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# **SURVEY ADMINISTRATION**

This image-based conjoint experiment was embedded in a nationally representative omnibus survey conducted in Mexico between August 27 and October 19, 2018. The omnibus survey was funded by the Social Science Experimentation Unit’s Lab of the Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE) and fielded by the Mexican polling firm Data OPM. The survey was based on probability sampling of Mexicans 18 years or above and the survey was administered on tablets using SurveyToGo. A total of 1,206 face-to-face surveys were conducted after visiting 4,544 households, which represents a response rate of 27%.

# **SURVEY WORDING AND QUESTIONS**

**Introduction**

* *English*: “The following are images of two people that work in law enforcement. Please observe both images carefully and answer the following questions.”
* *Spanish*: “A continuación te voy a mostrar imágenes de dos personas que trabajan en seguridad pública. Por favor obsérvalas cuidadosamente y contesta las siguientes preguntas.”

**Effectiveness, rating**

* *English*: “How would you rate their effectiveness?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Not at all effective to Very effective.
* *Spanish*: “¿Cómo calificaría la efectividad de esta persona?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Poca to Mucha.

**Civil liberties, rating**

* *English*: “To what extent do you think they respect civil liberties?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Never respects civil liberties to Always respects civil liberties.
* *Spanish*: “¿Hasta qué punto una persona así respeta libertades civiles?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Poco probable to Muy probable.

**Corruption, rating**

* *English*: “How prone to engaging in corruption do you think they are?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Not at all prone to Very prone.
* *Spanish*: ¿Qué tan probable es que una persona así cometa actos de corrupción? Response categories: 10-point scale from Poco probable to Muy probable.

**Neighborhood, rating**

* *English*: “To what extent would you support or oppose them in your neighborhood?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Strongly oppose to Strongly support.
* *Spanish*: “¿Qué tan de acuerdo estaría con que una persona así participe en su municipio?” Response categories: 10-point scale from Poco to Mucho.

# **DATA DESCRIPTION**

**Table A.1** Respondent characteristics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHARACTERISTIC** | **DESCRIPTION** | **MEAN** | **MIN** | **MAX** | **SD** |
| **Age** | Age | 41.98 | 18 | 87 | 16.11 |
| **Gender** | Gender | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 |
| **Education** | Education level (categorical) | 3.18 | 1 | 7 | 1.08 |
| **Income** | Household monthly income (categorical) | 3.36 | 1 | 8 | 1.36 |
| **Ideology** | Where would you locate yourself in this political scale [1 Left to 10 Right]? | 5.02 | 1 | 10 | 2.69 |
| **Victimization** | Have you been a victim of a crime in the past 12 months? | 0.24 | 0 | 1 | 0.43 |
| **Trust in the military** | In a scale from 1 to 7, how much do you trust the Mexican army? | 4.6 | 1 | 7 | 1.94 |
| **Party ID** | Political Party Identification with: |  |  |  |  |
| **PRI** | Partido Revolucionario Institucional | 0.14 | 0 | 1 | 0.34 |
| **PAN** | Partido Acción Nacional | 0.10 | 0 | 1 | 0.30 |
| **PRD** | Partido de la Revolución Democrática | 0.04 | 0 | 1 | 0.20 |
| **Morena** | Morena | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 0.51 |
| **PVEM** | Partido Verde Ecologista de México | 0.017 | 0 | 1 | 0.13 |
| **PT** | Partido del Trabajo | 0.006 | 0 | 1 | 0.04 |
| **PES** | Partido Encuentro Social | 0.001 | 0 | 1 | 0.04 |
| **MC** | Movimiento Ciudadano | 0.017 | 0 | 1 | 0.13 |
| **None** | No party | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.37 |

# **BALANCE TEST**

Although respondents’ potential choices are orthogonal to the profiles they will see in the experiment by design in randomized conjoint analysis, we nonetheless conducted a multivariate balance check to assess if our sample is well balanced in terms of respondent characteristics. To do so, as suggested by Hainmueller et al (2013), we regressed respondent characteristics on indicator variables for all attributes and test for their joint significance. As shown in table A.2, the experimental groups are well balanced.

