**Appendix**

Table A. Correlation matrix of main exploratory variables and controls

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Ingroup status in job market | Effect of being White in job market | Pros v. cons of being White | Pros v. cons of being Black | Pros v. cons of being Latinx | Systemic racism benefits Whites | Racial resentment toward Blacks |
| Ingroup status in job market | 1.0(860) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effect of being White in job market | 0.56\*\*\*(830) | 1.0(878) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pros v. cons of being White | 0.47\*\*\*(860) | 0.38\*\*\*(878) | 1.0(921) |  |  |  |  |
| Pros v. cons of being Black | -0.45\*\*\*(860) | -0.32\*\*\*(878) | -0.59\*\*\*(921) | 1.0(921) |  |  |  |
| Pros v. cons of being Latinx | -0.35\*\*\*(860) | -0.24\*\*\*(878) | -0.45\*\*\*(921) | 0.58\*\*\*(921) | 1.0(921) |  |  |
| Systemic racism benefits Whites | 0.47\*\*\*(817) | 0.41\*\*\*(827) | 0.43\*\*\*(858) | -0.41\*\*\*(858) | -0.32\*\*\*(858) | 1.0(858) |  |
| Racial resentment toward Blacks | -0.50\*\*\*(718) | -0.37\*\*\*(726) | -0.43\*\*\*(748) | 0.48\*\*\*(748) | 0.37\*\*\*(748) | -0.64\*\*\*(730) | 1.0(748) |
| *Notes*: Correlation coefficients and number of observations (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.For the purposes of this matrix, variables are coded as follows: Ingroup status in job market: 3=Whites better chance; 2=equal chance; 1= Blacks better chanceEffect of being White in job market: 3=advantage; 2=neither advantage nor disadvantage; 1=disadvantagePros v. cons variables: 3=more advantages; 2= don’t know; 1=more disadvantagesSystemic racism benefits Whites: highest value= agreementRacial resentment toward Blacks: highest value=most resentful |

Table B. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given attitudes about ingroup status in the job market (H1) and effect of being White in the job market (H2A and H2B).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 1* | *Hypothesis 2A* | *Hypothesis 2B* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Ingroup status* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whites have a better chance in job market | -1.12\*\*(0.40) | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |
| Blacks and Whites have an equal chance in job market | -0.84\*(0.33) | 0.43 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Effect of being White* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Being White has given R an advantage in job market |  |  | -0.69(0.42) | 0.50 | -0.86\*(0.38) | 0.42 |
| Being White has given R neither advantage nor disadvantage in job market |  |  | -0.82\*(0.33) | 0.44 | -1.00\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.37 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.19\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.21 | 0.21\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.23 |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  |  |  | 0.87\*\*(0.28) | 2.39 |
| DK |  |  |  |  | 0.48\*(0.24) | 1.61 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.63\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.62\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.81\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.39\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.25 | -1.25\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.29 | -1.30\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.27 |
| Liberal | 0.75\*(0.37) | 2.11 | 0.71(0.37) | 2.03 | 0.50(0.33) | 1.65 |
| Moderate | 0.58\*(0.28) | 1.79 | 0.65\*(0.28) | 1.92 | 0.46(0.25) | 1.58 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.79\*(0.38) | 2.20 | 0.64(0.37) | 1.89 | 0.46(0.34) | 1.58 |
| 60 <100% | 0.71(0.40) | 2.03 | 0.55(0.38) | 1.74 | 0.49(0.36) | 1.64 |
| 100+% | 0.14(0.39) | 1.15 | 0.05(0.38) | 1.05 | 0.10(0.35) | 1.10 |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.61(0.40) | 1.84 | 0.64(0.39) | 1.89 | 0.53(0.35) | 1.70 |
| 20 - <40% | 0.21(0.40) | 1.24 | 0.13(0.40) | 1.13 | -0.02(0.36) | 0.98 |
| 40 - <60% | 0.54(0.40) | 1.71 | 0.45(0.40) | 1.57 | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 |
| 60 - <100% | 0.94\*(0.39) | 2.56 | 0.99\*(0.39) | 2.68 | 0.75\*(0.35) | 2.12 |
