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Some evidence that differing interpretations were on racial lines.
Our key question:

If individuals’ race does alter their perceptions of events like Ferguson, how might that occur?
An initial study
Aug 29 - Sept 8, 2014
(3 weeks after the events in question)

- Questions about Ferguson embedded in the first wave of a four-wave panel study
- Nonprobability survey conducted on Qualtrics, using panelists sourced from Clear Voice
- 3,729 respondents
  (2,962 White, Non-Hispanic only; 253 Black, Non-Hispanic only)
- No quotas or weights applied
Four key questions:

- Given what you have heard, do you think that Darren Wilson, the police officer, should be charged with murder?
  (Definitely should be charged, probably should be charged, probably should not be charged, definitely should not be charged)

- Given what you have heard, how likely do you think it is that Michael Brown attacked Darren Wilson, the police officer?
  (Not at all likely, a little likely, somewhat likely, very likely, extremely likely)

- Do you happen to recall whether Michael Brown had a weapon?
  (He definitely did not have a weapon, he probably did not have a weapon, he probably had a weapon, he definitely had a weapon)

- How much of a role do you think race played in the shooting?
  (No role at all, a little role, a moderate role, a large role, an enormous role)

All variables coded to range from 0 to 1
Large differences in beliefs

- Wilson Should Be Charged
- Brown Attacked Wilson
- Brown Had Weapon
- Role of Race In Shooting
And the more people said they had heard about Ferguson . . .
And the more people said they had heard about Ferguson . . .
And the more people said they had heard about Ferguson . . .
Hence

- Evidence of a clear racial divide
- More informed respondents had the most discrepant perceptions of the incident
- But was this due to biases in the information people received, the people who sought information, or the lens through which they interpreted that information?
Three possible explanations for the racial divide in Ferguson

1. Racial differences in media exposure

2. Motivated reasoning on the basis of social identity (instead of partisanship)

3. Updating from radically different prior beliefs
The current study
Two-wave panel design

- Nonprobability surveys conducted on Qualtrics
- Quotas to achieve a 50% Black, 50% White sample
- Wave 1 collected June 15-20, 2016; N=1,430
- Wave 2 collected June 27-Aug 5, 2016; N=895
- Recontact rate of 62.6%
- Individuals contacted after July 5 (date of the Baton Rouge shooting) were excluded from all analyses.
The current study
Two-wave panel design

• Wave 1: Demographics, racial identity, perceptions of the criminal justice system, racial resentment, perceptions of Ferguson

• Wave 2: Experimental racial identity prime, scenario with statement evaluations (7 statements), questions about additional information desired (to measure selective exposure), overall perceptions of incident

• Respondents were not informed that the two waves were part of the same study
Dear Citizen,

We are writing to you on behalf of a local municipality where a police officer was recently involved in a controversial incident. As you may have heard, there has been increasing concern with police-involved shootings throughout the United States. We're looking to you and to other citizens to understand the best way to deal with the incident that has occurred. We'd like you to put yourself in the role of a local citizen who may be selected to serve on a grand jury deciding whether the officer should be indicted for acting inappropriately or whether he acted in good faith.

Over the course of this survey, we are going to ask you some questions and present you with some information that might be typical in a grand jury. First, we will ask you a few questions about yourself. We'll then present you with information about the incident in question, including an overall description of the incident and a number of witness statements. As in a real jury, we hope that you will tell us what you think of these various pieces of information and what they should contribute to our overall decision about what we should do about the incident in question. We have anonymized some details of the event as well as the city in question.

Your responses to these various pieces of information will help us better determine how to structure jury decision-making.

We appreciate your assistance. At the end of the survey, we will provide you with contact details should you have any questions.
Seven individual statements

Chief of Police, at a press conference shortly after the event:

At 6:47 PM, on the 300 block of [ ] Avenue, police were called to the scene of a heated argument between two individuals. According to the police report, when our officers arrived, one of the individuals, an African-American male in his mid-twenties, later determined to be [Mr. Taylor], fled the scene, at which point, Officer [Silver] pursued him on foot for approximately 50 yards. [Mr. Taylor] turned to confront the officer and reached into his pocket for what at the time appeared to be a weapon. In line with the training we provide all of our officers, Officer [Silver] drew his weapon and shot the subject twice at a distance of approximately 10 feet. Shortly afterwards, additional officers arrived at the scene and the individual was pronounced dead at 7:13 PM.

Officer [Silver] is a veteran police officer in the [ ] Police Department. He has served with competence for 14 years. Although he has offered the opportunity to be promoted to detective in the past, he has chosen to remain a beat cop. Recently, in recognition of his service to the department, Officer [Silver] was awarded our annual "Officer Excellence Award".

With respect to the deceased, we are always saddened when an incident like this occurs in our community. But while we regret that this happened, it is our job to keep our community safe. And when an individual threatens the safety of one of our officers, real or implied, we must take that threat seriously.

Regarding media reports that [Mr. Taylor] had a warrant out for his arrest, this is in fact the case. However, the warrant had nothing to do with this particular event and was for unpaid traffic tickets [Mr. Taylor] had accrued over prior months.

Excerpt from Deposition of Witness 5 - Mrs. Williams:

Where were you when the events occurred?

