

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix 1: Methodology and Descriptive Statistics from Qualitative Interviews

Appendix 2: Descriptive Statistics from Survey Samples

Appendix 3: Survey Instrument from 2018 Lucid and 2019 AmeriSpeak Surveys

Appendix 4: Tables Featuring Model Estimations for Figures 2 and 3

Appendix 5: Distribution of Attitudes towards Black Lives Matter among Black Respondents in 2016 ANES

Appendix 1: Methodology and Descriptive Statistics from Qualitative Interviews

In consultation with the Census brief “The Black Population: 2010,” Detroit was selected as the best metropolitan area to conduct interviews. Detroit has the fourth largest population of African Americans in the United States with a population of over 600,000 Black residents. For comparison purposes, the interviews were conducted in two neighboring counties: Washtenaw and Wayne county. These counties were selected given variation in composition—e.g., population size, racial breakdown, household income, and educational differences. For example, Washtenaw County has over 12 percent of the population as Black alone and 3.5 percent as two or more races, a median household income of over \$65,000, and over 54 percent having a college degree. In contrast, Wayne County has a 39 percent Black population with 2.5 percent identifying as two or more races, a median household income of \$43,700, and 23 percent having a college degree. Importantly, the proximity of these areas holds constant other external factors, social contexts, and political structures. Of course, future studies would benefit from work in other areas or regions where color-based dynamics may be distinct in style or strength.

The semi-structured interviews were advertised as a conversation about Black experiences in society via multiple methods of advertisement: student, faculty, and staff email listservs at a large public university in the metro-Detroit area, flyers posted at local coffee shops and libraries, postings in local church bulletins, as well as local Craigslist postings. A snowball sampling technique was also used such that upon completing an interview, participants were asked if they knew of anyone else who may be interested in participating. A flyer with more information about the interviews was provided to interested participants to share with others in their networks. All participants were selected for participation only after completing a pre-screening form to ensure variation on key demographic

factors of interest (e.g., gender, level of education). Ultimately, not everyone who completed the pre-screening form was selected for interviewing.

The interview topics included discussions about everyday experiences related to race and skin tone, as well as discussions of the relationship between skin tone and various topics including politics, power, representation, stereotypes, and resources. Each interview progressed as follows: The conversation began with a discussion of the participant's reactions to a set of photos of African Americans. Participants were then prompted to discuss the key values and characteristics thought to be important to many Black people in their community or social circles. The conversation then shifted to a focus on skin color—asking if they believed skin color to be important in society, if it operated differently varying by gender or age/generation, and asking participants to share stories about themselves or others related to color-based discrimination. Finally, there was a discussion of potential movement or policy responses geared towards addressing colorism. At the conclusion of the study, participants answered a series of demographic questions and were asked to provide feedback to the interviewer about the interview experience or other topics they suggested as important points of discussion.

There were two interviewers. One interviewer was a White woman (n=43) and the other a Black woman (n=24), allowing for an examination of potential race of interviewer effects and explore differences in conversational style and substance. The use of an inter-racial research team was purposeful. Each interviewer has distinct experiences with the intersection of race, color, and power in America based on their own appearance and background. Each interviewer implicitly brought these differences into the conversations they had with interview participants, which likely influenced the conversational style. The inclusion of interviewers from different backgrounds provides an opportunity to examine if or how the interviewer's race influences discussions of colorism. More broadly, the White researcher's experiences with colorism in society are constrained by their own light

skin and unearned privileges stemming from their Whiteness. In turn, this limits her ability to experience racism or colorism first-hand. Still, the White researcher felt that drawing attention to and speaking about systemic disparities based on racism or colorism should not fall solely on the shoulders of the marginalized, as it traditionally does. Conducting research related to the multidimensionality of race can serve to highlight the views and experiences of those who are often overlooked in mainstream political research. Speaking directly with Black interview participants—who often had very different backgrounds and experiences than either interviewer—informs our understanding of how individuals facing multiple axes of oppression navigate the intersections of race, color, and power in America.

The substance of the interview conversations was relatively constant across interviews—with similar patterns in responses and views for both interviewers. The style of the conversations, however, was distinct based on the race of the interviewer. Interview participants often spoke to the White interviewer in a more detailed fashion, perhaps assuming the interviewer was not familiar with the history of colorism or internal group dynamics of colorism in the present day. The Black interviewer seemed to be presumed to be well-aware of these topics and so responses were often shorter, invoking a shared understanding of this topic between Black people. In turn, this required more follow-up questions from the Black interviewer to prompt further elaboration.