| 100+% | 0.83\*(0.39) | 2.28 | 0.75\*(0.39) | 2.12 | 0.56(0.36) | 1.75 |
| Female | -0.18(0.27) | 0.84 | -0.18(0.27) | 0.83 | -0.16(0.25) | 0.85 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.22(0.28) | 1.24 | 0.04(0.27) | 1.04 | -0.33(0.24) | 0.72 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 |
| Northeast | 1.05\*\*(0.41) | 2.85 | 1.02\*\*(0.40) | 2.77 | 0.57(0.35) | 1.77 |
| Midwest | 0.33(0.40) | 1.39 | 0.31(0.39) | 1.37 | 0.17(0.35) | 1.19 |
| South | 0.73\*(0.36) | 2.07 | 0.79\*(0.35) | 2.21 | 0.56(0.32) | 1.76 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.53(0.28) | 1.71 | 0.46(0.29) | 1.59 | 0.50(0.26) | 1.64 |
| Generation X | 0.83\*\*(0.29) | 2.29 | 0.90\*\*(0.29) | 2.45 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 |
| constant | -3.03(0.89) | 0.05 | -3.19(0.88) | 0.04 | -1.19(0.63) | 0.31 |
|  | N=649 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=655 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=780 Pseudo R2=0.24 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for ingroup status=Blacks have a better chanceBase category for effect of being White=Being White has given R disadvantage in job marketBase category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table C. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given attitudes about ingroup status in the job market and effect of being White in the job market, modeled together.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Ingroup status* |  |  |  |  |
| Whites have a better chance in job market | -1.04\*(0.48) | 0.35 | -0.81(0.45) | 0.45 |
| Blacks and Whites have an equal chance in job market | -0.56(0.40) | 0.57 | -0.24(0.37) | 0.79 |
| *Effect of being White* |  |  |  |  |
| Being White has given R an advantage in job market | -0.12(0.50) | 0.89 | -0.40(0.45) | 0.67 |
| Being White has given R neither advantage nor disadvantage in job market | -0.48(0.40) | 0.62 | -0.80\*(0.36) | 0.45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.18\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.20 |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  | 0.76\*\*(0.29) | 2.14 |
| DK |  |  | 0.36(0.25) | 1.44 |
| Democrat | -2.58\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.08 | -2.71\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.07 |
| Independent | -1.29\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.27 | -1.25\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.29 |
| Liberal | 0.70(0.38) | 2.01 | 0.54(0.34) | 1.71 |
| Moderate | 0.57\*(0.29) | 1.77 | 0.41(0.26) | 1.50 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0- <60% | 0.70(0.39) | 2.02 | 0.55(0.36) | 1.74 |
| 60 <100% | 0.68(0.40) | 1.97 | 0.65(0.38) | 1.91 |
| 100+% | 0.12(0.40) | 1.13 | 0.17(0.37) | 1.18 |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.63(0.40) | 1.87 | 0.55(0.36) | 1.74 |
| 20 - <40% | 0.19(0.41) | 1.21 | -0.02(0.37) | 0.98 |
| 40 - <60% | 0.51(0.41) | 1.66 | 0.54(0.37) | 1.72 |
| 60 - <100% | 0.94\*(0.40) | 2.57 | 0.78\*(0.36) | 2.17 |
| 100+% | 0.81\*(0.40) | 2.26 | 0.58(0.37) | 1.78 |
| Female | -0.13(0.28) | 0.87 | -0.12(0.25) | 0.89 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.20(0.28) | 1.22 | -0.19(0.25) | 0.83 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.02(0.02) | 0.98 |
| Northeast | 0.99\*(0.41) | 2.70 | 0.50(0.37) | 1.65 |
| Midwest | 0.32(0.40) | 1.38 | 0.14(0.36) | 1.15 |
| South | 0.77\*(0.36) | 2.15 | 0.56(0.33) | 1.75 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.50(0.29) | 1.65 | 0.54\*(0.27) | 1.71 |
| Generation X | 0.83\*\*(0.30) | 2.28 | 0.68\*(0.27) | 1.97 |
| constant | -2.79(0.93) | 0.06 | -1.09(0.68) | 0.34 |
|  | N=631 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=738 Pseudo R2=0.24 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for ingroup status=Blacks have a better chanceBase category for effect of being White=Being White has given R disadvantage in job marketBase category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table D. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given agreement that systemic racism benefits Whites (H3A and H3B).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 3A*  | *Hypothesis 3B* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| Systemic racism benefits Whites=1 | -0.65\*(0.30) | 0.52 | -1.01\*\*\*(0.26) | 0.36 |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.18\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.19 |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  | 0.82\*\*(0.27) | 2.27 |