"I was walking my dog on the other side of [ ] Avenue. I had gone out with the dog a few minutes earlier and noticed the two guys arguing on the street in front of the yellow house, but I didn’t make too much of it at the time. As I’m walking back to my house, a police car pulls up and the officer jumps out and starts running toward one of the guys who was arguing. He tries to get away but doesn’t get very far before the officer catches up with him. They were coming right toward me, so I moved onto the grass and got out of the way. From where I was standing, it looked like the guy was not in good shape. He was breathing heavily and started coughing as he turned around to face the officer. You know how runners look after they’ve finished running? Sweaty, hands on head—that’s what the guy was doing. And the officer just takes the gun and shoots him. I couldn’t believe it. Kid didn’t put up a struggle or anything."
Seven individual statements

Chief of Police, at a press conference shortly after the event:

At 6:47 PM, on the 300 block of [ ] Avenue, police were called to the scene of a heated argument between two individuals. According to the police report, when our officers arrived, one of the individuals, an African-American male in his mid-twenties, later determined to be [Mr. Taylor], fled the scene, at which point, Officer [Silver] pursued him on foot for approximately 50 yards. [Mr. Taylor] turned to confront the officer and reached into his pocket for what at the time appeared to be a gun. Firing with

Respondents encountered all statements in the same order

officer [Silver] is a veteran police officer in the [ ] Police Department. He has served with competence for 14 years. Although he has been offered the opportunity to be promoted to detective in the past, he has chosen to remain a beat cop. Recently, in recognition of his service to the department, Officer [Silver] was awarded our annual "Officer Excellence Award".

With respect to the deceased, we are always saddened when an incident like this occurs in our community. But while we regret that this happened, it is our job to keep our community safe. And when an individual threatens the safety of one of our officers, real or implied, we must take that threat seriously.

Regarding media reports that [Mr. Taylor] had a warrant out for his arrest, this is in fact the case. However, the warrant had nothing to do with this particular event and was for unpaid traffic tickets [Mr. Taylor] had accrued over prior months.

"I was walking my dog on the other side of [ ] Avenue. I had gone out with the dog a few minutes earlier and noticed the two guys arguing on the street in front of the yellow house, but I didn't make too much of it at the time. As I'm walking back to my house, a police car pulls up and the officer jumps out and starts running toward one of the guys who was arguing. He tries to get away but doesn't get very far before the officer catches up with him. They were coming right toward me, so I moved onto the grass and got out of the way. From where I was standing, it looked like the guy was not in good shape. He was breathing heavily and started coughing as he turned around to face the officer. You know how runners look after they've finished running? Sweaty, hands on head...that's what the guy was doing. And the officer just takes the gun and shoots him. I couldn't believe it. Kid didn't put up a struggle or anything."
Seven individual statements

Respondents encountered all statements in the same order

Statements varied in whether they suggested that the officer behaved appropriately or inappropriately

Chief of Police, at a press conference shortly after the event:

At 6:47 PM, on the 300 block of [ ] Avenue, police were called to the scene of a heated argument between two individuals. According to the police report, when our officers arrived, one of the individuals, an African-American male in his mid-twenties, later determined to be [Mr. Taylor], fled the scene, at which point, Officer [Silver] pursued him on foot for approximately 50 yards. [Mr. Taylor] turned to confront the officer and reached into his pocket for what he believed to be a weapon. To wit, without any hesitation, Officer [Silver] fired his weapon, striking [Mr. Taylor] in the abdomen, revealing a hollow point bullet. When [Mr. Taylor] was taken into custody at [location], he was found to be in possession of a .45-caliber semiautomatic handgun.

With respect to the incident that occurred on [date], I want to reiterate that this has been an emotion-charged incident. We have a duty to protect our officers and those in our community. When an individual threatens the safety of one of our officers, real or implied, we must take that threat seriously.

Regarding media reports that [Mr. Taylor] had a warrant out for his arrest, this is in fact the case. However, the warrant had nothing to do with this particular event and was for unpaid traffic tickets. [Mr. Taylor] had accrued over prior months.
After the statements, respondents were presented with “excerpts” from additional statements and were asked to tell us what else they would be interested in reading. So that individuals’ information environments remained constant, respondents did not actually get to read the statements, though they had no way of knowing this would be the case at the time.
After all statements, respondents were asked:

• Given what you have heard, how appropriate do you think Officer Silver's actions were?
  (Not at all appropriate, a little appropriate, somewhat appropriate, very appropriate, completely appropriate)

• Given what you have read, do you think that Officer Silver should be charged with a crime?
  (Definitely should be charged, probably should be charged, probably should not be charged, definitely should not be charged)

• Given what you have read, how likely do you think it is that Mr. Taylor attacked Officer Silver?
  (Not at all likely, a little likely, somewhat likely, very likely, extremely likely)

• Do you happen to recall whether Mr. Taylor had a weapon?
  (He definitely did not have a weapon, he probably did not have a weapon, he probably had a weapon, he definitely had a weapon)

• How much of a role do you think race played in the shooting?
  (No role at all, a little role, a moderate role, a large role, an enormous role)

All variables coded to range from 0 to 1
Some expectations

• H1 - Black and White respondents will differ in their summary judgments even when they receive the same information (evidence of biased processing)

• H2 - Respondent will prefer to read excerpts that appear likely to bolster their group identities (evidence of motivated reasoning)

• H3 - