

**APPENDICES (to appear online)**

**APPENDIX FOR CHAPTER 2:**

**Arizona and New Mexico Survey with Embedded Experiment:** The telephone survey was conducted by ISA Corp. A mixture of sampling methods was used: Random digit dialing (RDD) landline untargeted; RDD landline targeted (zip codes where 30 percent or more of the population is Latino); RDD wireless; and targeted surname landline. The mean interview length was 15.65 minutes. The cooperation rate (percentage of participants contacted who agreed to participate) was 25.6%. Respondents were given the option to conduct the survey in either English or Spanish. The embedded experiment was located toward the end of the survey (see the survey instrument for exact placement). Respondents were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (welcoming policies or unwelcoming policies). The full sample included 1,903 respondents (see Table 2.1a for a summary of survey respondent characteristics). The numbers for each category may not add up to the total sample because of missing data and exclusion of subgroups not relevant to findings presented. For example, 43 foreign-born whites were excluded from the analyses because this sample was too small from which to interpret findings.

**Table 2.1a: Descriptive Characteristics of Survey Sample**

	Arizona	New Mexico	All
Sample Size	953	950	1903
<b>Age</b>			
Mean	55.95	57.24	56.59
Median	58.00	60.0	59.00

### Gender

Female	502 (53.0%)	520 (55.0%)	1022 (54.0%)
Male	446 (47.0%)	426 (45.0%)	872 (46.0%)

### Political Party Identification

Democrat	397 (52.6%)	410 (53.5%)	807 (53.1%)
Republican	290 (38.4%)	285 (37.2%)	575 (37.8%)
Independent	68 (9.0%)	71 (9.3%)	139 (9.1%)

### Race

Hispanic/Latino	478 (50.2%)	476 (50.1%)	954 (50.1%)
White	475 (49.8%)	474 (49.9%)	949 (49.9%)

### Citizenship

US Citizen	831	884	1715
	(87.2%)	(93.1%)	(90.1%)
Not US Citizen	122	66	188
	(12.8%)	(6.9%)	(9.90%)

Country of Birth

US	709	827	1536
	(74.4%)	(87.1%)	(80.7%)
Outside of US	243	364	
	(25.5%)	121	(19.1%)
		(12.7%)	
Don't Know/Refused	1	2	3
	(0.1%)	(0.2%)	(.20%)

Interview Language

English	763	866	1629
	(80.1%)	(91.2%)	(85.6%)
Spanish	190	84	274
	(19.9%)	(8.8%)	(14.4%)

Experimental Condition

Welcoming	490	499	989
	(51.4%)	(52.5%)	(52.0%)

Unwelcoming	463	451	914
	(48.6%)	(47.5%)	(48.0%)

## Survey Instrument

**(state)**

Before we begin, can you please verify that you live in [**Arizona/New Mexico**]?

**(state)**

Interviewer enter:

1. Arizona
2. New Mexico
3. Neither: end interview and thank respondent for his/her time.

**(yrsinstat)**

How long have you lived in [**Arizona/New Mexico**]?

nearest whole # of years

**(move0)**

In the past 12 months, have you thought about moving out of [**Arizona/New Mexico**]?

1. No
2. Yes

**(race)**

What race do you consider yourself to be? White, black, Asian, American Indian, or something else?

1. White
2. Black
3. Asian
4. American Indian
5. Hispanic/Latino (vol.)
6. Mixed race (vol.)
7. Something else (open end; if didn't volunteer Hispanic or mixed)

**(hispanic)**

Are you of Hispanic or Latin origin or descent?

1. Yes
2. No

[interview terminated if respondent is not white, non-hispanic OR Hispanic]

**(ethnicity)**

1. White, non-Hispanic
2. Hispanic
9. Interview terminated

**(imref)**

Which comes closest to your view about what government policy should be toward undocumented immigrants now living in the United States?

1. Deport all unauthorized immigrants and send them back to their home country.
2. Have a guest worker program that allows unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States in order to work, but only for a limited amount of time.
3. Allow unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes, learning English, and passing background checks.

**(imdream)**

There is a proposal from the federal government to allow people who were illegally brought into the U.S. as children to become permanent U.S. residents under some circumstances. Would you say you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose such a proposal?

1. Strongly favor
2. Somewhat favor
3. Neither favor nor oppose (vol.)
4. Somewhat oppose
5. Strongly oppose

**(usborn)** Were you born in the United States?

**(mborn)** Was your mother born in the United States?

**(fborn)** Was your father born in the United States?

1. Yes , born in U.S.
2. No, not born in U.S.

**(granborn)**

Thinking about all four of your grandparents, how many of them were born in the United States?

1. All 4 grandparents born in US
2. Some grandparents born in US
3. No grandparent born in US

**(yrsinus)** (note: only asked if usborn=2)

How long have you been living in the United States? Enter number of years:

99. No Answer

**(born)** (note: only asked if usborn=2)

In what country were you born?

Enter Country [open-ended response]

**(citizen)**

Are you a United States citizen?

1. Yes, a U.S. citizen.
2. No, not a U.S. citizen.

**(ynocit)** (note: only asked of non-citizens)

What would you say is the main reason why you have not become a U.S. citizen?

1. It costs too much
2. You do not know how
3. You have not been in the United States long enough
4. You do not have the necessary documents
5. You plan to return to your home country
6. Your strong affection for your home country
7. It takes too long
8. You just have not gotten to it yet

**(langhome)**

What is the primary language spoken in your home?

1. English
2. Spanish
3. Other (Please Specify) [open ended response]

**(party1)**

Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Republican, an independent, a Democrat, or something else?

1. Republican      Go to party2
2. Independent    Go to partlean
3. Democrat        Go to party3
4. Other (Please specify) [open ended response]      Go to q after party battery

**(party2)**

Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

1. Strong                      Go to q after party battery
2. Not very strong            Go to q after party battery

**(party3)**

Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

1. Strong                      Go to q after party battery
2. Not very strong            Go to q after party battery

**(partlean)**

Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

1. Closer to Republican Party
2. Closer to Democratic Party
3. True Independent

**(party7)**

Create 7 category variable based on party1 to partlean

1. Strong Dem (1 on party3)

2. Weak Dem (2 on party3)
3. Leans Dem (2 on partlean)
4. Independent (3 on partlean)
5. Leans Rep (1 on partlean)
6. Weak Rep (2 on party2)
7. Strong Rep (1 on party2)

**(ideo)**

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as conservative, moderate, or liberal?

1. Conservative
2. Moderate
3. Liberal

[Randomized order of selfamer, selfrace, selfst]

**(selfamer)**

How important is being American to you? Is it not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, or very important?

1. Not at all important
2. Not very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Very important

**(selfrace)**

How important is being [white/Latino] to you? (if necessary... "is it...")

1. Not at all important
2. Not very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Very important

**(selfst)**

How important is being from [Arizona/New Mexico] to you? (if necessary... "is it...")

1. Not at all important
2. Not very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Very important

**(dcourt)**

For the following questions, we would like you to think about your own background and how it has affected your everyday experiences. Because of your race or ethnicity, how often are you treated with less courtesy than other people? Never, less than once a year, a few times a year, a few times a month, at least once a week, almost every day?

1. Never
2. Less than once a year
3. A few times a year
4. A few times a month
5. At least once a week
6. Almost every day

**(dresp)**

Because of your race or ethnicity, how often are you treated with less respect than other people? (same response options)

1. Never
2. Less than once a year
3. A few times a year
4. A few times a month
5. At least once a week
6. Almost every day

[Note: randomized order of discrimus and discrimst]

**(discrimus)**

How much discrimination is there in the United States today against [ **if ethnicity = 1: whites; if ethnicity = 2: Hispanics**]? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none at all?

