Online Appendix for "Inverting the Lens: White Privilege Denial in Evaluations of Politicians and Policy"

Table of Contents

- A. White Privilege Items (p. 1)
- B. Distribution of Racial Attitudes (p. 2 3)
- C. Question Wording for WI, WC, SDO, Hostile Sexism, and Factor Analyses (pgs. 4 6)
- D. Robustness Checks, Controlling for SDO and Sexism (pgs. 7 9)
- E. Replication of Findings Using the Common Content in 2018 and 2020 (pgs. 10 12)
- F. Effects of the Racial Attitudes on Pro-Republican Affective Polarization (pgs. 13 14)
- G. Candidate Evaluations Analysis Alternative (p. 15)
- H. Interaction Effects of the Racial Attitudes by Ideology and Party ID (pgs. 16 22)
- I. Presidential Approval Ordered Logit Analysis (pg. 23)
- J. Question Wording for Policy Items (pg. 24)
- K. Exploring the Acknowledgement of White Privilege using WI and WC (pgs. 25 35)

A. White Privilege Items

Our inquiry utilizes three of the five items in the White Privilege scale designed by Swim and

Miller (1999) which focus on Whites' belief in White privilege at the group level. Here is the

original scale, with the group-level items we used in bold.

Table A1. Swim and Miller's (1999) White Privilege Scale

- 1. White people have certain advantages that minorities do not have in this society.
- 2. My status as a White person grants me unearned privileges in today's society.
- 3. I feel that White skin in the United States opens many doors for Whites during their everyday lives.
- 4. I do not feel that White people have any benefits due to their race.
- 5. My skin color is an asset to me in my everyday life

B. Distribution of Racial Attitudes

Figure B1. Distribution of WPD & RR among Liberals and Conservatives, 2016







C. Question Wording and Factor Analyses for WI, WC, SDO, and Hostile Sexism

The White Identity, White Consciousness, and Social Dominance Orientation items were not included on the 2016 survey, so the results we present for those are for 2018 only. We follow Jardina's (2019) coding for WI and WC. We used the SDO-8, a shortened version of the Social Dominance Orientation scale, and rescaled it in an index to run from 0 to 1.

The Hostile Sexism items vary across each year of the CES. The measures listed for 2016 were included only in our module of the CCES. The items for 2018 and 2020 were included in the common content. We rescaled these items in an index to run from 0 to 1.

White Identity

• How important is being white to your identity? Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Not important at all" to "Extremely important"

White Consciousness

- Many whites are unable to find a job because employers are hiring minorities instead. Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree"
- How important is it that whites work together to change laws that are unfair to whites? Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Not important at all" to "Extremely important"

Social Dominance Orientation

- 1. "An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom."
- 2. "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups."
- 3. "No one group should dominate in society."
- 4. "Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top."
- 5. "Group equality should not be our primary goal."
- 6. "It is unjust to try to make groups equal."
- 7. "We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups."
- 8. "We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed."

Responses for all items range on 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly oppose" to "Strongly favor"

Hostile Sexism

- 2016
 - "When women complain about discrimination, how often do they cause more problems than they solve?"
 - Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Always"
 - "When women demand equality these days, they are actually seeking special favors."

Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Always"

- 2018
 - "When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain." Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree"
 - "Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men." Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree"
- 2020
 - "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men." Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree"
 - "Women are too easily offended." Responses on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree"

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4
WPD 1	0.8302	0.0614	0.0343	0.0057
WPD 2	0.8382	0.029	0.0089	0.009
WPD 3	0.5274	0.2408	0.0643	-0.0243
RR 1	0.2719	0.3507	0.0386	0.2406
RR 2	0.0586	0.7823	0.0387	0.0333
RR 3	0.0952	0.7816	0.0338	-0.026
RR 4	0.3619	0.345	0.0106	0.2169
Sexism 1	-0.007	0.049	0.7629	-0.0037
Sexism 2	0.0574	0.008	0.7582	0.0065

Table C1. 2016 Factor Analysis of the Racial Attitudes and Hostile Sexism

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Factor5	Factor6	Factor7	Factor8
WPD 1	0.9218	-0.0735	0.0198	0.0481	0.0404	0.0204	-0.0067	-0.0091
WPD 2	0.9371	-0.0567	0.0203	0.0073	0.0145	0.0194	-0.0058	-0.0507
WPD 3	0.7065	0.2243	-0.0095	-0.0578	0.0061	-0.058	0.0426	0.0564
RR 1	0.3014	-0.0248	-0.0159	-0.0098	0.0112	0.4914	0.1166	-0.0094
RR 2	0.2897	0.0415	0.083	0.4814	0.0411	0.0141	-0.0241	-0.0037
RR 3	0.3195	-0.046	-0.0188	0.5502	-0.0145	-0.032	0.0472	0.0631
RR 4	0.3401	-0.0025	0.0169	0.0039	0.0193	0.4966	-0.0417	0.0258
WI	-0.1525	-0.0685	-0.0107	0.0558	0.0603	-0.0225	0.0624	0.5531
WC 1	0.2933	0.197	-0.0365	0.1568	-0.0412	0.0456	-0.0331	0.1221
WC 2	0.1632	0.0132	-0.0102	-0.0432	-0.0387	0.0205	-0.0571	0.5345
SDO 1	0.02	-0.0151	0.306	-0.0403	0.2669	-0.0332	0.071	0.145
SDO 2	-0.0097	0.024	0.0756	0.0946	0.2354	0.0643	-0.0611	0.1351
SDO 3	0.0249	0.0186	-0.0803	0.0239	0.6081	-0.0797	0.0572	0.0133
SDO 4	-0.0144	-0.0148	0.1157	-0.0163	0.6151	0.0257	-0.0065	0.0305
SDO 5	0.0843	-0.0054	0.6065	0.0298	-0.0321	-0.0226	0.0244	0.0351
SDO 6	0.0512	0.0031	0.6449	-0.0192	0.127	-0.0024	0.0028	-0.0169
SDO 7	0.1451	0.0365	0.2938	0.0251	0.5117	0.0037	0.0064	-0.046
SDO 8	0.0695	0.0059	-0.1003	-0.0101	0.7203	0.0491	-0.0287	0.024
Sexism 1	0.1461	0.3832	0.0626	0.0327	0.0689	-0.0129	0.0464	-0.0548
Sexism 2	0.2341	0.0794	0.1839	0.0447	0.006	0.1307	0.2569	-0.0058

Table C2. 2018 Factor Analysis of the Racial Attitudes, WI/WC, SDO, and HS

Table C3. 2020 Factor Analysis of the Racial Attitudes and Hostile Sexism

Variable	Factor1	Factor2
WPD 1	0.8197	0.0263
RR 2	0.7021	0.2239
RR 4	0.8595	0.0251
Sexism 1	0.0146	0.7234
Sexism 2	0.1418	0.6984

D. Robustness Checks, Controlling for SDO and Hostile Sexism

Here we replicate our main analysis while controlling for SDO and Hostile Sexism. In all but one case (the ACA model) WPD remains a significant predictor of Whites' political attitudes; the significance of RR disappears in 5 out of 13 models.

