**Online Appendix 1. Details about the American National Election Studies Time Series**

(1a) Overview of the 2012 ANES

This study was conducted on a sample of U.S. citizens, age 18 or older. For the first time in the history of the ANES time series survey, face-to-face interviewing was supplemented with data collection on the Internet. Data collection was conducted in the two modes independently, using separate samples. For the face-to-face mode, all sampled persons were interviewed in person using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI), which also incorporated an interview segment in each wave that was self-administered (CASI). The face-to-face mode used an address-based sample with in-person recruitment in addition to in-person interviews. For the Internet mode, all study participants were members of the KnowledgePanel, a panel of regular survey participants administered by GfK (formerly Knowledge Networks).

The dates of the survey were as follows:

Pre-election, face-to-face: Sept. 8 – Nov. 5 (median October13).

Pre-election, internet: Oct. 11 – Nov. 6 (median Oct. 25)

Post-election, face-to-face: Nov. 7 – January 13, 2013 (median Nov. 26).

Post-election, internet: Nov. 29 – January 24, 2013 (median Dec. 9).

 For more details, see www.electionstudies.org.

(1b) Question wording

Race/Ethnicity

“I am going to read you a list of five race categories. Please choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be: white; black or African-American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander?”

“Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?”

Education

What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received? **-**Less than 1st grade

-1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th grade

-5th or 6th grade

-7th or 8th grade

-9th grade

-10th grade

-11th grade

-12th grade no diploma

-High school graduate- high school diploma or equivalent (for example: GED)

-Some college but no degree

-Associate degree in college - Occupational/vocational program

-Associate degree in college -- Academic program

-Bachelor's degree (For example: BA, AB, BS)

-Master's degree (For example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA)

-Professional School Degree (For example: MD,DDS,DVM,LLB,JD)

-Doctorate degree (For example: PhD, EdD) 95. Other {SPECIFY

National welfare state policies index: an average of the following five questions

[Respondents were asked about a number of federal spending items; the order of these items was randomized. Respondents were also randomly assigned to questions that had wording that was either “about the same” or “the same.”]

“Next I am going to read you a list of federal programs. For each one, I would like you to tell me whether you would like to see spending increased or decreased. The first program is:”

(1) “(What about) aid to the poor? (Should federal spending on aid to the poor be increased, decreased, or kept [about the same / the same]?)”

(2) “(What about) child care? (Should federal spending on child care be increased, decreased, or kept [about the same / the same]?)”

(3) “(What about) welfare programs? (Should federal spending on welfare programs be increased, decreased, or kept [about the same / the same]?)”

(4) “Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?” [“Haven’t thought much about this” coded as missing.]

-1. Govt should see to jobs and standard of living

-2.

-3.

-4.

-5.

-6.

-7. Govt should let each person get ahead on own

(5) “Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.

Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? [“Haven’t thought much about this” coded as missing.]

-1. Govt should provide many fewer services

-2.

-3.

-4.

-5.

-6.

-7. Govt should provide many more services

Whites need to work together (Source: 2016 ANES; only white respondents analyzed)

How important is it that whites work together to change laws that are unfair

to whites?

-1. Extremely important

-2. Very important

-3. Moderately important

-4. A little important

-5. Not at all important

Whites unable to find job (Source: 2016 ANES; only white respondents analyzed)

How likely is it that many whites are unable to find a job because employers are

hiring minorities instead?

-1. Extremely likely

-2. Very likely

-3. Somewhat likely

-4. Not at all likely

Government treats whites worse than blacks (Source: 2016 ANES; only white respondents analyzed)

This is a branching question.

Part 1:

In general, does the federal government treat whites better than blacks, treat blacks

better than whites, or treat them both the same?

-1. Treats whites better

-2. Treats both the same

-3. Treats blacks better

Part 2:

If respondent says the federal government treats whites better:

Does the federal government treat whites [much better, moderately better, or a

little better / a little better, moderately better, or much better]? /

-1. Much

-2. Moderately

-3. A little

If respondent says the federal government treats blacks better:

Does the federal government treat blacks [much better, moderately better, or a

little better / a little better, moderately better, or much better]?

