Appendices

September 11, 2008

General Notes

Variable coding   All variables in all the models are coded to run from 0 to 1. The variables that represent percentages are limited to the 0 to 1 range but are not required to have minimum values of 0 and maximum values of 1. Unless otherwise specified, for policy or attitude variables, 0 anchors the more liberal position and 1 the conservative position.

Chapter 3

GSS 96: Chapter 3 Figure 2

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.37	0.04	0.00
Age	0.20	0.03	0.00
Education	0.05	0.03	0.16
Income	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Female	0.01	0.02	0.73
Black	0.01	0.03	0.82
Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.35
Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.49
Married	0.07	0.02	0.00
Parent	−0.01	0.02	0.51
Homeowner	0.04	0.02	0.04
Same City	0.09	0.02	0.00
Same State	0.00	0.02	0.89
South	0.03	0.02	0.17

Table 1: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Neighborhood (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes (GSS96,N=1041).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.40	0.04	0.00
Age	0.15	0.03	0.00
Education	0.02	0.03	0.50
Income	−0.02	0.03	0.61
Female	0.02	0.02	0.26
Black	0.04	0.03	0.10
Hispanic	0.09	0.04	0.03
Generation	0.02	0.03	0.50
Married	0.03	0.02	0.12
Parent	−0.04	0.02	0.05
Homeowner	0.01	0.02	0.50
Same City	0.13	0.02	0.00
Same State	0.01	0.02	0.67
South	−0.01	0.02	0.63

Table 2: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Town (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes (GSS96,N=1035).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.04	0.00
Age	0.14	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.01	0.03	0.75
Income	−0.05	0.03	0.13
Female	−0.01	0.02	0.71
Black	−0.04	0.03	0.15
Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.20
Generation	0.00	0.03	0.88
Married	0.00	0.02	0.93
Parent	−0.01	0.02	0.53
Homeowner	0.01	0.02	0.51
Same City	0.10	0.02	0.00
Same State	0.06	0.02	0.01
South	0.01	0.02	0.58

Table 3: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your State (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes (GSS96,N=1023).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.61	0.04	0.00
Age	0.19	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.01	0.03	0.85
Income	−0.03	0.03	0.28
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.01
Black	−0.09	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.09	0.04	0.02
Generation	0.09	0.03	0.00
Married	0.03	0.02	0.16
Parent	−0.01	0.02	0.49
Homeowner	0.01	0.02	0.68
Same City	−0.03	0.02	0.14
Same State	−0.04	0.02	0.04
South	0.01	0.02	0.76

Table 4: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to America (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes (GSS96,N=1028).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.04	0.00
Age	0.18	0.03	0.00
Education	0.04	0.04	0.29
Income	−0.02	0.03	0.60
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.08
Black	−0.15	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.05	0.10
Generation	0.05	0.03	0.15
Married	−0.02	0.02	0.38
Parent	−0.04	0.02	0.07
Homeowner	0.02	0.02	0.34
Same City	−0.05	0.02	0.04
Same State	−0.05	0.02	0.03
South	0.00	0.02	0.83

Table 5: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to North American (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes (GSS96,N=979).

GSS 96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 3 Figure 2

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.05	0.00
Age	0.14	0.03	0.00
Education	0.07	0.04	0.08
Income	−0.06	0.04	0.10
Female	−0.00	0.02	0.92
Generation	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Married	0.07	0.02	0.00
Parent	−0.00	0.03	0.93
Homeowner	0.03	0.02	0.18
Same City	0.07	0.02	0.01
Same State	0.01	0.03	0.76
South	0.04	0.02	0.07
Blacks in Neighborhood	−0.05	0.02	0.01

Table 6: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Neighborhood (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (GSS96,N=791,White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.40	0.05	0.00
Age	0.14	0.03	0.00
Education	0.05	0.03	0.16
Income	0.00	0.03	0.96
Female	0.04	0.02	0.02
Generation	0.02	0.03	0.59
Married	0.02	0.02	0.39
Parent	−0.03	0.02	0.15
Homeowner	−0.00	0.02	0.85
Same City	0.13	0.02	0.00
Same State	0.01	0.02	0.71
South	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Blacks in Neighborhood	0.00	0.02	0.90

Table 7: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Town (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (GSS96,N=787,White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.43	0.15	0.00
Age	0.29	0.09	0.00
Education	−0.15	0.11	0.16
Income	−0.05	0.10	0.58
Female	−0.04	0.06	0.52
Generation	0.09	0.11	0.42
Married	−0.03	0.07	0.67
Parent	−0.03	0.07	0.61
Homeowner	0.14	0.06	0.02
Same City	0.12	0.06	0.06
Same State	−0.07	0.08	0.42
South	−0.07	0.06	0.22
Blacks in Neighborhood	−0.05	0.07	0.45

Table 8: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Neighborhood (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (GSS96,N=122,Black Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.74	0.15	0.00
Age	0.19	0.09	0.03
Education	−0.09	0.11	0.42
Income	−0.19	0.10	0.06
Female	−0.15	0.06	0.01
Generation	−0.04	0.11	0.73
Married	−0.01	0.07	0.86
Parent	−0.09	0.07	0.18
Homeowner	0.08	0.06	0.22
Same City	0.15	0.06	0.02
Same State	−0.02	0.08	0.80
South	0.03	0.06	0.64
Blacks in Neighborhood	−0.05	0.07	0.45

Table 9: OLS model summarizing the relationship between Closeness to Your Town (0=not close at all, 1= very close) and personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (GSS96,N=119,Black Respondents Only).

SOCCAP: Chapter 3 Figure 3

Notes on the Social Capital National Sample Data: Throughout the book, Asian respondents are excluded from the analyses. There were too few of them (44) and they caused instability and proved overly influential (using conventional measures of influence of observations on linear models) in the models.

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.03	0.27	0.00
Age	−0.17	0.38	0.66
Education	−0.51	0.26	0.05
Income	−0.11	0.28	0.69
Female	0.18	0.15	0.22
Black	−0.40	0.20	0.04
Hispanic	−0.43	0.20	0.03
Married	0.35	0.16	0.02
Parent	0.08	0.17	0.61
Homeowner	0.40	0.18	0.02
Length of Residence	0.40	0.28	0.15
South	0.04	0.15	0.79

Table 10: Logit model summarizing the relationship between Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP,N=1255)

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.43	0.26	0.10
Age	0.64	0.37	0.08
Education	−0.63	0.25	0.01
Income	0.18	0.27	0.51
Female	0.10	0.14	0.48
Black	0.04	0.20	0.83
Hispanic	0.25	0.20	0.22
Married	0.18	0.15	0.23
Parent	0.36	0.16	0.02
Homeowner	0.03	0.18	0.88
Length of Residence	0.74	0.27	0.01
South	0.18	0.15	0.22

Table 11: Logit model summarizing the relationship between City Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP,N=1255)

SOCCAP: Extra Analyses for Chapter 3 Figure 3

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(> |z|)$
Constant	1.12	0.40	0.00
Age	−0.17	0.39	0.67
Education	−0.53	0.26	0.04
Income	−0.09	0.30	0.75
Female	0.13	0.15	0.39
Black	−0.12	0.23	0.60
Hispanic	−0.01	0.26	0.98
Married	0.30	0.16	0.06
Parent	0.12	0.17	0.48
Homeowner	0.41	0.18	0.02
Length of Residence	0.32	0.29	0.27
South	−0.04	0.16	0.81
Median Household Income (Tract)	0.48	0.88	0.59
% Foreign Born (Tract)	−1.46	1.19	0.22
I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)	−0.38	0.33	0.25
I(% Foreign Born > 40%) (Tract)	1.81	1.53	0.24
% Racial Outgroup (Tract)	0.10	0.54	0.86
I(% Racial Outgroup < 5%) (Tract)	0.42	0.58	0.47
I(% Racial Outgroup > 75%) (Tract)	4.81	2.27	0.03
% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)	24.77	9.48	0.01
% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born > 40%) (Tract)	−2.44	3.09	0.43
% Racial Outgroup × I(% Racial Outgroup < 5%) (Tract)	−18.14	15.99	0.26
% Racial Outgroup × I(% Racial Outgroup > 75%) (Tract)	−6.07	2.57	0.02

Table 12: Multilevel logit model summarizing the relationship between Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP and US Census 2000,N=1233,Tracts=1216). Diagnostic models fit with non-parametric functional forms for the tract level variables suggested non-linear relationships for % Foreign Born and % Racial Outgroup. In order to aid in interpretation, this model represents this nonlinearity with piecewise fits over subsets of the range of those variables where the breaks between the pieces were chosen after inspecting a variety of non-parametric, smooth, fits. Thus, the label 'I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)' indicates a variable which is 0 when % Foreign Born < 5% and 1 otherwise. This means that the coefficient on '% Foreign Born (Tract)' tells us the slope of the relationship when the % Foreign Born is between 5 and 40 %, and '% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)' tells us the difference in slope between the 5–40% range and the less than 5% range. Model specified with an intercept varying by census tract and slopes fixed. Estimated using the defaults of the `lme4` package for `R` (Bates, Maechler and Dai, 2008).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |z|)$
Constant	1.01	0.38	0.01
Age	0.72	0.38	0.06
Education	−0.60	0.26	0.02
Income	0.36	0.29	0.21
Female	0.08	0.15	0.57
Black	0.27	0.24	0.25
Hispanic	0.53	0.26	0.04
Married	0.11	0.16	0.47
Parent	0.40	0.17	0.01
Homeowner	−0.00	0.18	1.00
Length of Residence	0.66	0.28	0.02
South	0.23	0.16	0.16
Median Household Income (Tract)	−1.52	0.81	0.06
% Foreign Born (Tract)	0.00	1.19	1.00
I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)	−0.15	0.32	0.64
I(% Foreign Born > 40%) (Tract)	0.40	1.64	0.81
% Racial Outgroup (Tract)	−1.53	0.52	0.00
I(% Racial Outgroup < 5%) (Tract)	−0.55	0.54	0.31
I(% Racial Outgroup > 75%) (Tract)	−3.41	2.21	0.12
% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)	7.26	8.65	0.40
% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born > 40%) (Tract)	−0.02	3.40	1.00
% Racial Outgroup × I(% Racial Outgroup < 5%) (Tract)	15.05	15.59	0.33
% Racial Outgroup × I(% Racial Outgroup > 75%) (Tract)	4.43	2.53	0.08

Table 13: Multilevel logit model summarizing the relationship between City Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP and US Census 2000,N=1240,Tracts=1222). Diagnostic models fit with non-parametric functional forms for the tract level variables suggested non-linear relationships for % Foreign Born and % Racial Outgroup. In order to aid in interpretation, this model represents this nonlinearity with piecewise fits over subsets of the range of those variables where the breaks between the pieces were chosen after inspecting a variety of non-parametric, smooth, fits. Thus, the label 'I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)' indicates a variable which is 0 when % Foreign Born < 5% and 1 otherwise. This means that the coefficient on '% Foreign Born (Tract)' tells us the slope of the relationship when the % Foreign Born is between 5 and 40 %, and '% Foreign Born × I(% Foreign Born < 5%) (Tract)' tells us the difference in slope between the 5–40% range and the less than 5% range. Model specified with an intercept varying by census tract and slopes fixed. Estimated using the defaults of the `lme4` package for `R` (Bates, Maechler and Dai, 2008).

SOCCAP: Chapter 3 Figure 4

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.33	0.03	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.08	0.01	0.00
City Sense of Community	0.08	0.01	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.02	0.42
Social Trust (1=people can be trusted)	0.11	0.01	0.00
Age	0.17	0.03	0.00
Education	0.02	0.02	0.26
Income	−0.01	0.02	0.53
Female	0.04	0.01	0.00
Black	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	−0.00	0.02	0.78
Married	−0.00	0.01	0.92
Parent	−0.00	0.01	0.85
Homeowner	−0.00	0.01	0.87
Length of Residence	−0.05	0.02	0.03
South	0.02	0.01	0.08

Table 14: OLS model describing Political Trust (0=trust not at all, 1=trust a lot) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1143).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.04	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.09	0.02	0.00
City Sense of Community	0.08	0.02	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.03	0.58
Age	0.05	0.05	0.36
Education	0.07	0.03	0.03
Income	0.07	0.04	0.05
Female	0.04	0.02	0.03
Black	−0.00	0.03	0.94
Hispanic	−0.09	0.03	0.00
Married	0.04	0.02	0.07
Parent	−0.02	0.02	0.32
Homeowner	0.03	0.02	0.16
Length of Residence	−0.01	0.04	0.71
South	−0.00	0.02	0.98

Table 15: OLS model describing Political Alienation (0=agree strongly that leaders do not care about me, 1=disagree strongly) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1167).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.04	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.05	0.02	0.01
City Sense of Community	0.08	0.02	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.02	0.03	0.47
Age	−0.05	0.04	0.26
Education	0.08	0.03	0.01
Income	0.06	0.03	0.06
Female	0.02	0.02	0.24
Black	0.05	0.02	0.02
Hispanic	−0.00	0.02	0.83
Married	0.02	0.02	0.19
Parent	0.00	0.02	0.79
Homeowner	0.03	0.02	0.09
Length of Residence	0.03	0.03	0.36
South	0.01	0.02	0.42

Table 16: OLS model describing Political Efficacy (0=no impact at all, 1=a big impact) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1202).

SOCCAP: Extra Analyses for Chapter 3 Figure 4

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.28	0.03	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.06	0.01	0.00
City Sense of Community	0.06	0.01	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.02	0.39
Social Trust (1=people can be trusted)	0.10	0.01	0.00
Age	0.16	0.03	0.00
Education	0.02	0.02	0.45
Income	−0.03	0.02	0.12
Female	0.03	0.01	0.01
Black	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.71
Married	−0.00	0.01	0.82
Parent	−0.00	0.01	0.96
Homeowner	−0.01	0.01	0.46
Length of Residence	−0.04	0.02	0.05
South	0.02	0.01	0.16
R's rating of community	0.15	0.02	0.00

Table 17: OLS model describing Political Trust (0=trust them not at all, 1=trust them a lot) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1143).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.05	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.07	0.02	0.00
City Sense of Community	0.04	0.02	0.10
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.03	0.49
Age	0.02	0.05	0.73
Education	0.06	0.03	0.08
Income	0.03	0.04	0.41
Female	0.03	0.02	0.10
Black	0.03	0.03	0.28
Hispanic	−0.06	0.03	0.02
Married	0.03	0.02	0.10
Parent	−0.02	0.02	0.36
Homeowner	0.02	0.02	0.44
Length of Residence	−0.01	0.03	0.86
South	−0.01	0.02	0.68
R's rating of community	0.27	0.04	0.00

Table 18: OLS model describing Political Alienation (0=agree strongly that leaders do not care about me, 1=disagree strongly) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1167).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.42	0.04	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.03	0.02	0.13
City Sense of Community	0.05	0.02	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.02	0.03	0.56
Age	−0.07	0.04	0.07
Education	0.06	0.03	0.02
Income	0.02	0.03	0.46
Female	0.01	0.02	0.49
Black	0.08	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.50
Married	0.02	0.02	0.25
Parent	0.01	0.02	0.71
Homeowner	0.02	0.02	0.30
Length of Residence	0.03	0.03	0.24
South	0.01	0.02	0.68
R's rating of community	0.23	0.03	0.00

Table 19: OLS model describing Political Efficacy (0=no impact at all, 1=a big impact) as a function of local sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1202).

SOCCAP: Chapter 3 Figure 5

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−3.61	0.40	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.48	0.20	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.27	0.27	0.32
Age	1.65	0.41	0.00
Education	1.08	0.26	0.00
Income	1.51	0.30	0.00
Female	−0.12	0.15	0.42
Black	0.63	0.21	0.00
Hispanic	0.27	0.22	0.22
Married	0.08	0.16	0.61
Parent	0.09	0.17	0.59
Homeowner	0.24	0.20	0.24
Length of Residence	−0.21	0.28	0.45
South	−0.05	0.16	0.74

Table 20: Logit model summarizing Participation in a Neighborhood Association (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1219).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−1.56	0.53	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.66	0.30	0.03
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.41	0.40	0.31
Age	0.52	0.57	0.37
Education	−0.10	0.39	0.79
Income	0.70	0.42	0.10
Female	−0.39	0.22	0.08
Black	0.10	0.31	0.74
Hispanic	0.07	0.32	0.83
Married	0.09	0.24	0.70
Parent	0.14	0.26	0.58
Homeowner	0.24	0.29	0.41
Length of Residence	−0.01	0.43	0.98
South	−0.18	0.23	0.43

Table 21: Logit model summarizing Cooperation with Neighbors (0=no, 1=have worked with others) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=424).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−3.54	0.51	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.55	0.26	0.03
Lib-Con Ideology	0.55	0.35	0.11
Age	4.06	0.79	0.00
Education	1.39	0.37	0.00
Income	0.90	0.38	0.02
Female	0.68	0.20	0.00
Black	0.02	0.26	0.94
Hispanic	−0.28	0.25	0.28
Married	−0.17	0.23	0.45
Homeowner	0.02	0.24	0.92
Length of Residence	0.31	0.37	0.40
South	0.24	0.20	0.24

Table 22: Logit model summarizing Participation in a PTA (by Parents)(0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=555).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−4.53	0.73	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.04	0.35	0.91
Lib-Con Ideology	0.48	0.53	0.37
Age	−0.70	0.73	0.34
Education	1.75	0.48	0.00
Income	0.04	0.56	0.95
Female	0.60	0.30	0.05
Black	−0.17	0.47	0.72
Hispanic	0.15	0.49	0.76
Married	0.70	0.30	0.02
Homeowner	0.18	0.40	0.66
Length of Residence	0.82	0.56	0.14
South	0.21	0.29	0.49

Table 23: Logit model summarizing Participation in a PTA (by Non-Parents)(0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=664).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.05	0.05	0.30
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.06	0.02	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	0.22	0.04	0.00
Age	0.31	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.16	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.19
Black	0.10	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.15	0.03	0.00
Married	0.02	0.02	0.24
Parent	0.03	0.02	0.12
Homeowner	−0.02	0.03	0.48
Length of Residence	0.03	0.04	0.39
South	0.01	0.02	0.49

Table 24: OLS model summarizing Willingness to Ban a Book (0=disagree strongly that a book should be kept out of the library, 1=agree strongly) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community) and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1197).

SOCCAP: Extra Analyses for Chapter 3 Figure 5

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−3.70	0.43	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.45	0.20	0.03
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.27	0.27	0.33
Age	1.63	0.41	0.00
Education	1.08	0.26	0.00
Income	1.48	0.30	0.00
Female	−0.13	0.15	0.39
Black	0.65	0.21	0.00
Hispanic	0.28	0.22	0.20
Married	0.08	0.16	0.63
Parent	0.09	0.17	0.59
Homeowner	0.23	0.20	0.27
Length of Residence	−0.21	0.28	0.45
South	−0.06	0.16	0.72
R's rating of community	0.20	0.33	0.55

Table 25: Logit model describing Participation in a Neighborhood Association (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1219).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.39	0.56	0.01
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.71	0.31	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.43	0.40	0.29
Age	0.59	0.58	0.31
Education	−0.10	0.39	0.80
Income	0.80	0.44	0.07
Female	−0.37	0.22	0.09
Black	0.05	0.32	0.88
Hispanic	0.05	0.32	0.87
Married	0.09	0.24	0.69
Parent	0.15	0.26	0.57
Homeowner	0.27	0.29	0.35
Length of Residence	−0.03	0.43	0.94
South	−0.16	0.23	0.48
R's rating of community	−0.41	0.47	0.39

Table 26: Logit model describing Cooperation with Neighbors (0=no, 1=have worked with others) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=424).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−3.94	0.55	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.41	0.27	0.13
Lib-Con Ideology	0.58	0.35	0.10
Age	4.14	0.80	0.00
Education	1.31	0.37	0.00
Income	0.74	0.39	0.06
Female	0.66	0.21	0.00
Black	0.11	0.26	0.69
Hispanic	−0.25	0.25	0.33
Married	−0.18	0.23	0.43
Homeowner	−0.03	0.24	0.90
Length of Residence	0.31	0.37	0.40
South	0.20	0.20	0.31
R's rating of community	0.88	0.43	0.04

Table 27: Logit model describing Participation in a PTA (by Parents)(0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=555).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−5.02	0.81	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.14	0.35	0.70
Lib-Con Ideology	0.51	0.53	0.34
Age	−0.81	0.74	0.27
Education	1.77	0.48	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.56	0.91
Female	0.57	0.30	0.06
Black	−0.06	0.48	0.91
Hispanic	0.20	0.49	0.67
Married	0.67	0.30	0.03
Homeowner	0.13	0.40	0.75
Length of Residence	0.80	0.56	0.15
South	0.18	0.30	0.55
R's rating of community	0.92	0.66	0.16

Table 28: Logit model describing Participation in a PTA (by Non-Parents)(0=no, 1=yes) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=664).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.09	0.05	0.08
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.07	0.03	0.01
Lib-Con Ideology	0.22	0.04	0.00
Age	0.32	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.16	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.14
Black	0.09	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.15	0.03	0.00
Married	0.03	0.02	0.22
Parent	0.03	0.02	0.12
Homeowner	−0.01	0.03	0.61
Length of Residence	0.03	0.04	0.40
South	0.02	0.02	0.40
R's rating of community	−0.09	0.04	0.04

Table 29: OLS model describing Willingness to Ban a Book (0=disagree strongly that a book should be kept out of the library, 1=agree strongly) as a function of neighborhood sense of community (0=no sense of community, 1=sense of community), R's rating of the community (0=poor, 1=excellent), and personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=1197).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(|>z|)$
Constant	0.08	0.05	0.13
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.05	0.02	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.21	0.04	0.00
Age	0.31	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.15	0.04	0.18
Income	−0.13	0.04	0.07
Female	0.03	0.02	0.54
Black vs. White	0.11	0.03	0.36
Hispanic vs. White	0.18	0.04	0.00
Married	0.02	0.02	0.00
Parent	0.04	0.02	0.41
Homeowner	−0.02	0.03	0.40
Length of Residence	0.03	0.04	0.00
South	0.01	0.02	0.03
% Racial Outgroup (Tract)	−0.03	0.04	0.46
% Foreign Born (Tract)	−0.05	0.09	0.54
Median Household Income (Tract)	−0.12	0.11	0.27

Table 30: Multilevel linear model describing Willingness to Ban a Book (0=disagree strongly that a book should be kept out of the library, 1=agree strongly) as a function of sense of community, personal attributes, and attributes of the Census Tract where the Respondents live (SOCCAP and US Census 2000, N=1175,Tracts=1160). Model specified with an intercept varying by census tract and slopes fixed. The p-values (labeled $p(|>z|)$) for the null hypothesis of $\beta = 0$ assessed using 5000 MCMC samples from the posterior implied by the model. Estimated using the defaults of the `lme4` package for `R` (Bates, Maechler and Dai, 2008).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(| > z|)$
Constant	0.01	0.07	0.93
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.15	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.22	0.04	0.00
Age	0.31	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.15	0.04	0.18
Income	−0.13	0.04	0.09
Female	0.03	0.02	0.53
Black	0.11	0.03	0.38
Hispanic	0.18	0.04	0.00
Married	0.02	0.02	0.00
Parent	0.04	0.02	0.41
Homeowner	−0.02	0.03	0.41
Length of Residence	0.03	0.04	0.00
South	0.01	0.02	0.02
% Racial Outgroup (Tract)	−0.03	0.07	0.70
% Foreign Born (Tract)	−0.03	0.15	0.82
Median Household Income (Tract)	0.24	0.23	0.31
% Racial Outgroup × Neighborhood Sense of Community (Tract)	−0.01	0.08	0.91
% Foreign Born × Neighborhood Sense of Community (Tract)	−0.01	0.18	0.94
Median Household Income × Neighborhood Sense of Community (Tract)	−0.46	0.25	0.07

Table 31: Multilevel linear model describing Willingness to Ban a Book (0=disagree strongly that a book should be kept out of the library, 1=agree strongly) as a function of sense of community, personal attributes, and attributes of the Census Tract where the Respondents live (SOCCAP and US Census 2000, N=1175,Tracts=1160). Model specified with an intercept varying by census tract and slopes fixed. The p-values (labeled $p(| > z|)$) for the null hypothesis of $\beta = 0$ assessed using 5000 MCMC samples from the posterior implied by the model. Estimated using the defaults of the `lme4` package for `R` (Bates, Maechler and Dai, 2008).

PPIC: Chapter 3 Appendix Table

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.28	0.39
Age	0.39	0.31	0.21
Education	−0.23	0.31	0.45
Income	0.33	0.29	0.25
Female	−0.11	0.15	0.45
Black	0.17	0.26	0.52
Hispanic	0.37	0.22	0.09
Asian	0.60	0.33	0.07
Other Race	0.01	0.49	0.98
Parent	0.36	0.17	0.04
Homeowner	0.43	0.19	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.27	0.24	0.26

Table 32: Logit model describing Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) as a function of personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=863).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.55	0.05	0.00
Age	0.16	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Income	0.05	0.05	0.34
Female	0.02	0.03	0.39
Black	−0.12	0.05	0.01
Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.80
Asian	−0.01	0.06	0.90
Other Race	−0.22	0.08	0.00
Parent	0.02	0.03	0.46
Homeowner	0.15	0.03	0.00
Length of Residence	0.09	0.04	0.03

Table 33: Logit model describing Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) as a function of personal attributes (SOCCAP, N=798).

PPIC: Chapter 3 Figure 6

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.89	0.37	0.02
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.42	0.22	0.05
Age	−1.06	0.40	0.01
Education	−0.66	0.38	0.08
Income	0.19	0.35	0.59
Female	0.08	0.20	0.68
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.81	0.35	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.21	0.30	0.48

Table 34: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=418).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.85	0.44	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.27	0.25	0.28
Age	−1.20	0.44	0.01
Education	0.68	0.44	0.12
Income	−0.85	0.38	0.03
Female	0.30	0.22	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.68	0.41	0.10
Length of Residence	0.21	0.32	0.52

Table 35: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=414).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.48	0.42	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.46	0.25	0.06
Age	−0.75	0.43	0.08
Education	−1.05	0.41	0.01
Income	−0.56	0.39	0.15
Female	0.29	0.22	0.20
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.00	0.41	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.16	0.32	0.61

Table 36: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=362).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.22	0.40	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.46	0.23	0.04
Age	0.24	0.42	0.57
Education	−0.48	0.43	0.27
Income	0.26	0.38	0.49
Female	−0.07	0.22	0.74
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.34	0.38	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.75	0.32	0.02

Table 37: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=397).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.03	0.04	0.34
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.06	0.02	0.00
Age	0.02	0.04	0.60
Education	0.21	0.04	0.00
Income	0.07	0.03	0.04
Female	0.02	0.02	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.03	0.04
Length of Residence	0.05	0.03	0.11

Table 38: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=855).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.21	0.27	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.31	0.16	0.05
Age	−0.09	0.27	0.74
Education	0.74	0.27	0.01
Income	0.20	0.24	0.41
Female	0.13	0.14	0.35
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.25	0.93
Length of Residence	0.29	0.21	0.16

Table 39: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=859).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.38	0.06
Intended Length of Residence	0.04	0.28	0.87
Age	0.00	0.39	1.00
Education	0.48	0.40	0.23
Income	−0.79	0.36	0.03
Female	−0.25	0.21	0.23
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.95	0.36	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.19	0.31	0.53

Table 40: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=387).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.20	0.37	0.59
Intended Length of Residence	−0.26	0.29	0.37
Age	0.28	0.41	0.50
Education	0.64	0.43	0.14
Income	0.17	0.38	0.66
Female	0.61	0.22	0.01
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.08	0.38	0.83
Length of Residence	−0.61	0.32	0.06

Table 41: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=395).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.15	0.41	0.00
Intended Length of Residence	−0.19	0.30	0.52
Age	−1.07	0.42	0.01
Education	−0.64	0.43	0.14
Income	−0.07	0.38	0.86
Female	−0.05	0.22	0.83
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.69	0.37	0.06
Length of Residence	−0.05	0.34	0.87

Table 42: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=354).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.98	0.38	0.01
Intended Length of Residence	−0.10	0.29	0.72
Age	−0.01	0.41	0.99
Education	0.13	0.42	0.75
Income	0.34	0.38	0.37
Female	0.00	0.22	1.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.06	0.39	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.51	0.32	0.11

Table 43: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=364).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.14	0.04	0.00
Intended Length of Residence	−0.06	0.03	0.03
Age	−0.05	0.04	0.23
Education	0.11	0.04	0.01
Income	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.12
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.04	0.81
Length of Residence	0.04	0.03	0.17

Table 44: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=792).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.00	0.27	0.00
Intended Length of Residence	0.30	0.20	0.13
Age	−0.80	0.28	0.00
Education	0.67	0.29	0.02
Income	0.52	0.25	0.04
Female	0.18	0.15	0.24
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.26	0.77
Length of Residence	−0.04	0.22	0.85

Table 45: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=794).

PPIC: Extra Analysis for Chapter 3 Figure 6

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.25	0.46	0.59
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.32	0.23	0.16
Age	−1.01	0.44	0.02
Education	−0.14	0.43	0.74
Income	0.12	0.39	0.75
Female	0.17	0.21	0.42
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.76	0.36	0.03
Length of Residence	−0.29	0.33	0.37
Homeowner	0.40	0.26	0.12
Black	0.35	0.34	0.31
Hisp	0.78	0.31	0.01
Asian	0.22	0.46	0.63
Other race	−0.23	0.67	0.74
Parent	−0.08	0.24	0.73

Table 46: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=407).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.73	0.52	0.16
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.28	0.26	0.29
Age	−0.93	0.49	0.06
Education	1.24	0.48	0.01
Income	−0.90	0.44	0.04
Female	0.30	0.23	0.20
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.73	0.43	0.09
Length of Residence	0.38	0.36	0.29
Homeowner	0.23	0.30	0.45
Black	1.03	0.49	0.04
Hisp	0.87	0.33	0.01
Asian	0.15	0.43	0.73
Other race	1.48	1.12	0.19
Parent	0.47	0.26	0.07

Table 47: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=404).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.51	0.31
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.47	0.26	0.07
Age	−0.03	0.47	0.95
Education	−0.70	0.46	0.12
Income	−0.14	0.43	0.74
Female	0.28	0.24	0.24
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.18	0.44	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.13	0.35	0.71
Homeowner	−0.45	0.27	0.10
Black	0.28	0.37	0.44
Hisp	0.93	0.34	0.01
Asian	1.49	0.52	0.00
Other race	0.64	0.82	0.44
Parent	0.24	0.28	0.38

Table 48: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=354).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.50	0.16
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.37	0.24	0.12
Age	0.60	0.47	0.20
Education	−0.09	0.49	0.85
Income	0.55	0.45	0.22
Female	−0.13	0.23	0.57
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.39	0.40	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.77	0.36	0.03
Homeowner	−0.07	0.30	0.81
Black	0.11	0.44	0.80
Hisp	1.03	0.33	0.00
Asian	0.37	0.45	0.41
Other race	−1.27	0.86	0.14
Parent	−0.29	0.25	0.24

Table 49: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=387).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.07	0.04	0.14
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.05	0.02	0.02
Age	0.02	0.04	0.56
Education	0.25	0.04	0.00
Income	0.04	0.04	0.32
Female	0.02	0.02	0.35
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.04	0.06
Length of Residence	0.04	0.03	0.22
Homeowner	0.04	0.03	0.11
Black	0.03	0.04	0.40
Hisp	0.01	0.03	0.77
Asian	−0.06	0.04	0.19
Other race	−0.03	0.07	0.61
Parent	0.05	0.02	0.04

Table 50: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=832).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−3.00	0.38	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.18	0.17	0.30
Age	0.88	0.33	0.01
Education	1.79	0.33	0.00
Income	0.09	0.29	0.75
Female	0.07	0.16	0.64
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.27	0.67
Length of Residence	0.44	0.24	0.06
Homeowner	−0.04	0.19	0.84
Black	0.11	0.28	0.68
Hisp	0.80	0.22	0.00
Asian	−0.07	0.33	0.84
Other race	0.22	0.54	0.68
Parent	1.51	0.18	0.00

Table 51: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=836).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.11	0.50	0.82
Intended Length of Residence	0.09	0.30	0.77
Age	0.25	0.44	0.58
Education	0.73	0.44	0.10
Income	−0.36	0.42	0.40
Female	−0.31	0.22	0.17
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.07	0.38	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.05	0.33	0.88
Homeowner	−0.21	0.27	0.43
Black	0.78	0.37	0.04
Hispanic	0.79	0.30	0.01
Asian	0.52	0.53	0.33
Other race	−1.14	0.68	0.10
Parent	−0.11	0.24	0.64

Table 52: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=380).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.88	0.47	0.06
Intended Length of Residence	−0.33	0.31	0.29
Age	0.65	0.46	0.16
Education	1.16	0.47	0.01
Income	0.41	0.43	0.34
Female	0.67	0.23	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.13	0.40	0.74
Length of Residence	−0.50	0.36	0.17
Homeowner	−0.02	0.28	0.96
Black	1.04	0.43	0.02
Hispanic	0.99	0.30	0.00
Asian	0.97	0.50	0.05
Other race	−0.62	0.73	0.39
Parent	0.21	0.25	0.40

Table 53: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=385).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.01	0.53	0.98
Intended Length of Residence	−0.05	0.33	0.87
Age	−0.54	0.47	0.25
Education	−0.37	0.47	0.43
Income	0.46	0.44	0.30
Female	−0.02	0.24	0.92
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.82	0.39	0.04
Length of Residence	0.17	0.38	0.66
Homeowner	−0.36	0.29	0.22
Black	0.93	0.38	0.01
Hispanic	0.92	0.32	0.00
Asian	0.90	0.50	0.07
Other race	−0.75	0.70	0.28
Parent	0.38	0.26	0.14

Table 54: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=349).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.36	0.49	0.01
Intended Length of Residence	0.01	0.30	0.98
Age	0.01	0.47	0.99
Education	0.12	0.46	0.80
Income	0.53	0.44	0.23
Female	−0.04	0.23	0.88
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.06	0.43	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.56	0.35	0.11
Homeowner	−0.38	0.29	0.19
Black	−0.87	0.42	0.04
Hispanic	0.15	0.31	0.61
Asian	−0.09	0.52	0.86
Other race	−0.27	0.69	0.70
Parent	−0.55	0.25	0.03

Table 55: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=351).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.09	0.05	0.07
Intended Length of Residence	−0.05	0.03	0.10
Age	−0.02	0.04	0.66
Education	0.14	0.04	0.00
Income	0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.15
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.04	0.81
Length of Residence	0.05	0.03	0.13
Homeowner	−0.03	0.03	0.31
Black	0.04	0.04	0.30
Hispanic	0.02	0.03	0.54
Asian	−0.10	0.05	0.05
Other race	0.16	0.06	0.01
Parent	0.04	0.02	0.13

Table 56: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=774).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−2.23	0.37	0.00
Intended Length of Residence	0.21	0.22	0.34
Age	−0.09	0.33	0.80
Education	1.26	0.33	0.00
Income	0.14	0.31	0.65
Female	0.10	0.17	0.55
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.33	0.29	0.25
Length of Residence	−0.19	0.25	0.45
Homeowner	0.55	0.21	0.01
Black	0.11	0.28	0.71
Hispanic	0.20	0.22	0.37
Asian	0.15	0.36	0.68
Other race	0.48	0.46	0.30
Parent	1.58	0.18	0.00

Table 57: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (PPIC, N=776).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.74	0.60	0.22
Neighborhood Sense of Community	1.02	0.48	0.03
Age	−2.08	0.78	0.01
Education	−1.20	0.71	0.09
Income	−1.10	0.68	0.10
Female	−0.03	0.39	0.93
Length of Residence	0.19	0.59	0.75

Table 58: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community) and personal attributes (Conservatives only, PPIC, N=145).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.62	0.59	0.30
Intended Length of Residence	−0.25	0.51	0.63
Age	−0.25	0.71	0.72
Education	−0.21	0.80	0.79
Income	−0.59	0.68	0.39
Female	−0.24	0.38	0.52
Length of Residence	−0.64	0.56	0.25

Table 59: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood) and personal attributes (Conservatives only, PPIC, N=141).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.17	0.44	0.01
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.59	0.25	0.02
Age	−0.95	0.41	0.02
Education	−0.64	0.38	0.09
Income	0.25	0.36	0.48
Female	0.07	0.21	0.74
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.83	0.35	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.22	0.30	0.47
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.56	0.47	0.23

Table 60: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=416).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.98	0.52	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.23	0.27	0.40
Age	−1.23	0.44	0.01
Education	0.66	0.44	0.13
Income	−0.78	0.39	0.05
Female	0.33	0.22	0.14
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.69	0.41	0.10
Length of Residence	0.22	0.33	0.51
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.24	0.50	0.64

Table 61: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=409).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.44	0.48	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.42	0.28	0.14
Age	−0.78	0.44	0.07
Education	−1.06	0.41	0.01
Income	−0.55	0.39	0.16
Female	0.30	0.22	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.02	0.42	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.19	0.32	0.55
Neighborhood Satisfaction	0.11	0.51	0.83

Table 62: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=361).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.06	0.47	0.02
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.42	0.25	0.09
Age	0.22	0.43	0.60
Education	−0.48	0.43	0.26
Income	0.20	0.39	0.62
Female	−0.06	0.22	0.79
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.38	0.39	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.73	0.32	0.02
Neighborhood Satisfaction	0.32	0.48	0.51

Table 63: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=393).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.00	0.04	0.91
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.08	0.02	0.00
Age	0.03	0.04	0.39
Education	0.22	0.04	0.00
Income	0.08	0.03	0.02
Female	0.02	0.02	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.04	0.04
Length of Residence	0.04	0.03	0.13
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.08	0.04	0.08

Table 64: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=847).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.04	0.31	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.39	0.17	0.03
Age	−0.01	0.28	0.98
Education	0.76	0.27	0.01
Income	0.24	0.25	0.33
Female	0.13	0.14	0.38
Lib-Con Ideology	0.01	0.25	0.98
Length of Residence	0.29	0.21	0.17
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.34	0.32	0.28

Table 65: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=851).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.99	0.45	0.03
Intended Length of Residence	0.15	0.30	0.61
Age	−0.14	0.40	0.73
Education	0.46	0.41	0.26
Income	−0.80	0.36	0.03
Female	−0.25	0.21	0.25
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.02	0.36	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.10	0.31	0.74
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.34	0.42	0.41

Table 66: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=381).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.08	0.45	0.86
Intended Length of Residence	−0.34	0.30	0.26
Age	0.27	0.41	0.51
Education	0.62	0.43	0.15
Income	0.09	0.39	0.82
Female	0.55	0.23	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.38	0.91
Length of Residence	−0.70	0.33	0.03
Neighborhood Satisfaction	0.36	0.46	0.44

Table 67: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=391).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.25	0.46	0.01
Intended Length of Residence	−0.14	0.31	0.66
Age	−1.02	0.42	0.01
Education	−0.59	0.44	0.18
Income	−0.03	0.39	0.95
Female	−0.05	0.22	0.84
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.64	0.37	0.08
Length of Residence	−0.07	0.34	0.85
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.31	0.42	0.47

Table 68: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=351).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.05	0.47	0.03
Intended Length of Residence	−0.09	0.31	0.77
Age	−0.10	0.42	0.81
Education	0.26	0.43	0.54
Income	0.30	0.38	0.43
Female	0.01	0.23	0.96
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.25	0.40	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.48	0.33	0.14
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.01	0.49	0.98

Table 69: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=357).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.15	0.05	0.00
Intended Length of Residence	−0.06	0.03	0.04
Age	−0.05	0.04	0.23
Education	0.11	0.04	0.01
Income	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.14
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.04	0.75
Length of Residence	0.05	0.03	0.16
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.01	0.04	0.91

Table 70: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=781).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.88	0.32	0.01
Intended Length of Residence	0.35	0.21	0.10
Age	−0.78	0.29	0.01
Education	0.72	0.29	0.01
Income	0.54	0.26	0.04
Female	0.20	0.15	0.19
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.26	0.80
Length of Residence	−0.04	0.23	0.88
Neighborhood Satisfaction	−0.27	0.31	0.39

Table 71: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Intended Length of Residence (0=live outside of LA County, 1=live in current neighborhood), Neighborhood satisfaction (0=very dissatisfied, 1=very satisfied), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=783).

