

Appendix A: Interview Protocol, Research Site Information, and Interviewee Descriptions

This appendix provides the full interview protocol utilized for this paper. Importantly, each of these questions was not asked in each interview, nor was there a specific order that was always followed. Rather, the interviews were structured around these questions. That these were semi-structured interviews often meant that I asked follow up and probing questions which are not listed in this protocol.

Below the protocol is a brief explanation of the research sites from which interviewees were recruited, along with detail on the interview data's coding process. This section describes the selection process for these sites, how interviewees were recruited from these sites, and how the coding process led to the findings argued for in the main text.

Interview Protocol

1. Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me today. Your input today is going to help my dissertation project, and will hopefully help those of us studying politics better understand the relationship between people and government. I want to emphasize that there are no wrong answers to any of these questions. I am here only to learn from you. So let's start—maybe you can tell me a bit more about where you live.

1a. How have you seen it change in the time you've been living there?

1b. Do you see it as being similar to or different from some of the other neighborhoods in the area?

2. What is one of the biggest challenges you see facing your neighborhood?

2a. Is that something most of your neighbors also see as a big challenge?

2b. How do you see people trying to deal with these issues? Who do they go to in order to get these things fixed? The government? Community organizations? Churches?

2c. (If not government) What do you think makes people turn to places other than government in these cases?

2c. (If government) Do people tend to find that the government responds in these cases?

3. People mean many things when they say the word "government." Tell me a bit about what you think of when you hear the word government?

3a. Is there any particular experience, or conversation you've had, or person you talk to, or place you hear about politics that you think has had a big influence on you viewing government that way?

3b. Do you view government as being good or bad? Tell me more about that.

3c. Is there an area or issue where you feel like the government is too involved or does too much?

3d. What about an area where you feel the government doesn't do enough?

4. Think about the past year or so; can you remember having contact with government in any way?

4a. What did that experience tell you about how government works?

4b. What can you tell me about that experience? Is there anything that stands out for you?

4c. Would you describe that experience as "typical" of what happens when you deal with government?

4d. What about in your current life? What is the biggest way you feel government currently affects your life?

4e. Any other contact you've had with government that stands out to you?

4f. Would you say that government affects your life everyday?

4g. What about growing up? What do you remember hearing about government when you were growing up? Are there any experiences with government you remember?

4h. What do you remember learning about government in school? How do you think that's changed?

4i. Are there any government programs that you've ever benefited from? What were those experiences like?

4j. Would you prefer that the government be run more like a business?

5. What about among your friends and family? What do you hear from them about government?

5a. Has what you've heard from them fit with your own experiences?

5b. Is there any time where you felt like your views of government changed a lot?

6. If you felt the government had wronged you in some way, say by giving you an unfair parking ticket or making you wait in a long line for something they were supposed to send to you, what would you do?

6a. (If they say they couldn't do anything) Do you think there are other people who would be more successful in fighting that kind of thing?

7. Some people really like to follow politics, but others really try to avoid it. What about you? Do you see yourself as being interested in politics?

7a. People do all sorts of things to try to change their communities, their cities, the world and so on. Is there anything that you do where you feel you are trying to change the world around you?

7b. Do you view any of those things as political?

7c. A lot of people struggle to get out to vote because they don't have time, they have to work, or they just don't feel like it. What about you? In the last couple of elections, have you been able to make it to vote?

7d. If you had a friend who wanted to get involved in politics, what would your advice be for them?

8. When you think about your friends and family, do they talk about politics?

8a. What are those conversations like?

8b. Are there other places you tend to hear about politics or see political news, such as social media sites?

9. What do you think politicians see when they see you?

9a. Tell me a bit more about that.

9b. Are there other things they might see that could cut against that image of you?

9c. What does it mean to you for politicians to see you as X?

9d. What do you think makes politicians see somebody like you that way?

9e. Can you think of an experience you had with someone in government that made you feel like X?

9f. How much do you think people in X group can change the way government operates?

9g. How much do you think people in X group agree on their feelings about government and politics?

9h. How many of your friends and family do you think would also claim that politicians see them as X?

