupt. However, they retain much more trust in higher levels of officialdom, and particularly in the central leadership. (See Lianjiang Li, "Political Trust in Rural China," *Modern China*, 30:228-58, 2004; Tony Saich, "Citizens' Perceptions of Governance in Rural and Urban China," *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 12:1, 2007.) China's top leaders are only too happy to encourage the view that the governance system is rotten only at the bottom, while remaining virtuous and wise at the top.