PPIC: Chapter 3 Figure 7

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.40	0.08
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.40	0.23	0.08
Identification with LA County	0.68	0.35	0.05
Age	−0.97	0.41	0.02
Education	−0.49	0.39	0.21
Income	0.14	0.36	0.69
Female	0.10	0.21	0.62
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.80	0.36	0.03
Length of Residence	−0.15	0.31	0.62

Table 72: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=398).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.85	0.46	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.28	0.26	0.29
Identification with LA County	0.99	0.47	0.04
Age	−1.16	0.45	0.01
Education	0.69	0.47	0.14
Income	−0.75	0.40	0.06
Female	0.33	0.23	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.80	0.43	0.06
Length of Residence	0.01	0.34	0.98

Table 73: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=393).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.30	0.43	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.39	0.26	0.12
Identification with LA County	0.97	0.44	0.03
Age	−0.75	0.44	0.09
Education	−0.98	0.42	0.02
Income	−0.43	0.40	0.28
Female	0.33	0.23	0.15
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.00	0.43	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.05	0.33	0.87

Table 74: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=347).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.95	0.42	0.02
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.58	0.24	0.01
Identification with LA County	1.11	0.46	0.02
Age	0.17	0.44	0.70
Education	−0.37	0.45	0.41
Income	0.33	0.39	0.40
Female	−0.09	0.23	0.69
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.19	0.40	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.82	0.33	0.01

Table 75: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=372).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.03	0.04	0.40
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.06	0.02	0.01
Identification with LA County	−0.02	0.03	0.53
Age	0.03	0.04	0.49
Education	0.22	0.04	0.00
Income	0.05	0.04	0.14
Female	0.02	0.02	0.34
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.04	0.04
Length of Residence	0.06	0.03	0.06

Table 76: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=810).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−1.25	0.28	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.34	0.16	0.03
Identification with LA County	0.47	0.24	0.05
Age	−0.07	0.28	0.79
Education	0.68	0.28	0.02
Income	0.22	0.25	0.38
Female	0.10	0.15	0.47
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.26	0.97
Length of Residence	0.36	0.21	0.09

Table 77: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=814).

PPIC: Extra Analyses Chapter 3 Figure 7

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.18	0.45	0.69
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.39	0.23	0.10
Identification with LA County	0.61	0.37	0.10
Age	−1.05	0.43	0.01
Education	−0.45	0.40	0.27
Income	0.04	0.37	0.90
Female	0.11	0.22	0.61
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.97	0.38	0.01
Length of Residence	−0.15	0.31	0.64
County Quality of Life	1.17	0.43	0.01

Table 78: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=383).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.84	0.52	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.26	0.27	0.33
Identification with LA County	0.97	0.47	0.04
Age	−1.17	0.46	0.01
Education	0.68	0.47	0.15
Income	−0.79	0.41	0.05
Female	0.32	0.23	0.17
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.80	0.43	0.07
Length of Residence	−0.03	0.34	0.93
County Quality of Life	0.09	0.47	0.85

Table 79: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=385).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.89	0.48	0.06
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.34	0.26	0.20
Identification with LA County	1.03	0.46	0.03
Age	−0.64	0.45	0.15
Education	−0.95	0.42	0.03
Income	−0.40	0.40	0.32
Female	0.34	0.23	0.14
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.01	0.43	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.10	0.33	0.77
County Quality of Life	0.68	0.46	0.14

Table 80: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=338).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.43	0.48	0.36
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.50	0.24	0.04
Identification with LA County	1.38	0.49	0.01
Age	0.26	0.45	0.56
Education	−0.46	0.46	0.32
Income	0.29	0.40	0.47
Female	−0.09	0.23	0.69
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.27	0.41	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.91	0.34	0.01
County Quality of Life	1.19	0.48	0.01

Table 81: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=368).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.01	0.04	0.86
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.07	0.02	0.00
Identification with LA County	−0.03	0.04	0.37
Age	0.03	0.04	0.49
Education	0.22	0.04	0.00
Income	0.05	0.04	0.16
Female	0.02	0.02	0.37
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.04	0.06
Length of Residence	0.06	0.03	0.07
County Quality of Life	−0.04	0.04	0.36

Table 82: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=786).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−1.22	0.32	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.34	0.16	0.04
Identification with LA County	0.50	0.25	0.05
Age	0.08	0.29	0.79
Education	0.64	0.29	0.03
Income	0.27	0.25	0.29
Female	0.17	0.15	0.27
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.00	0.26	0.99
Length of Residence	0.38	0.21	0.07
County Quality of Life	−0.28	0.29	0.34

Table 83: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), County quality of life (0=things are going very badly, 1=things are going very well), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=790).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.45	0.42	0.28
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.40	0.23	0.08
Identification with LA County	0.77	0.36	0.03
Age	−0.91	0.42	0.03
Education	−0.53	0.39	0.18
Income	0.06	0.36	0.87
Female	0.10	0.21	0.62
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.87	0.37	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.17	0.31	0.57
Assessment of County Economy	0.93	0.41	0.02

Table 84: Logit model describing Support for a Parks Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=395).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	2.10	0.49	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	−0.28	0.26	0.29
Identification with LA County	1.08	0.48	0.03
Age	−1.16	0.45	0.01
Education	0.68	0.47	0.15
Income	−0.74	0.40	0.07
Female	0.32	0.23	0.17
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.80	0.44	0.06
Length of Residence	−0.04	0.34	0.92
Assessment of County Economy	−0.68	0.49	0.17

Table 85: Logit model describing Support for a Sin Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=390).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.33	0.47	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.37	0.26	0.15
Identification with LA County	0.96	0.44	0.03
Age	−0.72	0.45	0.11
Education	−1.02	0.42	0.02
Income	−0.43	0.40	0.28
Female	0.32	0.23	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.01	0.43	0.02
Length of Residence	−0.04	0.33	0.91
Assessment of County Economy	−0.01	0.47	0.99

Table 86: Logit model describing Support for Making it Easier to Pass Tax Votes (0=vote no, 1=vote yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=346).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.99	0.44	0.02
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.58	0.24	0.01
Identification with LA County	1.12	0.46	0.01
Age	0.10	0.44	0.82
Education	−0.33	0.45	0.46
Income	0.35	0.39	0.37
Female	−0.08	0.23	0.71
Lib-Con Ideology	−1.16	0.40	0.00
Length of Residence	−0.83	0.33	0.01
Assessment of County Economy	−0.15	0.46	0.74

Table 87: Logit model describing Support for a Transportation Tax (0=oppose tax, 1=favor tax) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=368).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.01	0.04	0.81
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.06	0.02	0.01
Identification with LA County	−0.02	0.03	0.50
Age	0.03	0.04	0.50
Education	0.22	0.04	0.00
Income	0.06	0.04	0.11
Female	0.02	0.02	0.37
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.04
Length of Residence	0.06	0.03	0.05
Assessment of County Economy	−0.07	0.04	0.11

Table 88: OLS model describing Volunteering in One's Community (0=none in last year, 1= more than 10 hours per week) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=804).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.19	0.29	0.00
Neighborhood Sense of Community	0.33	0.16	0.04
Identification with LA County	0.47	0.24	0.06
Age	−0.06	0.28	0.84
Education	0.65	0.28	0.02
Income	0.25	0.25	0.32
Female	0.09	0.15	0.54
Lib-Con Ideology	0.01	0.26	0.97
Length of Residence	0.38	0.21	0.08
Assessment of County Economy	−0.20	0.29	0.50

Table 89: Logit model describing Attending Local Meetings (0=no, 1=yes) as a function of Neighborhood Sense of Community (0=no sense of community, 1=neighborhood has sense of community), Identification with LA County (0=most identify with other, 1=most identify with LA County), Assessment of LA County Economy (0=economy is poor, 1=economy is excellent), and personal attributes (PPIC, N=808).

Chapter 4

Notes on the GSS models: Overly influential points made the results of the some of the models here unstable (i.e. the inclusion or removal of one point could change the coefficients more than a tiny amount). The models presented here were those in which between 5 and 10 of the most influential points were removed. Influence gauged using Cook's D statistic.[1]

---

[1]An excellent introduction to statistical influence in the context of linear models (including explanation of the Cook's D statistic) is Fox (1997).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Chapter 4, Figure 3

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.02	0.00
Age	0.10	0.02	0.00
Education	−0.12	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.02	0.06
Black	0.07	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.05	0.03	0.10
Female	0.03	0.01	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.54
Lib-Con Ideology	0.14	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.01
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.68
3rd Generation	0.00	0.01	0.93

Table 90: OLS model describing Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS96, N=938).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.84	0.02	0.00
Age	0.11	0.01	0.00
Education	−0.15	0.02	0.00
Income	0.09	0.09	0.31
Black	0.07	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.02	0.00
Female	0.03	0.01	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	−0.14	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.08	0.02	0.00
3rd Generation	−0.06	0.01	0.00

Table 91: OLS model describing Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS04, N=1027).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 3

Note: These extra models are run using the full GSS datasets — including the observations which on the previous datasets exerted undue influence on the coefficients (assess using a variety of measures such as dfbeta, plots of residuals vs hat values (leverage), and Cook's Distance; selected using Cook's Distance).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.02	0.00
Age	0.09	0.02	0.00
Education	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.76
Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.35
Female	0.01	0.01	0.23
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.02	0.89
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.02
2nd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.72
3rd Generation	0.01	0.01	0.62

Table 92: OLS model describing Assimilationist Component 96 (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS96, N=988).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.59	0.03	0.00
Age	0.14	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.29	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Black	0.16	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.07	0.05	0.11
Female	0.05	0.02	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.03	0.87
Lib-Con Ideology	0.22	0.04	0.00
1st Generation	−0.17	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.17
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.51

Table 93: OLS model describing Nativist Component 96 (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS96, N=961).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.91	0.02	0.00
Age	0.07	0.01	0.00
Education	−0.06	0.02	0.00
Income	0.13	0.07	0.07
Black	0.01	0.01	0.35
Hispanic	0.06	0.02	0.00
Female	0.02	0.01	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	−0.05	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.06	0.02	0.00
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.01	0.01

Table 94: OLS model describing Assimilationist Component 04 (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS04, N=1081).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.78	0.03	0.00
Age	0.14	0.02	0.00
Education	−0.24	0.03	0.00
Income	0.11	0.13	0.39
Black	0.12	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.13	0.03	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.24	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.14	0.03	0.00
3rd Generation	−0.08	0.02	0.00

Table 95: OLS model describing Nativist Component 04 (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) as a function of personal attributes (GSS04, N=1049).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.02	0.00
Age	0.10	0.01	0.00
Education	−0.11	0.02	0.00
Income	0.14	0.08	0.09
Black	0.06	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.10	0.02	0.00
Female	0.03	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	−0.13	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.08	0.02	0.00
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.01	0.00

Table 96: OLS model describing Exclusive American Community (7-item scale) as a function of personal attributes (GSS04, N=1037).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Chapter 4, Figure 4

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.34	0.04	0.00
Age	0.07	0.02	0.00
Education	−0.04	0.03	0.15
Income	0.07	0.02	0.00
Black	−0.05	0.03	0.07
Hispanic	−0.20	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.04	0.01	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.03	0.04
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.04
1st Generation	−0.06	0.04	0.12
2nd Generation	0.03	0.03	0.25
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.41

Table 97: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 1996 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=889).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.32	0.05	0.00
Age	0.11	0.02	0.00
Education	0.01	0.03	0.74
Income	−0.11	0.13	0.42
Black	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	−0.23	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.12	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.01	0.03	0.80
2nd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.49
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.32

Table 98: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 2004 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1011).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.41	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.31	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.04
Education	−0.22	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.01	0.02	0.50
Black	0.00	0.02	0.84
Hispanic	−0.06	0.03	0.08
Female	−0.01	0.01	0.56
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.02	0.19
Lib-Con Ideology	0.09	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	−0.09	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.64
3rd Generation	0.01	0.01	0.47

Table 99: OLS model describing Isolationism 1996 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=877).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.30	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.39	0.04	0.00
Age	0.00	0.02	0.96
Education	−0.13	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.10	0.81
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.86
Hispanic	−0.05	0.03	0.08
Female	0.01	0.01	0.58
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.02	0.74
1st Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.43
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.53
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.20

Table 100: OLS model describing Isolationism 2004 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=987).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.31	0.05	0.00
Age	0.02	0.02	0.53
Education	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	0.05	0.03	0.05
Black	−0.01	0.03	0.84
Hispanic	−0.02	0.05	0.72
Female	0.03	0.02	0.12
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.20
Lib-Con Ideology	0.03	0.04	0.42
1st Generation	−0.17	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.04	0.03	0.26
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.99

Table 101: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 1996 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=800).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.26	0.05	0.00
Age	0.04	0.02	0.12
Education	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.02	0.14	0.90
Black	−0.08	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	−0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.00	0.02	0.92
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.02	0.06
1st Generation	−0.19	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.00	0.03	0.95
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.40

Table 102: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=937).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.22	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.26	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.03	0.55
Education	−0.09	0.03	0.01
Income	0.01	0.03	0.76
Black	−0.00	0.03	0.93
Hispanic	−0.04	0.05	0.38
Female	−0.00	0.02	0.99
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.03	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.02
1st Generation	−0.12	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.47
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.60

Table 103: OLS model describing Disallow Refugees 1996 (0=agree strongly that refugees can stay, 1=disagree strongly that refugees can stay) as a function of sense of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=858).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 4

Note: These extra models are run using the full GSS datasets — including the observations which on the previous datasets exerted undue influence on the coefficients (assess using a variety of measures such as dfbeta, plots of residuals vs hat values (leverage), and Cook's Distance; selected using Cook's Distance).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.39	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.05	0.03	0.06
Education	−0.18	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.05	0.03	0.06
Black	0.06	0.02	0.01
Hispanic	0.08	0.02	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.03	0.04
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.01
1st Generation	−0.09	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.57
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.31
Assimilationist Component	0.39	0.05	0.00
Nativist Component	−0.03	0.03	0.34

Table 104: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 1996 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly(GSS96, N=904).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.64	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.18
Education	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Black	0.09	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.06	0.02	0.02
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.30
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.03	0.04
Lib-Con Ideology	0.15	0.04	0.00
1st Generation	−0.11	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.69
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.57
Close to America	0.05	0.03	0.10

Table 105: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 1996 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly(GSS96, N=930).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.48	0.06	0.00
Age	0.01	0.03	0.73
Education	0.11	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.12	0.13	0.36
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.03
Hispanic	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Female	−0.23	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.11	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.00	0.03	0.89
2nd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.61
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Assimilationist Component	0.27	0.07	0.00
Nativist Component	0.09	0.04	0.02

Table 106: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 2004 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly(GSS04, N=1022).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.05	0.00
Age	0.01	0.03	0.73
Education	0.11	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.13	0.13	0.31
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.04
Hispanic	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Female	−0.23	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.11	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.00	0.03	0.94
2nd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.71
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.27
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	0.32	0.05	0.00

Table 107: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 2004 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly(GSS04, N=1021).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.76	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.11
Education	0.14	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.01	0.13	0.91
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.33
Hispanic	−0.06	0.02	0.03
Female	−0.19	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.14	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.09
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.63
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.02	0.02
Close to America	0.03	0.03	0.30

Table 108: OLS model describing Stronger Measures to Exclude Illegals 2004 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly(GSS04, N=1066).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.40	0.04	0.00
Age	0.00	0.02	0.93
Education	−0.04	0.03	0.20
Income	−0.19	0.02	0.00
Black	−0.04	0.02	0.03
Hispanic	−0.01	0.02	0.62
Female	0.00	0.01	0.96
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.02	0.45
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.03	0.01
1st Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.07
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.44
3rd Generation	0.01	0.01	0.59
Assimilationist Component	0.17	0.04	0.00
Nativist Component	0.17	0.03	0.00

Table 109: OLS model describing Isolationism 1996 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners)(GSS96, N=892).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.61	0.03	0.00
Age	0.02	0.02	0.32
Education	−0.07	0.03	0.04
Income	−0.25	0.02	0.00
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.55
Hispanic	−0.03	0.02	0.11
Female	0.01	0.01	0.52
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.02	0.83
Lib-Con Ideology	0.12	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	−0.09	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.46
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.80
Close to America	0.03	0.03	0.19

Table 110: OLS model describing Isolationism 1996 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners)(GSS96, N=914).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.30	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.02	0.00
Education	0.00	0.02	0.96
Income	−0.04	0.10	0.70
Black	0.00	0.01	0.80
Hispanic	0.00	0.02	0.85
Female	−0.06	0.03	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.02	0.43
1st Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.53
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.80
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.25
Assimilationist Component	0.22	0.05	0.00
Nativist Component	0.18	0.03	0.00

Table 111: OLS model describing Isolationism 2004 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners)(GSS04, N=996).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.32	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.14	0.02	0.00
Education	0.00	0.02	0.83
Income	−0.03	0.11	0.77
Black	0.00	0.01	0.86
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.72
Female	−0.05	0.03	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.02	0.49
1st Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.29
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.46
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.13
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	0.37	0.04	0.00

Table 112: OLS model describing Isolationism 2004 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners)(GSS04, N=996).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.62	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.19	0.02	0.00
Education	0.03	0.02	0.16
Income	0.02	0.10	0.84
Black	0.01	0.01	0.30
Hispanic	0.03	0.02	0.15
Female	−0.02	0.03	0.54
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.02	0.01
1st Generation	−0.07	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.05	0.02	0.02
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.03
Close to America	0.04	0.03	0.17

Table 113: OLS model describing Isolationism 2004 (0=no favoritism, 1=favor American goods and owners)(GSS04, N=1036).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.22
Education	−0.08	0.05	0.09
Income	−0.09	0.03	0.01
Black	0.02	0.03	0.46
Hispanic	0.05	0.03	0.08
Female	0.02	0.02	0.22
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.19
Lib-Con Ideology	0.04	0.04	0.39
1st Generation	−0.16	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.07
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.97
Assimilationist Component	0.21	0.06	0.00
Nativist Component	0.09	0.04	0.01

Table 114: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 1996 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS96, N=815).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.68	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.05	0.03	0.09
Education	−0.10	0.05	0.03
Income	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Black	0.03	0.03	0.19
Hispanic	0.03	0.03	0.31
Female	0.03	0.02	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.03	0.53
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.02
1st Generation	−0.17	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.07
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.96
Close to America	−0.00	0.04	0.97

Table 115: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 1996 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS96, N=834).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.45	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Education	0.03	0.02	0.16
Income	−0.03	0.14	0.85
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.80
Hispanic	−0.08	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.02	0.10
1st Generation	−0.18	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.65
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Assimilationist Component	0.32	0.07	0.00
Nativist Component	0.04	0.04	0.28

Table 116: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=947).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Education	0.03	0.02	0.15
Income	−0.02	0.14	0.90
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.86
Hispanic	−0.08	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.05	0.02	0.06
1st Generation	−0.17	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.51
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.30
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	0.25	0.05	0.00

Table 117: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=943).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.75	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.16	0.03	0.00
Education	0.05	0.02	0.04
Income	0.15	0.13	0.26
Black	0.01	0.02	0.66
Hispanic	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Female	−0.12	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.21	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.06
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.02	0.07
Close to America	0.03	0.03	0.36

Table 118: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=981).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.27	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.03	0.56
Education	−0.04	0.05	0.42
Income	−0.07	0.03	0.03
Black	−0.02	0.03	0.52
Hispanic	0.02	0.03	0.51
Female	0.00	0.02	0.94
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.03	0.28
Lib-Con Ideology	0.09	0.04	0.03
1st Generation	−0.08	0.04	0.06
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.04	0.57
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.51
Assimilationist Component	0.07	0.06	0.27
Nativist Component	0.14	0.04	0.00

Table 119: OLS model describing Disallow Refugees 1996 (0=agree strongly that refugees can stay, 1=disagree strongly that refugees can stay)(GSS96, N=871).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.41	0.04	0.00
Age	0.02	0.03	0.59
Education	−0.05	0.05	0.30
Income	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Black	0.00	0.03	0.89
Hispanic	0.01	0.03	0.76
Female	0.01	0.02	0.62
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.03	0.29
Lib-Con Ideology	0.13	0.04	0.00
1st Generation	−0.13	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.16
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.40
Close to America	−0.01	0.04	0.88

Table 120: OLS model describing Disallow Refugees 1996 (0=agree strongly that refugees can stay, 1=disagree strongly that refugees can stay)(GSS96, N=895).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.32	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.19	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.06	0.03	0.03
Education	−0.17	0.04	0.00
Income	0.02	0.03	0.41
Black	0.09	0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.02	0.00
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.02
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.03	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.03
1st Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.45
2nd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.54
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.83
Immigrant Impact	0.39	0.05	0.00

Table 121: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS96, N=820).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.41	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.26	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.05	0.03	0.09
Education	−0.18	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.03	0.29
Black	0.06	0.02	0.01
Hispanic	0.08	0.02	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.06
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.03	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.04	0.08
1st Generation	−0.08	0.04	0.03
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.77
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.58
National Chauvinism	0.13	0.05	0.01

Table 122: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS96, N=864).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.42	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.18	0.05	0.00
Age	0.07	0.03	0.02
Education	0.12	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.06	0.13	0.63
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.04
Hispanic	−0.06	0.02	0.01
Female	−0.19	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.11	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.04	0.03	0.16
2nd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.71
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.52
Immigrant Impact	0.35	0.04	0.00

Table 123: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=986).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.19	0.05	0.00
Age	0.03	0.03	0.25
Education	0.11	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.15	0.14	0.27
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.07
Hispanic	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Female	−0.22	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.10	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.00	0.03	0.92
2nd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.77
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.25
National Chauvinism	0.23	0.05	0.00

Table 124: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=991).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.07	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.29	0.05	0.00
Age	0.02	0.03	0.61
Education	0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.17	0.15	0.26
Black	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Hispanic	−0.09	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.25	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.11	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.00	0.04	1.00
2nd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.54
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.19
Patriotism	0.11	0.07	0.13

Table 125: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=856).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.22	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.21	0.04	0.00
Age	0.02	0.02	0.28
Education	−0.02	0.03	0.62
Income	−0.14	0.02	0.00
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.50
Hispanic	−0.02	0.02	0.30
Female	0.00	0.01	0.81
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.02	0.97
Lib-Con Ideology	0.06	0.03	0.03
1st Generation	0.02	0.03	0.48
2nd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.63
3rd Generation	0.02	0.01	0.17
Immigrant Impact	0.44	0.04	0.00

Table 126: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship 1996 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS96, N=813).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.28	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.21	0.04	0.00
Age	0.02	0.02	0.40
Education	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Income	−0.18	0.02	0.00
Black	−0.05	0.02	0.01
Hispanic	−0.01	0.02	0.44
Female	0.01	0.01	0.62
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.02	0.32
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.03	0.02
1st Generation	−0.04	0.03	0.17
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.69
3rd Generation	0.01	0.01	0.30
National Chauvinism	0.30	0.04	0.00

Table 127: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship 1996 (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS96, N=859).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.16	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.22	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Education	0.02	0.02	0.22
Income	0.06	0.10	0.53
Black	0.01	0.01	0.52
Hispanic	0.02	0.02	0.26
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.60
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.02	0.74
1st Generation	0.04	0.02	0.06
2nd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.99
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.01	0.49
Immigrant Impact	0.44	0.03	0.00

Table 128: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=962).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.20	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.27	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.11	0.02	0.00
Education	−0.00	0.02	0.87
Income	−0.07	0.10	0.53
Black	0.01	0.01	0.56
Hispanic	0.02	0.02	0.42
Female	−0.05	0.03	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.64
1st Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.64
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.63
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.17
National Chauvinism	0.28	0.04	0.00

Table 129: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=970).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.29	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.37	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.14	0.02	0.00
Education	0.00	0.02	0.91
Income	−0.08	0.12	0.47
Black	0.01	0.01	0.59
Hispanic	−0.01	0.02	0.51
Female	−0.03	0.03	0.32
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.02	0.72
1st Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.40
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.83
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.05
Patriotism	0.06	0.05	0.24

Table 130: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=850).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.20	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.14	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.05	0.03	0.10
Education	−0.06	0.04	0.19
Income	0.02	0.03	0.53
Black	0.05	0.02	0.02
Hispanic	0.03	0.02	0.28
Female	0.01	0.02	0.34
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.11
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.04	0.61
1st Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.35
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.55
3rd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.55
Immigrant Impact	0.68	0.04	0.00

Table 131: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 1996 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS96, N=767).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.43	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.26	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.05	0.03	0.10
Education	−0.09	0.05	0.08
Income	−0.09	0.03	0.01
Black	0.01	0.03	0.74
Hispanic	0.05	0.03	0.08
Female	0.02	0.02	0.25
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.20
Lib-Con Ideology	0.03	0.04	0.46
1st Generation	−0.17	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.08
3rd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.79
National Chauvinism	0.10	0.06	0.10

Table 132: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 1996 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS96, N=783).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.37	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.05	0.05	0.32
Age	−0.01	0.03	0.60
Education	0.05	0.02	0.02
Income	0.06	0.13	0.66
Black	−0.00	0.01	0.93
Hispanic	−0.06	0.02	0.01
Female	−0.11	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.02	0.04
1st Generation	−0.10	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.00	0.03	0.97
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.92
Immigrant Impact	0.55	0.04	0.00

Table 133: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=917).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.50	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.18	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Education	0.03	0.02	0.22
Income	−0.02	0.14	0.87
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.97
Hispanic	−0.08	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.02	0.14
1st Generation	−0.16	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.60
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.47
National Chauvinism	0.17	0.06	0.00

Table 134: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=921).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.60	0.07	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.25	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Education	0.04	0.03	0.15
Income	0.08	0.15	0.62
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.91
Hispanic	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.03	0.11
1st Generation	−0.18	0.04	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.03	0.57
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.43
Patriotism	−0.08	0.07	0.26

Table 135: OLS model describing Decrease Immigration Level 2004 (0=increase a lot, 1=decrease a lot)(GSS04, N=807).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.05	0.06	0.44
Exclusive American Community	0.11	0.06	0.06
Age	0.00	0.03	0.94
Education	−0.01	0.05	0.88
Income	−0.01	0.04	0.70
Black	0.02	0.03	0.38
Hispanic	0.00	0.03	0.92
Female	0.00	0.02	0.95
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.02
1st Generation	−0.01	0.04	0.90
2nd Generation	0.01	0.04	0.72
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.81
Immigrant Impact	0.49	0.05	0.00

Table 136: OLS model describing Disallow Refugees 1996 (0=agree strongly that refugees can stay, 1=disagree strongly that refugees can stay)(GSS96, N=788).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.22	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.22	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.03	0.64
Education	−0.04	0.05	0.41
Income	−0.09	0.03	0.01
Black	−0.02	0.03	0.56
Hispanic	0.02	0.03	0.50
Female	0.00	0.02	0.92
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.19
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.03
1st Generation	−0.08	0.04	0.07
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.44
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.54
National Chauvinism	0.04	0.06	0.52

Table 137: OLS model describing Disallow Refugees 1996 (0=agree strongly that refugees can stay, 1=disagree strongly that refugees can stay)(GSS96, N=839).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Chapter 4, Figure 5

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.06	0.03	0.06
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.00
Education	0.01	0.02	0.77
Income	0.10	0.10	0.32
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.91
Hispanic	−0.00	0.03	0.95
Female	0.01	0.01	0.28
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.42
1st Generation	0.06	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	0.05	0.02	0.02
3rd Generation	0.05	0.01	0.00

Table 138: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Exclusive American community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1016).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.13	0.05	0.01
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.05
Education	0.03	0.03	0.36
Income	−0.11	0.14	0.43
Black	0.03	0.03	0.22
Hispanic	0.13	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.19
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.08	0.03	0.02
2nd Generation	0.06	0.03	0.06
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.89

Table 139: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly) as a function of Exclusive American community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1014).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.68	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.26	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Education	0.07	0.03	0.03
Income	−0.06	0.16	0.72
Black	−0.00	0.03	1.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.07
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.06
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.08	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.10	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.23
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.57

Table 140: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly) as a function of Exclusive American community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1009).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 5

Note: These extra models are run using the full GSS datasets — including the observations which on the previous datasets exerted undue influence on the coefficients (assess using a variety of measures such as dfbeta, plots of residuals vs hat values (leverage), and Cook's Distance; selected using Cook's Distance).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.04	0.00
Education	0.01	0.02	0.71
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.01
Income	0.06	0.10	0.57
Female	0.01	0.01	0.24
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.72
Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.26
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.02	0.34
1st Generation	0.07	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.06
3rd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.01
Assimilationist Component	−0.01	0.05	0.78
Nativist Component	−0.04	0.03	0.15

Table 141: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=1027).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.04	0.00
Education	0.01	0.02	0.60
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.01
Income	0.08	0.10	0.43
Female	0.01	0.01	0.29
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.54
Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.02	0.34
1st Generation	0.07	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.05
3rd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.01
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	−0.06	0.04	0.10

Table 142: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=1025).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.03	0.00
Education	0.03	0.02	0.14
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.00
Income	0.05	0.09	0.60
Female	0.01	0.01	0.59
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.46
Hispanic	−0.03	0.02	0.29
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.02	0.05
1st Generation	0.08	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	0.05	0.02	0.01
3rd Generation	0.04	0.01	0.01
Close to America	0.04	0.02	0.11

Table 143: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=1070).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.00	0.04	0.94
Education	−0.02	0.02	0.42
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.00
Income	0.05	0.10	0.64
Female	0.01	0.01	0.44
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.45
Hispanic	−0.05	0.03	0.06
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.47
1st Generation	0.05	0.02	0.02
2nd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.09
3rd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.02
Immigrant Impact	−0.16	0.03	0.00

Table 144: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=986).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.06	0.04	0.13
Education	0.01	0.02	0.58
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.01
Income	0.09	0.10	0.35
Female	0.01	0.01	0.28
Black	−0.01	0.02	0.64
Hispanic	−0.02	0.03	0.39
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.02	0.24
1st Generation	0.07	0.02	0.00
2nd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.07
3rd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.01
National Chauvinism	0.02	0.04	0.54

Table 145: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=994).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Education	0.00	0.02	0.98
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.01
Income	0.13	0.11	0.23
Female	0.01	0.01	0.58
Black	−0.00	0.02	0.95
Hispanic	−0.04	0.03	0.18
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.02	0.21
1st Generation	0.07	0.03	0.01
2nd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.06
3rd Generation	0.04	0.02	0.03
Patriotism	0.04	0.05	0.43

Table 146: OLS model describing Support Citizenship of Children of Americans Born Abroad (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(GSS04, N=857).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.83	0.06	0.00
Education	0.02	0.03	0.42
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.06
Income	−0.10	0.14	0.46
Female	0.02	0.02	0.31
Black	0.03	0.03	0.24
Hispanic	0.11	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.08
2nd Generation	0.05	0.03	0.13
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.98
Assimilationist Component	−0.15	0.07	0.03
Nativist Component	−0.04	0.04	0.33

Table 147: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1025).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.78	0.05	0.00
Education	0.03	0.03	0.33
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.07
Income	−0.08	0.14	0.54
Female	0.02	0.02	0.25
Black	0.03	0.03	0.21
Hispanic	0.11	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.08
2nd Generation	0.05	0.03	0.10
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.92
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	−0.15	0.05	0.00

Table 148: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1023).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.60	0.04	0.00
Education	0.05	0.03	0.06
Age	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.15	0.13	0.26
Female	0.01	0.02	0.41
Black	0.03	0.03	0.25
Hispanic	0.10	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.11	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.08	0.03	0.01
2nd Generation	0.07	0.03	0.01
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.91
Close to America	0.07	0.03	0.03

Table 149: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1069).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.92	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.03	0.05	0.62
Education	−0.04	0.03	0.16
Age	−0.06	0.02	0.02
Income	−0.18	0.14	0.21
Female	0.01	0.02	0.42
Black	0.01	0.03	0.65
Hispanic	0.09	0.04	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.08	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.01	0.03	0.80
2nd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.41
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.46
Immigrant Impact	−0.35	0.04	0.00

Table 150: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=983).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.14	0.06	0.01
Education	0.02	0.03	0.47
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.08
Income	−0.11	0.14	0.45
Female	0.01	0.02	0.37
Black	0.03	0.03	0.20
Hispanic	0.11	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.05	0.03	0.10
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.15
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.97
National Chauvinism	−0.02	0.06	0.77

Table 151: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=992).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.07	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.19	0.06	0.00
Education	0.03	0.03	0.33
Age	−0.03	0.03	0.21
Income	−0.23	0.15	0.14
Female	0.03	0.02	0.06
Black	0.04	0.03	0.20
Hispanic	0.13	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.10	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.04	0.04	0.21
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.24
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.64
Patriotism	0.18	0.07	0.01

Table 152: OLS model describing Support Birthright Citizenship (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=857).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.72	0.07	0.00
Education	0.07	0.03	0.03
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.16	0.83
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.09
Black	−0.00	0.03	0.98
Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.19
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.03	0.01
1st Generation	0.09	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.22
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.69
Assimilationist Component	−0.22	0.08	0.01
Nativist Component	−0.07	0.05	0.11

Table 153: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1020).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.67	0.06	0.00
Education	0.08	0.03	0.01
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.01	0.16	0.93
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.08
Black	0.00	0.03	0.93
Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.15
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.03	0.01
1st Generation	0.09	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	0.05	0.03	0.17
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.81
Exclusive American Community (7 item)	−0.25	0.06	0.00

Table 154: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1019).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.05	0.00
Education	0.12	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.10	0.15	0.49
Female	−0.05	0.02	0.01
Black	−0.01	0.03	0.82
Hispanic	0.01	0.04	0.80
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.10	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.13	0.03	0.00
2nd Generation	0.08	0.03	0.02
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	1.00
Close to America	0.00	0.04	0.95

Table 155: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=1064).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.11	0.06	0.06
Education	0.01	0.03	0.67
Age	−0.11	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.10	0.16	0.55
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.08
Black	−0.01	0.03	0.69
Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.46
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.08	0.03	0.01
1st Generation	0.05	0.04	0.17
2nd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.50
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.45
Immigrant Impact	−0.39	0.05	0.00

Table 156: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=979).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.78	0.07	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.17	0.06	0.01
Education	0.05	0.03	0.18
Age	−0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.04	0.16	0.83
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.05
Black	−0.00	0.03	0.94
Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.17
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.03	0.04
1st Generation	0.08	0.04	0.03
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.26
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.72
National Chauvinism	−0.21	0.06	0.00

Table 157: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=988).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.09	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.28	0.07	0.00
Education	0.06	0.04	0.09
Age	−0.09	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.17	0.18	0.35
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.15
Black	0.02	0.03	0.60
Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.31
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.03	0.03
1st Generation	0.11	0.04	0.01
2nd Generation	0.02	0.04	0.60
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.03	0.79
Patriotism	0.02	0.08	0.83

Table 158: OLS model describing LPRs should have Rights of Citizens (0=disagree strongly, 1=agree strongly)(GSS04, N=857).

GSS96: Chapter 4, Figure 6

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.48	0.08	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.30	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.11	0.04	0.01
Education	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Income	0.14	0.04	0.00
Black	−0.09	0.05	0.05
Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.92
Female	−0.13	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.20	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.15	0.07	0.03
1st Generation	−0.16	0.07	0.02
2nd Generation	0.12	0.05	0.03
3rd Generation	0.02	0.03	0.48

Table 159: OLS model describing Support Death Penalty 1996 (0=oppose, 1=favor) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=880).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.62	0.10	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.16	0.09	0.07
Age	0.03	0.04	0.46
Education	0.04	0.05	0.46
Income	−0.37	0.24	0.13
Black	0.06	0.05	0.21
Hispanic	0.10	0.07	0.16
Female	0.04	0.03	0.17
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.04	0.99
1st Generation	−0.13	0.06	0.03
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.05	0.70
3rd Generation	0.01	0.04	0.80

Table 160: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 2004 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=518).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.60	0.08	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.15	0.08	0.06
Age	−0.02	0.04	0.66
Education	0.04	0.05	0.44
Income	−0.05	0.04	0.25
Black	0.03	0.05	0.60
Hispanic	0.08	0.07	0.25
Female	0.03	0.03	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.05	0.55
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.07	0.24
1st Generation	−0.07	0.06	0.24
2nd Generation	0.07	0.05	0.20
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.13

Table 161: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 1996 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=488).