	Candidate	AffPolar	Obama
WPD	33.036*	16.270*	-1.008^{*}
	(10.31)	(5.82)	(0.4)
RR	40.931*	24.949*	-0.97
	(11.15)	(7.1)	(0.5)
Sexism	35.412*	26.282*	-1.427*
	(10.84)	(6.23)	(0.41)
Conservative	21.115*	15.012*	-1.353*
	(10.7)	(7.22)	(0.49)
Republican	81.837*	93.758*	-2.594*
-	(7.84)	(5.54)	(0.33)
Female	-1.129	4.084	-0.263
	(3.93)	(2.47)	(0.17)
Age	19.032*	0.176	-0.817*
_	(8.21)	(5.82)	(0.36)
Income	-28.816	0.61	0.306
	(16.81)	(10.11)	(0.81)
Education	-1.336	2.857	0.304
	(7.33)	(4.61)	(0.32)
Constant	-104.726*	-93.110*	
	(8.09)	(5.45)	
Cut 1			-3.544*
			(0.42)
R-Squared	0.666	0.769	
Ν	391	431	531
BIC	4083.8	4130	362.7

Table D1. 2016 Analyses Controlling for Hostile Sexism

	Trump	AffPolar	Affirmative	Welfare	ACA
WPD	1.359*	20.022*	1.406*	0.887*	0.504
	(0.41)	(6.71)	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.31)
RR	0.178	6.841	0.942*	0.472	0.971*
	(0.52)	(7.94)	(0.3)	(0.35)	(0.41)
Conservative	1.366*	37.787*	0.587*	1.349*	0.638
	(0.48)	(7.95)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.42)
Republican	2.135*	76.245*	(0.076	0.012	1.247*
	(0.32)	(6.45)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.29)
Female	-0.31	-1.969	0.061	0.069	-0.149
	(0.19)	(2.55)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.15)
Age	0.334	3.087	-0.068	0.071	0.067
	(0.43)	(5.31)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.33)
Income	0.215	2.734	0.667*	1.098*	-0.523
	(0.52)	(5.95)	(0.25)	(0.23)	(0.36)
Education	0.242	2.858	-0.172	0.196	0.199
	(0.37)	(4.36)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.27)
WI	0.134	4.497	-0.033	-0.082	-0.431
	(0.3)	(4.24)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.24)
WC	0.384	5.467	-0.19	-0.294	0.749*
	(0.38)	(5.76)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.32)
SDO	1.466*	13.529	0.14	0.879*	1.808*
	(0.48)	(7.56)	(0.33)	(0.3)	(0.42)
Sexism	1.158*	19.232*	1.173*	0.353	0.11
	(0.46)	(6.92)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.37)
Constant	-4.298*	-91.151*			-2.877*
	(0.46)	(5.29)			(0.35)
Cut 1			-0.191	0.614*	
			(0.23)	(0.22)	
Cut 2			0.513*	1.572*	
			(0.22)	(0.21)	
Cut 3			1.164*	2.910*	
			(0.22)	(0.22)	
Cut 4			2.188*	3.836*	
			(0.24)	(0.24)	
Cut 5			2.578*		
Cast 6			(0.25)		
Cuto			2.943*		
N	516	550	(0.20)	555	556
	240 222 4	332 5217 0	330 1700 4	333 1465 0	550 170 7
DIU	323.4	3317.8	1/00.4	1403.9	4/8./

Table D2. 2018 Analyses Controlling for Hostile Sexism and SDO (Presidential Approval, Affective Polarization, and Racialized Policies)

	<u>USMEX</u>	Levels	Refugees	Anthem	Birther
WPD	0.226***	0.869***	1.195***	1.468***	0.6/0*
DD	(0.05)	(0.25)	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.26)
KK	0.1/1**	1.150***	1.50/***	1.132**	0.29
	(0.06)	(0.31)	(0.45)	(0.41)	(0.36)
Conservative	0.240***	$1.1/0^{***}$	0.26	1.351***	0.415
D 11	(0.06)	(0.31)	(0.42)	(0.37)	(0.31)
Republican	0.1/9***	-0.161	1.101***	0.681*	1.466***
T 1	(0.05)	(0.22)	(0.32)	(0.27)	(0.23)
Female	-0.049**	0.218*	-0.005	0.117	0.267*
	(0.02)	(0.1)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Age	0.184***	0.313	1.045**	0.953***	0.128
_	(0.04)	(0.23)	(0.34)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Income	-0.021	-0.175	-0.13	0.224	(0.144
	(0.05)	(0.24)	(0.38)	(0.32)	(0.3)
Education	0.058	-0.086	0.177	-0.131	-0.464*
	(0.04)	(0.19)	(0.27)	(0.22)	(0.21)
WI	0.029	0.347	-0.197	-0.138	0.403*
	(0.03)	(0.18)	(0.27)	(0.21)	(0.18)
WC	0.140**	-0.004	1.078***	0.476	1.133***
	(0.04)	(0.24)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.26)
SDO	0.147*	0.722*	1.263**	1.018**	0.466
	(0.06)	(0.31)	(0.48)	(0.39)	(0.35)
Sexism	0.110*	0.209	0.297	0.823*	0.481
	(0.05)	(0.27)	(0.4)	(0.33)	(0.31)
Constant	-0.198***				
	(0.04)				
Cut 1		0.347	3.458***	2.139***	2.268***
		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.29)	(0.26)
Cut 2		1.314***		2.668***	3.273***
		(0.21)		(0.3)	(0.28)
Cut 3		2.710***		3.709***	4.235***
		(0.24)		(0.32)	(0.3)
Cut 4		3.212***		4.081***	
		(0.24)		(0.34)	
Ν	541	526	554	556	556
BIC	-87	1342.7	415.9	976.9	1007.1

Table D3. 2018 Analyses Controlling for Hostile Sexism and SDO (Immigration Policies and Symbolic Attitudes)

E. Replication of Findings Using the 2018 and 2020 CES Common Content

Here we replicate our analyses for items included in the common content of the 2018 and 2020 CES. The 2018 analyses allowed us to replicate results for Trump presidential approval, two racialized policies (ACA and Welfare), and immigration policy (Refugees and the Index as analyzed in the main paper). The same dependent variables were available in 2020 except for the item on Refugees. In addition to using the same question wording, the coding for all the variables is identical to that of the main paper. As an additional control, we also present models with and without Hostile Sexism.

White privilege denial is measured with a single item (for both years) that is similar to the first item in the WPD scale. The item from the 2018 and 2020 CES common content is "White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin" whereas the item from the WPD scale is "White people have certain advantages that minorities do not have in this society." Since these items are strikingly similar, it should come as no surprise that they correlate at a strong r = .854 in 2018. Thus, we have great confidence in this single item as a proxy for WPD in this larger analysis. Racial resentment is measured using all four items in 2018, but only two items from 2020 ("Irish, Italians, Jewish..." and "Generations of slavery..."). In every model, the single-item proxy for WPD and the RR items are significant predictors and in the hypothesized direction.

