

## **End of Manuscript. Additional Online Material Included for Purposes of Review**

### **Appendix 1. Question Wording and Summary Statistics for Dependent Variables**

#### *Affirmative action for Blacks:*

2008: What about your opinion -- are you FOR or AGAINST preferential hiring and promotion of blacks? Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY?/Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY? (ANES: V085157, V085157a, V085157b, "affirmative action")

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means strongly against and 1 means strongly in support

2012: What about your opinion -- are you FOR or AGAINST preferential hiring and promotion of blacks? Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY?/Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY? (ANES: aapost\_hire, aapost\_hirefav, aapost\_hireopp)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means strongly against and 1 means strongly support.

#### *Government assistance to Blacks:*

2008: Where would you place YOURSELF on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? 1. Govt should help blacks 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Blacks should help themselves (ANES: V083137, "aid to blacks")

*Coded:* 0 to 1, with above scale reversed such that 0 means that Blacks should help themselves, and 1 means that government should help the Blacks.

2012: Where would you place YOURSELF on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? 1. Govt should help blacks 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. Blacks should help themselves (ANES: aidblack\_self, "aid to blacks")

*Coded:* 0 to 1, with above scale reversed such that 0 means that Blacks should help themselves, and 1 means that government should help Blacks.

#### *Fair treatment in jobs for Blacks:*

2008: How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs OR is this not the federal government's business? (ANES: V085079a, branched from V085079, "fair jobs")

*Coded:* 0 or 1, where 0 means that it is not the federal government's business and 1 means that it is the government's responsibility to "see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs"

2012: Should the government in Washington see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or is this not the federal government's business? Do you feel strongly or not strongly that this is/is not the federal government's business? (ANES: fairjob\_opin, fairjob\_yes, fairjobs\_no, there is no first branching question in 2012, "fair jobs")

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means that it is not the federal government's business and 1 means that it is the government's responsibility to "see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs"

#### *Death Penalty:*

2008: Do you FAVOR or OPPOSE the death penalty for persons convicted of murder? Do you favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY? / Do you oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder STRONGLY or NOT STRONGLY?(ANES: V083163, V083163a, "death penalty")

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means the respondent strongly opposes the death penalty and 1 means respondent strongly supports the death penalty.

2012: Do you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder? Do you favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder strongly or not strongly? / Do you oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder strongly or not strongly?(ANES: penalty\_favdpn, penalty\_dpensr, “death penalty”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means the respondent strongly opposes the death penalty and 1 means respondent strongly supports the death penalty.

#### *Welfare:*

2008: What about WELFARE PROGRAMS? Should federal spending on welfare programs be INCREASED, DECREASED, or kept ABOUT THE SAME? Should it be increased A GREAT DEAL, A MODERATE AMOUNT, or A LITTLE? / Should it be decreased A GREAT DEAL, A MODERATE AMOUNT, or A LITTLE? (ANES: V083145, V083145a “welfare”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 0 means welfare should be decreased a great deal and 1 means welfare spending should be increased a great deal

2012: WELFARE PROGRAMS (Should federal spending be INCREASED, DECREASED, or kept [ABOUT THE SAME / THE SAME]?) (ANES: fedspend\_welfare, “welfare”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where 1 means spending should be increased and 0 means spending should be decreased.

#### *Vote choice:*

2008: Who did you vote for? (ANES: V085044a, voters and V085046a, non-voters, “vote Obama”)

*Coded:* 0 or 1, where 1 means voted for Obama (or supports Obama for models that rely on non-voters), 0 means did not vote (or support) Obama

2012: Who did you vote for? (ANES: presvote2012\_x)

*Coded:* 0 or 1, where 1 means voted for Obama.

#### *Prejudice Measures:*

##### *Stereotype Index*

2008: [lazy/intelligent] Where would you rate WHITES on this scale? Where would you rate BLACKS on this scale? (ANES: 083208b, V083207b, V083207a, V083208a “negative stereotypes”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where higher values mean the respondents has more negative stereotypes of blacks.

2012: [lazy/intelligent] Where would you rate WHITES in general on this scale? Where would you rate BLACKS on this scale? (ANES: stype\_intwhite, stype\_intblack, stype\_hwkwhite, stype\_hwkblack, “negative stereotypes”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, where higher values mean the respondents has more negative stereotypes of blacks.

##### *Sympathy measure:*

2008: How often have you felt sympathy for Blacks? VERY often, FAIRLY often, NOT TOO often, or NEVER? (ANES: V085115, “denial of sympathy”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, reversed, where 1 means a respondent never feels sympathy

2012: How often have you felt sympathy for Blacks? [ALWAYS, MOST OF THE TIME, ABOUT HALF THE TIME, SOME OF THE TIME, or NEVER / NEVER, SOME OF THE TIME, ABOUT HALF THE TIME, MOST OF THE TIME, or ALWAYS] (ANES: racecasi\_sympblacks, “denial of sympathy”)

*Coded:* 0 to 1, reversed, where 1 means a respondent never feels sympathy.

*Racial Resentment:*

2008: Index created from four questions: Do you [AGREE STRONGLY, AGREE SOMEWHAT, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, DISAGREE SOMEWHAT, or DISAGREE STRONGLY / DISAGREE STRONGLY, DISAGREE SOMEWHAT, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, AGREE SOMEWHAT, or AGREE STRONGLY] with this statement? (1) Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors; (2) Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class; (3) Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve; (4) It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites. (ANES: V085143, V085144, V085145, V085146, “racial resentment”).

*Coded:* averaged, and scaled 0 to 1, where 1 is the highest level of racial resentment.

2012: Index created from four questions: Do you [AGREE STRONGLY, AGREE SOMEWHAT, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, DISAGREE SOMEWHAT, or DISAGREE STRONGLY / DISAGREE STRONGLY, DISAGREE SOMEWHAT, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, AGREE SOMEWHAT, or AGREE STRONGLY] with this statement? (1) Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities over- came prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors; (2) Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class; (3) Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve; (4) It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites. (ANES: resent\_workway, resent\_slavery, resent\_deserve, resent\_try, “racial resentment”)

*Coded:* averaged, and scaled 0 to 1, where 1 is the highest level of racial resentment.

<i>Summary Statistics, 2008 and 2012<sup>a</sup> (weighted)</i>				
	Whites	US-Born Latinos	Foreign-Born Latinos	Blacks
<i>Affirmative Action, 0 (strongly against) to 1 (strongly support)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.16 SD = 0.01 N = 1086	Mean = 0.28 SD = 0.02 N = 438	Mean = 0.30 SD = 0.04 N = 124	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.02 N = 0.56
2012	Mean = 0.16 SD = 0.01 N=834	Mean = 0.21 SD = 0.03 N = 303	Mean = 0.25 SD = 0.05 N = 104	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.03 N=451
<i>Aid to Blacks, 0 (Blacks should help themselves) to 1 (government should help the Blacks)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.31 SD = 0.01 N = 971	Mean = 0.43 SD = 0.02 N = 353	Mean = 0.52 SD = 0.04 N = 104	Mean = 0.61 SD = 0.02 N = 486

2012	Mean = 0.31 SD = 0.01 N = 785	Mean = 0.43 SD = 0.03 N = 277	Mean = 0.44 SD = 0.05 N = 105	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.02 N = 438
<i>Fair Jobs</i> , 0 (not government's business) to 1 (government's business) <sup>b</sup>				
2008 <sup>c</sup>	Mean = 0.47 SD = 0.01 N = 1101	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.02 N = 448	Mean = 0.57 SD = 0.04 N = 125	Mean = 0.76 SD = 0.01 N = 566
2012	Mean = 0.47 SD = 0.02 N = 804	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.04 N = 292	Mean = 0.58 SD = 0.06 N = 111	Mean = 0.81 SD = 0.03 N = 456
<i>Death Penalty</i> , 0 (strongly oppose) to 1 (strongly support)				
2008	Mean = 0.72 SD = 0.01 N = 1062	Mean = 0.61 SD = 0.03 N = 418	Mean = 0.52 SD = 0.05 N = 116	Mean = 0.46 SD = 0.02 N = 500
2012	Mean = 0.72 SD = 0.01 N = 872	Mean = 0.67 SD = 0.03 N = 325	Mean = 0.57 SD = 0.05 N = 117	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.03 N = 466
<i>Welfare</i> , 0 (decreased) to 1 (increased) <sup>b</sup>				
2008	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.01 N = 1089	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.02 N = 444	Mean = 0.70 SD = 0.03 N = 126	Mean = 0.76 SD = 0.01 N = 557
2012	Mean = 0.32 SD = 0.01 N = 892	Mean = 0.47 SD = 0.03 N = 340	Mean = 0.49 SD = 0.06 N = 119	Mean = 0.53 SD = 0.03 N = 506
<i>Vote Choice 1</i> , 1 (vote for Obama), 0 (voted other candidate)				
2008	Mean = 0.43 SD = 0.02 N = 871	Mean = 0.69 SD = 0.04 N = 310	Mean = 0.72 SD = 0.06 N = 86	Mean = 0.99 SD = 0.01 N = 469
2012 (FTF)	Mean = 0.40 SD = 0.02 N = 622	Mean = 0.82 SD = 0.04 N = 181	Mean = 0.62 SD = 0.10 N = 70	Mean = 0.98 SD = 0.01 N = 391
2012 (Full)	Mean = 0.41 SD = 0.01 N = 2616	Mean = 0.69 SD = 0.04 N = 415	Mean = 0.75 SD = 0.05 N = 210	Mean = 0.96 SD = 0.01 N = 803
<i>Vote Choice 2</i> , 1 (vote for Obama), 0 (voted other candidate or did not vote)				
2008	Mean = 0.36 SD = 0.02 N = 1088	Mean = 0.48 SD = 0.03 N = 446	Mean = 0.45 SD = 0.05 N = 127	Mean = 0.78 SD = 0.04 N = 563
2012 (FTF)	Mean = 0.29 SD = 0.02 N = 906	Mean = 0.43 SD = 0.04 N = 342	Mean = 0.38 SD = 0.06 N = 123	Mean = 0.76 SD = 0.03 N = 511
2012 (Full)	Mean = 0.31 SD = 0.01 N = 3412	Mean = 0.42 SD = 0.03 N = 672	Mean = 0.47 SD = 0.04 N = 317	Mean = 0.73 SD = 0.02 N = 1011
<i>Stereotypes of Blacks: Lazy</i> [1 to 7]				
2008	Mean = 4.08	Mean = 3.86	Mean = 4.31	Mean = 2.87

	SD = 0.05 N = 1073	SD = 0.09 N = 445	SD = 0.20 N = 123	SD = 0.09 N = 557
2012	Mean = 3.99 SD = 0.05 N = 860	Mean = 4.07 SD = 0.12 N = 322	Mean = 4.30 SD = 0.20 N = 117	Mean = 2.83 SD = 0.11 N = 476
<i>Stereotypes of Blacks: Unintelligent [1 to 7]</i>				
2008	Mean = 3.71 SD = 0.05 N = 1076	Mean = 3.64 SD = 0.08 N = 442	Mean = 3.76 SD = 0.14 N = 126	Mean = 2.64 SD = 0.07 N = 557
2012	Mean = 3.62 SD = 0.05 N = 860	Mean = 3.53 SD = 0.09 N = 322	Mean = 3.46 SD = 0.20 N = 116	Mean = 2.56 SD = 0.09 N = 476
<i>Denial of Sympathy for Blacks<sup>b</sup></i>				
2008	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.01 N = 1091	Mean = 0.55 SD = 0.02 N = 447	Mean = 0.49 SD = 0.03 N = 124	Mean = 0.34 SD = 0.02 N = 562
2012	Mean = 0.70 SD = 0.01 N = 862	Mean = 0.67 SD = 0.02 N = 322	Mean = 0.63 SD = 0.03 N = 117	Mean = 0.41 SD = 0.02 N = 478
<i>Partisanship, 0 (strong Democrat) to 1 (strong Republican)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.52 SD = 0.01 N = 1099	Mean = 0.39 SD = 0.02 N = 445	Mean = 0.36 SD = 0.04 N = 126	Mean = 0.19 SD = 0.01 N = 564
2012	Mean = 0.54 SD = 0.01 N = 908	Mean = 0.31 SD = 0.02 N = 343	Mean = 0.32 SD = 0.04 N = 125	Mean = 0.15 SD = 0.01 N = 505
<i>Limited Government, 1 (more limited government)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.45 SD = 0.01 N = 1069	Mean = 0.28 SD = 0.03 N = 431	Mean = 0.24 SD = 0.03 N = 123	Mean = 0.17 SD = 0.01 N = 552
2012	Mean = 0.50 SD = 0.02 N = 860	Mean = 0.29 SD = 0.03 N = 321	Mean = 0.26 SD = 0.06 N = 118	Mean = 0.16 SD = 0.02 N = 480
<i>Egalitarianism, 1 (more egalitarian)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.60 SD = 0.01 N = 1100	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.01 N = 445	Mean = 0.61 SD = 0.02 N = 125	Mean = 0.74 SD = 0.01 N = 565
2012	Mean = 0.59 SD = 0.01 N = 864	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.01 N = 322	Mean = 0.58 SD = 0.03 N = 118	Mean = 0.75 SD = 0.01 N = 481
<i>Age, 0 to 1, (categorized, 1 is oldest)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.40 SD = 0.01 N = 1090	Mean = 0.31 SD = 0.01 N = 448	Mean = 0.40 SD = 0.03 N = 125	Mean = 0.35 SD = 0.01 N = 566
2012	Mean = 0.55 SD = 0.01	Mean = 0.30 SD = 0.02	Mean = 0.50 SD = 0.03	Mean = 0.41 SD = 0.02