GSS96 and GSS2004: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 6

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.44	0.15	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.34	0.15	0.02
Age	−0.09	0.08	0.25
Education	−0.01	0.11	0.93
Income	0.14	0.09	0.10
Black	−0.15	0.09	0.10
Hispanic	0.01	0.14	0.94
Female	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.22	0.09	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.13	0.76
1st Generation	−0.04	0.13	0.75
2nd Generation	0.06	0.11	0.59
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.06	0.58
Racial Prejudice	0.08	0.09	0.36
Authoritarianism	0.05	0.10	0.59

Table 162: OLS model describing Support Death Penalty 1996 (0=oppose, 1=favor) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=280).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.18	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.28	0.17	0.10
Age	0.01	0.09	0.95
Education	0.09	0.11	0.42
Income	−0.01	0.10	0.94
Black	−0.24	0.09	0.01
Hispanic	−0.05	0.20	0.79
Female	0.02	0.06	0.67
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.10	0.69
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.09	0.14	0.54
1st Generation	0.04	0.14	0.78
2nd Generation	−0.09	0.13	0.48
3rd Generation	0.00	0.06	0.99
Racial Prejudice	−0.02	0.11	0.88
Authoritarianism	0.03	0.11	0.75

Table 163: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 1996 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=148).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.63	0.06	0.00
Close to America	0.06	0.05	0.26
Age	−0.07	0.04	0.11
Education	−0.18	0.05	0.00
Income	0.12	0.04	0.01
Black	−0.12	0.05	0.01
Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.84
Female	−0.11	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.19	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.20	0.07	0.00
1st Generation	−0.13	0.06	0.04
2nd Generation	0.08	0.05	0.12
3rd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.72

Table 164: OLS model describing Support Death Penalty 1996 (0=oppose, 1=favor) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=921).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.65	0.07	0.00
Close to America	0.10	0.06	0.08
Age	−0.00	0.04	0.97
Education	0.04	0.05	0.38
Income	−0.06	0.23	0.79
Black	0.06	0.05	0.21
Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.74
Female	0.03	0.03	0.37
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.04	0.79
1st Generation	−0.12	0.05	0.02
2nd Generation	−0.04	0.05	0.47
3rd Generation	0.01	0.04	0.82

Table 165: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 2004 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=552).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.68	0.07	0.00
Close to America	0.04	0.06	0.47
Age	0.01	0.04	0.83
Education	0.02	0.05	0.76
Income	−0.06	0.04	0.18
Black	−0.05	0.05	0.25
Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.45
Female	0.06	0.03	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.05	0.44
Lib-Con Ideology	0.15	0.07	0.02
1st Generation	−0.14	0.06	0.02
2nd Generation	0.01	0.05	0.79
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.04	0.23

Table 166: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 1996 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=511).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.41	0.08	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.37	0.09	0.00
Nativist Component	−0.00	0.06	0.95
Age	−0.10	0.04	0.02
Education	−0.16	0.05	0.00
Income	0.14	0.04	0.00
Black	−0.10	0.05	0.03
Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.82
Female	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.19	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.12	0.07	0.07
1st Generation	−0.17	0.06	0.01
2nd Generation	0.07	0.05	0.21
3rd Generation	0.01	0.03	0.78

Table 167: OLS model describing Support Death Penalty 1996 (0=oppose, 1=favor) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=893).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.12	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.27	0.13	0.04
Nativist Component	−0.02	0.07	0.76
Age	0.01	0.04	0.82
Education	0.04	0.05	0.41
Income	−0.18	0.25	0.46
Black	0.04	0.05	0.45
Hispanic	0.04	0.07	0.61
Female	0.03	0.03	0.30
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.04	0.90
1st Generation	−0.14	0.06	0.02
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.05	0.60
3rd Generation	0.01	0.04	0.81

Table 168: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 2004 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=525).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.64	0.08	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.11	0.09	0.23
Nativist Component	0.01	0.06	0.82
Age	0.00	0.04	0.96
Education	0.01	0.05	0.85
Income	−0.05	0.05	0.25
Black	−0.06	0.05	0.23
Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.53
Female	0.05	0.03	0.12
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.05	1.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.07	0.27
1st Generation	−0.10	0.06	0.12
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.06	0.80
3rd Generation	−0.06	0.04	0.11

Table 169: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 1996 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=500).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.55	0.10	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.20	0.09	0.04
Age	0.01	0.04	0.87
Education	0.06	0.05	0.21
Income	−0.15	0.24	0.53
Black	0.03	0.05	0.57
Hispanic	0.04	0.07	0.56
Female	0.03	0.03	0.33
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.04	1.00
1st Generation	−0.12	0.06	0.04
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.05	0.68
3rd Generation	0.01	0.04	0.71

Table 170: OLS model describing Increase Spending for Law Enforcement 2004 (0=spending too much, 1=spending too little) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=527).

GSS96: Chapter 4, Figure 7

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	6.73	1.34	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−5.59	1.39	0.00
Age	−1.35	0.45	0.00
Education	2.69	0.69	0.00
Income	0.35	0.52	0.50
Female	−0.06	0.32	0.84
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.51	0.52	0.33
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.81	0.92
South	−0.38	0.32	0.23

Table 171: Logit model describing Oppose Antimiscegenation Laws as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=523, White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.64	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.12	0.07	0.08
Age	0.04	0.03	0.21
Education	0.01	0.04	0.81
Income	−0.08	0.04	0.04
Female	0.02	0.02	0.40
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.04	0.11
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.30	0.06	0.00
South	−0.05	0.03	0.05

Table 172: OLS model describing Support Government Programs to Help Blacks as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=556, White Respondents Only).

GSS96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 7

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	9.88	2.54	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−7.74	2.52	0.00
Education	1.92	1.02	0.06
Age	−1.12	0.71	0.12
Income	0.99	0.82	0.23
Female	0.21	0.51	0.67
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.26	0.82	0.75
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.42	1.29	0.74
South	−0.74	0.51	0.15
Racial Prejudice	−2.33	0.98	0.02

Table 173: Logit model describing Oppose Antimiscegenation Laws as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=234).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.10	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.02	0.10	0.85
Education	0.02	0.07	0.75
Age	0.08	0.05	0.11
Income	−0.07	0.06	0.18
Female	0.03	0.03	0.32
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.06	0.28
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.16	0.09	0.07
South	0.02	0.04	0.62
Racial Prejudice	−0.33	0.06	0.00
Authoritarianism	−0.04	0.07	0.52

Table 174: OLS model describing Support Government Programs to Help Blacks as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=251).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	1.65	0.71	0.02
Close to America	0.90	0.60	0.13
Age	−2.01	0.45	0.00
Education	3.20	0.65	0.00
Income	0.86	0.50	0.09
Female	0.02	0.31	0.95
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.28	0.49	0.57
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.61	0.75	0.42
South	−0.71	0.31	0.02

Table 175: Logit model describing Oppose Antimiscegenation Laws as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=543).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.05	0.00
Close to America	−0.01	0.05	0.79
Age	0.03	0.03	0.45
Education	0.04	0.04	0.36
Income	−0.08	0.04	0.03
Female	0.02	0.02	0.44
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.04	0.06
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.31	0.06	0.00
South	−0.05	0.03	0.06

Table 176: OLS model describing Support Government Programs to Help Blacks as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=578).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	6.13	1.60	0.00
Assimilationist Component	−2.15	1.82	0.24
Nativist Component	−2.94	0.88	0.00
Age	−1.28	0.45	0.00
Education	2.58	0.69	0.00
Income	0.31	0.52	0.55
Female	0.02	0.32	0.95
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.54	0.52	0.29
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.82	0.89
South	−0.33	0.32	0.31

Table 177: Logit model describing Oppose Antimiscegenation Laws as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=524).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.68	0.07	0.00
Assimilationist Component	−0.11	0.08	0.14
Nativist Component	−0.04	0.05	0.37
Age	0.05	0.03	0.18
Education	0.00	0.05	0.95
Income	−0.08	0.04	0.03
Female	0.02	0.02	0.41
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.04	0.10
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.30	0.06	0.00
South	−0.05	0.03	0.06

Table 178: OLS model describing Support Government Programs to Help Blacks as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=557).

GSS96: Chapter 4, Figure 8

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.39	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.50	0.06	0.00
Age	0.14	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.11	0.03	0.00
Income	0.21	0.16	0.21
Black	0.12	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.47
Female	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.32	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.09	0.04	0.02
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.45
3rd Generation	−0.08	0.03	0.00

Table 179: OLS model describing Oppose Gay Marriage 2004 (0=strongly agree homosexuals should have right to marry, 1=strongly disagree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1004).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.09	0.07	0.17
Exclusive American Community	0.37	0.07	0.00
Age	0.19	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.04	0.04	0.32
Income	0.02	0.04	0.56
Black	0.04	0.04	0.31
Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.66
Female	−0.12	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.14	0.06	0.02
1st Generation	−0.06	0.05	0.27
2nd Generation	0.06	0.05	0.23
3rd Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.02

Table 180: OLS model describing Disclosure for Government Clearance 1996 (0=govt definitely should not have right to ask about sexual orientation, 1=govt definitely should) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=920).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.01	0.07	0.83
Exclusive American Community	0.31	0.07	0.00
Age	0.17	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.29	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.09	0.04	0.01
Black	−0.00	0.04	1.00
Hispanic	0.07	0.06	0.26
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.37
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.04	0.10
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.06	0.19
1st Generation	−0.04	0.06	0.51
2nd Generation	−0.07	0.04	0.13
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.03	0.12

Table 181: OLS model describing Intolerance of Homosexuals 1996 (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=590).

GSS96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 8

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.11	0.12	0.34
Exclusive American Community	0.41	0.13	0.00
Age	0.32	0.06	0.00
Education	−0.13	0.08	0.11
Income	0.03	0.07	0.61
Black	0.03	0.07	0.65
Hispanic	−0.04	0.12	0.76
Female	−0.05	0.04	0.24
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.07	0.06
Lib-Con Ideology	0.14	0.11	0.20
1st Generation	−0.06	0.09	0.51
2nd Generation	0.05	0.08	0.52
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.06	0.50
Homophobia	0.10	0.06	0.08
Authoritarianism	0.07	0.08	0.41

Table 182: OLS model describing Disclosure for Government Clearance 1996 (0=govt definitely should not have right to ask about sexual orientation, 1=govt definitely should) as a function of Exclusive American Community and personal attributes (GSS96, N=264).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.13	0.10	0.19
Exclusive American Community	0.27	0.11	0.01
Age	0.20	0.05	0.00
Education	−0.28	0.07	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.05	0.54
Black	−0.08	0.06	0.19
Hispanic	−0.06	0.10	0.56
Female	0.01	0.04	0.87
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.06	0.88
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.09	0.30
1st Generation	0.05	0.08	0.51
2nd Generation	0.03	0.07	0.64
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.05	0.78
Homophobia	0.13	0.05	0.01
Authoritarianism	0.20	0.07	0.00

Table 183: OLS model describing Intolerance of Homosexuals 1996 (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Exclusive American Community and personal attributes (GSS96, N=269).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.72	0.05	0.00
Close to America	0.10	0.04	0.01
Age	0.16	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.19	0.03	0.00
Income	0.35	0.16	0.03
Black	0.16	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.56
Female	−0.07	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.34	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.01	0.04	0.86
2nd Generation	−0.07	0.04	0.06
3rd Generation	−0.10	0.03	0.00

Table 184: OLS model describing Oppose Gay Marriage 2004 (0=strongly agree homosexuals should have right to marry, 1=strongly disagree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1057).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.32	0.05	0.00
Close to America	0.02	0.05	0.59
Age	0.22	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Income	0.01	0.04	0.75
Black	0.08	0.04	0.05
Hispanic	−0.02	0.06	0.78
Female	−0.11	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.21	0.06	0.00
1st Generation	−0.07	0.05	0.18
2nd Generation	0.02	0.04	0.65
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.02

Table 185: OLS model describing Disclosure for Government Clearance 1996 (0=govt definitely should not have right to ask about sexual orienation, 1=govt definitely should) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=961).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.30	0.06	0.00
Close to America	−0.09	0.05	0.05
Age	0.21	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.30	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Black	0.03	0.04	0.52
Hispanic	0.12	0.06	0.05
Female	−0.05	0.02	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.08	0.04	0.06
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.06	0.06
1st Generation	0.02	0.05	0.66
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.04	0.65
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.12

Table 186: OLS model describing Intolerance of Homosexuals 1996 (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=624).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.08	0.00
Assimilationlist Component	0.05	0.08	0.55
Nativist Component	0.31	0.05	0.00
Age	0.13	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.10	0.04	0.00
Income	0.21	0.17	0.20
Black	0.11	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	−0.07	0.04	0.14
Female	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.32	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.07	0.04	0.07
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.42
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.00

Table 187: OLS model describing Oppose Gay Marriage 2004 (0=strongly agree homosexuals should have right to marry, 1=strongly disagree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1014).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.16	0.07	0.02
Assimilationist Component	0.09	0.08	0.22
Nativist Component	0.19	0.05	0.00
Age	0.19	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.03	0.04	0.56
Income	0.04	0.04	0.34
Black	0.02	0.04	0.62
Hispanic	−0.00	0.06	0.99
Female	−0.11	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.14	0.06	0.01
1st Generation	−0.04	0.05	0.45
2nd Generation	0.02	0.05	0.65
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.01

Table 188: OLS model describing Disclosure for Government Clearance 1996 (0=govt definitely should not have right to ask about sexual orienation, 1=govt definitely should) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=935).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.14	0.07	0.05
Assimilationist Component	−0.07	0.08	0.42
Nativist Component	0.26	0.05	0.00
Age	0.18	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.26	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.04	0.05
Black	−0.02	0.04	0.64
Hispanic	0.09	0.06	0.11
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.04	0.08
Lib-Con Ideology	0.06	0.06	0.33
1st Generation	0.06	0.05	0.26
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.56
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.03	0.17

Table 189: OLS model describing Intolerance of Homosexuals 1996 (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=602).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.36	0.07	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.52	0.06	0.00
Age	0.13	0.03	0.00
Education	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	0.19	0.17	0.26
Black	0.13	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	−0.07	0.04	0.10
Female	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.31	0.03	0.00
1st Generation	0.06	0.04	0.12
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.04	0.35
3rd Generation	−0.08	0.03	0.00

Table 190: OLS model describing Oppose Gay marriage 2004 (0=strongly agree homosexuals should have right to marry, 1=strongly disagree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1014).

GSS96: Chapter 4, Figure 9

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.07	0.07	0.34
Exclusive American Community	0.46	0.07	0.00
Age	0.21	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.28	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.09	0.04	0.03
Black	0.06	0.04	0.13
Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.68
Female	0.02	0.03	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.04	0.40
Lib-Con Ideology	0.13	0.06	0.03
1st Generation	0.09	0.06	0.15
2nd Generation	0.04	0.05	0.43
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.09

Table 191: OLS model describing Intolerance of Atheists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=589).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.06	0.08	0.46
Exclusive American Community	0.50	0.08	0.00
Age	0.25	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.26	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.04	0.13
Black	0.07	0.05	0.17
Hispanic	−0.02	0.08	0.78
Female	0.01	0.03	0.84
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.05	0.83
Lib-Con Ideology	0.16	0.07	0.02
1st Generation	0.20	0.07	0.00
2nd Generation	−0.10	0.05	0.05
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.05

Table 192: OLS model describing Intolerance of Militarists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=589).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.05	0.08	0.55
Exclusive American Community	0.46	0.08	0.00
Age	0.08	0.04	0.06
Education	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.06	0.04	0.19
Black	0.06	0.05	0.24
Hispanic	0.10	0.08	0.21
Female	0.01	0.03	0.62
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.05	0.98
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.07	0.30
1st Generation	0.15	0.07	0.03
2nd Generation	−0.11	0.05	0.03
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.11

Table 193: OLS model describing Intolerance of Racists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS96, N=589).

GSS96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 9

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.04	0.12	0.74
Exclusive American Community	0.31	0.12	0.01
Age	0.13	0.06	0.02
Education	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	−0.06	0.06	0.31
Black	0.03	0.06	0.63
Hispanic	0.05	0.09	0.60
Female	0.01	0.04	0.73
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.05	0.07	0.49
Lib-Con Ideology	0.17	0.10	0.08
1st Generation	0.12	0.09	0.21
2nd Generation	0.05	0.07	0.46
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.04	0.32
Racial Prejudice	0.05	0.08	0.52
Homophobia	0.07	0.05	0.15

Table 194: OLS model describing Intolerance of Atheists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=260).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.05	0.14	0.70
Exclusive American Community	0.51	0.14	0.00
Age	0.15	0.07	0.03
Education	−0.16	0.08	0.05
Income	−0.07	0.07	0.32
Black	−0.01	0.07	0.93
Hispanic	−0.00	0.10	0.99
Female	−0.02	0.05	0.74
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.15	0.08	0.05
Lib-Con Ideology	0.13	0.11	0.24
1st Generation	0.16	0.11	0.14
2nd Generation	−0.06	0.08	0.44
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.05	0.15
Racial Prejudice	−0.05	0.09	0.55
Homophobia	0.17	0.06	0.00

Table 195: OLS model describing Intolerance of Militarists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=260).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.13	0.14	0.36
Exclusive American Community	0.37	0.14	0.01
Age	0.00	0.07	0.98
Education	−0.12	0.08	0.16
Income	−0.04	0.07	0.58
Black	−0.00	0.08	0.99
Hispanic	0.10	0.10	0.31
Female	0.01	0.05	0.80
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.08	0.81
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.11	0.93
1st Generation	0.24	0.11	0.03
2nd Generation	0.00	0.08	0.98
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.05	0.36
Racial Prejudice	−0.09	0.09	0.35
Homophobia	0.13	0.06	0.02

Table 196: OLS model describing Intolerance of Racists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=260).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.28	0.06	0.00
Close to America	−0.03	0.05	0.62
Age	0.25	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.30	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.10	0.04	0.01
Black	0.08	0.04	0.08
Hispanic	0.08	0.06	0.23
Female	0.01	0.03	0.70
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.04	0.65
Lib-Con Ideology	0.19	0.06	0.00
1st Generation	0.09	0.06	0.12
2nd Generation	0.03	0.05	0.58
3rd Generation	−0.07	0.03	0.03

Table 197: OLS model describing Intolerance of Atheists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=622).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.07	0.00
Close to America	−0.04	0.06	0.53
Age	0.28	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.30	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.07	0.04	0.11
Black	0.08	0.05	0.12
Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.50
Female	0.01	0.03	0.72
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.05	0.70
Lib-Con Ideology	0.22	0.07	0.00
1st Generation	0.12	0.06	0.05
2nd Generation	−0.16	0.05	0.00
3rd Generation	−0.09	0.04	0.01

Table 198: OLS model describing Intolerance of Militarists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=623).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.40	0.07	0.00
Close to America	−0.04	0.06	0.45
Age	0.12	0.04	0.01
Education	−0.18	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.06	0.05	0.22
Black	0.06	0.05	0.20
Hispanic	0.20	0.07	0.00
Female	0.01	0.03	0.77
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.05	0.95
Lib-Con Ideology	0.13	0.07	0.06
1st Generation	0.07	0.06	0.25
2nd Generation	−0.09	0.05	0.09
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.04	0.21

Table 199: OLS model describing Intolerance of Racists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=622).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.04	0.08	0.56
Assimilationist Component	0.06	0.09	0.52
Nativist Component	0.29	0.06	0.00
Age	0.21	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.06	0.04	0.12
Black	0.04	0.04	0.35
Hispanic	−0.01	0.06	0.85
Female	0.01	0.03	0.70
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.56
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.06	0.06
1st Generation	0.10	0.06	0.07
2nd Generation	0.05	0.05	0.32
3rd Generation	−0.04	0.03	0.16

Table 200: OLS model describing Intolerance of Atheists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=601).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.12	0.09	0.18
Assimilationist Component	−0.06	0.10	0.52
Nativist Component	0.39	0.06	0.00
Age	0.22	0.04	0.00
Education	−0.20	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.03	0.04	0.43
Black	0.02	0.05	0.73
Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.36
Female	0.01	0.03	0.83
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.05	0.75
Lib-Con Ideology	0.15	0.07	0.03
1st Generation	0.17	0.07	0.01
2nd Generation	−0.09	0.05	0.08
3rd Generation	−0.06	0.03	0.09

Table 201: OLS model describing Intolerance of Militarists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=601).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.14	0.09	0.11
Assimilationist Component	0.08	0.10	0.41
Nativist Component	0.25	0.06	0.00
Age	0.08	0.04	0.05
Education	−0.13	0.05	0.02
Income	−0.05	0.04	0.28
Black	0.03	0.05	0.51
Hispanic	0.13	0.07	0.07
Female	0.02	0.03	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.05	0.89
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.07	0.24
1st Generation	0.12	0.07	0.06
2nd Generation	−0.07	0.05	0.19
3rd Generation	−0.05	0.03	0.20

Table 202: OLS model describing Intolerance of Racists (0=tolerant, 1=intolerant) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS96, N=601).

GSS: Chapter 4, Figure 10

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.21	0.03	0.00
Age	0.02	0.01	0.19
Education	−0.01	0.02	0.69
Income	0.12	0.07	0.11
Black	−0.02	0.01	0.07
Hispanic	0.05	0.02	0.01
Female	0.04	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.01	0.16
1st Generation	0.04	0.02	0.04
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.30
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.74

Table 203: OLS model describing Obligation to Obey Laws (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1026).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.60	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.14	0.03	0.00
Age	0.07	0.01	0.00
Education	0.09	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.05	0.08	0.50
Black	−0.02	0.01	0.25
Hispanic	0.02	0.02	0.35
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.01	0.69
1st Generation	0.02	0.02	0.36
2nd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.87
3rd Generation	0.00	0.01	0.99

Table 204: OLS model describing Obligation to Participate (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1013).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.73	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.06	0.04	0.07
Age	0.02	0.02	0.22
Education	0.00	0.02	0.97
Income	−0.11	0.10	0.25
Black	0.04	0.02	0.02
Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.02
Female	0.05	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.01	0.02	0.74
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.65
3rd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.54

Table 205: OLS model describing Obligation to Help Americans (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1027).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.58	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.04	0.05	0.38
Age	−0.04	0.02	0.13
Education	0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.16	0.14	0.25
Black	0.12	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.02	0.03
1st Generation	0.09	0.03	0.01
2nd Generation	0.03	0.03	0.30
3rd Generation	0.02	0.02	0.49

Table 206: OLS model describing Obligation to Help People in the Rest of the World (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1025).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.63	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.21	0.03	0.00
Age	0.04	0.01	0.00
Education	0.02	0.01	0.19
Income	−0.07	0.07	0.36
Black	−0.05	0.01	0.00
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.65
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.10	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	0.04	0.02	0.03
2nd Generation	0.02	0.01	0.18
3rd Generation	0.00	0.01	0.81

Table 207: OLS model describing Patriotism (0=minimum, 1=maximum) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=858).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.17	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.02	0.27
Education	0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	0.14	0.13	0.31
Black	−0.06	0.03	0.01
Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.29
Female	−0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.07	0.03	0.02
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.03	0.23
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.10

Table 208: OLS model describing Trust in Government (0=strongly disagree that we can trust people in Washington,1=strongly agree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American) and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1027).

GSS: Extra Analyses for Chapter 4, Figure 10

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.82	0.02	0.00
Close to America	0.06	0.02	0.00
Age	0.03	0.01	0.02
Education	−0.01	0.02	0.51
Income	0.15	0.08	0.05
Black	−0.01	0.01	0.31
Hispanic	0.07	0.02	0.00
Female	0.04	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.01	0.12
1st Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.89
2nd Generation	−0.04	0.02	0.02
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.01	0.30

Table 209: OLS model describing Obligation to Obey Laws (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1084).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.62	0.02	0.00
Close to America	0.11	0.02	0.00
Age	0.07	0.01	0.00
Education	0.08	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.05	0.08	0.48
Black	−0.01	0.01	0.51
Hispanic	0.03	0.02	0.20
Female	−0.01	0.01	0.23
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.01	0.90
1st Generation	0.00	0.02	0.82
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.53
3rd Generation	−0.01	0.01	0.67

Table 210: OLS model describing Obligation to Participate (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1068).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.03	0.00
Close to America	0.02	0.02	0.38
Age	0.02	0.02	0.33
Education	−0.01	0.02	0.77
Income	−0.12	0.10	0.23
Black	0.04	0.02	0.04
Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.02
Female	0.05	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.07	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.53
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.43
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.88

Table 211: OLS model describing Obligation to Help Americans (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1084).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.04	0.00
Close to America	0.01	0.03	0.67
Age	−0.05	0.02	0.04
Education	0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.13	0.14	0.36
Black	0.11	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.10	0.04	0.01
Female	0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.02	0.01
1st Generation	0.07	0.03	0.03
2nd Generation	0.05	0.03	0.11
3rd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.60

Table 212: OLS model describing Obligation to Help People in the Rest of the World (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1081).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.66	0.02	0.00
Close to America	0.18	0.02	0.00
Age	0.03	0.01	0.01
Education	−0.01	0.01	0.73
Income	0.01	0.07	0.91
Black	−0.02	0.01	0.15
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.50
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.07
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.10	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	0.02	0.02	0.20
2nd Generation	0.02	0.02	0.29
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.84

Table 213: OLS model describing Patriotism (0=minimum, 1=maximum) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=895).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.40	0.04	0.00
Close to America	0.12	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.02	0.26
Education	0.08	0.03	0.00
Income	0.12	0.13	0.34
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.24
Hispanic	0.05	0.03	0.16
Female	−0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.05	0.03	0.08
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.03	0.23
3rd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.23

Table 214: OLS model describing Trust in Government (0=strongly disagree that we can trust people in Washington,1=strongly agree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1085).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.04	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.07	0.04	0.10
Nativist Component	0.11	0.02	0.00
Age	0.02	0.01	0.24
Education	0.02	0.02	0.34
Income	0.17	0.08	0.04
Black	−0.03	0.01	0.02
Hispanic	0.05	0.02	0.02
Female	0.04	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.01	0.39
1st Generation	0.03	0.02	0.07
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.18
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.89

Table 215: OLS model describing Obligation to Obey Laws (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1036).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.04	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.18	0.04	0.00
Nativist Component	−0.00	0.02	0.90
Age	0.07	0.01	0.00
Education	0.10	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.02	0.08	0.83
Black	−0.02	0.02	0.23
Hispanic	0.01	0.02	0.73
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.01	0.97
1st Generation	0.01	0.02	0.47
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.77
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.75

Table 216: OLS model describing Obligation to Participate (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1024).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.75	0.05	0.00
Assimilationist Component	−0.01	0.05	0.91
Nativist Component	0.03	0.03	0.33
Age	0.02	0.02	0.28
Education	0.02	0.02	0.39
Income	−0.04	0.10	0.70
Black	0.04	0.02	0.04
Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.02
Female	0.05	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.57
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.52
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.79

Table 217: OLS model describing Obligation to Help Americans (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1038).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.07	0.00
Assimilationist Component	−0.24	0.07	0.00
Nativist Component	0.08	0.04	0.07
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.09
Education	0.12	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.12	0.14	0.40
Black	0.11	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.03
Female	0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.02	0.07
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.06
2nd Generation	0.04	0.03	0.22
3rd Generation	0.02	0.02	0.43

Table 218: OLS model describing Obligation to Help People in the Rest of the World (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1036).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.04	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.28	0.04	0.00
Nativist Component	0.02	0.02	0.33
Age	0.05	0.01	0.00
Education	0.02	0.02	0.28
Income	−0.03	0.07	0.70
Black	−0.05	0.01	0.00
Hispanic	0.00	0.02	0.93
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	0.02	0.02	0.21
2nd Generation	0.02	0.02	0.33
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.93

Table 219: OLS model describing Patriotism (0=minimum, 1=maximum) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=865).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.06	0.00
Assimilationist Component	0.12	0.07	0.07
Nativist Component	0.04	0.04	0.32
Age	−0.02	0.02	0.38
Education	0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	0.17	0.13	0.19
Black	−0.05	0.03	0.07
Hispanic	0.05	0.03	0.20
Female	−0.06	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.06
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.03	0.26
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.09

Table 220: OLS model describing Trust in Government (0=strongly disagree that we can trust people in Washington,1=strongly agree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1038).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.66	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.24	0.03	0.00
Age	0.01	0.01	0.34
Education	0.01	0.02	0.67
Income	0.16	0.08	0.04
Black	−0.03	0.01	0.02
Hispanic	0.05	0.02	0.03
Female	0.03	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.01	0.01	0.61
1st Generation	0.03	0.02	0.07
2nd Generation	−0.02	0.02	0.17
3rd Generation	−0.00	0.01	0.90

Table 221: OLS model describing Obligation to Obey Laws (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1036).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.16	0.03	0.00
Age	0.07	0.01	0.00
Education	0.10	0.02	0.00
Income	−0.04	0.08	0.59
Black	−0.03	0.02	0.06
Hispanic	0.00	0.02	0.99
Female	−0.02	0.01	0.02
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.01	0.89
1st Generation	0.02	0.02	0.20
2nd Generation	−0.00	0.02	0.98
3rd Generation	0.00	0.01	0.97

Table 222: OLS model describing Obligation to Participate (0=no obligations, 1=maximum obligations) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1023).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.73	0.04	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.05	0.04	0.18
Age	0.02	0.02	0.26
Education	0.01	0.02	0.63
Income	−0.10	0.10	0.33
Black	0.04	0.02	0.04
Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.03
Female	0.05	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.64
2nd Generation	−0.01	0.02	0.69
3rd Generation	0.00	0.02	0.94

Table 223: OLS model describing Obligation to Help Americans (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1037).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.57	0.06	0.00
Exclusive American Community	−0.05	0.05	0.34
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.16
Education	0.11	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.10	0.14	0.51
Black	0.12	0.03	0.00
Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.04
Female	0.05	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.03	0.06
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.08
2nd Generation	0.05	0.03	0.13
3rd Generation	0.01	0.02	0.51

Table 224: OLS model describing Obligation to Help People in the Rest of the World (0=no obligation, 1=obligation to help) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1035).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.58	0.03	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.25	0.03	0.00
Age	0.04	0.01	0.00
Education	0.02	0.02	0.18
Income	−0.03	0.07	0.69
Black	−0.06	0.01	0.00
Hispanic	−0.01	0.02	0.79
Female	−0.03	0.01	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.01	0.00
1st Generation	0.03	0.02	0.06
2nd Generation	0.02	0.02	0.22
3rd Generation	0.00	0.01	0.86

Table 225: OLS model describing Patriotism (0=minimum, 1=maximum) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=865).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.33	0.05	0.00
Exclusive American Community	0.18	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.02	0.30
Education	0.11	0.03	0.00
Income	0.14	0.13	0.27
Black	−0.05	0.03	0.06
Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.23
Female	−0.06	0.02	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.02	0.00
1st Generation	0.06	0.03	0.04
2nd Generation	−0.03	0.03	0.30
3rd Generation	−0.03	0.02	0.11

Table 226: OLS model describing Trust in Government (0=strongly disagree that we can trust people in Washington,1=strongly agree) as a function of Exclusive American Community (7-item scale, 0=no requirements, 1=all requirements needed to be a True American), and personal attributes (GSS04, N=1037).

Chapter 5

NES96 and GSS96: Chapter 5 Figure 2

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−1.34	0.37	0.00
Age	−0.98	0.47	0.04
Income	−1.57	0.48	0.00
South	−0.15	0.23	0.51
Education	−0.37	0.46	0.42
Female	0.09	0.22	0.70

Table 227: Logit model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not close, 1=close) as a function of personal attributes (White Respondents Only, NES96, N=1196).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.06	0.21	0.76
Age	−0.75	0.26	0.00
Income	0.15	0.23	0.51
South	0.02	0.12	0.87
Education	0.20	0.24	0.42
Female	−0.15	0.12	0.22

Table 228: Logit model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not close, 1=close) as a function of personal attributes (White Respondents Only, NES96, N=1196).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Income	−0.02	0.03	0.49
South	0.01	0.02	0.61
Education	0.05	0.03	0.12
Female	−0.01	0.02	0.77

Table 229: OLS model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not at all close, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes (White Respondents Only, GSS96, N=651).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.74	0.03	0.00
Age	0.01	0.03	0.72
Income	0.00	0.03	0.99
South	−0.01	0.02	0.60
Education	0.01	0.03	0.82
Female	0.03	0.02	0.09

Table 230: OLS model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not at all close, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes (White Respondents Only, GSS96, N=652).

GSS96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figure 2

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Income	−0.01	0.03	0.79
South	0.00	0.02	0.96
Education	0.04	0.03	0.22
Female	−0.00	0.02	0.99
Blacks in Neighborhood	0.09	0.02	0.00

Table 231: NA model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not at all close, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (White Respondents Only, GSS96, N=613).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.76	0.03	0.00
Age	0.01	0.03	0.78
Income	−0.01	0.03	0.80
South	−0.01	0.02	0.63
Education	0.01	0.03	0.84
Female	0.03	0.02	0.07
Blacks in Neighborhood	−0.02	0.02	0.28

Table 232: NA model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not at all close, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes, including whether or not blacks live in the neighborhood of the respondent (White Respondents Only, GSS96, N=613).

NES96 and GSS96: Chapter 5 Figure 3

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.09	0.04	0.02
Close to Whites	−0.04	0.02	0.02
Close to Blacks	0.18	0.03	0.00
Age	0.08	0.04	0.04
Income	−0.03	0.03	0.38
South	−0.01	0.02	0.47
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.01	0.02	0.46
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.12	0.03	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.26	0.05	0.00

Table 233: OLS model describing Racial Policy Support (0=oppose policies, 1=favor) as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (NES96, N=608, White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.50	0.06	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.06	0.05	0.19
Close to Blacks	0.23	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.16	0.03	0.00
Income	0.03	0.03	0.36
South	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Education	0.20	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.02	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.39
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.03	0.05	0.58

Table 234: OLS model describing Minimize Social Distance (0=maximize distance, 1=minimize) as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (GSS96, N=286, White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.28	0.08	0.00
Close to Whites	0.03	0.07	0.64
Close to Blacks	0.26	0.06	0.00
Age	0.02	0.04	0.73
Income	−0.07	0.05	0.17
South	−0.04	0.03	0.22
Education	0.14	0.05	0.01
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.85
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.16	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.18	0.07	0.02

Table 235: OLS model describing Government Obligation to Help Blacks (0=no special treatment, 1=government help) as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (GSS96, N=298, White Respondents Only).

NES96 and GSS96: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figure 3

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	−0.16	0.05	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.04	0.02	0.01
Close to Blacks	0.12	0.03	0.00
Age	0.11	0.04	0.00
Income	−0.04	0.03	0.19
South	−0.01	0.02	0.43
Education	0.13	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.01	0.02	0.55
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.11	0.03	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.23	0.04	0.00
Feeling Thermometer for Blacks	0.23	0.05	0.00
Stereotyping of Blacks	0.28	0.06	0.00

Table 236: OLS model describing Racial Policy Support (0=oppose policies, 1=favor) as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (NES96, N=572, White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.09	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.04	0.05	0.36
Close to Blacks	0.21	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.14	0.03	0.00
Income	0.03	0.03	0.31
South	−0.08	0.02	0.00
Education	0.19	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.02	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.24
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.03	0.05	0.59
Stereotyping of Blacks	0.17	0.10	0.08
Stereotyping of Whites	−0.10	0.11	0.34

Table 237: OLS model describing Minimize Social Distance (0=maximize distance, 1=minimize) as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (GSS96, N=278, White Respondents Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.10	0.05	0.04
Close to Whites	−0.04	0.02	0.03
Close to Blacks	0.18	0.03	0.00
Age	0.09	0.04	0.02
Income	−0.03	0.03	0.42
South	−0.02	0.02	0.32
Education	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.00	0.02	0.99
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.11	0.03	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	0.25	0.04	0.00
Humanitarianism	0.31	0.05	0.00

Table 238: OLS model describing Racial Policy Support as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (NES96, N=608, Whites Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	−0.12	0.03	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.02	0.01	0.10
Close to Blacks	0.13	0.03	0.00
Age	0.10	0.03	0.00
Income	−0.01	0.03	0.67
South	−0.01	0.01	0.43
Education	0.13	0.03	0.00
Female	0.02	0.01	0.21
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.12
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.06
Egalitarianism	0.61	0.04	0.00

Table 239: OLS model describing Racial Policy Support as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (NES96, N=608, Whites Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.28	0.04	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.04	0.02	0.03
Close to Blacks	0.17	0.03	0.00
Age	0.07	0.04	0.06
Income	−0.03	0.03	0.37
South	−0.01	0.02	0.39
Education	0.16	0.03	0.00
Female	0.00	0.02	0.87
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.03	0.27
Lib-Con Ideology	0.19	0.05	0.00
Individualism	−0.22	0.03	0.00

Table 240: OLS model describing Racial Policy Support as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (NES96, N=598, Whites Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.50	0.06	0.00
Close to Whites	−0.06	0.05	0.20
Close to Blacks	0.23	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.16	0.03	0.00
Income	0.01	0.04	0.75
South	−0.09	0.02	0.00
Education	0.22	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.02	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.48
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.06	0.51
Blacks in Neighborhood	0.01	0.02	0.73

Table 241: OLS model describing Minimize Social Distance as a function of Closeness and personal attributes (GSS96, N=266, Whites Only).

NES96 and NBES84: Chapter 5 Figure 4

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	1.82	0.86	0.03
Age	−2.22	0.99	0.02
Income	−0.36	1.15	0.75
South	0.31	0.44	0.48
Education	0.54	1.04	0.60
Female	0.08	0.45	0.85

Table 242: Logit model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not close, 1=close) as a function of personal attributes (NES96, N=148, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.97	0.89	0.28
Age	−2.54	1.12	0.02
Income	−0.72	1.31	0.58
South	0.00	0.48	1.00
Education	−3.13	1.26	0.01
Female	−0.28	0.48	0.56

Table 243: Logit model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not close, 1=not close) as a function of personal attributes (NES96, N=148, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.76	0.03	0.00
Age	0.12	0.04	0.00
Income	0.06	0.03	0.02
South	0.03	0.02	0.04
Education	0.01	0.03	0.70
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.10

Table 244: OLS model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes (NBES84, N=759, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.63	0.03	0.00
Age	0.21	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.02	0.03	0.58
South	−0.02	0.02	0.31
Education	−0.11	0.04	0.01
Female	−0.06	0.02	0.00

Table 245: OLS model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of personal attributes (NBES84, N=752, Blacks Only).