1. A great deal
2. A lot
3. A moderate amount
4. A little
5. None at all

**(discrimst)**

How much discrimination is there in [**Arizona/New Mexico**] today against [ **if ethnicity = 1: whites; if ethnicity = 2: Hispanics**]? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none at all?

1. A great deal
2. A lot
3. A moderate amount
4. A little
5. None at all

**(fate1)**

Do you think generally what happens to [“white people” if ethnicity=1, “Hispanic people” if ethnicity=2] in this country will have something to do with what happens in your own life?

1. Yes
2. No

**(fate1amt) Only ask if fate1=1**

Do you think it will affect you a lot, some, or not very much?

1. A lot
2. Some
3. Not very much

**(fate1sum)**

Program combined variable of fate1 and fate1amt:

1. No (2 from fate1)
2. Not very much (3 from fate1amt)
3. Some (2 from fate1amt)
4. A lot (1 from fate1amt)



**(fate2)**

Do you think generally what happens to immigrants in [Arizona/New Mexico] will have something to do with what happens in your own life?

1. Yes
2. No

**(fate2amt)** Only asked if fate2=1

Do you think it will affect you a lot, some, or not very much?

1. A lot
2. Some
3. Not very much

**(fate2sum)**

Program combined variable of fate2 and fate2amt:

1. No (2 from fate2)
2. Not very much (3 from fate2amt)
3. Some (2 from fate2amt)
4. A lot (1 from fate2amt)

Note: randomized order of belongus and belongst.

**(belongus)**

How much do you feel like you belong in the United States? A lot, some, a little, or none at all?

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. Not at all

**(belongst)**

How much do you feel like you belong in [Arizona/New Mexico]?

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. Not at all

**(belothus)**

How much do you think **other** people feel like you belong in the United States? (**Interviewer: emphasize “other”**)

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. Not at all

**(belothst)**

How much do you think **other** people feel like you belong in [Arizona/New Mexico]? (**Interviewer: emphasize “other”**)

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. Not at all

**[outintro]**

For the next few questions, I am going to read a statement. Then tell me if you strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree?

Randomized order of outus and outst

**(outus)**

I feel like an outsider in the United States.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Somewhat agree
5. Strongly agree

**(outst)**

I feel like an outsider in [Arizona/New Mexico]

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Somewhat agree
5. Strongly agree

**(ampride)**

I am proud to be American

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Somewhat agree
5. Strongly agree

**(stpride)**

I am proud to tell people I am from [Arizona/New Mexico].

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Somewhat agree
5. Strongly agree

**(stwel)**

In general, do you think that the state of [Arizona/New Mexico] tries to make immigrants feel: very welcome, somewhat welcome, somewhat unwelcome, very unwelcome?

1. Very welcome

2. Somewhat welcome
3. Somewhat unwelcome
4. Very unwelcome

### **EMBEDDED XPERIMENT**

The experiment was embedded at this point in the telephone survey. Participants were told that lawmakers in their home state were considering new policies that affect immigrants. The nature of the policies varied depending on whether participants were assigned to the welcoming or to the unwelcoming condition. Latino and White participants from Arizona and New Mexico were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions. After exposure to the experimental stimuli, participants were asked five questions about their reactions if their state adopted the proposed set of policies. Would they feel: 1) more or less at home; 2) more or less likely to want to move out of the state in the future; 3) angry; 4) sad; and 5) happy.

*Feelings.* Three measures (angry and sad reverse coded, happy) were averaged together to form a single indicator of positive feelings toward the proposal ( $\alpha=.75$ ).

*Belonging.* Two measures (feel more at home, want to move out of state-reverse coded) were averaged together for a single indicator of belonging,  $r(1614)=.49, p<.001$ .

#### **(condition)**

1. Respondent assigned to welcoming condition
2. Respondent assigned to hostile condition

#### **(primewel) Only for respondents where condition=1**

Some lawmakers in [**Arizona/New Mexico**] want the state to adopt policies that would make the state more welcoming for immigrants. Some policies that have been suggested include adding more social services for noncitizens, providing more government documents in languages other than English, and allowing all residents to get identification cards. In general, In general, would you support or oppose these kinds of efforts to make [**Arizona/New Mexico**] more welcoming for immigrants?

1. Support
2. Oppose
3. Neither (vol.)
9. DK/Refused

#### **(primewel2)**

Would you [support/oppose] these efforts a lot or a little?

1. A lot
2. A little
9. DK/Refused

#### **(primewelsum)**

Programmed variable combining **primewel** and **primewel2**

1. Oppose a lot
2. Oppose a little

3. Neither
4. Support a lot
5. Support a little
9. Not coded

**(primehost) Only for respondents where condition=2**

Some lawmakers in [Arizona/New Mexico] want the state to adopt policies that would make the state less welcoming for immigrants. Some policies that have been suggested include reducing social services for noncitizens, requiring that government documents be available only in English, and requiring employers to verify the immigration status of their employees. In general, would you support or oppose these kinds of efforts to make [Arizona/New Mexico] less welcoming for immigrants?

1. Support
2. Oppose
9. DK/Refuse

**(primehost2)**

Would you [support/oppose] these efforts a lot or a little?

1. A lot
2. A little
9. DK/Refused

**(primehostsum)**

Programmed variable combining **primehost** and **primehost2**

1. Oppose a lot
2. Oppose a little
3. Neither
4. Support a lot
5. Support a little
9. Not coded

**[feelings]**

I'm going to read you a list of feelings. To what extent would each feeling describe your response if [Arizona/New Mexico] adopted programs to make the state [more/less] welcoming to immigrants? [randomized order]

**(feelang)**

How about anger? Would you feel...

1. Very angry
2. Somewhat angry
3. A little angry
4. Not at all angry?

**(feelsad)**

How about sadness? Would you feel...

1. Very sad
2. Somewhat sad
3. A little sad

4. Not at all sad?

**(feelhap)**

How about happy? Would you feel...

1. Very happy
2. Somewhat happy
3. A little happy
4. Not at all happy

Note: angry and sad (both reverse coded) and happy were averaged together to form a single indicator of positive affect toward the proposal ( $\alpha=.75$ ).

**(home1)**

If [Arizona/New Mexico] adopted programs to make the state [more/less] welcoming to immigrants, would it make you feel more or less at home in the state?

1. More
2. Less
3. Neither (Vol.)

**(home2) Only if home1=1**

Would it make you feel a lot more at home or just a little more?

1. A lot
2. A little

**(home3) only if home1=2**

Would it make you feel a lot less at home or just a little less?

1. A lot
2. A little

**(homesum)**

**Program a summary variable of home1, home2, and home3**

1. A lot more (if home2=1)
2. A little more (if home2=2)
3. A little less (if home3=2)
4. A lot less (if home3=1)
5. Neither (Vol.) (if home1=3)

**(move1)**

If [Arizona/New Mexico] adopted programs to make the state [more/less] welcoming to immigrants, would it make you more or less likely to want to move out of the state in the future?

1. More
2. Less
3. Neither (Vol.)

**(move2) Only if move1=1**

Would it make you a lot more likely or just a little more?

1. A lot
2. A little

**(move3) only if move1=2**

Would it make you a lot less likely or just a little less?