	N = 894	N = 336	N = 117	N = 500
<i>Male, 1 (male)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.45 SD = 0.02 N = 1110	Mean = 0.45 SD = 0.03 N = 451	Mean = 0.46 SD = 0.06 N = 128	Mean = 0.42 SD = 0.03 N = 572
2012	Mean = 0.48 SD = 0.02 N = 918	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.04 N = 346	Mean = 0.42 SD = 0.07 N = 126	Mean = 0.49 SD = 0.03 N = 511
<i>Income, 0 to 1 (1 is highest income point)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.43 SD = 0.01 N = 1046	Mean = 0.38 SD = 0.02 N = 427	Mean = 0.38 SD = 0.03 N = 115	Mean = 0.33 SD = 0.01 N = 531
2012	Mean = 0.55 SD = 0.01 N = 787	Mean = 0.38 SD = 0.02 N = 276	Mean = 0.41 SD = 0.05 N = 101	Mean = 0.34 SD = 0.02 N = 397
<i>Education, 0 to 1 (highest education)<sup>b</sup></i>				
2008	Mean = 0.80 SD = 0.004 N = 1107	Mean = 0.78 SD = 0.01 N = 449	Mean = 0.66 SD = 0.03 N = 128	Mean = 0.74 SD = 0.01 N = 570
2012	Mean = 0.50 SD = 0.01 N = 910	Mean = 0.37 SD = 0.02 N = 346	Mean = 0.38 SD = 0.04 N = 125	Mean = 0.40 SD = 0.02 N = 505
<i>Racial Resentment, 0 to 1 (highest resentment)</i>				
2008	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.01 N = 1099	Mean = 0.57 SD = 0.01 N = 444	Mean = 0.57 SD = 0.02 N = 120	Mean = 0.47 SD = 0.01 N = 559
2012	Mean = 0.64 SD = 0.01 N = 862	Mean = 0.64 SD = 0.02 N = 322	Mean = 0.66 SD = 0.03 N = 118	Mean = 0.45 SD = 0.02 N = 480

<sup>a</sup> 2012 results use FTF interviews.

<sup>b</sup> Response options differ in 2008 and 2012 and cannot be compared directly.

<sup>c</sup> In 2008, an initial question measured whether respondents were interested in this issue. Those who were not interested were subsequently not asked the follow-up opinion questions. The data in the table includes those who said they were “uninterested” as the mid-point. If these respondents are excluded the patterns are as follows: Whites, mean = 0.44, SD = 0.02, N = 642; US-born Latinos, mean = 0.62, SD = 0.04, N = 239; Foreign-born Latinos, mean = 0.61, SD = 0.07, N = 75; Blacks, mean = 0.90, SD = 0.02, N = 386.

### Appendix 2. 2008 Data

In this appendix present the coefficients on the control variables from in-text Tables 1 and 2 (shown in Tables A1, A2 and A3).

*Table A1. Latinos (U.S.-born), Results with Controls (in-text Tables 1 and 2)*

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Pen.	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.24*** (0.08)	-0.32*** (0.12)	0.08 (0.10)	-0.19*** (0.08)	-0.55 (1.21)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.23*** (0.07)	-0.18*** (0.06)	-0.46*** (0.09)	0.16** (0.08)	0.03 (0.07)	-1.57* (0.82)
Party ID	-0.20*** (0.06)	-0.21*** (0.06)	-0.09 (0.09)	0.16* (0.08)	-0.04 (0.07)	-4.10*** (0.81)
Limited Govt	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.14 (0.10)	0.04 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-1.16* (0.69)
Egalitarianism	0.12 (0.12)	0.16 (0.11)	0.43** (0.18)	-0.24* (0.14)	0.25*** (0.12)	1.59 (1.28)
Age	-0.05 (0.10)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.12 (0.12)	-0.02 (0.12)	-0.07 (0.10)	-2.35** (1.02)
Male	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	0.05 (0.04)	-0.90* (0.47)
Income	-0.14 (0.09)	-0.16* (0.08)	0.04 (0.13)	0.22*** (0.11)	-0.16* (0.08)	2.29** (1.04)
Income - Missing	0.10 (0.11)	-0.15 (0.09)	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.13 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.09)	-- --
Education	-0.19 (0.15)	-0.00 (0.15)	-0.36* (0.21)	0.07 (0.18)	-0.01 (0.17)	-2.51 (1.61)
Constant	0.67*** (0.17)	0.73*** (0.15)	1.10*** (0.21)	0.44** (0.20)	0.64*** (0.16)	5.51*** (2.02)
N	451	451	451	451	451	296
F-stat	6.95	10.09	10.08	4.82	2.21	7.12

*See notes on Tables 1 and 2 for additional details.*

**Appendix 2, Continued.**

*Table A2. Latinos (foreign-born), Results with Controls (in-text Tables 1 and 2)*

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Pen.	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.09 (0.15)	-0.03 (0.15)	-0.31 (0.19)	0.10 (0.18)	-0.10 (0.10)	-3.14 (2.87)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.25* (0.15)	0.15 (0.15)	-0.07 (0.09)	-1.91* (1.00)
Party ID	-0.25*** (0.10)	-0.10 (0.12)	-0.10 (0.14)	0.05 (0.13)	0.09 (0.07)	-8.06*** (2.27)
Limited Govt	-0.08 (0.12)	-0.32** (0.12)	-0.06 (0.21)	-0.15 (0.18)	-0.19* (0.10)	-3.02* (1.66)
Egalitarianism	-0.58** (0.24)	-0.00 (0.12)	0.28 (0.36)	-0.50 (0.32)	0.01 (0.20)	2.73 (2.58)
Age	-0.17 (0.19)	-0.15 (0.14)	-0.03 (0.22)	0.34* (0.18)	-0.05 (0.11)	0.89 (1.47)
Male	0.02 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.07)	0.06 (0.10)	0.18** (0.08)	-0.11* (0.06)	0.45 (0.95)
Income	0.01 (0.16)	-0.32* (0.17)	-0.22 (0.24)	-0.03 (0.20)	0.26** (0.12)	0.15 (1.87)
Income - Missing	0.07 (0.16)	-0.18 (0.13)	0.07 (0.18)	0.15 (0.16)	0.04 (0.12)	-5.66*** (1.77)
Education	-0.36** (0.18)	0.08 (0.18)	-0.53** (0.23)	0.20 (0.20)	-0.06 (0.12)	-2.92 (2.85)
Constant	1.13*** (0.22)	0.88*** (0.23)	1.17*** (0.29)	0.39 (0.28)	0.80*** (0.17)	8.22 (4.96)
N	128	128	128	128	128	81
F-stat	3.25	2.18	2.46	2.07	2.27	3.88

*See notes on Tables 1 and 2 for additional details.*



## Appendix 2, Continued

*Table A3. Whites (non-Latino), Results with Controls (in-text Tables 1 and 2)*

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Pen.	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.17*** (0.05)	-0.38*** (0.08)	0.12* (0.07)	0.02 (0.05)	-0.69 (0.73)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.39*** (0.07)	0.14*** (0.05)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.92* (0.51)
Party ID	-0.12*** (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.04)	-0.10* (0.06)	0.14*** (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)	-5.21*** (0.49)
Limited Govt	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.06** (0.03)	-0.18*** (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.09*** (0.03)	-1.07*** (0.34)
Egalitarianism	0.13*** (0.05)	0.23*** (0.06)	0.46*** (0.11)	-0.21*** (0.09)	0.06 (0.07)	2.88*** (0.85)
Age	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.07)	0.07 (0.06)	0.07 (0.04)	-1.47*** (0.54)
Male	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.07* (0.04)	0.04* (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)	0.28 (0.26)
Income	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.01 (0.07)	0.13** (0.06)	-0.08* (0.04)	0.33 (0.56)
Income - Missing	-0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.05)	0.00 (0.08)	0.09 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.05)	0.25 (0.56)
Education	-0.10 (0.08)	0.18** (0.09)	-0.08 (0.16)	-0.64*** (0.10)	-0.13 (0.08)	-1.53 (1.20)
Constant	0.46*** (0.09)	0.40*** (0.10)	0.80*** (0.15)	1.03*** (0.12)	0.76*** (0.09)	3.51*** (1.23)
N	1110	1110	1110	1110	1110	841
F-stat	15.13	24.32	26.34	12.38	3.32	17.00

*See notes on Tables 1 and 2 for additional details.*

### Appendix 3. Changes in Specification, 2008

Below we present a set of analyses that shift the specification of our models in several different ways. First, we present results without multiple imputation (“No MI”), no control variables, (“No MI, No Controls”) and using semi-parametric imputation (“MI alternative”). In this MI alternative specification we use a semi-parametric approach to impute missing values only in the dependent variable, which is why the N is lower than in the multiple imputation approach that address listwise deletion by considering missings in all variables. In both cases,  $m = 100$ . In cases where we do not use OLS (vote choice, a version of the fair jobs variable) we rely on the semi-parametric approach due to the nature of estimation. We present these results alongside the results reported in the manuscript (“Table 1/2”) (Tables A4- A21). Across all specifications our results point to the same conclusions.

Without multiple imputation, the following percentages of cases would be lost due to listwise deletion. The rate of missing cases due to listwise deletion is as follows, by dependent variable. Affirmative action: 20.0% for US-born Latinos, 22.7% for foreign-born Latinos, 19.5% for whites; government aid to blacks: 38.4% for US-born Latinos, 36.0% for foreign-born Latinos, 29.0% for whites; welfare: 23.9% for US-born Latinos, 28.1% for foreign-born Latinos, 20.3% for whites; death penalty: 19.5% for US-born Latinos, 21.9% for foreign-born Latinos, 19.1% for whites; for respondents who answered the question about government efforts to end employment discrimination: 7.0% for US-born Latinos, 12.6% for foreign-born Latinos, and 13.2% among whites.

In addition, we also present a different approach to the “fair jobs” measure and the vote choice measure. The 2008 ANES asked respondents first if they were interested in the issue and only asked those respondents who said they were interested the actual opinion question. There are a number of ways of handling respondents who reported that they were not interested and we present the results of each in Tables A6, A12 and A18. Again, across all approaches our results point to the same conclusions.

We present an additional approach to the vote choice variable to retain consistency with the 2012 data analysis. Due to sample-size issues in 2012 we cannot include three different models of vote choice, each of which addresses the sample size issue. To increase sample size using the 2012 data we add additional interview cases (though these cases are from a different interview mode, over the internet), and estimate a model in which the dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent voted for Obama and 0 if a respondent took any other behavior (voting for Romney, not voting at all). As we cannot add cases to the 2008 data, we estimate a model that uses a version of the dependent variable that incorporates the non-voters. We do so to retain consistency across datasets; here too we find similar results.