10. Is there anything else you'd like me to know that we haven't covered so far?

Research Site Information and Coding Process

Though the main text focuses on race, I did not begin the interviews assuming that racial variation would be the most salient government visibility division. With that said, I was aware of the need to vary interviewees along dimensions central to the study of political science (Schaffer 2016). To accomplish this task, four interview sites were selected. These included: Site A- an urban, lower income and racially diverse neighborhood; Site B- an urban, middle-class and largely white neighborhood; Site C- an almost exclusively white, affluent suburb; and Site D- an economically diverse and predominantly white rural town. These sites provided variation along the dimensions of race, along with ethnicity, geography, class and partisanship. To expand interviewee variation, and avoid idiosyncrasies in these sites, several interviewees also came from a sample collected at a large fair that attracted individuals from all over the same state in which the four sites were located. This recruitment was also purposive, designed to recruit interviewees who varied along the same dimensions discussed above.¹

In these communities, I undertook observation at local meetings and social gatherings to begin building trust with residents. Over 100 hours were devoted to this initial ethnographic component. As noted in the text, the connections made through this work were used to recruit interviewees. Importantly, I was able to reach less engaged individuals through “snowball

¹ These interviewees came from a pool generously provided to me by the Center for Political Psychology at the University of Minnesota.

sampling,” in which I would ask my early interviewees to recommend someone else in the area I could talk to, and preferably an individual who spent less time coming to community gatherings (Morse 1990). In addition, these ethnographic methods gave me insight into each community, meaning I could more easily work to recruit individuals that I felt represented the range of viewpoints within the community. As noted in the text, this meant that my recruitment process employed a sequential case study logic in which each interviewee represented a new case used to inform the selection of the next case (Small 2009). From this perspective, analyzing the interview data as they were ongoing was necessary to make sure I was cognizant of the diversity among interviewee viewpoints, and the dimensions that seemed to be pertinent in constructing that diversity.

In accomplishing this task, the interview data was analyzed through a specific process. All were transcribed and then coded to create broad categories of interest. A data reduction procedure was then applied, involving summarizing and comparing each of these categories, providing a view of important factors across interviews, as well as variation within these factors across the interviewees (Rubin and Rubin 2011b). Through abductive reasoning (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2011), these factors generated preliminary expectations, which I tested against the subsequent interview data, creating revisions in those areas where the evidence did not match up. This abductive procedure was completed when I reached a saturation point, meaning the interviews were not providing new information (Small 2009) and had provided conclusions that the data was no longer contradicting.

Finally, the potential for interviewer bias within this project was important. I was aware of my appearance cuing ideas among interviewees. In an attempt to mitigate this issue, I avoided directly addressing social characteristics in my questions (e.g. race, gender, etc.) working to

minimize systematic bias. Further, the ethnographic work allowed me to build a certain level of trust with my interviewees, fostering an environment in which I hoped people would feel comfortable sharing their views. As noted in the text, however, this level of trust clearly did not prevent interviewer bias from taking place. White interviewees' use of possessive pronouns (e.g. discussing "our" tax burden) is likely only the most obvious manifestation of such bias. As Lin points out, such bias cannot really be eliminated, making it more important to consider "how [interviewer bias] works and what it tells us," (Lin 2000, 191). In this case, that race appears to have cued particular responses among white interviewees reveals the racialized nature of government visibility. More specifically, such responses illuminate the role that white identity might play in shaping government visibility, suggesting that future scholars might consider exploring this concept in alignment with the emerging scholarship on white identity politics (Jardina 2019).

Appendix References

- Jardina, Ashley. 2019. *White Identity Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, Ann Chih. 2000. *Reform in the Making*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Miles, Matthew B., A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldaña. 2013. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3 edition. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Morse, Janice, ed. 1990. *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*. 1 edition. Newbury Park, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. 2011. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 3 edition. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2015. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist Guide*. 1 edition. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. 2011. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. 1 edition. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2009. "How Many Cases Do I Need?" On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field-Based Research." *Ethnography* 10 (1):5–38.

Interviewee Descriptions

In the table below, I provide pseudonyms for each interviewee, along with the site from which they were recruited, their identification as either white or a person of color, and the date of our interview. I provide no additional identifying information to protect the interviewees' anonymity.

Pseudonym	Date	Site[^]	Racial Identification
Amy	4/13/16	F	White
Bernie and Lucie	9/29/16	B	White
Bogert	8/22/16	D	White
Carla	8/19/16	F	Person of Color
Carol Hill	12/7/16	B	White
Charlotte	11/3/16	A	White
Christine	3/9/16	F	White
Chuck Wes	11/1/16	A	Person of Color
Coach Y	10/16/16	B	Person of Color
Curt	11/7/16	D	White
Daisis Oasis	3/7/16	A	White
Dave	4/11/16	F	White
David	4/20/16	F	White
Deb	4/6/16	F	White
Dick and Jane	12/15/16	D	White
Dick Self	12/19/16	F	White
DK	9/27/16	B	White
Donna	12/15/16	D	White
DR	10/28/16	D	White
Emmie Brown	10/19/16	A	Person of Color
Eric Red	12/9/16	C	White
Hotmetal	11/29/16	B	White
Ishmael	12/20/16	F	White
Jackie	6/22/16	F	White
Jane	10/11/16	B	White
Jay	11/8/16, 12/1/16*	A	Person of Color
Jeff	8/23/16	D	White
Joe	3/11/16	F	White
Julie	7/14/16	F	White
Kathy	7/26/16	F	White
Katy	10/27/16, 11/16/16*	C	White
Kimmie Fagud	11/10/16	A	Person of Color
Kyle	3/29/16	F	White
Lisa	11/2/16	F	Person of Color
Marc	8/30/16	F	White
Maria Jackson	2/26/16	F	White