| Don’t know |  |  | 0.26(0.24) | 1.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.64\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.79\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.34\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.26 | -1.30\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.27 |
| Liberal | 0.84\*(0.37) | 2.31 | 0.74\*(0.34) | 2.10 |
| Moderate | 0.71\*(0.28) | 2.04 | 0.53\*(0.26) | 1.69 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.70(0.37) | 2.02 | 0.63(0.34) | 1.88 |
| 60 <100% | 0.60(0.38) | 1.83 | 0.68(0.37) | 1.98 |
| 100+% | 0.03(0.38) | 1.03 | 0.23(0.35) | 1.26 |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.56(0.39) | 1.75 | 0.54(0.35) | 1.72 |
| 20 - <40% | 0.07(0.39) | 1.07 | -0.05(0.35) | 0.95 |
| 40 - <60% | 0.46(0.40) | 1.59 | 0.47(0.37) | 1.60 |
| 60 - <100% | 0.94\*(0.38) | 2.56 | 0.64(0.35) | 1.89 |
| 100+% | 0.68(0.39) | 1.97 | 0.44(0.36) | 1.55 |
| Female | -0.25(0.26) | 0.78 | -0.26(0.24) | 0.77 |
| College education (or higher)=1 | 0.05(0.27) | 1.05 | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.02(0.02) | 0.98 |
| Northeast | 1.08\*\*(0.40) | 2.93 | 0.76\*(0.36) | 2.14 |
| Midwest | 0.25(0.39) | 1.28 | 0.15(0.35) | 1.17 |
| South | 0.72\*(0.35) | 2.05 | 0.53(0.32) | 1.69 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.50(0.28) | 1.64 | 0.49(0.26) | 1.63 |
| Generation X | 0.91\*\*(0.29) | 2.48 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.01 |
| constant | -3.33(0.85) | 0.04 | -1.71(0.59) | 0.18 |
|  | N=660 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=771 Pseudo R2=0.25 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table E. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given (Model 1) agreement that systemic racism benefits Whites x household income(controlling for racial resentment); (Model 2) agreement that systemic racism benefits Whites x household income (controlling for pros v. cons of being Latinx).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| Systemic racism benefits Whites=1 | 0.35(0.54) | 1.41 | 0.09(0.48) | 1.09 |
| Household income | -0.02(0.02) | 0.98 | -0.003(0.02) | 1.00 |
| Systemic racism benefits Whites x household income | -0.07\*(0.03) | 0.93 | -0.08\*(0.03) | 0.92 |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.18\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.20 |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |
| More disadvantages to being Latinx |  |  | -0.83\*\*(0.28) | 0.43 |
| Don’t know |  |  | -0.59\*(0.27) | 0.55 |
| Democrat | -2.70\*\*\*(0.37) | 0.07 | -2.83\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.39\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.25 | -1.34\*\*\*(0.32) | 0.26 |
| Liberal | 0.92\*(0.38) | 2.50 | 0.81\*(0.35) | 2.26 |
| Moderate | 0.74\*\*(0.29) | 2.09 | 0.54\*(0.26) | 1.71 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.68(0.37) | 1.97 | 0.60(0.35) | 1.82 |
| 60 <100% | 0.59(0.39) | 1.81 | 0.67(0.37) | 1.96 |
| 100+% | -0.03(0.38) | 0.97 | 0.16(0.36) | 1.18 |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.53(0.39) | 1.69 | 0.53(0.35) | 1.70 |
| 20 - <40% | 0.04(0.39) | 1.04 | -0.08(0.36) | 0.92 |
| 40 - <60% | 0.44(0.40) | 1.56 | 0.47(0.37) | 1.60 |
| 60 - <100% | 0.99\*\*(0.39) | 2.70 | 0.71\*(0.35) | 2.02 |
| 100+% | 0.70(0.40) | 2.02 | 0.48(0.37) | 1.61 |
| Female | -0.25(0.26) | 0.78 | -0.26(0.24) | 0.77 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.07(0.27) | 1.07 | -0.18(0.24) | 0.84 |
| Northeast | 1.09\*\*(0.40) | 2.99 | 0.77\*(0.36) | 2.16 |
| Midwest | 0.26(0.39) | 1.29 | 0.17(0.35) | 1.19 |
| South | 0.76\*(0.35) | 2.14 | 0.58(0.33) | 1.78 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.53(0.29) | 1.69 | 0.52\*(0.26) | 1.68 |
| Generation X | 0.96\*\*\*(0.29) | 2.62 | 0.75\*\*(0.27) | 2.12 |
| constant | -3.64(0.87) | 0.03 | -1.17(0.60) | 0.31 |