	<u>Trump 1</u>	<u>Trump 2</u>	<u>ACA 1</u>	<u>ACA 2</u>	Refugees 1	Refugees 2	USMEX 1	USMEX 2	Welfare 1	Welfare 2
WPD	0.187*	0.171*	0.146*	0.132*	0.144*	0.130*	0.163*	0.149*	0.094*	0.085*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
RR	1.792*	1.459*	1.140*	0.920*	2.335*	2.101*	1.956*	1.732*	1.261*	1.107*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Conservative	1.669*	1.491*	1.223*	1.091*	1.088*	0.928*	1.242*	1.103*	0.906*	0.813*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Republican	2.322*	2.226*	1.234*	1.161*	1.142*	1.048*	0.913*	0.837*	0.419*	0.367*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Female	-0.121*	-0.047*	-0.112*	-0.079*	-0.045*	0.003	-0.199*	-0.161*	0.003	0.025*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age	0.234*	0.340*	-0.089*	-0.029	0.777*	0.864*	0.662*	0.729*	0.110*	0.133*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Income	0.186*	0.202*	0.137*	0.138*	-0.044	-0.032	0.023	0.027	0.997*	1.001*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Education	-0.197*	-0.206*	-0.198*	-0.202*	-0.300*	-0.295*	-0.120*	-0.121*	0.190*	0.198*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Sexism		1.335*		0.758*		0.911*		0.781*		0.493*
		(0.05)		(0.04)		(0.05)		(0.03)		(0.03)
Constant	-3.821*	-4.225*	-2.461*	-2.620*	-2.892*	-3.122*	1.764*	1.917*	0.526*	0.605*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 1							2.500*	2.663*	1.422*	1.504*
							(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 2							2.993*	3.164*	2.732*	2.821*
							(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 3							3.540*	3.717*	3.497*	3.591*
							(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 4							4.573*	4.758*		
							(0.03)	(0.04)		
N	34,685	34,240	35,285	34,827	35,194	34,740	34,201	33,753	35,232	34,776
BIC	17304.9	16431.8	28291.2	27564.2	22516.9	21857.2	82878.9	81119.2	89741.3	88292.8

Table E1. Replication of Findings in 2018 Common Content

	<u>Trump 1</u>	<u>Trump 2</u>	<u>ACA 1</u>	<u>ACA 2</u>	USMEX 1	USMEX 2	Welfare 1	Welfare 2
WPD	0.260*	0.274*	0.184*	0.191*	0.202*	0.207*	0.140*	0.139*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
RR	1.517*	1.250*	1.043*	0.835*	1.575*	1.350*	1.044*	0.981*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Conservative	1.423*	1.341*	0.961*	0.873*	1.243*	1.150*	1.118*	1.094*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Republican	2.513*	2.474*	1.320*	1.283*	0.819*	0.775*	0.094*	0.086*
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Female	-0.045	0.050*	-0.054*	-0.004	-0.236*	-0.184*	-0.022	-0.008
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age	-0.363*	-0.293*	-0.331*	-0.285*	0.560*	0.615*	0.227*	0.242*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Income	0.08	0.135*	0.079	0.121*	-0.012	0.034	0.912*	0.919*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Education	-0.316*	-0.265*	-0.110*	-0.080*	-0.156*	-0.122*	0.179*	0.191*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Sexism		1.012*		0.659*		0.740*		0.187*
		(0.05)		(0.04)		(0.03)		(0.03)
Constant	-3.550*	-3.946*	-2.314*	-2.506*	1.342*	1.526*	0.710*	0.752*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 1					2.155*	2.357*	1.573*	1.615*
					(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 2					2.686*	2.899*	2.957*	3.001*
					(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 3					3.250*	3.469*	3.682*	3.725*
					(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Cut 4					4.173*	4.396*		
					(0.03	(0.03		
Ν	34,492	34,145	34,883	34,523	34,852	34,496	34,961	34,601
BIC	15594.4	14950.2	26546.1	25894.8	84560.4	82820.1	87788.7	86819.6

Table E2. Replication of Findings in 2020 Common Content

F. Effects of the Racial Attitudes on Pro-Republican Affective Polarization

We also examined whether White privilege denial contributes to affective polarization. Since race is a major dimension along which the parties are divided the arguments that animated our expectations about Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump and Barack Obama should manifest themselves in evaluations of the parties. Accordingly, White privilege denial is likely to engender positive feelings toward the Republican Party, the party of racial conservatism, and negative feelings toward the Democratic Party, the party of racial liberalism.

Whereas the conventional affective polarization measure uses feeling thermometers to capture animus towards the out-party relative to in-party warmth (e.g., Iyengar, Sood, and Lelkes 2012), our interest in the effect of racial attitudes, not to mention consistency with previous analyses, requires capturing positive affect toward the Republican Party and negative affect towards the Democratic Party. Accordingly, the dependent variable, pro-Republican affective polarization, was created by subtracting ratings for Democratic Party from the Republican Party with scores ranging from -100 to 100 in which higher values reflect greater relative affect for the Republican Party.

Table F1 displays the results of OLS models for both 2016 and 2018 pro-Republican Affective Polarization. Both WPD and RR are statistically significant predictors of pro-Republican affective polarization indicating that respondents higher in WPD or RR are more likely to exhibit warmer feelings toward the Republican Party relative to the Democratic Party. In 2016, WPD was associated with an increase in pro-Republican affective polarization by approximately twenty percentage points whereas RR does so by about thirty percentage points. Two years later, however, the effect size of RR has shrunk to sixteen percentage points whereas the effect of WPD increased slightly to twenty-two percentage points. We can only speculate

13

what accounts for the different effect sizes for racial resentment between 2016 and 2018, but again we find it plausible that Trump's 2016 campaign heightened the importance of racial resentment. When including White Identity and White Consciousness neither are statistically significant. However, similar to the presidential approval analysis, RR is no longer significant with WI and WC included.

Table F1. The Effect of White Privilege Denial on Pro-Republican Affective Polarization								
	<u>2016</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2018 – Controls</u>					
White Privilege Denial	20.122*	21.889*	22.777*					
	(5.86)	(6.39)	(6.60)					
Racial Resentment	30.327*	16.489*	12.785					
	(6.71)	(7.12)	(7.41)					
Conservative	20.789*	48.527*	46.918***					
	(7.59)	(7.65)	(7.75)					
Republican	94.627*	78.407*	79.405***					
	(5.79)	(6.19)	(6.28)					
Female	3.088	-1.88	-2.353					
	(2.53)	(2.44)	(2.46)					
Age	0.277	1.493	1.276					
	(5.9)	(5.17)	(5.25)					
Income	0.013	5.05	6.021					
	(9.92)	(5.87)	(5.98)					
Education	4.566	1.421	1.428					
	(4.69)	(4.29)	(4.32)					
White Identity			4.733					
			(4.18)					
White Consciousness			5.919					
			(5.69)					
Constant	-93.246*	-85.886*	-87.528*					
	(5.58)	(5.08)	(5.20)					
R-Squared	0.761	0.774	.777					
N	440	580	569					
BIC	4215	5656.3	5581.7					

* p < .05

References

Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(3): 405–31.

G. Candidate Evaluations Analysis – Alternative

	<u>Clinton</u>	<u>Trump</u>
White Privilege Denial (WPD)	-20.184*	17.529*
	(5.08)	(6.74)
Racial Resentment (RR)	-14.093*	33.631*
	(5.68)	(7.3)
Conservative	-13.679*	9.13
	(5.9)	(7.09)
Republican	-55.136*	37.375*
	(4.41)	(5.4)
Female	-1.498	-1.443
	(2.33)	(2.57)
Age	-1.871	10.707*
	(5.02)	(5.34)
Income	9.085	-11.371
	(9.62)	(10.29)
Education	-5.155	-6.369
	(4.09)	(4.52)
Constant	92.940*	-11.112*
	(5.18)	(5.4)
R-Squared	0.601	0.505
N	476	463
BIC	4457	4457

Table G1. The Effect of White Privilege Denial on Candidate Affect in the 2016 Election

* p < .05

Note: Clinton and Trump affect range from 0 to 100 and were measured by using feeling thermometers. Both models were estimated using OLS.