1. A lot
2. A little

**(movesum)**

**Program a summary variable of move1, move2, and move3**

1. A lot more likely (if move2=1)
2. A little more (if move2=2)
3. A little less (if move3=2)
4. A lot less (if move3=1)
5. Neither (Vol.) (if move1=3)

Note: Feel more at home and want to move out of state (reverse coded) were averaged together to for a single indicator of belonging for post-manipulation tests,  $r(1614)=.49$ ,  $p<.001$ .

**[ft intro]**

Now we'd like to get your feeling toward various groups. I'll read the name of a group and I'd like you to rate that group using any number between 0 and 100. The higher the number, the warmer or more favorable you feel toward that group, the lower the number, the colder or less favorable. You would rate this group at the 50-degree mark if you feel neither warm nor cold toward it.

Randomized order of FT questions

**(ftamer)** Americans

**(ftlat)** Latinos

**(ftlegim)** Documented immigrants

**(ftilim)** Undocumented immigrants

**(ftmus)** Muslims

**(ftafam)** African Americans

**(ftasian)** Asians

**(ftwhite)** Whites

**(ftme)** Middle Easterners

**(complat)**

Now I would like to ask your impressions of Latinos in [Arizona/New Mexico]. Would you say they are in general, they are...

1. Very competent
2. Somewhat competent
3. A little competent
4. Not at all competent

**(warmlat)**

Now, would you say in general Latinos in [Arizona/New Mexico] are

1. Very warm

2. Somewhat warm
3. A little warm
4. Not at all warm

**(complegim)**

I will now ask your impressions of legal immigrants in [**Arizona/New Mexico**]. Would you say they are in general

1. Very competent
2. Somewhat competent
3. A little competent
4. Not at all competent

**(warmlegim)**

Would you say in general legal immigrants in [**Arizona/New Mexico**] are

1. Very warm
2. Somewhat warm
3. A little warm
4. Not at all warm

**(compillim)**

I will now ask your impressions of undocumented immigrants in [**Arizona/New Mexico**]. Would you say they are in general

1. Very competent
2. Somewhat competent
3. A little competent
4. Not at all competent

**(warmillim)**

Would you say in general undocumented immigrants in [**Arizona/New Mexico**] are

1. Very warm
2. Somewhat warm
3. A little warm
4. Not at all warm

**(inc1)**

Before taxes, was your household income in 2014 more or less than \$50,000? (**if R says it WAS \$50,000, ask them if they think it was just below or just above**)

1. More
2. Less

**(inc2) ask if inc1=1**

Was it more or less than \$100,000?

1. More
2. Less

**(inc3) ask if inc2=1**

Was it more or less than \$150,000?

1. More
2. Less

**(inc4) ask if inc1=2**

Was it more or less than \$25,000?

1. More
2. Less

**(incsum)**

Program summary income variable from inc1 to inc4

1. Less than 25,000 (if inc4=2)
2. 25-50k (if inc4=1)
3. 50-100K (if inc2=2)
4. 100-150K (if inc3=2)
5. Over 150K (if inc3=1)

**(educ)**

What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?

1. Less than high school diploma
2. High school grad
3. Trade/Vocational school
4. Some college (No degree or associate's degree)
5. Bachelor's degree (BA or BS)
6. Some graduate school (No degree)
7. Graduate level degree

**(sex)**

Are you male, female, or something else?

1. Male
2. Female
3. Something else

**Mturk Replication of Experiment (National Sample)**

The national MTurk replication of the experiment embedded in the Arizona and New Mexico Survey used the same measures and the information participants saw in the welcoming and unwelcoming conditions was identical to the telephone survey but references to Arizona and New Mexico were replaced with “your state.”



The study consisted of a sample of 904 participants recruited from across the US through Amazon's MTurk on-line platform. Because MTurk relies on self-selection into the experiment, the final sample gathered cannot be said to be representative of the national population in the United States. Nonetheless, the sample still allowed us to see whether and to what extent the findings from our two-state experiment are robust. This self-selected sample included some foreign-born individuals, but this was not a large enough group on which to conduct reliable analyses. Thus, we restricted our analysis to US-born Latinos and US-born whites and excluded the small number of foreign-born respondents. The study was conducted in English only.

Participants included in the analyses were 316 US-born Latinos and 588 US-born whites, varying in political party identification (581 Democrats, 108 independents, and 209 Republicans), 52% woman, average age of 35 years with range from 18 to 86 years.

## **In-depth Interviews**

We conducted 123 in-depth interviews with residents of New Mexico and Arizona between August 2017 and October 2019. Table 2.2a displays the characteristics of our interview respondents. The interviews with whites and Latinos in both states deepened our understanding of the processes that explain our survey and experimental findings and helped us understand how individuals made sense of recent policy and political developments. The in-depth interviews do not define the range of responses available to respondents, and our subjects were thus able to share their views in an open-ended fashion about immigration, policy, culture, history, identity, and their own sense of belonging.

We hired research assistants based in Arizona and New Mexico to conduct the bulk of the interviews. Jiménez traveled to both states to conduct initial interviews and to train the research team. The training involved sharing with the research assistants the theoretical background of the study and the analyzed quantitative data. This portion of the training was particularly important because it provided the research assistants with the requisite background knowledge to pose follow-up probes and to pursue unanticipated findings. In Arizona, we hired a Spanish/English bilingual research assistant who is the daughter of Mexican immigrants. She conducted interviews in Arizona with Latinos, both US- and foreign-born. She also had ties to the immigrant community in the Phoenix metro area, facilitating recruitment among this population. Another research assistant in Arizona, also the daughter of Mexican immigrants, conducted the interviews with US-born whites. Before hiring this research assistant, we had some concern that white respondents would not fully disclose their views to her. On top of having outstanding interview skills, the research assistant can, by her own reckoning, “pass” as white: she has light skin; ethnically ambiguous first and last names; is tall and is able to embody an affect that most

would associate with US-born whites. In New Mexico, we hired two graduate students in the sociology department at the University of New Mexico to conduct the interviews. We hired a native New Mexican with Native American and Mexican ancestries to conduct the interviews with Latinos. This research assistant had superb Spanish and English language skills, and, like one of the research assistants in Phoenix, had a deep familiarity with the Latino community in the state. The pre-existing rapport that both of our Spanish-speaking research assistants had established with immigrant communities was crucial. It was likely only because of this rapport that they were able to interview the most vulnerable among the immigrant population, including individuals who were undocumented. A second research assistant in New Mexico with Native American and white ancestries conducted interviews with US-born Whites. This research assistant has dark skin that people often read as an indicator of Mexican ancestry. In each interview, this research assistant would mention her native ancestry in an effort to prevent respondents from feeling like they had to censor their articulation of negative attitudes about immigrants for fear of offending her. This research assistant was also conscientious about putting forth an interpersonal presentation of self that downplayed her native ancestry. The rapport that all four research assistants had with interview subjects is born out in the range of responses interviewees shared, including responses that were laden with racial prejudice and hostility toward immigrants.

We used a flexible interview protocol that included follow-up with probes that asked respondents to articulate their general views, how they arrived at those views, and concrete instances that inform and illustrate their views. The research team met regularly remotely with Jiménez to discuss sampling, respondent recruitment, emerging findings, and modifications to the interview protocol.