Further, the Black interviewer reported feeling more instances of hesitation or reluctance from participants in answering some questions related to skin tone than the White interviewer. This may, in part, be because standard concerns about race of interviewer effects are complicated in the case of a focused discussion on skin tone. Not only are there racial considerations at play, but there are also intra-racial differences in perceptions and stereotypes based on color (Banks 1999; Hunter 2005; Maddox and Gray 2002; Monk 2021). Ideally, one would not only race-match interviewers with participants, but also color-match. From a practical perspective, this would be nearly impossible to implement for two reasons: first, skin tone is not observed until the interview begins; and second, this

would require an incredibly large team of research assistants given the vast number of skin colors. Thus, attempting to match respondents and interviewers by skin color would not only greatly increase the cost, size of the research team, and corresponding training needed, but would also introduce more variation in interviewing styles.

Overall, the conversations were friendly, and participants seemed mostly at ease and willing to be forthcoming with both interviewers. Participants often seemed pleased that someone was interested in hearing their perspective and that they could talk at length about their experiences and views. While interviewer characteristics play an inevitable role in shaping the conversations, the race-of-interviewer analysis and feedback from interviewees themselves provide confidence in the general themes and patterns observed across conversations appropriately reflecting participants' beliefs.¹

In total, the interviews lasted 63 minutes on average, ranging from 29 to 120 minutes. The average age of participants was 40 years old, with a range from 20 to 67 years. Closely tracking Census estimates, the gender breakdown was nearly equal with 55 percent women and 45 percent men, and educational attainment ranged from less than high school diploma through Ph.D. The self-assessed skin color of the participants also ranged from very light to dark, with a slight skew towards the lighter end of the spectrum. Participants consented to participate in this research study and to be audio-recorded at the outset of the conversation.

¹ At the conclusion of each interview, participants were asked to provide feedback on how they feel the interview went or if there was anything the interviewer could do better moving forward. Some participants commented on the race of the White interviewer during this time and inquired about her interest in this topic. Below are some examples of these comments:

“I thought it was like a really cool and fun experience ... I will say this one thing. I was really surprised that you were White. [laughs] ... For me, it wouldn't influence the honesty level or anything. But it was surprising, and I also think I'm always interested in why people are interested in their research. And I think had it been a Black person, I would have just made assumptions about why I thought they were interested in the research. But with you I just wasn't sure.” –26-year-old, light-skinned woman

“You're gonna ambush those white people [by making them confront the issue of colorism], aren't ya? You really are. [laughs]” – 67-year-old, medium-skinned man

The interviews were transcribed by the interviewer who conducted them and formatted using a common template. The primary researcher then reviewed all 67 transcripts three times each, making notes of patterns of responses related to each item. These observations were then used to create a preliminary coding scheme of responses to the interview questions. The interviewer then used the Rapid and Rigorous Qualitative Data Analysis or “RADaR” technique (Watkins 2017) to take the detailed answers in response to any given question and parse them down to a simplified categorical response (e.g., “supports BLM,” “does not support BLM”). After the initial coding scheme was created, the researcher re-reviewed all transcripts and coded how the responses fit within the coding scheme along with the pertinent excerpts from the conversation. When responses fell outside of the preliminary coding scheme, a new category was added to the coding scheme and all transcripts were re-reviewed to determine if other responses should also be recategorized.

Table A1.1: Overview of Interview Participants’ Skin Color Distribution

| Total # by skin color (self-rating) | Total | Subtotal |
|--|--------------|-----------------|
| Light | 20 | 25 |
| Light/Medium | 5 | |
| Medium | 22 | 22 |
| Medium/Dark | 7 | |
| Dark | 13 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 67 | 67 |

Table A1.2: Overview of Interview Participants’ Education Distribution

| Highest Education | Total | Subtotal |
|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Less than High School | 3 | |
| GED | 3 | |
| High school diploma | 12 | |
| Some college, no degree | 15 | 33 |
| | | |
| Associate’s degree | 4 | |
| Bachelor’s degree | 12 | 16 |
| | | |
| Master’s degree | 16 | |
| PhD | 2 | 18 |
| Total | 67 | 67 |

