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**Section A: Respondent Demographics**

*Party Identification (includes leaners)*

Democrat 1,514 (60%)

Independent 320 (13%)

Republican 702 (28%)

The party identification variable used in the model is coded 1 for independents (baseline), 2 Democrat, 3 Republican. This includes leaners.

*Ideology*

Very liberal 441 (17%)

Liberal 581 (23%)

Lean liberal 605 (24%)

Lean conservative 474 (19%)

Conservative 313 (12%)

Very conservative 122 (5%)

In the model this is coded 1-6 where an increase is an increase in Conservatism.

*Gender*

Male 1,160 (46%)

Female 1,325 (52%)

Non-binary 51 (2%)

In the model this is coded 1 for those who identify as female and 0 else.

*Age*

18 – 85, mean 41, median 39

Raw number in the model.

*Race*

What is your race? (Select all that apply)

American Indian/Alaska Native 18 (.71%)

Asian 210 (8.28%)

Black or African American 239 (9.42%)

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander 3 (.12%)

White 1,901 (75%)

Other 63 (2.48%)

Coding for the control variable used in the models is 1 for white and 0 else.

*Ethnicity (Hispanic or Latino/a)*

Yes 235 (9%)

No 2,301 (91%)

*Political Knowledge*

0 – 4, mean 3, median 3

*Political Interest*

2-8, mean 5.8, median 6

*Household Income*

Less than $10,000 (n = 136, 5%)

$10,000-$19,999 (n = 146, 6%)

$20,000-$29,999 (n = 210, 8%)

$30,000-$39,999 (n = 249, 10%)

$40,000 - $49,999 (n = 222, 9%)

$50,000 - $59,999 (n = 240, 9%)

$60,000 - $69,999 (n = 231, 9%)

$70,000 - $79,999 (n = 199, 8%)

$80,000 - $89,999 (n = 140, 6%)

$90,000 - $99,999 (n = 148, 6%)

$100,000 - $119,999 (n = 178, 7%)

$120,000-$149,999 (n = 194, 8%)

$150,000-$199,999 (n = 120, 5%)

$200,000-$249,999 (n = 57, 2%)

$250,000 or more (n = 66, 3%)

This is left as 1-15 in the model.

*Racial Resentment*

0 – 16, mean 5.8, median 5

*Ethnic Resentment*

0 – 16, mean 6.4, median 6

We used the question batter from Kinder and Sanders (1996) to measure racial and ethnic resentment. We had two separate matrixes measuring racial and ethnic resentment. Responses we coded so that an increase indicates an increase in resentment. The questions are as follows:

Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.

It's 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.

Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.

For ethnic resentment we replaced the word “Black” with “Hispanic.” For the first question we also eliminated the word “slavery” to read: “Generations of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Hispanics to work their way out of the lower class.”

*Sexism*

0 - 8, mean 2.67, median 2

The two questions below were used to proxy sexist attitudes by adding responses together.Scores were coded so that the higher the score, the more sexist attitudes held.

How serious a problem is discrimination against women in the United States?
Not a problem at all (1)
A minor problem (2)
A moderately serious problem (3)
A very serious problem (4)
An extremely serious problem (5)

This question above was adapted from the Modern Sexism Scale (Swim et. al., 1995)

When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors?
Never (1)
Some of the time (2)
About half of the time (3)
Most of the time (4)
Always (5)

The question above was adapted from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996).

**Section B: Number of Respondents per Condition**

Table A1: Number of Respondents per Condition

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **n** |
| Control (not physical) | 260 |
| Control (physical) | 267 |
| Ethnicity (not physical) | 261 |
| Ethnicity (physical) | 241 |
| Gender DV (not physical) | 253 |
| Gender DV (physical) | 259 |
| Gender SH (not physical) | 253 |
| Gender SH (physical) | 242 |
| Race (not physical) | 254 |
| Race (physical) | 246 |