**Table 2.2a. Descriptive Characteristics of Sample**

	Arizona	New Mexico	All
<b>Age</b>			
Mean	41.0	43.9	42.4
Median	37	41	39
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	34 (52.3%)	27 (46.6%)	61 (49.6%)
Male	31 (47.7%)	31 (53.4%)	62 (50.4%)
<b>Political Party Affiliation</b>			
Democrat	24 (36.9%)	32 (55.2%)	56 (45.5%)
Republican	16 (24.6%)	10 (17.2%)	26 (21.1%)
Independent	20 (30.8%)	13 (22.4%)	33 (26.8%)
Libertarian	2 (3.1%)	0	2 (1.6%)

Constitutionalist	0	1 (1.7%)	1 (0.8%)
None/Not Registered	3 (4.6%)	2 (3.4%)	5 (4.1%)
Race			
Hispanic/Latino	29 (44.6%)	29 (50%)	58 (47.2%)
Afro-Latino	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)
White	35 (53.8%)	29 (50%)	64 (52.0%)
Legal Status			
Citizen	53 (81.5%)	51 (87.9%)	104 (84.6%)
Temporary Protective Status	0	1 (1.7%)	1 (0.8%)
Visa	1 (1.5%)	0	1 (0.8%)
Green Card	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (1.6%)
DACA	4 (6.2%)	2 (3.4%)	6 (4.9%)
Undocumented	6 (9.2%)	3 (5.2%)	9 (7.3%)
Interview Language			

English	52 (80%)	47 (81%)	99 (80.5%)
Spanish	12 (18.5%)	8 (13.7%)	20 (16.3%)
English/Spanish	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (2.5%)
No Language Reported	0	1 (1.7%)	1 (0.8%)
N	65	58	123

---

To recruit participation in the study, we offered each respondent a \$40 gift card to Target. Respondents received the gift card upon completing the interview. We relied on the research assistants' contacts and local organizations to identify respondents. We then utilized referral sampling, where respondents who already participated in an interview referred us to new interview respondents. We recruited these respondents separately from the respondents who answered the survey. We could have recruited in-depth interview respondents from our survey sample. By recruiting a separate sample for the in-depth interviews, we avoided priming interview respondents with the kinds of topics we asked them to discuss in the interview context. Thus, we were better positioned to understand how respondents made sense of the effect of immigration policy on their belonging relative to the other factors that contributed to that sense of belonging. The strategy allowed for flexibility in purposely selecting respondents whose characteristics (nativity, gender, ethnoracial ancestry, occupation, political identification, class, etc.) might offer greater insight into the processes at play in our quantitative results, while also adding empirical breadth and theoretical depth of insight (Small 2009). A risk with referral

sampling is that the overall sample contains too many similarly situated individuals.

Homogeneity among interview respondents in terms of key characteristics truncates the scope of potential insights that interviews generate. We thus carefully monitored the characteristics of the sample to ensure that we maximally sample for range, which entails capturing a broad set of respondents' attributes (Small 2009). Sampling for range is not the same as a random sampling, which is neither optimal nor necessary for in-depth interviewing. A random sample of in-depth interview respondents is prohibitively difficult to obtain. As others have discussed, attempts to assemble a random interview sample almost never accomplish that end (Waters 1999; Small 2009). Instead, such efforts yield a sample of talkative people who have abundant free time. Referral sampling, in contrast, uses trust embedded in networks to obtain respondents who would only agree to an interview because someone in their network vouched for the researcher and the interview process. A random interview sample is also unnecessary for our research purposes. Obtaining a random sample of in-depth interview respondents spread across two states and three groups (US- and foreign-born Latinos; US-born whites) would not enable us to generalize in a statistical sense from these data because there is such a small N. Our large N survey did, however, allow us to make generalizable claims.

We had to work hard to find certain categories of respondents. Interviewing undocumented immigrants in a context of ramped up immigration enforcement was challenging. We were able to find undocumented immigrants to interview, but only after providing abundant reassurances related to anonymity and confidentiality. Political polarization in the United States made it difficult to find white conservatives (we asked about political party identification during the interview and in a post-interview questionnaire). In Arizona, five such individuals agreed to an interview, but then canceled before we conducted it. Though we cannot know for sure why

they declined, their responses implied that they did not trust what they assumed would be a “liberal” professor’s portrayal of their views of the world fairly. In New Mexico, two white Republicans declined our request for an interview. One of those prospective respondents suggested that he did not trust representatives of what he perceived to be a liberal institution like Stanford (a Latino Republican shared the same suspicion during an interview, but decided to complete the interview nonetheless). We heard these declines despite offering assurances that we “had no ax to grind” and that we were genuinely interested in hearing their point of view. When research assistants did interview Republicans, they provided abundant verbal and non-verbal cues meant to make the respondent feel comfortable fully sharing their perspectives.

Professional transcribers transcribed all interviews. Spanish language interviews were transcribed by a fluent Spanish speaker and translated verbatim by the same transcriber. Jiménez read and coded all interviews. Jiménez regularly consulted with the other authors about emerging findings from the interviews. As the interviews came in, the research team used them to make sense of the surveys in the survey experiment. Likewise, we use findings from the two quantitative sources of data to make sense of the interviews.



## APPENDIX FOR CHAPTER 3

**Table 3.1a: State Welcome and Identity Importance**

	State is unwelcoming	American identity important	Latino identity important	State identity important
Arizona	<b>0.528***</b> (0.148)	0.255 (0.173)	0.127 (0.159)	0.085 (0.145)
Born in U.S.	-0.092 (0.145)	0.161 (0.193)	-0.002 (0.165)	<b>0.282*</b> (0.160)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	<b>0.308*</b> (0.170)	-0.246 (0.218)	-0.182 (0.189)	<b>-0.519***</b> (0.176)
Speaks English at home	<b>-0.185*</b> (0.107)	<b>0.423***</b> (0.149)	<b>-0.372***</b> (0.117)	-0.175 (0.112)
Education	0.014 (0.024)	-0.004 (0.034)	-0.030 (0.027)	<b>-0.084***</b> (0.025)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.036 (0.106)	-0.090 (0.145)	0.149 (0.119)	-0.115 (0.114)
\$50K-\$100K	0.059 (0.110)	0.169 (0.180)	0.127 (0.127)	-0.140 (0.120)
\$100-\$150K	<b>0.318**</b> (0.155)	0.017 (0.244)	0.128 (0.173)	-0.390** (0.168)
Over \$150K	0.096 (0.03)	-0.221 (0.258)	-0.041 (0.224)	-0.368* (0.220)
Refused to give income	-0.080 (0.135)	0.050 (0.167)	0.170 (0.140)	0.117 (0.139)
Democrat	0.082 (0.096)	0.162 (0.127)	<b>0.226**</b> (0.107)	0.143 (0.102)
Independent	0.059 (0.172)	<b>-0.376*</b> (0.219)	<b>-0.309*</b> (0.186)	<b>-0.380**</b> (0.172)
Republican	<b>-0.350***</b> (0.124)	<b>0.472***</b> (0.182)	<b>-0.326**</b> (0.132)	0.033 (0.131)
Cutpoint 1	-0.600	-1.910	-1.815	-1.897
Cutpoint 2	0.496	-1.389	-1.360	-1.347
Cutpoint 3	1.244	-0.580	-0.556	-0.547
N	857	901	879	894
$\chi^2$	138.95	36.28	67.79	77.46

