

Appendix A1: Durham Community Survey – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

The *DCS97* survey materials were addressed to an adult member of the household--names and addresses supplied by *The Polk Guide*--but included very strict instructions (with extensive explanation) that the survey could only be completed by the adult member of the household whose birthday was coming up next. (The available anecdotal evidence suggests a fairly high level of compliance with this instruction). Respondents were paid for completing the questionnaire in accordance with the speed of its return, with respondents instructed that they would earn anywhere from \$5 to \$20 dollars, depending upon the postmark on the return envelope. Over the next four months non-responders were mailed a second plea along with fresh materials, and up to two reminder postcards, and additionally those with known telephone numbers received up to four calls, with increasing incentives offered to the most intransigent. Those in the original sample who were deceased or had moved to unknown quarters were replaced by fresh draws from the original sampling frame as soon as this was known.

The respondents ranged in age from 18 to 95 years with a median age of 51, and 56 percent were male. Level of education was distributed nicely from less than eighth grade to completion of the PhD; the median level of education was a junior/community college degree. Over 57 percent were employed full-time in the workforce, and 19 percent considered themselves working class. Fifty-four percent thought of themselves as Democrats or Democrat 'leaners', 35 percent were Republicans/'leaners', and 11 percent were 'pure' Independents.

Endogenous Variables

Authoritarianism ('Authoritarian Predisposition'): My measure of authoritarianism relied upon respondents (i) making a series of value choices between five pairs of qualities, and then (ii) rank-ordering the ten qualities, in response to the instruction: "Next we have some questions about the qualities that people think we should try to encourage in children. Although there are a number of qualities that people feel that children should have, people still disagree about which of the qualities are more important to encourage in children. In the table that follows, we have set out for you pairs of qualities that one might try to encourage in children. You may well think that both qualities are important, or that neither quality is important. Still, for each pair of qualities, please circle one number across that line to indicate for us which one of the two you think is more important for a child to have". The final measure was formed by equally weighting the two components: (i) the number of authoritarian choices made from among the five pairs of qualities, and (ii) the sum of the rank orders assigned to the libertarian values and the reverse of the rank orders assigned to the authoritarian values, across the ten qualities ("once again thinking about which are the most important qualities to encourage in a child"). The values considered authoritarian were: "that a child obeys his parents" (v. "that he is responsible for his own actions"); "that he has good manners" (v. "that he has good sense and sound judgment"); "that he is neat and clean" (v. "that he is interested in how and why things happen"); "that he has respect for his elders" (v. "that he thinks for himself"); and "that he follows the rules" (v. "that he

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

follows his own conscience’). Of course to avoid acquiescence response bias, the order in which the two qualities were presented varied (authoritarian value first, or second). The final measure was re-scored to be of one-unit range, and centered on a mean of ‘0’.

Political Conservatism: Formed from responses to the instruction “please circle one number down the column to indicate for us how liberal or conservative you consider yourself to be”. Answered on the standard seven-point scale--“very liberal”, “quite liberal”, “somewhat liberal”, “moderate”, “somewhat conservative”, “quite conservative”, “very conservative” (missing values set to the modal category of “moderate”) --then rescored to be of one unit range, and centered on a mean of ‘0’.

‘Right-Wing Authoritarianism’: A measure of what I am calling ‘expressed authoritarian attitudes’ formed by averaging responses (reversed as appropriate) to twelve statements drawn from Altemeyer’s Right -Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale, but with responses here in my adaptation provided on seven-point Likert scales (ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree”). Note that to avoid well-known problems with acquiescence response bias the statements vary in ‘direction’ (half ‘protrait’, half ‘contrait’), where for some items the response considered indicative of authoritarianism (protrait) is to agree with the statement, and for other items to disagree (contrait). Missing values on the individual items were imputed based upon exogenous variables, and the final scale was rescored to be of one unit range. The twelve items with which respondents indicated the extent of their agreement/disagreement were as follows (and in this order):