NBES84: Chapter 5 Figure 5

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.25	0.03	0.00
Close to Whites	0.13	0.02	0.00
Close to Blacks	−0.07	0.03	0.01
Age	−0.04	0.03	0.19
Income	−0.06	0.02	0.00
South	0.02	0.01	0.13
Education	−0.10	0.02	0.00
Female	0.01	0.01	0.49
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.54
Lib-Con Ideology	0.03	0.02	0.03

Table 246: OLS model describing Perceived Equality (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=600, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.72	0.04	0.00
Close to Whites	0.10	0.03	0.00
Close to Blacks	−0.19	0.03	0.00
Age	−0.10	0.04	0.01
Income	0.07	0.02	0.00
South	−0.02	0.01	0.13
Education	0.04	0.03	0.18
Female	−0.00	0.01	0.87
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.03	0.58
Lib-Con Ideology	0.01	0.02	0.49

Table 247: OLS model describing Opposition to Black Nationalism (0=favor, 1=oppose) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=592, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.05	0.00
Close to Whites	0.08	0.03	0.01
Close to Blacks	−0.16	0.04	0.00
Age	0.04	0.05	0.40
Income	0.05	0.03	0.07
South	0.01	0.02	0.62
Education	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Female	0.02	0.02	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.04	0.21
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.03	0.04

Table 248: OLS model describing Racial Policy Opposition (0=support policy, 1=oppose) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=521, Blacks Only).

NBES84: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figure 5

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.03	0.00
Close to Whites	0.11	0.02	0.00
Close to Blacks	−0.07	0.03	0.02
Age	−0.03	0.03	0.37
Income	−0.07	0.02	0.00
South	0.02	0.01	0.15
Education	−0.10	0.02	0.00
Female	0.01	0.01	0.65
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.02	0.62
Lib-Con Ideology	0.03	0.02	0.03
Perceived Goodwill by Whites	0.05	0.01	0.00

Table 249: OLS model describing Perceived Equality (0=low, 1=high) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=566, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.04	0.00
Close to Whites	0.10	0.03	0.00
Close to Blacks	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.11	0.04	0.00
Income	0.07	0.02	0.00
South	−0.02	0.01	0.15
Education	0.03	0.03	0.26
Female	−0.00	0.01	0.89
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.03	0.66
Lib-Con Ideology	0.02	0.02	0.26
Perceived Goodwill by Whites	0.01	0.02	0.63

Table 250: OLS model describing Opposition to Black Nationalism (0=favor, 1=oppose) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=558, Blacks Only).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.35	0.05	0.00
Close to Whites	0.07	0.03	0.05
Close to Blacks	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Age	0.05	0.05	0.31
Income	0.04	0.03	0.21
South	0.01	0.02	0.45
Education	−0.05	0.03	0.12
Female	0.01	0.02	0.46
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.04	0.17
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.03	0.03
Perceived Goodwill by Whites	0.03	0.02	0.15

Table 251: OLS model describing Racial Policy Opposition (0=support policy, 1=oppose) as a function of Closeness (0=not close at all, 1=very close) and personal attributes (NBES84, N=489, Blacks Only).

NPS: Chapter 5 Figure 6

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.50	0.03	0.00
Age	0.07	0.05	0.19
Income	0.17	0.16	0.30
South	0.01	0.02	0.63
Education	0.05	0.03	0.13
Female	0.03	0.02	0.19
%Black in Tract	0.06	0.05	0.28
Black	0.26	0.05	0.00
Asian	−0.01	0.07	0.86
Hispanic	−0.03	0.05	0.54
Caribbean	0.07	0.06	0.24
Age x Black	−0.13	0.08	0.10
Age x Asian	−0.07	0.11	0.54
Age x Hispanic	−0.03	0.09	0.78
Age x Caribbean	−0.02	0.10	0.86
Income x Black	−0.33	0.32	0.29
Income x Asian	−0.11	0.25	0.65
Income x Hispanic	0.12	0.25	0.63
Income x Caribbean	0.35	0.38	0.36
South x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.46
South x Asian	0.09	0.05	0.07
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.34
South x Caribbean	0.03	0.05	0.51
Education x Black	0.03	0.05	0.57
Education x Asian	−0.12	0.07	0.09
Education x Hispanic	0.08	0.05	0.15
Education x Caribbean	0.08	0.07	0.23
Female x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.33
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.82
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.03	0.13
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.44
%Black in Tract x Black	0.00	0.07	0.99
%Black in Tract x Asian	0.07	0.11	0.55
%Black in Tract x Hispanic	−0.10	0.08	0.24
%Black in Tract x Caribbean	−0.00	0.07	0.99

Table 252: OLS model describing Closeness to Blacks (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of Racial Context and personal attributes (NPS, N=2158).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.75	0.05	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.05	0.56
Income	0.00	0.17	0.98
South	0.04	0.02	0.09
Education	0.01	0.04	0.73
Female	0.02	0.02	0.43
%Black in Tract	−0.00	0.04	0.94
Black	−0.24	0.06	0.00
Asian	−0.27	0.08	0.00
Hispanic	−0.29	0.06	0.00
Caribbean	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Age x Black	0.15	0.08	0.06
Age x Asian	0.04	0.11	0.72
Age x Hispanic	0.24	0.09	0.01
Age x Caribbean	0.28	0.10	0.01
Income x Black	0.01	0.32	0.98
Income x Asian	0.09	0.26	0.72
Income x Hispanic	0.27	0.26	0.30
Income x Caribbean	−0.12	0.38	0.75
South x Black	0.00	0.03	0.98
South x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.74
South x Hispanic	−0.00	0.03	0.98
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.05	0.94
Education x Black	−0.04	0.05	0.43
Education x Asian	0.03	0.07	0.65
Education x Hispanic	0.11	0.05	0.04
Education x Caribbean	−0.15	0.07	0.02
Female x Black	−0.08	0.03	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.04	0.28
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.03	0.17
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.04	0.81
%Black in Tract x Black	0.09	0.06	0.15
%Black in Tract x Asian	0.16	0.07	0.01
%Black in Tract x Hispanic	0.11	0.07	0.11
%Black in Tract x Caribbean	0.10	0.08	0.20

Table 253: OLS model describing Closeness to Whites (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of Racial Context and personal attributes (NPS, N=2156).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.39	0.04	0.00
Age	0.05	0.06	0.43
Income	0.30	0.18	0.10
South	−0.00	0.03	0.87
Education	0.21	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.06
%Black in Tract	0.10	0.12	0.38
Black	0.06	0.05	0.25
Asian	0.34	0.08	0.00
Hispanic	−0.05	0.05	0.34
Caribbean	0.05	0.07	0.48
Age x Black	−0.06	0.09	0.47
Age x Asian	−0.03	0.12	0.81
Age x Hispanic	0.01	0.10	0.90
Age x Caribbean	0.02	0.11	0.86
Income x Black	−0.49	0.35	0.17
Income x Asian	−0.60	0.28	0.03
Income x Hispanic	−0.17	0.28	0.55
Income x Caribbean	−0.32	0.42	0.45
South x Black	0.06	0.04	0.14
South x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.54
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.48
South x Caribbean	−0.05	0.05	0.34
Education x Black	−0.24	0.06	0.00
Education x Asian	−0.16	0.08	0.04
Education x Hispanic	−0.18	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Female x Black	−0.00	0.03	0.89
Female x Asian	0.00	0.04	0.95
Female x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.37
Female x Caribbean	0.07	0.04	0.12
%Black in Tract x Black	0.32	0.31	0.30
%Black in Tract x Asian	−0.08	0.15	0.60
%Black in Tract x Hispanic	0.21	0.18	0.24
%Black in Tract x Caribbean	−0.14	0.41	0.73

Table 254: OLS model describing Closeness to Asians (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of Racial Context and personal attributes (NPS, N=2105).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.04	0.00
Age	−0.00	0.05	0.93
Income	0.04	0.17	0.81
South	−0.01	0.02	0.76
Education	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.05
%Black in Tract	0.21	0.06	0.00
Black	0.17	0.05	0.00
Asian	−0.02	0.08	0.75
Hispanic	0.24	0.06	0.00
Caribbean	0.13	0.06	0.05
Age x Black	−0.18	0.08	0.03
Age x Asian	0.02	0.11	0.84
Age x Hispanic	−0.05	0.09	0.56
Age x Caribbean	−0.19	0.10	0.07
Income x Black	−0.12	0.33	0.72
Income x Asian	0.14	0.26	0.60
Income x Hispanic	0.03	0.27	0.90
Income x Caribbean	0.04	0.39	0.93
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.45
South x Asian	0.06	0.05	0.23
South x Hispanic	0.02	0.04	0.65
South x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.24
Education x Black	−0.06	0.06	0.26
Education x Asian	−0.13	0.08	0.08
Education x Hispanic	−0.10	0.06	0.07
Education x Caribbean	−0.05	0.07	0.47
Female x Black	0.02	0.03	0.61
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.84
Female x Hispanic	0.08	0.03	0.01
Female x Caribbean	0.06	0.04	0.13
%Black in Tract x Black	−0.08	0.09	0.34
%Black in Tract x Asian	−0.03	0.11	0.77
%Black in Tract x Hispanic	−0.13	0.07	0.08
%Black in Tract x Caribbean	0.10	0.10	0.32

Table 255: OLS model describing Closeness to Hispanics (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of Racial Context and personal attributes (NPS, N=2143).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.29	0.04	0.00
Age	0.05	0.07	0.46
Income	0.18	0.20	0.38
South	0.03	0.03	0.31
Education	0.16	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.61
%Black in Tract	0.73	0.25	0.00
Black	0.20	0.06	0.00
Asian	−0.00	0.08	0.95
Hispanic	0.07	0.06	0.20
Caribbean	0.33	0.07	0.00
Age x Black	−0.15	0.10	0.12
Age x Asian	−0.07	0.13	0.61
Age x Hispanic	0.00	0.11	0.97
Age x Caribbean	−0.10	0.12	0.42
Income x Black	−0.46	0.85	0.59
Income x Asian	−0.21	0.39	0.60
Income x Hispanic	0.09	0.31	0.77
Income x Caribbean	0.06	0.45	0.90
South x Black	−0.06	0.04	0.15
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.56
South x Hispanic	−0.00	0.04	0.94
South x Caribbean	−0.12	0.06	0.03
Education x Black	−0.06	0.07	0.37
Education x Asian	−0.14	0.09	0.12
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.07	0.42
Education x Caribbean	−0.07	0.08	0.41
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.58
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.66
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.23
Female x Caribbean	0.01	0.05	0.80
%Black in Tract x Black	−0.37	0.29	0.21
%Black in Tract x Asian	−0.07	0.52	0.90
%Black in Tract x Hispanic	0.09	0.33	0.79
%Black in Tract x Caribbean	−0.18	0.28	0.51

Table 256: OLS model describing Closeness to Caribbeans (0=not close at all, 1=very close) as a function of Racial Context and personal attributes (NPS, N=2045).

NPS: Chapter 5 Figures 7 and 8 (and Extra Analyses)

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.72	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.04	0.22	0.84
South	−0.02	0.03	0.55
Education	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.05	0.67
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.06	0.09
Close to Racial Group	0.14	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.13	0.10	0.22
Asian	−0.20	0.13	0.12
Hispanic	−0.07	0.09	0.49
Caribbean	−0.07	0.12	0.55
Age x Black	0.15	0.11	0.16
Age x Asian	−0.08	0.14	0.56
Age x Hispanic	−0.19	0.12	0.11
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.13	0.31
Income x Black	0.12	1.11	0.91
Income x Asian	−0.48	0.34	0.15
Income x Hispanic	0.11	0.32	0.72
Income x Caribbean	0.12	0.42	0.78
South x Black	−0.03	0.05	0.49
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.65
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.34
South x Caribbean	−0.07	0.07	0.29
Education x Black	0.02	0.07	0.78
Education x Asian	0.01	0.10	0.91
Education x Hispanic	0.09	0.07	0.22
Education x Caribbean	0.07	0.09	0.43
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.69
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.64
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.20
Female x Caribbean	−0.04	0.05	0.39
Party x Black	0.04	0.08	0.61
Party x Asian	0.15	0.08	0.07
Party x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.74
Party x Caribbean	−0.02	0.09	0.81
Ideology x Black	0.07	0.08	0.37
Ideology x Asian	0.12	0.11	0.26
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.44
Ideology x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.83
Close to group x Black	0.00	0.07	1.00
Close to group x Asian	−0.18	0.09	0.06
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.07	0.09
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.02	0.08	0.82

Table 257: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2184).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.14	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.24
Blacks	0.14	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.24
Asians	−0.03	0.08	1.33	−0.19	0.12
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.60	−0.07	0.12
Caribbeans	0.13	0.07	0.07	−0.01	0.26

Table 258: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 257).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.08	0.22	0.72
South	−0.02	0.03	0.46
Education	0.12	0.05	0.01
Female	0.05	0.03	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.04	0.34
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.05	0.05
Close to Racial Group	0.16	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.15	0.11	0.18
Asian	−0.24	0.13	0.06
Hispanic	−0.11	0.10	0.25
Caribbean	−0.15	0.12	0.23
Age x Black	0.16	0.11	0.13
Age x Asian	−0.05	0.14	0.74
Age x Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.09
Age x Caribbean	0.12	0.13	0.37
Income x Black	0.85	1.20	0.48
Income x Asian	−0.51	0.33	0.12
Income x Hispanic	0.06	0.32	0.86
Income x Caribbean	−0.00	0.42	1.00
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.60
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.63
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.35
South x Caribbean	−0.11	0.06	0.09
Education x Black	−0.01	0.07	0.87
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.89
Education x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.40
Education x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.82
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.69
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.63
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.38
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.22
Party x Black	0.06	0.08	0.44
Party x Asian	0.15	0.08	0.07
Party x Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.44
Party x Caribbean	−0.01	0.09	0.96
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.08	0.29
Ideology x Asian	0.12	0.10	0.26
Ideology x Hispanic	0.08	0.08	0.30
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.63
Close to group x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.66
Close to group x Asian	−0.10	0.09	0.27
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.04	0.07	0.57
Close to group x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.35

Table 259: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2236).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.16	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.27
Blacks	0.13	0.07	0.05	−0.00	0.25
Asians	0.06	0.08	0.43	−0.09	0.21
Hispanics	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.22
Caribbeans	0.25	0.08	0.00	0.10	0.40

Table 260: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 259).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.72	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Income	0.04	0.23	0.85
South	−0.03	0.03	0.37
Education	0.11	0.05	0.03
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.05	0.49
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.09	0.06	0.10
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.09	0.10	0.36
Asian	−0.25	0.12	0.04
Hispanic	−0.06	0.09	0.52
Caribbean	−0.11	0.13	0.39
Age x Black	0.12	0.11	0.27
Age x Asian	−0.13	0.15	0.38
Age x Hispanic	−0.23	0.12	0.06
Age x Caribbean	0.13	0.14	0.36
Income x Black	−0.03	1.12	0.98
Income x Asian	−0.73	0.44	0.10
Income x Hispanic	0.09	0.33	0.79
Income x Caribbean	0.09	0.43	0.83
South x Black	−0.01	0.05	0.84
South x Asian	0.07	0.07	0.30
South x Hispanic	0.06	0.05	0.21
South x Caribbean	−0.07	0.07	0.28
Education x Black	0.01	0.07	0.91
Education x Asian	0.02	0.10	0.85
Education x Hispanic	0.09	0.07	0.20
Education x Caribbean	0.07	0.09	0.47
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.58
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.69
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.20
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.24
Party x Black	0.06	0.08	0.47
Party x Asian	0.14	0.09	0.10
Party x Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.51
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.94
Ideology x Black	0.06	0.08	0.44
Ideology x Asian	0.12	0.11	0.25
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.47
Ideology x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.76
Close to group x Black	−0.09	0.07	0.17
Close to group x Asian	−0.08	0.08	0.34
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.18	0.07	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.06	0.08	0.47

Table 261: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2126).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.08	0.26
Blacks	0.08	0.05	0.12	−0.02	0.17
Asians	0.09	0.07	0.21	−0.05	0.22
Hispanics	−0.01	0.05	1.22	−0.10	0.08
Caribbeans	0.11	0.07	0.12	−0.03	0.24

Table 262: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 261).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.06	0.22	0.77
South	−0.03	0.03	0.40
Education	0.13	0.05	0.01
Female	0.06	0.03	0.01
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.53
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.05	0.07
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.12	0.11	0.27
Asian	−0.27	0.12	0.03
Hispanic	0.02	0.10	0.84
Caribbean	−0.09	0.13	0.50
Age x Black	0.16	0.11	0.14
Age x Asian	−0.08	0.14	0.58
Age x Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.08
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.13	0.31
Income x Black	−0.02	1.11	0.99
Income x Asian	−0.51	0.33	0.13
Income x Hispanic	0.09	0.32	0.78
Income x Caribbean	0.08	0.42	0.84
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.68
South x Asian	0.04	0.06	0.53
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.31
South x Caribbean	−0.07	0.07	0.26
Education x Black	0.00	0.07	1.00
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.95
Education x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.34
Education x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.49
Female x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.53
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.70
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.25
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.27
Party x Black	0.06	0.08	0.46
Party x Asian	0.15	0.08	0.08
Party x Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.46
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.94
Ideology x Black	0.07	0.08	0.38
Ideology x Asian	0.12	0.10	0.26
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.43
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.63
Close to group x Black	−0.05	0.07	0.52
Close to group x Asian	−0.03	0.09	0.71
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.25	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.07	0.08	0.42

Table 263: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2225).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.27
Blacks	0.12	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.23
Asians	0.14	0.07	0.07	−0.01	0.28
Hispanics	−0.08	0.06	1.82	−0.20	0.04
Caribbeans	0.10	0.07	0.12	−0.03	0.23

Table 264: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 263).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.76	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Income	0.07	0.22	0.76
South	−0.02	0.03	0.46
Education	0.13	0.05	0.00
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.49
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.05	0.06	0.45
Black	−0.09	0.11	0.41
Asian	−0.19	0.13	0.15
Hispanic	−0.09	0.11	0.38
Caribbean	−0.14	0.13	0.30
Age x Black	0.12	0.11	0.25
Age x Asian	−0.07	0.14	0.61
Age x Hispanic	−0.21	0.12	0.07
Age x Caribbean	0.08	0.14	0.56
Income x Black	−0.05	1.11	0.97
Income x Asian	−0.48	0.34	0.16
Income x Hispanic	0.08	0.32	0.79
Income x Caribbean	0.09	0.43	0.84
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.60
South x Asian	0.04	0.06	0.48
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.30
South x Caribbean	−0.09	0.06	0.14
Education x Black	0.00	0.07	0.98
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.10	0.83
Education x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.41
Education x Caribbean	0.08	0.09	0.37
Female x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.53
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.71
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.29
Female x Caribbean	−0.05	0.05	0.28
Party x Black	0.06	0.08	0.43
Party x Asian	0.16	0.08	0.06
Party x Hispanic	0.03	0.07	0.63
Party x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.79
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.08	0.30
Ideology x Asian	0.15	0.11	0.15
Ideology x Hispanic	0.08	0.08	0.32
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.65
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.08	0.49
Close to group x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.07
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.57
Close to group x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.56

Table 265: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2235).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.05	0.06	0.45	−0.08	0.17
Blacks	−0.01	0.05	1.14	−0.11	0.09
Asians	−0.14	0.08	1.91	−0.29	0.02
Hispanics	−0.00	0.06	1.00	−0.11	0.11
Caribbeans	0.10	0.07	0.14	−0.03	0.24

Table 266: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 265).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Income	0.20	0.21	0.34
South	−0.04	0.03	0.15
Education	0.12	0.05	0.01
Female	0.05	0.03	0.06
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.53
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.05	0.49
Close to Racial Group	0.15	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.06	0.10	0.56
Asian	0.05	0.13	0.70
Hispanic	−0.26	0.09	0.01
Caribbean	−0.12	0.12	0.31
Age x Black	0.17	0.10	0.11
Age x Asian	0.03	0.14	0.81
Age x Hispanic	0.12	0.12	0.30
Age x Caribbean	0.09	0.13	0.50
Income x Black	−1.39	0.89	0.12
Income x Asian	−0.24	0.33	0.46
Income x Hispanic	0.23	0.31	0.46
Income x Caribbean	0.54	0.41	0.19
South x Black	0.02	0.04	0.67
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.76
South x Hispanic	−0.00	0.05	0.97
South x Caribbean	0.10	0.06	0.11
Education x Black	0.10	0.07	0.15
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.95
Education x Hispanic	0.29	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.10	0.09	0.23
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.05	0.26
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.40
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.05	0.79
Party x Black	−0.11	0.07	0.16
Party x Asian	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Party x Hispanic	−0.10	0.07	0.12
Party x Caribbean	0.00	0.09	0.97
Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.08	0.51
Ideology x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.08
Ideology x Hispanic	0.03	0.08	0.66
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.45
Close to group x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.15
Close to group x Asian	−0.21	0.09	0.02
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.07	0.09
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.13	0.08	0.11

Table 267: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2216).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.24
Blacks	0.05	0.05	0.34	−0.05	0.15
Asians	−0.06	0.08	1.60	−0.22	0.09
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.56	−0.07	0.13
Caribbeans	0.01	0.07	0.86	−0.12	0.15

Table 268: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 267).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.06	0.00
Income	0.23	0.21	0.28
South	−0.05	0.03	0.09
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.03	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.04	0.15
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.05	0.05	0.36
Close to Racial Group	0.18	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.03	0.11	0.78
Asian	0.05	0.12	0.67
Hispanic	−0.37	0.09	0.00
Caribbean	−0.16	0.12	0.17
Age x Black	0.19	0.10	0.07
Age x Asian	0.04	0.14	0.75
Age x Hispanic	0.10	0.11	0.40
Age x Caribbean	0.08	0.13	0.54
Income x Black	−1.04	0.92	0.26
Income x Asian	−0.24	0.33	0.45
Income x Hispanic	0.17	0.31	0.58
Income x Caribbean	0.46	0.41	0.27
South x Black	0.03	0.04	0.48
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.61
South x Hispanic	0.01	0.04	0.74
South x Caribbean	0.08	0.06	0.19
Education x Black	0.05	0.07	0.45
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.62
Education x Hispanic	0.22	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.19	0.09	0.03
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.05	0.29
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.51
Female x Caribbean	−0.02	0.05	0.64
Party x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.26
Party x Asian	−0.01	0.08	0.90
Party x Hispanic	−0.07	0.07	0.26
Party x Caribbean	0.00	0.09	0.99
Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.07	0.66
Ideology x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.07
Ideology x Hispanic	0.08	0.08	0.30
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.51
Close to group x Black	−0.15	0.08	0.08
Close to group x Asian	−0.21	0.09	0.02
Close to group x Hispanic	0.12	0.07	0.09
Close to group x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.88

Table 269: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2269).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.18	0.05	0.00	0.08	0.28
Blacks	0.03	0.06	0.61	−0.09	0.16
Asians	−0.03	0.07	1.30	−0.17	0.12
Hispanics	0.30	0.05	0.00	0.20	0.40
Caribbeans	0.19	0.07	0.01	0.05	0.34

Table 270: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 269).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.82	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.24	0.07	0.00
Income	0.23	0.22	0.30
South	−0.06	0.03	0.05
Education	0.13	0.05	0.01
Female	0.05	0.03	0.06
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.05	0.05	0.32
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.03	0.06	0.60
Close to Racial Group	0.15	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.09	0.10	0.35
Asian	0.02	0.12	0.87
Hispanic	−0.28	0.09	0.00
Caribbean	−0.11	0.13	0.40
Age x Black	0.19	0.11	0.07
Age x Asian	0.06	0.15	0.69
Age x Hispanic	0.13	0.12	0.28
Age x Caribbean	0.10	0.14	0.47
Income x Black	−1.39	0.89	0.12
Income x Asian	−0.70	0.43	0.11
Income x Hispanic	0.17	0.33	0.60
Income x Caribbean	0.53	0.42	0.21
South x Black	0.05	0.05	0.30
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.65
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.05	0.48
South x Caribbean	0.11	0.07	0.09
Education x Black	0.08	0.07	0.24
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.10	0.84
Education x Hispanic	0.28	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.09	0.15
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Asian	−0.06	0.05	0.19
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.39
Female x Caribbean	−0.02	0.05	0.73
Party x Black	−0.10	0.08	0.21
Party x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.59
Party x Hispanic	−0.08	0.07	0.27
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.96
Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.08	0.50
Ideology x Asian	−0.22	0.11	0.04
Ideology x Hispanic	0.03	0.08	0.75
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.09	0.09	0.33
Close to group x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Close to group x Asian	−0.14	0.08	0.08
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.16	0.07	0.02
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.05

Table 271: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2154).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.24
Blacks	0.07	0.05	0.13	−0.02	0.17
Asians	0.01	0.07	0.90	−0.13	0.14
Hispanics	−0.00	0.05	1.04	−0.09	0.09
Caribbeans	−0.01	0.07	1.09	−0.14	0.13

Table 272: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 271).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.76	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Income	0.22	0.21	0.30
South	−0.04	0.03	0.14
Education	0.13	0.05	0.00
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.04	0.34
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.05	0.41
Close to Racial Group	0.19	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.04	0.11	0.71
Asian	0.05	0.12	0.68
Hispanic	−0.21	0.10	0.04
Caribbean	−0.14	0.12	0.26
Age x Black	0.17	0.10	0.11
Age x Asian	0.03	0.14	0.81
Age x Hispanic	0.09	0.11	0.43
Age x Caribbean	0.09	0.13	0.48
Income x Black	−1.34	0.88	0.13
Income x Asian	−0.23	0.33	0.47
Income x Hispanic	0.23	0.31	0.46
Income x Caribbean	0.52	0.41	0.21
South x Black	0.03	0.04	0.52
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.75
South x Hispanic	0.00	0.04	0.99
South x Caribbean	0.11	0.06	0.07
Education x Black	0.07	0.07	0.28
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.80
Education x Hispanic	0.28	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.14	0.09	0.10
Female x Black	−0.08	0.04	0.05
Female x Asian	−0.06	0.05	0.17
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.26
Female x Caribbean	−0.02	0.05	0.66
Party x Black	−0.09	0.07	0.23
Party x Asian	−0.03	0.08	0.70
Party x Hispanic	−0.08	0.07	0.22
Party x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.82
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.55
Ideology x Asian	−0.19	0.10	0.06
Ideology x Hispanic	0.05	0.08	0.56
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.45
Close to group x Black	−0.13	0.07	0.07
Close to group x Asian	−0.19	0.09	0.03
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.20	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.09	0.08	0.29

Table 273: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2259).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.19	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.29
Blacks	0.06	0.05	0.26	−0.05	0.17
Asians	−0.00	0.07	1.00	−0.14	0.14
Hispanics	−0.01	0.06	1.12	−0.12	0.11
Caribbeans	0.11	0.07	0.10	−0.02	0.24

Table 274: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 273).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.88	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Income	0.24	0.22	0.26
South	−0.04	0.03	0.14
Education	0.16	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.03	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.04	0.33
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.05	0.05	0.37
Close to Racial Group	−0.04	0.06	0.54
Black	−0.19	0.11	0.08
Asian	−0.12	0.13	0.38
Hispanic	−0.42	0.10	0.00
Caribbean	−0.30	0.13	0.02
Age x Black	0.15	0.10	0.14
Age x Asian	0.03	0.14	0.83
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.11	0.59
Age x Caribbean	0.02	0.13	0.89
Income x Black	−1.55	0.89	0.08
Income x Asian	−0.27	0.33	0.42
Income x Hispanic	0.16	0.32	0.61
Income x Caribbean	0.51	0.42	0.22
South x Black	0.02	0.04	0.68
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.76
South x Hispanic	0.01	0.04	0.89
South x Caribbean	0.08	0.06	0.20
Education x Black	0.06	0.07	0.40
Education x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.53
Education x Hispanic	0.22	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.14	0.09	0.12
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.05	0.24
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.39
Female x Caribbean	−0.02	0.05	0.71
Party x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.28
Party x Asian	−0.02	0.08	0.80
Party x Hispanic	−0.08	0.07	0.20
Party x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.72
Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Ideology x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.09
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.48
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.40
Close to group x Black	0.15	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Asian	0.11	0.10	0.29
Close to group x Hispanic	0.20	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	0.23	0.09	0.01

Table 275: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2269).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.04	0.06	1.46	−0.16	0.08
Blacks	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.22
Asians	0.07	0.08	0.39	−0.09	0.22
Hispanics	0.16	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.27
Caribbeans	0.19	0.07	0.00	0.06	0.33

Table 276: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 275).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.78	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.42	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.23	0.18	0.21
South	−0.03	0.03	0.28
Education	0.12	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.02	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.40
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.25	0.04	0.00
Black	0.05	0.09	0.58
Asian	0.20	0.11	0.07
Hispanic	0.04	0.08	0.62
Caribbean	0.08	0.10	0.42
Age x Black	0.32	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.36	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.10	0.44
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.11	0.23
Income x Black	0.51	0.76	0.50
Income x Asian	0.13	0.28	0.63
Income x Hispanic	0.37	0.27	0.17
Income x Caribbean	−0.14	0.35	0.70
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.34
South x Asian	0.07	0.05	0.18
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.36
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.06	0.23
Education x Black	−0.06	0.06	0.29
Education x Asian	−0.20	0.08	0.01
Education x Hispanic	0.01	0.06	0.89
Education x Caribbean	−0.10	0.08	0.19
Female x Black	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.04	0.72
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.36
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.04	0.06
Party x Black	−0.05	0.06	0.43
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.62
Party x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.61
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.06	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.50
Ideology x Hispanic	0.14	0.07	0.04
Ideology x Caribbean	0.16	0.08	0.04
Close to group x Black	−0.17	0.06	0.00
Close to group x Asian	−0.22	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.18	0.06	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.26	0.07	0.00

Table 277: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2216).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.25	0.04	0.00	0.17	0.33
Blacks	0.08	0.04	0.06	−0.00	0.16
Asians	0.03	0.07	0.60	−0.10	0.16
Hispanics	0.07	0.04	0.09	−0.01	0.15
Caribbeans	−0.01	0.06	1.12	−0.12	0.11

Table 278: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 277).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.42	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.19	0.18	0.30
South	−0.03	0.03	0.22
Education	0.18	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.16
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.04	0.65
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.16	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.30	0.04	0.00
Black	0.12	0.09	0.20
Asian	0.29	0.11	0.01
Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.46
Caribbean	0.12	0.10	0.24
Age x Black	0.33	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.36	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.10	0.42
Age x Caribbean	0.13	0.11	0.24
Income x Black	0.51	0.78	0.52
Income x Asian	0.08	0.28	0.77
Income x Hispanic	0.30	0.26	0.26
Income x Caribbean	−0.20	0.35	0.56
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.39
South x Asian	0.07	0.05	0.18
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.33
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.05	0.19
Education x Black	−0.13	0.06	0.02
Education x Asian	−0.25	0.08	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.07	0.06	0.25
Education x Caribbean	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Female x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.34
Female x Asian	0.00	0.04	0.99
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.03	0.66
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.04	0.14
Party x Black	−0.05	0.06	0.47
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.27
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.64
Party x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.59
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.06	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.07	0.09	0.40
Ideology x Hispanic	0.15	0.07	0.03
Ideology x Caribbean	0.13	0.08	0.08
Close to group x Black	−0.24	0.07	0.00
Close to group x Asian	−0.28	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.06	0.05
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.22	0.08	0.00

Table 279: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2268).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.30	0.04	0.00	0.21	0.39
Blacks	0.06	0.05	0.26	−0.05	0.17
Asians	0.02	0.06	0.76	−0.10	0.14
Hispanics	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.09	0.26
Caribbeans	0.08	0.06	0.24	−0.05	0.20

Table 280: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 279).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.78	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.41	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.23	0.19	0.23
South	−0.02	0.03	0.40
Education	0.16	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.02	0.12
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.04	0.23
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.16	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.21	0.04	0.00
Black	0.04	0.09	0.64
Asian	0.23	0.11	0.03
Hispanic	0.05	0.08	0.50
Caribbean	0.11	0.11	0.31
Age x Black	0.32	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.36	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.10	0.56
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.11	0.24
Income x Black	0.42	0.76	0.59
Income x Asian	0.14	0.37	0.70
Income x Hispanic	0.32	0.28	0.26
Income x Caribbean	−0.13	0.36	0.71
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.37
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.21
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.47
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.06	0.24
Education x Black	−0.10	0.06	0.10
Education x Asian	−0.23	0.08	0.01
Education x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.55
Education x Caribbean	−0.14	0.08	0.08
Female x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.38
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.04	0.88
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.53
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.04	0.15
Party x Black	−0.07	0.07	0.27
Party x Asian	−0.11	0.07	0.14
Party x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.40
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.92
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.07	0.09	0.42
Ideology x Hispanic	0.12	0.07	0.09
Ideology x Caribbean	0.15	0.08	0.06
Close to group x Black	−0.13	0.06	0.03
Close to group x Asian	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.14	0.06	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.24	0.07	0.00

Table 281: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2153).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.21	0.04	0.00	0.14	0.29
Blacks	0.09	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.17
Asians	−0.02	0.06	1.25	−0.13	0.10
Hispanics	0.07	0.04	0.07	−0.01	0.15
Caribbeans	−0.03	0.06	1.36	−0.14	0.09

Table 282: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 281).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.73	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.40	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.19	0.18	0.29
South	−0.03	0.03	0.19
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.02	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.47
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.28	0.04	0.00
Black	0.08	0.09	0.35
Asian	0.24	0.10	0.02
Hispanic	0.16	0.08	0.06
Caribbean	0.11	0.11	0.28
Age x Black	0.30	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.34	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.05	0.10	0.57
Age x Caribbean	0.13	0.11	0.25
Income x Black	0.47	0.75	0.54
Income x Asian	0.08	0.28	0.78
Income x Hispanic	0.32	0.27	0.22
Income x Caribbean	−0.17	0.35	0.63
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.50
South x Asian	0.08	0.05	0.14
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.24
South x Caribbean	0.08	0.05	0.14
Education x Black	−0.09	0.06	0.11
Education x Asian	−0.23	0.08	0.01
Education x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.66
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.07	0.08
Female x Black	−0.05	0.03	0.18
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.04	0.73
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.36
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.04	0.07
Party x Black	−0.04	0.06	0.56
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.27
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.06	0.68
Party x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.69
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.06	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.53
Ideology x Hispanic	0.14	0.07	0.04
Ideology x Caribbean	0.15	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Black	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Close to group x Asian	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.33	0.06	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.26	0.07	0.00

Table 283: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2256).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.28	0.04	0.00	0.20	0.36
Blacks	0.07	0.05	0.12	−0.02	0.16
Asians	0.05	0.06	0.40	−0.07	0.17
Hispanics	−0.05	0.05	1.72	−0.15	0.04
Caribbeans	0.02	0.06	0.67	−0.09	0.13

Table 284: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 283).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.87	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.41	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.20	0.19	0.29
South	−0.02	0.03	0.42
Education	0.18	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.02	0.09
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.34
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.00	0.05	0.98
Black	−0.04	0.09	0.68
Asian	0.07	0.11	0.51
Hispanic	−0.02	0.09	0.86
Caribbean	−0.01	0.11	0.92
Age x Black	0.30	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.35	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.07	0.10	0.49
Age x Caribbean	0.13	0.11	0.24
Income x Black	0.36	0.76	0.64
Income x Asian	0.08	0.29	0.78
Income x Hispanic	0.34	0.27	0.22
Income x Caribbean	−0.16	0.36	0.65
South x Black	−0.05	0.04	0.23
South x Asian	0.06	0.05	0.28
South x Hispanic	0.02	0.04	0.55
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.05	0.22
Education x Black	−0.12	0.06	0.04
Education x Asian	−0.26	0.08	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.48
Education x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.03
Female x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.32
Female x Asian	−0.00	0.04	0.91
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.03	0.52
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.04	0.14
Party x Black	−0.05	0.06	0.45
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.24
Party x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.51
Party x Caribbean	0.02	0.08	0.79
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.06	0.01
Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.53
Ideology x Hispanic	0.14	0.07	0.04
Ideology x Caribbean	0.17	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Black	0.07	0.07	0.32
Close to group x Asian	0.10	0.09	0.26
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.00	0.07	0.99
Close to group x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.87

Table 285: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2267).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.00	0.05	0.98	−0.10	0.11
Blacks	0.07	0.04	0.11	−0.02	0.16
Asians	0.10	0.07	0.15	−0.03	0.23
Hispanics	0.00	0.05	1.00	−0.09	0.09
Caribbeans	0.01	0.06	0.80	−0.10	0.13

Table 286: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 285).

NPS: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figures 7 and 8

The stereotype items are coded from 0=hardworking to 1=lazy.