**Table A.2** Balance check

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTIC** | **JOINT F-TEST** | **P-VALUE FOR THE JOINT F-TEST** |
| **Sex** | 0.05 | 0.99 |
| **Income** | 0.67 | 0.62 |
| **Age** | 1.06 | 0.38 |
| **Education** | 0.85 | 0.49 |
| **Victimization** | 0.47 | 0.75 |
| **Trust in the military** | 1.34 | 0.25 |
| **Ideology** | 0.30 | 0.88 |
| **Party ID** | 0.52 | 0.72 |

# **PHOTOS OF SOLDIERS AND POLICE OFFICERS IN MEXICO**

In this section in figure A1 we provide some images of police officers and soldiers in Mexico to show that the images presented in the experiment are fairly typical in that country. Most police officers wear blue uniforms and darker bulletproof vests (there is some variation within police organizations and across specialized units) and most soldiers wear an olive-green camouflaged uniform. Both can often be found carrying long weapons.

**Figure A1.** Photos of police officers and soldiers involved in domestic policing in Mexico

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description and link to article** | **Photo** |
| Joint operation in the state of Michoacán  <https://cuartopodermichoacan.com/ejercito-y-policia-ya-cubren-vacio-de-gendarmeria-en-morelia/> | Ejército y Policía ya cubren vacío de Gendarmería en Morelia – Cuarto Poder  Michoacán |
| Marines and Acapulco police  <https://elcomercio.pe/mundo/latinoamerica/mexico-militares-desarman-policia-acapulco-sospechas-criminales-infiltrados-noticia-561575-noticia/> | Latinoamérica: Militares desarman a la policía de Acapulco por sospechas de  criminale | NOTICIAS EL COMERCIO PERÚ |
| Joint operation in the state of Puebla  <https://www.tehuacan.gob.mx/web/noticia.php?id=1342> | Pagina Oficial del H. Ayuntamiento de Tehuacán Puebla 2018- 2021 |
| Joint Operation in the state of Puebla <https://imagenpoblana.com/18/12/06/sedena-y-ssptm-robustecen-el-operativo-pasajero-seguro-en-puebla> | A person standing in front of a building  Description automatically generated |
| Joint Operation in Tijuana  <https://www.uniradioinforma.com/noticias/tijuana/555643/refuerzan-fuerzas-federales-operativos-en-tijuana.html> | Refuerzan 'Fuerzas Federales' operativos en Tijuana |
| Joint operations in Mazatlán  <http://mazatlaninforma.com/%EF%BB%BFciudadanos-ven-con-buenos-ojos-operativos-de-proximidad-social-de-la-policia-militar-policia-estatal-preventiva-y-policia-federal/> | Ciudadanos ven con buenos ojos operativos de Proximidad Social de la Policía  Militar, Policía Estatal Preventiva y Policía Federal | Mazatlán Informa |

# **BENCHMARK REGRESSION**

In this section we report the regression results for the benchmark models that compute the Average Marginal Component Effects presented graphically in the manuscript.

**Regression results for AMCEs (figure 5 in main text)**

The dependent variables take on the following values:

* *Effectiveness*: 10-point scale from Not at all effective to Very effective, rescaled to standard deviations.
* *Civil liberties*: 10-point scale from Never respects civil liberties to Always respects civil liberties, rescaled to standard deviations.
* *Corruption*: 10-point scale from Not at all prone to Very prone, rescaled to standard deviations.
* *Neighborhood*: 10-point scale from Strongly oppose to Strongly support, rescaled to standard deviations.

The independent variables are dummy variables that measure the security personnel attributes – uniform, weapon, sex and skin color. Uniform takes the value of one if the security personnel is wearing a military uniform and zero if police uniform. Weapon takes the value of one if the security personnel is carrying an assault rifle and zero if not. Gender takes a value of one if the security personnel is male and zero if female. Skin color takes the value of one if the security personnel has light skin color and zero if darker skin color.