For the domains referenced below in Table A1.3, these were developed through the same process and simply noting what relationships with skin color were referenced in each conversation. Some of these mentions were organic at the outset of the conversation or in sharing stories about one’s own experiences, while other references may have been prompted later in the interview based on the interviewer’s questions. The domains referenced as meaningfully associated with skin color throughout the conversations were coded into broader, systematic categories. With 67 interviewees and a total of 153 distinct categories/domains mentioned, there was an average of over two domains mentioned per participant. Consistent with broader literatures (e.g., Hunter 2002, 2007), the most frequently referenced domain was with respect to beauty and relationships—receiving a total of 35 percent of mentions. The second and third most frequently referenced domains—related to policing and employment opportunities—are more institutional in nature. Policing and policing-related racialized stereotypes received 25 percent of total mentions. Indeed, 40 of 67 interview participants referenced darker skin as either being associated with perceptions of being more threatening or aggressive generally, or explicitly invoked darker skin as being associated with being a likelier target of police violence. The associations between skin color and these other domains are explored further in other forthcoming projects (e.g., see Yadon 2020).

| Table A1.3: Domains Referenced as Associated with Skin Tone among Interview Participants (n=67) | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Domain Mentioned | # of mentions | % of total mentions |
| Beauty, Relationships | 53 | 35% |
| Perceived Violence, Aggression, Physical Strength, Targets of Police | 38 | 25% |
| Jobs, Opportunities, Promotions | 30 | 20% |
| Education, Intelligence, Competency | 10 | 6% |
| Perceived “Goodness” or “Badness” | 4 | 3% |
| Inequality, Wealth, Power | 4 | 3% |
| Confidence, Over-Confidence | 4 | 3% |
| Personality Characteristics (e.g., Being Loud, Having an Attitude) | 3 | 2% |
| Success | 2 | 1% |
| Being Relatable to Other Racial Groups or Making Other Races “Comfortable” | 2 | 1% |
| Trust, Trustworthiness | 2 | 1% |
| Communication skills | 1 | <1% |
| Total | 153 | 100.0% |

Appendix 2: Descriptive Statistics from Survey Samples

**Table A2.1: Descriptive Statistics from Samples of African Americans
Compared to 2016 ANES Web Sample**

| | 2018 Lucid | 2019 AmeriSpeak | ANES 2016 |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Survey Mode | Web Only | Web Only | Web Only |
| % Female | 56% | 66% | 58% |
| Age (average) | 40 years | 42 years | 43 years |
| Income (average) | \$40,000 - \$44,999 | \$35,000 - \$39,999 | \$30,000 - \$34,999 |
| Education (average) | Some college | Some college / Associate's degree | Some college |
| % South | 55% | 60% | 53% |
| Partisanship | 11% Republican 12% Independent 78% Democrat | 7% Republican 16% Independent 77% Democrat | 8% Republican 13% Indep. 79% Democrat |
| Ideology | 19% Conservative 40% Moderate 42% Liberal | 12% Conservative 27% Moderate 61% Liberal | 25% Conservative 28% Moderate 47% Liberal |
| Number of observations | 1,825 | 1,045 | 235 |

Note: Partisanship and ideology calculations combine leaners and weak partisans/ideologues into the broader partisan/ideologue category. Survey weights are not employed with AmeriSpeak sample because the size of the weights are outside the standard recommended range and based on the independent variables in the models, thereby introducing bias into the OLS regression estimates (Thomas 2017; Winship and Radbill 1994).

Appendix 3: Survey Instrument from 2018 Lucid and 2019 AmeriSpeak Surveys

Items from 2018 Lucid Survey

Items from Lucid Panel Data

Education:

- Some high school or less
- High school graduate
- Other post high school vocational training
- Completed some college, but no degree
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's or professional degree
- Doctorate degree
- None of the above

Region:

- Northeast
- Midwest
- South
- West

Household income:

- Less than \$14,999
- \$15,000 to \$19,999
- \$20,000 to \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$29,999
- \$30,000 to \$34,999
- \$35,000 to \$39,999
- ...
- \$75,000 to \$79,999
- \$80,000 to \$84,999
- \$85,000 to \$89,999
- \$90,000 to \$94,999
- \$95,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$124,999
- \$125,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 to \$174,999
- \$175,000 to \$199,999

