**Appendix 1: Experimental Treatments and Survey Measures**

***Educational Treatments***

*Placebo Treatment:*

***Guesses and Hype Give Way to Data in Study of Education***

What works in science and math education? Until recently, there had been few solid answers. But now the Department of Education is starting to get some real data. One conclusion is that the choice of instructional materials — textbooks, curriculum guides, homework, quizzes — can affect achievement as profoundly as teachers themselves; a poor choice of materials is at least as bad as a terrible teacher, and a good choice can help offset a bad teacher’s deficiencies.

[If respondent is selected to receive the politicized cue, then also display:]

Experts predict that the future of education reform will depend on the results of the 2016 elections, with the Republican and Democratic parties expected to present competing proposals.

*Inequality Treatments:*

***School Data Finds Pattern of Inequality***

[*Black/Latino/Black and Latino*] students are more likely than white students to be suspended from school, to have less access to rigorous math and science classes, and to be taught by lower-paid teachers with less experience, according to the Department of Education. In the analysis of information from all of the country’s 97,000 public schools, the Education Department found a pattern of inequality on a number of fronts, with race as the dividing factor.

[If respondent is selected to receive the politicized cue in the SSI Study, then also display:]

Experts predict that the future of education reform will depend on the results of the 2016 elections, with the Republican and Democratic parties expected to present competing proposals.

***Housing Treatments***

*Placebo Treatment:*

***Guesses Give Way to Data in Study of Mortgage Lending***

What policies can improve home loans and reduce foreclosures? Until recently, there had been few solid answers. But now the Department of Housing and Urban Development is starting to get some real data. One conclusion is that providing borrowers with more time to review disclosure forms before signing will ensure that they can review the terms of their loan and make a more informed decision.

[If respondent is selected to receive the politicized cue, then also display:]

Experts predict that access to home loans will depend on the results of the 2016 elections, with the Republican and Democratic parties expected to present competing proposals.

*Inequality Treatments:*

***Home Lending Data Finds Pattern of Inequality***

[*Black/Latino/Black and Latino]* borrowers are more likely than white borrowers to be given higher-priced mortgages, to receive less coaching and basic information, and receive fewer loan options when borrowing from large banks, according to the Department of Housing. In the analysis of information from all of the country’s large banking institutions, the Housing Department found a pattern of inequality on a number of fronts with race as the dividing factor.

[If respondent is selected to receive the politicized cue, then also display:]

Experts predict that access to home loans will depend on the results of the 2016 elections, with the Republican and Democratic parties expected to present competing proposals.

**Measures from Survey**

**Manipulation Check:**

Proposed legislation in your state would increase state sales tax by 0.5% to fund programs intended to close [education gaps/ gaps in access to home loans]. Would you support or oppose this proposal?

1 Strongly support

2 Somewhat support

3 Neither support nor oppose

4 Somewhat oppose

5 Strongly oppose

**Commonality:**

Thinking about government services, political power, and representation, how much do Blacks/African-Americans have in common with other racial groups in the United States today?

1. Latinos
2. Whites

1 Nothing

2 A little

3 Some

4 A lot

**Linked fate:**

Do you think that what happens generally to Black/African-American people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?

1 Yes

0 No

**Experienced discrimination:**

During the past 12 months, have you ever personally experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly because of your race?

1 Yes

2 No

**Voter registration:**

Are you currently registered to vote?

1 Yes

0 No,

0 Don't know

**Education:** (recoded to more than HS diploma, where 0 and 1 are recoded to 0 and 2 through 5 are recoded to 1)

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

0 Did not graduate from high school

1 High school graduate

2 Some college, but no degree (yet)

3 2-year college degree

4 4-year college degree

5 Post-graduate degree (MA, MBA, MD, JD, PhD, etc.)

**Ideology:**

In general, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?

