# Appendices

*(Supplemental information intended for online publication)*

## Extracting a symbolic racism factor

Table A1 reports the results of the factor analysis I conduct to construct a symbolic racism factor, following Tarman and Sears (2005). These authors conduct factor analysis on five GSS surveys administered between 1994 and 2000 in order to demonstrate consistency in the conceptual distinction between old-fashioned and symbolic racism over time. My only departure from Tarman and Sears is my decision not to include a question about whether interracial marriage should be legal. By the time of the 2000 survey, this question is answered by so few that I eliminate it in order to avoid limiting my symbolic racism scale to a small number of survey responses.

Note that I keep the symbolic racism (SR) factor produced by the factor analysis but discard the old-fashioned racism (OFR) factor. I instead focus on the black laziness stereotype as a measure of traditional prejudice, given the centrality of this particular belief in explaining opposition to welfare.

### Table A1: Racial Attitude Factor Loadings

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SR Factor** | **OFR Factor** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Symbolic racism (SR)** | **0.49** |  |  |
| Discrimination not responsible for racial disparities | -0.13 |  |
| Lack of motivation is responsible for disparities | **0.47** | 0.26 |  |
| Blacks should work their way up; no special favors | **0.51** | 0.10 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Old-fashioned racism (OFR)** |  | **0.48** |  |
| Lack of inborn ability is responsible for disparities | 0.02 |  |
| Blacks lack intelligence (compared to whites) | 0.11 | **0.44** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Interfactor correlation = 0.36* |  |  |  |

Source: 2000 General Social Survey (n = 2,213). Table reports coefficients from exploratory factor analysis, oblique rotations, including all non-black respondents. Factor loadings exceeding 0.40 are bolded.

## County-level predictors of welfare preferences

In this appendix, I report the results of analysis conducted using county-level measures of black population share and poverty rate in order to ensure that my results are not purely the product of how MSA boundaries are drawn. I have explained my focus on the MSA (or metropolitan division when applicable; see note 4) on the grounds that urban residents are likely to cross county lines in their daily activities and also to be aware of populations in neighboring counties. However, counties (as opposed to states or census tracts) are similar to MSAs as mid-size containers, and therefore county-level data should produce similar results when incorporated into the analysis.

Table A2 presents the results of this analysis. The interactions between both measures of racial geography (either black population share or racial segregation) and the laziness stereotype hold when measuring context at the county level. The interaction between income segregation and symbolic racism also remains significant. The interaction between symbolic racism and county poverty rate, however, is no longer significant (p = 0.107). This result is consistent with the reasoning behind my incorporation of central city poverty rates in the main analysis. It is possible that sorting within a metropolitan area produces variation in poverty rates among the counties that comprise an MSA. Despite this sorting, we would expect metropolitan area residents to have a general awareness of visible, central city poverty.