-1. Much

-2. Moderately

-3. A little

Police treat whites worse than blacks (Source: 2016 ANES; only white respondents analyzed)

This is a branching question.

In general, do the police treat whites better than blacks, treat blacks better than

whites, or treat them both the same?

-1. Treat whites better

-2. Treat both the same

-3. Treat blacks better

If respondent says police treat whites better:

Do the police treat whites [much better, moderately better, or a little better / a

little better, moderately better, or much better]? /

-1. Much

-2. Moderately

-3. A little

If respondent says police treat blacks better:

Do the police treat blacks [much better, moderately better, or a little better / a

little better, moderately better, or much better]?

-1. Much

-2. Moderately

-3. A little

Affirmative action in the workplace (only black respondents analyzed)

This is a branching question.

Part 1:

“Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose allowing companies to increase the number of black workers by considering race along with other factors when choosing employees?

-1. Favor

-2. Oppose

-3. Neither favor nor oppose

Part 2:

If respondent favors allowing affirmative action at work:

“Do you favor that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]?” [respondent randomly assigned to one of these two response option orders]

-1. A great deal

-2. A moderate amount

-3. A little

If respondent opposes allowing affirmative action at work:

“Do you oppose that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]?” [respondent randomly assigned to one of these two response option orders]

-1. A great deal

-2. A moderate amount

-3. A little

Affirmative action in universities (only black respondents analyzed)

This is a branching question.

Part 1:

“Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose allowing universities to increase the number of black students studying at their schools by considering race along with other factors when choosing students?

-1. Favor

-2. Oppose

-3. Neither favor nor oppose

Part 2:

If respondent favors allowing affirmative action in universities:

Do you favor that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]?” [respondent randomly assigned to one of these two response option orders]

-1. A great deal

-2. A moderate amount

-3. A little

If respondent opposes allowing affirmative action in universities:

Do you oppose that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]?” [respondent randomly assigned to one of these two response option orders]

-1. A great deal

-2. A moderate amount

-3. A little

Federal government enforcement of legislation barring employment discrimination against black people (only black respondents analyzed)

This is a branching question.

Part 1:

“Should the government in Washington see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or is this not the federal government's business?”

-1. Government in Washington should see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs

-2. This is not the federal government's business

Part 2:

If respondent’s position is that government should see to fair jobs for blacks:

“Do you feel strongly or not strongly that the government in Washington should see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs?

-1. Strongly

-2. Not strongly

If respondent’s position is that it is not the government’s business to see to fair jobs for blacks:

“Do you feel strongly or not strongly that this is not the federal government’s business?

-1. Strongly

-2. Not strongly

Federal government aid to blacks (only black respondents analyzed)

“Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.”

“Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?” [“Haven’t thought much about this” coded as missing.]

-1. Govt should help blacks

-2.

-3.

-4.

-5.

-6.

-7. Blacks should help themselves

State legislation requires police to check immigration status (only Latino respondents analyzed)

Some states have passed a law that will require state and local police to determine the immigration status of a person if they find that there is a reasonable suspicion he or she is an undocumented immigrant. Those found to be in the U.S. without permission will have broken state law.

From what you have heard, do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose these immigration laws?

-1. Favor

-2. Oppose

-3. Neither favor or oppose

Some who entered the country illegally can become permanent residents (only Latino respondents analyzed)

There is a proposal to allow people who were illegally brought into the U.S. as children to become permanent U.S. residents under some circumstances. Specifically, citizens of other countries who illegally entered the U.S. before age 16, who have lived in the U.S. 5 years or longer, and who graduated high school would be allowed to stay in the U.S. as permanent residents if they attend college or serve in the military. From what you have heard, do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose this proposal?