### Appendix 3.1 US-Born Latinos

Table A4. Latinos (US-Born), Affirmative Action Results, 2008

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI, alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.13 (0.09)	-0.12 (0.08)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.23*** (0.07)	-0.22*** (0.07)	-0.25*** (0.08)	-0.21*** (0.07)
Party ID	-0.20*** (0.06)	-0.19*** (0.06)	---	-0.16** (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.00 (0.06)	---	-0.02 (0.07)
Egalitarianism	0.12 (0.12)	0.15 (0.12)	---	0.04 (0.12)
Age	-0.05 (0.10)	-0.07 (0.10)	---	-0.07 (0.10)
Male	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	---	-0.04 (0.04)
Income	-0.14 (0.09)	-0.12 (0.09)	---	-0.13 (0.09)
Income – Missing	0.10 (0.11)	0.12 (0.15)	---	0.14 (0.11)
Education	-0.19 (0.15)	-0.18 (0.16)	---	-0.25 (0.16)
Constant	0.67*** (0.17)	0.64*** (0.18)	0.47*** (0.06)	0.73*** (0.16)
N	451	362	380	371
F-statistic	6.95	6.43	6.98	4.02

**Appendix 3.1, Continued**

*Table A5. Latinos (US-Born), Aid to Blacks Results, 2008*

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI, Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes – Blacks	-0.24*** (0.08)	-0.23** (0.09)	-0.31*** (0.09)	-0.16** (0.07)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.18*** (0.06)	-0.16** (0.07)	-0.25*** (0.07)	-0.15** (0.06)
Party ID	-0.21*** (0.06)	-0.23*** (0.07)	---	-0.25*** (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.07)	---	-0.09 (0.06)
Egalitarianism	0.16 (0.11)	0.18 (0.12)	---	0.06 (0.11)
Age	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.08)	---	-0.13 (0.09)
Male	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	---	-0.01 (0.04)
Income	-0.16* (0.08)	-0.15* (0.08)	---	-0.07 (0.08)
Income – Missing	-0.15 (0.09)	-0.19 (0.13)	---	-0.13 (0.11)
Education	-0.00 (0.15)	-0.08 (0.18)	---	-0.11 (0.14)
Constant	0.73*** (0.15)	0.78*** (0.16)	0.71*** (0.06)	0.84*** (0.15)
N	451	279	296	371
F-statistic	10.09	12.66	16.25	5.49

**Appendix 3.1, Continued**

*Table A6. Latinos (US-Born), Fair Jobs Results, 2008*

	Table 1	Uninterested as Mid-point	Uninterested excluded	Second Question, no controls
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.38*** (0.08)	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.30** (0.14)	-1.92** (0.90)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.39*** (0.07)	-0.32*** (0.06)	-0.61 *** (0.09)	-4.37*** (0.75)
Party ID	-0.10* (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.06 (0.11)	---
Limited Government	-0.18*** (0.05)	-0.05 (0.07)	-0.16 (0.13)	---
Egalitarianism	0.46*** (0.11)	0.42*** (0.14)	0.33 (0.22)	---
Age	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.09)	-0.20 (0.14)	---
Male	0.07* (0.04)	-0.00 (0.04)	0.02 (0.06)	---
Income	-0.01 (0.07)	0.02 (0.09)	0.06 (0.15)	---
Income - Missing	0.00 (0.08)	-0.00 (0.09)	-0.09 (0.15)	---
Education	-0.08 (0.16)	-0.21 (0.16)	-0.41* (0.26)	---
Constant	0.80*** (0.15)	0.73*** (0.14)	1.30*** (0.22)	4.04*** (0.72)
N	1110	451	242	179
F-statistic	26.34	7.91	12.90	18.88

There are a number of approaches that can be taken to this branched question, which has three parts: (1) an introduction question that asks if people are interested, (2) a follow-up for those who are interested, and (3) a final follow-up to measure strength of positions. Table A6 presents four of these approaches. The first approach (which is shown in Table 1 of the main text) focuses on parts 2 and 3 of the branched question, but treats those who were uninterested (part 1) as missing, using multiple imputation to deal with these missings as well as any additional listwise deletion. This approach allows us to include those who said they were uninterested in the analysis. The second approach uses all three parts of the branched question by placing those who were uninterested at the mid-point, and uses multiple imputation to deal with listwise deletion. This second approach is somewhat weaker, as it places those people who stated they were uninterested in the first question at the mid-point, despite the fact that it is unclear that they would actually fall in that position. A third approach focuses only on parts 2 and 3 and includes only those who reported that they were interested, using multiple imputation to deal with any listwise deletion. A final approach still further limits the analysis, focusing only on part 2 of the branched question (without considering the strength of positions in part 3) and using no controls.

**Appendix 3.1, Continued**

*Table A7. Latinos (US-Born), Death Penalty Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes – Blacks	0.10 (0.18)	0.12 (0.10)	0.16 (0.11)	0.11 (0.10)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	0.15 (0.15)	0.15* (0.08)	0.22** (0.09)	0.14* (0.08)
Party ID	0.05 (0.13)	0.17** (0.09)	--- ---	0.16* (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.15 (0.18)	0.04 (0.07)	--- ---	0.04 (0.06)
Egalitarianism	-0.50 (0.32)	-0.25* (0.15)	--- ---	-0.24 (0.15)
Age	0.34* (0.18)	-0.05 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.03 (0.12)
Male	0.18** (0.08)	0.02 (0.05)	--- ---	0.02 (0.05)
Income	-0.03 (0.20)	0.24** (0.11)	--- ---	0.23** (0.11)
Income - Missing	0.15 (0.16)	-0.12 (0.15)	--- ---	-0.13 (0.15)
Education	0.20 (0.20)	0.07 (0.20)	--- ---	0.03 (0.19)
Constant	0.39 (0.28)	0.43** (0.20)	0.42*** (0.07)	0.46*** (0.15)
N	128	344	359	423
F-statistic	2.07	5.04	5.10	4.68

**Appendix 3.1, Continued**

*Table A8. Latinos (US-Born), Welfare Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.19*** (0.08)	-0.20** (0.08)	-0.22** (0.08)	-0.20** (0.08)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	0.03 (0.07)	0.00 (0.07)	-0.01 (0.07)	0.01 (0.07)
Party ID	-0.04 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.07)	---	-0.05 (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.00 (0.08)	---	0.00 (0.08)
Egalitarianism	0.25*** (0.12)	0.25** (0.12)	---	0.25** (0.12)
Age	-0.07 (0.10)	-0.12 (0.11)	---	-0.10 (0.11)
Male	0.05 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	---	0.06 (0.04)
Income	-0.16* (0.08)	-0.17** (0.09)	---	-0.16* (0.09)
Income - Missing	-0.01 (0.09)	-0.06 (0.10)	---	-0.05 (0.10)
Education	-0.01 (0.17)	0.05 (0.19)	---	0.02 (0.19)
Constant	0.64*** (0.16)	0.62*** (0.16)	0.76*** (0.05)	0.63*** (0.16)
N	451	364	383	422
F-statistic	2.21	2.50	4.52	4.68

### Appendix 3.1, Continued

*Table A9. Latinos (US-Born), Vote Choice Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	Candidate Preference	With Non-Voters
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.43 (1.22)	-0.63 (1.29)	-0.86 (0.76)	-1.47* (0.83)	-1.02* (0.60)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-1.81** (0.81)	-1.66** (0.84)	-1.63*** (0.52)	-1.81*** (0.58)	-0.08 (0.56)
Party ID	-4.47*** (0.84)	-4.33*** (0.84)	---	-3.42*** (0.61)	-3.27*** (0.63)
Limited Government	-1.28* (0.69)	-1.14 (0.71)	---	-1.59*** (0.56)	-0.00 (0.50)
Egalitarianism	1.41 (1.27)	1.58 (1.36)	---	2.00* (1.14)	2.76*** (0.93)
Age	-2.65** (1.04)	-2.38** (1.07)	---	-2.01** (0.85)	0.64 (0.72)
Male	-0.79* (0.47)	-0.95* (0.49)	---	-0.51* (0.36)	-0.72** (0.31)
Income	2.09** (1.03)	2.45** (1.10)	---	1.15 (0.84)	1.00 (0.80)
Income - Missing	--	--	---	-0.467 (0.92)	-0.66 (1.13)
Education	-2.03 (1.47)	-2.21 (1.57)	---	2.54** (1.25)	2.07* (1.24)
Constant	5.60*** (1.95)	5.43** (2.12)	2.17*** (0.44)	5.96*** (1.61)	-1.92 (1.18)
N	308	234	255	416	363
F-statistic	7.42	6.85	7.19	7.43	7.40

In the particular case of the vote-choice variable, as a check we include a dependent variable that considers candidate preference rather than vote choice. This variable includes the preferences of those who did not vote. A second check – to ensure consistency with the 2012 data – is a measure that codes voting for Obama as 1 and people who voted for McCain, or did not vote at all as 0.



### Appendix 3.2. Foreign-born Latinos

Table A10. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Affirmative Action Results, 2008

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.09 (0.15)	-0.08 (0.16)	-0.09 (0.16)	-0.11 (0.15)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.13)	0.02 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.12)
Party ID	-0.25*** (0.10)	-0.28*** (0.09)	---	-0.28*** (0.09)
Limited Government	-0.08 (0.12)	0.03 (0.13)	---	0.01 (0.13)
Egalitarianism	-0.58** (0.24)	-0.73*** (0.24)	---	-0.68*** (0.24)
Age	-0.17 (0.19)	-0.23 (0.21)	---	-0.26 (0.21)
Male	0.02 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.08)	---	-0.02 (0.08)
Income	0.01 (0.16)	0.03 (0.17)	---	0.01 (0.17)
Income - Missing	0.07 (0.16)	0.16 (0.17)	---	0.25 (0.17)
Education	-0.36** (0.18)	-0.34* (0.19)	---	-0.32* (0.19)
Constant	1.13*** (0.22)	1.20*** (0.22)	0.33*** (0.11)	1.18*** (0.22)
N	128	99	106	115
F-statistic	3.25	4.57	0.20	5.02

**Appendix 3.2, Continued**

*Table A11. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Aid to Blacks Results, 2008*

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.03 (0.15)	-0.00 (0.16)	0.02 (0.19)	-0.12 (0.16)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.20 (0.13)	-0.18 (0.12)	-0.21* (0.12)
Party ID	-0.10 (0.12)	-0.02 (0.13)	---	-0.05 (0.11)
Limited Government	-0.32** (0.12)	-0.32** (0.14)	---	-0.19 (0.15)
Egalitarianism	-0.00 (0.12)	-0.09 (0.18)	---	-0.15 (0.24)
Age	-0.15 (0.14)	-0.24 (0.16)	---	-0.09 (0.17)
Male	-0.02 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.08)	---	-0.04 (0.07)
Income	-0.32* (0.17)	-0.48** (0.19)	---	-0.39** (0.16)
Income - Missing	-0.18 (0.13)	-0.22 (0.14)	---	-0.09 (0.16)
Education	0.08 (0.18)	0.04 (0.19)	---	0.06 (0.17)
Constant	0.88*** (0.23)	1.05*** (0.23)	0.59*** (0.13)	0.98*** (0.22)
N	128	82	87	104
F-statistic	2.18	3.28	0.3	1.51

### Appendix 3.2, Continued

Table A12. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Fair Jobs Results, 2008

	Table 1	Uninterested as Mid-point	Uninterested Excluded	Second Question, no controls
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.31 (0.19)	-0.17 (0.13)	-0.15 (0.22)	-1.12 (1.07)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.25* (0.15)	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.17 (0.19)	-1.13 (1.02)
Party ID	-0.10 (0.14)	-0.07 (0.11)	-0.16 (0.16)	---
Limited Government	-0.06 (0.21)	0.03 (0.15)	0.07 (0.28)	---
Egalitarianism	0.28 (0.36)	0.17 (0.26)	0.36 (0.39)	---
Age	-0.03 (0.22)	-0.04 (0.17)	-0.10 (0.26)	---
Male	0.06 (0.10)	0.06 (0.08)	0.02 (0.12)	---
Income	-0.22 (0.24)	-0.20 (0.17)	-0.26 (0.25)	---
Income - Missing	0.07 (0.18)	0.04 (0.14)	0.25 (0.24)	---
Education	-0.53** (0.23)	-0.41 (0.18)	-0.74*** (0.25)	---
Constant	1.17*** (0.29)	0.98*** (0.24)	1.21*** (0.31)	1.40* (0.82)
N	128	128	78	61
F-statistic	2.46	2.11	2.84	1.05

There are a number of approaches that can be taken to this branched question, which is based on three parts: (1) an introduction question that asks if people are interested, (2) a follow-up for those who are interested, and (3) a final follow-up to measure strength of positions. Table A12 presents four of these approaches. The first approach (Table 1) focuses on parts 2 and 3 of the branched question, but treats those who were uninterested (part 1) as missing, using multiple imputation to deal with these missings as well as any additional listwise deletion. This approach allows us to include those who said they were uninterested in the analysis. The second approach uses all three parts of the branched question by placing those who were uninterested at the mid-point, and uses multiple imputation to deal with listwise deletion. This second approach is somewhat weaker, as it places those people who stated they were uninterested in the first question at the mid-point, despite the fact that it is unclear that they would actually fall in that position. A third approach focuses only on parts 2 and 3 and includes only those who reported that they were interested, using multiple imputation to deal with any listwise deletion. A final approach still further limits the analysis, focusing only on part 2 of the branched question (without considering the strength of positions in part 3) and using no controls.

