Supplementary Materials

For: Marc Hooghe & Ruth Dassonneville, Explaining the Trump Vote. The Effect of Racism and Anti-Immigrant Sentiments.

Appendix 1. Multinomial logit models (replication of Model 3 and Model 4 in Table 1)

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Trump vs. other		*Trump vs. abstain*		*Trump vs. other*		*Trump vs. abstain*	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Age	-0.024	(0.016)	0.015	(0.012)	-0.027	(0.016)	0.003	(0.012)
Female	0.034	(0.554)	-0.024	(0.471)	-0.093	(0.560)	-0.319	(0.445)
Education	-0.213	(1.159)	-0.798	(0.752)	-0.321	(1.197)	-0.917	(0.774)
Income	-3.679***	(0.954)	-0.377	(0.660)	-3.588***	(1.002)	0.060	(0.634)
Race (ref: White)								
Black	0.382	(0.669)	-1.302	(0.931)	0.125	(0.658)	-1.702*	(0.827)
Hispanic	2.695**	(0.882)	0.715	(0.872)	2.207*	(0.861)	0.755	(0.873)
Other non-white	-1.278	(1.209)	-0.636	(0.638)	-1.504	(1.150)	-0.468	(0.637)
Republican partisanship	2.567**	(0.963)	5.055***	(0.852)	2.608**	(0.959)	5.263***	(0.824)
Conservative ideology	1.748	(1.143)	3.681***	(0.907)	2.657*	(1.210)	4.201***	(0.920)
Economic evaluation	-1.448	(1.201)	-3.968**	(1.226)	-1.634	(1.166)	-3.719**	(1.136)
Political trust	0.350	(1.307)	2.174	(1.189)	0.173	(1.253)	2.346*	(1.162)
Satisfaction with democracy	-0.438	(0.985)	-0.476	(0.829)	-0.162	(1.052)	0.115	(0.853)
Racist resentment	3.040*	(1.218)	4.329***	(1.154)				
Anti-immigrant sentiment					0.217	(1.161)	4.017***	(0.856)
Constant	-1.706	(1.200)	-4.681***	(1.131)	-1.125	(1.260)	-5.313***	(1.159)
Pseudo R^2	0.623				0.624			
N observations	641				641			

Estimates from multinomial logistic regression model explaining voting for Trump (=1) or Abstaining (=2) versus voting for Clinton, Stein, Johnson or another candidate (=0). Multinomial logistic regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) are reported. Significance levels: * $p <$ 0.05, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. Data are weighted to reflect the characteristics of the national electorate. Source: CCES 2016 Survey.

Appendix 2. Question wording and coding of variables

Variable	Question wording and coding
Age	Age of the respondent (in years)
Female	Dummy variable distinguishing between female (=1) and male (=0) respondents
Education	Highest level of education that the respondent has completed: 1 = no high school, 2 = high school graduate, 3 = some college, but no degree, 4 = 2-year college degree, 5 = 4-year college degree, 6 = postgraduate degree. Variable was rescaled to run from 0 (no high school) to 1 (postgraduate degree).
Income	Reported family income, grouped in 12 categories from less than $10,000 to $150,000 or more. Rescaled to run from 0 to 1.
Race	Respondent race, distinguishing between non-Hispanic whites, blacks, Hispanics and other non-whites.
Republican partisanship	7-point partisanship scale: 1 = strong Democrat, 2 = weak Democrat, 3 = leaning Democrat, 4 = Independent, 5 = leaning Republican, 6 = weak Republican, 7 = strong Republican. Rescaled to run from 0 (= strong Democrat) to 1 (= strong Republican).
Conservative ideology	Respondent's self-placement on an ideological scale: 1 = very liberal, 2 = liberal, 3 = somewhat liberal, 4 = middle of the road, 5 = somewhat conservative, 6 = conservative, 7 = very conservative. Rescaled to run from 0 (= very liberal) to 1 (= very conservative).
Economic evaluation	Retrospective sociotropic economic evaluation, based on the following question: 'Would you say that over the past year the nation's economoy has…?' Answer options were 1 = gotten much worse, 2 = gotten worse, 3 = stayed about the same, 4 = gotten better, 5 = gotten much better. Rescaled to run from 0 (much worse) to 1 (much better).
Political trust	Sum-scale of respondents' reported level of trust (0 = no trust at all, 10 = complete trust) in US Congress, politicians and political parties. Rescaled to run from 0 to 1.
Satisfaction with democracy	Respondent's answer to the question 'on the whole, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in the United States'. Respondents answered on a scale from 0 (extremely dissatisfied) to 10 (extremely satisfied). Variables was rescaled to run from 0 to 1.
Racist resentment	Sum-scale of respondents' level of agreement (1 = strongly agree, 2 = somewhat agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat disagree, 5 = strongly disagree) on the following items: - 'I am angry that racism exists.' - 'White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.' - Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.' (reverse coding)
Anti-immigrant sentiment	Sum-scale of respondents' answers to the following three questions (each on a 0-10 scale): - 'Would you say it is generally bad or good for the US economy that people come live here from other countries? On this score, 0 means bad for the economy and 10 means good for the economy.' - 'Would you say that US cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries? On this score, 0 means that cultural life is undermined, and 10 means that cultural life is enriched.' - Is the US made a worse or a better place to live by people coming to live here from other countries? On this score, 0 means it is a worse place to live, and 10 means it is a better place to live.' The sum-scale was rescaled to run from 0 to 1.

