### **Online Appendix**

### "No, You're Playing the Race Card": Testing the Effects of Anti-Black, Anti-Latino, and Anti-Immigration Appeals in the post-Obama Era

### Appendix A

### Figure A1: Polarization in Egalitarianism and Feeling Thermometers Over Time



a: Egalitarianism Measures



### b: Feeling Thermometers

Note: Figures show weighted means, conditional on partisanship, and loess smoothers for egalitarianism measures (panel a) and feeling thermometers (panel b) for all available years in the American National Election Survey. Partisan categories include leaners. All egalitarianism measures were recoded to be directionally consistent. Figures show a clear and consistent polarization in the Obama and post-Obama eras on all measures of belief in egalitarian values as well as in feeling thermometer ratings for "African Americans," "Illegal Immigrants," and "Latinos." All question wording below.

### <u>Egalitarianism</u>

Egalitarianism measures come from 5-pt Likert agreement (5 = strongly agree, 1=strongly disagree) with the following statements:

### **Equal Rights**

"We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country." (mean=4.3, sd=0.98) **Equal Opp** 

"Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed" (mean=3.03, sd=1.38)

### **Equal Chance 1**

"One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance." (mean=3.3,sd=1.32)

### **Equal Chance 2**

"It is not really that big a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others." (mean=3.34, sd=1.24)

### **Feeling Thermometers**

Feeling thermometers ask:

"We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one."

**Black Therm** (mean = 65.5, sd=20.9) **Illegal Imm Therm** (mean = 39.6, sd=26.2) **Latino Therm** (mean = 63.2, sd = 20.7)

### Appendix B

### **Issue-Group Congruency**

When designing our treatments, we hypothesized that more congruent implicit issue-group pairings will be more "racialized" and recognized as racial by White respondents than less congruence issue-group pairings. We posited that gang violence is frequently paired in the media and therefore in our minds with African Americans and immigration with Latinos. We are less frequently exposed to gang violence, however, where the gang members are Latinos, at least before the Trump Administration push to eradicate MS-13 which occurred after the surveys in this paper were fielded, and therefore implicit Latino gang appeals will be less likely to be recognized as racial.

In order to corroborate our perception that certain issues and groups are more frequently paired than others, we gathered news transcripts and imagery from the UCLA NewsScape Archive, a collection of televised news programs collected from cable and broadcast news sources from 2005 to the present. The archive contains thousands of hours of news programs that are indexed and time-referenced via their closed captioning to allow for full-text searches. This allows users to view and code associated imagery that accompanies any topic of discussion. We limited our analysis to just CNN transcripts because the cable network is national, an agenda setter in the larger media space both domestically and internationally (Groshek 2008), more likely to cover sensational and emotional issues like gangs and immigration than CSPAN, and is less clearly partisan than Fox or MSNBC.

We began by searching for coverage of "gang" and "violence" in CNN transcripts from 2006 to 2016. In order to ensure that we weren't picking up mentions of non-criminal gangs (ie "Senate Gang of 8") in one portion of a transcript and violence in another, we restricted the proximity of these keywords so that they had to be within 10 words of one another. This search yielded n=311 program transcripts where gang violence was a topic of discussion. We then went through and hand coded the program to assess both using associated screen captures, streaming video, and surrounding text, whether the gang violence under discussion was in reference to Black gang violence (ie "African American youth in south side of Chicago") or Latino gang violence (ie "MS-13" and violent Central American gangs).

We then did the same thing but for mentions of immigration. We searched for any transcript addressing immigration (n=11,813) and then coded the proportion of those transcripts that explicitly referenced Mexicans, Latinos, or Hispanics.

In Figure B1 below, we display the proportion of ads that fit this coding criteria for each year in CNN transcripts. We find that, as expected, discussion of gang violence is often accompanied by racial cues signaling Black gang violence and much less frequently Latino gang violence. Similarly, discussions of immigration are often accompanied by clear Latino/Hispanic/Mexican racial cues. To the extent that we do find references to Latino gangs, they are almost entirely driven by Lou Dobbs' coverage of immigration debates in 2006-2008, where he emerged as a strong immigration hardliner, and by the debate over child refugees fleeing Central American gang violence in 2014. Otherwise, coverage of gangs is dominated primarily by discussion of violence on the south side of Chicago. In Figure B2, we further show that public interest in MS-13, the well-known and now politicized Latino gang, didn't spike until after Donald J. Trump took office in 2017.