0 Very liberal

1 Liberal

2 Moderate

3 Conservative

4 Very Conservative

2 Not Sure

**Political interest:** (recoded to a binary variable, with 0 and 1 collapsed to 0 and 2 and 3 collapsed to 1)

Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs?}

0 Hardly at all

1 Only now and then

2 Some of the time

3 Most of the time

**Appendix 2: Null Effects**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A1. OLS Estimates of Treatment Effects with Controls, Coefficients and (SEs)** | | |
|  | Domain: Education | Domain: Housing |
|  |  |  |
| **Race by Politicization Treatments**  Placebo, Non-politicized (ref)  Placebo, Politicized | 0.011 | 0.071 |
|  | (0.138) | (0.157) |
| Black, Non-politicized | 0.089 | 0.251+ |
|  | (0.142) | (0.148) |
| Black, Politicized | 0.044 | 0.174 |
|  | (0.142) | (0.154) |
| Latino, Non-politicized | 0.133 | 0.032 |
|  | (0.142) | (0.152) |
| Latino, Politicized | 0.064 | 0.218 |
|  | (0.147) | (0.149) |
| Black & Latino, Non-politicized | 0.005 | 0.284+ |
|  | (0.143) | (0.157) |
| Black & Latino, Politicized | -0.144 | 0.234 |
|  | (0.139) | (0.147) |
| **Controls**  Education (ref= Less than college degree)  College degree + | 0.062 | -0.051 |
|  | (0.086) | (0.087) |
| Interest in news (ref= Low)  High | 0.237\*\* | 0.149+ |
|  | (0.081) | (0.081) |
| Linked fate (ref= No)  Yes | 0.122 | 0.169+ |
|  | (0.083) | (0.086) |
| Experience with discrimination (ref= No)  Yes | 0.015 | -0.063 |
|  | (0.075) | (0.078) |
| State-level immigration exposure (ref= Low)  New destination | -0.169+ | -0.063 |
|  | (0.094) | (0.098) |
| Traditional destination | -0.164+ | 0.043 |
|  | (0.095) | (0.098) |
| % Latino in Zip-code (ref= Below average)  Above average | 0.196\* | 0.075 |
|  | (0.092) | (0.094) |
| % White in Zip-code (ref= Below average)  Above average | 0.090 | 0.063 |
|  | (0.075) | (0.077) |
| Constant | 2.805\*\*\* | 2.605\*\*\* |
|  | (0.135) | (0.145) |
| N | 594 | 601 |
| R-squared | 0.044 | 0.031 |
| \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.10. Data from SSI study. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A2. Commonality by Moderators, Means and (SDs) with Bivariate Tests for Differences** | | |
|  | *Latino Commonality* |
| Education  Less than college degree (ref)  College degree + (includes AA degree) | 2.96 (.91)  3.01 (.87)  (N =1,299) |
| Linked fate  No (ref)  Yes | 2.86 (.92)  3.02 (.89)\*\*  (N=1,300) |
| Personal experience with discrimination  No (ref)  Yes | 2.98 (.87)  2.99 (.93)  (N=1,211) |
| State-level exposure to immigration  New destination state  Traditional immigration state  Low-exposure state (ref) | 2.88 (.95)\*  3.01 (.86)  3.01 (.90)  (N=1,300) |
| Zip-code percent Latino  Less than 15.7% (sample mean) (ref)  15.7% or greater | 2.94 (.92)  3.07 (.84)\*  (N=1,196) |
| Zip-code percent White  Less than 40.4% (sample mean) (ref)  40.4% or greater | 2.97 (.90)  3.00 (.90)  (N=1,196) |
| \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.10. Data from SSI study | |
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**Figure A1. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent Education**
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**Figure A2. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent Sense of Black Linked Fate**
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**Figure A3. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent Experiences of Discrimination../../../Figures%20and%20Tables/destination_ssi_moderator.pdfFigure A4. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent State-Level Exposure to Immigration**
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**Figure A5. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent Zip Code Percent Latino**
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**Figure A6. Treatment Effects on Latino Commonality by Respondent Zip Code Percent White**

**Appendix 3: Manipulation Test and Pre-Treatment Effects**

***Follow-Up Study Design***

In December of 2017 we ran a third follow-up study designed to test whether our null treatment effects could be explained by a lack of attention to our treatments and/or due to high levels of pre-treatment (e.g., pre-existing knowledge of Black-Latino shared social disadvantage relative to Whites). This study is limited to one domain—housing inequality—and only includes one treatment: shared Black and Latino disadvantage compared to Whites. We also include the housing placebo from our previous study. We limited the number of treatments to maximize statistical power.

We implemented an additional attention check by asking respondents to select a statement summarizing the article they had just read right after measuring the dependent variable (Latino commonality). This measure is designed to identify any respondents who did not read the articles and thus did not receive the treatment or placebo.

We also asked three true-false statements about Black-Latino disadvantage in home lending relative to Whites. Two of these statements came directly from the treatment article. The third, while a true statement about social disadvantage, was not reported in the treatment article. None of the statements were reported in the placebo news article. If pre-treatment is driving our null effects, we would expect respondents to display a high level of accuracy in evaluating all the statements as true, regardless of their experimental condition (treatment or placebo). Alternatively, if our treatment is increasing awareness of social disadvantage, we would expect to see higher accuracy on the first two statements, which are based on the treatment article, among respondents assigned to the treatment, compared to those who receive the placebo. We would not expect differences on the third statement across treatment conditions.