### Table A2: Racialized Welfare Preferences Across Counties

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Opposition to Welfare** | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  |
| Laziness Stereotype | Symbolic Racism |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Racial Attitudes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype | 1.257\*\*\* | 0.961 | 1.043 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.101) | (0.139) | (0.125) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism |  |  |  | 1.219\*\*\* | 0.977 | 1.652\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.066) | (0.141) | (0.234) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contextual Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Percent Black | 1.005 | 0.503\*\* |  | 1.066 | 1.052 | 1.081 |  |
| (log) | (0.084) | (0.150) |  | (0.112) | (0.112) | (0.111) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Poverty Rate | 1.028 | 1.024 | 1.026 | 1.024 | 0.906 |  |  |
|  | (0.023) | (0.023) | (0.021) | (0.030) | (0.072) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype× County Percent Black (log) |  | 1.140\*\*(0.065) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial Segregation |  |  | 0.866\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.051) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype× Racial Segregation |  |  | 1.025\*\*(0.011) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism× County Poverty Rate |  |  |  |  | 1.021(0.013) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Segregation |  |  |  |  |  | 1.339\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.207) |  |
| Symbolic Racism× Income Segregation |  |  |  |  |  |  0.943\*\*(0.022) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Control Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 0.992 | 0.992 | 0.992 | 0.993 | 0.991 | 0.994 |  |
|  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.007) | (0.007) | (0.007) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 1.283 | 1.299 | 1.287 | 1.249 | 1.212 | 1.161 |  |
|  | (0.248) | (0.252) | (0.245) | (0.291) | (0.284) | (0.274) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marital Status | 1.138 | 1.142 | 1.134 | 1.105 | 1.109 | 1.102 |  |
|  | (0.221) | (0.221) | (0.215) | (0.261) | (0.269) | (0.270) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education (years) | 0.930\*\* | 0.932\*\* | 0.930\*\* | 0.953 | 0.953 | 0.952 |  |
|  | (0.034) | (0.033) | (0.034) | (0.043) | (0.045) | (0.044) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent | 2.158\*\*\* | 2.125\*\*\* | 2.116\*\*\* | 2.255\*\*\* | 2.146\*\* | 2.411\*\*\* |  |
|  | (0.559) | (0.559) | (0.553) | (0.688) | (0.644) | (0.743) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Republican | 2.379\*\*\* | 2.335\*\*\* | 2.420\*\*\* | 1.821\*\* | 1.810\*\* | 1.907\*\* |  |
|  | (0.530) | (0.520) | (0.541) | (0.491) | (0.488) | (0.526) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.324 | 1.298 | 0.940 | 0.234 | 0.985 | 0.0644\*\* |  |
|  | (0.270) | (1.287) | (0.875) | (0.209) | (1.215) | (0.084) |  |
| Observations | 512 | 512 | 512 | 361 | 361 | 361 |  |
| Counties | 147 | 147 | 147 | 136 | 136 | 136 |  |
| Log likelihood | -323.3 | -321.0 | -321.2 | -223.5 | -222.1 | -220.2 |  |

Table reports odds ratios from logistic regression estimating probability of saying too much is spent on welfare; standard errors in parentheses.

Source: 2000 General Social Survey. Party base category is Democrat.

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

##  “Assistance to the poor” versus “welfare”

I conduct a confirmatory test of my main results by repeating the analysis using the dependent variable “assistance to the poor,” which lacks welfare’s reputation as a threat to the way of life of hardworking Americans. The relative unpopularity of welfare is apparent in the GSS dataset: 39.45% of the sample says too much is spent on welfare, compared to 13.48% among those respondents who were instead asked about assistance to the poor.

Still, both racial attitude variables are predictive of opinion regarding assistance to the poor in the first two models of Table A3. In other words, attitudes about blacks are implicated even when a less racialized term is used.

### Table A3: No Effect of Context on Opposition to Assisting the Poor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assisting the Poor** | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |  |
| Laziness Stereotype | Symbolic Racism  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Racial Attitudes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype | 1.418\*\*\* | 1.839\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.170) | (0.379) |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism |  |  | 1.171\*\* | 1.238 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.077) | (0.200) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contextual Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Black (Log) |  | 1.763 |  | 0.795\* |  |
|  |  | (0.944) |  | (0.097) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Rate |  | 1.005 |  | 1.037 |  |
|  |  | (0.025) |  | (0.067) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype |  | 0.883 |  |  |  |
| × Percent Black (Log) |  | (0.078) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism |  |  |  | 0.997 |  |
| × Poverty Rate |  |  |  | (0.009) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Control Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent | 1.142 | 1.166 | 0.732 | 0.762 |  |
|  | (0.438) | (0.445) | (0.343) | (0.361) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Republican | 1.518 | 1.570 | 1.359 | 1.377 |  |
|  | (0.486) | (0.506) | (0.484) | (0.509) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.993 | 0.994 |  |
|  | (0.007) | (0.007) | (0.009) | (0.009) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 1.068 | 1.070 | 1.114 | 1.155 |  |
|  | (0.313) | (0.321) | (0.350) | (0.379) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marital Status | 1.036 | 1.103 | 0.786 | 0.776 |  |
|  | (0.275) | (0.294) | (0.256) | (0.254) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education (years) | 1.098\* | 1.085 | 1.071 | 1.062 |  |
|  | (0.055) | (0.056) | (0.059) | (0.061) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.00680\*\*\* | 0.00212\*\*\* | 0.0360\*\*\* | 0.0301\*\* |  |
|  | (0.008) | (0.003) | (0.038) | (0.045) |  |
| Observations | 505 | 505 | 347 | 347 |  |
| MSAs | 92 | 92 | 87 | 87 |  |
| Log likelihood | -200.5 | -199.1 | -146.0 | -144.6 |  |