**Appendix 3.2, Continued**

*Table A13. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Death Penalty Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	0.10 (0.18)	0.22 (0.20)	0.17 (0.20)	0.17 (0.19)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	0.15 (0.15)	0.14 (0.16)	0.21 (0.15)	0.15 (0.15)
Party ID	0.05 (0.13)	0.04 (0.14)	---	0.06 (0.13)
Limited Government	-0.15 (0.18)	-0.05 (0.20)	---	-0.10 (0.20)
Egalitarianism	-0.50 (0.32)	-0.75** (0.32)	---	-0.54 (0.33)
Age	0.34* (0.18)	0.42** (0.17)	---	0.35* (0.18)
Male	0.18** (0.08)	0.14* (0.09)	---	0.16* (0.09)
Income	-0.03 (0.20)	0.15 (0.20)	---	0.02 (0.21)
Income - Missing	0.15 (0.16)	0.27 (0.18)	---	0.11 (0.15)
Education	0.20 (0.20)	0.15 (0.23)	---	0.18 (0.19)
Constant	0.39 (0.28)	0.39 (0.29)	0.33** (0.15)	0.36 (0.29)
N	128	92	98	118
F-statistic	2.07	3.80	1.20	2.12

**Appendix 3.2, Continued**

*Table A14. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Welfare Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.10 (0.10)	-0.07 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.10)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.09 (0.09)
Party ID	0.09 (0.07)	0.12* (0.07)	--- ---	0.09 (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.19* (0.10)	-0.21* (0.11)	--- ---	-0.21* (0.11)
Egalitarianism	0.01 (0.20)	-0.06 (0.21)	--- ---	-0.02 (0.20)
Age	-0.05 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.06 (0.11)
Male	-0.11* (0.06)	-0.10 (0.06)	--- ---	-0.10 (0.06)
Income	0.26** (0.12)	0.28** (0.12)	--- ---	0.28** (0.12)
Income - Missing	0.04 (0.12)	-0.08 (0.14)	--- ---	-0.06 (0.13)
Education	-0.06 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.13)	--- ---	-0.07 (0.13)
Constant	0.80*** (0.17)	0.82*** (0.19)	0.76*** (0.09)	0.82*** (0.18)
N	128	100	107	118
F-statistic	2.27	2.85	0.39	2.55

### Appendix 3.2, Continued

*Table A15. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Vote Choice Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	Candidate Preference	With Non-Voters
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-2.70 (2.61)	-2.52 (2.67)	-2.39 (1.78)	-0.62 (1.66)	-0.31 (1.45)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-2.45** (1.06)	-1.77* (0.95)	-0.46 (0.91)	-1.87* (1.25)	0.05 (0.79)
Party ID	-8.00*** (1.99)	-8.16*** (2.38)	--- ---	-5.12*** (0.14)	-5.64*** (1.49)
Limited Government	-2.40 (1.62)	-2.61* (1.49)	--- ---	-3.17* (1.65)	-2.91** (1.38)
Egalitarianism	2.63 (2.45)	2.52 (1.99)	--- ---	5.85 (3.61)	3.90* (2.11)
Age	0.32 (1.68)	-0.55 (1.98)	--- ---	-3.28 (2.09)	-0.21 (1.61)
Male	0.33 (0.84)	0.27 (1.00)	--- ---	-0.66 (0.96)	-0.35 (0.61)
Income	0.31 (1.71)	1.09 (2.53)	--- ---	-0.84 (1.65)	2.48* (1.42)
Income - Missing	-5.01*** (1.69)	-4.94*** (1.54)	--- ---	-2.54 (1.68)	-1.27 (1.54)
Education	-3.65 (2.53)	-4.55 (3.47)	--- ---	-1.39 (2.16)	2.29 (1.72)
Constant	8.86* (4.54)	9.08* (5.28)	2.41* (1.34)	5.17* (2.72)	-2.12 (1.70)
N	86	65	68	114	101
F-statistic	4.00	4.50	0.93	3.49	2.68

In the particular case of the vote-choice variable, as a check we include a dependent variable that considers candidate preference rather than vote choice. This variable includes the preferences of those who did not vote. A second check – to ensure consistency with the 2012 data – is a measure that codes voting for Obama as 1 and people who voted for McCain, or did not vote at all as 0.

### Appendix 3.3. Whites (Non-Latino)

Table A16. Whites (Non-Latino), Affirmative Action Results, 2008

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.27*** (0.04)	-0.32*** (0.04)	-0.26*** (0.03)
Party ID	-0.12*** (0.03)	-0.11*** (0.03)	--- ---	-0.12** (0.03)
Limited Government	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.06** (0.02)	--- ---	-0.05** (0.03)
Egalitarianism	0.13*** (0.05)	0.15** (0.06)	--- ---	0.16*** (0.05)
Age	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	--- ---	-0.03 (0.04)
Male	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	--- ---	0.03* (0.04)
Income	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)	--- ---	-0.09** (0.04)
Income – Missing	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.06 (0.05)
Education	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.09)	--- ---	-0.11 (0.07)
Constant	0.46*** (0.09)	0.40*** (0.09)	0.36*** (0.04)	0.42*** (0.08)
N	1110	894	952	942
F-statistic	15.13	14.24	31.20	19.04

**Appendix 3.3, Continued**

*Table A17. Whites (Non-Latino), Aid to Blacks Results, 2008*

	Table 1	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.17*** (0.05)	-0.14*** (0.05)	-0.19*** (0.05)	-0.15*** (0.05)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.37*** (0.04)	-0.23*** (0.04)
Party ID	-0.14*** (0.04)	-0.13*** (0.03)	--- ---	-0.18*** (0.03)
Limited Government	-0.06** (0.03)	-0.05* (0.03)	--- ---	-0.03 (0.03)
Egalitarianism	0.23*** (0.06)	0.26*** (0.06)	--- ---	0.23*** (0.06)
Age	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.05)	--- ---	-0.04 (0.04)
Male	0.03 (0.02)	0.04* (0.02)	--- ---	0.03 (0.02)
Income	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.04 (0.04)
Income – Missing	0.02 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	--- ---	0.03 (0.04)
Education	0.18** (0.09)	0.23** (0.09)	--- ---	0.15** (0.07)
Constant	0.40*** (0.10)	0.29*** (0.10)	0.61*** (0.03)	0.38*** (0.08)
N	1110	797	846	942
F-statistic	24.32	24.22	62.44	23.64



### Appendix 3.3, Continued

Table A18. Whites (Non-Latino), Fair Jobs Results, 2008

	Table 1	Uninterested as Mid-point	Uninterested Excluded	Second Question, no controls
Neg. Stereotypes – Blacks	-0.38*** (0.08)	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.39*** (0.08)	-2.68*** (0.61)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.39*** (0.07)	-0.26*** (0.04)	-0.43*** (0.07)	-3.12*** (0.43)
Party ID	-0.10* (0.06)	-0.07** (0.03)	-0.08 (0.06)	---
Limited Government	-0.18*** (0.05)	-0.10*** (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.05)	---
Egalitarianism	0.46*** (0.11)	0.36*** (0.06)	0.51*** (0.10)	---
Age	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.08)	---
Male	0.07* (0.04)	0.04** (0.02)	0.08** (0.04)	---
Income	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.07)	---
Income – Missing	0.00 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.10)	---
Education	-0.08 (0.16)	0.09 (0.08)	0.11 (0.14)	---
Constant	0.80*** (0.15)	0.52*** (0.09)	0.59*** (0.16)	2.69*** (0.39)
N	1110	1110	651	508
F-statistic	26.34	26.96	39.07	36.33

There are a number of approaches that can be taken to this branched question, which is based on three parts: (1) an introduction question that asks if people are interested, (2) a follow-up for those who are interested, and (3) a final follow-up to measure strength of positions. Table A18 presents four of these approaches. The first approach (Table 1) focuses on parts 2 and 3 of the branched question, but treats those who were uninterested (part 1) as missing, using multiple imputation to deal with these missings as well as any additional listwise deletion. This approach allows us to include those who said they were uninterested in the analysis. The second approach uses all three parts of the branched question by placing those who were uninterested at the mid-point, and uses multiple imputation to deal with listwise deletion. This second approach is somewhat weaker, as it places those people who stated they were uninterested in the first question at the mid-point, despite the fact that it is unclear that they would actually fall in that position. A third approach focuses only on parts 2 and 3 and includes only those who reported that they were interested, using multiple imputation to deal with any listwise deletion. A final approach still further limits the analysis, focusing only on part 2 of the branched question (without considering the strength of positions in part 3) and using no controls.

**Appendix 3.3, Continued**

*Table A19. Whites (Non-Latino), Death Penalty Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	0.12* (0.07)	0.09 (0.07)	0.18** (0.07)	0.08 (0.09)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	0.14*** (0.05)	0.15*** (0.05)	0.26*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.05)
Party ID	0.14*** (0.04)	0.13*** (0.04)	--- ---	0.14*** (0.04)
Limited Government	0.02 (0.04)	0.00 (0.04)	--- ---	0.01 (0.04)
Egalitarianism	-0.21*** (0.09)	-0.23** (0.09)	--- ---	-0.24*** (0.09)
Age	0.07 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)	--- ---	0.06 (0.06)
Male	0.04* (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	--- ---	0.04 (0.03)
Income	0.13** (0.06)	0.12** (0.06)	--- ---	0.14** (0.06)
Income – Missing	0.09 (0.06)	0.10 (0.07)	--- ---	0.08 (0.07)
Education	-0.64*** (0.10)	-0.62*** (0.11)	--- ---	-0.64*** (0.11)
Constant	1.03*** (0.12)	1.07*** (0.13)	0.49*** (0.05)	1.07*** (0.13)
N	1110	885	935	1036
F-statistic	12.38	10.48	18.92	14.55

**Appendix 3.3, Continued**

*Table A20. Whites (Non-Latino), Welfare Results, 2008*

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	MI Alternative
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	0.02 (0.05)	0.04 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)
Party ID (Republican)	0.03 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	---	0.03 (0.03)
Limited Government	-0.09*** (0.03)	-0.09*** (0.03)	---	-0.09*** (0.03)
Egalitarianism	0.06 (0.07)	0.05 (0.07)	---	0.06 (0.07)
Age	0.07 (0.04)	0.08* (0.05)	---	0.08* (0.05)
Male	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	---	-0.02 (0.02)
Income	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.08* (0.05)	---	-0.08* (0.04)
Income – Missing	-0.05 (0.05)	0.00 (0.06)	---	-0.04 (0.05)
Education	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.15* (0.09)	---	-0.12 (0.08)
Constant	0.76*** (0.09)	0.76*** (0.10)	0.67*** (0.04)	0.74*** (0.10)
N	1110	898	955	1036
F-statistic	3.32	2.97	0.95	2.91

### Appendix 3.3, Continued

Table A21. Whites (Non-Latino), Vote Choice Results, 2008

	Table 2	No MI	No MI, No Controls	Candidate Preference	With Non-Voters
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.97 (0.68)	-0.81 (0.75)	-0.97** (0.45)	-0.85 (0.58)	-0.73 (0.60)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.68 (0.47)	-0.88* (0.51)	-1.74*** (0.33)	-1.10** (0.43)	-0.43 (0.41)
Party ID	-5.26*** (0.47)	-5.38*** (0.51)	---	-5.24*** (0.43)	-4.40*** (0.43)
Limited Government	-0.99*** (0.33)	-0.99*** (0.36)	---	-0.89*** (0.29)	-0.78** (0.33)
Egalitarianism	3.09*** (0.80)	2.83*** (0.88)	---	2.71*** (0.69)	2.31*** (0.72)
Age	-1.06** (0.50)	-1.77*** (0.56)	---	-1.29*** (0.47)	-0.09 (0.47)
Male	0.35 (0.25)	0.31 (0.27)	---	0.48** (0.22)	-0.07 (0.22)
Income	0.13 (0.54)	0.36 (0.60)	---	-0.14 (0.50)	0.95** (0.48)
Income - Missing	0.58 (0.49)	-0.17 (0.54)	---	0.27 (0.47)	0.62 (0.51)
Education	-1.62 (1.13)	-1.57 (1.29)	---	-2.31** (0.98)	1.82* (0.99)
Constant	3.38*** (1.17)	3.76*** (1.28)	1.15*** (0.27)	4.60*** (1.02)	-1.07 (0.93)
N	893	704	745	1040	898
F-statistic	19.53	16.54	17.83	22.02	20.03

In the particular case of the vote-choice variable, as a check we include a dependent variable that considers candidate preference rather than vote choice. This variable includes the preferences of those who did not vote. A second check – to ensure consistency with the 2012 data – is a measure that codes voting for Obama as 1 and people who voted for McCain, or did not vote at all as 0.

## Appendix 4. Racial Resentment

Table A22. Latinos (US-Born), Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2008

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation				
	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare
Racial Resentment	-0.58*** (0.09)	-0.32*** (0.08)	-5.60*** (1.17)	0.39*** (0.11)	-0.09 (0.10)	-1.83 (1.25)	-0.58*** (0.08)	-0.42*** (0.08)	-0.77*** (0.11)	0.41*** (0.11)	-0.08 (0.09)
Party ID	-0.16*** (0.06)	-0.22*** (0.07)	-0.71 (0.77)	0.16** (0.08)	-0.06 (0.07)	-4.08*** (0.84)	-0.16*** (0.06)	-0.19*** (0.06)	-0.05 (0.10)	0.14* (0.08)	-0.04 (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.41 (0.93)	0.04 (0.07)	0.00 (0.08)	-1.09 (0.75)	0.00 (0.06)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.15 (0.09)	0.05 (0.08)	-0.00 (0.08)
Egalitarianism	0.03 (0.12)	0.16 (0.12)	2.69 (1.66)	-0.17 (0.14)	0.23* (0.13)	1.86 (1.65)	0.01 (0.12)	0.07 (0.12)	0.37** (0.17)	-0.16 (0.14)	0.23* (0.12)
Age	0.03 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.09)	0.93 (1.06)	-0.09 (0.12)	-0.10 (0.11)	-1.95* (1.08)	0.04 (0.10)	0.02 (0.08)	0.11 (0.12)	-0.09 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.10)
Male	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	0.70 (0.48)	0.02 (0.05)	0.07 (0.04)	-0.95** (0.48)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.05 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	0.05 (0.04)
Income	-0.18** (0.08)	-0.23*** (0.08)	0.01 (1.23)	0.29*** (0.10)	-0.20** (0.09)	1.99 (1.21)	-0.17 (0.15)	0.04 (0.16)	-0.32 (0.22)	0.01 (0.18)	0.00 (0.17)
Income - Missing	0.11 (0.17)	-0.21 (0.15)	-0.86 (0.84)	-0.13 (0.17)	-0.07 (0.10)	--- ---	-0.21** (0.09)	-0.24*** (0.08)	-0.12 (0.12)	0.28*** (0.10)	-0.19** (0.09)
Education	-0.19 (0.16)	0.02 (0.18)	-2.61 (2.61)	0.01 (0.19)	0.05 (0.19)	-1.17 (1.68)	0.04 (0.12)	-0.20** (0.10)	-0.12 (0.11)	-0.09 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.08)
Constant	0.85*** (0.16)	0.70*** (0.15)	3.97** (1.75)	0.33* (0.19)	0.59*** (0.16)	4.09* (2.14)	0.86*** (0.15)	0.79*** (0.13)	1.11*** (0.20)	0.34* (0.18)	0.63*** (0.15)
N	414	331	224	396	418	287	451	451	451	451	451
F-statistic	9.99	12.17	3.96	7.00	1.91	9.06	10.95	11.77	14.32	6.67	1.75

Models rely on OLS (affirmative action, aid to blacks, fair jobs, death penalty and welfare). Logit for the vote choice measure (1 if voted for Obama, 0 if voted for McCain, excludes non-voters). Fair jobs measure is based on the second part of the branched question. The approach is described in Appendix 3, Tables A6, A12 and A18.