|  | N=660Pseudo R2=0.27 | N=771Pseudo R2=0.25 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More advantages to being Latinx |

Table F. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given pros v. cons of being White, pros v. cons of being Black, and pros v. cons of being Latinx (H4A, H4B, H4C, and H4D).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 4A* | *Hypothesis 4B* | *Hypothesis 4C* | *Hypothesis 4D* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Pros v. cons of being White* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being White | -1.12\*\*\*(0.27) | 0.33 | -0.80\*(0.33) | 0.45 | -0.82\*\*(0.30) | 0.44 | -0.75\*(0.33) | 0.47 |
| Don’t know | -1.14\*\*\*(0.29) | 0.32 | -0.83\*(0.35) | 0.44 | -1.10\*\*\*(0.32) | 0.33 | -0.84\*(0.35) | 0.43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Black* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Black |  |  | 0.54(0.31) | 1.71 |  |  | 0.20(0.36) | 1.23 |
| Don’t know |  |  | -0.01(0.31) | 0.99 |  |  | -0.40(0.35) | 0.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  |  |  | 0.75\*(0.30) | 2.12 | 0.65(0.34) | 1.91 |
| Don’t know |  |  |  |  | 0.57\*(0.26) | 1.76 | 0.70\*(0.29) | 2.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.90\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.90\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.86\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.89\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.40\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.40\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.39\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.41\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.24 |
| Liberal | 0.47(0.33) | 1.61 | 0.50(0.33) | 1.66 | 0.47(0.33) | 1.60 | 0.51(0.33) | 1.67 |
| Moderate | 0.33(0.24) | 1.40 | 0.36(0.24) | 1.44 | 0.37(0.25) | 1.45 | 0.39(0.25) | 1.47 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.48(0.34) | 1.62 | 0.52(0.34) | 1.69 | 0.50(0.34) | 1.65 | 0.51(0.34) | 1.66 |
| 60 <100% | 0.50(0.36) | 1.65 | 0.52(0.36) | 1.68 | 0.52(0.36) | 1.68 | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 |
| 100+% | 0.18(0.35) | 1.19 | 0.20(0.35) | 1.22 | 0.14(0.35) | 1.15 | 0.14(0.35) | 1.15 |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.51(0.34) | 1.67 | 0.54(0.35) | 1.72 | 0.52(0.35) | 1.69 | 0.56(0.35) | 1.75 |
| 20 - <40% | -0.08(0.35) | 0.93 | -0.07(0.35) | 0.93 | -0.06(0.35) | 0.95 | -0.05(0.35) | 0.95 |
| 40 - <60% | 0.41(0.35) | 1.51 | 0.40(0.36) | 1.49 | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 | 0.50(0.36) | 1.65 |
| 60 - <100% | 0.72\*(0.34) | 2.06 | 0.73\*(0.34) | 2.08 | 0.71\*(0.34) | 2.03 | 0.73\*(0.34) | 2.08 |
| 100+% | 0.55(0.35) | 1.73 | 0.56(0.36) | 1.76 | 0.55(0.36) | 1.74 | 0.59(0.36) | 1.80 |
| Female | -0.14(0.24) | 0.87 | -0.16(0.24) | 0.85 | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | -0.23(0.23) | 0.80 | -0.21(0.23) | 0.81 | -0.24(0.23) | 0.79 | -0.23(0.24) | 0.79 |
| Household income | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 |
| Northeast | 0.52(0.34) | 1.69 | 0.53(0.34) | 1.71 | 0.54(0.34) | 1.72 | 0.53(0.35) | 1.69 |
| Midwest | 0.04(0.34) | 1.04 | 0.03(0.34) | 1.03 | 0.08(0.34) | 1.08 | 0.05(0.34) | 1.05 |
| South | 0.47(0.31) | 1.60 | 0.46(0.31) | 1.58 | 0.47(0.31) | 1.60 | 0.46(0.31) | 1.58 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.44(0.25) | 1.56 | 0.51\*(0.26) | 1.67 | 0.50\*(0.25) | 1.65 | 0.50(0.26) | 1.65 |
| Generation X | 0.66\*\*(0.26) | 1.94 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.01 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 |
| constant | -0.66(0.58) | 0.52 | -1.09(0.64) | 0.33 | -1.25(0.62) | 0.29 | -1.32(0.65) | 0.27 |
|  | N=815Pseudo R2=0.23 | N=815Pseudo R2=0.23 | N=815Pseudo R2=0.24 | N=815Pseudo R2=0.24 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being White=More disadvantages to being WhiteBase category for pros v. cons of being Black=More disadvantages to being BlackBase category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table G. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given attitudes about ingroup status in the job market (H1). Shaded column replicates model without second-order contextual variables.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 1* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Ingroup status* |  |  |  |  |