Figure B1: Issue-Group Congruence in CNN Transcripts 2006-2016

Note: points indicate percentage of "violent gang" coverage that is accompanied by images or references to Black vs. Latino gangs and immigration coverage that is accompanied by references to Latinos/Hispanics/Mexicans in CNN transcripts from 2006-2016.

Figure B2: MS-13 And Google Searches



Note: Lines indicate google search volume for MS-13, showing a large spike following the 2016 elections and after our study was concluded.

### Appendix C

### Figure C.1: Storyboard of "Latino Immigrant" Treatment



"IT'S TIME TO TAKE AMERICA BACK ... "

"VOTE SCOTT RITTER FOR UNITED STATES SENATE"

Note: Ritter advertisement storyboard for "Latino Immigrant" treatment. Each treatment simply swapped out the upper right panel with the appropriate treatment text and image, previewed below.

**Figure C.2: Treatment Images and Text** 



"BY CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS WHO DESERVE TO BE LOCKED UP..."



"BY CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS WHO DESERVE TO BE LOCKED UP..."



"BY ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO DESERVE TO BE DEPORTED..."

Note: Ritter advertisement treatment panel for (1) "Latino Gang," (2) "Black Gang," and (3) "Latino Immigrant." Each treatment storyboard simply replaced the upper right-hand panel from the full storyboard above (Figure 1) with one of these image/text pairings.

### Figure C.3: Op=Ed

ONPOLITICS HOUSE SENATE 2016 STATES ADS CAMPAIGN FINANCE POLLS TALKERS

# U.S. Senate Candidate Scott Ritter Plays the Race Card

By David Jackson November 27, 2015 9:39 am ET 🔰 Follow @djusatoday



On Monday, U.S. Senate candidate Scott Ritter released a hardhitting campaign video on Instagram that hammers Washington for its lack of attention to [immigration/crime ].

The ad argues that the United States is being destroyed by ['criminal gang members'/'illegal aliens'] who ['deserve to be locked up'/'deserve to be deported,'] a common theme among some candidates today. It ends with a plea to take America back. In the middle of the ad, Ritter flashes threatening pictures of supposed [Latino/Black] [immigrants/gang members], unapologetically playing the race card.

Lack of facts or fear of social sanction has never stopped Mr. Ritter before, but this level of overt racism has not been on display in decades . As the media and congressional leaders point out, turning to race-based fear mongering should be interpreted as an explicit effort to divide Americans along lines of race. Let us hope that fair-minded Republicans, Democrats, and independents will tell Mr. Ritter that they reject his effort to play to Americans' racial fears.



Another of Paul Walker's family is suing Porsche Nov 26, 8:46 a.m.



Paul Walker's father sues Porsche over son's fatal crash Nov 26, 9:22 a.m.



Eagles of Death Metal, Walker, Obama Nov 26, 12:10 a.m.



Stuck waiting: Ground delays at U.S. airports on the rise Nov 23, 2:50 a.m.



TWEET

Thanksgiving travel weather forecast: Stormy for western, central U.S. Nov 24, 3:42 a.m.

 $\square$ 

### 791 shares



**y** 

EMAIL

Note: Op-Ed template. Terms used in Op-Ed correspond to treatment delivered.

Q 🖌 💆

### Appendix D

### Question Wordings, Sample Characteristics, and Balance Tests

### Racial Resentment

Response options for the original questions ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4); the items included (1, reverse-coded) "The Irish, Italians, Jews, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors." (2) "Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class." (3, reverse-coded) "It is really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites." (4) "Over the past years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve." Higher values therefore represent more racially resentful views.