We find WPD and RR are both associated with less warm attitudes toward Clinton. That is, WPD is associated with a decrease in warmth toward Clinton by about 20 percentage points whereas RR does so by only 14 percentage points. RR produces a larger effect size in explaining warmth toward Trump, as it is associated with higher support by nearly 34 percentage points whereas WPD exhibits a slightly smaller association of about 18 percentage points. The larger effect size of WPD in the Clinton analysis (RR for Trump) suggests that different types of racial attitudes were more or less important in explaining candidate sentiment; White privilege denial mattered more for Clinton whereas racial resentment played a larger role for Trump.

H. Interaction Effects of the Racial Attitudes and Ideology/Party ID

	etion Lifeets ($\lim \operatorname{the} 2010 \operatorname{L}$	
	Clinton 1	Clinton 2	Clinton 3	<u>Trump 1</u>	<u>Trump 2</u>	Trump 3
WPD	-20.184*	-34.145*	-28.534*	17.529*	33.372*	19.735
	(5.08)	(11.49)	(9.54)	(6.74)	(15.58)	(12.44)
RR	-14.093*	10.281	-7.779	33.631*	0.196	18.71
	(5.68)	(10.46)	(8.82)	(7.3)	(14.22)	(11.56)
Conservative	-13.679*	2.52	-13.476*	9.13	-16.773	8.633
	(5.9)	(9.01)	(5.91)	(7.09)	(9.89)	(7.07)
Republican	-55.136*	-53.897*	-56.077*	37.375*	36.599*	17.613*
	(4.41)	(4.33)	(8.19)	(5.4)	(5.42)	(8.93)
Female	-1.498	-1.652	-1.649	-1.443	-1.261	-1.529
	(2.33)	(2.3)	(2.33)	(2.57)	(2.53)	(2.57)
Age	-1.871	-0.773	-1.959	10.707*	8.978	9.559
	(5.02)	(5.02)	(5.11)	(5.34)	(5.42)	(5.39)
Income	9.085	8.462	8.97	-11.371	-11.033	-13.055
	(9.62)	(9.49)	(9.71)	(10.29)	(9.81)	(9.93)
Education	-5.155	-5.339	-5.544	-6.369	-6.699	-6.804
	(4.09)	(4.09)	(4.1)	(4.52)	(4.55)	(4.47)
Conservative						
x WPD		26.544			-27.256	
		(17.39)			(24.28)	
Conservative						
x RR		-54.694**			68.981*	
		(17.92)			(24.77)	
Republican x						
WPD			16.249			-2.096
			(13.13)			(19.82)
Republican x						
RR			-12.505			35.119
			(13.77)			(19.2)
Constant	92.940*	87.312*	93.556*	-11.112*	-0.6	-3.494
	(5.18)	(5.52)	(5.58)	(5.4)	(5.85)	(5.73)
R-Squared	0.601	0.608	0.602	0.505	0.516	0.511
Ν	476	474	474	462	460	460
BIC	4457	4461.5	4468.4	4457	4458.4	4463.2

Table H1. Interaction Effects of the Racial Attitudes on Candidate Affect in the 2016 Election

	<u>Trump 1</u>	Trump 2	Trump 3	<u>AP 1</u>	<u>AP 2</u>	<u>AP 3</u>
WPD	1.426	1.278	0.677	22.777*	19.617	22.495*
	(0.37)	(1.03)	(0.68)	(6.6)	(12.38)	(11.08)
RR	0.931	0.922	1.74	12.785	-5.765	-5.5
	(0.49)	(1.35)	(0.98)	(7.41)	(13.08)	(11.19)
Conservative	1.691*	1.543	1.687*	46.918*	24.179*	48.140*
	(0.45)	(0.94)	(0.45)	(7.75)	(10.38)	(7.77)
Republican	2.238*	2.242*	2.467*	79.405*	77.607*	54.581*
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.8)	(6.28)	(6.3)	(10.68)
Female	-0.327	-0.326	-0.336	-2.353	-1.994	-2.311
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(2.46)	(2.44)	(2.44)
Age	0.182	0.181	0.218	1.276	0.848	-0.358
	(0.4)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(5.25)	(5.29)	(5.28)
Income	0.37	0.368	0.412	6.021	4.495	2.936
	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.48)	(5.98)	(5.83)	(5.83)
Education	0.431	0.426	0.42	1.428	0.48	0.593
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(4.32)	(4.32)	(4.32)
WI	0.122	0.129	0.136	4.733	4.549	4.681
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(4.18)	(4.14)	(4.17)
WC	0.347	0.343	0.397	5.919	4.798	4.958
	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(5.69)	(5.64)	(5.64)
Cons x WPD		0.247			6.186	
		(1.68)			(18.46)	
Cons x RR		0.037			41.906	
		(2.18)			(22.25)	
Repub x WPD			1.269			0.905
			(1.09)			(16.12)
Repub x RR			-1.467			43.184*
			(1.47)			(19.02)
Constant	-3.940*	-3.862*	-4.087*	-87.528*	-78.049*	-77.762*
	(0.43)	(0.66)	(0.66)	(5.2)	(5.5)	(5.62)
R-Squared				0.777	0.781	0.781
N				569	567	567
BIC	343.1	355.8	354.6	5581.7	5583.1	5582.6

Table H2. Interaction Effects of the Racial Attitudes on Presidential Approval and Affective Polarization

	AffAct 1	AffAct 2	AffAct 3	Welfare 1	Welfare 2	Welfare 3
WPD	1.598*	1.384*	1.588*	1.108*	0.689	1.130*
	(0.27)	(0.56)	(0.47)	(0.26)	(0.57)	(0.45)
RR	1.279*	1.903*	1.389*	0.720*	1.1	0.517
	(0.29)	(0.57)	(0.47)	(0.31)	(0.63)	(0.48)
Conservative	0.858*	1.301*	0.852*	1.367*	1.369*	1.381*
	(0.28)	(0.41)	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.4)	(0.29)
Republican	0.061	0.106	0.196	0.184	0.199	-0.066
_	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.36)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)
Female	-0.005	-0.01	-0.004	0.019	0.014	0.02
	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Age	-0.157	-0.139	-0.146	0.073	0.079	0.056
	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Income	0.720*	0.736*	0.735*	1.138*	1.124*	1.108*
	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Education	-0.182	-0.177	-0.179	0.222	0.208	0.217
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
WI	0.046	0.056	0.047	0.002	0.014	0.002
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.17)
WC	-0.213	-0.188	-0.208	-0.279	-0.269	-0.288
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Cons x WPD		0.366			0.713	
		(0.85)			(0.91)	
Cons x RR		-1.293			-0.667	
		(0.94)			(1.06)	
Repub x WPD			0.018			-0.031
			(0.68)			(0.66)
Repub x RR			-0.259			0.469
			(0.76)			(0.76)
Cut 1	-0.333	-0.162	-0.285	0.554*	0.561*	0.459*
	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.23)
Cut 2	0.332	0.514*	0.382	1.489*	1.494*	1.392*
	(0.21)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.23)
Cut 3	0.974*	1.169*	1.028*	2.821*	2.826*	2.722*
	(0.21)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.24)
Cut 4	2.004*	2.206*	2.059*	3.738*	3.747*	3.644*
	(0.23)	(0.28)	(0.26)	(0.23)	(0.26)	(0.25)
Cut 5	2.385*	2.584*	2.439*			
	(0.23)	(0.29)	(0.27)			
Cut 6	2.740*	2.936*	2.793*			
	(0.24)	(0.29)	(0.27)	1537	1548.8	1549
BIC	1786.2	1795.8	1798.7			

Table H3. Interaction Effects of Racial Attitudes on (Racialized) Policy Attitudes