| Whites have a better chance in job market | -1.12\*\*(0.40) | 0.33 | -1.01\*\*(0.38) | 0.36 |
| Blacks and whites have an equal chance in job market | -0.84\*(0.33) | 0.43 | -0.76\*(0.31) | 0.47 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.19\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.21 | 0.15\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.63\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.65\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.07 |
| Independent | -1.39\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.25 | -1.36\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.26 |
| Liberal | 0.75\*(0.37) | 2.11 | 0.69\*(0.35) | 2.00 |
| Moderate | 0.58\*(0.28) | 1.79 | 0.59\*(0.27) | 1.80 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.79\*(0.38) | 2.20 |  |  |
| 60 <100% | 0.71(0.40) | 2.03 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.14(0.39) | 1.15 |  |  |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.61(0.40) | 1.84 |  |  |
| 20 - <40% | 0.21(0.40) | 1.24 |  |  |
| 40 - <60% | 0.54(0.40) | 1.71 |  |  |
| 60 - <100% | 0.94\*(0.39) | 2.56 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.83\*(0.39) | 2.28 |  |  |
| Female | -0.18(0.27) | 0.84 | -0.21(0.26) | 0.81 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.22(0.28) | 1.24 | 0.19(0.26) | 1.21 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 |
| Northeast | 1.05\*\*(0.41) | 2.85 | 1.14\*\*(0.38) | 3.12 |
| Midwest | 0.33(0.40) | 1.39 | 0.43(0.37) | 1.54 |
| South | 0.73\*(0.36) | 2.07 | 0.89\*\*(0.33) | 2.43 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.53(0.28) | 1.71 | 0.43(0.26) | 1.54 |
| Generation X | 0.83\*\*(0.29) | 2.29 | 0.61\*(0.27) | 1.84 |
| constant | -3.03(0.89) | 0.05 | -1.75(0.70) | 0.17 |
|  | N=649 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=679 Pseudo R2=0.24 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for ingroup status=Blacks have a better chance |

Table H. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given attitudes about the effect of being White in the job market (H2A and H2B). Shaded columns replicate models without second-order contextual variables.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 2A* | *Hypothesis 2B* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Effect of being White* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Being White has given R an advantage in job market | -0.69(0.42) | 0.50 | -0.67(0.40) | 0.51 | -0.86\*(0.38) | 0.42 | -0.86\*(0.36) | 0.42 |
| Being White has given R neither advantage nor disadvantage in job market | -0.82\*(0.33) | 0.44 | -0.73\*(0.31) | 0.48 | -1.00\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.37 | -0.94\*\*\*(0.29) | 0.39 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.21\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.23 | 0.16\*\*\*(0.04) | 1.17 |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  |  |  | 0.87\*\*(0.28) | 2.39 | 0.73\*\*(0.27) | 2.07 |
| DK |  |  |  |  | 0.48\*(0.24) | 1.61 | 0.39(0.23) | 1.48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.62\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.66\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.07 | -2.81\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.78\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.25\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.29 | -1.24\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.29 | -1.30\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.27 | -1.26\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.28 |
| Liberal | 0.71(0.37) | 2.03 | 0.69(0.35) | 1.99 | 0.50(0.33) | 1.65 | 0.45(0.31) | 1.56 |
| Moderate | 0.65\*(0.28) | 1.92 | 0.67\*(0.27) | 1.95 | 0.46(0.25) | 1.58 | 0.47\*(0.24) | 1.60 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.64(0.37) | 1.89 |  |  | 0.46(0.34) | 1.58 |  |  |
| 60 <100% | 0.55(0.38) | 1.74 |  |  | 0.49(0.36) | 1.64 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.05(0.38) | 1.05 |  |  | 0.10(0.35) | 1.10 |  |  |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.64(0.39) | 1.89 |  |  | 0.53(0.35) | 1.70 |  |  |