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Income	0.05	0.22	0.81
South	−0.01	0.03	0.70
Education	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.02	0.05	0.72
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.06	0.08
Close to Racial Group	0.15	0.05	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	0.02	0.07	0.75
Black	−0.11	0.11	0.33
Asian	−0.26	0.14	0.07
Hispanic	−0.05	0.10	0.65
Caribbean	−0.01	0.13	0.91
Age x Black	0.15	0.11	0.17
Age x Asian	−0.08	0.15	0.56
Age x Hispanic	−0.19	0.12	0.12
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.14	0.31
Income x Black	0.14	1.12	0.90
Income x Asian	−0.46	0.34	0.17
Income x Hispanic	0.16	0.35	0.65
Income x Caribbean	0.09	0.42	0.83
South x Black	−0.02	0.05	0.61
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.72
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.34
South x Caribbean	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Education x Black	0.03	0.07	0.72
Education x Asian	0.01	0.10	0.95
Education x Hispanic	0.08	0.07	0.26
Education x Caribbean	0.05	0.09	0.61
Female x Black	−0.01	0.04	0.79
Female x Asian	0.03	0.05	0.50
Female x Hispanic	−0.06	0.04	0.15
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.29
Party x Black	0.03	0.08	0.72
Party x Asian	0.17	0.08	0.05
Party x Hispanic	0.03	0.07	0.67
Party x Caribbean	−0.04	0.10	0.70
Ideology x Black	0.06	0.08	0.41
Ideology x Asian	0.15	0.11	0.17
Ideology x Hispanic	0.07	0.08	0.37
Ideology x Caribbean	0.00	0.09	0.98
Close to group x Black	0.01	0.07	0.93
Close to group x Asian	−0.16	0.10	0.10
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.07	0.09
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.02	0.09	0.83
Group lazy x Black	−0.09	0.10	0.33
Group lazy x Asian	0.10	0.15	0.48
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.09	0.10	0.36
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.11	0.12	0.37

Table 287: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2113).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.25
Blacks	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.26
Asians	−0.01	0.08	1.13	−0.17	0.15
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.60	−0.07	0.13
Caribbeans	0.13	0.07	0.06	−0.01	0.27

Table 288: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies(Appendix Table 287).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.75	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.24	0.07	0.00
Income	0.06	0.22	0.79
South	−0.02	0.03	0.49
Education	0.13	0.05	0.01
Female	0.05	0.03	0.07
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.05	0.33
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.06	0.04
Close to Racial Group	0.15	0.06	0.01
Racial Group Lazy	−0.07	0.07	0.27
Black	−0.21	0.12	0.08
Asian	−0.12	0.15	0.41
Hispanic	−0.08	0.11	0.47
Caribbean	−0.10	0.14	0.47
Age x Black	0.18	0.11	0.08
Age x Asian	−0.02	0.14	0.87
Age x Hispanic	−0.22	0.12	0.07
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.13	0.41
Income x Black	0.85	1.20	0.48
Income x Asian	−0.46	0.34	0.17
Income x Hispanic	0.19	0.35	0.59
Income x Caribbean	−0.00	0.42	1.00
South x Black	−0.02	0.05	0.73
South x Asian	0.05	0.06	0.42
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.27
South x Caribbean	−0.13	0.07	0.05
Education x Black	−0.01	0.07	0.84
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.61
Education x Hispanic	0.03	0.07	0.67
Education x Caribbean	−0.00	0.09	0.98
Female x Black	−0.00	0.04	0.97
Female x Asian	0.03	0.05	0.48
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.24
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.17
Party x Black	0.05	0.08	0.55
Party x Asian	0.16	0.09	0.07
Party x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.36
Party x Caribbean	−0.02	0.09	0.87
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.08	0.29
Ideology x Asian	0.13	0.11	0.21
Ideology x Hispanic	0.10	0.08	0.24
Ideology x Caribbean	0.05	0.09	0.62
Close to group x Black	−0.01	0.09	0.92
Close to group x Asian	−0.16	0.10	0.11
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.55
Close to group x Caribbean	0.09	0.10	0.36
Group lazy x Black	0.10	0.09	0.25
Group lazy x Asian	−0.16	0.12	0.17
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.05	0.09	0.59
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.07	0.11	0.50

Table 289: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2172).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.15	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.26
Blacks	0.14	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.27
Asians	−0.01	0.08	1.14	−0.17	0.15
Hispanics	0.10	0.05	0.07	−0.01	0.21
Caribbeans	0.24	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.40

Table 290: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies(Appendix Table 289).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.08	0.00
Income	0.06	0.23	0.79
South	−0.03	0.03	0.34
Education	0.10	0.05	0.05
Female	0.06	0.03	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.05	0.39
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.06	0.09
Close to Racial Group	0.14	0.05	0.01
Racial Group Lazy	−0.04	0.08	0.56
Black	−0.14	0.12	0.25
Asian	−0.32	0.15	0.04
Hispanic	−0.10	0.11	0.38
Caribbean	−0.11	0.15	0.46
Age x Black	0.15	0.12	0.19
Age x Asian	−0.26	0.16	0.12
Age x Hispanic	−0.23	0.13	0.09
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.14	0.43
Income x Black	−0.13	1.13	0.91
Income x Asian	−0.22	0.61	0.71
Income x Hispanic	0.05	0.37	0.88
Income x Caribbean	0.06	0.43	0.89
South x Black	0.02	0.05	0.64
South x Asian	0.05	0.07	0.50
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.31
South x Caribbean	−0.07	0.07	0.30
Education x Black	0.02	0.08	0.82
Education x Asian	0.02	0.11	0.84
Education x Hispanic	0.11	0.08	0.15
Education x Caribbean	0.07	0.10	0.49
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.73
Female x Asian	0.04	0.05	0.49
Female x Hispanic	−0.06	0.05	0.15
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.18
Party x Black	0.04	0.08	0.60
Party x Asian	0.16	0.10	0.09
Party x Hispanic	0.07	0.07	0.36
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.10	0.95
Ideology x Black	0.06	0.08	0.45
Ideology x Asian	0.15	0.12	0.20
Ideology x Hispanic	0.09	0.09	0.31
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.10	0.71
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.07	0.42
Close to group x Asian	−0.09	0.09	0.37
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.18	0.07	0.02
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.55
Group lazy x Black	0.01	0.10	0.90
Group lazy x Asian	0.14	0.15	0.33
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.01	0.10	0.92
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.01	0.13	0.97

Table 291: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=1910).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.14	0.05	0.01	0.04	0.25
Blacks	0.08	0.05	0.11	−0.02	0.19
Asians	0.06	0.08	0.45	−0.09	0.21
Hispanics	−0.03	0.05	1.46	−0.14	0.07
Caribbeans	0.09	0.08	0.24	−0.06	0.24

Table 292: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies(Appendix Table 291).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.70	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.07	0.22	0.75
South	−0.02	0.03	0.48
Education	0.13	0.05	0.00
Female	0.06	0.03	0.02
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.05	0.55
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.06	0.06
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.05	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.02	0.06	0.79
Black	−0.13	0.11	0.25
Asian	−0.17	0.14	0.22
Hispanic	0.05	0.11	0.66
Caribbean	−0.04	0.13	0.79
Age x Black	0.19	0.11	0.08
Age x Asian	−0.03	0.14	0.83
Age x Hispanic	−0.22	0.12	0.07
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.14	0.43
Income x Black	−0.06	1.11	0.96
Income x Asian	−0.53	0.33	0.12
Income x Hispanic	0.11	0.35	0.76
Income x Caribbean	0.05	0.42	0.91
South x Black	−0.02	0.05	0.73
South x Asian	0.04	0.06	0.57
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.30
South x Caribbean	−0.11	0.07	0.11
Education x Black	−0.00	0.07	0.98
Education x Asian	−0.04	0.10	0.71
Education x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.38
Education x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.49
Female x Black	−0.01	0.04	0.79
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.67
Female x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.19
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.15
Party x Black	0.05	0.08	0.54
Party x Asian	0.17	0.09	0.05
Party x Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.44
Party x Caribbean	−0.02	0.09	0.86
Ideology x Black	0.06	0.08	0.43
Ideology x Asian	0.14	0.11	0.21
Ideology x Hispanic	0.07	0.08	0.36
Ideology x Caribbean	0.05	0.09	0.61
Close to group x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.64
Close to group x Asian	−0.08	0.09	0.38
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.26	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.52
Group lazy x Black	−0.01	0.09	0.91
Group lazy x Asian	−0.22	0.12	0.05
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.07	0.09	0.42
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.07	0.11	0.49

Table 293: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2159).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.27
Blacks	0.13	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.24
Asians	0.09	0.08	0.26	−0.07	0.24
Hispanics	−0.09	0.06	1.86	−0.21	0.03
Caribbeans	0.12	0.07	0.09	−0.02	0.25

Table 294: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies(Appendix Table 293).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.71	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.21	0.07	0.00
Income	0.08	0.23	0.71
South	−0.02	0.03	0.61
Education	0.14	0.05	0.00
Female	0.06	0.03	0.02
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.44
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.06	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.06	0.06	0.37
Racial Group Lazy	0.10	0.07	0.15
Black	−0.07	0.12	0.55
Asian	−0.21	0.15	0.15
Hispanic	−0.04	0.11	0.71
Caribbean	−0.08	0.14	0.60
Age x Black	0.13	0.11	0.21
Age x Asian	−0.07	0.14	0.62
Age x Hispanic	−0.26	0.12	0.03
Age x Caribbean	0.06	0.14	0.64
Income x Black	−0.16	1.12	0.89
Income x Asian	−0.47	0.34	0.17
Income x Hispanic	0.15	0.36	0.68
Income x Caribbean	0.07	0.43	0.86
South x Black	−0.02	0.05	0.60
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.60
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.31
South x Caribbean	−0.09	0.07	0.17
Education x Black	−0.00	0.07	0.98
Education x Asian	−0.03	0.10	0.77
Education x Hispanic	0.05	0.07	0.51
Education x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.53
Female x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.64
Female x Asian	0.02	0.05	0.67
Female x Hispanic	−0.06	0.04	0.17
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.16
Party x Black	0.05	0.08	0.48
Party x Asian	0.18	0.08	0.04
Party x Hispanic	0.03	0.07	0.64
Party x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.75
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.08	0.31
Ideology x Asian	0.18	0.11	0.10
Ideology x Hispanic	0.09	0.08	0.28
Ideology x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.73
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.08	0.48
Close to group x Asian	−0.19	0.10	0.07
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.05	0.09	0.53
Close to group x Caribbean	0.05	0.10	0.63
Group lazy x Black	−0.04	0.09	0.68
Group lazy x Asian	0.03	0.14	0.84
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.07	0.09	0.44
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.09	0.11	0.41

Table 295: OLS model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2180).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.06	0.06	0.37	−0.07	0.19
Blacks	−0.00	0.05	1.02	−0.11	0.10
Asians	−0.13	0.08	1.89	−0.29	0.03
Hispanics	0.00	0.06	0.94	−0.11	0.12
Caribbeans	0.10	0.07	0.14	−0.03	0.24

Table 296: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups can be Political Allies(Appendix Table 295).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.83	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.20	0.21	0.34
South	−0.05	0.03	0.11
Education	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female	0.05	0.03	0.09
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.50
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.06	0.44
Close to Racial Group	0.13	0.05	0.01
Racial Group Lazy	−0.06	0.07	0.34
Black	−0.10	0.11	0.35
Asian	−0.05	0.14	0.74
Hispanic	−0.25	0.10	0.01
Caribbean	−0.10	0.13	0.43
Age x Black	0.20	0.11	0.06
Age x Asian	0.05	0.15	0.71
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.12	0.61
Age x Caribbean	0.10	0.13	0.48
Income x Black	−1.53	0.89	0.09
Income x Asian	−0.22	0.33	0.51
Income x Hispanic	0.18	0.35	0.60
Income x Caribbean	0.51	0.41	0.21
South x Black	0.01	0.05	0.77
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.73
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.82
South x Caribbean	0.12	0.07	0.07
Education x Black	0.11	0.07	0.13
Education x Asian	0.00	0.10	0.98
Education x Hispanic	0.30	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Female x Black	−0.06	0.04	0.18
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.05	0.38
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.39
Female x Caribbean	−0.02	0.05	0.75
Party x Black	−0.12	0.08	0.12
Party x Asian	−0.02	0.08	0.83
Party x Hispanic	−0.10	0.07	0.14
Party x Caribbean	−0.01	0.09	0.95
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.61
Ideology x Asian	−0.16	0.11	0.13
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.47
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.41
Close to group x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.27
Close to group x Asian	−0.17	0.09	0.06
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.11	0.07	0.11
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.12	0.08	0.17
Group lazy x Black	0.08	0.09	0.39
Group lazy x Asian	0.19	0.15	0.18
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.06	0.10	0.56
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.08	0.12	0.53

Table 297: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2143).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.13	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.22
Blacks	0.05	0.05	0.34	−0.05	0.15
Asians	−0.05	0.08	1.45	−0.20	0.11
Hispanics	0.01	0.05	0.79	−0.09	0.11
Caribbeans	0.01	0.07	0.87	−0.12	0.15

Table 298: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other(Appendix Table 297).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.06	0.00
Income	0.22	0.22	0.31
South	−0.06	0.03	0.06
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.04	0.03	0.09
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.04	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.05	0.45
Close to Racial Group	0.14	0.06	0.01
Racial Group Lazy	−0.12	0.06	0.07
Black	−0.07	0.12	0.54
Asian	0.10	0.15	0.49
Hispanic	−0.39	0.11	0.00
Caribbean	−0.10	0.14	0.47
Age x Black	0.20	0.10	0.06
Age x Asian	0.06	0.14	0.69
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.12	0.52
Age x Caribbean	0.06	0.13	0.62
Income x Black	−1.07	0.92	0.25
Income x Asian	−0.19	0.33	0.56
Income x Hispanic	0.24	0.35	0.50
Income x Caribbean	0.44	0.41	0.28
South x Black	0.03	0.04	0.50
South x Asian	0.06	0.06	0.37
South x Hispanic	0.02	0.04	0.72
South x Caribbean	0.08	0.06	0.22
Education x Black	0.05	0.07	0.46
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.62
Education x Hispanic	0.22	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.21	0.09	0.02
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.05	0.34
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.41
Female x Caribbean	−0.04	0.05	0.45
Party x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.28
Party x Asian	−0.01	0.08	0.93
Party x Hispanic	−0.08	0.07	0.21
Party x Caribbean	−0.02	0.09	0.85
Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Ideology x Asian	−0.17	0.10	0.09
Ideology x Hispanic	0.08	0.08	0.33
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.39
Close to group x Black	−0.13	0.09	0.14
Close to group x Asian	−0.23	0.10	0.02
Close to group x Hispanic	0.15	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Caribbean	0.02	0.10	0.86
Group lazy x Black	0.05	0.09	0.55
Group lazy x Asian	−0.10	0.11	0.38
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.02	0.09	0.83
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.09	0.10	0.40

Table 299: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2202).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.14	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.25
Blacks	0.01	0.07	0.83	−0.12	0.14
Asians	−0.09	0.08	1.76	−0.24	0.06
Hispanics	0.29	0.05	0.00	0.19	0.39
Caribbeans	0.16	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.31

Table 300: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other(Appendix Table 299).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.86	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.27	0.07	0.00
Income	0.22	0.23	0.33
South	−0.08	0.03	0.02
Education	0.14	0.05	0.01
Female	0.06	0.03	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.05	0.05	0.34
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.01	0.06	0.84
Close to Racial Group	0.14	0.05	0.01
Racial Group Lazy	−0.12	0.07	0.12
Black	−0.16	0.12	0.17
Asian	0.00	0.15	0.98
Hispanic	−0.28	0.11	0.01
Caribbean	−0.10	0.14	0.49
Age x Black	0.25	0.11	0.03
Age x Asian	−0.00	0.16	0.99
Age x Hispanic	0.10	0.13	0.45
Age x Caribbean	0.14	0.14	0.33
Income x Black	−1.54	0.90	0.09
Income x Asian	−1.11	0.60	0.07
Income x Hispanic	0.02	0.37	0.95
Income x Caribbean	0.55	0.42	0.20
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.39
South x Asian	0.07	0.07	0.31
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.05	0.50
South x Caribbean	0.15	0.07	0.02
Education x Black	0.08	0.08	0.29
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.11	0.92
Education x Hispanic	0.27	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.07
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Asian	−0.07	0.05	0.18
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.33
Female x Caribbean	−0.03	0.05	0.54
Party x Black	−0.07	0.08	0.41
Party x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.80
Party x Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.41
Party x Caribbean	−0.00	0.09	0.97
Ideology x Black	−0.07	0.08	0.37
Ideology x Asian	−0.26	0.12	0.03
Ideology x Hispanic	0.01	0.09	0.86
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.12	0.10	0.20
Close to group x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.16
Close to group x Asian	−0.19	0.09	0.04
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.16	0.09	0.08
Group lazy x Black	0.18	0.10	0.07
Group lazy x Asian	0.09	0.14	0.52
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.03	0.10	0.76
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.03	0.13	0.79

Table 301: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=1932).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.14	0.05	0.01	0.04	0.25
Blacks	0.04	0.05	0.45	−0.06	0.14
Asians	−0.05	0.08	1.44	−0.20	0.11
Hispanics	−0.02	0.05	1.30	−0.12	0.08
Caribbeans	−0.02	0.07	1.18	−0.16	0.13

Table 302: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other(Appendix Table 301).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Income	0.22	0.21	0.31
South	−0.05	0.03	0.08
Education	0.13	0.05	0.00
Female	0.06	0.03	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.04	0.04	0.42
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.05	0.46
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.05	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.07	0.06	0.23
Black	−0.08	0.11	0.47
Asian	0.03	0.14	0.85
Hispanic	−0.25	0.11	0.02
Caribbean	−0.11	0.13	0.40
Age x Black	0.20	0.11	0.06
Age x Asian	0.05	0.14	0.70
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.12	0.52
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.13	0.42
Income x Black	−1.41	0.89	0.11
Income x Asian	−0.23	0.33	0.49
Income x Hispanic	0.19	0.35	0.58
Income x Caribbean	0.51	0.41	0.22
South x Black	0.03	0.05	0.55
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.64
South x Hispanic	0.00	0.05	0.97
South x Caribbean	0.12	0.07	0.06
Education x Black	0.08	0.07	0.26
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.90
Education x Hispanic	0.28	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.05
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Asian	−0.07	0.05	0.17
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.30
Female x Caribbean	−0.04	0.05	0.44
Party x Black	−0.09	0.08	0.21
Party x Asian	−0.01	0.08	0.87
Party x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.16
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.88
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.56
Ideology x Asian	−0.18	0.11	0.10
Ideology x Hispanic	0.04	0.08	0.60
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.48
Close to group x Black	−0.13	0.08	0.10
Close to group x Asian	−0.19	0.09	0.04
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.19	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.08	0.08	0.35
Group lazy x Black	0.08	0.09	0.37
Group lazy x Asian	−0.03	0.11	0.79
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.16	0.09	0.08
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.07	0.11	0.52

Table 303: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2190).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.08	0.27
Blacks	0.05	0.06	0.38	−0.06	0.16
Asians	−0.02	0.08	1.19	−0.17	0.13
Hispanics	−0.02	0.06	1.25	−0.14	0.10
Caribbeans	0.10	0.07	0.15	−0.04	0.23

Table 304: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other(Appendix Table 303).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.92	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Income	0.24	0.22	0.28
South	−0.05	0.03	0.07
Education	0.16	0.05	0.00
Female	0.05	0.03	0.05
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.03	0.04	0.42
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.04	0.05	0.43
Close to Racial Group	−0.05	0.06	0.47
Racial Group Lazy	−0.10	0.07	0.13
Black	−0.22	0.12	0.06
Asian	−0.11	0.15	0.46
Hispanic	−0.46	0.11	0.00
Caribbean	−0.23	0.14	0.09
Age x Black	0.18	0.10	0.09
Age x Asian	0.01	0.14	0.96
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.12	0.60
Age x Caribbean	0.00	0.13	0.99
Income x Black	−1.55	0.89	0.08
Income x Asian	−0.27	0.33	0.42
Income x Hispanic	0.15	0.35	0.66
Income x Caribbean	0.45	0.42	0.28
South x Black	0.02	0.04	0.62
South x Asian	0.04	0.06	0.50
South x Hispanic	0.01	0.04	0.90
South x Caribbean	0.11	0.06	0.08
Education x Black	0.06	0.07	0.41
Education x Asian	−0.07	0.10	0.47
Education x Hispanic	0.23	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.05
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Asian	−0.06	0.05	0.21
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.45
Female x Caribbean	−0.05	0.05	0.33
Party x Black	−0.09	0.07	0.23
Party x Asian	−0.02	0.08	0.84
Party x Hispanic	−0.10	0.07	0.12
Party x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.76
Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Ideology x Asian	−0.16	0.11	0.13
Ideology x Hispanic	0.06	0.08	0.44
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.11	0.09	0.24
Close to group x Black	0.15	0.08	0.08
Close to group x Asian	0.11	0.10	0.26
Close to group x Hispanic	0.21	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	0.23	0.09	0.02
Group lazy x Black	0.08	0.09	0.40
Group lazy x Asian	−0.07	0.14	0.61
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.13	0.09	0.17
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.06	0.11	0.61

Table 305: OLS model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2213).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.05	0.06	1.53	−0.17	0.08
Blacks	0.10	0.05	0.06	−0.00	0.20
Asians	0.07	0.08	0.39	−0.09	0.22
Hispanics	0.16	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.27
Caribbeans	0.18	0.07	0.01	0.04	0.32

Table 306: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Groups Comfortable with Each Other(Appendix Table 305).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.84	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.41	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.26	0.18	0.16
South	−0.02	0.03	0.40
Education	0.11	0.04	0.01
Female	0.04	0.02	0.10
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.26
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.18	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.22	0.04	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.18	0.06	0.00
Black	−0.01	0.09	0.91
Asian	0.10	0.12	0.41
Hispanic	−0.03	0.08	0.69
Caribbean	0.04	0.11	0.72
Age x Black	0.29	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.37	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.09	0.10	0.40
Age x Caribbean	0.15	0.11	0.19
Income x Black	0.54	0.75	0.48
Income x Asian	0.18	0.28	0.53
Income x Hispanic	0.33	0.29	0.26
Income x Caribbean	−0.14	0.35	0.70
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.26
South x Asian	0.07	0.05	0.22
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.29
South x Caribbean	0.06	0.06	0.28
Education x Black	−0.05	0.06	0.46
Education x Asian	−0.19	0.08	0.02
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.72
Education x Caribbean	−0.07	0.08	0.33
Female x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.39
Female x Asian	0.00	0.04	0.96
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.48
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.04	0.06
Party x Black	−0.06	0.06	0.38
Party x Asian	−0.09	0.07	0.22
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.61
Party x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.71
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.07	0.01
Ideology x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.60
Ideology x Hispanic	0.16	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.15	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Black	−0.12	0.06	0.05
Close to group x Asian	−0.18	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.15	0.06	0.01
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Group lazy x Black	0.12	0.08	0.12
Group lazy x Asian	0.28	0.12	0.02
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.15	0.08	0.07
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.11	0.10	0.29

Table 307: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2144).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.22	0.04	0.00	0.14	0.30
Blacks	0.11	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.19
Asians	0.05	0.07	0.49	−0.09	0.18
Hispanics	0.07	0.04	0.10	−0.01	0.16
Caribbeans	−0.01	0.06	1.17	−0.13	0.10

Table 308: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage(Appendix Table 307).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.43	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.24	0.18	0.19
South	−0.04	0.03	0.15
Education	0.18	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.38
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.04	0.55
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.22	0.05	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.02	0.10	0.81
Asian	0.24	0.12	0.05
Hispanic	−0.01	0.09	0.92
Caribbean	−0.06	0.12	0.60
Age x Black	0.32	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.38	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.03	0.10	0.78
Age x Caribbean	0.15	0.11	0.18
Income x Black	0.52	0.78	0.51
Income x Asian	0.16	0.28	0.56
Income x Hispanic	0.36	0.29	0.22
Income x Caribbean	−0.15	0.35	0.68
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.45
South x Asian	0.09	0.05	0.09
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.04	0.16
South x Caribbean	0.08	0.05	0.14
Education x Black	−0.14	0.06	0.02
Education x Asian	−0.27	0.08	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.09	0.06	0.11
Education x Caribbean	−0.17	0.07	0.03
Female x Black	−0.02	0.03	0.55
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.72
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.03	0.80
Female x Caribbean	−0.05	0.04	0.24
Party x Black	−0.04	0.06	0.50
Party x Asian	−0.09	0.07	0.19
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.65
Party x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.61
Ideology x Black	0.14	0.06	0.03
Ideology x Asian	−0.08	0.09	0.36
Ideology x Hispanic	0.16	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.13	0.08	0.09
Close to group x Black	−0.15	0.07	0.03
Close to group x Asian	−0.24	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.07	0.07	0.28
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.13	0.08	0.11
Group lazy x Black	0.24	0.07	0.00
Group lazy x Asian	0.10	0.10	0.31
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.12	0.08	0.13
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.30	0.09	0.00

Table 309: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2204).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.22	0.05	0.00	0.13	0.32
Blacks	0.07	0.06	0.20	−0.04	0.18
Asians	−0.02	0.07	1.22	−0.15	0.11
Hispanics	0.15	0.04	0.00	0.07	0.24
Caribbeans	0.09	0.07	0.17	−0.04	0.22

Table 310: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage(Appendix Table 309).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.86	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.41	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.14	0.19	0.47
South	−0.03	0.03	0.28
Education	0.18	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.03	0.38
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.06	0.04	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.04	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.22	0.06	0.00
Black	−0.02	0.10	0.85
Asian	0.17	0.13	0.18
Hispanic	0.01	0.09	0.91
Caribbean	0.02	0.12	0.90
Age x Black	0.30	0.10	0.00
Age x Asian	0.36	0.14	0.01
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.11	0.47
Age x Caribbean	0.12	0.12	0.30
Income x Black	0.28	0.76	0.72
Income x Asian	0.06	0.51	0.91
Income x Hispanic	0.14	0.31	0.64
Income x Caribbean	−0.21	0.36	0.55
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.55
South x Asian	0.09	0.06	0.14
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.41
South x Caribbean	0.10	0.06	0.10
Education x Black	−0.13	0.06	0.04
Education x Asian	−0.27	0.09	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.06	0.06	0.35
Education x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.04
Female x Black	−0.01	0.04	0.89
Female x Asian	0.01	0.05	0.82
Female x Hispanic	0.00	0.04	0.91
Female x Caribbean	−0.04	0.04	0.33
Party x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.26
Party x Asian	−0.11	0.08	0.16
Party x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.38
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.93
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.07	0.10	0.46
Ideology x Hispanic	0.14	0.07	0.06
Ideology x Caribbean	0.13	0.08	0.12
Close to group x Black	−0.08	0.06	0.21
Close to group x Asian	−0.21	0.08	0.01
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.19	0.08	0.01
Group lazy x Black	0.10	0.08	0.22
Group lazy x Asian	0.17	0.12	0.16
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.10	0.09	0.24
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.23	0.11	0.03

Table 311: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=1931).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.08	0.26
Blacks	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.18
Asians	−0.04	0.06	1.45	−0.17	0.09
Hispanics	0.03	0.04	0.51	−0.06	0.12
Caribbeans	−0.02	0.06	1.25	−0.14	0.10

Table 312: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage(Appendix Table 311).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.82	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.40	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.21	0.18	0.23
South	−0.04	0.03	0.10
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.05	0.02	0.04
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.33
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.18	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.24	0.04	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	−0.19	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.01	0.10	0.95
Asian	0.16	0.12	0.16
Hispanic	0.04	0.09	0.69
Caribbean	0.07	0.11	0.51
Age x Black	0.28	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.37	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.10	0.57
Age x Caribbean	0.12	0.11	0.28
Income x Black	0.48	0.75	0.52
Income x Asian	0.11	0.28	0.70
Income x Hispanic	0.30	0.29	0.31
Income x Caribbean	−0.14	0.35	0.69
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.57
South x Asian	0.09	0.05	0.10
South x Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.12
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.06	0.19
Education x Black	−0.10	0.06	0.09
Education x Asian	−0.24	0.08	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.41
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.07	0.09
Female x Black	−0.04	0.03	0.20
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.04	0.78
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.37
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.04	0.08
Party x Black	−0.03	0.06	0.63
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.29
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.57
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.92
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.06	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.03	0.09	0.73
Ideology x Hispanic	0.15	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.15	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Black	−0.15	0.06	0.02
Close to group x Asian	−0.19	0.08	0.02
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.26	0.07	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Group lazy x Black	0.16	0.07	0.03
Group lazy x Asian	0.12	0.10	0.23
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.26	0.08	0.00
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.08	0.09	0.40

Table 313: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2188).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.24	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.32
Blacks	0.09	0.05	0.07	−0.01	0.18
Asians	0.05	0.07	0.46	−0.08	0.18
Hispanics	−0.03	0.05	1.38	−0.13	0.08
Caribbeans	0.02	0.06	0.78	−0.10	0.13

Table 314: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage(Appendix Table 313).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.92	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.43	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.21	0.19	0.27
South	−0.03	0.03	0.25
Education	0.19	0.04	0.00
Female	0.03	0.02	0.15
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.04	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	−0.01	0.05	0.79
Racial Group Lazy	−0.13	0.06	0.02
Black	−0.09	0.10	0.37
Asian	−0.02	0.12	0.88
Hispanic	−0.06	0.10	0.55
Caribbean	−0.14	0.12	0.24
Age x Black	0.30	0.09	0.00
Age x Asian	0.36	0.12	0.00
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.10	0.53
Age x Caribbean	0.16	0.12	0.15
Income x Black	0.33	0.76	0.67
Income x Asian	0.10	0.29	0.72
Income x Hispanic	0.29	0.30	0.34
Income x Caribbean	−0.10	0.36	0.79
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.33
South x Asian	0.07	0.05	0.22
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.32
South x Caribbean	0.07	0.06	0.20
Education x Black	−0.14	0.06	0.02
Education x Asian	−0.27	0.08	0.00
Education x Hispanic	−0.06	0.06	0.28
Education x Caribbean	−0.15	0.08	0.04
Female x Black	−0.03	0.03	0.37
Female x Asian	0.00	0.04	0.97
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.03	0.46
Female x Caribbean	−0.05	0.04	0.25
Party x Black	−0.06	0.06	0.38
Party x Asian	−0.09	0.07	0.20
Party x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.35
Party x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.93
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.06	0.02
Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.54
Ideology x Hispanic	0.14	0.07	0.04
Ideology x Caribbean	0.17	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Black	0.10	0.07	0.16
Close to group x Asian	0.13	0.09	0.14
Close to group x Hispanic	0.01	0.07	0.90
Close to group x Caribbean	0.05	0.08	0.53
Group lazy x Black	0.14	0.08	0.08
Group lazy x Asian	0.21	0.12	0.07
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.14	0.08	0.07
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.30	0.09	0.00

Table 315: OLS model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2213).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.01	0.05	1.21	−0.12	0.09
Blacks	0.09	0.05	0.06	−0.00	0.17
Asians	0.11	0.07	0.09	−0.02	0.25
Hispanics	−0.01	0.05	1.09	−0.10	0.09
Caribbeans	0.04	0.06	0.54	−0.08	0.15

Table 316: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Approval of Interracial Marriage(Appendix Table 315).

NPS: Chapter 5 Figures 9 through 13

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.19	0.07	0.01
Age	0.24	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.18	0.18	0.31
South	0.02	0.03	0.34
Education	−0.17	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.31
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.04	0.83
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.05	0.12
Close to Target Group	−0.22	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.12	0.05	0.03
Black	0.05	0.10	0.60
Hispanic	0.21	0.09	0.02
Caribbean	0.21	0.11	0.06
Age x Black	−0.04	0.09	0.64
Age x Hispanic	−0.17	0.10	0.07
Age x Caribbean	−0.01	0.11	0.92
Income x Black	−0.19	0.97	0.84
Income x Hispanic	0.11	0.26	0.68
Income x Caribbean	0.29	0.34	0.39
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.41
South x Hispanic	−0.06	0.04	0.10
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.05	0.61
Education x Black	0.06	0.06	0.30
Education x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.61
Education x Caribbean	0.07	0.07	0.37
Female x Black	0.04	0.03	0.23
Female x Hispanic	0.07	0.03	0.05
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.47
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.09	0.06	0.13
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.75
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.62
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.06	0.58
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.10	0.07	0.12
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.14	0.08	0.06
Close to Target Group x Black	0.12	0.06	0.03
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.16	0.06	0.01
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.75
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.69
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.20
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.52

Table 317: OLS model describing Competition from Asians (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1848). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.22	0.04	2.00	−0.29	−0.14
Black	−0.09	0.04	1.97	−0.18	−0.01
Hispanic	−0.06	0.04	1.83	−0.14	0.02
Caribbean	−0.19	0.06	2.00	−0.31	−0.08

Table 318: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Asians (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 317).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.18	0.06	0.00
Age	0.20	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.22	0.17	0.19
South	0.03	0.02	0.15
Education	−0.16	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.01	0.02	0.61
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.24
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.04	0.01
Close to Target Group	−0.23	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.10	0.05	0.04
Asian	0.14	0.11	0.20
Hispanic	0.18	0.09	0.04
Caribbean	0.20	0.10	0.06
Age x Asian	0.00	0.11	0.98
Age x Hispanic	−0.10	0.09	0.25
Age x Caribbean	0.05	0.10	0.63
Income x Asian	0.23	0.26	0.37
Income x Hispanic	0.21	0.24	0.39
Income x Caribbean	0.43	0.32	0.18
South x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.71
South x Hispanic	−0.09	0.03	0.01
South x Caribbean	−0.05	0.05	0.32
Education x Asian	0.11	0.08	0.14
Education x Hispanic	0.01	0.05	0.79
Education x Caribbean	−0.09	0.07	0.19
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.72
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.03	0.22
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.38
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.08	0.06	0.20
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.01	0.05	0.79
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	−0.01	0.07	0.94
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.08	0.49
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.09	0.06	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.10	0.07	0.17
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.12	0.07	0.11
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.06	0.06	0.30
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.14	0.08	0.06
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.01	0.08	0.93
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.70
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.08	0.07	0.27

Table 319: OLS model describing Competition from Blacks (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1693). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.23	0.04	2.00	−0.31	−0.14
Asian	−0.11	0.06	1.92	−0.23	0.01
Hispanic	−0.17	0.04	2.00	−0.24	−0.09
Caribbean	−0.08	0.06	1.81	−0.20	0.04

Table 320: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Blacks (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 319).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.19	0.07	0.00
Age	0.21	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.22	0.17	0.18
South	0.04	0.02	0.14
Education	−0.18	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.21
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.04	0.87
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.04	0.28
Close to Target Group	−0.21	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.11	0.05	0.03
Black	0.01	0.09	0.91
Asian	0.09	0.11	0.40
Hispanic	0.16	0.09	0.06
Age x Black	0.03	0.08	0.72
Age x Asian	−0.06	0.11	0.58
Age x Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.39
Income x Black	−0.48	0.91	0.60
Income x Asian	0.11	0.33	0.73
Income x Hispanic	0.07	0.24	0.78
South x Black	−0.01	0.04	0.76
South x Asian	−0.06	0.05	0.21
South x Hispanic	−0.06	0.04	0.07
Education x Black	0.02	0.06	0.71
Education x Asian	0.11	0.08	0.16
Education x Hispanic	−0.04	0.05	0.43
Female x Black	0.04	0.03	0.23
Female x Asian	−0.00	0.04	0.94
Female x Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.09
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.06	0.06	0.35
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.07	0.07	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.02	0.05	0.73
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	0.04	0.06	0.46
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.00	0.08	0.99
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.08	0.06	0.23
Close to Target Group x Black	0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.25	0.06	0.00
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.26	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.06	0.07	0.42
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.02	0.08	0.83
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.11	0.07	0.10

Table 321: OLS model describing Competition from Caribbeans (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1810). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.21	0.04	2.00	−0.28	−0.14
Black	−0.04	0.04	1.71	−0.11	0.03
Asian	0.04	0.05	0.43	−0.06	0.15
Hispanic	0.05	0.04	0.14	−0.02	0.12

Table 322: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Caribbeans (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 321).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.21	0.06	0.00
Age	0.23	0.05	0.00
Income	0.12	0.17	0.49
South	0.05	0.02	0.05
Education	−0.20	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.32
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.35
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.06
Close to Target Group	−0.30	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.17	0.05	0.00
Black	0.16	0.10	0.10
Asian	0.09	0.11	0.41
Caribbean	0.28	0.11	0.01
Age x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.86
Age x Asian	0.00	0.11	0.97
Age x Caribbean	0.04	0.10	0.73
Income x Black	−1.65	0.95	0.08
Income x Asian	−0.25	0.26	0.35
Income x Caribbean	0.35	0.33	0.29
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.21
South x Asian	−0.08	0.05	0.10
South x Caribbean	−0.09	0.05	0.10
Education x Black	0.06	0.06	0.32
Education x Asian	0.12	0.08	0.10
Education x Caribbean	0.04	0.07	0.60
Female x Black	0.02	0.03	0.49
Female x Asian	0.02	0.04	0.57
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	−0.00	0.06	0.98
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.22
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	−0.02	0.07	0.79
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.06	0.06	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.03	0.08	0.69
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.19	0.07	0.01
Close to Target Group x Black	0.21	0.06	0.00
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.27	0.07	0.00
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.16	0.07	0.02
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.12	0.08	0.12
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.08	0.08	0.31
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.04

Table 323: OLS model describing Competition from Hispanics (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1721). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.30	0.04	2.00	−0.37	−0.22
Black	−0.09	0.05	1.94	−0.18	0.00
Asian	−0.02	0.06	1.29	−0.14	0.10
Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	1.99	−0.24	−0.03

Table 324: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Hispanics (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 323).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.36	0.08	0.00
Age	0.32	0.07	0.00
Income	0.20	1.04	0.85
South	−0.00	0.03	0.94
Education	−0.12	0.05	0.01
Female	0.00	0.03	0.99
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.11	0.06	0.05
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.06	0.05	0.18
Close to Target Group	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.23	0.06	0.00
Asian	0.10	0.13	0.47
Hispanic	0.12	0.11	0.26
Caribbean	0.02	0.13	0.89
Age x Asian	−0.16	0.13	0.23
Age x Hispanic	−0.24	0.11	0.03
Age x Caribbean	−0.02	0.13	0.85
Income x Asian	−0.45	1.06	0.67
Income x Hispanic	−0.41	1.06	0.70
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	1.08	0.99
South x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.43
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.39
South x Caribbean	0.01	0.06	0.81
Education x Asian	0.01	0.09	0.90
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.79
Education x Caribbean	0.01	0.08	0.90
Female x Asian	0.02	0.04	0.69
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.32
Female x Caribbean	0.05	0.05	0.25
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	0.01	0.08	0.86
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.08	0.07	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.10	0.09	0.27
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.57
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	0.03	0.07	0.65
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.01	0.08	0.87
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.11	0.08	0.18
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.41
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.63
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.12	0.09	0.20
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.22	0.08	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.09	0.08	0.29

Table 325: OLS model describing Competition from Whites (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree) as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1556). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Blacks.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Blacks	−0.23	0.05	2.00	−0.33	−0.14
Asian	−0.12	0.07	1.91	−0.26	0.02
Hispanic	−0.18	0.05	2.00	−0.27	−0.08
Caribbean	−0.27	0.06	2.00	−0.39	−0.15

Table 326: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Whites (0=strongly disagree, 1=strongly agree)(Appendix Table 325).