	STUDY	STUDY	ANES
	1	2	(2016)
AGE: 18-29	47.8	51.1	14.2
AGE: 30-44	24.4	18.1	23.0
AGE: 45-59	21.6	14.8	29.2
AGE: OVER 60	6.20	16.0	33.7
FEMALE	49.0	57.4	52.8
COLLEGE	73.2	65.3	41.1
DEMOCRAT	48.6	52.2	38.8
INDEPENDENT	15.8	9.20	11.5
REPUBLICAN	35.6	38.6	49.2
LIBERAL	42.3	48.5	23.4
MODERATE	26.9	20.5	19.2
CONSERVATIVE	30.8	31.1	33.6
RACIAL	0.49	0.61	0.58
RESENTMENT			

#### **Table D.1: Sample Characteristics**

*Note: The table shows means of sample characteristics for both sample and the weighted 2016 ANES study data.* 

Table D.2: Assessing Balance	
------------------------------	--

STUDY	VARIABLE	LAT GANG IMP	LAT GANG EXP	LAT IMM IMP	LAT IMM EXP	BLACK GANG IMP	BLACK GANG EXP
2016	Age 18-29	51.0	53.0	50.3	51.1	54.2	46.5
	Age 30-44	16.3	12.4	19.9	20.9	15.8	24.1
	Age 45-59	16.8	16.8	13.3	15.4	13.7	12.4
	Age Over 60	15.8	17.8	16.6	12.6	16.3	17.1
	College	62.8	65.4	69.6	62.6	63.7	68.2
	Female	55.1	58.9	55.8	60.4	56.3	56.5
	Conservative	31.1	30.3	34.3	30.8	28.4	31.8
	Moderate	21.9	22.7	15.5	17.6	23.7	21.2
	Liberal	46.9	47.0	50.3	51.6	47.9	47.1
	Democrat	49.7	52.0	48.6	54.2	53.3	55.8
	Independent	10.5	11.3	9.83	4.52	9.78	9.20
	Republican	39.8	36.7	41.6	41.2	37.0	35.0
	Racial Resentment	0.62	0.60	0.62	0.60	0.60	0.59
2015	Age 18-29	44.5	42.0	54.4	50.7	47.8	46.9
	Age 30-44	29.9	26.7	21.3	21.7	25.0	22.1
	Age 45-59	16.1	27.5	18.4	21.7	22.8	23.4
	Age Over 60	9.49	3.82	5.88	5.8	4.41	7.59
	College	79.1	64.5	75.8	74.8	75.2	69.9
	Female	48.9	55.7	44.9	46.8	46.0	51.7
	Conservative	32.8	26	34.6	29.5	33.6	28.3
	Moderate	27.0	29.8	25.7	28.8	24.8	25.5
	Liberal	40.1	44.3	39.7	41.7	41.6	46.2
	Democrat	44.5	43.5	46.3	51.1	53.3	52.4
	Independent	16.8	19.8	18.4	12.2	11.7	15.9
	Republican	38.7	36.6	35.3	36.7	35.0	31.7
	Racial Resentment	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49

Note: Table shows variable means across each treatment group for the 2015 and 2016 studies. We regress treatment assignment on all covariates for each treatment group separately for each sample and calculate the p-value of the observed F-statistic. In both samples, all p-values are larger than 0.10 for all experimental condition pairs.

### Appendix E

### Racial Resentment as Proxy for Latino and Immigrant Resentment?

Though racial resentment has been shown to be associated with generalized out-group prejudice and correlated with anti-Latino attitudes (Kinder and Kam 2010, Kalkan et al. 2009; Carney and Enos 2017) we wanted to test the extent to which racial resentment is an appropriate proxy for attitudes towards Latinos and Latino immigrants. As such, we analyzed a survey conducted by The Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at U.C. Berkeley in December of 2017 to analyze Californians' racial attitudes. While the sample is restricted to California, the inclusion of immigrant and racial resentment scales allow for direct comparison of the two to assess whether racial resentment explains similar variation in attitudes toward immigrants, immigration, and Latinos as immigrant resentment does. The full survey includes 500 white adult respondents and was completed online.

Our dependent variables include a 4-item immigration policy scale that combines responses to attitudes toward four different potential approaches to immigration policy, a Latino feeling thermometer, and an immigrant feeling thermometer. For the immigration policy scale, respondents were asked "how important a goal should each of the followed be for immigration policy in the U.S.?" 1) Increasing deportations of immigrants currently in the country without documentation; 2) Establishing a way for all immigrants who came to the country without documentation to stay here; 3) Allowing immigrants who came to the country without documentation as children to remain in the U.S. and apply for legal status; and 4) Building a 1,900 mile wall along the entire U.S.-Mexico border.