	<u>ACA 1</u>	ACA 2	ACA 3
WPD	0.586*	1.957*	1.578*
	(0.3)	(0.77)	(0.6)
RR	1.382*	-0.255	0.977
	(0.37)	(0.82)	(0.66)
Conservative	0.788*	0.475	0.798*
	(0.38)	(0.62)	(0.38)
Republican	1.351*	1.319*	1.852*
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.58)
Female	-0.188	-0.182	-0.172
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Age	0.049	0.014	0.073
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Income	-0.497	-0.5	-0.455
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.35)
Education	0.263	0.291	0.29
	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)
WI	-0.218	-0.263	-0.23
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.22)
WC	0.568	0.556	0.545
	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)
Conservative x WPD		-2.173	
		(1.14)	
Conservative x RR		2.702*	
		(1.3)	
Republican x WPD			-1.585
			(0.85)
Republican x RR			0.587
			(1.04)
Constant	-2.590*	-2.393*	-2.885*
	(0.32)	(0.4)	(0.44)
BIC	516.3	524.9	525.8

Table H3 (continued). Interaction Effects of Racial Attitudes on (Racialized) Policy Attitudes

	USMEX 1	USMEX 2	USMEX 3	Levels 1	Levels 2	Levels 3
WPD	0.253*	0.37*	0.235*	0.979*	1.889*	1.422*
	(0.05)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.24)	(0.52)	(0.44)
RR	0.247*	0.004	0.206*	1.395*	1.208*	1.353*
	(0.06)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.28)	(0.51)	(0.43)
Conservative	0.275*	0.131	0.278*	1.229*	1.873*	1.214*
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.29)	(0.43)	(0.29)
Republican	0.201*	0.184*	0.124	(0.043	(0.022	0.364
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.37)
Female	-0.061*	-0.057*	-0.061*	0.156	0.156	0.165
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.1)
Age	0.169*	0.166*	0.165*	0.29	0.297	0.32
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Income	-0.017	-0.022	-0.026	-0.17	-0.11	-0.111
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Education	0.058	0.058	0.055	-0.064	-0.01	-0.036
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
WI	0.048	0.043	0.048	0.365*	0.346*	0.354*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)
WC	0.142*	0.133*	0.141*	0.021	0.046	0.021
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Cons x WPD		-0.204			-1.562*	
		(0.14)			(0.79)	
Cons x RR		0.489*			0.105	
		(0.15)			(0.89)	
Repub x WPD			0.033			-0.794
			(0.13)			(0.64)
Repub x RR			0.107			-0.045
			(0.14)			(0.74)
Cut 1				0.282	0.529*	0.440*
				(0.2)	(0.22)	(0.21)
Cut 2				1.242*	1.521*	1.416*
				(0.2)	(0.23)	(0.22)
Cut 3				2.630*	2.925*	2.812*
				(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.24)
Cut 4				3.133*	3.423*	3.312*
~				(0.23)	(0.26)	(0.25)
Constant	-0.175*	-0.115*	-0.145*			
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)			
R-squared	0.703	0.708	0.704			
N	557	555	555		4 4 6 6 7	
BIC	-94.4	-92.2	-83.7	1404.4	1408.3	1413.7

Table H4. Interaction Effects of Racial Attitudes on Immigration Policy

	Refugee 1	Refugee 2	Refugee 3
WPD	1.301*	1.580*	1.362*
	(0.33)	(0.72)	(0.58)
RR	1.709*	2.171*	2.265*
	(0.42)	(0.95)	(0.75)
Conservative	0.392	1.152	0.372
	(0.4)	(0.81)	(0.41)
Republican	1.347*	1.362*	2.097*
	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.66)
Female	-0.02	-0.019	-0.014
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Age	1.060*	1.071*	1.110*
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.35)
Income	-0.299	-0.267	-0.224
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.37)
Education	0.244	0.269	0.249
	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.26)
WI	-0.119	-0.136	-0.127
	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)
WC	1.039*	1.039*	1.047*
	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)
Conservative x WPD		-0.528	
		(1.18)	
Conservative x RR		-0.934	
		(1.65)	
Republican x WPD			-0.128
			(0.92)
Republican x RR			-1.191
			(1.21)
Cut 1	3.239*	3.620*	3.609*
	(0.36)	(0.53)	(0.49)
BIC	431.9	443	442.9

Table H4 (continued). Interaction Effects of Racial Attitudes on Refugee Policy

	Anthem 1	Anthem 2	Anthem 3	Birther 1	Birther 2	Birther 3
WPD	1.536*	1.321*	1.386*	0.859*	2.007*	2.084*
	(0.32)	(0.62)	(0.52)	(0.26)	(0.65)	(0.56)
RR	1.445*	1.920*	1.405*	0.592	-0.011	0.211
	(0.37)	(0.72)	(0.59)	(0.33)	(0.81)	(0.67)
Conservative	1.587*	1.883*	1.597*	0.354	0.875	0.334
	(0.35)	(0.5)	(0.36)	(0.29)	(0.61)	(0.28)
Republican	0.969*	0.991*	0.739	1.534*	1.509*	2.303*
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.49)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.51)
Female	0.1	0.097	0.096	0.21	0.212	0.234*
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Age	0.864*	0.872*	0.859*	0.111	0.112	0.17
	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Income	0.189	0.194	0.164	-0.118	-0.062	-0.019
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.3)	(0.31)
Education	-0.126	-0.12	-0.138	-0.383	-0.346	-0.35
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
WI	-0.064	-0.059	-0.052	0.503**	0.480*	0.486*
	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
WC	0.607*	0.616*	0.604*	1.116*	1.117*	1.108*
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Cons x WPD		0.394			-1.772*	
		(1.03)			(0.9)	
Cons x RR		-0.999			0.801	
		(1.34)			(1.15)	
Repub x WPD			0.343			-1.900*
			(0.85)			(0.75)
Repub x RR			0.149			0.441
			(1.06)			(0.93)
Cut 1	1.930*	2.059*	1.848*	2.180*	2.438*	2.622*
	(0.27)	(0.36)	(0.34)	(0.25)	(0.4)	(0.41)
Cut 2	2.432*	2.565*	2.348*	3.149*	3.411*	3.598*
	(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.35)	(0.26)	(0.42)	(0.42)
Cut 3	3.413*	3.547*	3.330*	4.097*	4.354*	4.542*
	(0.3)	(0.39)	(0.37)	(0.28)	(0.43)	(0.44)
Cut 4	3.788*	3.921*	3.708*			
	(0.32)	(0.4)	(0.39)			
BIC	1042.6	1054.4	1054.8	1054.3	1062	1057.7

Table H5. Interaction Effects of Racial Attitudes on Symbolic Attitudes

I. Presidential Approval Ordered Logit Analysis

We present an ordered logit analysis to analyze the original 4-point scale for presidential

approval ranging from "strongly disapprove" to "strongly approve."