Marny	12/6/16	D	White
Maya	10/18/16	A	Person of Color
Michelle	9/15/16	F	Person of Color
MichMpls	12/22/16	F	White
Millie	11/30/16	B	White
Mohammed	9/8/16	F	Person of Color
PetPeeve	10/13/16	B	White
Publicus Anonymous	11/17/16	C	White
Robert and Laura	12/2/16	C	White
Rose	9/26/16	B	White
Rose Stone	10/14/16	C	White
Sam	12/6/16	D	White
Sanyare	11/28/16	A	Person of Color
Sierra	7/12/16	F	Person of Color
Sky	11/4/16	A	Person of Color
Stephanie Lawrence	12/8/16	C	White
TJ	12/15/16	A	Person of Color
Trey Turner	12/16/16	F	White
TS	10/31/16	A	Person of Color
William and Sophia	10/4/16	B	White
Zack Sloane	12/13/16	C	White
Zoe	3/8/16	F	White

^Sites A, B, C and D are described above. Site F refers to the large fair from which the remaining interviewees were recruited.

*Interviews with both Jay and Katy were held over two sessions.

Appendix B: Question Wording

Dependent Variable

Political Trust- based on respondent's answer to the question: *How often can you trust the federal government in Washington to do what is right?* Scale includes: Never (0), Some of the time (.25), About half of the time (.5), Most of the time (.75), and Always (1).

Key Independent Variables

Welfare, Social Security, Environmental, and Child Care spending scales- Each uses a three-point scale, includes a desire for decreased spending (0), keeping spending levels the same (0.5), or increased spending (1).

Race- Self-identification of the respondent's racial identity as a person of color (0) or white (1). People of color include individuals who identified as black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or Hispanic.

Police Feeling Thermometer- response to how people would rate the police on a feeling thermometer running from 0 to 100, rescaled to run from most negative (0) to most positive (1).

Party Identification- 7 categories, scaled to run from strong Democrat (0) to strong Republican (1).

Control Variables

Ideology- 7 categories, scaled to run from extremely liberal (0) to extremely conservative (1).

Gender- Self-identification of the respondent's gender as male (0) or female (1).

Age group- 12 categories, scaled to run from 18-20 (0) to 75 or older (1).

Income groups- 28 categories, scaled to run from under \$5,000 (0) to more than \$250,000 (1).

Education- 13 categories, scaled to run from "Less than 1st grade" (0) to "Doctorate degree" (1).

Political knowledge scale- Constructed from four questions, where 0 is the incorrect answer and 1 is the correct answer. These are then added together and rescaled to run from no correct answers (0) to four correct answers (1). Below are the specific questions.

For how many years is a United States Senator elected – that is, how many years are there in one full term of office for a U.S. Senator? Correct answer: 6.

On which of the following does the U.S. federal government currently spend the least [Foreign Aid, Medicare, National Defense, Social Security]? Correct answer: Foreign aid.

Do you happen to know which party currently has the most members in the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington? Correct answer: Republicans.

Do you happen to know which party currently has the most members in the U.S. Senate? Correct answer: Republicans.

Religiosity- Binary indicator for an individual indicating that religion is not an important part of their life (0) or is an important part of their life (1).

Appendix C: Robustness Checks

Table C1- Racial Contingences in the Relationship Between Political Trust and Welfare Attitudes/Police Attitudes Using Ordinal Logistic Regression