- \$200,000 to \$249,999
- \$250,000 and above
- Prefer not to answer

[*Study Intro Screen:*]

Current Issues Opinion Survey

Thank you for participating in this study. This study aims to identify the thoughts and opinions that people in the United States hold about a variety of topics. It should take approximately 20 minutes for you to complete this survey. This survey is part of a study being conducted by researchers at the [University], and all answers will remain completely confidential. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability. There are no right or wrong answers

Please indicate your racial identification (check all that apply)

- White, non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- Black, African American
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

How important is being Black to your identity?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- A little important
- Not at all important

Please indicate your gender identity

- Male
- Female

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent

{If R considers self a Democrat/Republican} Would you call yourself a strong or a not very strong Democrat/Republican?

- Strong (1)
- Not very strong (2)

{ If R's party Identification is independent, no preference, other, etc.}: Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party?

- Closer to Republican (1)
- Neither (2)
- Closer to Democratic (3)

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Using the seven-point scale below, on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative, please indicate where you would place yourself on this scale.

- Extremely liberal
- Liberal
- Slightly liberal
- Moderate; middle of the road
- Slightly conservative
- Conservative
- Extremely conservative

As you know, human beings display a wide variety of physical characteristics. One of these is skin color. Displayed above is a skin color scale that ranges from 1 (representing the lightest possible skin color) to 10 (representing the darkest possible skin color). The 10 shades of skin color are represented by a hand of identical form, but differing in color. Please indicate which hand depicted above comes closest to your skin color.

[Yadon-Ostfeld Skin Color Scale displayed here]

How often do you think that black people with darker skin receive harsher treatment by police compared to those with lighter skin?

- Always
- Most of the time
- About half of the time
- Some of the time
- Never

Items from 2019 AmeriSpeak Survey

Items from AmeriSpeak Panel Data

Please indicate your gender identity

- Male
- Female

Race/Ethnicity

- White, non-Hispanic
- Black, non-Hispanic
- Other, non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- 2+, non-Hispanic
- Asian, non-Hispanic

Education (highest degree)

- No formal education
- 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade
- 5th or 6th grade
- 7th or 8th grade
- 9th grade
- 10th grade
- 11th grade
- 12 grade no diploma
- High school graduate
- Some college, no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelors degree
- Masters degree
- Professional or doctorate degree

Household Income

- Less than \$5,000
- \$5,000-\$9,999
- \$10,000-\$14,999
- \$15,000-\$19,999
- \$20,000-\$24,999
- \$25,000-29,999
- ...
- \$75,000-\$84,999
- \$85,000-\$99,999
- \$100,000-\$124,999

- \$125,000-\$149,999
- \$150,000-\$174,999
- \$175,000-\$199,999
- \$200,000 or more

Region:

- Northeast
- Midwest
- South
- West

Party ID:

- Strong Democrat
- Moderate Democrat
- Lean Democrat
- Don't Lean/ Independent/ None
- Lean Republican
- Moderate Republican
- Strong Republican

Ideology:

- Extremely liberal
- Liberal
- Slightly liberal
- Moderate; middle of the road
- Slightly conservative
- Conservative
- Extremely conservative

Home ownership:

- Owned or being bought by you or someone in your household
- Rented for cash
- Occupied without payment of cash rent

Employment:

- Working – as a paid employee
- Working – self-employed
- Not working – on temporary layoff from a job
- Not working – looking for work
- Not working – retired
- Not working – disabled
- Not working – other

[*Study Intro Screen:*]

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our new AmeriSpeak survey! This survey is interested in the views and opinions of African Americans. To thank you for sharing your opinions, we will give you a reward of [personalized incentive] AmeriPoints after completing the survey. As always, your answers are confidential.

How important is being Black to your identity?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- A little important
- Not at all important

As you know, human beings display a wide variety of physical characteristics. One of these is skin color. Displayed below is a skin color scale that ranges from 1 (representing the lightest possible skin color) to 10 (representing the darkest possible skin color). The 10 shades of skin color are represented by a hand of identical form, but differing in color. Please indicate which hand depicted below comes closest to your skin color.