Table reports odds ratios from logistic regression estimating probability of saying too much is spent on welfare; standard errors in parentheses.

Source: 2000 General Social Survey. Party base category is Democrat.

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

However, neither previously identified interaction between racial attitudes and context holds when assistance to the poor is the dependent variable. Racial geography does not make traditional racial prejudice more accessible in regard to a race-neutral reference to redistribution; economic geography is similarly insignificant in determining the effect of symbolic racism on views about assistance to the poor. In a similar vein, party identification was a significant predictor of welfare views—reflecting the Republican Party’s embrace of the narrative that welfare encourages dependency—but is not significant in predicting views on assisting the poor. The results reported in this appendix therefore indicate the power of a policy narrative to make particular racial attitudes sensitive to contextual symbols associated with welfare.

Note that the slight significance of black population share in the fourth column of Table A3 and the simultaneous insignificance of symbolic racism in that model may be a product of the small effect of black population share in predicting higher levels of symbolic racism, discussed in the next appendix.

## The possible endogeneity of attitudes to context

Some applications of the threat hypothesis have argued that a greater minority presence will increase the expression of prejudice among majority group members, posing prejudice itself rather than vote choice or policy preferences as the dependent variable (e.g. Quillian 1995). My analysis instead assumes that racial attitudes are exogenous to the settings in which people live. This assumption is inevitably imperfect, but with policy preferences as the outcome variable, it would be futile to investigate any predictive power of context without controlling for white individuals’ orientations toward blacks (see Branton and Jones 2005 for a similar approach).

Furthermore, I confirm that the effects of context on racial animus itself are minimal in the 2000 GSS sample, evidenced by OLS regression clustering standard errors by MSA (Table A4). Poverty rate is not significant in predicting either racial attitude variable. Black population share is not significant in predicting agreement with the black laziness stereotype, although it is predictive of symbolic racism. A unit increase in percent black predicts an increase of 0.03 on the 0-10 symbolic racism scale (p<0.01). However, I deem this effect small enough not to bias my results when controlling for context and racial attitudes together. Moreover, even if levels of symbolic racism are slightly higher in racially diverse contexts, the fact that economic geography (i.e. poverty rate) rather than racial geography is predicted to amplify the effect of symbolic racism dampens concerns about endogeneity in the symbolic racism models.

### Table A4: Effect of Racial Context on Racial Attitudes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | Dep. Var.: **Laziness Stereotype** | Dep. Var.: **Symbolic Racism** |
|  |  |  |
| Percent Black | 0.00689 | 0.0286\*\*\* |
|  | (0.005) | (0.010) |
|  |  |  |
| Age | 0.0125\*\*\* | 0.0142\*\* |
|  | (0.003) | (0.005) |
|  |  |  |
| Gender | 0.0948 | 0.356\*\* |
|  | (0.083) | (0.145) |
|  |  |  |
| Marital Status | 0.0328 | 0.165 |
|  | (0.090) | (0.195) |
|  |  |  |
| Education (years) | -0.0734\*\*\* | -0.230\*\*\* |
|  | (0.020) | (0.038) |
|  |  |  |
| Income (thous.) | 0.000107 | -0.00323 |
|  | (0.001) | (0.002) |
|  |  |  |
| Independent | 0.100 | 0.406\* |
|  | (0.114) | (0.238) |
|  |  |  |
| Republican | 0.0876 | 1.077\*\*\* |
|  | (0.095) | (0.226) |
|  |  |  |
| Poverty Rate | 0.0118 | 0.00355 |
|  | (0.008) | (0.022) |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | 5.316\*\*\* | 7.193\*\*\* |
|  | (0.328) | (0.794) |
| Observations | 1051 | 728 |
| MSAs | 95 | 93 |
| R-sq. | 0.0678 | 0.151 |