| 20 - <40% | 0.13(0.40) | 1.13 |  |  | -0.02(0.36) | 0.98 |  |  |
| 40 - <60% | 0.45(0.40) | 1.57 |  |  | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 |  |  |
| 60 - <100% | 0.99\*(0.39) | 2.68 |  |  | 0.75\*(0.35) | 2.12 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.75\*(0.39) | 2.12 |  |  | 0.56(0.36) | 1.75 |  |  |
| Female | -0.18(0.27) | 0.83 | -0.22(0.25) | 0.80 | -0.16(0.25) | 0.85 | -0.17(0.24) | 0.84 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.04(0.27) | 1.04 | 0.02(0.26) | 1.02 | -0.33(0.24) | 0.72 | -0.33(0.23) | 0.72 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.03(0.02) | 0.97 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.006(0.02) | 0.99 |
| Northeast | 1.02\*\*(0.40) | 2.77 | 1.07\*\*(0.38) | 2.93 | 0.57(0.35) | 1.77 | 0.68\*(0.34) | 1.97 |
| Midwest | 0.31(0.39) | 1.37 | 0.40(0.37) | 1.50 | 0.17(0.35) | 1.19 | 0.25(0.33) | 1.29 |
| South | 0.79\*(0.35) | 2.21 | 0.93\*\*(0.32) | 2.54 | 0.56(0.32) | 1.76 | 0.75\*\*(0.29) | 2.12 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.46(0.29) | 1.59 | 0.41(0.26) | 1.51 | 0.50(0.26) | 1.64 | 0.46(0.24) | 1.58 |
| Generation X | 0.90\*\*(0.29) | 2.45 | 0.72\*\*(0.27) | 2.05 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 | 0.52\*(0.25) | 1.67 |
| constant | -3.19(0.88) | 0.04 | -2.02(0.69) | 0.13 | -1.19(0.63) | 0.31 | -0.65(0.49) | 0.52 |
|  | N=655 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=685 Pseudo R2=0.23 | N=780 Pseudo R2=0.24 | N=818 Pseudo R2=0.22 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for effect of being White=Being White has given R disadvantage in job marketBase category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table I. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given agreement that systemic racism benefits Whites (H3A and H3B). Shaded columns replicate models without second-order contextual variables.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 3A* | *Hypothesis 3B* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| Systemic racism benefits Whites=1 | -0.65\*(0.30) | 0.52 | -0.69\*(0.29) | 0.50 | -1.01\*\*\*(0.26) | 0.36 | -0.94\*\*\*(0.25) | 0.39 |
| Racial resentment against Blacks | 0.18\*\*\*(0.05) | 1.19 | 0.13\*\*(0.05) | 1.14 |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx |  |  |  |  | 0.82\*\*(0.27) | 2.27 | 0.67\*(0.26) | 1.96 |
| Don’t know |  |  |  |  | 0.26(0.24) | 1.30 | 0.20(0.23) | 1.23 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.64\*\*\*(0.36) | 0.07 | -2.67\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.07 | -2.79\*\*\*(0.35) | 0.06 | -2.73\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.34\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.26 | -1.29\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.28 | -1.30\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.27 | -1.26\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.28 |
| Liberal | 0.84\*(0.37) | 2.31 | 0.82\*(0.35) | 2.27 | 0.74\*(0.34) | 2.10 | 0.66\*(0.33) | 1.94 |
| Moderate | 0.71\*(0.28) | 2.04 | 0.72\*\*(0.27) | 2.05 | 0.53\*(0.26) | 1.69 | 0.54\*(0.24) | 1.71 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.70(0.37) | 2.02 |  |  | 0.63(0.34) | 1.88 |  |  |
| 60 <100% | 0.60(0.38) | 1.83 |  |  | 0.68(0.37) | 1.98 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.03(0.38) | 1.03 |  |  | 0.23(0.35) | 1.26 |  |  |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.56(0.39) | 1.75 |  |  | 0.54(0.35) | 1.72 |  |  |
| 20 - <40% | 0.07(0.39) | 1.07 |  |  | -0.05(0.35) | 0.95 |  |  |
| 40 - <60% | 0.46(0.40) | 1.59 |  |  | 0.47(0.37) | 1.60 |  |  |
| 60 - <100% | 0.94\*(0.38) | 2.56 |  |  | 0.64(0.35) | 1.89 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.68(0.39) | 1.97 |  |  | 0.44(0.36) | 1.55 |  |  |
| Female | -0.25(0.26) | 0.78 | -0.26(0.25) | 0.77 | -0.26(0.24) | 0.77 | -0.25(0.23) | 0.78 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | 0.05(0.27) | 1.05 | 0.04(0.26) | 1.04 | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 | -0.17(0.23) | 0.84 |
| Household income | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.04\*(0.02) | 0.96 | -0.02(0.02) | 0.98 | -0.02(0.02) | 0.98 |
| Northeast | 1.08\*\*(0.40) | 2.93 | 1.15\*\*(0.38) | 3.15 | 0.76\*(0.36) | 2.14 | 0.85\*(0.34) | 2.34 |