-1. Favor

-2. Oppose

-3. Neither favor or oppose

Some unauthorized immigrants can become U.S. citizens, or all become felons and are deported (only Latino respondents analyzed)

Which comes closest to your view about what government policy should be toward unauthorized immigrants now living in the United States?

-1. Make all unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back to their home country.

-2. Have a guest worker program that allows unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States in order to work, but only for a limited amount of time.

-3. Allow unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes and fines, learning English, and passing background checks.

-4. Allow unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, without penalties.

Linked fate

This is a branching question.

Part I:

“Do you think that what happens generally to [hispanic people/black people/white people] in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?”

-1. Yes

-2. No

Part II (if yes):

“Will it affect you [a lot, some, or not very much/not very much, some, or a lot]?”

-1. A lot

-2. Some

-3. Not very much

**Online Appendix 2: Responses in each domain, by experimental condition and race or ethnicity, CCES 2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Control* | *Small Disparity* | *Large Disparity* |
| *School* | *Job* | *Candidate* | *School* | *Job* | *Candidate* | *School* | *Job* | *Candidate* |
| *Whites* | 479 | 505 | 442 | 527 | 543 | 552 | 598 | 547 | 583 |
| *Blacks* | 88 | 89 | 77 | 88 | 77 | 89 | 89 | 98 | 94 |
| *Latinos* | 52 | 63 | 48 | 51 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 38 | 52 |

**Online Appendix 3: Subsamples for well- and poorly-educated respondents, by race or ethnicity, CCES 2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | White | Black | Latino |
| High school or less | 36% (581) | 23% (62) |  20% (46) |
| Some college or more | 65% (1054) | 77% (211) |  79% (176) |

**Online Appendix 4. Distribution of support for government social provision index (2012 ANES)**







**Online Appendix 5. Regression models on which Figure 3 is based, and alternative specifications**

(5a) Models with no control variables (basis for Figure 3)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Whites | Blacks | Latinos |
| High School Grad | -0.04\* | -0.03 | -0.07\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Some College | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.10\*\* | -0.14\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| College Plus | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.09\*\* | -0.18\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Constant | 0.51\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.66\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
| Observations | 3462 | 1006 | 996 |
| R-squared | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.07 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.001 (one-tailed); cell entries are ordinary least squares regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is support for government social provision, and the omitted category is less than a high school education. Source: 2012 ANES

(5b) Models with control variables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Whites | Blacks | Latinos |
| High School Grad | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.08\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| Some College | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.09\*\* | -0.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| College Plus | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.08\* | -0.17\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| Partisanship (Republican) | -0.35\*\*\* | -0.24\*\*\* | -0.23\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| Male | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Age | -0.07\*\*\* | 0.00 | -0.06 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| South | -0.01 | -0.02 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Constant | 0.74\*\*\* | 0.78\*\*\* | 0.77\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 3428 | 991 | 974 |
| R-squared | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.18 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.001 (one-tailed); cell entries are ordinary least squares regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is support for government social provision, and the omitted category is less than a high school education. Source: 2012 ANES

(5c) Same as Appendix 5a except only the face-to-face sample is included

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Whites | Blacks | Latinos |
| High School Grad | -0.04 | -0.03 | -0.09\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| Some College | -0.06\* | -0.09\*\* | -0.15\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| College Plus | -0.11\*\*\* | -0.11\*\* | -0.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.07) |
| Constant | 0.54\*\*\* | 0.79\*\*\* | 0.75\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 909 | 504 | 471 |
| R-squared | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.10 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.001 (one-tailed); cell entries are ordinary least squares regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is support for government social provision, and the omitted category is less than a high school education. Source: 2012 ANES

(5d) Same as Appendix 5a except only the Internet sample is included

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Whites | Blacks | Latinos |
| High School Grad | -0.04 | -0.03 | -0.07\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Some College | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.11\* | -0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| College Plus | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.08 | -0.16\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| Constant | 0.49\*\*\* | 0.71\*\*\* | 0.63\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.02) |
| Observations | 2553 | 502 | 525 |
| R-squared | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.07 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.001 (one-tailed); cell entries are ordinary least squares regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is support for government social provision, and the omitted category is less than a high school education. Source: 2012 ANES