Our key independent variables were either racial resentment (see Appendix B for wording) or immigrant resentment (which is identical to racial resentment but replaces "blacks" with "immigrants" and removed references to slavery). The two are correlated at r=0.73. Control variables include partisanship, ideology, gender, education, age, and marital status. All models are OLS.

In Table E.1 we present regression results. Columns 1 and 2 display results of regressing immigration policy views on racial resentment (1) or immigrant resentment (2) with full controls. Columns 3 and 4 present results for Latino thermometer ratings regressed on racial resentment (3) or immigrant resentment (4). Finally, columns 5 and 6 present results for immigrant thermometer ratings regressed on racial resentment (5) or immigrant resentment (6). We find that the association between racial resentment and each outcome is almost identical to the association between immigrant resentment and each outcome, suggesting that racial resentment is an appropriate proxy.

	Dependent variable:					
	Immigration	Therm	Latinos	Therm Immigrants		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Racial Resentment Scale	0.425***		-27.680***		-30.610***	
	(0.042)		(4.985)		(5.230)	
Immigrant Resentment Scale		0.596***		-28.614***		-32.691***
		(0.042)		(5.431)		(5.688)
Party ID (7pt R)	0.031***	$0.024^{***}$	-0.766	-0.700	-2.239***	-2.129***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.651)	(0.659)	(0.683)	(0.690)
Conservative	0.051***	$0.045^{***}$	-0.182	-0.367	0.049	-0.097
	(0.010)	(0.009)	(1.222)	(1.221)	(1.282)	(1.279)
Male	0.003	0.006	-1.658	-1.991	0.904	0.551
	(0.018)	(0.017)	(2.199)	(2.203)	(2.307)	(2.307)
College	-0.020	-0.011	-2.251	-2.457	1.809	1.545
	(0.018)	(0.017)	(2.196)	(2.206)	(2.304)	(2.310)
Age	-0.002***	-0.002***	0.043	0.050	0.096	0.105
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.065)	(0.065)	(0.068)	(0.069)
Married	-0.016	-0.009	-5.111**	-5.316**	-2.112	-2.369
	(0.021)	(0.019)	(2.502)	(2.511)	(2.625)	(2.630)
Constant	0.031	-0.022	87.882***	89.343***	84.781***	86.600***
	(0.036)	(0.034)	(4.334)	(4.412)	(4.547)	(4.620)
Observations	500	500	500	500	500	500
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0.499	0.570	0.112	0.107	0.164	0.162
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.492	0.564	0.100	0.094	0.153	0.151
Residual Std. Error (df = 492)	0.235	0.218	28.141	28.224	29.524	29.559
F Statistic (df = 7; 492)	70.130***	93.331***	8.877***	8.411***	13.828***	13.632***

Note: Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses.  ${}^{*}p<0.1; {}^{**}p<0.05; {}^{***}p<0.01$ 

### Appendix F

## Regression with Covariate Adjustment, Difference-in-Means, and Negligible Effect Tests

Consistent with racial priming literature, we interact our explicit treatment with racial resentment and omit the implicit version of the appeal as the base category. Because it is difficult to interpret these interactions with omitted categories, we provide visualizations of both average support for each treatment across each level of racial resentment (Figure 3) as well as conditional average treatment effects (Figure 4) in the manuscript.

	Dependent variable:						
-			Suppor	rt Ritter			
	Latino	o Gang	Latino Ir	nmigrant	Black Gang		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Explicit Latino Gang	-0.057	-0.090***					
2	(0.036)	(0.034)					
Explicit Latino Immigrant			-0.026	0.016			
			(0.034)	(0.035)			
Explicit Black Gang					-0.031	-0.013	
					(0.035)	(0.033)	
Medium RR	0.225***	$0.097^{**}$	$0.071^{*}$	$0.200^{***}$	$0.128^{***}$	$0.185^{***}$	
	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.043)	(0.038)	
High RR	0.279***	0.149***	0.139***	$0.281^{***}$	0.185***	$0.201^{***}$	
	(0.050)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.051)	(0.041)	
Age	0.001	-0.0002	0.001	$-0.001^{*}$	-0.001	-0.001	
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	
Female	-0.007	-0.067****	0.001	-0.060***	-0.033	-0.026	
	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.021)	
College	-0.051*	0.001	-0.022	0.035	-0.014	-0.010	
	(0.030)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.024)	
Republican (3pt)	0.038**	0.063***	$0.040^{**}$	$0.088^{***}$	0.056***	0.046***	
	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.016)	
Ideology	0.001	0.020	0.098***	-0.005	0.030	$0.030^{*}$	
	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.016)	
Student Sample Dummy	-0.022	-0.083**	-0.047	-0.131***	-0.076*	-0.100***	
	(0.043)	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.033)	(0.045)	(0.032)	

