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Confederates’ Characteristics

To confirm that it was likely that the ethnicity of the confederates had been assumed to be Hispanic by persons on the train platform and to explore how train passengers might have viewed the confederates, I surveyed 757 persons. Respondents were shown either a photo of the face of one of the confederates, randomly selected from the seven confederates for each subject, or a photo of 1 of 14 other self-reported Hispanic or Anglo whites. These images were drawn from a sample of individuals from a similar age and sex balance as that of the confederates.

Respondents were shown the photo and a list of adjectives and asked to respond on a five-point scale indicating how well the word described the pictured face, ranging from “does not describe this face at all” to “describes this face perfectly.” Fig. S1 displays the mean responses for all of the confederates, and the other Hispanic and Anglo faces.

The survey responses indicate nothing extraordinary about the appearance of the confederates. The confederates may have even had characteristics that would make them relatively desirable community members, including being “approachable,” “intelligent,” “successful,” “professional,” and “industrious.” The confederates were not judged to be particularly “intimidating.” Importantly, when asked about the adjectives “foreign” and “immigrant,” the confederates were more likely than Anglo whites and about equally as likely as other Hispanics to be identified as such. In open-ended responses, the confederates were typically described as looking “nice” and physically attractive.

Subsets

I also examined the effect on subsets that are informative about the validity of the treatment and the mechanism causing the attitudinal shift. Among the variables collected in the survey, I examined pretreatment variables that are prominent in the literature or have a clear theoretical expectation. No randomization occurred between these subsets, so the difference between subsets should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal effect of the subsetting variable.

I created subsets by the self-reported number of Latino friends before beginning the experiment. With people who have the lowest level of Latino friends (zero), the effect becomes even larger, which might be expected because the treatment would be more novel to these individuals or they might have a stronger underlying aversion to Latinos (Fig. S2).

The effects may be moderated by political ideology (Fig. S3). The effect is clearly stronger for liberals and moderates, with conservatives showing little movement from T1 to T2 due to the nature of the treatment. The relatively uniform response across the two different experiments, and that the difference between subsets should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal effect of the subsetting variable.
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Fig. S1. Impressionistic confederate characteristics compared with other persons. Survey responses are divided into four panels for visual ease. Letters represent the mean response for each of the characteristics for confederates (C), other Hispanics (H), and Anglos (A). The dotted lines represent 95% confidence intervals of the mean estimate. Letters farther to the right mean that the faces were rated higher on this attribute. When the letters are clustered together, this indicates that respondents saw little difference between the faces. Survey \( n = 757 \). All variables are the average response on a five-point scale from 1 (“does not describe this face at all”) to 5 (“describes this face perfectly”) for each characteristic. All variables are recoded 0–1. White and Hispanic are the percent of respondents agreeing that the face looked “White” and “Hispanic,” respectively.

Fig. S2. Conditional ATE by number of Latino friends. Points are conditional average treatment effects (CATE) and 95% confidence intervals for persons with pretreatment, self-reported lowest quartile of Latino friends (L) (0), inner quartile (M) (0–5), or top quartile (H) (>5); \( n = 24, 28, \) and 30, respectively. The T1 mean level and SD in parentheses are listed to the left of each symbol representing the CATE. Confidence intervals are constructed by drawing the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles from the randomization distribution.
Fig. S3. CATE by ideology. Points are CATE and 95% confidence intervals for pretreatment, self-identified liberals (L), moderates (M), and conservatives (C). \( n = 49, 21, \) and 21, respectively. The T1 mean level and SD in parentheses are listed to the left of each symbol representing the CATE. Confidence intervals are constructed by drawing the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles from the randomization distribution.

Fig. S4. CATE by income. Points are CATE and 95%-confidence intervals for pretreatment, self-reported income subgroups by low income (L) (<$105,000), middle income (M) ($105,000 to 135,000), and high income (H) (> $135,000). The T1 mean level and SD in parentheses are listed to the left of each symbol representing the CATE. Confidence intervals are constructed by drawing the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles from the randomization distribution.

Fig. S5. Recruitment Instrument, front (A) and back (B).
Table S1. Spanish-language priming experiment results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prime experiment</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of immigrants be increased?*†</td>
<td>0.017 (0.301)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of undocumented be allowed to stay?</td>
<td>0.023 (0.434)</td>
<td>0.073 (0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as official language?</td>
<td>0.028 (0.296)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the “Prime experiment” column, ATE represents responses in T2-T1 for the treatment group compared with the control group for the experimental sample for the priming experiment. In the “All respondents” column, ATE represents responses in T2-T1 for the treatment group compared with the control group for the entire experimental sample.

*P values from a one-tailed test against the Null Hypothesis of no effect are in parentheses.

†All variables scaled 0–1.