Table I1. Predicted Probabilities for Obama Approval at the Minimum and Maximum	Values for
the Racial Attitudes	

	When $WPD = 0$		When WPD = 1	
	Predicted		Predicted	
	Probability	95% CI	Probability	95% CI
Strongly Disapprove	0.1303	[0.0599, 0.2007]	0.5188	[0.3924, 0.6451]
Somewhat Disapprove	0.1893	[0.1374, 0.2412]	0.2403	[0.1951, 0.2855]
Somewhat Approve	0.4368	[0.3778, 0.4959]	0.21	[0.1969, 0.2232]
Strongly Approve	0.2436	[0.1460, 0.3412]	0.031	[0.0049, 0.0570]
	$M/h_{am} DD = 0$		When RR = 1	
	when $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{K} = 0$		WHEN INT	
	$\frac{When RR = 0}{Predicted}$		Predicted	
	Predicted Probability	95% CI	Predicted Probability	95% CI
Strongly Disapprove	Predicted Probability 0.1424	95% CI [0.0547, 0.2300]	Predicted Probability 0.4582	95% CI [0.3310, 0.5855]
Strongly Disapprove Somewhat Disapprove	$\frac{\text{When } \text{RK} = 0}{\text{Predicted}}$ $\frac{1}{2} \text{Probability}$ 0.1424 0.1972	95% CI [0.0547, 0.2300] [0.1441, 0.2504]	Predicted Probability 0.4582 0.251	95% CI [0.3310, 0.5855] [0.2013, 0.3008]
Strongly Disapprove Somewhat Disapprove Somewhat Approve	$\frac{\text{When RR} = 0}{\text{Predicted}}$ $\frac{0.1424}{0.1972}$ 0.4338	95% CI [0.0547, 0.2300] [0.1441, 0.2504] [0.3771, 0.4906]	Predicted Probability 0.4582 0.251 0.2476	95% CI [0.3310, 0.5855] [0.2013, 0.3008] [0.2303, 0.2648]

Table I2. Predicted Probabilities for Trump Approval at the Minimum and Maximum Values for the Racial Attitudes

	When WPD = 0		When WPD = 1	
	Predicted		Predicted	
	Probability	95% CI	Probability	95% CI
Strongly Disapprove	0.6985	[0.6008, 0.7962]	0.2375	[0.1343, 0.3407]
Somewhat Disapprove	0.1432	[0.1083, 0.1780]	0.1704	[0.1144, 0.2263]
Somewhat Approve	0.1335	[0.1221, 0.1448]	0.3589	[0.2991, 0.4187]
Strongly Approve	0.0248	[0.0062, 0.0435]	0.2332	[0.1242, 0.3422]
	<u>When RR = 0</u>		<u>When RR = 1</u>	
	Predicted		Predicted	
	Probability	95% CI	Probability	95% CI
Strongly Disapprove	0.7337	[0.5997, 0.8677]	0.249	[0.1344, 0.3635]
Somewhat Disapprove	0.1318	[0.1006, 0.1630]	0.1732	[0.1168, 0.2296]
Somewhat Approve	0.1151	[0.1059, 0.1243]	0.3557	[0.2975, 0.4139]
Strongly Approve	0.0194	[-0.0025, 0.0413]	0.2222	[0.1172, 0.3271]

J. Question Wording for Policy Items

Immigration Laws Index

- 1. Increase spending on border security by \$25 billion, including building a wall between the U.S. and Mexico
- 2. Provide legal status to children of immigrants who are already in the United States and were brought to the United States by their parents. Provide these children the option of citizenship in 10 years if they meet the citizenship requirements and commit no crimes. (DACA).
- 3. Reduce legal immigration by eliminating the visa lottery and ending family-based migration
- 4. Withhold federal funds form any local police department that does not report to the federal government anyone they identify as an illegal immigrant
- 5. Send to prison any person who has been deported from the United States and reenters the United States

Opinion of Immigration Levels

Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be...

Refugees

Tell us whether you support or oppose the order in principle. Ban immigrants from Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen, Syria, and Libya from coming to the United States for 90 days. Permanently prohibits Syrian refugees from entering the country.

Affirmative Action

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

Welfare

How would you like your legislature to spend money on each of the five areas below? Welfare.

Repeal ACA

Thinking now about health care policy, would you support or oppose each of the following proposals? Repeal the entire Affordable Care Act

Anthem

Do you approve to disapprove of football players protesting by kneeling during the national anthem?

Birther

Do you believe that Barack Obama was born in the United States of America?

K. Exploring the Acknowledgement of White Privilege using WI and WC

Although we focus on the extent to which Whites deny racial privilege, there are potentially important differences among Whites who acknowledge racial privilege (Jardina 2019a; Schildkraut 2019). Although many are likely to embrace—or at least appreciate—the privilege associated with being White (appreciators), some may lament the fact that it exists (lamenters). Since our measure of White privilege denial makes no distinction between appreciators and lamenters, we investigate it here. In this section, we attempt a look at this distinction, and then assess whether it meaningfully affects our paper's findings.

We used White identity and White consciousness to distinguish appreciators from lamenters. Following Jardina's theorizing (2019a, 134), we expect White identifiers to be more likely to embrace White privilege as appreciators since it is "the feature of their group they desire to maintain and protect." Conversely, Whites who do not strongly identify with their race are more likely to be lamenters since they are likely to find their privileged position objectionable. To provide a general analysis, we follow Jardina (2019b) and combine the White Identity (1 item) and White Consciousness (2 items) measures into a single measure and rescaled it to range from 0 to 1. Restricting the sample only to respondents who rejected all the WPD items, we coded these respondents as either appreciators or as lamenters based on a median split (1 = High; 0 = Low). This procedure yields 32 appreciators (5% of all Whites) and 89 lamenters (13.5%). Although the small number of cases must be interpreted with caution, Whites who acknowledge racial privilege are nearly three times more likely to be lamenters than appreciators.

Regarding political views, appreciators should, compared to lamenters, have more favorable evaluations of Trump and greater opposition to policies that are perceived to help racial and ethnic minorities. Again, given the small number of cases we are reluctant to draw

25

strong conclusions. Nevertheless, it appears that the appreciators and lamenters have much in common. As demonstrated in Table K1, nearly all Whites in these two sub-groups are disapproving of Trump and supportive of public policies that help racial and ethnic minorities. As with our main analysis, all dependent variables are coded such that higher values reflect more racially conservative attitudes.

	White Identity/	Consciousness Index
	Appreciators $(N = 32)$	Lamenters $(N = 89)$
% Trump approval	9%	1%
Affirmative Action (mean)	2.78	2.52
Welfare (mean)	2.22	2.02
ranges from 1 to 5		
% Approving of ACA	9%	0%
Repeal		
Immigration Laws Index	.17	.03
ranges from 0 to 1		
Immigration Levels	2.23	1.72
ranges from 1 to 5		
% Approving of Refugee	12%	1%
Executive Order		
Birther	1.22	1.04
ranges from 1 to 4		
Anthem	1.66	1.28
ranges from 1 to 5		

Table K1. Political Attitudes of Privilege-Acknowledging Whites

While appreciators tend to have slightly more conservative leanings than lamenters, the substantive results are such that nearly all respondents hold racially liberal attitudes. Indeed, 101 of the 121 (78%) privilege-acknowledging Whites identify as at least "Slightly Liberal" when asked about political ideology. This is consistent with our descriptive analysis in Appendix B in which we find that acknowledging White privilege is far more common among liberals than conservatives.

We also look at White identity and White consciousness separately. For White identity, the same procedure yields 72 appreciators (11% of all Whites) and 51 lamenters. For White consciousness, there are 23 appreciators (4%) and 98 lamenters (15%). Although the proportion of appreciators to lamenters varies depending on whether we use White identity or White consciousness, we still find that, by and large, these two-sub-groups are similar in political attitudes. In the White identity analysis, 103 of the 123 (84%) privilege-acknowledging Whites identify as at least "Slightly Liberal". Similarly, using the White consciousness measure we found that 111 out of the 121 (92%) privilege-acknowledging Whites self-identify as at least "Slightly Liberal". As Table 2 shows, regardless of the measure used, privilege-acknowledging Whites are generally disapproving of Trump and supportive of policies perceived to benefit racial and ethnic minorities.