| Midwest | 0.25(0.39) | 1.28 | 0.34(0.36) | 1.40 | 0.15(0.35) | 1.17 | 0.23(0.33) | 1.26 |
| South | 0.72\*(0.35) | 2.05 | 0.86\*\*(0.32) | 2.37 | 0.53(0.32) | 1.69 | 0.68\*(0.30) | 1.98 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.50(0.28) | 1.64 | 0.42(0.26) | 1.52 | 0.49(0.26) | 1.63 | 0.44(0.24) | 1.55 |
| Generation X | 0.91\*\*(0.29) | 2.48 | 0.71\*\*(0.27) | 2.03 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.01 | 0.51\*(0.25) | 1.66 |
| constant | -3.33(0.85) | 0.04 | -2.08(0.66) | 0.12 | -1.71(0.59) | 0.18 | -1.03(0.46) | 0.36 |
|  | N=660 Pseudo R2=0.26 | N=690 Pseudo R2=0.24 | N=771 Pseudo R2=0.25 | N=807 Pseudo R2=0.23 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |

Table J. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given pros v. cons of being White (H4A) and pros v. cons of being Black (H4B). Shaded columns replicate models without second-order contextual variables.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 4A* | *Hypothesis 4B* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Pros v. cons of being White* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being White | -1.12\*\*\*(0.27) | 0.33 | -1.02\*\*\*(0.26) | 0.36 | -0.80\*(0.33) | 0.45 | -0.73\*(0.32) | 0.48 |
| Don’t know | -1.14\*\*\*(0.29) | 0.32 | -1.02\*\*\*(0.27) | 0.36 | -0.83\*(0.35) | 0.44 | -0.74\*(0.33) | 0.48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Black* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Black |  |  |  |  | 0.54(0.31) | 1.71 | 0.48(0.30) | 1.62 |
| Don’t know |  |  |  |  | -0.01(0.31) | 0.99 | -0.06(0.30) | 0.99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.90\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.86\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.06 | -2.90\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.86\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.40\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.35\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.26 | -1.40\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.36\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.26 |
| Liberal | 0.47(0.33) | 1.61 | 0.41(0.31) | 1.51 | 0.50(0.33) | 1.66 | 0.45(0.31) | 1.56 |
| Moderate | 0.33(0.24) | 1.40 | 0.35(0.23) | 1.42 | 0.36(0.24) | 1.44 | 0.38(0.23) | 1.46 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.48(0.34) | 1.62 |  |  | 0.52(0.34) | 1.69 |  |  |
| 60 <100% | 0.50(0.36) | 1.65 |  |  | 0.52(0.36) | 1.68 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.18(0.35) | 1.19 |  |  | 0.20(0.35) | 1.22 |  |  |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.51(0.34) | 1.67 |  |  | 0.54(0.35) | 1.72 |  |  |
| 20 - <40% | -0.08(0.35) | 0.93 |  |  | -0.07(0.35) | 0.93 |  |  |
| 40 - <60% | 0.41(0.35) | 1.51 |  |  | 0.40(0.36) | 1.49 |  |  |
| 60 - <100% | 0.72\*(0.34) | 2.06 |  |  | 0.73\*(0.34) | 2.08 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.55(0.35) | 1.73 |  |  | 0.56(0.36) | 1.76 |  |  |
| Female | -0.14(0.24) | 0.87 | -0.14(0.23) | 0.87 | -0.16(0.24) | 0.85 | -0.16(0.23) | 0.85 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | -0.23(0.23) | 0.80 | -0.23(0.22) | 0.79 | -0.21(0.23) | 0.81 | -0.22(0.22) | 0.80 |
| Household income | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.004(0.02) | 1.00 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.006(0.02) | 0.99 |
| Northeast | 0.52(0.34) | 1.69 | 0.64(0.33) | 1.89 | 0.53(0.34) | 1.71 | 0.64\*(0.33) | 1.90 |
| Midwest | 0.04(0.34) | 1.04 | 0.14(0.32) | 1.15 | 0.03(0.34) | 1.03 | 0.13(0.32) | 1.13 |
| South | 0.47(0.31) | 1.60 | 0.66\*(0.28) | 1.94 | 0.46(0.31) | 1.58 | 0.65\*(0.28) | 1.91 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.44(0.25) | 1.56 | 0.43(0.23) | 1.54 | 0.51\*(0.26) | 1.67 | 0.49\*(0.24) | 1.63 |
| Generation X | 0.66\*\*(0.26) | 1.94 | 0.49\*(0.24) | 1.64 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 | 0.52\*(0.24) | 1.68 |
| constant | -0.66(0.58) | 0.52 | -0.24(0.45) | 0.79 | -1.09(0.64) | 0.33 | -0.59(0.51) | 0.55 |
|  | N=815 Pseudo R2=0.23 | N=853 Pseudo R2=0.21 | N=815 Pseudo R2=0.23 | N=853 Pseudo R2=0.22 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being White=More disadvantages to being WhiteBase category for pros v. cons of being Black=More disadvantages to being Black |