Respondents were recruited via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk platform. We used a two-stage design to limit our sample to self-identified Black respondents (see Christenson and Glick 2013). In the first stage all US-based MTurk respondents were eligible to complete a short demographic survey that collected data on race but also age, education, and gender. In the second stage, only respondents who self-identified as Black in the first survey were invited to complete a second survey with our experimental manipulations (see below).[[1]](#footnote-1) The second-stage survey was in the field from December 9th-11th, 2017. This sampling approach yielded 178 African-American respondents who completed our follow-up study.

***Follow-Up Study Measures***

*Placebo Treatment:*

***Guesses Give Way to Data in Study of Mortgage Lending***

What policies can improve home loans and reduce foreclosures? Until recently, there had been few solid answers. But now the Department of Housing and Urban Development is starting to get some real data. One conclusion is that providing borrowers with more time to review disclosure forms before signing will ensure that they can review the terms of their loan and make a more informed decision.

*Black-Latino Treatment*

***Home Lending Data Finds Pattern of Inequality***

Black and Latino borrowers are more likely than white borrowers to be given higher-priced mortgages, to receive less coaching and basic information, and receive fewer loan options when borrowing from large banks, according to the Department of Housing. In the analysis of information from all of the country’s large banking institutions, the Housing Department found a pattern of inequality on a number of fronts with race as the dividing factor.

**Commonality:**

Thinking about government services, political power, and representation, how much do Blacks/African-Americans have in common with other racial groups in the United States today?

1. Latinos
2. Whites

1 Nothing

2 A little

3 Some

4 A lot

**Attention Check:**

Which of these statements best summarizes the article you just read?

1. Blacks are disadvantaged relative to Whites and Latinos
2. Blacks and Latinos are disadvantaged relative to Whites
3. Good data is important to understanding social problems
4. Women are disadvantaged relative to men.

**Pre-Treatment Check:**

Please indicate whether you believe each statement to be true or false.

1. Black and Latino borrowers are more likely than white borrowers to be given higher-priced mortgages.
2. Compared to whites, on average black and Latino borrowers receive less coaching and basic information about home loans.
3. Black and Latino borrowers are more likely to own homes in disadvantaged neighborhoods compared to whites.

***Follow-Up Study Findings***

As shown in Table A3 (below), our null finding replicates. Respondents assigned to both the treatment and placebo conditions pass the manipulation check at high rates (92 and 83% respectively). Limiting our analysis to only respondents who pass the manipulation check has no effect on our null finding. These findings support our contention that our respondents received our treatments and that inattentiveness is not an explanation for our null findings.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table A3. Attention Check and Pre-Treatment Evaluations** | | | | | |
|  | Housing: Placebo | | Housing: Black and Latino Treatment | | *Two-Tailed T-Test (p-value)* |
|  | *Mean (SD)* | *N* | *Mean (SD)* | *N* |  |
| Full Sample: Mean Latino Commonality | 3.26 (.70) | 90 | 3.18 (.86) | 88 | 0.72 (.47) |
| Attentive Sample: Mean Latino Commonality | 3.32 (.68) | 75 | 3.20 (.86) | 81 | .98 (.33) |
|  | *Proportion* | *N* | *Proportion* | *N* | *Chi-Square Test (p-value)* |
| Pass Attention Check | .83 | 90 | .92 | 88 |  |
| Pre-Treatment Measures: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher Priced, Mentioned in Treatment (correct=1) | .86 | 90 | .95 | 88 | 5.04\* (.025) |
| Less Coaching, Mentioned in Treatment (correct =1) | .90 | 90 | .95 | 88 | 1.96 (.16) |
| Disadvantaged Neighborhoods, Not Mentioned in Treatment (correct =1) | .90 | 90 | .86 | 88 | .57 (.45) |
| Source: MTurk Attention Check Sample, Collected December 9-11, 2017. Note: All respondents self-identify as Black or African American. \* p<0.05 | | | | | |

We also find that there are at least some differences in knowledge of shared social disadvantage in this domain. Respondents who received the treatment are more likely than those assigned to the placebo to correctly answer the first two true-false questions that are based on the treatment article (p<.05 for the first item; p=.16 for the second item). There is no statistically significant difference in accuracy for the third item, which was not included in either the treatment or control.

These findings indicate that our treatment is increasing knowledge of shared Black-Latino social disadvantage. We also find overall high-levels of knowledge in both the treatment and placebo conditions (accuracy rates range from 86 to 95%). Together, these results suggest that (some) pre-treatment knowledge of shared social disadvantage is likely present, but can only be a partial explanation for our null treatment effects.