NPS: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figures 9 through 13

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.23	0.08	0.00
Age	0.22	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.18	0.21	0.39
South	0.02	0.03	0.52
Education	−0.19	0.05	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.03	0.51
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology	0.09	0.05	0.08
Close to Target Group	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.06	0.06	0.32
Black	−0.07	0.12	0.58
Hispanic	0.19	0.11	0.08
Caribbean	0.31	0.13	0.02
Age x Black	0.17	0.10	0.09
Age x Hispanic	−0.12	0.11	0.28
Age x Caribbean	−0.17	0.13	0.18
Income x Black	−0.77	1.16	0.51
Income x Hispanic	0.15	0.31	0.62
Income x Caribbean	0.28	0.41	0.48
South x Black	0.01	0.04	0.88
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.76
South x Caribbean	0.04	0.06	0.56
Education x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.56
Education x Hispanic	−0.07	0.07	0.30
Education x Caribbean	−0.03	0.09	0.77
Female x Black	0.04	0.04	0.29
Female x Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.04
Female x Caribbean	0.01	0.05	0.86
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.08	0.07	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.83
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.88
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.14	0.08	0.06
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.17	0.08	0.03
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.14	0.09	0.12
Close to Target Group x Black	0.19	0.07	0.00
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.16	0.07	0.02
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.53
Close to Ingroup x Black	0.23	0.09	0.01
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.36
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.02	0.10	0.87

Table 327: OLS model describing Economic Competition from Asians as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1871). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.23	0.05	2.00	−0.32	−0.14
Black	−0.04	0.05	1.56	−0.14	0.06
Hispanic	−0.07	0.05	1.85	−0.17	0.03
Caribbean	−0.28	0.07	2.00	−0.42	−0.15

Table 328: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Economic Competition from Asians(Appendix Table 327).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.17	0.07	0.02
Age	0.21	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.21	0.20	0.28
South	0.02	0.03	0.45
Education	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Female	0.01	0.02	0.65
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.04	0.21
Lib-Con Ideology	0.12	0.05	0.01
Close to Target Group	−0.21	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.09	0.06	0.10
Asian	0.11	0.13	0.40
Hispanic	0.16	0.10	0.11
Caribbean	0.27	0.12	0.03
Age x Asian	−0.06	0.13	0.64
Age x Hispanic	−0.10	0.10	0.33
Age x Caribbean	−0.02	0.12	0.84
Income x Asian	0.18	0.30	0.54
Income x Hispanic	0.18	0.29	0.53
Income x Caribbean	0.44	0.38	0.24
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.67
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.29
South x Caribbean	0.01	0.06	0.81
Education x Asian	0.10	0.09	0.26
Education x Hispanic	0.00	0.06	0.97
Education x Caribbean	−0.12	0.08	0.13
Female x Asian	−0.00	0.04	1.00
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.23
Female x Caribbean	0.00	0.05	0.96
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.11	0.08	0.13
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.00	0.06	0.94
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	−0.03	0.08	0.70
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.55
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.17	0.07	0.02
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.08	0.44
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.19	0.09	0.03
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.09	0.07	0.19
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.12	0.09	0.17
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.92
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.02	0.08	0.79
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.12	0.09	0.18

Table 329: OLS model describing Economic Competition from Blacks as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1711). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.21	0.05	2.00	−0.31	−0.11
Asian	−0.02	0.07	1.24	−0.16	0.12
Hispanic	−0.12	0.05	1.99	−0.21	−0.03
Caribbean	−0.09	0.07	1.77	−0.23	0.05

Table 330: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Economic Competition from Blacks(Appendix Table 329).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.08	0.00
Age	0.16	0.06	0.01
Income	−0.24	0.20	0.23
South	0.03	0.03	0.26
Education	−0.20	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.01	0.02	0.63
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.04	0.39
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.05	0.16
Close to Target Group	−0.22	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.06	0.06	0.32
Black	−0.12	0.11	0.28
Asian	0.03	0.13	0.85
Hispanic	0.16	0.10	0.11
Age x Black	0.05	0.10	0.62
Age x Asian	−0.09	0.13	0.51
Age x Hispanic	−0.01	0.11	0.95
Income x Black	1.24	0.84	0.14
Income x Asian	0.28	0.39	0.47
Income x Hispanic	0.11	0.29	0.70
South x Black	0.03	0.04	0.47
South x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.48
South x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.22
Education x Black	−0.01	0.07	0.88
Education x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.61
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.47
Female x Black	0.01	0.04	0.69
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.87
Female x Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.09
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.09	0.07	0.22
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.10	0.08	0.21
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.49
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	0.08	0.07	0.26
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.00	0.10	0.98
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Close to Target Group x Black	0.18	0.06	0.00
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.30	0.08	0.00
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.27	0.06	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Black	0.03	0.09	0.72
Close to Ingroup x Asian	0.07	0.10	0.51
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.10	0.08	0.22

Table 331: OLS model describing Economic Competition from Caribbeans as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1834). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.22	0.04	2.00	−0.31	−0.14
Black	−0.05	0.05	1.70	−0.13	0.04
Asian	0.08	0.06	0.24	−0.05	0.20
Hispanic	0.05	0.04	0.23	−0.03	0.13

Table 332: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Economic Competition from Caribbeans(Appendix Table 331).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.27	0.08	0.00
Age	0.20	0.06	0.00
Income	0.19	0.21	0.37
South	0.04	0.03	0.19
Education	−0.25	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.58
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.05	0.04	0.29
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.05	0.20
Close to Target Group	−0.28	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.12	0.06	0.04
Black	0.08	0.12	0.52
Asian	0.01	0.14	0.95
Caribbean	0.40	0.13	0.00
Age x Black	0.03	0.10	0.79
Age x Asian	−0.06	0.14	0.68
Age x Caribbean	−0.01	0.13	0.93
Income x Black	−0.28	0.90	0.75
Income x Asian	−0.22	0.32	0.50
Income x Caribbean	−0.10	0.40	0.80
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.41
South x Asian	−0.07	0.06	0.28
South x Caribbean	−0.02	0.06	0.70
Education x Black	0.03	0.07	0.64
Education x Asian	0.09	0.09	0.33
Education x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.59
Female x Black	−0.00	0.04	0.95
Female x Asian	0.04	0.05	0.39
Female x Caribbean	−0.03	0.05	0.53
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.05	0.07	0.48
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.11	0.08	0.17
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	−0.09	0.09	0.31
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.02	0.07	0.75
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.00	0.10	1.00
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.15	0.09	0.09
Close to Target Group x Black	0.17	0.07	0.02
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.25	0.09	0.00
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.16	0.08	0.05
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.07	0.09	0.46
Close to Ingroup x Asian	0.01	0.10	0.91
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.16	0.09	0.08

Table 333: OLS model describing Economic Competition from Hispanics as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1741). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.28	0.05	2.00	−0.37	−0.18
Black	−0.11	0.06	1.94	−0.22	0.00
Asian	−0.02	0.07	1.24	−0.17	0.12
Caribbean	−0.12	0.07	1.92	−0.25	0.02

Table 334: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Economic Competition from Hispanics(Appendix Table 333).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.25	0.10	0.01
Age	0.43	0.09	0.00
Income	−0.84	1.24	0.50
South	0.03	0.03	0.40
Education	−0.23	0.06	0.00
Female	0.02	0.03	0.60
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.10	0.07	0.14
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.06	0.06	0.30
Close to Target Group	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.29	0.07	0.00
Asian	0.14	0.16	0.38
Hispanic	0.16	0.13	0.21
Caribbean	0.07	0.15	0.66
Age x Asian	−0.25	0.16	0.11
Age x Hispanic	−0.28	0.13	0.04
Age x Caribbean	−0.19	0.15	0.21
Income x Asian	0.55	1.27	0.67
Income x Hispanic	0.79	1.27	0.53
Income x Caribbean	0.80	1.30	0.54
South x Asian	−0.04	0.07	0.59
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.05	0.44
South x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.80
Education x Asian	0.00	0.10	0.98
Education x Hispanic	0.04	0.08	0.60
Education x Caribbean	0.06	0.10	0.56
Female x Asian	0.06	0.05	0.29
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.44
Female x Caribbean	0.05	0.06	0.34
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.03	0.10	0.79
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.05	0.09	0.58
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.10	0.11	0.37
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.09	0.11	0.42
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	0.09	0.08	0.26
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	0.12	0.10	0.21
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.06	0.10	0.52
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	−0.00	0.08	0.96
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.36
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.14	0.11	0.19
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.27	0.09	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.15	0.10	0.13

Table 335: OLS model describing Economic Competition from Whites as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1567). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Blacks.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Blacks	−0.17	0.05	2.00	−0.28	−0.06
Asian	−0.10	0.09	1.78	−0.27	0.06
Hispanic	−0.17	0.06	2.00	−0.29	−0.06
Caribbean	−0.25	0.07	2.00	−0.40	−0.11

Table 336: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Economic Competition from Whites(Appendix Table 335).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.11	0.08	0.15
Age	0.27	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.18	0.21	0.39
South	0.02	0.03	0.40
Education	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.24
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.04	0.92
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.05	0.14
Close to Target Group	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.17	0.06	0.01
Black	0.20	0.11	0.08
Hispanic	0.25	0.10	0.02
Caribbean	0.16	0.13	0.22
Age x Black	−0.06	0.10	0.52
Age x Hispanic	−0.22	0.11	0.04
Age x Caribbean	0.08	0.13	0.54
Income x Black	−1.67	1.12	0.13
Income x Hispanic	0.04	0.30	0.90
Income x Caribbean	0.28	0.39	0.47
South x Black	−0.06	0.04	0.13
South x Hispanic	−0.09	0.04	0.03
South x Caribbean	−0.08	0.06	0.19
Education x Black	0.08	0.07	0.26
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.75
Education x Caribbean	0.18	0.09	0.04
Female x Black	0.06	0.04	0.14
Female x Hispanic	0.05	0.04	0.18
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.03	0.07	0.67
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.01	0.06	0.83
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.71
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.07	0.53
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.06	0.08	0.43
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.16	0.09	0.06
Close to Target Group x Black	0.12	0.07	0.06
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.15	0.07	0.02
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.11	0.08	0.17
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.13	0.09	0.13
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.11	0.08	0.21
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.10	0.09	0.26

Table 337: OLS model describing Political Competition from Asians as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1871). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.19	0.04	2.00	−0.28	−0.11
Black	−0.07	0.05	1.87	−0.17	0.02
Hispanic	−0.04	0.05	1.65	−0.14	0.05
Caribbean	−0.08	0.07	1.78	−0.22	0.05

Table 338: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Political Competition from Asians(Appendix Table 337).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.18	0.07	0.01
Age	0.20	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.22	0.20	0.26
South	0.05	0.03	0.08
Education	−0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.20
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.03	0.04	0.39
Lib-Con Ideology	0.11	0.05	0.03
Close to Target Group	−0.25	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.12	0.06	0.05
Asian	0.19	0.13	0.13
Hispanic	0.21	0.10	0.04
Caribbean	0.11	0.12	0.39
Age x Asian	0.04	0.13	0.73
Age x Hispanic	−0.10	0.10	0.35
Age x Caribbean	0.07	0.12	0.57
Income x Asian	0.25	0.30	0.40
Income x Hispanic	0.23	0.29	0.42
Income x Caribbean	0.37	0.38	0.33
South x Asian	−0.07	0.06	0.25
South x Hispanic	−0.12	0.04	0.00
South x Caribbean	−0.13	0.06	0.03
Education x Asian	0.11	0.09	0.20
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.71
Education x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.53
Female x Asian	0.03	0.04	0.46
Female x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.48
Female x Caribbean	0.05	0.05	0.31
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.08	0.08	0.31
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.72
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.05	0.08	0.57
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.59
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.81
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.11	0.08	0.17
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.09	0.09	0.28
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.36
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.23	0.09	0.01
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.83
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.50
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.35

Table 339: OLS model describing Political Competition from Blacks as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1723). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.25	0.05	2.00	−0.35	−0.15
Asian	−0.16	0.07	1.97	−0.29	−0.02
Hispanic	−0.19	0.05	2.00	−0.28	−0.10
Caribbean	−0.02	0.07	1.24	−0.16	0.12

Table 340: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Political Competition from Blacks(Appendix Table 339).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.11	0.08	0.14
Age	0.27	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.21	0.19	0.29
South	0.04	0.03	0.20
Education	−0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.04	0.02	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.00	0.04	0.97
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.05	0.31
Close to Target Group	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.17	0.06	0.01
Black	0.20	0.11	0.06
Asian	0.19	0.13	0.13
Hispanic	0.20	0.10	0.05
Age x Black	0.01	0.10	0.93
Age x Asian	−0.04	0.13	0.73
Age x Hispanic	−0.14	0.10	0.17
Income x Black	−2.05	1.05	0.05
Income x Asian	−0.06	0.38	0.87
Income x Hispanic	0.01	0.28	0.98
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.29
South x Asian	−0.08	0.06	0.16
South x Hispanic	−0.07	0.04	0.08
Education x Black	0.04	0.06	0.56
Education x Asian	0.17	0.09	0.05
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.06	0.46
Female x Black	0.07	0.04	0.05
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.04	0.79
Female x Hispanic	0.05	0.04	0.18
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	−0.01	0.07	0.92
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.07	0.08	0.39
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.05	0.06	0.41
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.07	0.63
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.03	0.10	0.79
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.79
Close to Target Group x Black	0.15	0.06	0.01
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.20	0.07	0.01
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.25	0.06	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.18	0.09	0.04
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.11	0.09	0.22
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.14	0.08	0.09

Table 341: OLS model describing Political Competition from Caribbeans as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1846). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.19	0.04	2.00	−0.27	−0.11
Black	−0.04	0.04	1.61	−0.12	0.05
Asian	0.01	0.06	0.88	−0.11	0.13
Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.14	−0.02	0.14

Table 342: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Political Competition from Caribbeans(Appendix Table 341).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.14	0.07	0.06
Age	0.27	0.06	0.00
Income	0.05	0.20	0.79
South	0.05	0.03	0.06
Education	−0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.03	0.02	0.16
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.04	0.53
Lib-Con Ideology	0.09	0.05	0.05
Close to Target Group	−0.30	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.20	0.06	0.00
Black	0.21	0.11	0.05
Asian	0.18	0.12	0.15
Caribbean	0.16	0.12	0.19
Age x Black	−0.07	0.09	0.45
Age x Asian	0.03	0.13	0.78
Age x Caribbean	0.05	0.12	0.69
Income x Black	−1.14	1.06	0.28
Income x Asian	−0.28	0.30	0.35
Income x Caribbean	0.80	0.37	0.03
South x Black	−0.04	0.04	0.35
South x Asian	−0.09	0.06	0.10
South x Caribbean	−0.16	0.06	0.01
Education x Black	0.07	0.06	0.25
Education x Asian	0.17	0.08	0.05
Education x Caribbean	0.11	0.08	0.16
Female x Black	0.07	0.04	0.05
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.80
Female x Caribbean	0.09	0.04	0.03
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	−0.05	0.07	0.48
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.06	0.07	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.06	0.08	0.43
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.21
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.07	0.09	0.43
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.21	0.08	0.01
Close to Target Group x Black	0.24	0.07	0.00
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.28	0.08	0.00
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.15	0.08	0.06
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.16	0.08	0.06
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.17	0.09	0.06
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.16	0.09	0.07

Table 343: OLS model describing Political Competition from Hispanics as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1747). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.30	0.04	2.00	−0.39	−0.22
Black	−0.07	0.05	1.79	−0.17	0.04
Asian	−0.02	0.07	1.26	−0.16	0.11
Caribbean	−0.16	0.06	1.99	−0.28	−0.04

Table 344: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Political Competition from Hispanics(Appendix Table 343).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.47	0.10	0.00
Age	0.22	0.09	0.01
Income	1.06	1.26	0.40
South	−0.03	0.04	0.37
Education	0.01	0.06	0.92
Female	−0.02	0.03	0.54
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.09	0.07	0.16
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.06	0.06	0.29
Close to Target Group	−0.30	0.06	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.18	0.07	0.01
Asian	0.04	0.16	0.80
Hispanic	0.06	0.13	0.64
Caribbean	−0.01	0.15	0.94
Age x Asian	−0.10	0.16	0.53
Age x Hispanic	−0.20	0.14	0.14
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.15	0.48
Income x Asian	−1.26	1.29	0.33
Income x Hispanic	−1.44	1.28	0.26
Income x Caribbean	−0.66	1.32	0.62
South x Asian	−0.05	0.07	0.43
South x Hispanic	−0.02	0.05	0.66
South x Caribbean	0.00	0.07	0.95
Education x Asian	−0.00	0.11	0.98
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.08	0.82
Education x Caribbean	−0.07	0.10	0.48
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.65
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.42
Female x Caribbean	0.05	0.06	0.35
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	0.09	0.10	0.35
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.13	0.09	0.13
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.13	0.11	0.23
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.02	0.11	0.85
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.02	0.09	0.82
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.14	0.10	0.14
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.17	0.10	0.10
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.12	0.08	0.13
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	−0.00	0.09	0.96
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.10	0.11	0.34
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.17	0.10	0.07
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.04	0.10	0.67

Table 345: OLS model describing Political Competition from Whites as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1573). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Blacks.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Blacks	−0.30	0.06	2.00	−0.41	−0.19
Asian	−0.13	0.09	1.86	−0.29	0.04
Hispanic	−0.17	0.06	2.00	−0.29	−0.06
Caribbean	−0.30	0.07	2.00	−0.45	−0.15

Table 346: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Political Competition from Whites(Appendix Table 345).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.21	0.07	0.00
Age	0.23	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.18	0.18	0.31
South	0.02	0.03	0.39
Education	−0.17	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.33
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.00	0.04	0.95
Lib-Con Ideology	0.06	0.05	0.20
Close to Target Group	−0.21	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.11	0.05	0.03
Target Group Lazy	−0.02	0.06	0.73
Black	0.01	0.11	0.96
Hispanic	0.16	0.10	0.10
Caribbean	0.18	0.12	0.13
Age x Black	−0.03	0.09	0.76
Age x Hispanic	−0.16	0.10	0.10
Age x Caribbean	−0.00	0.11	0.99
Income x Black	−0.10	0.97	0.92
Income x Hispanic	0.04	0.28	0.89
Income x Caribbean	0.30	0.34	0.37
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.35
South x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.16
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.05	0.53
Education x Black	0.05	0.06	0.36
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.06	0.75
Education x Caribbean	0.06	0.08	0.41
Female x Black	0.03	0.03	0.34
Female x Hispanic	0.07	0.03	0.04
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.49
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.11	0.06	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.05	0.06	0.37
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.05	0.08	0.50
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.02	0.06	0.77
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.13	0.08	0.08
Close to Target Group x Black	0.12	0.06	0.05
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.16	0.06	0.01
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.78
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.87
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.07	0.07	0.36
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.61
Target Group Lazy x Black	0.09	0.08	0.23
Target Group Lazy x Hispanic	−0.02	0.08	0.76
Target Group Lazy x Caribbean	0.09	0.10	0.36

Table 347: OLS model describing Competition from Asians as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, Stereotypes of the Targeted Group (0=hardworking, 1=lazy), and personal attributes (NPS, N=1785). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.21	0.04	2.00	−0.29	−0.14
Black	−0.10	0.04	1.97	−0.18	−0.01
Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	1.79	−0.14	0.03
Caribbean	−0.19	0.06	2.00	−0.31	−0.07

Table 348: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Asians(Appendix Table 347).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.05	0.07	0.48
Age	0.22	0.05	0.00
Income	−0.19	0.17	0.25
South	0.04	0.02	0.10
Education	−0.16	0.03	0.00
Female	−0.00	0.02	0.99
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.04	0.03	0.26
Lib-Con Ideology	0.10	0.04	0.01
Close to Target Group	−0.16	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.08	0.05	0.09
Target Group Lazy	0.23	0.05	0.00
Asian	0.13	0.12	0.28
Hispanic	0.22	0.10	0.02
Caribbean	0.29	0.11	0.01
Age x Asian	0.01	0.11	0.95
Age x Hispanic	−0.11	0.09	0.25
Age x Caribbean	0.02	0.10	0.81
Income x Asian	0.16	0.26	0.53
Income x Hispanic	0.08	0.27	0.75
Income x Caribbean	0.41	0.32	0.20
South x Asian	−0.04	0.05	0.40
South x Hispanic	−0.09	0.04	0.01
South x Caribbean	−0.05	0.05	0.30
Education x Asian	0.13	0.08	0.09
Education x Hispanic	0.03	0.05	0.59
Education x Caribbean	−0.09	0.07	0.19
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.87
Female x Hispanic	0.04	0.03	0.18
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.49
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.08	0.07	0.22
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.02	0.05	0.67
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.00	0.07	0.97
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.05	0.08	0.57
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.09	0.06	0.17
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.09	0.07	0.22
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.10	0.08	0.21
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.73
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.10	0.08	0.20
Close to Ingroup x Asian	0.01	0.08	0.93
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.85
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.08	0.08	0.31
Target Group Lazy x Asian	−0.04	0.09	0.68
Target Group Lazy x Hispanic	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Target Group Lazy x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.05

Table 349: OLS model describing Competition from Blacks as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, Stereotypes of the Targeted Group (0=hardworking, 1=lazy), and personal attributes (NPS, N=1647). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.16	0.04	2.00	−0.24	−0.07
Asian	−0.06	0.07	1.61	−0.18	0.07
Hispanic	−0.14	0.04	2.00	−0.22	−0.05
Caribbean	−0.05	0.07	1.60	−0.18	0.07

Table 350: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Blacks(Appendix Table 349).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.12	0.08	0.11
Age	0.21	0.06	0.00
Income	−0.22	0.17	0.20
South	0.04	0.03	0.08
Education	−0.19	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.30
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.01	0.04	0.82
Lib-Con Ideology	0.03	0.05	0.58
Close to Target Group	−0.18	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.14	0.06	0.01
Target Group Lazy	0.14	0.06	0.01
Black	0.06	0.11	0.59
Asian	0.14	0.13	0.29
Hispanic	0.18	0.10	0.08
Age x Black	0.04	0.09	0.63
Age x Asian	−0.07	0.12	0.56
Age x Hispanic	−0.04	0.10	0.72
Income x Black	−0.31	0.91	0.73
Income x Asian	0.34	0.46	0.45
Income x Hispanic	0.24	0.28	0.38
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.35
South x Asian	−0.08	0.05	0.13
South x Hispanic	−0.07	0.04	0.06
Education x Black	0.04	0.06	0.50
Education x Asian	0.11	0.08	0.20
Education x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.61
Female x Black	0.04	0.03	0.26
Female x Asian	−0.00	0.04	0.92
Female x Hispanic	0.06	0.03	0.08
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.06	0.06	0.35
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.10	0.07	0.19
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.04	0.06	0.46
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	0.07	0.06	0.26
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.02	0.09	0.79
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.34
Close to Target Group x Black	0.15	0.06	0.01
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.24	0.07	0.00
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.22	0.06	0.00
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.11	0.08	0.15
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.01	0.09	0.90
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.23
Target Group Lazy x Black	−0.05	0.08	0.54
Target Group Lazy x Asian	−0.12	0.11	0.28
Target Group Lazy x Hispanic	−0.18	0.08	0.02

Table 351: OLS model describing Competition from Caribbeans as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, Stereotypes of the Targeted Group (0=hardworking, 1=lazy), and personal attributes (NPS, N=1627). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.18	0.04	2.00	−0.26	−0.10
Black	−0.03	0.04	1.49	−0.11	0.05
Asian	0.06	0.06	0.28	−0.05	0.18
Hispanic	0.04	0.04	0.30	−0.04	0.12

Table 352: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Caribbeans(Appendix Table 351).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.17	0.07	0.01
Age	0.23	0.05	0.00
Income	0.12	0.17	0.48
South	0.05	0.02	0.03
Education	−0.21	0.04	0.00
Female	−0.02	0.02	0.48
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.02	0.04	0.56
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.04	0.09
Close to Target Group	−0.27	0.04	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.16	0.05	0.00
Target Group Lazy	0.10	0.05	0.05
Black	0.18	0.10	0.08
Asian	0.05	0.12	0.67
Caribbean	0.25	0.11	0.03
Age x Black	−0.01	0.09	0.87
Age x Asian	0.01	0.12	0.94
Age x Caribbean	0.07	0.11	0.52
Income x Black	−1.64	0.95	0.08
Income x Asian	−0.26	0.27	0.32
Income x Caribbean	0.35	0.33	0.28
South x Black	−0.05	0.04	0.19
South x Asian	−0.09	0.05	0.09
South x Caribbean	−0.08	0.05	0.16
Education x Black	0.06	0.06	0.27
Education x Asian	0.14	0.08	0.08
Education x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.74
Female x Black	0.01	0.03	0.84
Female x Asian	0.02	0.04	0.66
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.04	0.39
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Black	0.01	0.06	0.90
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	−0.07	0.07	0.28
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.01	0.07	0.92
Lib-Con Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.06	0.40
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	−0.03	0.09	0.71
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.17	0.07	0.02
Close to Target Group x Black	0.18	0.06	0.00
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.28	0.08	0.00
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	0.13	0.07	0.07
Close to Ingroup x Black	−0.11	0.08	0.13
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.08	0.08	0.35
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.14	0.08	0.09
Target Group Lazy x Black	−0.02	0.07	0.82
Target Group Lazy x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.55
Target Group Lazy x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.80

Table 353: OLS model describing Competition from Hispanics as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, Stereotypes of the Targeted Group (0=hardworking, 1=lazy), and personal attributes (NPS, N=1671). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Whites.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.27	0.04	2.00	−0.35	−0.19
Black	−0.09	0.05	1.94	−0.18	0.00
Asian	0.01	0.06	0.88	−0.11	0.13
Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	1.99	−0.25	−0.03

Table 354: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Hispanics(Appendix Table 353).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.34	0.08	0.00
Age	0.34	0.07	0.00
Income	0.17	1.04	0.87
South	−0.00	0.03	0.89
Education	−0.13	0.05	0.01
Female	0.00	0.03	0.88
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.10	0.06	0.06
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.06	0.05	0.20
Close to Target Group	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Ingroup	0.23	0.06	0.00
Target Group Lazy	0.07	0.05	0.18
Asian	0.12	0.14	0.39
Hispanic	0.12	0.11	0.27
Caribbean	0.04	0.14	0.77
Age x Asian	−0.17	0.13	0.19
Age x Hispanic	−0.27	0.12	0.02
Age x Caribbean	−0.01	0.13	0.95
Income x Asian	−0.42	1.07	0.69
Income x Hispanic	−0.32	1.07	0.77
Income x Caribbean	0.02	1.09	0.98
South x Asian	−0.05	0.06	0.42
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.43
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	0.94
Education x Asian	0.03	0.09	0.72
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.74
Education x Caribbean	0.00	0.08	0.96
Female x Asian	0.01	0.04	0.81
Female x Hispanic	0.03	0.04	0.44
Female x Caribbean	0.05	0.05	0.27
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Asian	0.01	0.08	0.89
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Hispanic	0.08	0.07	0.28
Dem-Rep Partisanship x Caribbean	0.10	0.09	0.29
Lib-Con Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.59
Lib-Con Ideology x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.81
Lib-Con Ideology x Caribbean	−0.01	0.08	0.89
Close to Target Group x Asian	0.10	0.09	0.23
Close to Target Group x Hispanic	0.06	0.07	0.38
Close to Target Group x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.58
Close to Ingroup x Asian	−0.11	0.09	0.22
Close to Ingroup x Hispanic	−0.20	0.08	0.01
Close to Ingroup x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.38
Target Group Lazy x Asian	−0.08	0.12	0.50
Target Group Lazy x Hispanic	−0.04	0.08	0.65
Target Group Lazy x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.43

Table 355: OLS model describing Competition from Whites as a function of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group, Closeness to Racial Ingroup, Stereotypes of the Targeted Group (0=hardworking, 1=lazy), and personal attributes (NPS, N=1517). Members of the targeted group are never included in the model. The racial group not explicitly represented by an indicator (i.e. the excluded dummy variable) is Blacks.

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Blacks	−0.23	0.05	2.00	−0.33	−0.14
Asian	−0.13	0.07	1.93	−0.27	0.01
Hispanic	−0.17	0.05	2.00	−0.27	−0.08
Caribbean	−0.28	0.06	2.00	−0.40	−0.16

Table 356: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Targeted Racial Group for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Competition from Whites(Appendix Table 355).

NPS: Chapter 5 Figure 14 (and extra analyses)

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.57	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.09	0.08	0.28
Income	−0.42	0.26	0.11
South	−0.03	0.04	0.50
Education	−0.08	0.06	0.18
Female	0.12	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.29	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.26	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.11	0.06	0.06
Black	0.24	0.13	0.06
Asian	0.00	0.16	0.98
Hispanic	0.09	0.12	0.47
Caribbean	0.14	0.15	0.38
Age x Black	0.10	0.13	0.47
Age x Asian	0.06	0.18	0.74
Age x Hispanic	0.05	0.15	0.75
Age x Caribbean	0.27	0.17	0.12
Income x Black	−1.34	1.34	0.32
Income x Asian	0.73	0.40	0.07
Income x Hispanic	0.74	0.42	0.08
Income x Caribbean	0.67	0.50	0.18
South x Black	0.00	0.06	0.99
South x Asian	0.04	0.08	0.60
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.06	0.55
South x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.59
Education x Black	0.14	0.09	0.12
Education x Asian	0.13	0.12	0.30
Education x Hispanic	−0.10	0.09	0.24
Education x Caribbean	0.22	0.11	0.05
Female x Black	−0.14	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.06	0.57
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.85
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Party x Black	−0.12	0.09	0.21
Party x Asian	−0.16	0.10	0.12
Party x Hispanic	−0.13	0.09	0.13
Party x Caribbean	−0.12	0.12	0.33
Ideology x Black	0.09	0.09	0.35
Ideology x Asian	0.07	0.13	0.62
Ideology x Hispanic	0.29	0.10	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.21	0.11	0.07
Close to group x Black	−0.07	0.09	0.38
Close to group x Asian	−0.04	0.12	0.73
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.39
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.24	0.11	0.02

Table 357: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2022).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.11	0.06	0.06	−0.00	0.23
Blacks	0.04	0.06	0.54	−0.08	0.16
Asians	0.07	0.10	0.46	−0.12	0.27
Hispanics	0.04	0.07	0.58	−0.09	0.17
Caribbeans	−0.13	0.09	1.85	−0.30	0.04

Table 358: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 357).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.46	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.08	0.34
Income	−0.41	0.26	0.12
South	−0.04	0.04	0.34
Education	−0.05	0.06	0.39
Female	0.11	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.28	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.23	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.22	0.07	0.00
Black	0.29	0.14	0.04
Asian	0.07	0.16	0.66
Hispanic	0.18	0.12	0.14
Caribbean	0.15	0.16	0.33
Age x Black	0.09	0.13	0.46
Age x Asian	0.07	0.18	0.70
Age x Hispanic	0.07	0.15	0.64
Age x Caribbean	0.24	0.17	0.16
Income x Black	−1.91	1.45	0.19
Income x Asian	0.69	0.40	0.09
Income x Hispanic	0.69	0.42	0.10
Income x Caribbean	0.63	0.51	0.21
South x Black	0.02	0.05	0.77
South x Asian	0.03	0.08	0.70
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.06	0.44
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.08	0.76
Education x Black	0.12	0.09	0.17
Education x Asian	0.09	0.12	0.46
Education x Hispanic	−0.13	0.09	0.13
Education x Caribbean	0.17	0.11	0.12
Female x Black	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.06	0.06	0.34
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.91
Female x Caribbean	−0.15	0.06	0.02
Party x Black	−0.11	0.09	0.23
Party x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.09
Party x Hispanic	−0.11	0.09	0.19
Party x Caribbean	−0.09	0.12	0.45
Ideology x Black	0.07	0.09	0.45
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.13	0.82
Ideology x Hispanic	0.25	0.10	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.19	0.11	0.09
Close to group x Black	−0.14	0.10	0.19
Close to group x Asian	0.02	0.12	0.84
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.20	0.10	0.04
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.18	0.12	0.13

Table 359: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2062).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.22	0.07	0.00	0.09	0.36
Blacks	0.09	0.08	0.28	−0.07	0.24
Asians	0.25	0.10	0.01	0.06	0.44
Hispanics	0.02	0.07	0.73	−0.11	0.16
Caribbeans	0.05	0.10	0.63	−0.14	0.24

Table 360: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 359).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.06	0.08	0.45
Income	−0.42	0.27	0.11
South	−0.04	0.04	0.28
Education	−0.07	0.06	0.24
Female	0.14	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.25	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.26	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.21	0.06	0.00
Black	0.27	0.13	0.03
Asian	0.11	0.15	0.48
Hispanic	0.09	0.12	0.45
Caribbean	0.08	0.16	0.59
Age x Black	0.09	0.13	0.50
Age x Asian	0.10	0.18	0.58
Age x Hispanic	0.05	0.15	0.74
Age x Caribbean	0.24	0.17	0.17
Income x Black	−1.53	1.34	0.26
Income x Asian	0.64	0.52	0.22
Income x Hispanic	0.69	0.43	0.11
Income x Caribbean	0.64	0.51	0.21
South x Black	0.03	0.06	0.59
South x Asian	0.10	0.08	0.23
South x Hispanic	0.06	0.06	0.35
South x Caribbean	−0.01	0.08	0.87
Education x Black	0.13	0.09	0.13
Education x Asian	0.08	0.13	0.52
Education x Hispanic	−0.12	0.09	0.16
Education x Caribbean	0.18	0.11	0.11
Female x Black	−0.17	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.06	0.06	0.29
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.05	0.55
Female x Caribbean	−0.16	0.06	0.01
Party x Black	−0.09	0.10	0.34
Party x Asian	−0.15	0.11	0.14
Party x Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.34
Party x Caribbean	−0.07	0.12	0.55
Ideology x Black	0.09	0.10	0.33
Ideology x Asian	0.06	0.13	0.67
Ideology x Hispanic	0.29	0.11	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.24	0.12	0.04
Close to group x Black	−0.16	0.08	0.05
Close to group x Asian	−0.11	0.10	0.29
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.08	0.16
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.16	0.11	0.13

Table 361: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=1969).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.21	0.06	0.00	0.09	0.32
Blacks	0.05	0.06	0.42	−0.07	0.16
Asians	0.10	0.09	0.27	−0.07	0.27
Hispanics	0.09	0.06	0.15	−0.03	0.21
Caribbeans	0.05	0.09	0.60	−0.13	0.22

Table 362: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 361).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.55	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.08	0.29
Income	−0.40	0.26	0.13
South	−0.02	0.04	0.54
Education	−0.05	0.06	0.40
Female	0.12	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.31	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.25	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.06	0.06	0.32
Black	0.27	0.13	0.04
Asian	0.02	0.15	0.90
Hispanic	−0.03	0.13	0.83
Caribbean	0.07	0.16	0.65
Age x Black	0.08	0.13	0.54
Age x Asian	0.06	0.18	0.72
Age x Hispanic	0.09	0.15	0.55
Age x Caribbean	0.25	0.17	0.14
Income x Black	−1.36	1.34	0.31
Income x Asian	0.67	0.40	0.09
Income x Hispanic	0.71	0.42	0.09
Income x Caribbean	0.62	0.50	0.22
South x Black	0.00	0.06	0.94
South x Asian	0.05	0.08	0.58
South x Hispanic	0.02	0.06	0.67
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Education x Black	0.10	0.09	0.24
Education x Asian	0.10	0.12	0.43
Education x Hispanic	−0.14	0.09	0.10
Education x Caribbean	0.17	0.11	0.13
Female x Black	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.47
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.79
Female x Caribbean	−0.16	0.06	0.01
Party x Black	−0.11	0.09	0.23
Party x Asian	−0.20	0.10	0.05
Party x Hispanic	−0.18	0.09	0.04
Party x Caribbean	−0.10	0.12	0.43
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.09	0.42
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.13	0.83
Ideology x Hispanic	0.25	0.10	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.20	0.11	0.08
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.09	0.51
Close to group x Asian	0.10	0.11	0.39
Close to group x Hispanic	0.15	0.10	0.12
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.03	0.10	0.77

Table 363: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2053).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.06	0.06	0.32	−0.06	0.18
Blacks	0.00	0.07	0.99	−0.13	0.13
Asians	0.16	0.09	0.09	−0.03	0.34
Hispanics	0.22	0.08	0.01	0.06	0.37
Caribbeans	0.03	0.08	0.72	−0.14	0.20

Table 364: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 363).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.54	0.10	0.00
Age	−0.06	0.08	0.49
Income	−0.41	0.27	0.12
South	−0.02	0.04	0.54
Education	−0.05	0.06	0.34
Female	0.12	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.30	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.25	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.05	0.08	0.49
Black	0.29	0.14	0.04
Asian	0.14	0.17	0.38
Hispanic	0.18	0.13	0.17
Caribbean	0.08	0.17	0.63
Age x Black	0.06	0.13	0.66
Age x Asian	0.04	0.18	0.81
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.15	0.67
Age x Caribbean	0.21	0.17	0.23
Income x Black	−1.39	1.34	0.30
Income x Asian	0.71	0.40	0.08
Income x Hispanic	0.69	0.42	0.10
Income x Caribbean	0.64	0.51	0.21
South x Black	0.00	0.05	0.99
South x Asian	0.05	0.08	0.55
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.06	0.59
South x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.62
Education x Black	0.11	0.09	0.20
Education x Asian	0.10	0.12	0.41
Education x Hispanic	−0.11	0.09	0.22
Education x Caribbean	0.18	0.11	0.11
Female x Black	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.06	0.39
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.89
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	0.02
Party x Black	−0.12	0.09	0.20
Party x Asian	−0.17	0.10	0.10
Party x Hispanic	−0.14	0.09	0.10
Party x Caribbean	−0.11	0.12	0.37
Ideology x Black	0.09	0.09	0.35
Ideology x Asian	0.06	0.13	0.62
Ideology x Hispanic	0.26	0.10	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.22	0.11	0.05
Close to group x Black	−0.07	0.10	0.51
Close to group x Asian	−0.16	0.13	0.19
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.18	0.11	0.10
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.02	0.12	0.89