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

**Table 3.2a: Perceptions of Discrimination**

	Individual discrimination scale	Discrimination in US	Discrimination in state
Arizona	-0.260 (0.177)	-0.001 (0.129)	<b>0.560***</b> (0.138)
Born in U.S.	0.022 (0.188)	-0.219 (0.136)	-0.110 (0.138)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	0.259 (0.206)	0.146 (0.157)	0.261 (0.163)
Speaks English at home	-0.144 (0.137)	0.084 (0.104)	-0.030 (0.099)
Education	0.033 (0.031)	0.007 (0.023)	-0.019 (0.022)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.091 (0.137)	-0.157 (0.102)	<b>-0.205**</b> (0.098)
\$50K-\$100K	<b>-0.313**</b> (0.145)	-0.089 (0.113)	-0.013 (0.114)
\$100-\$150K	<b>-0.326*</b> (0.192)	0.202 (0.156)	0.078 (0.158)
Over \$150K	-0.387 (0.247)	<b>-0.319*</b> (0.193)	-0.208 (0.193)
Refused to give income	<b>-0.476***</b> (0.153)	-0.145 (0.122)	-0.152 (0.118)
Democrat	0.157 (0.118)	0.104 (0.094)	<b>0.253***</b> (0.090)
Independent	-0.095 (0.203)	<b>-0.296**</b> (0.150)	0.017 (0.167)
Republican	-0.144 (0.150)	<b>-0.476***</b> (0.120)	<b>-0.361***</b> (0.118)
Constant	2.441		
Cutpoint 1		-1.989	-1.169
Cutpoint 2		-1.086	-0.254
Cutpoint 3		-0.167	0.652
Cutpoint 4		0.553	1.301
N	902	871	881
R <sup>2</sup>	0.032		
χ <sup>2</sup>		53.09	155.56

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \*p≤0.1; \*\*p≤0.05; \*\*\*p≤0.01; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at p=0.1 or lower are highlighted in bold.

Discrimination in state and US: 0=none at all; 1=a little; 2=a moderate amt; 3=a lot; 4=a great deal

**Table 3.3a: Perceptions Of Being An Insider Or Outsider**

	Belong in US	Belong in state	Others feel R belongs in US	Others feel R belongs in state	Outsider in US	Outsider in state
Arizona	0.071 (0.155)	<b>0.351**</b> (0.143)	0.131 (0.138)	0.066 (0.143)	0.072 (0.138)	0.095 (0.132)
Born in U.S.	<b>0.659***</b> (0.182)	<b>0.679***</b> (0.163)	<b>0.672***</b> (0.153)	<b>0.489***</b> (0.151)	<b>-0.479***</b> (0.157)	<b>-0.434***</b> (0.144)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	-0.223 (0.216)	<b>-0.580***</b> (0.187)	-0.157 (0.175)	<b>-0.382**</b> (0.178)	-0.088 (0.177)	0.127 (0.171)
Speaks English at home	<b>0.533***</b> (0.145)	<b>0.188</b> (0.124)	0.159 (0.121)	<b>0.313***</b> (0.111)	<b>-0.230**</b> (0.116)	<b>-0.337***</b> (0.109)
Education	-0.012 (0.035)	-0.007 (0.028)	0.001 (0.027)	0.014 (0.029)	-0.052 (0.028)	<b>-0.045*</b> (0.028)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.021 (0.140)	0.04 (0.123)	0.187 (0.116)	-0.028 (0.112)	0.046 (0.112)	0.114 (0.112)
\$50K-\$100K	0.212 (0.179)	0.119 (0.139)	<b>0.321***</b> (0.128)	<b>0.242*</b> (0.127)	<b>0.218*</b> (0.130)	0.051 (0.129)
\$100-\$150K	<b>0.655**</b> (0.318)	0.095 (0.208)	<b>0.457***</b> (0.185)	0.259 (0.188)	<b>-0.524**</b> (0.216)	-0.215 (0.177)
Over \$150K	-0.274 (0.228)	-0.087 (0.224)	0.213 (0.212)	0.185 (0.239)	0.182 (0.225)	<b>0.470**</b> (0.211)
Refused to give income	0.191 (0.160)	<b>0.248*</b> (0.152)	<b>0.263*</b> (0.141)	<b>0.272*</b> (0.150)	0.187 (0.135)	-0.023 (0.137)
Democrat	<b>0.491***</b> (0.118)	<b>0.285***</b> (0.111)	0.065 (0.105)	0.065 (0.106)	<b>-0.244**</b> (0.103)	-0.039 (0.106)
Independent	0.183 (0.212)	-0.045 (0.210)	-0.108 (0.181)	0.002 (0.207)	-0.249 (0.172)	-0.106 (0.180)
Republican	<b>0.529***</b> (0.178)	<b>0.238*</b> (0.146)	<b>0.291**</b> (0.149)	0.204 (0.147)	<b>-0.338**</b> (0.138)	-0.129 (0.138)
Cutpoint 1	-1.380	-1.197	-1.007	-1.157	-0.331	-0.171
Cutpoint 2	-0.652	-0.542	-0.160	-0.379	0.106	0.316
Cutpoint 3	0.040	0.051	0.649	0.470	0.301	0.511
Cutpoint 4					0.816	1.014
N	901	905	813	805	904	902
X <sup>2</sup>	113.63	51.11	94.41	76.59	120.88	101.51

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \*p≤0.1; \*\*p≤0.05; \*\*\*p≤0.01; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at p=0.1 or lower are highlighted in bold.

Coding for the four belonging variables: 0=not at all; 1= a little; 2=some; 3=a lot

Coding for the two outsider variables: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

**Table 3.4a: National and State Pride**

	Proud to be American	Proud to be from state
Arizona	<b>0.274*</b> (0.149)	-0.192 (0.142)
Born in U.S.	<b>0.706***</b> (0.181)	0.200 (0.163)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	<b>-0.449**</b> (0.206)	-0.200 (0.179)
Speaks English at home	<b>0.593***</b> (0.138)	<b>0.223*</b> (0.118)
Education	-0.038 (0.031)	<b>-0.068***</b> (0.025)
\$25K-\$50K	0.106 (0.131)	-0.124 (0.123)
\$50K-\$100K	0.122 (0.177)	<b>-0.227*</b> (0.137)
\$100-\$150K	0.107 (0.211)	<b>-0.346**</b> (0.169)
Over \$150K	0.070 (0.280)	-0.195 (0.210)
Refused to give income	<b>0.298*</b> (0.158)	0.164 (0.143)
Democrat	<b>0.378***</b> (0.122)	-0.117 (0.109)
Independent	0.097 (0.235)	-0.267 (0.192)
Republican	<b>0.417***</b> (0.165)	-0.028 (0.139)
Cutpoint 1	-1.149	-1.939
Cutpoint 2	-0.822	-1.629
Cutpoint 3	-0.504	-1.376
Cutpoint 4	0.059	-0.824
N	901	903
$\chi^2$	104.75	44.69