**Appendix 4. Continued**

*Table A23. Latinos (Foreign-Born), Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2008*

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation				
	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare
Racial Resentment	-0.57*** (0.19)	-0.40** (0.20)	0.39 (2.38)	0.27 (0.23)	0.38** (0.15)	-4.25** (1.98)	-0.64*** (0.19)	-0.52*** (0.20)	-0.29 (0.31)	0.16 (0.23)	0.40*** (0.14)
Party ID	0.21*** (0.08)	-0.00 (0.12)	-1.33 (0.89)	-0.01 (0.14)	0.04 (0.08)	-7.73*** (2.32)	-0.17** (0.08)	-0.04 (0.11)	-0.12 (0.14)	0.08 (0.12)	0.01 (0.07)
Limited Government	-0.02 (0.11)	-0.36*** (0.12)	0.13 (1.63)	-0.06 (0.21)	-0.20* (0.11)	-2.92* (1.63)	-0.07 (0.11)	-0.32*** (0.11)	-0.06 (0.21)	-0.14 (0.18)	-0.18* (0.09)
Egalitarianism	-0.83*** (0.25)	-0.10 (0.18)	3.24 (2.44)	-0.71** (0.32)	0.12 (0.18)	3.12 (2.27)	-0.72*** (0.25)	-0.04 (0.19)	0.27 (0.36)	-0.51* (0.31)	0.15 (0.17)
Age	-0.19 (0.18)	-0.26* (0.14)	-1.73 (1.77)	0.42** (0.17)	-0.05 (0.10)	1.34 (1.71)	-0.10 (0.17)	-0.15 (0.13)	-0.06 (0.22)	0.36** (0.18)	-0.04 (0.10)
Male	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.29 (0.70)	0.16* (0.09)	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.14 (1.00)	-0.05 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.07)	0.02 (0.10)	0.20** (0.09)	-0.08 (0.05)
Income	0.07 (0.16)	-0.38** (0.18)	-1.00 (1.61)	0.11 (0.20)	0.23* (0.12)	0.37 (2.12)	-0.39** (0.17)	-0.04 (0.16)	-0.58*** (0.21)	0.22 (0.20)	-0.03 (0.11)
Income - Missing	0.03 (0.19)	-0.31*** (0.10)	--- (1.92)	0.23 (0.17)	0.00 (0.12)	-5.76*** (1.61)	0.04 (0.15)	-0.27* (0.16)	-0.19 (0.22)	-0.04 (0.19)	0.24** (0.12)
Education	-0.35* (0.18)	-0.02 (0.18)	-4.66** (1.92)	0.12 (0.22)	-0.01 (0.11)	-3.06 (3.46)	-0.00 (0.15)	-0.21* (0.12)	0.13 (0.20)	0.07 (0.16)	0.12 (0.11)
Constant	1.54*** (0.25)	1.24*** (0.23)	3.13 (2.51)	0.47 (0.29)	0.41** (0.17)	7.74*** (3.71)	1.50*** (0.24)	1.15*** (0.21)	1.16*** (0.35)	0.38 (0.28)	0.40** (0.16)
N	112	96	69	106	114	78	128	128	128	128	128
F-stat	3.60	3.46	1.24	2.61	3.56	3.54	128	128	128	128	128

Models rely on OLS (affirmative action, aid to blacks, fair jobs, death penalty and welfare). Logit for the vote choice measure (1 if voted for Obama, 0 if voted for McCain, excludes non-voters). Fair jobs measure is based on the second part of the branched question. The approach is described in Appendix 3, Tables A6, A12 and A18.

**Appendix 4, Continued**

*Table A24. White (Non-Latino), Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2008*

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation				
	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Obama	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare
Racial Resentment	-0.44*** (0.04)	-0.55*** (0.04)	-3.88*** (0.66)	0.51*** (0.06)	0.03 (0.05)	-3.60*** (0.70)	-0.43*** (0.04)	-0.55*** (0.04)	-0.66*** (0.08)	0.49*** (0.06)	0.04 (0.05)
Party ID	-0.08*** (0.03)	-0.07** (0.03)	-0.11 (0.42)	0.08* (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)	-5.38*** (0.52)	-0.09*** (0.03)	-0.08** (0.03)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.09** (0.04)	0.02 (0.03)
Limited Government	-0.05** (0.02)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.63* (0.34)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.09*** (0.03)	-1.09*** (0.36)	-0.05* (0.02)	-0.05* (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.09*** (0.03)
Egalitarianism	0.05 (0.05)	0.13** (0.06)	3.15*** (0.80)	-0.08 (0.09)	0.08 (0.07)	2.05** (0.90)	0.06 (0.05)	0.12** (0.06)	0.38*** (0.11)	-0.08 (0.08)	0.09 (0.07)
Age	-0.01 (0.05)	0.00 (0.04)	0.06 (0.58)	0.06 (0.06)	0.09** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.56)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.00 (0.04)	0.02 (0.07)	0.05 (0.05)	0.07* (0.04)
Male	0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	0.23 (0.25)	0.07** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)	0.15 (0.28)	0.00 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)	0.07*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)
Income	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.03)	0.49 (0.52)	0.10* (0.06)	-0.08* (0.04)	0.43 (0.59)	-0.22*** (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.25* (0.14)	-0.45*** (0.11)	-0.11 (0.08)
Income - Missing	-0.04 (0.04)	0.07 (0.05)	0.51 (0.78)	0.07 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.08 (0.55)	-0.06* (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	0.00 (0.07)	0.09* (0.06)	-0.09** (0.04)
Education	-0.19** (0.09)	0.02 (0.08)	-1.26 (1.04)	0.47*** (0.11)	-0.11 (0.08)	-3.04** (1.29)	-0.02 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.07)	0.06 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.05)
Constant	0.66*** (0.08)	0.64*** (0.10)	1.40 (1.26)	0.67*** (0.13)	0.70*** (0.10)	6.82*** (1.58)	0.69*** (0.08)	0.71*** (0.10)	0.95*** (0.17)	0.66*** (0.13)	0.70*** (0.09)
N	1016	914	589	1000	1018	823	1,110	1,110	1,110	1,110	1,110
F-stat	22.43	56.18	9.36	25.94	3.41	21.96	23.75	51.54	32.86	24.34	3.89

Models rely on OLS (affirmative action, aid to blacks, fair jobs, death penalty and welfare). Logit for the vote choice measure (1 if voted for Obama, 0 if voted for McCain, excludes non-voters). Fair jobs measure is based on the second part of the branched question. The approach is described in Appendix 3, Tables A6, A12 and A18.

**Appendix 4, Continued**

*Table A25. Latino (US-Born) Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2012*

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation			
	Aff Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty
Racial Resentment	-0.38*** (0.14)	-0.53*** (0.08)	-0.59*** (0.12)	0.24* (0.14)	-0.01 (0.38)	-1.66 (1.78)	-0.41*** (0.13)	-0.55*** (0.08)	-0.61*** (0.12)	0.28** (0.14)
Party ID	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.18 (0.11)	0.15* (0.09)	-1.17*** (0.32)	-7.79*** (1.49)	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.14 (0.11)	0.09 (0.09)
Limited Government	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.10 (0.12)	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.11 (0.32)	-0.77 (0.73)	-0.05 (0.07)	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.11)	-0.08 (0.10)
Egalitarianism	0.15 (0.15)	0.39*** (0.13)	0.83*** (0.16)	-0.17 (0.17)	0.41 (0.51)	-0.07 (1.78)	0.11 (0.16)	0.34*** (0.12)	0.75*** (0.17)	-0.15 (0.19)
Age	0.06 (0.13)	-0.19** (0.08)	-0.03 (0.12)	0.07 (0.12)	-0.64* (0.39)	0.38 (1.19)	-0.00 (0.12)	-0.11 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.11)	0.13 (0.12)
Male	0.02 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.04)	0.02 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	-0.34** (0.17)	-0.12 (0.81)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)
Income	0.05 (0.13)	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.12 (0.13)	0.18 (0.13)	-1.33*** (0.41)	-1.37 (1.15)	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.11)	-0.04 (0.11)
Income - Missing	0.09 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.06)	0.09 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.10)	-0.16 (0.24)	-2.64*** (1.00)	0.02 (0.13)	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.13)	0.16 (0.12)
Education	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.11 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.13)	-0.12 (0.41)	-0.74 (1.32)	0.05 (0.10)	-0.07 (0.05)	0.06 (0.09)	0.04 (0.10)
Constant cut1	---	---	---	---	-1.44** (0.59)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant cut2	---	---	---	---	-0.24 (0.57)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant	0.39** (0.17)	0.67*** (0.12)	0.50*** (0.17)	0.53*** (0.19)	---	7.63*** (2.16)	0.49*** (0.18)	0.67*** (0.12)	0.57*** (0.17)	0.49** (0.20)
N	292	252	282	294	305	174	346	346	346	346
F-Statistic	3.33	15.92	25.51	1.57	4.86	5.52	2.13	12.52	18.83	1.30

Models rely on OLS (affirmative action, aid to blacks, fair jobs and death penalty). Ordered probit for welfare and logit for the vote choice measure (includes non-voters). Fair jobs measure is based on the second part of the branched question. The approach is described in Appendix 3, Tables A6, A12 and A18.



**Appendix 4, Continued**

*Table A26. Latino (Foreign-Born) Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2012*

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation			
	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty
Racial Resentment	-0.85*** (0.20)	-0.69*** (0.17)	-1.01*** (0.22)	0.21 (0.22)	-1.45* (0.75)	5.06 (3.11)	-0.86*** (0.18)	-0.63*** (0.15)	-0.88*** (0.22)	0.36* (0.22)
Party ID	-0.22 (0.17)	-0.43*** (0.13)	0.02 (0.16)	0.34** (0.15)	-0.97** (0.47)	-8.23*** (2.71)	-0.17 (0.17)	-0.28* (0.15)	0.04 (0.15)	0.19 (0.18)
Limited Government	-0.08 (0.12)	0.02 (0.12)	-0.26* (0.15)	-0.19 (0.17)	-0.97* (0.54)	0.54 (2.03)	-0.12 (0.12)	-0.08 (0.12)	-0.28** (0.14)	-0.11 (0.17)
Egalitarianism	-0.43** (0.17)	-0.10 (0.22)	-0.27 (0.32)	0.19 (0.33)	-1.78 (1.15)	4.13* (2.39)	-0.39* (0.21)	-0.06 (0.22)	-0.28 (0.31)	0.04 (0.34)
Age	0.00 (0.14)	0.00 (0.20)	0.20 (0.16)	0.13 (0.20)	-0.22 (0.52)	-3.86 (2.60)	0.01 (0.15)	0.04 (0.17)	0.15 (0.17)	0.01 (0.20)
Male	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.08)	0.08 (0.09)	-0.20* (0.10)	-0.02 (0.31)	2.76* (1.44)	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.07)	0.12 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.11)
Income	0.22* (0.13)	-0.19 (0.17)	-0.40** (0.15)	0.32 (0.23)	-1.15* (0.66)	2.02 (2.45)	-0.21* (0.12)	0.09 (0.15)	0.28* (0.16)	-0.18 (0.21)
Income - Missing	-0.13 (0.11)	0.09 (0.16)	-0.09 (0.16)	-0.11 (0.16)	-0.03 (0.39)	--- ---	0.05 (0.14)	-0.15 (0.16)	-0.41*** (0.15)	0.31 (0.22)
Education	-0.30*** (0.11)	0.05 (0.16)	0.35** (0.16)	-0.16 (0.23)	-0.92 (0.68)	-3.03* (1.57)	-0.22** (0.10)	0.06 (0.13)	-0.16 (0.15)	-0.03 (0.15)
Constant cut1	---	---	---	---	-3.97*** (1.22)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant cut2	---	---	---	---	-2.72** (1.22)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant	1.25*** (0.26)	1.14*** (0.33)	1.35*** (0.30)	0.26 (0.36)	---	-0.80 (3.21)	1.30*** (0.25)	1.03*** (0.27)	1.31*** (0.30)	0.28 (0.36)
N	95	91	102	100	102	58	126	126	126	126
F- Statistic	5.24	10.00	7.67	2.14	4.34	2.10	4.17	6.12	6.82	0.89