**Appendix 4: Reporting Standards for Experiments**

1. Hypotheses
   1. Our experiment tests whether messages about social disadvantage promote a sense of shared political interests with Latinos among African American respondents.
   2. H1: Framing racial inequality as Black and Latino shared inequality compared to Whites should boost perceived commonality with Latinos.
   3. H2: Linked fate should be positively associated with Latino commonality independent of treatments.
2. Subjects and Context
   1. Our survey was fielded in its entirety to 1200 African American respondents drawn from Survey Sampling International’s online panel from January 21, 2016 to February 26, 2016. More than 1200 respondents completed at least part of the survey, as we contracted with SSI to deliver 1200 complete interviews. Self-identified African Americans over the age of 18 were eligible to participate in the study. Any respondent who indicated that they were not African American/Black or were not 18 years old were excluded from the sample. We quota sampled and therefore once a quota was complete, any respondent who filled a complete quota was not eligible for the survey.
   2. We ran an additional manipulation check on Black MechanicalTurk respondents from December 9-11, 2017, to test whether respondents were attentive. Respondents were eligible to be included in this survey if they self-identified as African American/Black and consented to participate in a pre-screen survey. We sent a follow-up survey containing the manipulation check to eligible respondents.
3. Simple random assignment was used through Qualtrics’ survey software to assign respondents to each treatment condition.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table X. Testing for Balance Across Treatments, Main Sample | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *Domain: Education* | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Placebo | Placebo, Politicized | Black | Black, Politicized | Latino | Latino, Politicized | Black & Latino | Black & Latino, Politicized | Chi-Square Test a  (p-value) |
| College degree (0/1) | .25 | .27 | .17 | .31 | .21 | .15 | .20 | .27 |  |
| Registered to Vote (0/1) | .93 | .91 | .85 | .93 | .93 | .97 | .80 | .94 |  |
| High Interest in Politics (0/1) | .22 | .28 | .24 | .31 | .34 | .25 | .30 | .29 |  |
| Black Linked Fate (0/1) | .75 | .69 | .73 | .76 | .74 | .74 | .70 | .66 |  |
|  | *Domain: Housing* | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Placebo | Placebo, Politicized | Black | Black, Politicized | Latino | Latino, Politicized | Black & Latino | Black & Latino, Politicized |  |
| College degree (0/1) | .22 | .27 | .26 | .25 | .21 | .24 | .23 | .26 | 11.2 (.74) |
| Registered to Vote (0/1) | .92 | .89 | .89 | .90 | .84 | .89 | .87 | .87 | 21.3 (.13) |
| High Interest in Politics (0/1) | .30 | .32 | .37 | .35 | .32 | .36 | .36 | .26 | 12.4 (.65) |
| Black Linked Fate (0/1) | .64 | .67 | .66 | .77 | .71 | .80 | .70 | .69 | 12.94 (.61) |
| a Chi-Square tests compare across all sixteen treatments. | | | | | | | | | |

1. CONSORT Participant Flow

**Assessed for eligibility (n=2880)**

* Excluded (n=1558)
  + Not meeting inclusion criteria (n=149)
  + Declined to participate (n=261)
  + Removed due to filled quotas (n=1070)
  + Break off before randomization (n=78)
* Randomized into treatments (n=1322)

**The 1322 respondents were randomized into a 4x2x2 design.**

**Racial comparison treatment:**

* Black-White comparison
  + Received allocated intervention (n=333)
  + Analysed (n=324)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=9)
* Black and Latino-White comparison
  + Received allocated intervention (n=332)
  + Analysed (n=331)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=1)
* Latino-White comparison
  + Received allocated intervention (n=329)
  + Analysed (n=323)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=6)
* Placebo condition
  + Received allocated intervention (n=328)
  + Analysed (n=322)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=6)

**Domain treatment:**

* Housing condition
  + Received allocated intervention (n=666)
  + Analysed (n=654)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=12)
* Education condition
  + Received allocated intervention (n=656)
  + Analysed (n=646)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=10)

**Politicization treatment:**

Analysed (n= )  
 Excluded from analysis (give reasons) (n= )

* Politicized condition
  + Received allocated intervention (n=653)
  + Analysed (n=643)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=10)
* Non-politicized condition
  + Received allocated intervention (n=669)
  + Analysed (n=657)  
    Excluded from analysis (break-off before measurement of DV) (n=12)

1. We used Leeper, Messing, Murphy, Chang, and Brown’s R package mTurkR package to recontact workers who qualified from the first demographic screen.  [https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MTurkR](https://cran.r-project.org/package=MTurkR) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)