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

Coding: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

APPENDIX FOR CHAPTER 4

Table 4.1a: State Welcome and Identity Importance

	State is unwelcoming	American identity important	White identity important	State identity important
Arizona	<b>0.832***</b> (0.131)	0.091 (0.159)	0.016 (0.132)	<b>-0.295**</b> (0.130)
Education	0.021 (0.026)	-0.033 (0.031)	<b>-0.045*</b> (0.024)	<b>-0.080***</b> (0.024)
\$25K-\$50K	0.100 (0.143)	-0.019 (0.177)	<b>-0.306**</b> (0.133)	-0.010 (0.128)
\$50K-\$100K	<b>0.300**</b> (0.134)	0.013 (0.167)	<b>-0.223*</b> (0.129)	-0.157 (0.122)
\$100-\$150K	0.114 (0.168)	-0.089 (0.202)	<b>-0.421***</b> (0.150)	-0.173 (0.162)
Over \$150K	-0.000 (0.179)	0.313 (0.247)	<b>-0.289*</b> (0.157)	<b>-0.302**</b> (0.150)
Refused to give income	-0.025 (0.150)	0.167 (0.196)	0.086 (0.155)	0.187 (0.143)
Republican	<b>-0.670***</b> (0.121)	<b>0.814***</b> (0.198)	<b>0.236*</b> (0.124)	0.054 (0.125)
Independent	<b>-0.494**</b> (0.194)	-0.119 (0.224)	<b>-0.578***</b> (0.216)	<b>-0.350*</b> (0.212)
Nonpartisan	<b>-0.460***</b> (0.151)	0.332 (0.220)	-0.026 (0.179)	<b>-0.440***</b> (0.162)
Republican*Arizona	-0.191 (0.180)	-0.118 (0.267)	-0.049 (0.175)	0.149 (0.174)
Independent*Arizona	0.053 (0.295)	0.227 (0.344)	0.146 (0.301)	0.290 (0.277)
Nonpartisan*Arizona	-0.020 (0.241)	<b>-0.583**</b> (0.293)	-0.384 (0.252)	0.349 (0.233)
Cutpoint 1	-0.440	-1.934	-0.764	-1.183
Cutpoint 2	0.694	-1.577	-0.222	-0.646
Cutpoint 3	1.538	-0.898	0.467	0.131
N	805	879	818	853
$\chi^2$	136.94	51.75	52.66	53.97

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

**Table 4.2a: Perceptions of Discrimination**

	Individual discrimination scale	Discrimination against whites in US	Discrimination against whites in state
Arizona	-0.026 (0.141)	-0.061 (0.124)	<b>-0.252**</b> (0.128)
Education	-0.020 (0.027)	<b>-0.046*</b> (0.024)	<b>-0.050**</b> (0.024)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.079 (0.149)	-0.139 (0.130)	<b>-0.217*</b> (0.130)
\$50K-\$100K	-0.167 (0.145)	<b>-0.277**</b> (0.128)	<b>-0.376***</b> (0.132)
\$100-\$150K	0.046 (0.178)	<b>-0.542***</b> (0.156)	<b>-0.460***</b> (0.163)
Over \$150K	-0.109 (0.175)	<b>-0.322**</b> (0.162)	<b>-0.352**</b> (0.158)
Refused to give income	-0.226 (0.174)	<b>-0.265*</b> (0.151)	<b>-0.398***</b> (0.152)
Republican	<b>0.295**</b> (0.138)	<b>0.859***</b> (0.121)	<b>0.557***</b> (0.112)
Independent	<b>0.576**</b> (0.239)	<b>0.803***</b> (0.203)	<b>0.544***</b> (0.196)
Nonpartisan	<b>0.636***</b> (0.195)	<b>0.799***</b> (0.156)	<b>0.366***</b> (0.138)
Republican*Arizona	-0.077 (0.194)	-0.301 (0.168)	-0.165 (0.169)
Independent*Arizona	-0.074 (0.343)	-0.183 (0.286)	-0.261 (0.305)
Nonpartisan*Arizona	-0.441 (0.274)	-0.100 (0.226)	-0.154 (0.232)
Constant	2.090		
Cutpoint 1		-1.037	-1.243
Cutpoint 2		-0.021	-0.165
Cutpoint 3		0.927	0.820
Cutpoint 4		1.413	1.288
N	876	823	833
R <sup>2</sup>	0.031		
X <sup>2</sup>		134.31	79.07

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \*p≤0.1; \*\*p≤0.05; \*\*\*p≤0.01; Robust standard errors in parentheses. Coefficients significant at p=0.1 or lower are highlighted in bold.

Discrimination in state and US: 0=none at all; 1=a little; 2=a moderate amt; 3=a lot; 4=a great deal



**Table 4.3a: Perceptions of Being An Insider Or Outsider**

	Belong in US	Belong in state	Others feel R belongs in US	Others feel R belongs in state	Outsider in US	Outsider in state
Arizona	-0.114 (0.199)	<b>-0.295**</b> (0.137)	-0.287 (0.194)	-0.109 (0.143)	0.264 (0.189)	<b>0.331**</b> (0.143)
Education	0.004 (0.039)	-0.040 (0.029)	<b>0.057*</b> (0.034)	-0.027 (0.028)	-0.029 (0.030)	-0.004 (0.027)
\$25K-\$50K	0.257 (0.197)	<b>0.387***</b> (0.148)	0.115 (0.177)	0.019 (0.156)	-0.126 (0.146)	-0.214 (0.141)
\$50K-\$100K	0.069 (0.177)	0.125 (0.140)	-0.052 (0.168)	-0.113 (0.151)	-0.102 (0.145)	-0.194 (0.134)
\$100-\$150K	0.248 (0.247)	0.235 (0.170)	<b>0.393*</b> (0.231)	0.013 (0.185)	-0.178 (0.218)	-0.103 (0.181)
Over \$150K	0.424 (0.269)	-0.005 (0.178)	0.237 (0.225)	-0.020 (0.185)	<b>0.787***</b> (0.241)	-0.178 (0.173)
Refused to give income	<b>0.578**</b> (0.266)	<b>0.285*</b> (0.157)	0.025 (0.200)	0.014 (0.173)	<b>-0.359**</b> (0.181)	-0.204 (0.156)
Republican	<b>0.451*</b> (0.242)	0.044 (0.140)	-0.227 (0.184)	-0.116 (0.140)	<b>0.347**</b> (0.172)	0.216 (0.134)
Independent	-0.412 (0.252)	-0.287 (0.204)	-0.108 (0.293)	<b>-0.367*</b> (0.198)	<b>0.503**</b> (0.216)	<b>0.419**</b> (0.199)
Nonpartisan	-0.183 (0.232)	<b>-0.334**</b> (0.168)	<b>0.521**</b> (0.205)	<b>0.444***</b> (0.169)	<b>0.515**</b> (0.202)	<b>0.417***</b> (0.160)
Republican*Arizona	0.018 (0.314)	<b>0.603***</b> (0.196)	0.353 (0.258)	<b>0.514**</b> (0.208)	<b>-0.487**</b> (0.242)	<b>0.870***</b> (0.201)
Independent*Arizona	0.445 (0.392)	<b>0.459*</b> (0.280)	0.378 (0.401)	<b>0.723**</b> (0.318)	-0.363 (0.314)	<b>-0.596**</b> (0.282)
Nonpartisan*Arizona	-0.094 (0.316)	<b>0.532**</b> (0.247)	<b>0.475*</b> (0.292)	<b>0.645**</b> (0.259)	-0.308 (0.280)	<b>-0.453*</b> (0.241)
Cutpoint 1	-2.438	-1.798	-1.901	-1.892	0.827	0.390
Cutpoint 2	-1.780	-1.223	-1.397	-1.436	1.229	0.809
Cutpoint 3	-1.107	-0.428	-0.847	-0.513	1.390	0.956
Cutpoint 4					1.888	1.541
N	884	878	768	760	881	885
X <sup>2</sup>	30.46	47.01	19.84	28.93	30.72	37.27

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

*Notes:* \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

Coding for the four belonging variables: 0=not at all; 1= a little; 2=some; 3=a lot

Coding for the two outsider variables: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