**Appendix 4, Continued**

*Table A27. Whites (Non-Latino), Racial Resentment as a Covariate, 2012*

	No Multiple Imputation						Multiple Imputation			
	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty
Racial Resentment	-0.49*** (0.05)	-0.47*** (0.04)	-0.66*** (0.07)	0.46*** (0.07)	-0.75*** (0.24)	-2.08** (0.84)	-0.49*** (0.05)	-0.48*** (0.04)	-0.67*** (0.07)	0.45*** (0.07)
Party ID	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.09*** (0.03)	-0.00 (0.06)	0.12** (0.05)	-0.42** (0.18)	-5.53*** (0.67)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)	0.00 (0.05)	0.12** (0.05)
Limited Government	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.06* (0.03)	-0.24*** (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.60*** (0.15)	-1.20** (0.50)	-0.07** (0.03)	-0.07* (0.03)	-0.25*** (0.05)	0.00 (0.04)
Egalitarianism	0.05 (0.07)	0.10* (0.06)	0.46*** (0.09)	-0.03 (0.09)	1.06*** (0.31)	1.56 (1.00)	0.04 (0.06)	0.09 (0.06)	0.43*** (0.09)	-0.02 (0.09)
Age	-0.00 (0.04)	0.00 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	0.37** (0.17)	-0.10 (0.53)	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)
Male	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.05* (0.03)	-0.18* (0.10)	0.38 (0.31)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)
Income	-0.09* (0.05)	-0.08** (0.04)	0.00 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)	-0.67*** (0.19)	-0.73 (0.69)	-0.11*** (0.04)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.02 (0.05)	-0.23*** (0.05)
Income - Missing	-0.06* (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.05)	-0.19 (0.18)	0.11 (0.61)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)
Education	-0.11*** (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.05)	-0.24*** (0.06)	0.10 (0.18)	0.85 (0.62)	-0.06* (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)
Constant cut1	---	---	---	---	-0.65* (0.34)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant cut2	---	---	---	---	0.89*** (0.33)	---	---	---	---	---
Constant	0.58*** (0.09)	0.65*** (0.07)	0.73*** (0.10)	0.48*** (0.11)	---	3.16** (1.31)	0.60*** (0.08)	0.70*** (0.07)	0.76*** (0.10)	0.47*** (0.10)
Observations	796	709	766	787	806	592	918	918	918	918
R-squared	18.22	40.11	91.30	17.47	18.72	18.29	20.07	40.13	85.88	18.67

## Appendix 5. 2012 Results

In this appendix we present the full coefficient results from Table 3 of the manuscript, which shows the patterns for the 2012 ANES. The results rely on multiple imputation to deal with listwise deletion in all cases except welfare and vote choice where the categorical structure of the variable makes relying on these approaches more difficult.

Table A28. Full Coefficient Results for Table 3, US-Born Latinos

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.03 (0.14)	-0.12 (0.13)	-0.39*** (0.14)	0.03 (0.15)	-1.07** (0.43)	0.13 (0.63)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.45*** (0.10)	-0.20** (0.09)	-0.27** (0.11)	0.26** (0.12)	-0.47 (0.34)	-0.97 (0.61)
Party ID	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.17 (0.11)	0.11 (0.10)	-1.16*** (0.33)	-3.27*** (0.40)
Limited Gov't	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.16 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.30)	-0.91** (0.38)
Egalitarianism	0.09 (0.16)	0.47*** (0.14)	0.80*** (0.17)	-0.14 (0.19)	-0.06 (0.52)	1.52* (0.82)
Age	-0.12 (0.11)	-0.24*** (0.10)	-0.17 (0.13)	0.21* (0.12)	-0.72* (0.41)	0.08 (0.45)
Male	0.04 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.04)	0.05 (0.06)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.36** (0.17)	-0.38 (0.24)
Income	0.04 (0.11)	-0.10 (0.10)	-0.03 (0.12)	0.16 (0.12)	-1.31*** (0.40)	-0.33 (0.51)
Income - Missing	0.06 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.06)	0.11 (0.10)	0.02 (0.09)	-0.17 (0.24)	-0.07 (0.44)
Education	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.08 (0.11)	-0.01 (0.41)	-0.04 (0.46)
Constant	0.56*** (0.17)	0.51*** (0.16)	0.49** (0.19)	0.46** (0.20)	--- ---	2.43*** (0.84)
Cut Point 1	---	---	---	---	-2.54*** (0.63)	---
Cut Point 2	---	---	---	---	-1.30** (0.59)	---
N	346	346	346	346	310	413
F-statistic	4.36	4.45	13.56	1.80	5.27	13.99

**Appendix 5, Continued**

*Table A29. Full Coefficient Results for Table 3, Foreign-Born Latinos*

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes – Blacks	-0.14 (0.21)	-0.30* (0.17)	-0.43** (0.20)	0.46** (0.20)	0.85 (0.80)	1.45 (1.09)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.37** (0.16)	-0.39 (0.15)	-0.40*** (0.14)	-0.14 (0.18)	-2.05** (0.79)	-0.42 (0.84)
Party ID (Republican)	-0.11 (0.14)	-0.22* (0.12)	0.14 (0.14)	0.14 (0.18)	-0.70 (0.48)	-4.14*** (0.79)
Limited Government	-0.07 (0.13)	-0.05 (0.12)	-0.27* (0.14)	-0.03 (0.18)	-0.94* (0.54)	-0.80* (0.48)
Egalitarianism	-0.24 (0.25)	0.07 (0.25)	-0.16 (0.35)	0.13 (0.35)	-0.35 (1.07)	0.94 (0.98)
Age	0.01 (0.18)	0.07 (0.17)	0.12 (0.18)	-0.03 (0.20)	-0.22 (0.56)	-2.06*** (0.57)
Male	0.05 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.07)	0.26** (0.08)	-0.10 (0.10)	0.50 (0.30)	1.16*** (0.38)
Income	0.13 (0.20)	-0.07 (0.19)	-0.30 (0.20)	0.30 (0.22)	-0.41 (0.67)	-0.83 (0.62)
Income - Missing	-0.17 (0.11)	0.10 (0.13)	-0.13 (0.14)	0.00 (0.15)	-0.04 (0.45)	--- ---
Education	-0.33* (0.17)	-0.00 (0.15)	0.11 (0.18)	-0.14 (0.22)	-1.77** (0.69)	-0.14 (0.71)
Constant	0.85*** (0.29)	0.85*** (0.30)	1.06*** (0.31)	0.33 (0.34)	--- ---	2.77** (1.37)
Cut Point 1	---	---	---	---	-3.00** (1.17)	---
Cut Point 2	---	---	---	---	-1.50 (1.12)	---
N	125	126	125	125	106	201
F-statistic	1.72	5.58	6.92	1.17	3.44	6.82

**Appendix 5, Continued**

*Table A30. Full Coefficient Results for Table 3, Whites (Non-Latino)*

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Welfare	Vote Choice
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.14** (0.06)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.14* (0.08)	0.20*** (0.07)	-0.40 (0.28)	-0.58** (0.25)
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.05)	-0.30*** (0.07)	0.15** (0.06)	-0.11 (0.23)	0.07 (0.25)
Party ID (Republican)	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.16*** (0.04)	-0.09 (0.06)	0.18*** (0.05)	-0.51*** (0.17)	-3.13*** (0.18)
Limited Government	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.08** (0.03)	-0.28*** (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)	-0.62*** (0.15)	-0.82*** (0.14)
Egalitarianism	0.16** (0.06)	0.23*** (0.06)	0.63*** (0.09)	-0.14 (0.09)	1.21*** (0.30)	1.50*** (0.32)
Age	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.07** (0.04)	-0.10* (0.05)	-0.00 (0.05)	0.31* (0.18)	-0.05 (0.18)
Male	0.03 (0.02)	0.03* (0.02)	0.07** (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.00 (0.09)
Income	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.07* (0.04)	0.04 (0.06)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.59*** (0.19)	-0.13 (0.19)
Income - Missing	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.13 (0.19)	0.35 (0.24)
Education	-0.04 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.10 (0.05)	-0.28*** (0.10)	0.18 (0.18)	0.58*** (0.18)
Constant	0.45*** (0.08)	0.54*** (0.08)	0.52*** (0.10)	0.62*** (0.06)	---	0.96** (0.39)
Cut Point 1	---	---	---	---	-0.34 (0.35)	---
Cut Point 2	---	---	---	---	1.18*** (0.34)	---
N	917	918	917	917	819	2,591
F-statistic	11.76	19.55	50.59	12.87	14.67	67.71

## **Appendix 6. Changes in Specification, 2012**

Much as we did with the 2008 data, we present a set of analyses that shift the specification of our models in several different ways. The results below show our results without multiple imputation (“No MI”) and without no control variables, (“No MI, No Controls”). Again across all specifications our results point to the same conclusions.

We follow the same imputation approaches as described in Appendix 3. The following percentages of cases would be lost due to listwise deletion if we did not rely on multiple imputation. Among US-born Latinos: affirmative action, 15.6%, aid to blacks 27.2%, fair jobs 18.5%, death penalty 15.02% and welfare 11.8%. Among foreign-born Latinos: affirmative action 25.6%, aid to blacks 28.8%, fair jobs 20%, death penalty 21.6% and welfare 20%. Among whites: affirmative action 13.7%, aid to blacks 23.1%, fair jobs 16.9%, death penalty 14.6% and welfare 12.5%.

Table A31. Alternative Specifications, Latinos (US-Born), 2012

	Affirmative Action			Aid to Blacks			Fair Jobs		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.03 (0.14)	0.03 (0.17)	-0.04 (0.14)	-0.12 (0.13)	-0.12 (0.13)	-0.23 (0.17)	-0.39*** (0.14)	-0.44*** (0.14)	-0.62*** (0.17)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.45*** (0.10)	-0.51*** (0.11)	-0.49*** (0.09)	-0.20** (0.09)	-0.19** (0.10)	-0.26** (0.11)	-0.27** (0.11)	-0.29*** (0.09)	-0.43 (0.10)
Party ID	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)	--- ---	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.08)	--- ---	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.20* (0.11)	--- ---
Limited Gov't	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.06)	--- ---	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.08)	--- ---	-0.16 (0.11)	-0.15 (0.11)	--- ---
Egalitarianism	0.09 (0.16)	0.18 (0.18)	--- ---	0.47*** (0.14)	0.48** (0.15)	--- ---	0.80*** (0.17)	0.80*** (0.16)	--- ---
Age	-0.12 (0.11)	-0.14 (0.13)	--- ---	-0.24*** (0.10)	-0.35 (0.10)	--- ---	-0.17 (0.13)	-0.23* (0.13)	--- ---
Male	0.04 (0.05)	0.04 (0.06)	--- ---	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.00 (0.05)	--- ---	0.05 (0.06)	0.06 (0.05)	--- ---
Income	0.04 (0.11)	0.10 (0.13)	--- ---	-0.10 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.11)	--- ---	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.12)	--- ---
Income - Missing	0.06 (0.08)	0.05 (0.09)	--- ---	-0.06 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.07)	--- ---	0.11 (0.10)	0.11 (0.09)	--- ---
Education	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.08 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.08)	--- ---	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.13)	--- ---
Constant	0.56*** (0.17)	0.46** (0.20)	0.55*** (0.09)	0.51*** (0.16)	0.48*** (0.18)	0.70*** (0.12)	0.49** (0.19)	0.56*** (0.17)	1.10*** (0.08)
N	346	292	303	346	252	260	346	282	292
F-statistic	4.36	3.94	14.54	4.45	5.97	3.91	13.56	22.99	30.75

Table A32. Alternative Specifications, Latinos (US-Born), 2012

	Death Penalty			Welfare			Vote Choice		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes	0.03 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.06 (0.14)	-1.07** (0.43)	-1.06** (0.43)	1.14** (0.38)	0.13 (0.63)	0.58 (0.58)	0.16 (0.50)
Denial of Sympathy	0.26** (0.12)	0.24** (0.12)	0.27*** (0.10)	-0.47 (0.34)	-0.47 (0.34)	-0.51 (0.30)	-0.97 (0.61)	-0.87* (0.51)	-1.13** (0.45)
Party ID	0.11 (0.10)	0.17** (0.08)	---	-1.16*** (0.33)	-1.20*** (0.30)	---	-3.27*** (0.40)	-3.54*** (0.42)	---
Limited Government	-0.06 (0.10)	-0.06 (0.09)	---	-0.04 (0.30)	-0.03 (0.30)	---	-0.91** (0.38)	-1.07*** (0.37)	---
Egalitarianism	-0.14 (0.19)	-0.15 (0.17)	---	-0.06 (0.52)	-0.04 (0.52)	---	1.52* (0.82)	1.74** (0.87)	---
Age	0.21* (0.12)	0.16 (0.12)	---	-0.72* (0.41)	-0.73* (0.42)	---	0.08 (0.45)	0.10 (0.46)	---
Male	0.01 (0.06)	0.00 (0.06)	---	-0.36** (0.17)	-0.37** (0.17)	---	-0.38 (0.24)	-0.33 (0.24)	---
Income	0.16 (0.12)	0.17 (0.13)	---	-1.31*** (0.40)	-1.31*** (0.40)	---	-0.33 (0.51)	-0.27 (0.54)	---
Income - Missing	0.02 (0.09)	-0.01 (0.09)	---	-0.17 (0.24)	-0.17 (0.24)	---	-0.07 (0.44)	-0.06 (0.43)	---
Education	-0.08 (0.11)	-0.08 (0.13)	---	-0.01 (0.41)	-0.03 (0.40)	---	-0.04 (0.46)	0.07 (0.46)	---
Constant	0.46** (0.20)	0.49*** (0.18)	0.47*** (0.09)	---	---	---	2.43*** (0.84)	2.06*** (0.71)	1.23*** (0.34)
Cut Point 1	---	---	---	-2.54*** (0.63)	-2.54*** (0.62)	-1.31*** (0.27)	---	---	---
Cut Point 2	---	---	---	-1.30** (0.59)	-1.30** (0.59)	-0.19 (0.26)	---	---	---
N	345	294	305	310	305	316	413	405	413
F-statistic	1.80	2.28	4.29	5.27	5.73	6.92	13.99	14.19	3.29