**Section C: Raw Means of Dependent Variables by Treatment Condition**

Table A2: Raw Means of Judge is a Threat to Rights

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Threat to women | Threat to racial minorities | Threat to ethnic minorities |
| Control (not physical) | 2.38 | 2.43 | 2.41 |
| Control (physical) | 2.37 | 2.39 | 2.36 |
| Ethnicity (not physical) | 3.08 | 4.12 | 4.18 |
| Ethnicity (physical) | 2.90 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| Gender DV (not physical) | 4.75 | 3.57 | 3.58 |
| Gender DV (physical) | 4.27 | 3.03 | 3.05 |
| Gender SH (not physical) | 4.35 | 3.26 | 3.20 |
| Gender SH (physical) | 3.99 | 2.94 | 2.92 |
| Race (not physical) | 3.30 | 4.55 | 4.47 |
| Race (physical) | 2.99 | 4.26 | 4.20 |

Table A3: Raw Means of Judge Will Rule Fairly on Matters Related to

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women | Racial minorities | Ethnic minorities |
| Control (not physical) | 3.99 | 3.93 | 3.93 |
| Control (physical) | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.07 |
| Ethnicity (not physical) | 3.43 | 2.63 | 2.59 |
| Ethnicity (physical) | 3.32 | 2.51 | 2.50 |
| Gender DV (not physical) | 2.35 | 3.12 | 3.11 |
| Gender DV (physical) | 2.69 | 3.53 | 3.52 |
| Gender SH (not physical) | 2.58 | 3.30 | 3.34 |
| Gender SH (physical) | 3.04 | 3.63 | 3.64 |
| Race (not physical) | 3.36 | 2.47 | 2.50 |
| Race (physical) | 3.39 | 2.78 | 2.78 |

**Section D: Attention Check Questions**

Do you recall the gender of the judge referred to in the story?

Correct 2,482 (98%)

Incorrect 54 (2%)

Do you recall the ideological leaning of the judge referred to in the story?

Correct (not stated) 2,166 (85%)

Incorrect (conservative) 318 (13%)

Incorrect (liberal) 52 (2%)

**Section E: Models Including Control Variables**
**Table A4: Judge is a Threat to Rights**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable(Treatment Condition) | Threat to Women | Threat to Racial Minorities | Threat to Ethnic Minorities |
| Control (physical) | -.026(.097) | -.051(.100) | -.062(.098) |
| Ethnicity Targeted (not physical) | .629\*\*\*(.097) | 1.63\*\*\*(.100) | 1.70\*\*\*(.099) |
| Ethnicity Targeted (physical) | .432\*\*\*(.099) | 1.86\*\*\*(.102) | 1.90\*\*\*(.101) |
| Gender Targeted (DV-not physical) | 2.23\*\*\*(.098) | .999\*\*\*(.101) | 1.03\*\*\*(.100) |
| Gender Targeted (DV- physical) | 1.82\*\*\*(.097) | .528\*\*\*(.101) | .561\*\*\*(.099) |
| Gender Targeted (SH-not physical) | 1.89\*\*\*(.098) | .757\*\*\*(.101) | .718\*\*\*(.100) |
| Gender Targeted (SH- physical) | 1.51\*\*\*(.099) | .424\*\*\*(.102) | .412\*\*\*(.101) |
| Race Targeted (not physical) | .827\*\*\*(.098) | 2.03\*\*\*(.101) | 1.97\*\*\*(.100) |
| Race Targeted (physical) | .497\*\*\*(.099) | 1.71\*\*\*(.102) | 1.67\*\*\*(.100) |
| Female | .077(.046) | -.023(.048) | .009(.047) |
| Democrat | .078(.075) | .149(.078) | .135(.076) |
| Republican | -.067(.082) | .020(.084) | .016(.083) |
| Ideology (Conservatism) | -.113\*\*\*(.027) | -.141\*\*\*(.028) | -.151\*\*\*(.027) |
| White | -.088(.051) | -.172\*\*\*(.053) | -.181\*\*\*(.052) |
| Income | -.014\*(.006) | -.000(.006) | -.003(.006) |
| Racial Resentment | .005(.010) | -.018(.011) | -.010(.011) |
| Ethnic Resentment | -.038\*\*\*(.011) | -.042\*\*\*(.011) | -.049\*\*\*(.011) |
| Sexism | -.157\*\*\*(.017) | -.124\*\*\*(.018) | -.126\*\*\*(.017) |
| Constant | 3.53\*\*\*(.138) | 3.68\*\*\*(.142) | 3.72\*\*\*(.140) |
| NR2 | 2,536.45 | 2,536.44 | 2,536.45 |

Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is non-physical control. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test).
Corresponds to Table 2 in the manuscript.