Table K. Logistic regressions predicting support for Trump given pros v. cons of being Latinx (H4C) and all pros v. cons attitudes (H4D). Shaded columns replicate models without second-order contextual variables.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Hypothesis 4C* | *Hypothesis 4D* |
|  | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR | B(SE) | OR |
| *Pros v. cons of being White* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being White | -0.82\*\*(0.30) | 0.44 | -0.79\*\*(0.29) | 0.46 | -0.75\*(0.33) | 0.47 | -0.69\*(0.32) | 0.50 |
| Don’t know | -1.10\*\*\*(0.32) | 0.33 | -0.98\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.37 | -0.84\*(0.35) | 0.43 | -0.75\*(0.34) | 0.47 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Black* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Black |  |  |  |  | 0.20(0.36) | 1.23 | 0.24(0.34) | 1.27 |
| Don’t know |  |  |  |  | -0.40(0.35) | 0.67 | -0.34(0.34) | 0.71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pros v. cons of being Latinx* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More advantages to being Latinx | 0.75\*(0.30) | 2.12 | 0.61\*(0.28) | 1.83 | 0.65(0.34) | 1.91 | 0.49(0.32) | 1.63 |
| Don’t know | 0.57\*(0.26) | 1.76 | 0.46(0.24) | 1.58 | 0.70\*(0.29) | 2.02 | 0.59\*(0.28) | 1.80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | -2.86\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.81\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.06 | -2.89\*\*\*(0.34) | 0.06 | -2.84\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.06 |
| Independent | -1.39\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25 | -1.35\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.26 | -1.41\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.24 | -1.37\*\*\*(0.30) | 0.25 |
| Liberal | 0.47(0.33) | 1.60 | 0.41(0.31) | 1.50 | 0.51(0.33) | 1.67 | 0.45(0.31) | 1.56 |
| Moderate | 0.37(0.25) | 1.45 | 0.38(0.23) | 1.46 | 0.39(0.25) | 1.47 | 0.39(0.23) | 1.48 |
| *Δ Unemployed population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <60% | 0.50(0.34) | 1.65 |  |  | 0.51(0.34) | 1.66 |  |  |
| 60 <100% | 0.52(0.36) | 1.68 |  |  | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.14(0.35) | 1.15 |  |  | 0.14(0.35) | 1.15 |  |  |
| *Δ Foreign-born population* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 - <20% | 0.52(0.35) | 1.69 |  |  | 0.56(0.35) | 1.75 |  |  |
| 20 - <40% | -0.06(0.35) | 0.95 |  |  | -0.05(0.35) | 0.95 |  |  |
| 40 - <60% | 0.51(0.36) | 1.66 |  |  | 0.50(0.36) | 1.65 |  |  |
| 60 - <100% | 0.71\*(0.34) | 2.03 |  |  | 0.73\*(0.34) | 2.08 |  |  |
| 100+% | 0.55(0.36) | 1.74 |  |  | 0.59(0.36) | 1.80 |  |  |
| Female | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 | -0.19(0.23) | 0.83 | -0.20(0.24) | 0.82 | -0.19(0.23) | 0.83 |
| College education (or higher) = 1 | -0.24(0.23) | 0.79 | -0.24(0.22) | 0.79 | -0.23(0.24) | 0.79 | -0.24(0.23) | 0.79 |
| Household income | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.004(0.02) | 1.00 | -0.01(0.02) | 0.99 | -0.005(0.02) | 0.99 |
| Northeast | 0.54(0.34) | 1.72 | 0.65\*(0.33) | 1.92 | 0.53(0.35) | 1.69 | 0.64(0.33) | 1.90 |
| Midwest | 0.08(0.34) | 1.08 | 0.16(0.32) | 1.18 | 0.05(0.34) | 1.05 | 0.14(0.32) | 1.15 |
| South | 0.47(0.31) | 1.60 | 0.66\*(0.28) | 1.94 | 0.46(0.31) | 1.58 | 0.65\*(0.28) | 1.91 |
| Baby Boomer+ | 0.50\*(0.25) | 1.65 | 0.47\*(0.24) | 1.60 | 0.50(0.26) | 1.65 | 0.47(0.24) | 1.60 |
| Generation X | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.01 | 0.50\*(0.24) | 1.66 | 0.70\*\*(0.26) | 2.02 | 0.51\*(0.25) | 1.67 |
| constant | -1.25(0.62) | 0.29 | -0.69(0.49) | 0.50 | -1.32(0.65) | 0.27 | -0.77(0.52) | 0.46 |
|  | N=815 Pseudo R2=0.24 | N=853 Pseudo R2=0.22 | N=815 Pseudo R2=0.24 | N=853 Pseudo R2=0.22 |
| Unstandardized coefficients, odds ratios, and standard errors (in parentheses) reported. \* *p*<.05 level; \*\* *p*<.01 level; \*\*\* *p*<.001.Base category for pros v. cons of being White=More disadvantages to being WhiteBase category for pros v. cons of being Black=More disadvantages to being BlackBase category for pros v. cons of being Latinx=More disadvantages to being Latinx |