- (i) Life imprisonment is justified for certain crimes.
- (ii) It is important to protect the rights of radicals and deviants in all ways.
- (iii) There are many radical, immoral people in our country today, who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
- (iv) There is no ‘ONE right way’ to live life; everybody has to create their *own* way.
- (v) Our country *needs* free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.
- (vi) It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines so that people could not get their hands on trashy and disgusting material.
- (vii) It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’ t like, and to make their own ‘rules’ to govern their behavior.
- (viii) What our country *really* needs, instead of more ‘civil rights’, is a good stiff dose of law and order.
- (ix) Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the ‘normal way’ things are supposed to be done.
- (x) Once our government leaders give us the ‘go ahead’, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.
- (xi) We should treat protestors and radicals with open arms and open minds, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.
- (xii) The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Perception of a 'Dangerous World': Overall measure of the tendency to perceive a dangerous world, constructed by averaging extent of respondents' agreement/disagreement (indicated on seven-point Likert scales) with the following six statements (reversed as appropriate), all drawn from Altemeyer's original scale. Missing values on individual items were imputed from exogenous variables, and the final measure was rescored to be of one unit range.

- (i) Although every era has its problems, a person's chances of living a safe, untroubled life are better today than ever before.
- (ii) With everything in such a state of disorder, it's hard for people to know where they stand from one day to the next.
- (iii) If our society keeps degenerating the way it has been lately, it's likely to collapse like a rotten log and everything will be chaos.
- (iv) There is really no reason for people to be fearful of the future.
- (v) Any day now, chaos and anarchy could erupt around us. All the signs are pointing to it.
- (vi) No matter how much things seem to change, the world just goes smoothly on as if nothing had happened.

'Right-Wing' Party Identification: Formed from responses to the standard question "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?", with respondents locating themselves on a seven-point scale ranging across "strong Democrat", "not very strong Democrat", "Independent, leaning toward Democrats", "Independent", "Independent, leaning toward Republicans", "not very strong Republican", and "strong Republican". Final measure was rescored to be of one unit range (Republican scored high).

Opposition to Racial Quotas in University Admissions: A four-point scale (re-scored to range '0' to '1') ordering responses to the question "Are you for or against college quotas to admit black students?", across the options "I strongly favor college quotas", "I favor college quotas", "I oppose college quotas", up to "I strongly oppose college quotas".

Explanatory Variables

Political knowledge: A summary measure of political knowledge formed by averaging two components. The first component was the overall measure of knowledge of public figures. Under the guise of being "interested in finding out how much news about politics and public affairs gets out to the citizens of Durham from television, newspapers and the like" I asked respondents to "write what you remember about the job or political office that each of the following individuals holds in the space provided" for each of ten public figures: Strom Thurmond, Ted Turner, Jim Hunt, Elizabeth Dole, Boris Yeltsin, Sam Nunn, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Fidel Castro, Newt Gingrich, and Clarence Thomas. An overall measure of knowledge of public figures was then formed by simply counting up the number of correct identifications, with half-marks for partially correct answers, and rescored the total to range from '0' to '1'.

The second component was an overall measure of knowledge of public affairs, formed from a simple scoring (again reflecting a trained coder's judgment as to what constituted a

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

partially and a fully correct response in each case) of open-ended commentary offered by respondents on each of three events—“Oklahoma City Bombing”, “Waco” and “Ruby Ridge” — in response to the following instruction: “And now finally, each of the events listed below was covered, but in widely varying degrees, in the national news media. So we are interested in finding out what news about each of these different events managed to reach the citizens of Durham. Could you please write whatever you can remember about the following important events in the space provided”. The final measure (formed from the two equally weighted components) was rescored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Father college-educated: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent indicates father had a college education, otherwise ‘0’. Missing values set to the mode.

Father had professional occupation: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent indicates father was “a professional of some type (e.g. doctor, lawyer)”, otherwise ‘0’. Missing values set to the mode.

Male: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ for males, ‘0’ for females.

Age: Respondent’s age in years, computed directly from their reporting of year of birth.

Conscientiousness: Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience (see below) are two of the five universal dimensions of personality widely accepted in psychological theory and supported by psychometric research (the remainder being extraversion/introversion, neuroticism, and amiability). From the lengthy batteries of items developed to measure each of these dimensions of personality, I selected six items apiece that could be inserted into an unsolicited survey questionnaire purporting to be concerned with community issues, without raising eyebrows, suspicion or defenses. In essence, I tried to select items that--in addition to being reliable, and varying in ‘direction’ (to avoid response set problems) --bore on matters that could conceivably, legitimately be of interest to a political scientist.

To allay any concerns, my general introduction to the personality series read: “We are asking these questions because we are trying to get a sense of how the people of Durham feel about themselves, their lives, their work, and their community; what they like and dislike; and what are their hopes, dreams, and ambitions. In order to arrive at this overall picture of the many different kinds of people who make up the Durham community, in the following section we propose a series of statements that may or may not be true of you. Please read each of the following statements carefully. And then indicate—as honestly as you possibly can—how much you agree or disagree with the statement in so far as it applies to you personally”.

Conscientiousness was measured first, with respondents indicating (on a seven-point Likert scale) their agreement with the statements: “I am a productive person who always gets the job done”; “I’m something of a workaholic” ; “I don’t feel like I’m driven to get ahead”; “I tend to be somewhat fastidious or exacting”; “I waste a lot of time before settling down to work”; and “I would rather keep my options open than plan everything in advance”. For the overall scale responses were reversed as appropriate, summed, and rescored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Openness to experience: Same section and same procedure as above, with respondents this time reacting to the statements: ‘If I feel my mind starting to drift off into daydreams, I usually get busy and start concentrating on some work or activity instead’; ‘I find philosophical arguments boring’; ‘Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement’; ‘I have a wide range of intellectual interests’; ‘Watching ballet or modern dance bores me’; and ‘I enjoy concentrating on a fantasy or daydream and exploring all its possibilities, letting it grow and develop’.

Number of characters in commentary: The total number of characters (in hundreds) in the commentary that respondents wrote regarding ‘the Oklahoma City bombing’, ‘Waco’ and ‘Ruby Ridge’ in response to the instruction: “ And now finally, each of the events listed below was covered, but in widely varying degrees, in the national news media. So we are interested in finding out what news about each of these different events managed to reach the citizens of Durham. Could you please write whatever you can remember about the following important events in the space provided”.

Errors per word in commentary: A count of the number of spelling and serious grammatical errors per word written in response to the instructions described immediately above. These errors were counted by a coder specifically trained for this particular task and blind to my objectives and hypotheses. By my instruction, ‘errors’ would include misspellings, serious grammatical errors, and also obviously wrong word choices (e.g. writing about ‘evasion’ when context made apparent he/she really meant ‘invasion’).

Education level: A twelve-point ordinal scale formed directly from responses to the question “What is the highest level of education that you have completed?”. The response options ordered along the scale were: ‘less than 8th grade’, ‘8th grade’, ‘9th grade’, ‘10th grade’, ‘11th grade’, ‘12th grade, but did not obtain high school diploma or equivalency’, ‘high school diploma or equivalency’, ‘more than 12 years of schooling, but did not obtain any college degree’, ‘junior or community college degree’, ‘Bachelors degree’, ‘advanced degree (beyond Bachelors) of a professional nature (MBA, LLB)’ and ‘higher degree (PhD)’. Missing values were imputed from exogenous variables.

Punitive childhood – extent of spanking: A count (rescored from ‘0’ to ‘1’) of the number of times respondents indicated ‘spanking’ (v. ‘loss of privileges’, ‘scolding’, ‘expressed disappointment’, and ‘no punishment’) as the punishment their father or mother would most typically have meted out for each of a series of childhood misbehaviors, specifically: ‘not cleaning up your room’, ‘lying about something minor’, ‘using ‘dirty’ language’, ‘talking back to some adult’, ‘getting dirt on the furniture’, ‘starting a fight in school’, ‘deliberately defying your father’, and ‘stealing a dollar from mom’s purse’.

Family attended religious services weekly: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent answered ‘yes’ to the question ‘Did your family attend religious services on a regular weekly basis?’, otherwise ‘0’. Missing values set to the mode.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Raised in the South: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent answered “yes” to the question “Did you grow up mainly in the South?”, otherwise ‘0’. Missing values set to the mode.

Raised in a rural area: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent answered “yes” to the question “Did you grow up mainly in a rural area?”, otherwise ‘0’. Missing values set to the mode.

Subjective social class: Respondents’ identification of the social class to which they think they belong, as indicated on seven-point ordinal scale ranging from “lower working class” to “upper class” (rescored to range ‘0’ to ‘1’).

Employed full-time in the workforce: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent claimed to be currently employed full-time in the workforce, otherwise ‘0’.

Overall perception of normative threat: Overall measure of perceived normative threat formed by averaging the four components described immediately below, and re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Negativity of evaluation of leaders’ traits: The average of respondents’ character trait evaluations of both Bill Clinton and Bob Dole (equally weighted) on the standard dimensions “really cares about people like you”, “provides strong leadership”, “compassionate”, “inspiring”, “honest” and “gets things done”. Trait evaluations were offered in reaction to the query “how well does this word or phrase describe (Bill Clinton/Bob Dole)?”, with response options ordered along a four-point scale, from “extremely well”, “quite well”, “not too well”, to “not well at all”. Final measure re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with negative responses scoring high.

Perceived ideological distance from the major parties: The sum of the absolute distances that a respondent (by implication) perceives to exist between his/her own ideology (via self-placement on the seven-point liberal/conservative scale, described earlier) and the perceived ideological stances of each of the Democratic and Republican parties (as located by the respondent on the same scale). Final measure re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with higher scores indicating greater absolute perceived distance between the respondent and each of the two major parties. All up, in this section of the survey respondents indicate their understanding of the ideological location of six political actors (self, Clinton, Dole, Democratic Party, Republican Party, and ‘typical Americans’, in that order), following the prelude: “Now we would like to know how liberal or conservative you consider yourself to be. And how about the political parties and the major political leaders? Where would you place them? How liberal or conservative do you consider each of them to be?”.

Ideological distance from ‘typical Americans’: As above (collected at the same time and by the same device), the absolute distance that a respondent apparently perceives to exist between his/her own ideology (via self-placement) and the ideological stance of ‘typical Americans’ (again, as located by the respondent). Final measure re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with higher scores indicating greater absolute perceived distance between the respondent’s ideology and that of ‘typical Americans’.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Belief divergence from typical Americans and Congress: Formed by averaging responses to two questions embedded in a battery of items asking respondents to indicate, in turn, the extent to which they felt their own beliefs diverged from those held by ten different targets (including “typical Americans” and “members of Congress”). The prelude to the series read: “Next, we would like you to think about various people and groups in society. For each person or group listed in bold-type down the left-hand side of the table below, think about the beliefs and values they tend to have about society and the world in general. And then consider whether those beliefs and values are similar to, or different from your own. For each person or group listed below, please *circle one number across that line* to indicate for us *how similar to, or different from your own beliefs and values you think their beliefs and values tend to be*”. The response options ranged across “exactly the same”, “almost the same”, “quite similar”, “quite different” and “very different” up to “completely different”. Missing values on the individual items were imputed using exogenous variables. Overall measure averaged the two six-point ordinal items and rescored the result to be of one unit range, centered on mean 0’.

Negativity of perceptions of family finances: Formed by averaging responses to the two questions “Next, we are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you and your immediate family are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?” (with response options “much better off”, “better off”, “about the same”, “worse off” and “much worse off”), and “And would you say that over the last year, your/your family’s income has gone up more than the cost of living, has it fallen behind, or has it stayed about even with the cost of living?” (with response options “gone up a lot more”, “gone up a little more”, “stayed about even”, “fallen behind a little” and “fallen behind a lot”). Missing values on the individual items were imputed using exogenous variables. Overall measure rescored to be of one unit range (negativity scoring high) and centered on mean 0’.

Negativity of perceptions of national economy: Formed by averaging responses to the two questions (following immediately after the foregoing) “Now, how about *the national economy*? Would you say that over the past year, the nation’s economy has gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse?” and “And how about *America’s ability to compete in the world economy*? Over the past year, would you say that America’s ability to compete in the world economy has gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse?” Answered in each case on a five-point scale ranging across “gotten much better”, “gotten better”, “stayed the same”, “gotten worse” and “gotten much worse”. Missing values on the individual items were imputed using exogenous variables. Overall measure rescored to be of one unit range (negativity scoring high) and centered on mean 0’.

Victim of crime --burglarized/mugged past year: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if respondent answered “yes” to either of the questions “First, during the last year, did anyone burglarize, break into, or somehow illegally get into your home?” and “And during the last year, did anyone take something directly from you, or from a member of your immediate family, by using force--such as a stickup or a mugging?”, otherwise ‘0’.

Extent of personal/family trauma past year: Formed from two (equally weighted) components each reflecting personal trauma, with missing values on each component imputed using exogenous variables. The first component was an eight-point interval measure formed from

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

responses to the following instruction: “Now, it is unfortunately true that over a period of time, a family may experience a number of traumatic events, such as the death of a loved one, divorce or separation, a major illness or accident. Over the last year, how many of these major, traumatic events would you say that you and your *immediate* family have experienced? Please just try to give us your best guess of the number”. (The number of events respondents reported ranged originally from ‘0’ to ‘7’). The second component was a five-point ordinal measure formed from responses to the question “And over the past year, have you ever felt that your family’ s personal difficulties were completely overwhelming?”, with response options ranging across ‘never felt that’, ‘hardly ever felt that’, ‘sometimes felt that’ and ‘often felt that’ up to ‘always felt that’. Overall measure rescored to be of one unit range and centered on mean ‘0’.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Table A1.1: Univariate Statistics

Endogenous Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism ('authoritarian predisposition') (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.26)	-.38 -- .62
Political Conservatism (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.25)	-.51 -- .49
Right-Wing Authoritarianism ('expressed attitudes')	.53(.20)	0 – 1
Perception of a 'Dangerous World'	.48(.20)	0 – 1
*'Right-Wing' Party Identification (<i>Republican high</i>)	.45(.34)	0 -- 1
Opposition to Racial Quotas in University Admissions (<i>N=350</i>)	.66(.24)	0 – 1
Implicit affection for Super-Patriot/Militia movement	.44(.22)	0 – 1
Explanatory Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.20)	-.48 -- .52
Political Conservatism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.19)	-.45 -- .55
Political knowledge (<i>public figures & public affairs</i>)	.61(.21)	0 – 1
Age (<i>years</i>)	53.32(16.51)	18 – 95
Conscientiousness	.59(.18)	0 – 1
Openness to Experience	.53(.21)	0 – 1
Number of characters in commentary (<i>100s</i>)	3.53(2.78)	0 – 18.18
Errors per word in commentary	.0321(.0444)	0 -- .40
Education level	.72(.20)	0 – 1
Punitive childhood: extent of spanking	.27(.25)	0 – 1
Subjective social class	.61(.21)	0 – 1
Overall perception of normative threat	.00(.18)	-.38 -- .62
Negativity of evaluation of leaders' traits	.00(.13)	-.52 -- .48
Ideological distance from the major parties	.00(.18)	-.38 -- .62
Ideological distance from 'typical Americans'	.00(.25)	-.28 -- .72
Belief divergence from typical Americans & Congress	.00(.16)	-.45 -- .55
Negativity of perceptions of the national economy	.00(.19)	-.49 -- .51
Negativity of perceptions of family finances	.00(.18)	-.51 -- .49
*Extent of personal/family trauma in the past year	.00(.20)	-.27 -- .73
<i>Categorical Variables</i>	<i>% in category</i>	
Father was college-educated	37.12%	
Father had a professional occupation	21.61%	
Male	55.96%	
Family attended religious services weekly	72.30%	
Raised in the South	66.48%	
Raised in a rural area	37.12%	
Employed full-time in the workforce	57.34%	
*Victim of crime: burglarized/mugged in the past year	12.19%	

Source: DCS97, Whites only, N=361 unless otherwise indicated.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Table A1.2: Determinants of Authoritarianism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, adding threats
Political Conservatism (<i>instrument</i>) _a		.23(.11)**	.23(.11)**
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Father was college-educated	-.04(.03)*	-.04(.03)**	-.04(.03)*
Father had professional occupation	-.02(.03)	--	--
Male	.05(.02)**	--	--
Age (<i>years</i>)	.0018(.0008)**	.0012(.0009)*	.0013(.0009)*
Openness to Experience	-.26(.06)**	-.18(.08)**	-.17(.08)**
Conscientiousness	-.01(.06)	--	--
Number of characters in commentary (<i>100s</i>)	-.0117(.0038)**	-.0112(.0037)**	-.0109(.0037)**
Errors per word in commentary	.51(.24)**	.51(.23)**	.50(.23)**
Education level	-.21(.07)**	-.15(.07)**	-.13(.07)**
Punitive childhood: extent of spanking	.12(.05)**	.10(.05)**	.10(.05)**
Family attended religious services weekly	.04(.02)*	.03(.02)*	.03(.02)*
Raised in the South	.04(.03)*	--	--
Raised in a rural area	.05(.02)**	.04(.02)**	.04(.02)**
Subjective social class	.04(.06)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
Employed full-time in workforce	-.04(.03)*	-.04(.03)*	-.04(.03)*
<i>Threat Perceptions</i>			
Overall perception of normative threat			-.06(.06)
Negativity of perceptions of national economy			.07(.06)
Negativity of perceptions of family finances			--
Victim of crime: burglarized/mugged past year			--
Extent of personal/family trauma past year			--
<i>Political Conservatism_a*Threat Perceptions</i>			
Conservatism*overall normative threat			--
Conservatism*negativity national economy			--
Conservatism*negativity family finances			--
Conservatism*recent victim of crime			--
Conservatism*extent of personal trauma			--
Constant	.11(.09)	.14(.08)	.11(.08)
R ²	.40	.40	.40

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table A1.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table A1.3, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for political conservatism.

Source: DCS97, Whites only, N=361.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Table A1.3: Determinants of Political Conservatism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, adding threats
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>) _a		.37(.09)**	.39(.08)**
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Father was college-educated	.02(.03)	--	--
Father had professional occupation	-.10(.04)**	-.07(.03)**	-.02(.03)
Male	.08(.02)**	.05(.02)**	.05(.02)**
Age (<i>years</i>)	.0017(.0010)*	--	--
Openness to Experience	-.27(.06)**	-.16(.08)**	-.06(.07)
Conscientiousness	.14(.07)**	.13(.06)**	.06(.06)
Number of characters in commentary (<i>100s</i>)	-.0018(.0048)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
Errors per word in commentary	-.01(.26)	--	--
Education level	-.19(.08)**	--	--
Punitive childhood: extent of spanking	.08(.06)	--	--
Family attended religious services weekly	.01(.03)	--	--
Raised in the South	.08(.03)**	.06(.03)**	.02(.03)
Raised in a rural area	.00(.03)	--	--
Subjective social class	.20(.06)**	.17(.06)**	.20(.05)**
Employed full-time in workforce	-.00(.03)	--	--
<i>Threat Perceptions</i>			
Overall perception of normative threat			-.01(.07)
Negativity of perceptions of national economy			.23(.06)**
Negativity of perceptions of family finances			.04(.06)
Victim of crime: burglarized/mugged past year			.03(.03)
Extent of personal/family trauma past year			-.00(.06)
<i>Authoritarianism_a*Threat Perceptions</i>			
Authoritarianism*overall normative threat			2.44(.24)**
Authoritarianism*negativity national economy			--
Authoritarianism*negativity family finances			-.62(.27)**
Authoritarianism*recent victim of crime			--
Authoritarianism*extent of personal trauma			-.47(.23)**
Constant	-.13(.10)	-.15(.06)**	-.13(.06)**
R ²	.27	.27	.44

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table A1.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table A1.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism.

Source: DCS97, Whites only, N=361.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Table A1.4: The Interaction of Authoritarianism and Political Conservatism on ‘Right-Wing’ Party Identification and Opposition to Affirmative Action

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	‘Right-Wing’ Party Identification	Opposition to Racial Quotas in Univ. Admissions
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>) _a	-.45(.16)**	-.21(.12)**
Political Conservatism (<i>instrument</i>) _b	.99(.17)**	.45(.12)**
Authoritarianism _a *Conservatism _b	-.70(.37)*	-.73(.27)**
constant	.48(.02)**	.68(.01)**
R^2 (<i>with conservatism only</i>)	.11	.05
R^2 (<i>adding authoritarianism</i>)	.14	.08

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized multiple regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). See Table A1.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table A1.2, ‘1st stage estimates’, for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism.

_b See Table A1.3, ‘1st stage estimates’, for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for political conservatism.

Source: DCS97, Whites only; N=361 (party id), N=350 (quotas).

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

Table A1.5: Influence of Authoritarian Predisposition on Related Predispositions Given Varying Perceptions of Threat

<i>Endogenous Variables</i> →	Authoritarian Attitudes (RWA Scale)	Perception of a 'Dangerous World'
<i>↓Explanatory Variables</i>		
Authoritarian predisposition (<i>instrument</i>) _a	.26(.10)**	.38(.05)**
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>		
Father was college-educated	-.03(.02)**	--
Father had professional occupation	--	--
Male	-.06(.02)**	-.04(.02)**
Age (<i>years</i>)	.0026(.0006)**	--
Openness to Experience	-.10(.06)**	--
Conscientiousness	.08(.04)**	.08(.05)**
Number of characters in commentary (<i>100s</i>)	-.0037(.0032)	--
Errors per word in commentary	<i>excl.</i>	--
Education level	--	--
Punitive childhood: extent of spanking	--	.05(.04)
Family attended religious services weekly	.02(.02)*	-.03(.02)*
Raised in the South	--	--
Raised in a rural area	.03(.02)**	<i>excl.</i>
Subjective social class	--	-.05(.04)
Employed full-time in workforce	--	--
<i>Threat Perceptions</i>		
Overall perception of normative threat	-.18(.05)**	.08(.05)
Negativity of perceptions of national economy	.19(.04)**	.34(.05)**
Negativity of perceptions of family finances	--	--
Victim of crime: burglarized/mugged past year	.04(.02)**	--
Extent of personal/family trauma past year	.06(.04)*	.13(.04)**
<i>Authoritarianism_a*Threat Perceptions</i>		
Authoritarianism*overall normative threat	.95(.18)**	.40(.22)**
Authoritarianism*negativity national economy	--	--
Authoritarianism*negativity family finances	--	--
Authoritarianism*recent victim of crime	--	--
Authoritarianism*extent of personal trauma	-.21(.15)*	-.29(.20)*
Constant	.43(.05)**	.51(.04)**
<i>R</i> ²	.60	.41

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** $p < .05$, * $p < .10$ (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; – indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table A1.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table A1.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism (authoritarian predisposition).

Source: DCS97, Whites only, N=361.

Appendix A1: DCS – Self-Administered Questionnaire 1997

**Table A1.6: Determinants of Implicit Affection
for Super-Patriot/Militia Movement**

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	Implicit Affection for Super-Patriot / Militia Movement
<i>Predispositions</i>	
Authoritarianism	.10(.05)**
Political Conservatism	.08(.06)
<i>Threat Perceptions</i>	
Negativity of evaluation of leaders' traits	.17(.09)*
Ideological distance from the major parties	--
Ideological distance from 'typical Americans'	.14(.05)**
Belief divergence from Americans & Congress	-.15(.09)*
Negativity of perceptions of national economy	-.16(.07)**
Negativity of perceptions of family finances	--
Victim of crime: burglarized/mugged past year	--
Extent of personal/family trauma past year	--
<i>Authoritarianism*Threat Perceptions</i>	
Authoritarianism*negativity of leader evaluation	--
Authoritarianism*parties' ideological distance	--
Authoritarianism*'typical Americans'' ideol. distance	.25(.20)
Authoritarianism*belief diverge. Americans & Congress	.71(.30)**
Authoritarianism*negativity re. national economy	--
Authoritarianism*negativity re. family finances	--
Authoritarianism*recent victim of crime	--
Authoritarianism*extent of personal trauma	--
<i>Political Conservatism*Threat Perceptions</i>	
Conservatism*negativity of leader evaluation	-.39(.24)**
Conservatism*parties' ideological distance	--
Conservatism*'typical Americans'' ideol. distance	-.11(.18)
Conservatism*belief diverge. Americans & Congress	--
Conservatism*negativity re. national economy	--
Conservatism*negativity re. family finances	--
Conservatism*recent victim of crime	--
Conservatism*extent of personal trauma	--
Constant	.45(.01)**
R^2	.08

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized OLS multiple regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** $p < .05$, * $p < .10$ (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table A1.1 for univariate statistics. Source: DCS97, Whites only, N=361.