[Yadon-Ostfeld Skin Color Scale displayed here]

Please tell us how often you believe the following statements are true:

“Black people with darker skin receive harsher treatment by police compared to those with lighter skin.”

- Always
- Most of the time
- About half of the time
- Some of the time
- Never

“Talking about skin tone is just a way to divide Black people and keep us from talking about the bigger issue of race.”

- Always
- Most of the time
- About half of the time
- Some of the time
- Never

Appendix 4: Tables Featuring Model Estimations for Figures 2 and 3

| | 2018 Study <i>Colorism Among Police</i> | | 2019 Study <i>Colorism Among Police</i> | | <i>Skin Tone Distracts from Race</i> | | |
|--------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Skin Tone | -- | 0.101*** (0.027) | Skin Tone | -- | 0.088* (0.046) | -- | -0.128** (0.052) |
| Black ID | 0.229*** (0.025) | 0.220*** (0.025) | Black ID | 0.170*** (0.035) | 0.161*** (0.036) | 0.136*** (0.039) | 0.146*** (0.040) |
| Female | 0.048*** (0.013) | 0.059*** (0.014) | Female | 0.017 (0.022) | 0.024 (0.023) | 0.006 (0.025) | -0.003 (0.025) |
| Education | -0.022 (0.021) | -0.023 (0.020) | Education | 0.125*** (0.047) | 0.121*** (0.047) | -0.071 (0.052) | -0.060 (0.052) |
| Age | -0.102*** (0.027) | -0.093*** (0.027) | Age | -0.126** (0.052) | -0.118** (0.052) | 0.109* (0.058) | 0.099* (0.058) |
| Income | -0.023 (0.026) | -0.021 (0.025) | Income | -0.078 (0.052) | -0.074 (0.052) | -0.060 (0.058) | -0.061 (0.058) |
| South | -0.012 (0.013) | -0.015 (0.013) | South | -0.007 (0.022) | -0.006 (0.022) | -0.032 (0.024) | -0.035 (0.024) |
| Democrat | 0.002 (0.025) | 0.003 (0.025) | Democrat | 0.208*** (0.049) | 0.204*** (0.049) | 0.122** (0.055) | 0.124** (0.055) |
| Liberal | 0.029 (0.027) | 0.032 (0.027) | Liberal | 0.003 (0.046) | 0.000 (0.046) | -0.058 (0.051) | -0.056 (0.051) |
| Hispanic | 0.018 (0.020) | 0.026 (0.020) | Hispanic | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Homeowner | -- | -- | Homeowner | -0.032 (0.024) | -0.032 (0.024) | 0.030 (0.027) | 0.029 (0.027) |
| Employed | -- | -- | Employed | -0.036 (0.024) | -0.037 (0.024) | -0.009 (0.027) | -0.012 (0.027) |
| Constant | 0.506*** (0.034) | 0.443*** (0.038) | Constant | 0.386*** (0.062) | 0.342*** (0.067) | 0.440*** (0.069) | 0.510*** (0.075) |
| Observations | 1,638 | 1,638 | Observations | 810 | 808 | 812 | 810 |
| R-squared | 0.075 | 0.083 | R-squared | 0.084 | 0.087 | 0.040 | 0.047 |

Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
 Note: tables exclude controls for survey design effects

**Appendix 5: Distribution of Attitudes towards Black Lives Matter
among Black Respondents in 2016 ANES**

**Table A5.1: Distribution of Feeling Thermometer Scores towards Black Lives Matter Movement among African Americans
(2016 ANES, Black subsample)**

| Thermometer Score | Combined Sample | | Face-to-Face Sample Only | | Online Sample Only | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | # of mentions | % of total mentions | # of mentions | % of total mentions | # of mentions | % of total mentions |
| 0 | 6 | 2% | 2 | 2% | 4 | 2% |
| 1-25 | 6 | 2% | 2 | 2% | 4 | 2% |
| 26-50 | 31 | 9% | 12 | 12% | 19 | 8% |
| 51-75 | 77 | 23% | 23 | 24% | 54 | 23% |
| 76-99 | 76 | 23% | 22 | 22% | 54 | 23% |
| 100 | 133 | 40% | 37 | 38% | 96 | 42% |
| Total | 329 | 100% | 98 | 100% | 231 | 100% |

Note: These numbers are the unweighted distribution of responses in the 2016 ANES among Black participants