	White Ic	lentity	White Consciousness		
	Appreciators	Lamenters	Appreciators	Lamenters	
	(N = 72)	(N = 51)	(N = 23)	(N = 98)	
% Trump approval	6%	0%	13%	1%	
Affirmative Action	2.63	2.51	2.74	2.55	
(mean)					
ranges from 1 to 7					
Welfare (mean)	2.21	1.86	2.17	2.05	
ranges from 1 to 5					
% Approving of ACA	4%	0%	13%	0%	
Repeal					
Immigration Laws Index	.1	.02	.16	.05	
ranges from 0 to 1					
Immigration Levels	2	1.64	2.09	1.8	
ranges from 1 to 5					
% Approving of Refugee	7%	0%	17%	1%	
Executive Order					
Birther	1.09	1.08	1.3	1.04	
ranges from 1 to 4					
Anthem	1.4	1.33	1.87	1.27	
ranges from 1 to 5					

Table K2. Political Attitudes of Privilege-Acknowledging Whites by White Identity and White Consciousness

We next explore the possibility of interaction effects between White privilege denial and White identity/consciousness in our regression analyses of presidential approval and policy attitudes. We begin by interacting the dichotomous single-item measure (combing both White Identity and Consciousness) with our measure of White Privilege in Tables K3 through K6. In only one model (Presidential Approval, Table K3) do we find that that the combined measure of White Identity/Consciousness has a significant interaction with White Privilege denial. In this instance, the results suggest that the potential effect of WPD on approval for President Trump are limited to lamenters.

	<u>Trump 1</u>	Trump 2
WPD	1.446*	2.304*
	(0.37)	(0.52)
RR	0.962*	0.81
	(0.48)	(0.48)
Conservative	1.712*	1.753*
	(0.45)	(0.45)
Republican	2.239*	2.245*
	(0.32)	(0.33)
Female	-0.299	-0.332
	(0.17)	(0.18)
Age	0.189	0.181
	(0.4)	(0.41)
Income	0.349	0.351
	(0.47)	(0.47)
Education	0.421	0.431
	(0.34)	(0.35)
WI/WC	0.189	0.971*
	(0.17)	(0.35)
WI/WC x WPD		-1.426*
		(0.59)
Constant	-3.921*	-4.294*
	(0.43)	(0.46)
N	573	573
BIC	337.3	338.6

Table K3. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial and White Identity/Consciousness on President Trump Approval

	Affirmative 1	Affirmative 2	Welfare 1	Welfare 2	<u>ACA 1</u>	<u>ACA 2</u>
WPD	1.551*	1.651*	1.056*	0.900*	0.734*	1.084*
	(0.26)	(0.29)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.29)	(0.4)
RR	1.254*	1.243*	0.652*	0.673*	1.493*	1.445*
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.36)	(0.37)
Conservative	0.840*	0.838*	1.319*	1.327*	0.873*	0.864*
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.38)	(0.38)
Republican	0.073	0.074	0.206	0.203	1.278*	1.279*
	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Female	-0.005	-0.008	0.02	0.027	-0.192	-0.205
	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Age	-0.15	-0.148	0.07	0.063	0.056	0.065
	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Income	0.724*	0.720*	1.159*	1.157*	-0.529	-0.505
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.33)
Education	-0.182	-0.181	0.224	0.221	0.287	0.29
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.25)	(0.25)
WI&WC	-0.057	0.03	-0.023	-0.169	-0.01	0.356
	(0.1)	(0.17)	(0.1)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.28)
WI&WC x		0.107		0.007		0.60
WPD		-0.197		0.307		-0.63
		(0.3)		(0.29)	0.577*	(0.45)
Constant					-2.577*	-2.741*
G + 1	0.22	0.200	0.570*	0.524*	(0.31)	(0.32)
Cut I	-0.33	-0.308	0.579*	0.534*		
	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.2)	(0.2)		
Cut 2	0.333	0.357	1.510*	1.464*		
	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.2)	(0.2)		
Cut 3	0.975*	1.000*	2.838*	2.791*		
-	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)		
Cut 4	2.003*	2.030*	3.757*	3.714*		
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.23)		
Cut 5	2.383*	2.411*				
	(0.23)	(0.23)				
Cut 6	2.739*	2.766*				
	(0.23)	(0.24)				
N	584	584	583	583	584	584
BIC	1780.5	1786.4	1532.6	1537.8	513.8	518.3

Table K4. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial and White Identity/Consciousness Racial(ized) Policy Attitudes

	Index 1	Index 2	Levels 1	Levels 2	Refugees 1	Refugees 2
WPD	0.264*	0.298*	0.890*	1.059*	1.490*	2.023*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.23)	(0.27)	(0.31)	(0.46)
RR	0.266*	0.262*	1.403*	1.381*	1.784*	1.710*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.41)	(0.41)
Conservative	0.289*	0.288*	1.231*	1.230*	0.459	0.43
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.4)	(0.41)
Republican	0.198*	0.199*	-0.02	-0.02	1.318*	1.335*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.31)	(0.31)
Female	-0.059*	-0.061*	0.168	0.16	0.007	-0.003
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Age	0.172*	0.172*	0.311	0.315	1.025*	1.057*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Income	-0.032	-0.032	-0.221	-0.22	-0.317	-0.304
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.35)	(0.35)
Education	0.056	0.057	-0.084	-0.082	0.258	0.264
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.26)	(0.26)
WI&WC	0.062*	0.095*	0.128	0.286	0.354*	0.854*
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.1)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.28)
WI&WC x						
WPD		-0.067		-0.332		-0.973
		(0.05)		(0.3)		(0.52)
Constant	-0.158*	-0.168*				
	(0.04)	(0.04)				
Cut 1			0.202	0.246	3.238*	3.473*
			(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.36)	(0.37)
Cut 2			1.162*	1.212*		
			(0.2)	(0.2)		
Cut 3			2.544*	2.599*		
			(0.22)	(0.22)		
Cut 4			3.044*	3.098*		
			(0.22)	(0.23)		
Ν	557	556	553	553	581	581
BIC	-89.5	-84.7	1402.6	1407.6	429.9	432.9

Table K5. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial and White Identity/Consciousness on Immigration Policy Attitudes

	Anthem 1	Anthem 2	Birther 1	Birther 2
WPD	1.644*	1.574*	0.875*	0.822*
	(0.31)	(0.34)	(0.24)	(0.31)
RR	1.471*	1.481*	0.826*	0.833*
	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Conservative	1.589*	1.593*	0.509	0.512)
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.3)	(0.29)
Republican	0.972*	0.972*	1.434*	1.433*
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Female	0.105	0.108	0.232*	0.235*
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Age	0.854*	0.856*	0.128	0.126
	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Income	0.186	0.189	-0.277	-0.281
	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.29)
Education	-0.129	-0.132	-0.384	-0.385
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.2)	(0.2)
WI&WC	0.275*	0.212	0.388*	0.333
	(0.12)	(0.21)	(0.11)	(0.23)
WI&WC x WPD		0.149		0.094
		(0.43)		(0.35)
Cut 1	1.938*	1.921*	1.976*	1.952*
	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Cut 2	2.439*	2.422*	2.901*	2.877*
	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.26)	(0.27)
Cut 3	3.415*	3.397*	3.791*	3.768*
	(0.29)	(0.3)	(0.28)	(0.29)
Cut 4	3.790*	3.773*		
	(0.31)	(0.32)		
N	584	584	584	584
BIC	1036.3	1042.5	1081.8	1088.1

Table K6. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial and White Identity/Consciousness on Symbolic Racial Political Attitudes

Next, we conduct an extended analysis, this time separately interacting White Identity and Consciousness with the White privilege scale in Tables K7 through K10. As before, both White identity and White consciousness are coded dichotomously (based on a median split). In the analyses that follow, no models present significant interaction effects between WPD and White consciousness and only one model (Birther) contains a significant interaction between WPD and White identity.