**Table 4.4a: National and State Pride**

	Proud to be American	Proud to be from state
Arizona	0.113 (0.159)	<b>-0.625***</b> (0.133)
Education	-0.029 (0.033)	<b>-0.077***</b> (0.027)
\$25K-\$50K	0.215 (0.188)	0.227 (0.150)
\$50K-\$100K	0.067 (0.173)	0.087 (0.144)
\$100-\$150K	-0.039 (0.211)	-0.100 (0.167)
Over \$150K	0.226 (0.236)	0.049 (0.182)
Refused to give income	0.334 (0.208)	<b>0.315*</b> (0.170)
Republican	<b>1.076***</b> (0.215)	0.003 (0.141)
Independent	0.059 (0.230)	-0.314 (0.212)
Nonpartisan	0.263 (0.210)	<b>-0.398**</b> (0.170)
Republican*Arizona	<b>-0.555**</b> (0.282)	<b>0.587***</b> (0.191)
Independent*Arizona	<b>1.037**</b> (0.487)	<b>0.592**</b> (0.297)
Nonpartisan*Arizona	-0.357 (0.276)	<b>0.583**</b> (0.241)
Cutpoint 1	-1.849	-2.214
Cutpoint 2	-1.459	-1.861
Cutpoint 3	-1.227	-1.395
Cutpoint 4	-0.730	-0.799
N	888	871
$\chi^2$	48.68	58.20

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

Coding: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

**Table 4.5a: Correlations Among Belonging Measures For White Arizona Republicans**

	selfamer	selfrace	selfst	discrimus	discrimst	belongus	belongst	belothus	belothst	outus	outst	ampride	stpride
selfamer	1.0000												
selfrace	0.2102	1.0000											
selfst	0.2028	0.1883	1.0000										
discrimus	0.0011	-0.0722	-0.0343	1.0000									
discrimst	-0.0452	-0.1057	-0.0916	0.5917	1.0000								
belongus	-0.1872	0.1067	0.1143	-0.0620	-0.0771	1.0000							
belongst	-0.1255	0.1143	-0.2273	-0.0151	-0.1438	0.1683	1.0000						
belothus	-0.0255	0.1173	0.0429	-0.0873	-0.1047	0.0867	0.2404	1.0000					
belothst	0.0021	0.0664	-0.0972	0.0088	-0.1539	0.0884	0.3370	0.5672	1.0000				
outus	-0.0853	0.0500	0.0299	-0.3644	-0.4412	0.2014	-0.0141	0.3716	0.2359	1.0000			
outst	-0.0687	0.0324	-0.0854	-0.2291	-0.3730	0.0768	0.3184	0.1783	0.2431	0.5750	1.0000		
ampride	0.0985	0.1139	-0.0090	0.1636	0.0590	-0.0151	-0.1808	0.0981	0.0895	0.0467	-0.1130	1.0000	
stpride	0.1572	0.0499	0.4536	0.0290	0.1202	-0.0132	-0.5338	-0.0251	-0.1545	0.0453	-0.3048	0.3099	1.0000
stwel	0.0566	0.0240	-0.2256	0.1837	0.1811	-0.0890	0.1848	0.0186	0.1681	-0.2153	-0.0275	-0.0620	-0.2399

**Variable names:**

selfamer = American identity importance; selfrace = racial identity importance; selfst = state identity importance; discrimus = racial discrimination in the US; discrimst = racial discrimination in one’s state; belongus = feeling of belonging in the US; belongst = feeling of belonging in one’s state; belothus = thinks others feel that R belongs in the US; belothst = thinks others feel that R belongs in the state; outus = feels like an outsider in the US; outst = feels like an outsider in one’s state; ampride = pride in being American; stpride = pride in being from one’s state; stwel = perception of how welcoming one’s state is toward immigrants.

**Table 4.6a Correlations Among Belonging Measures For White Arizona Democrats**

	selfamer	selfrace	selfst	discrimus	discrimst	belongus	belongst	belothus	belothst	outus	outst	ampride	stpride
selfamer	1.0000												
selfrace	0.2309	1.0000											
selfst	0.2178	0.1749	1.0000										
discrimus	-0.2178	-0.2748	-0.1900	1.0000									
discrimst	-0.0882	-0.1515	-0.0173	0.6214	1.0000								
belongus	-0.3775	-0.0448	-0.0318	-0.0240	-0.1196	1.0000							
belongst	-0.1596	-0.1701	-0.4777	0.1635	-0.0034	0.1893	1.0000						
belothus	-0.1379	-0.0628	0.0297	-0.1351	-0.0137	0.3037	0.1120	1.0000					
belothst	-0.1626	-0.1103	-0.0917	-0.0687	0.0659	0.2890	0.3235	0.6104	1.0000				
outus	-0.0672	-0.0267	0.1492	-0.2899	-0.0576	0.2215	0.0166	0.3310	0.3137	1.0000			
outst	-0.1187	-0.1013	-0.1052	-0.1159	-0.1487	0.1720	0.5339	0.2778	0.3552	0.4470	1.0000		
ampride	0.4730	0.2539	0.1457	-0.2622	-0.2002	-0.2383	-0.0823	-0.1286	-0.1519	-0.1421	-0.0943	1.0000	
stpride	0.2484	0.0972	0.4479	-0.3929	-0.1720	-0.1519	-0.5389	-0.0908	-0.1745	0.0425	-0.2509	0.3883	1.0000
stwel	-0.3117	-0.0977	-0.1584	0.3427	0.3386	0.1183	0.2642	0.0418	0.0109	-0.1940	0.0671	-0.1675	-0.2620

**Table 4.7a Correlations Among Belonging Measures For White New Mexico Republicans**

	selfamer	selfrace	selfst	discrimus	discrimst	belongus	belongst	belothus	belothst	outus	outst	ampride	stpride
selfamer	1.0000												
selfrace	0.1084	1.0000											
selfst	0.2216	0.1407	1.0000										
discrimus	-0.0332	0.0187	-0.0709	1.0000									
discrimst	-0.0530	0.0602	0.0257	0.5423	1.0000								
belongus	0.0314	0.1300	-0.0502	-0.1475	-0.1850	1.0000							
belongst	0.0900	0.1910	-0.3292	-0.0544	-0.1759	0.2383	1.0000						
belothus	0.0977	0.1880	-0.0299	-0.1686	-0.2871	0.2599	0.2566	1.0000					
belothst	0.0058	0.1597	-0.2466	-0.0429	-0.2796	0.1823	0.5819	0.5484	1.0000				
outus	0.0853	0.2025	-0.0346	-0.1502	-0.2996	0.4347	0.1948	0.3002	0.2006	1.0000			
outst	0.0959	0.1087	-0.1667	-0.1258	-0.3857	0.3185	0.5196	0.2804	0.5173	0.4724	1.0000		
ampride	0.0095	0.0224	0.0503	0.1037	-0.0539	0.0222	-0.0290	0.0390	0.0803	0.0326	0.0897	1.0000	
stpride	-0.0828	-0.1768	0.2485	0.1274	0.1985	-0.2634	-0.6556	-0.2182	-0.4542	-0.2136	-0.4797	0.3418	1.0000
stwel	-0.0454	0.2213	-0.0134	0.2683	0.2697	-0.1130	0.0165	-0.0801	0.0300	-0.1586	-0.0421	0.0234	-0.0028