### Table F.1. Regression Results for Study 1 and Study 2 Models

Lat Gang * RR Med	-0.042	0.035				
	(0.053)	(0.051)				
Lat Gang * RR High	-0.094*	-0.038				
	(0.056)	(0.050)				
Lat Imm * RR Med			-0.028	-0.045		
			(0.052)	(0.049)		
Lat Imm * RR High			0.0003	-0.122**		
			(0.053)	(0.051)		
Black Gang * RR Med					-0.030	-0.015
					(0.053)	(0.048)
Black Gang * RR High					-0.008	-0.030
					(0.054)	(0.050)
Constant	0.331****	0.430***	0.175***	0.332****	0.331***	$0.315^{***}$
	(0.076)	(0.051)	(0.067)	(0.047)	(0.074)	(0.047)
Observations	250	368	243	350	261	347
R <sup>2</sup>	0.478	0.365	0.537	0.456	0.437	0.411
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.454	0.346	0.515	0.438	0.412	0.392
Residual Std. Error	0.175 (df = 238)	0.197 (df = 356)	0.167 (df = 231)	0.191 (df = 338)	0.176 (df = 249)	0.187 (df = 335)
F Statistic	19.842 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 238)	18.640 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 356)	24.350 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 231)	25.775 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 338)	17.545 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 249)	21.254 <sup>***</sup> (df = 11; 335)

Note: Unstandardized OLS coefficients. Heteroskedastic robust standard errors in parentheses. Columns 1, 3, and 5 are for Study 1. Columns 2, 4, and 6 are for Study 2. \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

### Table F.2. Results of Simulation and Bootstrap

Dataset	Condition	Difference in	Lower 90% CI	Upper 90% CI
		Means		
2015	Latino Gang	-0.15	-0.23	-0.07
	Latino Imm	-0.03	-0.11	0.06
	Black Gang	-0.04	-0.13	0.00
2016	Latino Gang	-0.13	-0.20	-0.06
	Latino Imm	-0.11	-0.17	-0.04
	Black Gang	-0.04	-0.11	0.03

### A. Simulation Results

### **B.** Bootstrap Results

Dataset	Condition	Difference in	Lower 90%	Upper 90%	Prob <
		Means	CI	CI	-0.125
2015	Latino Gang	-0.14	-0.22	-0.06	0.62
	Latino Imm	-0.06	-0.15	0.02	0.12
	Black Gang	-0.02	-0.11	0.07	0.03
2016	Latino Gang	-0.13	-0.20	-0.06	0.52
	Latino Imm	-0.08	-0.15	-0.00	0.13
	Black Gang	-0.05	-0.12	0.02	0.05

Note: Cells indicate differences in means as well as lower and upper 90% confidence intervals for both simulation results (A; n=1000) and bootstrap results (B; n=10,000). Simulation results rely on point estimates extracted from a covariate adjusted model. Bootstrap results rely solely on difference-in-means tests with no covariate adjustment. Table B additionally reports the proportion of difference-in-means estimates from the bootstrap that fell below our threshold value (substantive effect) of -0.125. All results are calculated only among respondents who score in the top tercile of racial resentment as estimated independently within each sample.

### References

- Carney, Riley K, and Ryan D Enos. 2017. "Conservatism and Fairness in Contemporary Politics: Unpacking the Psychological Underpinnings of Modern Racism." Working paper. <u>https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rkcarney/files/carneyenos.pdf</u>
- Groshek, Jacob. 2008. "Homogenous Agenda, Disparate Frames: CNN and CNN International Coverage Online." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 52(1): 52-68.
- Kalkan, Kerem Ozan, Geoffrey C. Layman, and Eric M. Uslaner. 2009. "'Bands of Others'?
  Attitudes toward Muslims in Contemporary American Society." *The Journal of Politics* 71 (3): 847.
- Kinder, Donald, and Cindy Kam. 2010. Us Against Them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion. University of Chicago Press.