	Model C1.1 Political Trust and Welfare Attitudes	Model C1.2 Political Trust and Welfare Attitudes Across Races	Model C1.3 Political trust and Police Attitudes	Model C1.4 Political trust and Police Attitudes Across Races
Party ID	-0.120 (0.12)	-0.115 (0.12)	-0.158 (0.12)	-0.165 (0.12)
Ideology	-0.655*** (0.12)	-0.636*** (0.12)	-0.835*** (0.12)	-0.813*** (0.12)
Female	0.012 (0.08)	0.013 (0.08)	0.004 (0.08)	0.009 (0.08)
Age	0.041 (0.16)	0.044 (0.16)	-0.039 (0.16)	-0.013 (0.16)
Income	0.112 (0.16)	0.108 (0.17)	0.006 (0.16)	0.004 (0.16)
Education	0.150 (0.34)	0.137 (0.34)	0.098 (0.35)	0.101 (0.35)
Political Knowledge	-0.186 (0.16)	-0.187 (0.16)	-0.140 (0.16)	-0.154 (0.16)
Religiosity	0.105 (0.09)	0.113 (0.09)	0.078 (0.09)	0.091 (0.09)
White	-0.588*** (0.10)	-0.777*** (0.14)	-0.729*** (0.10)	-0.170 (0.33)
Welfare Attitudes	0.334** (0.12)	0.029 (0.24)		
White x Welfare Attitudes		0.458 [^] (0.27)		
Police Attitudes			0.788*** (0.22)	1.228*** (0.34)
White x Police Attitudes				-0.791 [^] (0.44)
Intercept 1	-2.554*** (0.29)	-2.688*** (0.30)	-2.451*** (0.31)	-2.143*** (0.36)
Intercept 2	-0.297 (0.28)	-0.428 (0.29)	-0.191 (0.30)	0.117 (0.35)
Intercept 3	1.631*** (0.29)	1.501*** (0.30)	1.749*** (0.31)	2.061*** (0.36)
Intercept 4	3.546*** (0.35)	3.415*** (0.37)	3.665*** (0.37)	3.980*** (0.42)
Observations	3845	3845	3779	3779
Method	Ordinal Logistic	Ordinal Logistic	Ordinal Logistic	Ordinal Logistic
Pseudo R ²	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.04

Source: 2016 ANES, [^]p<.1, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed.

Table C2- Placebo Tests: Racial contingencies in relationship between trust and other government entities

	Model C2.1 Social Security Spending	Model C2.2 Child Care Spending	Model C2.3 Environmental Spending
Ideology	-0.090*** (0.01)	-0.081*** (0.01)	-0.065*** (0.01)
Female	0.001 (0.01)	-0.001 (0.01)	-0.002 (0.01)
Age	0.013 (0.02)	0.007 (0.02)	0.008 (0.02)
Income	0.003 (0.02)	0.009 (0.02)	0.007 (0.02)
Education	-0.005 (0.04)	-0.002 (0.04)	-0.003 (0.04)
Political Knowledge	-0.019 (0.02)	-0.013 (0.02)	-0.009 (0.02)
Religiosity	0.014 (0.01)	0.014 (0.01)	0.019 [^] (0.01)
White	-0.105** (0.03)	-0.111*** (0.03)	-0.107*** (0.03)
Party ID	-0.020 (0.01)	-0.018 (0.01)	-0.014 (0.01)
Social Security Spending Preferences	-0.051 (0.04)		
White x Social Security Spending	0.036 (0.04)		
Child Care Spending Preferences		-0.004 (0.03)	
White x Child Care Spending		0.051 (0.03)	
Environmental Spending Preferences			0.036 (0.03)
White x Environmental Spending Preferences			0.051 (0.04)
Constant	0.509*** (0.04)	0.463*** (0.04)	0.417*** (0.04)
Observations	3849	3835	3848
Method	OLS	OLS	OLS
R ²	0.06	0.06	0.07

Source: 2016 ANES, [^]p<.1, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed.

**Table C3- Partisan Contingences in the Relationship Between
Political Trust and Welfare Attitudes/Police Attitudes**

	Model C3.1 Political Trust and Welfare Attitudes Across Party ID	Model C3.2 Political Trust and Police Attitudes Across Party ID
Ideology	-0.075*** (0.01)	-0.095*** (0.01)
Female	-0.000 (0.01)	-0.001 (0.01)
Age	0.006 (0.02)	-0.004 (0.02)
Income	0.014 (0.02)	0.002 (0.02)
Education	-0.003 (0.04)	-0.010 (0.04)
Political Knowledge	-0.018 (0.02)	-0.014 (0.02)
Religiosity	0.015 (0.01)	0.012 (0.01)
White	-0.071*** (0.01)	-0.087*** (0.01)
Party ID	-0.034^ (0.02)	0.033 (0.06)
Welfare Attitudes	0.018 (0.02)	
Police Attitudes		0.118* (0.05)
Party ID x Welfare Attitudes	0.045 (0.04)	
Party ID x Police Attitudes		-0.072 (0.07)
Constant	0.445*** (0.03)	0.405*** (0.05)
Observations	3845	3779
Method	OLS	OLS
R ²	0.06	0.07

Source: 2016 ANES, ^p<.1, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance tests are two-tailed. Survey weights provided by the ANES are employed.