(5e) Same as Appendix 5b except including linked fate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Whites | Blacks | Latinos |
| High School Grad | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.08\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| Some College | -0.06\*\*\* | -0.09\* | -0.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| College Plus | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.09\* | -0.16\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Partisanship (Republican) | -0.34\*\*\* | -0.23\*\*\* | -0.23\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| Male | -0.03\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Age | -0.07\*\*\* | 0.02 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| South | -0.00 | -0.02 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Linked fate | -0.04\*\* | 0.06\*\* | 0.08\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| Constant | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.74\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| Observations | 3072 | 912 | 868 |
| R-squared | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.20 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.001 (one-tailed); cell entries are ordinary least squares regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is support for government social provision, and the omitted category is less than a high school education. Source: 2012 ANES

**Online Appendix 6. Same as Figure 3 except income is used instead of education**



This graph plots unstandardized ordinary least squares coefficient estimates with 95% confidence intervals. Values represent the relationship between support for government social provision policies and income (measured as a continuous variable). N=3283 whites; 879 blacks; 899 Latinos. Source: 2012 ANES.

**Online Appendix 7: Analyses separating Blacks and Latino respondents**





**Online Appendix 8: CCES analyses with family income in place of education**

To test the robustness of our results, we replicate the findings in the text by using family income instead of years of schooling. This provides a finer grained measure than the two-point education indicator. Similar to the findings in the text, there is relatively little difference in the choice for group environment between those with high and low incomes in the Control condition (although higher income respondents are especially committed to descriptive representation). In all domains and for all incomes, the experimental treatments have their expected impact.

Also similar to the findings in the text and more theoretically relevant, affluent respondents of color respond to the experimental treatments more substantially than do those of lesser means. In the Job and Candidate domains, there is a linear decline by income in choosing the same-race context once salary or policy disparities are introduced; in both domains we see a roughly 20 percentage point difference in group connection between the most and least affluent in both Small and Large Disparity treatments. The School domain shows the same 20 percentage point difference by income in choosing group connection when a Small Disparity is introduced, though no further drop with a Large Disparity.

*Proportion choosing own-group option across treatments by race, family income, and arena of life, CCES 2014 (unweighted)*



For whites, however, we see different results when using family income rather than years of schooling as a measure of status. The results reported in the text, in short, do not replicate smoothly. Unlike our results using education as a measure of status, there are no substantial differences by income among whites in the Control condition. In the Small and Large Disparity conditions, whites behave much like respondents of color; the affluent move away from same-race contexts when presented with the option of individualized interests more than do those with lower incomes. The differences are fairly small, about 10 percentage points between the most and least affluent in all domains and both Disparity conditions, but they are consistent.

*Proportion choosing own-group option across treatments by race, family income, and arena of life, CCES 2014 (unweighted)*



**Online Appendix 9: Codeable open-ended responses by group, condition, and circumstance, CIR module in CCES 2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *School/Neighborhood* | *Salary* | *Mayoral candidate* |
|  | *Control* | *Small Disparity* | *Large Disparity* | *Control* | *Small Disparity* | *Large Disparity* | *Control* | *Small Disparity* | *Large Disparity* |
| *Total* | 187 | 228 | 199 | 225 | 209 | 197 | 212 | 193 | 224 |
| *White* | 141 | 159 | 145 | 167 | 152 | 145 | 150 | 139 | 173 |
| *Black* | 18 | 32 | 26 | 28 | 23 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 24 |
| *Hispanic* | 18 | 20 | 13 | 15 | 23 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 16 |

Note: This table includes everyone who said something codeable in the open-ended responses. However, 43 respondents in the neighborhood, 47 in the job, and 55 in the candidate conditions did not respond to the close-ended item preceding the query of “why?” (Their open-ended response presumably can be read as “why someone should or would make that choice.”)