**Table A5: Judge Will Rule Fairly on Matters Related to the rights of…**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable(Treatment Condition) | Women | Racial Minorities | Ethnic Minorities |
| Control (physical) | .113(.090) | .146(.095) | .157(.094) |
| Ethnicity Targeted (not physical) | -.489\*\*\*(.091) | -1.23\*\*\*(.095) | -1.27\*\*\*(.094) |
| Ethnicity Targeted (physical) | -.581\*\*\*(.093) | -1.34\*\*\*(.097) | -1.35\*\*\*(.096) |
| Gender Targeted (DV-not physical) | -1.50\*\*\*(.091) | -.676\*\*\*(.096) | -.686\*\*\*(.095) |
| Gender Targeted (DV- physical) | -1.21\*\*\*(.091) | -.320\*\*\*(.095) | -.323\*\*\*(.095) |
| Gender Targeted (SH-not physical) | -1.34\*\*\*(.092) | -.564\*\*\*(.096) | -.521\*\*\*(.095) |
| Gender Targeted (SH- physical) | -.856\*\*\*(.093) | -.219\*(.097) | -.201\*(.096) |
| Race Targeted (not physical) | -.544\*\*\*(.091) | -1.38\*\*\*(.096) | -1.34\*\*\*(.095) |
| Race Targeted (physical) | -.477\*\*\*(.092) | -1.04\*\*\*(.097) | -1.03\*\*\*(.096) |
| Female | -.048(.043) | -.032(.045) | -.012(.045) |
| Democrat | -.027(.070) | -.146\*(.073) | -.165\*(.073) |
| Republican | .107(.076) | .028(.080) | .028(.079) |
| Ideology (Conservatism) | .156\*\*\*(.025) | .131\*\*\*(.026) | .126\*\*\*(.026) |
| White | .021(.048) | .104\*(.050) | .081(.050) |
| Income | .008(.005) | .004(.006) | .000(.006) |
| Racial Resentment | .013(.010) | .024\*(.010) | .016(.010) |
| Ethnic Resentment | .028\*\*(.010) | .031\*\*(.011) | .037\*\*\*(.011) |
| Sexism | .142\*\*\*(.016) | .115\*\*\*(.017) | .127\*\*\*(.017) |
| Constant | 2.75\*\*\*(.129) | 2.81\*\*\*(.134) | 2.84\*\*\*(.134) |
| NR2 | 2,536.40 | 2,536.38 | 2,536.39 |

Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is non-physical control. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test)
Corresponds to Table 3 in manuscript.

**Section F: Comparing Effect Sizes**

The manuscript reports differences in effect sizes between treatment groups. For example, in the non-physical sexual harassment condition, where a woman was the target of the misconduct, there was a 1.89-point increase in stating the judge was a threat to the rights of women, relative to the control (p < .001). However, there were only a .757 and .718-point increases in stating the judge was a threat to the rights of racial and ethnic minorities, respectively, relative to the control (p < .001 and p < .001, respectively). That is over a 1-point difference between agreement with the judge being a threat to the rights of women and the judge being a threat to the rights of racial and ethnic minorities.

Here, we demonstrate that these differences are statistically significant. For simplicity (since there are 10 discriminatory misconduct conditions to compare to each other) we pool conditions as either discriminatory towards women, racial minorities, or ethnic minorities. The variable is coded so that the control conditions (physical and non-physical) are coded 0, the ethnic discrimination conditions are coded 1, gender discrimination conditions are coded 2, and racial discrimination conditions are coded 3. Then we compare effect sizes across these groups (as opposed to the control) by determining the appropriate reference group. The models include full demographic controls, similar to the manuscript, which are not reported for simplicity.