**Table A.3** Regression results for ratings, full sample

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effectiveness** | | **Civil Liberties** | | **Corruption** | | **Neighborhood** | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **COEFF** | **SE** | **COEFF** | **SE** | **COEFF** | **SE** | **COEFF** | **SE** |
| **Military uniform** | 0.08 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.04) | -0.07 | (0.04) | 0.01 | (0.04) |
| **Assault rifle** | 0.13 | (0.04) | 0.13 | (0.04) | 0.05 | (0.04) | 0.09 | (0.04) |
| **Male** | 0.01 | (0.04) | -0.08 | (0.04) | 0.08 | (0.04) | -0.05 | (0.04) |
| **Light skin color** | 0.04 | (0.04) | 0.04 | (0.04) | -0.02 | (0.04) | -0.01 | (0.04) |

Note: This table shows regression coefficients and robust standard errors clustered by respondent.

# **ROBUSTNESS CHECK**

While the results in the manuscript focused on security personnel ratings, we also asked respondents to choose which image was more effective (forced choice) in order to make sure that results were not sensitive to answer choices. As seen in Figure A.2, we get similar results between the forced choice effectiveness question versus the effectiveness rating question. Military uniform increases the probability of choosing a security personnel as more effective by 9.6 percentage points and an assault rifle increases the probability by 14.8 percentage points. Gender attributes do not change which security personnel is chosen as more effective, while light skin color is associated with a 3.8 percentage point decrease in the probability of choosing a security personnel as more effective – though this effect is only significant at the 90% level.

**Figure A.2** Effects of attributes on the probability of being chosen as more effective



Note: This plot shows estimates of the randomly assigned attributes (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color) in the probability of selecting an image as more effective. Estimates are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust SE clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. The points without bars represent the reference category for each attribute.

**Question wording for effectiveness, forced choice**

* *English*: “Which of these two people is most effective in law enforcement?” Response categories: Person 1, Person 2.
* *Spanish*: “¿Cuál de las dos personas consideras que es más efectiva en seguridad pública?” Response categories: Persona 1, Persona 2.

**Regression results for AMCEs on effectiveness, forced choice**

The dependent variable “Who is more effective” takes the value of one if the security personnel profile is preferred by the respondent and zero otherwise. The independent variables are dummy variables that measure the security personnel attributes – uniform, weapon, sex and skin color. Uniform takes the value of one if the security personnel is wearing a military uniform and zero if police uniform. Weapon takes the value of one if the security personnel is carrying an assault rifle and zero if not. Gender takes a value of one if the security personnel is male and zero if female. Skin color takes the value of one if the security personnel has light skin color and zero if darker skin color.

**Table A.4** Regression results for effectiveness forced choice

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **COEFFICIENT** | **SE** |
| **Military uniform** | 0.096 | (0.020) |
| **Assault rifle** | 0.148 | (0.020) |
| **Male** | -0.002 | (0.020) |
| **Light skin color** | -0.038 | (0.020) |
| **Observations:** 2410 | | |
| **Number of respondents:** 1205 | | |

Note: This table shows regression coefficients and robust standard errors clustered by respondent.

# **HETEROGENEOUS EFFECTS (ADDITIONAL RESULTS OF INTEREST)**

## **DIFFERENCES IN AVERAGE MARGINAL COMPONENT EFFECTS BY SUBGROUP**

This section graphically presents tests of the *differences* in Average Marginal Component Effects of the full sample baseline model by subgroups of respondents. Except for ideology and party identification, we divided groups by below and above the median value.