Table 365: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2065).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.05	0.08	0.49	−0.10	0.21
Blacks	−0.01	0.06	1.17	−0.14	0.11
Asians	−0.11	0.10	1.73	−0.30	0.08
Hispanics	−0.12	0.07	1.91	−0.27	0.02
Caribbeans	0.04	0.09	0.67	−0.13	0.21

Table 366: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 365).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.07	0.24
Income	−0.05	0.22	0.82
South	−0.03	0.03	0.32
Education	0.07	0.05	0.14
Female	0.01	0.03	0.84
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.05	0.15
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.06	0.23
Close to Racial Group	0.13	0.05	0.01
Black	−0.07	0.10	0.52
Asian	0.14	0.13	0.31
Hispanic	−0.13	0.10	0.18
Caribbean	−0.10	0.13	0.45
Age x Black	0.24	0.11	0.03
Age x Asian	0.14	0.14	0.34
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.12	0.50
Age x Caribbean	0.09	0.14	0.50
Income x Black	−0.95	0.91	0.30
Income x Asian	0.05	0.34	0.89
Income x Hispanic	−0.06	0.32	0.86
Income x Caribbean	−0.13	0.43	0.75
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.37
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.28
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.35
South x Caribbean	0.09	0.07	0.20
Education x Black	0.00	0.07	0.96
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.94
Education x Hispanic	0.01	0.07	0.90
Education x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.43
Female x Black	0.04	0.04	0.31
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.71
Female x Hispanic	0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.05	0.52
Party x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.90
Party x Asian	−0.07	0.09	0.44
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.89
Party x Caribbean	0.15	0.10	0.11
Ideology x Black	0.02	0.08	0.83
Ideology x Asian	−0.16	0.11	0.14
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.07	0.08	0.39
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.52
Close to group x Black	−0.19	0.07	0.01
Close to group x Asian	−0.29	0.09	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.22
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.21	0.09	0.02

Table 367: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2206).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.13	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.22
Blacks	−0.06	0.05	1.75	−0.16	0.04
Asians	−0.16	0.08	1.95	−0.32	0.00
Hispanics	0.04	0.05	0.40	−0.06	0.14
Caribbeans	−0.08	0.07	1.73	−0.22	0.06

Table 368: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 367).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.50	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.09	0.07	0.16
Income	−0.03	0.22	0.91
South	−0.03	0.03	0.33
Education	0.10	0.05	0.03
Female	−0.00	0.03	0.94
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.09	0.04	0.05
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.06	0.34
Close to Racial Group	0.16	0.05	0.00
Black	−0.00	0.11	0.98
Asian	0.05	0.13	0.73
Hispanic	−0.10	0.10	0.30
Caribbean	−0.15	0.13	0.26
Age x Black	0.26	0.11	0.01
Age x Asian	0.17	0.14	0.23
Age x Hispanic	0.09	0.12	0.44
Age x Caribbean	0.12	0.14	0.38
Income x Black	−0.85	0.96	0.38
Income x Asian	0.07	0.34	0.85
Income x Hispanic	−0.08	0.32	0.81
Income x Caribbean	−0.19	0.43	0.65
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.39
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.25
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.27
South x Caribbean	0.09	0.07	0.17
Education x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.60
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.59
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.77
Education x Caribbean	−0.14	0.09	0.13
Female x Black	0.05	0.04	0.23
Female x Asian	−0.00	0.05	0.96
Female x Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.06
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.44
Party x Black	0.02	0.08	0.81
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.52
Party x Hispanic	−0.00	0.07	0.94
Party x Caribbean	0.14	0.10	0.15
Ideology x Black	0.03	0.08	0.74
Ideology x Asian	−0.15	0.11	0.15
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.54
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.04	0.09	0.64
Close to group x Black	−0.25	0.09	0.00
Close to group x Asian	−0.14	0.09	0.12
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.12	0.08	0.11
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.10	0.57

Table 369: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2255).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.16	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.26
Blacks	−0.09	0.07	1.81	−0.22	0.04
Asians	0.01	0.08	0.86	−0.14	0.16
Hispanics	0.04	0.05	0.46	−0.06	0.14
Caribbeans	0.10	0.08	0.19	−0.05	0.26

Table 370: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 369).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.52	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.09	0.07	0.23
Income	−0.06	0.23	0.80
South	−0.03	0.03	0.41
Education	0.12	0.05	0.01
Female	0.02	0.03	0.53
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.06	0.05	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology	0.08	0.06	0.17
Close to Racial Group	0.05	0.05	0.26
Black	−0.07	0.11	0.49
Asian	0.01	0.13	0.91
Hispanic	−0.11	0.10	0.27
Caribbean	−0.06	0.13	0.62
Age x Black	0.24	0.11	0.03
Age x Asian	0.17	0.15	0.25
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.12	0.52
Age x Caribbean	0.10	0.14	0.46
Income x Black	−0.91	0.92	0.32
Income x Asian	0.36	0.45	0.42
Income x Hispanic	0.04	0.33	0.91
Income x Caribbean	−0.10	0.43	0.82
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.41
South x Asian	0.09	0.07	0.19
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.28
South x Caribbean	0.09	0.07	0.19
Education x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.60
Education x Asian	−0.06	0.10	0.53
Education x Hispanic	−0.04	0.07	0.60
Education x Caribbean	−0.11	0.09	0.24
Female x Black	0.03	0.04	0.48
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.05	0.48
Female x Hispanic	0.06	0.04	0.19
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.05	0.63
Party x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.92
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.51
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.76
Party x Caribbean	0.14	0.10	0.15
Ideology x Black	0.00	0.08	0.98
Ideology x Asian	−0.16	0.11	0.15
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.08	0.08	0.32
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.10	0.10	0.28
Close to group x Black	−0.11	0.07	0.12
Close to group x Asian	−0.12	0.09	0.17
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.05	0.07	0.48
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.13	0.09	0.13

Table 371: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2144).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.05	0.05	0.26	−0.04	0.15
Blacks	−0.05	0.05	1.73	−0.15	0.04
Asians	−0.06	0.07	1.63	−0.20	0.08
Hispanics	0.01	0.05	0.89	−0.09	0.10
Caribbeans	−0.08	0.07	1.71	−0.21	0.06

Table 372: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 371).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.07	0.20
Income	−0.02	0.22	0.91
South	−0.02	0.03	0.47
Education	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female	0.01	0.03	0.75
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.08	0.04	0.07
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.06	0.36
Close to Racial Group	0.09	0.05	0.08
Black	−0.10	0.11	0.34
Asian	0.00	0.13	0.98
Hispanic	0.02	0.10	0.82
Caribbean	−0.15	0.13	0.24
Age x Black	0.24	0.11	0.02
Age x Asian	0.15	0.14	0.30
Age x Hispanic	0.07	0.12	0.55
Age x Caribbean	0.11	0.14	0.41
Income x Black	−0.90	0.91	0.33
Income x Asian	0.06	0.34	0.85
Income x Hispanic	−0.07	0.32	0.82
Income x Caribbean	−0.16	0.43	0.70
South x Black	0.03	0.05	0.46
South x Asian	0.06	0.06	0.32
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.33
South x Caribbean	0.10	0.07	0.14
Education x Black	−0.03	0.07	0.63
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.60
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.79
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Female x Black	0.04	0.04	0.31
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.75
Female x Hispanic	0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.05	0.53
Party x Black	0.01	0.08	0.88
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.46
Party x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.74
Party x Caribbean	0.16	0.10	0.10
Ideology x Black	0.04	0.08	0.59
Ideology x Asian	−0.16	0.11	0.15
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.56
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.56
Close to group x Black	−0.11	0.07	0.14
Close to group x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.57
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.30	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.58

Table 373: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2244).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.09	0.05	0.08	−0.01	0.18
Blacks	−0.02	0.06	1.32	−0.13	0.09
Asians	0.04	0.08	0.64	−0.11	0.18
Hispanics	−0.21	0.06	2.00	−0.33	−0.09
Caribbeans	0.04	0.07	0.56	−0.09	0.17

Table 374: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 373).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.62	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.07	0.21
Income	−0.03	0.22	0.89
South	−0.03	0.03	0.38
Education	0.11	0.05	0.01
Female	0.01	0.03	0.85
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.08	0.04	0.08
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.06	0.37
Close to Racial Group	−0.05	0.06	0.41
Black	−0.20	0.11	0.08
Asian	−0.08	0.14	0.55
Hispanic	−0.24	0.11	0.02
Caribbean	−0.22	0.14	0.11
Age x Black	0.26	0.11	0.01
Age x Asian	0.17	0.14	0.23
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.12	0.50
Age x Caribbean	0.10	0.14	0.45
Income x Black	−0.91	0.91	0.32
Income x Asian	0.07	0.34	0.84
Income x Hispanic	−0.09	0.33	0.79
Income x Caribbean	−0.14	0.43	0.74
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.42
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.26
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.26
South x Caribbean	0.10	0.07	0.14
Education x Black	−0.05	0.07	0.44
Education x Asian	−0.08	0.10	0.43
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.07	0.49
Education x Caribbean	−0.12	0.09	0.20
Female x Black	0.04	0.04	0.27
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.66
Female x Hispanic	0.07	0.04	0.08
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.48
Party x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.94
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.47
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.90
Party x Caribbean	0.15	0.10	0.11
Ideology x Black	0.03	0.08	0.68
Ideology x Asian	−0.15	0.11	0.16
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.04	0.08	0.60
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.49
Close to group x Black	0.09	0.08	0.29
Close to group x Asian	0.09	0.10	0.39
Close to group x Hispanic	0.13	0.08	0.13
Close to group x Caribbean	0.06	0.10	0.50

Table 375: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2259).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.05	0.06	1.59	−0.18	0.07
Blacks	0.04	0.05	0.50	−0.07	0.14
Asians	0.04	0.08	0.66	−0.12	0.20
Hispanics	0.08	0.06	0.18	−0.03	0.19
Caribbeans	0.01	0.07	0.87	−0.13	0.15

Table 376: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 375).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.20	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.06	0.71
Income	−0.01	0.20	0.95
South	−0.04	0.03	0.22
Education	0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.37
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.15	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.07	0.04	0.09
Black	0.20	0.10	0.04
Asian	0.04	0.12	0.73
Hispanic	0.11	0.09	0.23
Caribbean	0.17	0.11	0.13
Age x Black	0.07	0.10	0.49
Age x Asian	−0.19	0.13	0.15
Age x Hispanic	0.01	0.11	0.96
Age x Caribbean	−0.12	0.13	0.34
Income x Black	−0.79	1.05	0.45
Income x Asian	0.34	0.31	0.27
Income x Hispanic	−0.10	0.32	0.76
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	0.39	0.98
South x Black	0.08	0.04	0.05
South x Asian	−0.03	0.06	0.57
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.79
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	0.94
Education x Black	0.02	0.07	0.74
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.86
Education x Hispanic	−0.20	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.68
Female x Black	−0.10	0.04	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.04	0.38
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.52
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.05	0.07
Party x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.15
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.08	0.64
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.67
Party x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.48
Ideology x Black	0.17	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.10	0.79
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.08	0.09	0.37
Close to group x Black	0.00	0.07	0.96
Close to group x Asian	0.08	0.09	0.39
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.70
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.53

Table 377: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2207).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.07	0.04	0.09	−0.01	0.16
Blacks	0.08	0.05	0.11	−0.02	0.17
Asians	0.15	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.30
Hispanics	0.05	0.05	0.30	−0.04	0.14
Caribbeans	0.03	0.06	0.69	−0.10	0.15

Table 378: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 377).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\mathrm{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.18	0.06	0.01
Age	−0.02	0.06	0.73
Income	−0.00	0.20	0.99
South	−0.04	0.03	0.20
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.47
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.10	0.05	0.05
Black	0.17	0.11	0.11
Asian	0.01	0.12	0.91
Hispanic	0.13	0.09	0.16
Caribbean	0.23	0.11	0.04
Age x Black	0.07	0.10	0.50
Age x Asian	−0.19	0.13	0.16
Age x Hispanic	0.01	0.11	0.92
Age x Caribbean	−0.11	0.13	0.39
Income x Black	−0.34	1.12	0.76
Income x Asian	0.27	0.31	0.38
Income x Hispanic	−0.12	0.32	0.70
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	0.39	0.98
South x Black	0.08	0.04	0.05
South x Asian	−0.07	0.06	0.23
South x Hispanic	−0.00	0.04	0.93
South x Caribbean	−0.01	0.06	0.91
Education x Black	−0.00	0.07	0.97
Education x Asian	0.00	0.09	0.98
Education x Hispanic	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.69
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.04	0.31
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.42
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.05	0.08
Party x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.15
Party x Asian	−0.03	0.08	0.75
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.06	0.85
Party x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.52
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.07	0.03
Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.10	0.62
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.29
Close to group x Black	0.03	0.08	0.66
Close to group x Asian	0.20	0.09	0.02
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.42
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.15	0.09	0.08

Table 379: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2258).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.19
Blacks	0.13	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.25
Asians	0.29	0.07	0.00	0.15	0.44
Hispanics	0.04	0.05	0.39	−0.05	0.14
Caribbeans	−0.05	0.07	1.55	−0.19	0.08

Table 380: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 379).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.19	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.02	0.06	0.78
Income	−0.01	0.21	0.98
South	−0.04	0.03	0.14
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.03	0.36
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.11	0.04	0.01
Black	0.21	0.10	0.03
Asian	0.09	0.12	0.43
Hispanic	0.11	0.09	0.23
Caribbean	0.20	0.12	0.09
Age x Black	0.06	0.10	0.55
Age x Asian	−0.19	0.14	0.17
Age x Hispanic	0.04	0.11	0.72
Age x Caribbean	−0.13	0.13	0.33
Income x Black	−0.96	1.05	0.36
Income x Asian	0.25	0.41	0.55
Income x Hispanic	−0.06	0.33	0.87
Income x Caribbean	−0.03	0.40	0.95
South x Black	0.09	0.04	0.03
South x Asian	−0.03	0.06	0.63
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.78
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	0.96
Education x Black	0.01	0.07	0.83
Education x Asian	−0.03	0.09	0.75
Education x Hispanic	−0.20	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.69
Female x Black	−0.10	0.04	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.05	0.44
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.57
Female x Caribbean	−0.09	0.05	0.05
Party x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.19
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.08	0.66
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.06	0.74
Party x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.47
Ideology x Black	0.17	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	0.04	0.10	0.69
Ideology x Hispanic	0.25	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.32
Close to group x Black	−0.03	0.06	0.63
Close to group x Asian	0.14	0.08	0.08
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.08	0.06	0.18
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.12	0.08	0.14

Table 381: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2142).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.11	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.20
Blacks	0.08	0.04	0.07	−0.01	0.17
Asians	0.25	0.07	0.00	0.12	0.38
Hispanics	0.03	0.04	0.49	−0.06	0.12
Caribbeans	−0.00	0.06	1.03	−0.13	0.12

Table 382: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 381).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.19	0.06	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.06	0.64
Income	−0.00	0.20	0.99
South	−0.03	0.03	0.28
Education	0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.40
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.15	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.09	0.05	0.06
Black	0.16	0.10	0.11
Asian	0.03	0.12	0.81
Hispanic	0.09	0.09	0.34
Caribbean	0.14	0.12	0.24
Age x Black	0.07	0.10	0.50
Age x Asian	−0.19	0.13	0.16
Age x Hispanic	0.02	0.11	0.84
Age x Caribbean	−0.10	0.13	0.43
Income x Black	−0.80	1.04	0.44
Income x Asian	0.25	0.31	0.42
Income x Hispanic	−0.12	0.32	0.72
Income x Caribbean	−0.04	0.39	0.93
South x Black	0.08	0.04	0.06
South x Asian	−0.05	0.06	0.41
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.82
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	0.97
Education x Black	0.02	0.07	0.71
Education x Asian	−0.00	0.09	0.96
Education x Hispanic	−0.20	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.64
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.04	0.38
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.35
Female x Caribbean	−0.09	0.05	0.07
Party x Black	−0.09	0.07	0.22
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.08	0.64
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.61
Party x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.48
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.07	0.03
Ideology x Asian	0.04	0.10	0.71
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.07	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.27
Close to group x Black	0.04	0.07	0.53
Close to group x Asian	0.19	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.81
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.01	0.08	0.85

Table 383: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2250).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.09	0.05	0.06	−0.00	0.18
Blacks	0.13	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.23
Asians	0.27	0.07	0.00	0.14	0.41
Hispanics	0.07	0.06	0.21	−0.04	0.18
Caribbeans	0.07	0.06	0.24	−0.05	0.19

Table 384: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 383).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.31	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.06	0.60
Income	0.06	0.21	0.77
South	−0.02	0.03	0.45
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.31
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	−0.09	0.06	0.11
Black	0.09	0.10	0.40
Asian	0.07	0.13	0.59
Hispanic	−0.01	0.10	0.95
Caribbean	0.13	0.12	0.30
Age x Black	0.06	0.10	0.57
Age x Asian	−0.18	0.13	0.17
Age x Hispanic	0.02	0.11	0.86
Age x Caribbean	−0.08	0.13	0.53
Income x Black	−0.96	1.05	0.36
Income x Asian	0.24	0.32	0.44
Income x Hispanic	−0.20	0.32	0.54
Income x Caribbean	−0.09	0.39	0.82
South x Black	0.06	0.04	0.13
South x Asian	−0.05	0.06	0.42
South x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.58
South x Caribbean	−0.02	0.06	0.71
Education x Black	0.02	0.06	0.78
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.09	0.91
Education x Hispanic	−0.20	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.02	0.08	0.78
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.05	0.04	0.24
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.37
Female x Caribbean	−0.09	0.05	0.06
Party x Black	−0.06	0.07	0.36
Party x Asian	−0.00	0.08	0.95
Party x Hispanic	0.00	0.06	0.97
Party x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.48
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.07	0.03
Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.10	0.62
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.32
Close to group x Black	0.16	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Asian	0.01	0.10	0.88
Close to group x Hispanic	0.12	0.08	0.11
Close to group x Caribbean	0.01	0.09	0.93

Table 385: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2259).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.09	0.06	1.89	−0.21	0.02
Blacks	0.07	0.05	0.16	−0.03	0.17
Asians	−0.08	0.08	1.71	−0.23	0.07
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.57	−0.07	0.13
Caribbeans	−0.09	0.06	1.82	−0.21	0.04

Table 386: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 385).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.79	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Income	0.14	0.22	0.51
South	−0.04	0.03	0.25
Education	0.05	0.05	0.29
Female	0.01	0.03	0.83
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.06	0.05	0.20
Black	0.06	0.10	0.56
Asian	−0.08	0.13	0.51
Hispanic	−0.12	0.09	0.19
Caribbean	0.04	0.12	0.77
Age x Black	0.13	0.10	0.21
Age x Asian	−0.01	0.14	0.97
Age x Hispanic	−0.19	0.11	0.10
Age x Caribbean	−0.14	0.13	0.27
Income x Black	−0.40	0.89	0.65
Income x Asian	−0.44	0.33	0.19
Income x Hispanic	0.07	0.32	0.84
Income x Caribbean	0.09	0.42	0.83
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.63
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.66
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.32
South x Caribbean	0.02	0.06	0.79
Education x Black	0.21	0.07	0.00
Education x Asian	0.02	0.10	0.81
Education x Hispanic	0.27	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.25	0.09	0.00
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.06
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.51
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.80
Female x Caribbean	−0.00	0.05	0.94
Party x Black	−0.15	0.07	0.04
Party x Asian	0.05	0.08	0.55
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.78
Party x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.06
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.62
Ideology x Asian	−0.04	0.10	0.66
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.00	0.08	0.99
Ideology x Caribbean	0.05	0.09	0.59
Close to group x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Close to group x Asian	−0.08	0.09	0.38
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.69
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.13	0.08	0.10

Table 387: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Asians and personal attributes (NPS, N=2224).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.06	0.05	0.20	−0.03	0.15
Blacks	−0.02	0.05	1.35	−0.12	0.08
Asians	−0.02	0.08	1.20	−0.17	0.13
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.51	−0.06	0.13
Caribbeans	−0.07	0.07	1.73	−0.21	0.06

Table 388: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 387).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.12	0.06	0.06
Income	0.15	0.22	0.49
South	−0.04	0.03	0.18
Education	0.06	0.04	0.16
Female	−0.00	0.03	0.92
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.13	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.08	0.05	0.12
Black	0.02	0.11	0.86
Asian	−0.11	0.12	0.39
Hispanic	−0.13	0.09	0.18
Caribbean	−0.04	0.12	0.74
Age x Black	0.13	0.10	0.20
Age x Asian	−0.01	0.14	0.95
Age x Hispanic	−0.18	0.11	0.10
Age x Caribbean	−0.16	0.13	0.22
Income x Black	−0.65	0.92	0.48
Income x Asian	−0.44	0.33	0.18
Income x Hispanic	0.05	0.31	0.89
Income x Caribbean	0.01	0.41	0.99
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.65
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.70
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.47
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	0.99
Education x Black	0.18	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	0.03	0.09	0.79
Education x Hispanic	0.25	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.20	0.09	0.02
Female x Black	−0.06	0.04	0.11
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.73
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.85
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.05	0.84
Party x Black	−0.17	0.07	0.02
Party x Asian	0.03	0.08	0.69
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.88
Party x Caribbean	−0.20	0.09	0.03
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.59
Ideology x Asian	−0.06	0.10	0.57
Ideology x Hispanic	0.01	0.08	0.91
Ideology x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.51
Close to group x Black	0.02	0.08	0.82
Close to group x Asian	−0.01	0.09	0.87
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.86
Close to group x Caribbean	0.08	0.09	0.36

Table 389: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Blacks and personal attributes (NPS, N=2277).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.08	0.05	0.12	−0.02	0.18
Blacks	0.10	0.06	0.12	−0.03	0.22
Asians	0.07	0.07	0.38	−0.08	0.21
Hispanics	0.07	0.05	0.18	−0.03	0.17
Caribbeans	0.16	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.31

Table 390: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 389).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.07	0.06
Income	0.15	0.22	0.48
South	−0.03	0.03	0.34
Education	0.06	0.05	0.20
Female	0.00	0.03	0.88
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.10	0.06	0.06
Close to Racial Group	0.06	0.05	0.17
Black	0.07	0.10	0.48
Asian	−0.08	0.12	0.53
Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.37
Caribbean	0.05	0.12	0.70
Age x Black	0.10	0.11	0.34
Age x Asian	−0.00	0.14	0.99
Age x Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.08
Age x Caribbean	−0.16	0.13	0.24
Income x Black	−0.44	0.89	0.62
Income x Asian	−0.67	0.43	0.12
Income x Hispanic	0.01	0.32	0.98
Income x Caribbean	0.06	0.42	0.89
South x Black	−0.03	0.05	0.47
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.72
South x Hispanic	−0.05	0.05	0.32
South x Caribbean	−0.00	0.06	1.00
Education x Black	0.20	0.07	0.00
Education x Asian	−0.00	0.10	0.99
Education x Hispanic	0.27	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.22	0.09	0.01
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.63
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.72
Female x Caribbean	−0.00	0.05	0.93
Party x Black	−0.16	0.08	0.04
Party x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.59
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.71
Party x Caribbean	−0.20	0.09	0.03
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.58
Ideology x Asian	−0.05	0.11	0.65
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.01	0.08	0.93
Ideology x Caribbean	0.05	0.09	0.58
Close to group x Black	−0.07	0.07	0.28
Close to group x Asian	−0.09	0.08	0.27
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.08	0.06	0.19
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.07	0.08	0.39

Table 391: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans and personal attributes (NPS, N=2163).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.06	0.05	0.17	−0.03	0.15
Blacks	−0.01	0.05	1.12	−0.10	0.09
Asians	−0.03	0.07	1.32	−0.16	0.11
Hispanics	−0.02	0.05	1.35	−0.11	0.07
Caribbeans	−0.01	0.07	1.08	−0.14	0.13

Table 392: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 391).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.77	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.06	0.04
Income	0.15	0.22	0.48
South	−0.04	0.03	0.16
Education	0.05	0.04	0.23
Female	0.00	0.03	0.98
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.05	0.04
Close to Racial Group	0.08	0.05	0.09
Black	−0.03	0.10	0.80
Asian	−0.10	0.12	0.41
Hispanic	−0.15	0.10	0.12
Caribbean	0.08	0.12	0.49
Age x Black	0.14	0.10	0.17
Age x Asian	0.00	0.14	0.99
Age x Hispanic	−0.17	0.11	0.14
Age x Caribbean	−0.15	0.13	0.24
Income x Black	−0.32	0.88	0.72
Income x Asian	−0.45	0.33	0.17
Income x Hispanic	0.06	0.31	0.85
Income x Caribbean	0.07	0.41	0.87
South x Black	−0.01	0.04	0.74
South x Asian	0.02	0.06	0.75
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.37
South x Caribbean	0.02	0.06	0.72
Education x Black	0.20	0.07	0.00
Education x Asian	0.01	0.09	0.91
Education x Hispanic	0.28	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.24	0.09	0.00
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.09
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.54
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.69
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.05	0.91
Party x Black	−0.15	0.07	0.05
Party x Asian	0.03	0.08	0.71
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.60
Party x Caribbean	−0.18	0.09	0.05
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.60
Ideology x Asian	−0.07	0.10	0.49
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.01	0.08	0.93
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.69
Close to group x Black	0.05	0.07	0.49
Close to group x Asian	−0.00	0.09	0.97
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.00	0.08	0.98
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.16	0.08	0.04

Table 393: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Hispanics and personal attributes (NPS, N=2267).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.08	0.05	0.09	−0.01	0.17
Blacks	0.13	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.23
Asians	0.08	0.07	0.29	−0.07	0.22
Hispanics	0.08	0.06	0.18	−0.04	0.19
Caribbeans	−0.08	0.06	1.80	−0.21	0.04

Table 394: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 393).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.86	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.12	0.06	0.06
Income	0.18	0.22	0.42
South	−0.04	0.03	0.19
Education	0.06	0.04	0.17
Female	0.00	0.03	0.94
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.12	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	−0.06	0.06	0.32
Black	0.04	0.11	0.70
Asian	−0.13	0.13	0.34
Hispanic	−0.17	0.10	0.09
Caribbean	0.01	0.13	0.94
Age x Black	0.13	0.10	0.22
Age x Asian	−0.04	0.14	0.78
Age x Hispanic	−0.18	0.11	0.11
Age x Caribbean	−0.13	0.13	0.31
Income x Black	−0.38	0.88	0.67
Income x Asian	−0.44	0.33	0.18
Income x Hispanic	0.04	0.32	0.91
Income x Caribbean	0.04	0.41	0.92
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.70
South x Asian	0.04	0.06	0.55
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.46
South x Caribbean	0.01	0.06	0.84
Education x Black	0.18	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	0.03	0.09	0.78
Education x Hispanic	0.26	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.21	0.09	0.01
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.06
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.61
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.68
Female x Caribbean	0.00	0.05	0.98
Party x Black	−0.17	0.07	0.02
Party x Asian	0.06	0.08	0.44
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.80
Party x Caribbean	−0.20	0.09	0.03
Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.07	0.52
Ideology x Asian	−0.02	0.10	0.83
Ideology x Hispanic	0.00	0.08	0.99
Ideology x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.48
Close to group x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.94
Close to group x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.61
Close to group x Hispanic	0.05	0.08	0.53
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.04	0.09	0.70

Table 395: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Whites and personal attributes (NPS, N=2279).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.06	0.06	1.68	−0.18	0.06
Blacks	−0.07	0.05	1.81	−0.17	0.03
Asians	−0.11	0.08	1.85	−0.27	0.04
Hispanics	−0.01	0.05	1.14	−0.11	0.10
Caribbeans	−0.10	0.07	1.84	−0.23	0.04

Table 396: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 395).

NPS: Extra Analyses for Chapter 5 Figure 14

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.51	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.08	0.36
Income	−0.38	0.27	0.15
South	−0.03	0.04	0.45
Education	−0.06	0.06	0.33
Female	0.11	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.30	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.25	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.11	0.06	0.07
Racial Group Lazy	0.17	0.08	0.04
Black	0.31	0.13	0.02
Asian	0.05	0.18	0.76
Hispanic	0.15	0.13	0.25
Caribbean	0.16	0.16	0.31
Age x Black	0.08	0.13	0.55
Age x Asian	0.07	0.18	0.71
Age x Hispanic	0.02	0.16	0.90
Age x Caribbean	0.25	0.18	0.15
Income x Black	−1.34	1.35	0.32
Income x Asian	0.68	0.41	0.09
Income x Hispanic	0.66	0.43	0.13
Income x Caribbean	0.65	0.51	0.20
South x Black	0.01	0.06	0.90
South x Asian	0.04	0.08	0.63
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.06	0.45
South x Caribbean	−0.05	0.08	0.57
Education x Black	0.11	0.09	0.22
Education x Asian	0.12	0.12	0.33
Education x Hispanic	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Education x Caribbean	0.21	0.12	0.06
Female x Black	−0.14	0.05	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.06	0.68
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.91
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Party x Black	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Party x Asian	−0.18	0.10	0.09
Party x Hispanic	−0.13	0.09	0.13
Party x Caribbean	−0.12	0.12	0.32
Ideology x Black	0.07	0.10	0.45
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.13	0.81
Ideology x Hispanic	0.26	0.11	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.20	0.12	0.09
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.09	0.47
Close to group x Asian	−0.04	0.12	0.71
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.06	0.09	0.54
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.23	0.11	0.03
Group lazy x Black	−0.21	0.12	0.08
Group lazy x Asian	−0.09	0.18	0.61
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.11
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.08	0.15	0.61

Table 397: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Asians, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1955).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.11	0.06	0.07	−0.01	0.23
Blacks	0.05	0.06	0.46	−0.08	0.17
Asians	0.07	0.10	0.51	−0.13	0.27
Hispanics	0.05	0.07	0.42	−0.08	0.19
Caribbeans	−0.12	0.09	1.82	−0.30	0.05

Table 398: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 397).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.54	0.10	0.00
Age	−0.10	0.08	0.24
Income	−0.39	0.26	0.14
South	−0.04	0.04	0.29
Education	−0.04	0.06	0.49
Female	0.10	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.28	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.22	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.17	0.07	0.02
Racial Group Lazy	−0.11	0.08	0.20
Black	0.24	0.15	0.11
Asian	0.15	0.18	0.41
Hispanic	0.18	0.14	0.20
Caribbean	0.07	0.18	0.70
Age x Black	0.11	0.13	0.39
Age x Asian	0.17	0.18	0.35
Age x Hispanic	0.07	0.15	0.65
Age x Caribbean	0.26	0.17	0.13
Income x Black	−1.94	1.45	0.18
Income x Asian	0.67	0.40	0.10
Income x Hispanic	0.66	0.43	0.12
Income x Caribbean	0.61	0.51	0.23
South x Black	0.02	0.06	0.68
South x Asian	0.04	0.08	0.62
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.06	0.36
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.08	0.77
Education x Black	0.11	0.09	0.23
Education x Asian	0.09	0.12	0.46
Education x Hispanic	−0.15	0.09	0.10
Education x Caribbean	0.16	0.11	0.15
Female x Black	−0.14	0.05	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.06	0.57
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.89
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Party x Black	−0.12	0.09	0.19
Party x Asian	−0.21	0.11	0.05
Party x Hispanic	−0.10	0.09	0.26
Party x Caribbean	−0.10	0.12	0.42
Ideology x Black	0.06	0.09	0.53
Ideology x Asian	−0.02	0.13	0.89
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.11	0.02
Ideology x Caribbean	0.19	0.11	0.10
Close to group x Black	−0.09	0.11	0.42
Close to group x Asian	−0.00	0.12	0.97
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.19	0.10	0.07
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.11	0.13	0.38
Group lazy x Black	0.05	0.11	0.64
Group lazy x Asian	−0.13	0.15	0.39
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.03	0.12	0.82
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.11	0.13	0.41

Table 399: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Blacks, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2007).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.17	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.31
Blacks	0.08	0.08	0.34	−0.08	0.24
Asians	0.16	0.10	0.11	−0.04	0.36
Hispanics	−0.02	0.07	1.21	−0.16	0.12
Caribbeans	0.06	0.10	0.59	−0.15	0.26

Table 400: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 399).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{SE}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.10	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.09	0.35
Income	−0.42	0.27	0.12
South	−0.07	0.04	0.10
Education	−0.09	0.06	0.17
Female	0.12	0.04	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.30	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.27	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.18	0.06	0.00
Racial Group Lazy	0.01	0.09	0.88
Black	0.22	0.14	0.12
Asian	0.31	0.19	0.09
Hispanic	0.12	0.14	0.38
Caribbean	0.02	0.18	0.90
Age x Black	0.08	0.14	0.56
Age x Asian	0.18	0.20	0.38
Age x Hispanic	0.05	0.17	0.77
Age x Caribbean	0.25	0.18	0.16
Income x Black	−1.41	1.34	0.29
Income x Asian	0.97	0.72	0.18
Income x Hispanic	0.75	0.44	0.09
Income x Caribbean	0.64	0.51	0.21
South x Black	0.07	0.06	0.25
South x Asian	0.11	0.09	0.23
South x Hispanic	0.07	0.06	0.26
South x Caribbean	0.03	0.09	0.76
Education x Black	0.15	0.09	0.11
Education x Asian	0.17	0.13	0.21
Education x Hispanic	−0.10	0.09	0.28
Education x Caribbean	0.19	0.12	0.11
Female x Black	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.07	0.88
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.56
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.07	0.03
Party x Black	−0.13	0.10	0.18
Party x Asian	−0.26	0.11	0.02
Party x Hispanic	−0.17	0.09	0.07
Party x Caribbean	−0.11	0.12	0.39
Ideology x Black	0.09	0.10	0.39
Ideology x Asian	0.01	0.14	0.94
Ideology x Hispanic	0.28	0.11	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.25	0.12	0.03
Close to group x Black	−0.10	0.09	0.28
Close to group x Asian	−0.20	0.11	0.09
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.10	0.09	0.28
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.12	0.11	0.31
Group lazy x Black	0.00	0.12	0.99
Group lazy x Asian	−0.54	0.17	0.00
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.06	0.13	0.62
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.02	0.15	0.88

Table 401: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1773).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.18	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.31
Blacks	0.09	0.06	0.17	−0.04	0.21
Asians	−0.01	0.09	1.11	−0.20	0.17
Hispanics	0.08	0.07	0.24	−0.05	0.22
Caribbeans	0.07	0.09	0.47	−0.12	0.25

Table 402: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 401).