Appendix 3. Explaining voting for Trump among non-Hispanic whites only

	Model 1		Model 2	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Age	0.014	(0.013)	0.004	(0.013)
Female	0.087	(0.483)	-0.102	(0.463)
Education	-1.113	(0.786)	-1.064	(0.808)
Income	-0.760	(0.688)	-0.459	(0.657)
Republican partisanship	4.685***	(0.919)	4.662***	(0.853)
Conservative ideology	3.753**	(1.150)	4.282***	(1.109)
Economic evaluation	-4.508**	(1.381)	-4.043**	(1.282)
Political trust	1.788	(1.360)	1.626	(1.324)
Satisfaction with democracy	0.006	(0.856)	0.575	(0.913)
Racist resentment	3.117*	(1.223)		
Anti-immigrant sentiment			3.809***	(0.953)
Constant	-3.657**	(1.139)	-4.660***	(1.262)
Pseudo R^2	0.681		0.691	
N observations	473		473	

Estimates from logistic regression model explaining voting for Trump (=1) versus Clinton, Stein, Johnson or another candidate (=0). Abstainers are excluded from the analyses. Logistic regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) are reported. Significance levels: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. Data are weighted to reflect the characteristics of the national electorate. Source: CCES 2016 Survey.

Appendix 4. Interactions partisanship and anti-immigrant sentiment/racist attitudes

	Model 1		Model 2	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Age	0.005	(0.014)	0.020	(0.012)
Female	-0.396	(0.465)	0.144	(0.556)
Education	-1.172	(0.828)	-1.900*	(0.836)
Income	-0.019	(0.703)	0.114	(0.699)
Race (ref: white)	0.000	(.)	0.000	(.)
Black	-1.888	(1.079)	-1.917	(1.274)
Hispanic	0.913	(0.913)	1.244	(1.019)
Other non-white	-0.438	(0.744)	-0.799	(0.672)
Partisanship (ref: strong Democrat)				
Weak Democrat	3.037	(2.514)	3.615**	(1.313)
Leaning Democrat	3.687	(2.496)	1.714	(1.622)
Independent	4.014	(2.460)	1.886	(1.434)
Leaning Republican	1.549	(4.326)	4.011	(2.076)
Weak Republican	5.601*	(2.659)	4.426*	(2.028)
Strong Republican	7.420**	(2.379)	-1.007	(4.528)
Conservative ideology	4.343***	(1.084)	2.895**	(1.053)
Economic evaluation	-3.768**	(1.372)	-4.816**	(1.534)
Political trust	2.318	(1.249)	2.890*	(1.353)
Satisfaction with democracy	0.498	(0.888)	0.091	(1.011)
Anti-immigrant sentiment	4.341	(3.586)		
Weak Democrat × anti-imm.	-0.624	(4.414)		
Leaning Democrat × anti-imm.	-1.847	(4.175)		
Independent × anti-imm.	-0.628	(4.188)		
Leaning Republican × anti-imm.	9.366	(8.651)		
Weak Republican × anti-imm.	-1.438	(4.442)		
Strong Republican × anti-imm.	-2.380	(3.833)		
Racist resentment			1.707	(3.148)
Weak Democrat × racist			-2.540	(3.356)
Leaning Democrat × racist			3.414	(4.504)
Independent × racist			5.853	(3.597)
Leaning Republican × racist			6.873	(5.319)
Weak Republican × racist			1.910	(4.633)
Strong Republican × racist			39.275	(26.053)
Constant	-6.768**	(2.316)	-4.871**	(1.646)
Pseudo R^2	0.738		0.759	
N observations	606		606	

Estimates from logistic regression model explaining voting for Trump (=1) versus Clinton, Stein, Johnson or another candidate (=0). Abstainers are excluded from the analyses. Logistic regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) are reported. Significance levels: $^*p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{***}p < 0.001$. Data are weighted to reflect the characteristics of the national electorate. Source: CCES 2016 Survey.