The subgroup analysis includes graphical summaries for:

* Age: 18-40 years old vs over 40 years old. **Figure A**.3
* Gender: female vs. male. **Figure A**.4
* Education: less than high school diploma vs. HS diploma or above. **Figure A**.5
* Income: household monthly income < US$200 vs. > US$200. **Figure A**.6
* Trust in the military: 1-4 vs 5-7 in a 1-7 scale of trust in the military. **Figure A.**7
* Ideology: self-placement on left vs right of ideological spectrum. **Figure A**.8
* Victimization: self-reported victim vs. non-victim of crime in the last year. **Figure A**.9
* Party ID: respondents who identify with the PAN vs. PRI vs. Morena. **Figure A.**10
* Perceptions of insecurity: respondents in states where over 63.7% of residents

consider their municipality insecure vs respondents who live in states where less

than 63.7% of residents consider their municipality insecure according to the data

from the 2017 Natl. Survey of Victimization & Perception of Public Security. **Figure A**.11

* Municipality’s homicide rate: respondents who live in municipalities with

homicide rates per 100,000 people above vs. below the median 5-year

homicide rate (15.86) for 2012-2017, based on data from the National Institute

of Statistics and Geography (INEGI). [[1]](#footnote-1) **Figure A**.12

**Figure A.3** Difference in AMCE by age (over 40 years old minus 18-40 years old)

**Box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated with low confidence**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided into two groups, those 40 years old or above and those less than 40 years old. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.4** Difference in AMCE by gender (female minus male)

Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided into two groups, female and male. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.5** Difference in AMCE by education (HS diploma or above minus < HS diploma)

Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided into two groups, those with a high school diploma or above and those with less than a high school diploma. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.6** Difference in AMCE by income (> $200 USD minus < $200 USD)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided into two groups, those that earn $200 USD or more a month and those that earn less than $200 USD a month. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.7** Difference in AMCE by trust in the military (5-7 minus 1-4)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, respondents who give a 5 to 7 on a 7-point trust scale and those that give a 1 to 4. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.8** Difference in AMCE by ideology (right minus left)

Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those that self-place on the left of the ideological spectrum and those that self-place on the right. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.9** Difference in AMCE by victimization (victim minus non-victim)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, self-reported victims of a crime during the last year and those that were not victims of a crime. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.10** Difference in AMCE by Party ID (PAN minus Morena and PRI minus Morena)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in three groups by party identification, Panistas, Priistas and Morenistas. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.11** Difference in AMCE by perceptions of insecurity (>63.9% minus <63.9%)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those who live in states where 63.9% of the residents considered their municipality insecure and those who live in states where less than 63.9% of residents considered their municipality insecure. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.12** Difference in AMCE by 5-year average homicide rate (>15.8 minus <15.8)[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the difference in Average Marginal Component Effects by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those who live in municipalities that had an average homicide rate above 15.8 per 100,000 residents and those that live in municipalities with a rate below 15.8 in the 2013-2017 period. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. AMCEs are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the black bars represent 95% confidence intervals and the gray bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

## **ABSOLUTE LEVELS OF FAVORABILITY BY SUBGROUP**

This section graphically presents the marginal means of the full sample baseline model for different respondent subgroups. Marginal means refer to the level of favorability towards a profile that has a specific attribute (Leeper et al 2020). By focusing on marginal means instead of AMCEs we can test whether preferences for security personnel differ by respondent type. Except for ideology and party identification, we divided groups by below and above the median value.

The subgroup analysis includes graphical summaries for:

* Age: 18-40 years old vs over 40 years old. **Figure A.**13
* Gender: female vs. male. **Figure A.**14
* Education: less than high school diploma vs. HS diploma or above. **Figure A**.15
* Income: household monthly income < US$200 vs. > US$200. **Figure A.**16
* Trust in the military: 1-4 vs 5-7 in a 1-7 scale of trust in the military. **Figure A.**17
* Ideology: self-placement on left vs right of ideological spectrum. **Figure A**.18
* Victimization: self-reported victim vs. non-victim of crime in the last year. **Figure A.**19
* Party ID: respondents who identify with the PAN vs. PRI vs. Morena. **Figure A.**20
* Perceptions of insecurity: respondents in states where over 63.9% of residents

consider their municipality insecure vs respondents who live in states where less

than 63.9% of residents consider their municipality insecure according to data

from the 2017 Natl Survey of Victimization & Perception of Public Security. **Figure A**.21

* Municipality’s homicide rate: respondents who live in municipalities with

homicide rates per 100,000 people above vs. below the median 5-year

homicide rate (15.86) for 2012-2017, based on data from the National Institute

of Statistics and Geography (INEGI). **Figure A**.22

**Figure A.13** Levels of favorability by age

Chart, bar chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided into two groups, those 40 years old or above and those less than 40 years old. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.14** Levels of favorability by gender.