	<u>Trump 1</u>	<u>Trump 2</u>
WPD	1.324*	2.092*
	(0.38)	(0.57)
RR	0.875	0.774
	(0.49)	(0.48)
Conservative	1.606*	1.603*
	(0.46)	(0.46)
Republican	2.376*	2.401*
	(0.33)	(0.33)
Female	-0.299	-0.32
	(0.18)	(0.18)
Age	0.164	0.17
	(0.39)	(0.4)
Income	0.228	0.162
	(0.46)	(0.45)
Education	0.505	0.518
	(0.35)	(0.35)
WI	-0.214	-0.007
	(0.18)	(0.36)
WC	0.538*	1.084*
	(0.19)	(0.36)
WPD x WI		-0.364
		(0.6)
WPD x WC		-0.983
		(0.62)
Constant	-3.903*	-4.254*
	(0.44)	(0.47)
Ν	573	573
BIC	336.8	346.4

Table K7. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial with White Identity and White Consciousness on President Trump Approval

	Affirmative 1	Affirmative 2	Welfare 1	Welfare 2	ACA 1	ACA 2
WPD	1.549*	1.537*	1.121*	1.017*	0.606*	0.933*
	(0.27)	(0.32)	(0.26)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.44)
RR	1.270*	1.317*	0.695*	0.730*	1.408*	1.381*
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.36)	(0.36)
Conservative	0.865*	0.859*	1.370*	1.379*	0.761*	0.737
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.3)	(0.29)	(0.38)	(0.38)
Republican	0.068	0.071	0.183	0.18	1.371*	1.381*
	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Female	-0.003	0	0.015	0.019	-0.167	-0.175
	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Age	-0.149	-0.139	0.076	0.077	0.03	0.036
	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Income	0.718*	0.719*	1.169*	1.176*	-0.539	-0.554
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Education	-0.187	-0.201	0.213	0.203	0.317	0.321
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.26)	(0.26)
WI	-0.061	0.085	0.064	0.128	-0.185	-0.117
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.09)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.28)
WC	-0.094	-0.22	-0.177	-0.318	0.368*	0.640*
	(0.11)	(0.18)	(0.1)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.29)
WPD x WI		-0.362		-0.142		-0.117
		(0.29)		(0.27)		(0.45)
WPD x WC		0.31		0.305		-0.472
		(0.32)		(0.3)		(0.47)
Constant					-2.583*	-2.734*
					(0.33)	(0.35)
Cut 1	-0.371	-0.326	0.595*	0.591*		
	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.22)		
Cut 2	0.293	0.336	1.530*	1.525*		
	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.22)		
Cut 3	0.935*	0.974*	2.860*	2.854*		
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.23)		
Cut 4	1.965*	2.003*	3.780*	3.779*		
	(0.23)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)		
Cut 5	2.345*	2.386*				
	(0.24)	(0.26)				
Cut 6	2.702*	2.744*				
	(0.25)	(0.26)				
N	584	584	583	583	584	584
BIC	1785.6	1796.2	1536.1	1547.7	513.9	525.5

Table K8. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial with White Identity and White Consciousness on Racial(ized) Policy Attitudes

	Index 1	Index 2	Levels 1	Levels 2	Refugees 1	Refugees 2
WPD	0.258*	0.269*	0.965*	1.053*	1.348*	1.805*
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.23)	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.47)
RR	0.270*	0.275*	1.445*	1.408*	1.813*	1.771*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.41)	(0.41)
Conservative	0.281*	0.281*	1.255*	1.254*	0.376	0.339
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.4)	(0.4)
Republican	0.196*	0.197*	-0.051	-0.049	1.362*	1.379*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.31)	(0.31)
Female	-0.060*	-0.060*	0.161	0.157	0.008	0.007
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.15)	(0.16)
Age	0.173*	0.174*	0.304	0.304	1.069*	1.078*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Income	-0.032	-0.033	-0.2	-0.209	-0.404	-0.424
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.35)	(0.36)
Education	0.06	0.058	-0.085	-0.071	0.307	0.307
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.26)	(0.26)
WI	0.017	0.038	0.202*	0.131	-0.138	-0.024
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.1)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.3)
WC	0.070*	0.064	0.01	0.143	0.521*	0.851*
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.11)	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.29)
WPD x WI		-0.046		0.159		-0.219
		(0.05)		(0.29)		(0.54)
WPD x WC		0.015		-0.285		-0.643
		(0.06)		(0.32)		(0.54)
Constant	-0.169*	-0.177*				
	(0.04)	(0.04)				
Cut 1			0.301	0.299	3.203*	3.392*
			(0.2)	(0.21)	(0.38)	(0.41)
Cut 2			1.262*	1.264*		
			(0.21)	(0.22)		
Cut 3			2.649*	2.653*		
			(0.23)	(0.24)		
Cut 4			3.150*	3.154*		
			(0.23)	(0.24)		
R-Squared	0.699	0.7				
N	556	554	553	553	581	581
BIC	-87.5	-75.6	1405.9	1417.6	431.4	442.2

Table K9. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial with White Identity and White Consciousness on Immigration Policy Attitudes

	Anthem 1	Anthem 2	Birther 1	Birther 2
WPD	1.588*	1.576*	0.925*	0.529
	(0.32)	(0.38)	(0.25)	(0.32)
RR	1.494*	1.467*	0.767*	0.724*
	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.32)	(0.33)
Conservative	1.575*	1.581*	0.438	0.47
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.3)	(0.3)
Republican	0.970*	0.970*	1.480*	1.491*
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Female	0.11	0.11	0.233*	0.249*
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Age	0.857*	0.849*	0.13	0.099
	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Income	0.15	0.149	-0.253	-0.268
	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.29)
Education	-0.111	-0.105	-0.345	-0.291
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.2)	(0.2)
WI	0	-0.1	0.247*	-0.407
	(0.11)	(0.2)	(0.11)	(0.26)
WC	0.297*	0.368	0.542*	0.646*
	(0.12)	(0.22)	(0.12)	(0.26)
WPD x WI		0.253		1.107*
		(0.4)		(0.39)
WPD x WC		-0.182		-0.186
		(0.42)		(0.39)
Cut 1	1.929*	1.900*	2.201*	1.934*
	(0.27)	(0.29)	(0.25)	(0.26)
Cut 2	2.432*	2.405*	3.155*	2.898*
	(0.28)	(0.3)	(0.27)	(0.28)
Cut 3	3.414*	3.387*	4.070*	3.823*
	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.3)
Cut 4	3.789*	3.761*		
	(0.32)	(0.34)		
Ν	584	584	584	584
BIC	1042.1	1054.3	1068.7	1072.3

Table K10. The Interaction of White Privilege Denial with White Identity and White Consciousness on Symbolic Racial Policy Attitudes

References

Jardina, Ashley. 2019a. White Identity Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jardina, Ashley. 2019b. "White Consciousness and White Prejudice: Two Compounding Forces

in Contemporary American Politics." The Forum 17(3):447-466.

Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2019. "The Political Meaning of Whiteness for Liberals and

Conservatives." The Forum 17(3):421-446.