Table A33. Latinos (Foreign-Born), 2012

	Affirmative Action			Aid to Blacks			Fair Jobs		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.14 (0.21)	-0.12 (0.21)	0.07 (0.23)	-0.30* (0.17)	-0.26* (0.15)	-0.21 (0.16)	-0.43** (0.20)	-0.55* (0.18)	-0.48** (0.19)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.37** (0.16)	-0.42** (0.18)	-0.40** (0.20)	-0.39 (0.15)	-0.38*** (0.13)	-0.50*** (0.12)	-0.40*** (0.14)	-0.42*** (0.13)	-0.44*** (0.14)
Party ID	-0.11 (0.14)	-0.08 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.30*** (0.10)	--- ---	0.14 (0.14)	0.18 (0.13)	--- ---
Limited Government	-0.07 (0.13)	-0.08 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.05 (0.12)	-0.02 (0.12)	--- ---	-0.27* (0.14)	-0.25* (0.14)	--- ---
Egalitarianism	-0.24 (0.25)	0.18 (0.27)	--- ---	0.07 (0.25)	0.13 (0.23)	--- ---	-0.16 (0.35)	0.11 (0.35)	--- ---
Age	0.01 (0.18)	-0.02 (0.16)	--- ---	0.07 (0.17)	0.02 (0.18)	--- ---	0.12 (0.18)	0.16 (0.17)	--- ---
Male	0.05 (0.07)	0.07 (0.08)	--- ---	-0.00 (0.07)	0.07 (0.07)	--- ---	0.26** (0.08)	-0.31*** (0.09)	--- ---
Income	0.13 (0.20)	0.37* (0.20)	--- ---	-0.07 (0.19)	-0.02 (0.20)	--- ---	-0.30 (0.20)	-0.14 (0.20)	--- ---
Income - Missing	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.10 (0.12)	--- ---	0.10 (0.13)	0.11 (0.15)	--- ---	-0.13 (0.14)	-0.09 (0.17)	--- ---
Education	-0.33* (0.17)	-0.49*** (0.16)	--- ---	-0.00 (0.15)	-0.14 (0.16)	--- ---	0.11 (0.18)	-0.02 (0.17)	--- ---
Constant	0.85*** (0.29)	0.77** (0.33)	0.48 (0.17)	0.85*** (0.30)	0.84*** (0.32)	0.85*** (0.11)	1.06*** (0.31)	0.83** (0.32)	1.09*** (0.11)
N	125	93	102	126	89	95	125	100	109
F-statistic	1.72	3.94	2.06	5.58	9.58	11.36	6.92	8.54	10.57

Table A34. Latinos (Foreign-Born), 2012

	Death Penalty			Welfare			Vote Choice		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes	0.46** (0.20)	0.53*** (0.20)	0.51*** (0.17)	0.85 (0.80)	1.07 (0.80)	1.22* (0.70)	1.45 (1.09)	1.75 (1.17)	0.39 (0.65)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.14 (0.18)	-0.38** (0.16)	-0.23 (0.17)	-2.05** (0.79)	-2.58*** (0.72)	-2.34*** (0.55)	-0.42 (0.84)	-0.79 (0.77)	-1.09** (0.52)
Party ID	0.14 (0.18)	0.35** (0.14)	--- ---	-0.70 (0.48)	-0.80* (0.47)	--- ---	-4.14*** (0.79)	-4.31*** (0.89)	--- ---
Limited Gov't	-0.03 (0.18)	-0.16 (0.15)	--- ---	-0.94* (0.54)	-1.12** (0.53)	--- ---	-0.80* (0.48)	-0.64 (0.52)	--- ---
Egalitarianism	0.13 (0.35)	0.07 (0.31)	--- ---	-0.35 (1.07)	-0.57 (1.07)	--- ---	0.94 (0.98)	0.70 (1.00)	--- ---
Age	-0.03 (0.20)	0.14 (0.17)	--- ---	-0.22 (0.56)	-0.28 (0.55)	--- ---	-2.06*** (0.57)	-2.55*** (0.69)	--- ---
Male	-0.10 (0.10)	-0.24*** (0.09)	--- ---	0.50 (0.30)	0.48 (0.29)	--- ---	1.16*** (0.38)	1.31*** (0.44)	--- ---
Income	0.30 (0.22)	0.21 (0.20)	--- ---	-0.41 (0.67)	-0.47 (0.67)	--- ---	-0.83 (0.62)	-0.68 (0.63)	--- ---
Income - Missing	0.00 (0.15)	-0.11 (0.15)	--- ---	-0.04 (0.45)	-0.11 (0.41)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Education	-0.14 (0.22)	0.01 (0.21)	--- ---	-1.77** (0.69)	1.66** (0.68)	--- ---	-0.14 (0.71)	-0.32 (0.65)	--- ---
Constant	0.33 (0.34)	0.41 (0.30)	0.48 (0.15)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	2.77** (1.37)	3.15** (1.29)	1.15** (0.51)
Cut Point 1	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	-3.00** (1.17)	-3.51*** (1.09)	-1.48*** (0.46)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Cut Point 2	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	-1.50 (1.12)	-1.92* (1.07)	-0.37 (0.46)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
N	125	98	107	106	100	109	201	190	207
F-statistic	1.17	5.24	4.73	3.44	4.98	9.36	6.82	6.23	2.60

Table A35. White (Non-Latino), 2012

	Affirmative Action			Aid to Blacks			Fair Jobs		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.14** (0.06)	-0.14** (0.06)	-0.19*** (0.06)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11* (0.06)	-0.18*** (0.06)	-0.14* (0.08)	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.30*** (0.09)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.24*** (0.05)	-0.25*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.06)	-0.27*** (0.06)	-0.30*** (0.07)	-0.30*** (0.08)	-0.44*** (0.08)
Party ID	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.07 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.16*** (0.04)	-0.16*** (0.04)	--- ---	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.09 (0.06)	--- ---
Limited Government	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.09** (0.04)	--- ---	-0.08** (0.03)	-0.07** (0.03)	--- ---	-0.28*** (0.05)	-0.26*** (0.05)	--- ---
Egalitarianism	0.16** (0.06)	0.16** (0.06)	--- ---	0.23*** (0.06)	0.23*** (0.06)	--- ---	0.63*** (0.09)	0.64*** (0.09)	--- ---
Age	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.07** (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.10* (0.05)	-0.11 (0.05)	--- ---
Male	0.03 (0.02)	0.04 (0.02)	--- ---	0.03* (0.02)	0.04* (0.02)	--- ---	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	--- ---
Income	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	--- ---	-0.07* (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	--- ---	0.04 (0.06)	0.05 (0.06)	--- ---
Income - Missing	-0.07* (0.04)	0.05 (0.09)	--- ---	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	--- ---	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.08 (0.05)	--- ---
Education	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.07* (0.04)	--- ---	0.06 (0.04)	0.07** (0.04)	--- ---	0.10 (0.05)	0.09 (0.06)	--- ---
Constant	0.45*** (0.08)	0.45*** (0.08)	0.42*** (0.05)	0.54*** (0.08)	0.48*** (0.08)	0.58*** (0.05)	0.52*** (0.10)	0.51*** (0.11)	0.92*** (0.07)
N	917	792	830	918	706	737	917	763	800
F-statistic	11.76	3.94	19.74	19.55	19.34	21.46	50.59	51.17	25.99

Table A36. White (Non-Latino), 2012

	Death Penalty			Welfare			Vote Choice		
	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls	Table 3	No MI	No Controls
Neg. Stereotypes	0.20*** (0.07)	0.20*** (0.07)	0.32*** (0.07)	-0.40 (0.28)	-0.40 (0.28)	-0.74*** (0.26)	-0.58** (0.25)	-0.70*** (0.25)	-1.07*** (0.17)
Denial of Sympathy	0.15** (0.06)	0.16** (0.07)	0.23*** (0.07)	-0.11 (0.23)	-0.11 (0.23)	-0.62*** (0.21)	0.07 (0.25)	-0.05 (0.26)	-0.95*** (0.15)
Party ID	0.18*** (0.05)	0.18*** (0.05)	--- ---	-0.51*** (0.17)	-0.51*** (0.17)	--- ---	-3.13*** (0.18)	-3.38*** (0.18)	--- ---
Limited Gov't	0.02 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	--- ---	-0.62*** (0.15)	-0.64*** (0.15)	--- ---	-0.82*** (0.14)	-0.85*** (0.14)	--- ---
Egalitarianism	-0.14 (0.09)	-0.14 (0.09)	--- ---	1.21*** (0.30)	1.22*** (0.30)	--- ---	1.50*** (0.32)	1.43*** (0.29)	--- ---
Age	-0.00 (0.05)	0.00 (0.06)	--- ---	0.31* (0.18)	0.32* (0.18)	--- ---	-0.05 (0.18)	-0.19 (0.18)	--- ---
Male	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	--- ---	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.15 (0.10)	--- ---	-0.00 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.09)	--- ---
Income	0.01 (0.06)	0.01 (0.07)	--- ---	-0.59*** (0.19)	-0.61*** (0.19)	--- ---	-0.13 (0.19)	-0.11 (0.20)	--- ---
Income - Missing	0.01 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.05)	--- ---	-0.13 (0.19)	-0.15 (0.18)	--- ---	0.35 (0.24)	0.28 (0.25)	--- ---
Education	-0.28*** (0.10)	-0.29*** (0.06)	--- ---	0.18 (0.18)	0.19 (0.18)	--- ---	0.58*** (0.18)	0.63*** (0.18)	--- ---
Constant	0.62*** (0.06)	0.63*** (0.11)	0.41*** (0.06)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	0.96** (0.39)	1.31*** (0.35)	0.95*** (0.13)
Cut Point 1	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	-0.34 (0.35)	-0.39 (0.35)	-0.85*** (0.17)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
Cut Point 2	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---	1.18*** (0.34)	1.18*** (0.34)	0.51*** (0.16)	--- ---	--- ---	--- ---
N	917	784	821	819	803	839	2,591	2,539	2,584
F-statistic	12.87	11.48	21.43	14.67	15.41	11.32	67.71	68.73	47.24

### **Appendix 7: Alternative Specifications, Focusing on Vote Choice**

As an additional check on our results, we re-estimate our models using only FTF interviews in the 2012 ANES. In order to ensure a high enough sample size, we use an alternative measure of vote choice – one which categorizes voting for Obama as 1 and all other behaviors (voting for Romney, not voting at all) as 0. Given that previous research (Krupnikov and Piston, forthcoming) suggests that people with higher levels of racial prejudice both opt for white candidates and fail to turn out in the presence of a Black candidate, this measure is a reasonable means of dealing with a small sample due to non-turnout. We call the “Obama or all else” measure “Measure 1.” In order to ensure robustness, we also estimate this model using racial resentment.

We also use a second measure, in which voting for Obama is coded as 1 and voting for Romney is coded as 0. This measure – “Measure 2” – excludes non-voters. We estimate models using this measure for native-born Latino and White respondents. Given rates of turnout among foreign-born Latinos reported in FTF interviews, the resulting N is too small to estimate a valid model using probit.

Finally, we estimate models using Measure 1 for the 2008 data as well to ensure that we again obtain similar results.

Across all cases our original conclusions hold. Racial prejudice is sometimes related to vote choice among Latinos, although the relationship is not as consistent as the relationship between racial prejudice and explicitly racial policies such as affirmative action or aid to Blacks.

In 2012 all models in Table A37 use the weight associated with the FTF sample; the 2008 models rely on the general survey weight for 2008.

Table A37. Alternative Specifications, Vote Choice, 2012

	Latinos, US Born				Latinos, Foreign Born			Whites, Non-Latino			
	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 2
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.19 (0.55)	-0.14 (0.51)	--- (0.49)	1.18 (0.89)	0.99 (0.73)	0.56 (0.73)	--- (0.91)	-0.82** (0.32)	-1.02*** (0.27)	--- (0.33)	-1.59*** (0.45)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.61 (0.39)	-0.66** (0.32)	--- (0.49)	-1.79** (0.69)	-0.61 (0.64)	-0.25 (0.57)	--- (0.91)	0.02 (0.32)	-0.60*** (0.23)	--- (0.33)	0.09 (0.46)
Racial Resentment	--- (0.49)	--- (0.49)	-0.21 (0.49)	--- (0.49)	--- (0.49)	--- (0.49)	-0.39 (0.91)	--- (0.33)	--- (0.33)	-0.93*** (0.33)	--- (0.33)
Party ID	-2.02*** (0.37)	--- (0.37)	-2.00*** (0.38)	-4.94*** (1.00)	-2.60*** (0.70)	--- (0.70)	-2.53*** (0.69)	-2.65*** (0.28)	--- (0.28)	-2.55*** (0.28)	-3.31*** (0.35)
Limited Gov't	-0.52 (0.33)	--- (0.33)	-0.56* (0.32)	-0.49 (0.46)	-0.01 (0.67)	--- (0.67)	-0.10 (0.65)	-0.29 (0.21)	--- (0.21)	-0.23 (0.21)	-0.82*** (0.27)
Egalitarianism	-0.07 (0.65)	--- (0.65)	0.13 (0.65)	-0.21 (1.05)	2.01 (1.26)	--- (1.26)	0.90 (1.30)	1.44*** (0.39)	--- (0.39)	1.28*** (0.44)	1.35*** (0.49)
Age	0.64 (0.41)	--- (0.41)	0.79* (0.40)	-0.52 (0.74)	-0.03 (0.75)	--- (0.75)	0.11 (0.79)	0.39* (0.24)	--- (0.24)	0.41* (0.23)	-0.07 (0.31)
Male	0.20 (0.23)	--- (0.23)	0.19 (0.22)	0.39 (0.32)	-0.27 (0.36)	--- (0.36)	-0.54 (0.40)	0.12 (0.13)	--- (0.13)	0.05 (0.13)	0.34* (0.18)
Income	0.49 (0.47)	--- (0.47)	0.46 (0.46)	-0.82 (0.75)	2.24*** (0.80)	--- (0.80)	1.78** (0.83)	0.34 (0.26)	--- (0.26)	0.28 (0.28)	-0.41 (0.36)
Inc – Missing	-0.65** (0.31)	--- (0.31)	-0.63** (0.31)	-1.59** (0.72)	0.58 (0.59)	--- (0.59)	0.52 (0.61)	0.28 (0.25)	--- (0.25)	0.25 (0.25)	0.16 (0.34)
Education	1.06** (0.45)	--- (0.45)	1.00** (0.45)	0.32 (0.87)	-0.51 (0.71)	--- (0.71)	-0.08 (0.69)	0.86*** (0.25)	--- (0.25)	0.78*** (0.26)	0.66** (0.33)
Constant	0.49 (0.66)	0.48* (0.29)	-0.03 (0.68)	4.77*** (1.20)	-1.32 (1.24)	-0.35 (0.46)	-0.31 (1.37)	-0.57 (0.46)	0.38** (0.19)	-0.25 (0.49)	1.47** (0.62)
Observations	306	318	306	170	103	113	105	807	847	810	576
F- Statistic	7.48	2.50	7.90	7.55	2.77	0.32	3.07	23.17	12.10	24.46	20.96

Table A38 Alternative Specifications, Vote Choice, 2008

	Latinos, US-Born			Latinos, Foreign-Born			Whites		
	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1
Neg. Stereotypes	-0.59*	-0.63**	---	-0.30	-0.44	---	-0.49	-0.59**	---
	(0.35)	(0.31)	---	(0.78)	(0.52)	---	(0.32)	(0.24)	---
Denial of Sympathy	-0.03	-0.65**	---	0.06	-0.61	---	-0.23	-0.94***	---
	(0.32)	(0.25)	---	(0.46)	(0.41)	---	(0.23)	(0.17)	---
Racial Resentment	---	---	-1.33***	---	---	-0.37	---	---	-1.46***
	---	---	(0.41)	---	---	(0.96)	---	---	(0.28)
Party ID	-1.87***	---	-1.96***	-3.03***	---	-2.80***	-2.52***	---	-2.51***
	(0.34)	---	(0.35)	(0.67)	---	(0.62)	(0.22)	---	(0.23)
Limited Gov't	-0.04	---	0.03	-1.54**	---	-1.66**	-0.46***	---	-0.52***
	(0.29)	---	(0.31)	(0.74)	---	(0.70)	(0.18)	---	(0.18)
Egalitarianism	1.57***	---	1.24**	2.34*	---	2.40*	1.34***	---	0.96**
	(0.54)	---	(0.58)	(1.20)	---	(1.24)	(0.38)	---	(0.39)
Age	0.42	---	0.44	0.05	---	0.30	-0.01	---	0.11
	(0.42)	---	(0.41)	(0.95)	---	(0.88)	(0.26)	---	(0.25)
Male	-0.45**	---	-0.42**	-0.18	---	-0.10	-0.06	---	-0.12
	(0.18)	---	(0.18)	(0.34)	---	(0.32)	(0.12)	---	(0.12)
Income	0.57	---	0.48	1.40*	---	1.29*	0.58**	---	0.59**
	(0.45)	---	(0.45)	(0.78)	---	(0.73)	(0.26)	---	(0.26)
Inc – Missing	-0.24	---	-0.48	-0.84	---	-0.90	0.40	---	0.38
	(0.62)	---	(0.66)	(0.79)	---	(0.84)	(0.30)	---	(0.29)
Education	1.09	---	1.18*	0.98	---	1.23	0.99*	---	0.75
	(0.72)	---	(0.71)	(0.85)	---	(0.85)	(0.54)	---	(0.53)
Constant	-1.01	0.62***	-0.37	-1.16	0.35	-1.38	-0.56	0.39***	0.40
	(0.68)	(0.19)	(0.73)	(0.97)	(0.39)	(0.98)	(0.52)	(0.14)	(0.58)
Observations	363	385	364	101	108	101	954	1017	979
F- Statistic	8.16	6.88	10.28	3.79	1.26	3.77	21.31	20.40	33.10





## Appendix 8. Explaining the Latino/White Racial Divide under Various Hypothetical Circumstances

In order to determine the cause of the divide between Latinos and whites on policy relevant to blacks and vote choice for Obama, we follow the procedure outlined in Kinder and Winter (2001)'s analysis of the black/white policy opinion divide. First, relying on the 2008 ANES, we take the difference between mean Latino opinion and mean white opinion, resulting in the "raw" divide: the divide in opinion "unencumbered by controls" (445). Next, given that we want to "compare the racial divide in raw form with our best guess of what the racial divide would look like under various hypothetical circumstances" (445), we estimate a series of regression models, one per policy<sup>1</sup> (and one for electoral behavior), including both Latinos and whites in each model.<sup>2</sup> We also include interaction terms between each independent variable and an indicator variable for whether the respondent is Latino, in order to account for the possibility that each independent variable influences Latinos and whites differently. The coefficients from these models allow us to simulate, for example, what would happen to the Latino/white divide on opinion about affirmative action if differences in partisanship were to disappear.

We conduct such simulations for a given dependent variable, by: (1) setting values for all respondents on a given set of independent variables to the mean value for Latinos;<sup>3</sup> (2) allowing all other values of independent variables to take on their "observed values" for each respondent<sup>4</sup> (n.b., Hanmer and Kalkan 2013); (3) generating predicted values for each respondent; and (4) taking the absolute value of the difference between the mean predicted value of the dependent variable for Latinos and the mean predicted value for whites. This process yields the simulated divide in opinion if differences between Latinos and whites on a given set of independent variable were to disappear.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We do not conduct this analysis for opinion about welfare, since mean Latino and white support for welfare are nearly identical.

<sup>2</sup> Foreign-born and U.S.-born Latinos are collapsed in this analysis in order to facilitate the focus of the presentation on the Latino/white divide.

<sup>3</sup> Alternatively, we could have set values to the white mean or to the Latino/white midpoint, and a complete accounting for the Latino/white divide might have looked at all three. It is sufficient for our purposes to note that any of these approaches would have yielded the same general finding – that racial attitudes cannot explain this divide, while other factors such as partisanship and principles make more headway.

<sup>4</sup> This is the only respect in which our approach differs from Kinder and Winter's (2001); following the logic of Hanmer and Kalkan (2013), we argue that an observed values approach is more defensible because it does not construct estimates based on the (possibly non-existent) "average respondent."

<sup>5</sup> These analyses are admittedly unrealistic in that they assume changes in one independent variable would not affect the others. Like Kinder and Winter (2001), we view these analyses as "heuristic exercises to help us unravel how race is entwined with opinion."

Table A39: Predicting Latino and White Policy Opinion and Electoral Behavior

	Aff. Action	Aid to Blacks	Fair Jobs	Death Penalty	Vote
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.15*** (0.05)	-2.50*** (0.67)	0.08 (0.07)	-0.85 (0.78)
Latino	0.39** (0.17)	0.56*** (0.17)	4.14** (1.86)	-0.69*** (0.21)	1.81 (2.28)
Latino X Ster.	-0.09 (0.09)	-0.01 (0.10)	0.40 (1.09)	0.04 (0.12)	0.03 (1.35)
Denial of Sympathy	-0.27*** (0.04)	-0.26*** (0.04)	-2.59*** (0.52)	0.15*** (0.05)	-0.87* (0.52)
Latino X Symp.	0.09 (0.08)	0.07 (0.07)	-0.26 (0.88)	0.00 (0.09)	-0.46 (0.92)
Party ID (Republican)	-0.11*** (0.03)	-0.13*** (0.03)	-0.51 (0.38)	0.13*** (0.04)	-5.57*** (0.53)
Latino X PID	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.08)	0.19 (0.74)	0.04 (0.09)	0.69 (0.87)
Limited Government	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.05* (0.03)	-0.79** (0.35)	0.00 (0.04)	-0.92** (0.36)
Latino X Lim. Govt.	0.03 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.07)	0.33 (0.79)	0.01 (0.08)	-0.00 (0.75)
Egalitarianism	0.15** (0.06)	0.24*** (0.06)	2.96*** (0.83)	-0.25*** (0.09)	2.73*** (0.88)
Latino X Egal.	-0.15 (0.13)	-0.15 (0.12)	-1.02 (1.56)	-0.07 (0.16)	-1.16 (1.49)
Age	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.62 (0.62)	0.07 (0.06)	-1.70*** (0.55)
Latino X Age	-0.04 (0.11)	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.28 (1.05)	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.56 (1.14)
Male	0.02 (0.02)	0.04** (0.02)	0.61** (0.26)	0.05* (0.03)	0.36 (0.27)
Latino X Male	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.09** (0.04)	-0.35 (0.48)	-0.00 (0.05)	-1.13** (0.52)
Income	-0.06* (0.04)	-0.08** (0.04)	0.07 (0.56)	0.08 (0.05)	0.31 (0.53)
Latino X Income	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.07 (0.09)	0.16 (1.07)	0.11 (0.11)	1.80 (1.14)
Education	-0.07 (0.09)	0.24*** (0.09)	0.68 (1.07)	-0.59*** (0.11)	-1.74 (1.28)
Latino X Educ.	-0.21 (0.15)	-0.35** (0.17)	-3.89** (1.70)	0.72*** (0.19)	-0.91 (1.86)
Constant	0.41*** (0.09)	0.30*** (0.10)	(1.20) 0.54	0.72*** (0.13)	4.04*** (1.30)
N	2,141	1,945	1,500	2,107	1,793
R-squared/F-stat	0.18	0.28	7.03	0.15	13.88

Source: 2008 ANES. Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). All variables coded 0 to 1; analyses weighted for national representativeness.

*Table A40. Mean Values of Covariates from Models in Table 4.*


	Whites	Latinos
Neg. Stereotypes - Blacks	.468	.482
Denial of Sympathy for Blacks	.557	.537
Partisanship (Republican)	.521	.381
Limited Government	.449	.276
Egalitarianism	.597	.644
Age	.405	.326
Income	.408	.360
Education	.808	.751

Source: 2008 ANES. All variables coded from 0 to 1. Analyses weighted for national representativeness.

**Appendix 9. Bivariate Patterns, FTF and Web interviews combined, 2012 ANES**

**Figure A1: Public Opinion and Vote Choice in 2012, FTF and Web, by Race/Ethnicity**

Proportion of groups supporting policy  
(2012 ANES, 95% Confidence Interval)



**Figure A2: Prejudice Against Blacks by Race/Ethnicity, FTF and Web Interviews**  
 2012 ANES, 95% Confidence Intervals

Figure A2a: Negative Stereotypes About Blacks





Figure A2b: Sympathy for Blacks



### **References Included in the Appendix**

Hanmer, Michael J., and Kerem Ozan Kalkan. 2013. "Behind the curve: Clarifying the best approach to calculating predicted probabilities and marginal effects from limited dependent variable models." *American Journal of Political Science* 57: 263-277.

Kinder, Donald R., and Nicholas Winter. 2001. "Exploring the racial divide: Blacks, whites, and opinion on national policy." *American Journal of Political Science*: 439-456.