Chart, bar chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, female and male. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.15** Levels of favorability by education

Chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those with a high school diploma or above and those with less than a high school diploma. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.16** Levels of favorability by income

**Chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those that earn $200 USD or more a month and those that earn less than $200 USD a month. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.17** Levels of favorability by trust in the military

**Chart, histogram, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, respondents who give a 5 to 7 on a 7-point trust scale and those that give a 1 to 4. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.18** Levels of favorability by ideology

Chart, bar chart

Description automatically generated

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those that self-place on the left of the ideological spectrum and those that self-place on the right. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.19** Levels of favorability by victimization

**Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated**

Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, self-reported victims of a crime during the last year and those that were not victims of a crime. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.20** Levels of favorability by party identification
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Note: This plot shows the difference in marginal means (or the levels of towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in three groups by party identification, Panistas, Priistas and Morenistas. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.21** Levels of favorability by perceptions of insecurity

Chart
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Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those who live in states where 63.9% of the residents considered their municipality insecure and those who live in states where less than 63.9% of residents considered their municipality insecure. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

**Figure A.22** Levels of favorability by 5-year average homicide rate
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Note: This plot shows the marginal means (or the levels of favorability towards security personnel with a given feature) by attribute (uniform, weapon, gender, and skin color). Respondents were divided in two groups, those who live in municipalities that had an average homicide rate above 15.8 per 100,000 residents and those that live in municipalities with a rate below 15.8 in the 2013-2017 period. Ratings were rescaled to vary from 0 to 1 and then the corresponding marginal means were estimated. Marginal means are based on the benchmark OLS model with robust standard errors clustered by respondent; the bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The vertical dashed grey lines represent the average rating. Effectiveness is measured from not at all to very effective; civil liberties is measured from never respects to always respects; corruption is measured from not at all prone to very prone to commit acts of corruption; and neighborhood is measured from strongly oppose to strongly support.

## **ADDITIONAL MILITARY PRESENCE CONTINUOUS INTERACTION EFFECTS**

This section graphically presents the effect of weapons, gender, and skin color on perceived ratings as military presence intensifies.

**Figure A.23** Interaction between military presence and assault weapon attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between military confrontations that occurred between 2006 and 2016 and assault rifle. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the assault rifle attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the light gray areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure A.24** Interaction between military presence and male attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between military confrontations that occurred between 2006 and 2016 and male attribute. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the male attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the light gray areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure A.25** Interaction between military presence and light skin attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between military confrontations that occurred between 2006 and 2016 and light skin attribute. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the light skin attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the light gray areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

## **ADDITIONAL HOMICIDE RATE CONTINUOUS INTERACTION EFFECTS**

This section graphically presents the effect of weapons, gender, and skin color on perceived ratings as the average homicide rate increases.

**Figure A.26** Interaction between 5-year average homicide rate and assault rifle attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between the 5-year average homicide rate and assault rifle attribute. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the assault rifle attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the grey areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure A.27** Interaction between 5-year average homicide rate and male attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between the 5-year average homicide rate and male attribute. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the male attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the light gray areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure A.28** Interaction between 5-year average homicide rate and light skin attribute
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Note: This figure plots the interaction between the 5-year average homicide rate and light skin attribute. The horizontal axis represents the values of the moderator, on the vertical axis are the values of the slope relating the light skin attribute to the effectiveness, civil liberties, corruption, and neighborhood ratings measured in standard deviations. The dark gray areas represent regions of significance and the light gray areas represent regions of non-significance using 95% confidence intervals.

1. We also examine 3-year homicide rates and results are unchanged. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Results are unchanged when relying on 3-year average homicide rates. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)