As demonstrated in Table A6 below, we see statistically significant differences when using gender discrimination as the baseline. In other words, respondents in the racial and ethnic discrimination conditions are less likely to say the judge is a threat to women and more likely to state the judge is a threat to the rights of racial and ethnic minorities, compared to those in the gender discrimination conditions. Similarly, they’re more likely to state the judge will rule fairly in cases related to women’s issues and less likely to state the judge will rule fairly in cases related to racial and ethnic minorities.

The reverse is true when we use racial discrimination (Table A7) and ethnic discrimination (Table A8) as the baselines. In these scenarios, in the gender discrimination conditions we see respondents are more likely to state the judge is a threat to the rights of women and less able to rule fairly on cases pertaining to women, relative to those in the racial and ethnic discrimination conditions. Respondents in the gender discrimination conditions are less likely to agree that the judge is a threat to the rights of racial and ethnic minorities and more likely to state he is able to rule fairly in cases pertaining to the rights of racial and ethnic minorities, relative to those in the racial and ethnic discrimination conditions.

We do not see differences in effect sizes when comparing the racial and ethnic discrimination conditions to each other.

**Table A6: Threat to Rights and Ability to Full Fairly Across Treatments (Discrimination towards women as baseline)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable(Treatment Condition) |  Threat to Women |  Threat to Racial Minorities |  Threat to Ethnic Minorities |  Rule Fairly Women |  Rule Fairly Racial Minorities |  Rule Fairly Ethnic Minorities |
| Controls | -1.88\*\*\*(.060) | -.705\*\*\*(.062) | -.714\*\*\*(.061) | 1.29\*\*\*(.056) | .520\*\*\*(.059) | .514\*\*\*(.058) |
| Ethnicity Targeted | -1.33\*\*\*(.061) | 1.06\*\*\*(.063) | 1.11\*\*\*(.062) | .698\*\*\*(.057) | -.840\*\*\*(.060) | -.872\*\*\*(.059) |
| Race Targeted   | -1.20\*\*\*(.061) | 1.20\*\*\*(.063) | 1.14\*\*\*(.062) | .720\*\*\*(.057) | -.768\*\*\*(.060) | -.753\*\*\*(.059) |

Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is discrimination towards women. Control variables also included for respondent gender, party identification, ideology (conservatism), race (white), income, racial resentment, ethnic resentment, sexism, not included for simplicity. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table A7: Threat to Rights and Ability to Full Fairly Across Treatments (discrimination towards racial minorities as baseline)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable(Treatment Condition) |  Threat to Women |  Threat to Racial Minorities |  Threat to Ethnic Minorities |  Rule Fairly Women |  Rule Fairly Racial Minorities |  Rule Fairly Ethnic Minorities |
| Controls | -.678\*\*\*(.070) | -1.90\*\*\*(.072) | -1.86\*\*\*(.071) | .569\*\*\*(.065) | 1.29\*\*\*(.068) | 1.27\*\*\*(.068) |
| Ethnicity Targeted | -.130(.071) | -.134(.073) | -.031(.072) | -.022(.066) | -.072(.069) | -.118(.068) |
| Gender Targeted   | 1.20\*\*\*(.061) | -1.20\*\*\*(.063) | -1.14\*\*\*(.062) | -.720\*\*\*(.057) | .768\*\*\*(.060) | .753\*\*\*(.059) |

Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is discrimination towards racial minorities. Control variables also included for respondent gender, party identification, ideology (conservatism), race (white), income, racial resentment, ethnic resentment, sexism, not included for simplicity. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test)

**Table A8: Threat to Rights and Ability to Full Fairly Across Treatments (discrimination towards ethnic minorities as baseline)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable(Treatment Condition) |  Threat to Women |  Threat to Racial Minorities |  Threat to Ethnic Minorities |  Rule Fairly Women |  Rule Fairly Racial Minorities |  Rule Fairly Ethnic Minorities |
| Controls | -.548\*\*\*(.070) | -1.77\*\*\*(.072) | -1.82\*\*\*(.071) | .591\*\*\*(.065) | 1.36\*\*\*(.068) | 1.39\*\*\*(.068) |
| Gender Targeted | 1.33\*\*\*(.061) | -1.06\*\*\*(.063) | -1.11\*\*\*(.062) | -.698\*\*\*(.057) | .840\*\*\*(.060) | .872\*\*\*(.059) |
| Race Targeted   | .130(.071) | .134(.073) | .031(.072) | .022(.066) | .072(.069) | .118(.068) |

Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is discrimination towards ethnic minorities. Control variables also included for respondent gender, party identification, ideology (conservatism), race (white), income, racial resentment, ethnic resentment, sexism, not included for simplicity. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test)

**Section G: Group Specific Responses**

One possibility is that judicial misconduct elicits distrust across the board, rather than threat towards specific groups, as we report in the manuscript. Fortunately, we have data that allows us to rule out this possibility. Our survey also included questions about whether the judge was viewed as a threat to the rights of men and whites.

The table below demonstrates that the judge is only viewed as a threat to men in the ethnicity targeted (physical) condition and the two race targeted conditions, but not the gender targeted conditions. This makes sense theoretically, as it demonstrates that a judge accused of discrimination towards women is not viewed as a threat to men. It also makes sense in that a judge who discriminates against a racial or ethnic group is viewed as a threat to men as well as women since racial and ethnic minorities can be either men or women. Relatedly, Table A9 demonstrates that judges accused of racial or ethnic discrimination are not viewed as threat to whites. However, a judge accused of gender discrimination is, as this can include white women as well as women of color. This demonstrates that respondents are differentiating threat among different groups based on their treatment condition.

**Table A9: Group Specific Responses: Judge is a…**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   |  |  |
|  Independent Variable(Treatment Condition)  | Threat toMen  |  Threat toWhites |
|  Control (physical) | .044 | .063 |
|   | (.099) | (.094) |
|  Ethnicity Targeted (not physical) | .197\* | -.119 |
|   | (.099) | (.095) |
|  Ethnicity Targeted (physical) | .187 | -.177 |
|   | (.101) | (.097) |
|  Gender Targeted (DV- not physical) | .148 | .503\*\*\* |
|   | (.100) | (.096) |
|  Gender Targeted (DV - physical) | .133 | .276\*\* |
|   | (.099) | (.095) |
|  Gender Targeted (SH - not physical) | -.058 | .260\*\* |
|   | (.100) | (.096) |
|  Gender Targeted (SH - physical) | .068 | .154 |
|   | (.101) | (.097) |
|  Race Targeted (not physical) | .333\*\*\* | .167 |
|   | (.100) | (.096) |
|  Race Targeted (physical) | .266\*\* | -.143 |
|   | (.101) | (.096) |
|  Female | -.151\*\*\* | -.042 |
|   | (.047) | (.045) |
|  Democrat | .003 | .088 |
|   | (.077) | (.073) |
|  Republican | -.198\* | -.092 |
|   | (.083) | (.080) |
|  Ideology (Conservatism) | .042 | .040 |
|   | (.027) | (.026) |
|  White | -.200\*\*\* | -.013 |
|   | (.053) | (.050) |
|  Income | -.014\* | -.012\* |
|   | (.006) | (.006) |
|  Racial Resentment | .016 | .011 |
|   | (.011) | (.010) |
|  Ethnic Resentment | -.041\*\*\* | -.012 |
|   | (.011) | (.011) |
|  Sexism | -.017 | -.016 |
|   | (.018) | (.017) |
|  Constant | 2.657\*\*\* | 2.142\*\*\* |
|   | (.141) | (.135) |
|  N | 2,536 | 2,536 |
|  R2 | .045 | .041 |
| Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is non-physical control. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test). Table made with the help of asdoc (Shah 2018).  |

**Section H: CloudResearch Connect Platform**

The Connect platform by CloudResearch (formerly known as TurkPrime) initially worked with MTurk to provide screeners for higher quality participants. They then created Prime Panels which recruit independently from MTurk, as does the Connect platform. They aim to provide researchers with high quality data by closely vetting and screening participants. This screening includes technical checks to ensure respondents do not send multiple responses from one IP address, monthly data quality checks, and similar to other platforms, researchers can flag participants that provide low quality responses (Hartman et. al. 2023). A 2023 study in PLOS ONE compared MTurk, CloudResearch, Qualtrics, and SONA (Douglas, Ewell, and Brauer 2023). While they did not specifically address the CloudResearch Connect platform itself, they assessed CloudResearch’s MTurk Toolkit which uses some of the same data quality features mentioned above. The findings indicated Prolific and CloudResearch provided higher quality data compared to MTurk, Qualtrics, and SONA (Douglas, Ewell, and Brauer 2023).