Table reports results of OLS regression; standard errors in parentheses.

Source: 2000 General Social Survey. Party base category is Democrat.

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

In a separate analysis, I confirm that the welfare preferences I study at the MSA level do not simply reflect differences across states or regions. Table A5 presents two approaches to accounting for regional and state-level characteristics that are shared across MSAs. The first two models include a dummy variable for the region in which each MSA is located, and the second uses multilevel modeling to nest each MSA within a state. Across the models, the interaction between attitudes and contexts remains significant. Orientations toward blacks as well as ideas about welfare spending may partially reflect cultural differences across the United States—but, after accounting for these, I still find that features of local context are predictive of the strength of the relationship between racial attitudes and welfare preferences.

### Table A5: Controlling for Regional and State-Level Characteristics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Opposition to Welfare** | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |  |
| Regional Dummy Variables | Nested in States |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contextual Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Black (log) | 0.405\*\* | 1.141 | 0.436\*\* | 1.015 |  |
|  | (0.143) | (0.150) | (0.171) | (0.120) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Rate | 1.003 | 0.891⇤⇤ | 1.001 | 0.891\*\* |  |
|  | (0.019) | (0.050) | (0.018) | (0.051) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Black (log) | 1.171\*\* |  | 1.165\*\* |  |  |
| × Laziness Stereotype | (0.080) |  | (0.084) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism |  | 1.024\*\* |  | 1.025\*\*\* |  |
| × Poverty Rate |  | (0.011) |  | (0.010) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Individual-Level Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laziness Stereotype | 0.884 |  | 0.897 |  |  |
|  | (0.165) |  | (0.160) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Symbolic Racism |  | 0.817 |  | 0.792 |  |
|  |  | (0.147) |  | (0.133) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent | 2.202\*\*\* | 2.485\*\*\* | 2.145\*\*\* | 2.292\*\* |  |
|  | (0.593) | (0.827) | (0.565) | (0.744) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Republican | 2.345\*\*\* | 1.943\*\* | 2.407\*\*\* | 1.869\*\* |  |
|  | (0.561) | (0.566) | (0.523) | (0.493) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Region Dummy Variables** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Atlantic | 0.461 | 0.771 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.280) | (0.407) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E. North Central | 0.631 | 0.673 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.363) | (0.331) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W. North Central | 0.767 | 2.095 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.598) | (1.596) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Atlantic | 0.590 | 0.560 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.345) | (0.310) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E. South Central | 1.099 | 0.958 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.799) | (0.662) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W. South Central | 1.147 | 0.791 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.655) | (0.446) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain | 0.554 | 0.923 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.360) | (0.572) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pacific | 0.567 | 0.897 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.325) | (0.461) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 4.764 | 2.151 | 2.513 | 2.332 |  |
|  | (6.529) | (2.793) | (2.906) | (3.015) |  |
| Observations | 512 | 361 | 512 | 361 |  |
| MSAs | 91 | 89 | 91 | 89 |  |
| Log likelihood | -317.1 | -217.4 | -321.7 | -220.0 |  |
| States |  |  | 33 | 32 |  |

Table reports odds ratios from logistic regression (Models 1 and 2) and multilevel logistic regression (Models 3 and 4); standard errors in parentheses.

Party base category is Democrat; region base category is New England; for concision, other control variables are not displayed.

Source: 2000 General Social Survey.

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01