277

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.57	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.09	0.08	0.25
Income	−0.38	0.26	0.15
South	−0.02	0.04	0.58
Education	−0.04	0.06	0.52
Female	0.11	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.31	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.25	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.03	0.06	0.66
Racial Group Lazy	0.01	0.08	0.91
Black	0.27	0.14	0.05
Asian	0.15	0.17	0.38
Hispanic	0.04	0.14	0.76
Caribbean	0.04	0.17	0.82
Age x Black	0.10	0.13	0.47
Age x Asian	0.20	0.18	0.28
Age x Hispanic	0.06	0.15	0.69
Age x Caribbean	0.25	0.17	0.14
Income x Black	−1.45	1.34	0.28
Income x Asian	0.60	0.40	0.14
Income x Hispanic	0.62	0.43	0.15
Income x Caribbean	0.61	0.50	0.23
South x Black	0.01	0.06	0.90
South x Asian	0.03	0.08	0.70
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.06	0.63
South x Caribbean	−0.04	0.08	0.65
Education x Black	0.09	0.09	0.32
Education x Asian	0.10	0.12	0.43
Education x Hispanic	−0.12	0.09	0.17
Education x Caribbean	0.16	0.11	0.15
Female x Black	−0.15	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.53
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.82
Female x Caribbean	−0.16	0.06	0.01
Party x Black	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Party x Asian	−0.21	0.11	0.05
Party x Hispanic	−0.18	0.09	0.03
Party x Caribbean	−0.11	0.12	0.38
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.10	0.38
Ideology x Asian	−0.02	0.13	0.91
Ideology x Hispanic	0.27	0.10	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.20	0.12	0.09
Close to group x Black	−0.03	0.09	0.79
Close to group x Asian	0.06	0.12	0.62
Close to group x Hispanic	0.15	0.10	0.15
Close to group x Caribbean	0.02	0.11	0.87
Group lazy x Black	−0.06	0.11	0.56
Group lazy x Asian	−0.32	0.14	0.02
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.27	0.12	0.02
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.04	0.13	0.77

Table 403: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1993).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.03	0.06	0.66	−0.10	0.15
Blacks	0.00	0.07	0.96	−0.13	0.14
Asians	0.09	0.10	0.38	−0.11	0.28
Hispanics	0.18	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.33
Caribbeans	0.05	0.09	0.59	−0.12	0.22

Table 404: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 403).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.57	0.11	0.00
Age	−0.09	0.08	0.28
Income	−0.39	0.27	0.15
South	−0.03	0.04	0.38
Education	−0.04	0.06	0.49
Female	0.11	0.03	0.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.31	0.06	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.07	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.04	0.08	0.58
Racial Group Lazy	−0.09	0.08	0.31
Black	0.25	0.15	0.09
Asian	0.20	0.18	0.26
Hispanic	0.21	0.14	0.13
Caribbean	0.06	0.18	0.74
Age x Black	0.10	0.13	0.47
Age x Asian	0.07	0.18	0.69
Age x Hispanic	0.03	0.15	0.85
Age x Caribbean	0.24	0.18	0.18
Income x Black	−1.42	1.35	0.29
Income x Asian	0.66	0.41	0.11
Income x Hispanic	0.63	0.43	0.14
Income x Caribbean	0.60	0.51	0.24
South x Black	0.01	0.06	0.80
South x Asian	0.07	0.08	0.41
South x Hispanic	0.06	0.06	0.35
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Education x Black	0.09	0.09	0.29
Education x Asian	0.09	0.12	0.48
Education x Hispanic	−0.12	0.09	0.18
Education x Caribbean	0.16	0.11	0.15
Female x Black	−0.14	0.05	0.00
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.47
Female x Hispanic	−0.00	0.05	0.93
Female x Caribbean	−0.14	0.06	0.03
Party x Black	−0.13	0.09	0.15
Party x Asian	−0.19	0.10	0.07
Party x Hispanic	−0.14	0.09	0.10
Party x Caribbean	−0.12	0.12	0.31
Ideology x Black	0.08	0.10	0.40
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.13	0.80
Ideology x Hispanic	0.26	0.11	0.01
Ideology x Caribbean	0.22	0.12	0.06
Close to group x Black	−0.05	0.10	0.60
Close to group x Asian	−0.16	0.13	0.20
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.20	0.11	0.08
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.00	0.12	0.98
Group lazy x Black	0.09	0.11	0.40
Group lazy x Asian	−0.12	0.18	0.48
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.07	0.12	0.59
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.05	0.14	0.73

Table 405: OLS model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing) as a function of Closeness to Whites, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2015).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.04	0.08	0.58	−0.11	0.20
Blacks	−0.01	0.07	1.12	−0.14	0.12
Asians	−0.12	0.10	1.77	−0.32	0.08
Hispanics	−0.15	0.08	1.95	−0.30	−0.00
Caribbeans	0.04	0.09	0.64	−0.13	0.21

Table 406: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Affirmative Action (0=a bad thing, 1=a good thing)(Appendix Table 405).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.53	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.06	0.07	0.41
Income	−0.05	0.22	0.84
South	−0.03	0.03	0.37
Education	0.06	0.05	0.21
Female	−0.00	0.03	0.95
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.05	0.05	0.25
Lib-Con Ideology	0.07	0.06	0.22
Close to Racial Group	0.11	0.05	0.02
Racial Group Lazy	−0.06	0.07	0.40
Black	−0.07	0.11	0.52
Asian	0.10	0.15	0.49
Hispanic	−0.15	0.10	0.15
Caribbean	−0.15	0.13	0.24
Age x Black	0.22	0.11	0.04
Age x Asian	0.11	0.15	0.46
Age x Hispanic	0.12	0.13	0.34
Age x Caribbean	0.04	0.14	0.78
Income x Black	−1.03	0.92	0.26
Income x Asian	0.06	0.34	0.87
Income x Hispanic	0.09	0.36	0.81
Income x Caribbean	−0.12	0.43	0.78
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.37
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.28
South x Hispanic	0.03	0.05	0.52
South x Caribbean	0.09	0.07	0.18
Education x Black	0.04	0.08	0.55
Education x Asian	−0.00	0.10	0.98
Education x Hispanic	0.02	0.07	0.75
Education x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.61
Female x Black	0.06	0.04	0.17
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.05	0.83
Female x Hispanic	0.09	0.04	0.04
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.44
Party x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.69
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.51
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.75
Party x Caribbean	0.15	0.10	0.13
Ideology x Black	0.02	0.08	0.82
Ideology x Asian	−0.14	0.11	0.20
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.07	0.08	0.44
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.10	0.52
Close to group x Black	−0.18	0.07	0.01
Close to group x Asian	−0.27	0.10	0.00
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.09	0.07	0.24
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.16	0.09	0.06
Group lazy x Black	−0.02	0.10	0.81
Group lazy x Asian	0.08	0.15	0.59
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.03	0.10	0.80
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.19	0.12	0.11

Table 407: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Asians, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2130).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.21
Blacks	−0.07	0.05	1.80	−0.17	0.04
Asians	−0.16	0.08	1.95	−0.32	0.00
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.60	−0.08	0.13
Caribbeans	−0.05	0.07	1.53	−0.19	0.09

Table 408: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 407).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.60	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.08	0.07	0.23
Income	−0.08	0.23	0.71
South	−0.03	0.03	0.29
Education	0.10	0.05	0.04
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.58
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.08	0.05	0.09
Lib-Con Ideology	0.06	0.06	0.29
Close to Racial Group	0.11	0.06	0.06
Racial Group Lazy	−0.17	0.07	0.01
Black	−0.20	0.13	0.11
Asian	−0.02	0.15	0.89
Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.09
Caribbean	−0.25	0.14	0.09
Age x Black	0.30	0.11	0.01
Age x Asian	0.16	0.15	0.27
Age x Hispanic	0.12	0.12	0.35
Age x Caribbean	0.09	0.14	0.53
Income x Black	−0.69	0.96	0.47
Income x Asian	0.16	0.34	0.65
Income x Hispanic	0.14	0.36	0.70
Income x Caribbean	−0.14	0.43	0.75
South x Black	0.05	0.05	0.27
South x Asian	0.09	0.06	0.19
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.29
South x Caribbean	0.11	0.07	0.11
Education x Black	−0.02	0.07	0.76
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.59
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.80
Education x Caribbean	−0.14	0.09	0.14
Female x Black	0.07	0.04	0.10
Female x Asian	0.01	0.05	0.77
Female x Hispanic	0.09	0.04	0.03
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.40
Party x Black	−0.00	0.08	1.00
Party x Asian	−0.05	0.09	0.55
Party x Hispanic	−0.00	0.07	0.96
Party x Caribbean	0.12	0.10	0.20
Ideology x Black	0.02	0.08	0.79
Ideology x Asian	−0.15	0.11	0.18
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.06	0.08	0.46
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.53
Close to group x Black	−0.17	0.09	0.06
Close to group x Asian	−0.13	0.10	0.19
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.07	0.08	0.41
Close to group x Caribbean	0.01	0.10	0.90
Group lazy x Black	0.36	0.09	0.00
Group lazy x Asian	0.11	0.12	0.34
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.13	0.09	0.15
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.19	0.11	0.07

Table 409: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Blacks, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2188).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.11	0.06	0.06	−0.00	0.22
Blacks	−0.06	0.07	1.61	−0.19	0.07
Asians	−0.02	0.08	1.21	−0.18	0.14
Hispanics	0.04	0.06	0.43	−0.06	0.15
Caribbeans	0.12	0.08	0.14	−0.04	0.29

Table 410: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 409).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.64	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.08	0.66
Income	−0.04	0.23	0.87
South	−0.04	0.03	0.22
Education	0.12	0.05	0.03
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.68
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.05	0.18
Lib-Con Ideology	0.09	0.06	0.14
Close to Racial Group	0.00	0.05	0.96
Racial Group Lazy	−0.27	0.08	0.00
Black	−0.19	0.12	0.11
Asian	−0.10	0.16	0.53
Hispanic	−0.28	0.12	0.02
Caribbean	−0.26	0.15	0.08
Age x Black	0.22	0.12	0.07
Age x Asian	0.19	0.17	0.26
Age x Hispanic	0.08	0.13	0.56
Age x Caribbean	0.02	0.14	0.87
Income x Black	−1.01	0.92	0.27
Income x Asian	0.62	0.62	0.31
Income x Hispanic	0.19	0.38	0.62
Income x Caribbean	−0.15	0.44	0.73
South x Black	0.06	0.05	0.24
South x Asian	0.07	0.07	0.31
South x Hispanic	0.07	0.05	0.18
South x Caribbean	0.13	0.07	0.08
Education x Black	−0.00	0.08	1.00
Education x Asian	−0.09	0.11	0.45
Education x Hispanic	−0.04	0.08	0.57
Education x Caribbean	−0.10	0.10	0.30
Female x Black	0.06	0.04	0.16
Female x Asian	0.00	0.06	0.95
Female x Hispanic	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female x Caribbean	0.06	0.05	0.29
Party x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.76
Party x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.58
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.89
Party x Caribbean	0.17	0.10	0.10
Ideology x Black	−0.02	0.08	0.77
Ideology x Asian	−0.20	0.12	0.09
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.08	0.09	0.37
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.10	0.10	0.30
Close to group x Black	−0.05	0.08	0.53
Close to group x Asian	−0.12	0.10	0.21
Close to group x Hispanic	0.01	0.08	0.86
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.61
Group lazy x Black	0.25	0.10	0.02
Group lazy x Asian	0.33	0.15	0.03
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.32	0.11	0.00
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.45	0.13	0.00

Table 411: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1921).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.00	0.05	0.96	−0.10	0.11
Blacks	−0.05	0.05	1.61	−0.15	0.06
Asians	−0.12	0.08	1.87	−0.27	0.04
Hispanics	0.02	0.05	0.77	−0.09	0.12
Caribbeans	−0.05	0.08	1.44	−0.20	0.11

Table 412: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 411).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$
Constant	0.56	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.07	0.27
Income	−0.02	0.22	0.94
South	−0.03	0.03	0.38
Education	0.10	0.05	0.03
Female	0.00	0.03	0.86
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.05	0.13
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.06	0.34
Close to Racial Group	0.07	0.05	0.19
Racial Group Lazy	−0.08	0.06	0.23
Black	−0.16	0.12	0.19
Asian	0.05	0.14	0.73
Hispanic	−0.01	0.11	0.94
Caribbean	−0.24	0.14	0.09
Age x Black	0.25	0.11	0.02
Age x Asian	0.16	0.15	0.28
Age x Hispanic	0.07	0.12	0.56
Age x Caribbean	0.10	0.14	0.49
Income x Black	−0.96	0.92	0.30
Income x Asian	0.10	0.34	0.78
Income x Hispanic	0.03	0.36	0.93
Income x Caribbean	−0.17	0.43	0.68
South x Black	0.04	0.05	0.37
South x Asian	0.07	0.07	0.27
South x Hispanic	0.04	0.05	0.34
South x Caribbean	0.14	0.07	0.04
Education x Black	−0.01	0.07	0.87
Education x Asian	−0.05	0.10	0.60
Education x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.81
Education x Caribbean	−0.13	0.09	0.16
Female x Black	0.05	0.04	0.21
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.05	0.85
Female x Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.07
Female x Caribbean	0.03	0.05	0.51
Party x Black	−0.01	0.08	0.92
Party x Asian	−0.08	0.09	0.38
Party x Hispanic	0.01	0.07	0.90
Party x Caribbean	0.15	0.10	0.12
Ideology x Black	0.03	0.08	0.70
Ideology x Asian	−0.17	0.11	0.13
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.57
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.06	0.09	0.54
Close to group x Black	−0.10	0.08	0.20
Close to group x Asian	−0.09	0.10	0.36
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.28	0.08	0.00
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.01	0.09	0.95
Group lazy x Black	0.15	0.09	0.10
Group lazy x Asian	−0.06	0.12	0.64
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.09	0.09	0.36
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.23	0.11	0.03

Table 413: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2174).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.07	0.05	0.19	−0.03	0.17
Blacks	−0.03	0.06	1.42	−0.14	0.08
Asians	−0.02	0.08	1.18	−0.18	0.14
Hispanics	−0.21	0.06	2.00	−0.34	−0.09
Caribbeans	0.06	0.07	0.37	−0.07	0.20

Table 414: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 413).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.65	0.09	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.07	0.28
Income	−0.02	0.23	0.92
South	−0.03	0.03	0.32
Education	0.11	0.05	0.02
Female	0.00	0.03	0.98
Dem-Rep Partisanship	−0.07	0.05	0.14
Lib-Con Ideology	0.05	0.06	0.33
Close to Racial Group	−0.07	0.07	0.27
Racial Group Lazy	−0.08	0.07	0.25
Black	−0.22	0.12	0.07
Asian	−0.18	0.15	0.23
Hispanic	−0.30	0.12	0.01
Caribbean	−0.27	0.15	0.06
Age x Black	0.27	0.11	0.01
Age x Asian	0.17	0.15	0.25
Age x Hispanic	0.11	0.12	0.38
Age x Caribbean	0.08	0.14	0.59
Income x Black	−0.92	0.92	0.32
Income x Asian	0.09	0.34	0.80
Income x Hispanic	0.07	0.36	0.85
Income x Caribbean	−0.13	0.43	0.76
South x Black	0.05	0.05	0.32
South x Asian	0.07	0.06	0.26
South x Hispanic	0.05	0.05	0.28
South x Caribbean	0.12	0.07	0.09
Education x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.54
Education x Asian	−0.08	0.10	0.45
Education x Hispanic	−0.05	0.07	0.47
Education x Caribbean	−0.11	0.09	0.24
Female x Black	0.05	0.04	0.19
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.72
Female x Hispanic	0.08	0.04	0.05
Female x Caribbean	0.04	0.05	0.47
Party x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.72
Party x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.49
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.75
Party x Caribbean	0.14	0.10	0.15
Ideology x Black	0.02	0.08	0.79
Ideology x Asian	−0.14	0.11	0.21
Ideology x Hispanic	−0.05	0.08	0.54
Ideology x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.40
Close to group x Black	0.09	0.09	0.30
Close to group x Asian	0.12	0.11	0.25
Close to group x Hispanic	0.16	0.09	0.07
Close to group x Caribbean	0.11	0.10	0.28
Group lazy x Black	0.06	0.09	0.54
Group lazy x Asian	0.20	0.14	0.15
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.11	0.10	0.23
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.13	0.11	0.24

Table 415: OLS model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support) as a function of Closeness to Whites, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2202).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.07	0.07	1.73	−0.20	0.06
Blacks	0.02	0.05	0.75	−0.09	0.12
Asians	0.05	0.08	0.55	−0.11	0.21
Hispanics	0.09	0.06	0.12	−0.02	0.20
Caribbeans	0.03	0.07	0.63	−0.11	0.18

Table 416: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Descriptive Representation (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly support)(Appendix Table 415).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.19	0.07	0.01
Age	−0.03	0.06	0.64
Income	−0.02	0.20	0.91
South	−0.03	0.03	0.29
Education	0.15	0.05	0.00
Female	0.02	0.03	0.45
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.16	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.08	0.05	0.08
Racial Group Lazy	−0.01	0.06	0.90
Black	0.23	0.10	0.02
Asian	−0.03	0.13	0.80
Hispanic	0.09	0.09	0.33
Caribbean	0.19	0.12	0.11
Age x Black	0.06	0.10	0.55
Age x Asian	−0.14	0.14	0.31
Age x Hispanic	0.02	0.11	0.85
Age x Caribbean	−0.08	0.13	0.54
Income x Black	−0.81	1.05	0.44
Income x Asian	0.38	0.31	0.22
Income x Hispanic	−0.01	0.33	0.98
Income x Caribbean	0.01	0.39	0.99
South x Black	0.07	0.04	0.09
South x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.46
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.77
South x Caribbean	−0.02	0.06	0.74
Education x Black	−0.00	0.07	0.99
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.83
Education x Hispanic	−0.19	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.02	0.09	0.81
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.61
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.60
Female x Caribbean	−0.06	0.05	0.19
Party x Black	−0.11	0.07	0.12
Party x Asian	−0.03	0.08	0.70
Party x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.56
Party x Caribbean	−0.09	0.09	0.33
Ideology x Black	0.17	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.10	0.76
Ideology x Hispanic	0.22	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.10	0.09	0.27
Close to group x Black	0.01	0.07	0.86
Close to group x Asian	0.09	0.09	0.29
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.85
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.07	0.08	0.38
Group lazy x Black	−0.06	0.09	0.50
Group lazy x Asian	0.24	0.14	0.09
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.07	0.09	0.44
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.10	0.11	0.38

Table 417: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Asians, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2134).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.08	0.05	0.08	−0.01	0.17
Blacks	0.09	0.05	0.06	−0.00	0.19
Asians	0.17	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.33
Hispanics	0.07	0.05	0.16	−0.03	0.16
Caribbeans	0.01	0.06	0.87	−0.12	0.14

Table 418: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 417).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.06	0.63
Income	0.01	0.21	0.97
South	−0.03	0.03	0.24
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.01	0.02	0.75
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.07	0.05	0.20
Racial Group Lazy	−0.12	0.06	0.05
Black	0.16	0.12	0.18
Asian	0.11	0.14	0.44
Hispanic	0.04	0.11	0.73
Caribbean	0.27	0.13	0.04
Age x Black	0.05	0.10	0.59
Age x Asian	−0.14	0.14	0.31
Age x Hispanic	0.04	0.11	0.75
Age x Caribbean	−0.08	0.13	0.54
Income x Black	−0.35	1.12	0.76
Income x Asian	0.29	0.31	0.35
Income x Hispanic	−0.06	0.33	0.86
Income x Caribbean	−0.03	0.39	0.95
South x Black	0.08	0.04	0.07
South x Asian	−0.06	0.06	0.35
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.85
South x Caribbean	−0.04	0.06	0.50
Education x Black	−0.02	0.07	0.71
Education x Asian	−0.02	0.09	0.82
Education x Hispanic	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.03	0.08	0.76
Female x Black	−0.08	0.04	0.03
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.59
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.82
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.12
Party x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.15
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.08	0.61
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.06	0.68
Party x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.43
Ideology x Black	0.16	0.07	0.03
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.10	0.79
Ideology x Hispanic	0.23	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.31
Close to group x Black	0.05	0.08	0.58
Close to group x Asian	0.16	0.09	0.09
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.88
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.07
Group lazy x Black	0.03	0.08	0.70
Group lazy x Asian	−0.11	0.11	0.33
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.15	0.09	0.08
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.04	0.10	0.69

Table 419: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Blacks, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2191).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.07	0.05	0.20	−0.04	0.17
Blacks	0.11	0.06	0.07	−0.01	0.24
Asians	0.23	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.37
Hispanics	0.06	0.05	0.26	−0.04	0.16
Caribbeans	−0.10	0.07	1.81	−0.24	0.05

Table 420: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 419).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.24	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.07	0.07	0.34
Income	−0.04	0.21	0.84
South	−0.05	0.03	0.10
Education	0.14	0.05	0.00
Female	0.03	0.03	0.37
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.16	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.06	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.10	0.05	0.05
Racial Group Lazy	−0.08	0.07	0.26
Black	0.15	0.11	0.18
Asian	0.10	0.15	0.48
Hispanic	0.06	0.11	0.59
Caribbean	0.22	0.14	0.11
Age x Black	0.09	0.11	0.39
Age x Asian	−0.13	0.15	0.39
Age x Hispanic	0.11	0.12	0.35
Age x Caribbean	−0.04	0.13	0.78
Income x Black	−0.89	1.06	0.40
Income x Asian	0.35	0.57	0.54
Income x Hispanic	0.11	0.35	0.76
Income x Caribbean	0.03	0.40	0.94
South x Black	0.11	0.05	0.02
South x Asian	−0.00	0.07	0.95
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.05	0.75
South x Caribbean	−0.01	0.06	0.87
Education x Black	0.01	0.07	0.85
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.10	0.89
Education x Hispanic	−0.21	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.68
Female x Black	−0.10	0.04	0.01
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.52
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.74
Female x Caribbean	−0.10	0.05	0.04
Party x Black	−0.12	0.08	0.12
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.09	0.70
Party x Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.39
Party x Caribbean	−0.11	0.09	0.20
Ideology x Black	0.17	0.08	0.03
Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.11	0.65
Ideology x Hispanic	0.26	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.07	0.09	0.42
Close to group x Black	0.00	0.07	0.99
Close to group x Asian	0.10	0.09	0.26
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.06	0.07	0.38
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.11	0.09	0.21
Group lazy x Black	0.12	0.09	0.20
Group lazy x Asian	−0.10	0.14	0.44
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.09	0.10	0.35
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.07	0.12	0.58

Table 421: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1919).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.10	0.05	0.05	−0.00	0.20
Blacks	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.19
Asians	0.20	0.07	0.01	0.05	0.34
Hispanics	0.04	0.05	0.46	−0.06	0.13
Caribbeans	−0.01	0.07	1.13	−0.15	0.13

Table 422: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 421).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.23	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.03	0.06	0.61
Income	−0.02	0.20	0.91
South	−0.03	0.03	0.27
Education	0.14	0.04	0.00
Female	0.01	0.02	0.60
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.15	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.24	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	0.07	0.05	0.14
Racial Group Lazy	−0.11	0.06	0.06
Black	0.12	0.11	0.27
Asian	0.03	0.13	0.80
Hispanic	0.09	0.10	0.38
Caribbean	0.13	0.12	0.29
Age x Black	0.06	0.10	0.55
Age x Asian	−0.14	0.14	0.30
Age x Hispanic	0.03	0.11	0.80
Age x Caribbean	−0.07	0.13	0.59
Income x Black	−0.85	1.04	0.42
Income x Asian	0.25	0.31	0.41
Income x Hispanic	−0.06	0.33	0.86
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	0.39	0.97
South x Black	0.08	0.04	0.05
South x Asian	−0.06	0.06	0.36
South x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.75
South x Caribbean	−0.03	0.06	0.60
Education x Black	0.01	0.07	0.85
Education x Asian	−0.00	0.09	0.96
Education x Hispanic	−0.18	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.61
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.51
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.47
Female x Caribbean	−0.07	0.05	0.12
Party x Black	−0.10	0.07	0.16
Party x Asian	−0.04	0.08	0.61
Party x Hispanic	−0.04	0.06	0.48
Party x Caribbean	−0.08	0.09	0.37
Ideology x Black	0.17	0.07	0.02
Ideology x Asian	0.03	0.10	0.75
Ideology x Hispanic	0.25	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.12	0.09	0.18
Close to group x Black	0.06	0.07	0.38
Close to group x Asian	0.18	0.09	0.04
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.02	0.08	0.81
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.02	0.08	0.79
Group lazy x Black	0.13	0.08	0.11
Group lazy x Asian	−0.02	0.11	0.88
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.07	0.08	0.44
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.04	0.10	0.69

Table 423: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Hispanics, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2181).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> \lvert t \rvert)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.07	0.05	0.14	−0.02	0.16
Blacks	0.13	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.24
Asians	0.25	0.07	0.00	0.11	0.40
Hispanics	0.05	0.06	0.37	−0.06	0.17
Caribbeans	0.05	0.06	0.43	−0.07	0.17

Table 424: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 423).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.30	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.04	0.06	0.55
Income	0.05	0.21	0.79
South	−0.02	0.03	0.46
Education	0.15	0.04	0.00
Female	0.02	0.02	0.43
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.23	0.05	0.00
Close to Racial Group	−0.09	0.06	0.13
Racial Group Lazy	−0.02	0.06	0.79
Black	0.09	0.11	0.43
Asian	0.10	0.14	0.47
Hispanic	0.03	0.11	0.76
Caribbean	0.13	0.13	0.31
Age x Black	0.05	0.10	0.60
Age x Asian	−0.18	0.13	0.18
Age x Hispanic	0.00	0.11	0.98
Age x Caribbean	−0.05	0.13	0.73
Income x Black	−1.07	1.05	0.31
Income x Asian	0.24	0.32	0.45
Income x Hispanic	−0.11	0.33	0.74
Income x Caribbean	−0.08	0.40	0.83
South x Black	0.06	0.04	0.17
South x Asian	−0.04	0.06	0.49
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.43
South x Caribbean	−0.04	0.06	0.53
Education x Black	−0.00	0.07	1.00
Education x Asian	−0.03	0.09	0.75
Education x Hispanic	−0.20	0.06	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.02	0.08	0.84
Female x Black	−0.09	0.04	0.02
Female x Asian	−0.04	0.05	0.36
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.42
Female x Caribbean	−0.08	0.05	0.11
Party x Black	−0.07	0.07	0.31
Party x Asian	−0.01	0.08	0.94
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.06	0.89
Party x Caribbean	−0.07	0.09	0.39
Ideology x Black	0.15	0.07	0.04
Ideology x Asian	0.05	0.10	0.65
Ideology x Hispanic	0.24	0.08	0.00
Ideology x Caribbean	0.09	0.09	0.30
Close to group x Black	0.17	0.08	0.03
Close to group x Asian	0.01	0.10	0.90
Close to group x Hispanic	0.12	0.08	0.13
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.00	0.09	0.96
Group lazy x Black	0.06	0.08	0.51
Group lazy x Asian	−0.06	0.13	0.66
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.09	0.09	0.29
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.01	0.10	0.89

Table 425: OLS model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor) as a function of Closeness to Whites, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2204).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.09	0.06	1.87	−0.21	0.03
Blacks	0.08	0.05	0.12	−0.02	0.17
Asians	−0.08	0.08	1.71	−0.23	0.07
Hispanics	0.03	0.05	0.59	−0.08	0.13
Caribbeans	−0.10	0.07	1.86	−0.22	0.03

Table 426: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Preferences For Past Discrimination (0=strongly oppose, 1=strongly favor)(Appendix Table 425).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.07	0.05
Income	0.13	0.22	0.55
South	−0.02	0.03	0.44
Education	0.03	0.05	0.51
Female	0.01	0.03	0.80
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.06	0.05	0.21
Racial Group Lazy	−0.02	0.07	0.79
Black	0.08	0.11	0.47
Asian	−0.18	0.14	0.19
Hispanic	−0.05	0.10	0.60
Caribbean	0.08	0.12	0.54
Age x Black	0.13	0.11	0.22
Age x Asian	0.05	0.14	0.73
Age x Hispanic	−0.26	0.12	0.03
Age x Caribbean	−0.13	0.13	0.32
Income x Black	−0.49	0.88	0.58
Income x Asian	−0.39	0.33	0.24
Income x Hispanic	−0.05	0.35	0.88
Income x Caribbean	0.07	0.41	0.87
South x Black	−0.05	0.05	0.31
South x Asian	0.01	0.06	0.89
South x Hispanic	−0.06	0.05	0.21
South x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.78
Education x Black	0.20	0.07	0.00
Education x Asian	0.04	0.10	0.66
Education x Hispanic	0.26	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.26	0.09	0.00
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.07
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.66
Female x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.42
Female x Caribbean	0.01	0.05	0.92
Party x Black	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Party x Asian	0.05	0.08	0.52
Party x Hispanic	−0.02	0.07	0.72
Party x Caribbean	−0.20	0.09	0.03
Ideology x Black	−0.05	0.08	0.49
Ideology x Asian	−0.02	0.10	0.81
Ideology x Hispanic	0.02	0.08	0.85
Ideology x Caribbean	0.07	0.09	0.41
Close to group x Black	−0.08	0.07	0.24
Close to group x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.55
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.04	0.07	0.56
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.14	0.08	0.09
Group lazy x Black	0.04	0.09	0.69
Group lazy x Asian	0.25	0.14	0.08
Group lazy x Hispanic	−0.16	0.10	0.09
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.25	0.12	0.03

Table 427: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Asians, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2149).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.06	0.05	0.21	−0.03	0.16
Blacks	−0.02	0.05	1.34	−0.12	0.08
Asians	0.01	0.08	0.94	−0.15	0.16
Hispanics	0.02	0.05	0.69	−0.08	0.12
Caribbeans	−0.08	0.07	1.76	−0.21	0.05

Table 428: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Asians for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 427).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.90	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.06	0.04
Income	0.14	0.22	0.53
South	−0.04	0.03	0.20
Education	0.05	0.04	0.26
Female	−0.02	0.03	0.56
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.12	0.04	0.01
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	0.02	0.06	0.67
Racial Group Lazy	−0.21	0.06	0.00
Black	−0.15	0.12	0.20
Asian	−0.05	0.15	0.73
Hispanic	−0.13	0.11	0.24
Caribbean	−0.08	0.14	0.54
Age x Black	0.14	0.10	0.17
Age x Asian	−0.00	0.14	0.97
Age x Hispanic	−0.20	0.12	0.09
Age x Caribbean	−0.16	0.13	0.22
Income x Black	−0.61	0.92	0.51
Income x Asian	−0.36	0.33	0.27
Income x Hispanic	−0.04	0.35	0.92
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	0.41	0.99
South x Black	−0.02	0.04	0.60
South x Asian	0.05	0.06	0.44
South x Hispanic	−0.03	0.04	0.51
South x Caribbean	−0.02	0.06	0.75
Education x Black	0.18	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	0.01	0.09	0.88
Education x Hispanic	0.24	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.21	0.09	0.01
Female x Black	−0.05	0.04	0.19
Female x Asian	−0.01	0.05	0.80
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.59
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.05	0.89
Party x Black	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Party x Asian	0.03	0.08	0.70
Party x Hispanic	−0.01	0.07	0.93
Party x Caribbean	−0.20	0.09	0.03
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.07	0.61
Ideology x Asian	−0.03	0.10	0.76
Ideology x Hispanic	0.02	0.08	0.84
Ideology x Caribbean	0.07	0.09	0.46
Close to group x Black	0.09	0.09	0.32
Close to group x Asian	−0.04	0.10	0.69
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.01	0.08	0.92
Close to group x Caribbean	0.11	0.10	0.25
Group lazy x Black	0.29	0.09	0.00
Group lazy x Asian	−0.10	0.11	0.40
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.02	0.09	0.83
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.03	0.10	0.77

Table 429: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Blacks, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2212).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.02	0.06	0.67	−0.09	0.13
Blacks	0.11	0.07	0.09	−0.02	0.24
Asians	−0.01	0.08	1.15	−0.17	0.14
Hispanics	0.02	0.05	0.76	−0.09	0.12
Caribbeans	0.13	0.08	0.09	−0.02	0.29

Table 430: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Blacks for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 429).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.15	0.07	0.04
Income	0.11	0.23	0.62
South	−0.03	0.03	0.40
Education	0.04	0.05	0.41
Female	−0.01	0.03	0.85
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.15	0.05	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.11	0.06	0.06
Close to Racial Group	0.03	0.05	0.54
Racial Group Lazy	−0.15	0.07	0.05
Black	0.06	0.12	0.60
Asian	−0.10	0.15	0.51
Hispanic	−0.09	0.11	0.43
Caribbean	−0.05	0.14	0.72
Age x Black	0.10	0.11	0.38
Age x Asian	0.00	0.16	1.00
Age x Hispanic	−0.26	0.13	0.04
Age x Caribbean	−0.12	0.14	0.39
Income x Black	−0.42	0.89	0.64
Income x Asian	−1.19	0.60	0.05
Income x Hispanic	−0.09	0.37	0.81
Income x Caribbean	0.11	0.42	0.79
South x Black	−0.02	0.05	0.65
South x Asian	0.03	0.07	0.72
South x Hispanic	−0.07	0.05	0.14
South x Caribbean	0.01	0.07	0.83
Education x Black	0.20	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	−0.01	0.11	0.94
Education x Hispanic	0.27	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.25	0.09	0.01
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.10
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.60
Female x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.43
Female x Caribbean	0.01	0.05	0.91
Party x Black	−0.18	0.08	0.02
Party x Asian	0.05	0.09	0.61
Party x Hispanic	−0.04	0.07	0.62
Party x Caribbean	−0.21	0.09	0.02
Ideology x Black	−0.06	0.08	0.46
Ideology x Asian	−0.02	0.12	0.88
Ideology x Hispanic	0.02	0.09	0.85
Ideology x Caribbean	0.04	0.09	0.66
Close to group x Black	−0.06	0.07	0.43
Close to group x Asian	−0.11	0.09	0.25
Close to group x Hispanic	−0.07	0.07	0.36
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.03	0.09	0.77
Group lazy x Black	0.07	0.10	0.48
Group lazy x Asian	0.10	0.14	0.49
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.04	0.10	0.69
Group lazy x Caribbean	0.15	0.13	0.22

Table 431: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Caribbeans, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=1939).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.03	0.05	0.54	−0.07	0.14
Blacks	−0.03	0.05	1.40	−0.13	0.07
Asians	−0.08	0.08	1.68	−0.23	0.07
Hispanics	−0.04	0.05	1.51	−0.14	0.07
Caribbeans	0.01	0.07	0.94	−0.14	0.15

Table 432: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Caribbeans for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 431).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.80	0.07	0.00
Age	−0.13	0.06	0.05
Income	0.14	0.22	0.52
South	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Education	0.04	0.05	0.33
Female	0.00	0.03	0.99
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.14	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.02
Close to Racial Group	0.08	0.05	0.12
Racial Group Lazy	−0.06	0.06	0.34
Black	−0.03	0.11	0.77
Asian	−0.02	0.14	0.87
Hispanic	−0.21	0.11	0.05
Caribbean	0.05	0.13	0.69
Age x Black	0.15	0.11	0.17
Age x Asian	0.00	0.14	0.99
Age x Hispanic	−0.17	0.11	0.13
Age x Caribbean	−0.13	0.13	0.33
Income x Black	−0.28	0.88	0.75
Income x Asian	−0.38	0.33	0.25
Income x Hispanic	−0.05	0.35	0.88
Income x Caribbean	0.09	0.41	0.82
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.54
South x Asian	0.01	0.06	0.83
South x Hispanic	−0.05	0.04	0.31
South x Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.73
Education x Black	0.18	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	0.03	0.10	0.77
Education x Hispanic	0.28	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.26	0.09	0.00
Female x Black	−0.06	0.04	0.11
Female x Asian	−0.03	0.05	0.51
Female x Hispanic	−0.01	0.04	0.73
Female x Caribbean	0.00	0.05	0.95
Party x Black	−0.14	0.07	0.05
Party x Asian	0.02	0.08	0.79
Party x Hispanic	−0.04	0.07	0.58
Party x Caribbean	−0.17	0.09	0.06
Ideology x Black	−0.03	0.08	0.68
Ideology x Asian	−0.04	0.11	0.67
Ideology x Hispanic	0.00	0.08	0.97
Ideology x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.49
Close to group x Black	0.06	0.07	0.44
Close to group x Asian	−0.06	0.09	0.51
Close to group x Hispanic	0.03	0.08	0.72
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.18	0.08	0.03
Group lazy x Black	−0.00	0.09	0.98
Group lazy x Asian	−0.19	0.11	0.10
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.10	0.09	0.24
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.01	0.11	0.95

Table 433: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Hispanics, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2198).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(>|t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	0.08	0.05	0.12	−0.02	0.18
Blacks	0.14	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.24
Asians	0.02	0.08	0.81	−0.13	0.17
Hispanics	0.11	0.06	0.08	−0.01	0.23
Caribbeans	−0.10	0.07	1.86	−0.23	0.03

Table 434: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Hispanics for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 433).

	$\hat{\beta}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$
Constant	0.85	0.08	0.00
Age	−0.12	0.06	0.07
Income	0.18	0.22	0.40
South	−0.04	0.03	0.23
Education	0.06	0.05	0.22
Female	0.00	0.03	1.00
Dem-Rep Partisanship	0.12	0.04	0.00
Lib-Con Ideology	−0.12	0.05	0.03
Close to Racial Group	−0.06	0.06	0.33
Racial Group Lazy	0.03	0.07	0.61
Black	0.02	0.12	0.89
Asian	−0.19	0.15	0.19
Hispanic	−0.16	0.11	0.16
Caribbean	0.06	0.14	0.67
Age x Black	0.13	0.10	0.22
Age x Asian	−0.02	0.14	0.87
Age x Hispanic	−0.19	0.12	0.11
Age x Caribbean	−0.14	0.13	0.29
Income x Black	−0.51	0.89	0.57
Income x Asian	−0.42	0.33	0.20
Income x Hispanic	−0.11	0.35	0.76
Income x Caribbean	−0.01	0.42	0.97
South x Black	−0.03	0.04	0.55
South x Asian	0.03	0.06	0.65
South x Hispanic	−0.04	0.04	0.36
South x Caribbean	0.03	0.06	0.68
Education x Black	0.17	0.07	0.01
Education x Asian	0.05	0.10	0.63
Education x Hispanic	0.26	0.07	0.00
Education x Caribbean	0.21	0.09	0.02
Female x Black	−0.07	0.04	0.07
Female x Asian	−0.02	0.05	0.60
Female x Hispanic	−0.02	0.04	0.66
Female x Caribbean	−0.01	0.05	0.86
Party x Black	−0.16	0.07	0.03
Party x Asian	0.07	0.08	0.43
Party x Hispanic	−0.03	0.07	0.64
Party x Caribbean	−0.19	0.09	0.04
Ideology x Black	−0.04	0.08	0.56
Ideology x Asian	−0.01	0.11	0.96
Ideology x Hispanic	0.01	0.08	0.93
Ideology x Caribbean	0.06	0.09	0.51
Close to group x Black	0.00	0.08	0.96
Close to group x Asian	−0.04	0.10	0.67
Close to group x Hispanic	0.04	0.08	0.63
Close to group x Caribbean	−0.05	0.09	0.61
Group lazy x Black	0.07	0.09	0.42
Group lazy x Asian	0.11	0.14	0.43
Group lazy x Hispanic	0.00	0.09	0.99
Group lazy x Caribbean	−0.15	0.11	0.16

Table 435: OLS model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose as a function of Closeness to Whites, Stereotypes of the Racial Group, and personal attributes (NPS, N=2222).

	$\widehat{\text{Slope}}$	$\widehat{\text{SE}}$	$p(> |t|)$	95% CI	
Whites	−0.06	0.06	1.67	−0.18	0.06
Blacks	−0.06	0.05	1.73	−0.16	0.05
Asians	−0.10	0.08	1.81	−0.26	0.05
Hispanics	−0.02	0.06	1.28	−0.13	0.09
Caribbeans	−0.11	0.07	1.88	−0.24	0.03

Table 436: Slopes for the effect of Closeness to Whites for respondents from different racial groups estimated from the model describing Racial Profiling (0=strongly favor, 1=strongly oppose(Appendix Table 435).

Note

This document was created using the Sweave system for literate programming (Leisch, 2002*a*,*b*). This system allows combines the R statistical computing environment (R Development Core Team, 2008) with LaTeX(Lamport, 1994).

References

Bates, Douglas, Martin Maechler and Bin Dai. 2008. *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using S4 classes.* R package version 0.999375-25.
   URL: *http://lme4.r-forge.r-project.org/*

Fox, John. 1997. *Applied Regression Analysis, Linear Models, and Related Methods.* SAGE Publications.

Lamport, L. 1994. "LaTeX: A Document Preparation System User's Guide and Reference Manual." *Reading, Mass* .

Leisch, Friedrich. 2002*a*. Sweave: Dynamic Generation of Statistical Reports Using Literate Data Analysis. In *Compstat 2002 — Proceedings in Computational Statistics*, ed. Wolfgang Härdle and Bernd Rönz. Physica Verlag, Heidelberg pp. 575–580. ISBN 3-7908-1517-9.
   URL: *http://www.stat.uni-muenchen.de/ leisch/Sweave*

Leisch, Friedrich. 2002*b*. "Sweave, Part I: Mixing R and LaTeX." *R News* 2(3):28–31.
   URL: *http://CRAN.R-project.org/doc/Rnews/*

R Development Core Team. 2008. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
   URL: *http://www.R-project.org*