In their [internal white paper](https://www.cloudresearch.com/introducing-connect-by-cloudresearch/), data quality monitoring is elaborated on. For example, in monthly attention checks given to respondents on the platform at random, 96-98% of respondents passed the attention checks. CloudResearch also requires respondents to do a series of tests and quality checks during the onboarding process to ensure respondents follow directions, pay attention, answer honestly, and show language proficiency.

Further, our sample demographics (section A of supplementary materials) are close to U.S. demographics (for example, the average age in U.S. is 38, ours is 41; white population in U.S. is 75.5%, ours was 75%). Table 1 on page 8 of the Douglas, Ewell, and Brauer (2023) article provides sample demographics across platforms and can serve as a comparison to our sample demographics (section A of supplemental materials).

**Section I: Respondent Party**

Inferred Judge was Conservative by Party Identification:

77% of Independents

86% of Democrats

70% of Republicans

**Table A10: Republican Respondents Only: Judge is a threat to the rights of…**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable (Treatment Condition) | Women | Racial Minorities | Ethnic Minorities |
|  Control (physical) | .217 | .176 | .165 |
|   | (.175) | (.188) | (.186) |
|  Ethnicity Targeted (not physical) | .238 | 1.14\*\*\* | 1.20\*\*\* |
|   | (.182) | (.196) | (.194) |
|  Ethnicity Targeted (physical) | .059 | 1.49\*\*\* | 1.48\*\*\* |
|   | (.183) | (.197) | (.195) |
|  Gender Targeted (DV-not physical) | 2.40\*\*\* | .804\*\*\* | .781\*\*\* |
|   | (.188) | (.202) | (.200) |
|  Gender Targeted (DV-physical) | 1.71\*\*\* | .495\* | .481\* |
|   | (.183) | (.197) | (.195) |
|  Gender Targeted (SH-not physical) | 1.77\*\*\* | .596\*\* | .560\*\* |
|   | (.177) | (.191) | (.188) |
|  Gender Targeted (SH-physical) | 1.48\*\*\* | .443\* | .468\* |
|   | (.182) | (.196) | (.194) |
|  Race Targeted (not physical) | .579\*\*\* | 1.65\*\*\* | 1.54\*\*\* |
|   | (.179) | (.193) | (.190) |
|  Race Targeted (physical) | .241 | 1.18\*\*\* | 1.17\*\*\* |
|   | (.185) | (.199) | (.197) |
|  Female | .191\* | -.033 | -.040 |
|   | (.087) | (.093) | (.092) |
|  Conservatism | -.026 | -.051 | -.067 |
|   | (.052) | (.056) | (.056) |
|  White | -.116 | -.185 | -.190 |
|   | (.113) | (.121) | (.120) |
|  Income | -.022\* | -.018 | -.023\* |
|   | (.011) | (.012) | (.012) |
|  Racial Resentment | .001 | -.018 | -.023 |
|   | (.018) | (.019) | (.019) |
|  Ethnic Resentment | -.036 | -.049\* | -.042\* |
|   | (.02) | (.021) | (.021) |
|  Sexism | -.153\*\*\* | -.149\*\*\* | -.157\*\*\* |
|   | (.027) | (.029) | (.029) |
|  Constant | 3.196\*\*\* | 3.79\*\*\* | 3.903\*\*\* |
|   | (.297) | (.320) | (.316) |
|  N | 702 | 702 | 702 |
|  R2 | .435 | .282 | .286 |
| Entries are OLS estimates. Baseline is non-physical control. \* p ≤ .05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed test). |
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