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# A1: Religion Classification Scheme

In this section, I outline the religious classification scheme used in the main paper. Because of my theoretical interest in understanding White evangelical preferences for elite religiosity, I require a religious classification scheme that allows for the inclusion of race. As noted in the main paper, this already precludes me from using classification methods such as RELTRAD. Therefore, I defer to the method outlined by Burge and Lewis (2018a), where white evangelicals are defined as Protestant adherents who identify subjectively as “born again” or evangelical Christians. With this definition in mind, I now turn to outline my coding scheme.

For my specific coding scheme, I defer to the classifications outlined by the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI) in their public opinion surveys of religious attitudes. The PRRI scheme outlines nine different religious classifications that allow for the inclusion of race. These classifications are: white mainline Protestant, white evangelical Protestant, Black Protestant, Hispanic Protestant, white Catholic, Hispanic Catholic, “other” Christian, non-Christian, and the religiously unaffiliated. With this classification scheme in mind, I construct a total of eight variables for religion, with white mainline Protestants serving as the base category.

 White evangelical Protestants are coded as any white Protestant respondent who also considers themselves a “born again” or evangelical Christian (13.08% of the sample). The remaining Protestant categories are non-Hispanic Black Protestant (9.35%), and Hispanic Protestant (3.17%). Catholics are broken down by Catholic (10.74%) and Hispanic Catholic (6.58%). “Other Christians,” include Latter Day Saints (1.32%), Orthodox Christians (0.35%), Black Catholics (0.45%), and Protestants or Catholics of any other race (2.25%). Any respondents who identified their religion as Jewish (4.76%), Muslim (0.61%), Buddhist (0.60%), Hindu (0.61%), or “other” (2.17%) are collapsed into a single measure for “non-Christian.” Lastly, the religiously unaffiliated include atheists (6.21%), agnostics (5.97%), and those who do not identity with any particular religion (17.20%) (Hackett et al. 2015). Accordingly, any respondents who met this definition were collapsed into a single measure of “unaffiliated” status. A sample breakdown using the PRRI classification scheme is presented below in **Table A1**.

**Table A1: Sample Breakdown by Religious Classification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category | % of Sample |
| White mainline Protestant | 13.08% |
| White evangelical Protestant  | 14.50% |
| Black Protestant | 9.35% |
| Hispanic Protestant | 3.17% |
| White Catholic | 10.74% |
| Hispanic Catholic | 6.58% |
| Other Christian | 4.40% |
| Non-Christian | 8.80% |
| Unaffiliated | 29.38% |

Notes: Weighted estimates.

**Source:** American Trends Panel (Wave 61).
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# A2: Full Model Estimates for Minority Status Perceptions

**Table A2: Logit Estimates for Minority Status Perceptions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Does R consider self to be minority because of religious beliefs? |
| White evangelical Protestant | 1.161\*\*\*(.166) |
| Black Protestant | .891\*\*\*(.209) |
| Hispanic Protestant  | .999\*\*\*(.277) |
| White Catholic | .111(.200) |
| Hispanic Catholic | .449(.554) |
| Other Christian  | 1.220\*\*\*(.206) |
| Non-Christian  | 2.402\*\*\*(.194) |
| Unaffiliated | 1.228\*\*\*(.171) |
| Religiosity | 1.165\*\*\*(.203) |
| Republican | .110(.115) |
| Ideology (conservative) | -.147(.222) |
| Age | -.157(.126) |
| Male | .212\*(.084) |
| Education | .488\*\*\*(.129) |
| South | -.048(.086) |
| Constant | -2.982\*\*\*(.234) |
| Pseudo $R^{2}$Log pseudolikelihoodN | .071-3008.41285,950 |

Notes: Table entries are logit coefficients. Robust standard errors given in parentheses. Data are weighted. \*p <.05 \*\*p <.01 \*\*\*p <.001.

**Source:** American Trends Panel (Wave 61).

# A3: Full Model Estimations for Trump’s Election as a Divine Outcome

**Table A3: Multinomial Logit Estimates for Trump’s Election as a Divine Outcome**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | God chose Trump to be president | Trump’s election part of God’s plan |
| Minority because of religious beliefs  | .796\*\*(.297) | .607\*\*(.224) |
| Religiosity | 3.596\*\*\*(.796) | 3.607\*\*\*(.478) |
| Republican | 1.670\*\*(.651) | .583\*(.263) |
| Ideology (conservative) | 5.142\*\*\*(.814) | 1.559\*\*\*(.540) |
| Age | -.018(.448) | -.616\*(.304) |
| Male | -1.008\*\*\*(.277) | -.497\*\*(.187) |
| Education | -.861(.459) | .486(.291) |
| South | .077(.265) | .067(.179) |
| Constant | -8.326\*\*\*(1.002) | -3.206\*\*\*(.491) |
| Log pseudolikelihood N | -251.2694859 |

Notes: Table entries are multinomial logit coefficients. Robust standard errors clustered at the respondent level given in parentheses. Sample limited to white evangelical respondents. Data are unweighted. Reference category for dependent measure is 3 = “God does not get involved in elections.” \*p <.05 \*\*p <.01 \*\*\*p <.001.

**Source:** American Trends Panel (Wave 61).