**Table 4.8a Correlations Among Belonging Measures For White New Mexico Democrats**

	selfamer	selfrace	selfst	discrim	discrimst	belongus	belongst	belothus	belothst	outus	outst	ampride	stpride	stwel
selfamer	1.0000													
selfrace	0.2858	1.0000												
selfst	0.2023	0.2045	1.0000											
discrimus	-0.0694	0.0063	-0.0148	1.0000										
discrimst	-0.0565	-0.0972	0.0975	0.4190	1.0000									
belongus	-0.3085	-0.1516	-0.2082	-0.0329	-0.1002	1.0000								
belongst	-0.1328	-0.0522	-0.2946	-0.0015	-0.1900	0.3646	1.0000							
belothus	0.0867	-0.1493	0.0334	-0.0262	-0.0548	0.2420	-0.0394	1.0000						
belothst	-0.1749	-0.1032	-0.2234	0.0646	-0.1087	0.1967	0.4335	0.2568	1.0000					
outus	-0.0031	-0.0103	-0.0352	-0.0102	-0.0569	0.5080	0.1386	0.1547	0.1411	1.0000				
outst	-0.0427	-0.0817	-0.2194	-0.1191	-0.2200	0.3782	0.5832	0.0427	0.4776	0.4708	1.0000			
ampride	0.2625	0.1150	0.0676	0.0200	0.0099	-0.5438	-0.3249	-0.0106	-0.1487	-0.3529	-0.4119	1.0000		
stpride	0.0616	0.0643	0.3923	-0.0686	-0.1119	-0.3640	-0.3397	-0.0866	-0.1536	-0.2731	-0.3060	0.3355	1.0000	
stwel	0.2270	0.0272	0.0105	-0.0573	0.0507	0.0846	0.0039	0.1644	0.0694	0.1421	0.0922	-0.0515	0.0031	1.0000

## APPENDIX FOR CHAPTER 6

**Table 6.1a: Latino Support for Welcoming and Unwelcoming Primes**

	Welcoming condition	Unwelcoming condition
Arizona	0.052 (0.195)	<b>0.577*</b> (0.298)
Born in U.S.	<b>-0.628**</b> (0.252)	<b>0.712**</b> (0.297)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	0.096 (0.269)	-0.485 (0.350)
Speaks English at home	<b>-0.451**</b> (0.192)	0.205 (0.199)
Education	0.037 (0.043)	-0.077 (0.055)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.026 (0.201)	-0.273 (0.221)
\$50K-\$100K	-0.150 (0.207)	0.018 (0.256)
\$100-\$150K	-0.003 (0.290)	-0.080 (0.344)
Over \$150K	-0.275 (0.361)	0.484 (0.480)
Refused to give income	-0.063 (0.204)	0.007 (0.286)
Democrat	0.255 (0.163)	<b>0.428**</b> (0.204)
Independent	-0.224 (0.162)	<b>0.759**</b> (0.345)
Republican	<b>-1.019***</b> (0.240)	<b>1.068***</b> (0.258)
Perceives state as unwelcoming	<b>0.166**</b> (0.067)	<b>-0.372***</b> (0.087)
Constant	<b>4.154***</b> -0.297	<b>2.433***</b> (0.347)
N	426	386
R-sq	0.242	0.137

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

**Table 6.2a: White Support for Welcoming and Unwelcoming Primes**

	Welcoming condition	Unwelcoming condition
Arizona	<b>-0.807***</b> (0.263)	<b>0.760**</b> (0.302)
Education	-0.064 (0.045)	<b>-0.084*</b> (0.049)
\$25K-\$50K	0.102 (0.242)	-0.226 (0.294)
\$50K-\$100K	-0.047 (0.242)	-0.279 (0.272)
\$100-\$150K	0.258 (0.297)	-0.157 (0.298)
Over \$150K	0.410 (0.301)	<b>-0.584*</b> (0.355)
Refused to give income	-0.081 (0.268)	0.252 (0.323)
Republican	<b>-2.456***</b> (0.224)	<b>1.910***</b> (0.266)
Independent	<b>-1.262**</b> (0.328)	<b>1.359***</b> (0.381)
Nonpartisan	<b>-2.101***</b> (0.339)	<b>1.343***</b> (0.368)
Republican*AZ	<b>1.310***</b> (0.328)	<b>-0.601</b> (0.376)
Independent*AZ	0.005 (0.640)	-0.402 (0.547)
Nonpartisan*AZ	<b>1.904***</b> (0.454)	-0.855 (0.541)
Perceives state as unwelcoming	<b>0.455***</b> (0.090)	<b>-0.410***</b> (0.094)
Constant	<b>3.511***</b> (0.368)	<b>3.461***</b> (0.401)
N	407	346
R-sq	0.370	0.288

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

**Table 6.3a: Latino SUPPORT for a Path to Citizenship; OPPOSITION to Dreamers**

	Path	Dreamers
Arizona	-0.323 (0.207)	<b>0.412***</b> (0.131)
Born in U.S.	<b>-0.602***</b> (0.208)	<b>0.758***</b> (0.159)
Arizona*Born in U.S.	0.278 (0.235)	<b>-0.511***</b> (0.173)
Speaks English at home	-0.009 (0.133)	<b>0.376***</b> (0.135)
Education	0.022 (0.031)	-0.021 (0.030)
\$25K-\$50K	<b>0.232*</b> (0.138)	-0.075 (0.129)
\$50K-\$100K	<b>0.288*</b> (0.151)	-0.091 (0.152)
\$100-\$150K	0.301 (0.211)	<b>-0.432**</b> (0.174)
Over \$150K	-0.060 (0.243)	0.133 (0.282)
Refused to give income	-0.098 (0.158)	-0.203 (0.142)
Democrat	<b>0.246*</b> (0.127)	<b>-0.190*</b> (0.111)
Independent	-0.132 (0.217)	0.219 (0.229)
Republican	<b>-0.330**</b> (0.148)	<b>0.540***</b> (0.156)
Perceives state as unwelcoming	<b>0.089*</b> (0.053)	<b>-0.170***</b> (0.046)
Constant	<b>-0.783***</b> (0.240)	<b>1.800***</b> (0.180)
N	857	836
Chi-sq (path); R-sq (Dreamers)	47.91	0.144

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

Probit for path (favor = 1); OLS for Dreamers (opposition coded higher).



**Table 6.4a: White SUPPORT for a Path to Citizenship; OPPOSITION to Dreamers**

	Path	Dreamers
Arizona	<b>-0.296*</b> (0.180)	<b>0.333**</b> (0.137)
Education	0.037 (0.029)	<b>-0.063**</b> (0.030)
\$25K-\$50K	-0.056 (0.159)	0.083 (0.166)
\$50K-\$100K	0.047 (0.152)	0.017 (0.162)
\$100-\$150K	0.109 (0.193)	-0.263 (0.194)
Over \$150K	0.058 (0.190)	-0.285 (0.211)
Refused to give income	0.055 (0.178)	0.006 (0.186)
Republican	<b>-0.547***</b> (0.161)	<b>1.414***</b> (0.146)
Independent	<b>-0.420*</b> (0.245)	<b>0.764***</b> (0.239)
Nonpartisan	<b>-0.652***</b> (0.203)	<b>0.912***</b> (0.231)
Republican*AZ	-0.067 (0.223)	-0.202 (0.205)
Independent*AZ	0.249 (0.348)	-0.260 (0.327)
Nonpartisan*AZ	<b>0.498*</b> (0.286)	-0.426 (0.309)
Perceives state as unwelcoming	<b>0.194***</b> (0.054)	<b>-0.288***</b> (0.056)
Constant	0.223 (0.235)	<b>2.556***</b> (0.226)
N	805	784
R-sq	66.83	0.237

Source: AZNM Survey (Dovidio et al. 2016)

Notes: \* $p \leq 0.1$ ; \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ ; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Coefficients significant at  $p=0.1$  or lower are highlighted in bold.

Probit for path (favor = 1); OLS for Dreamers (opposition coded higher).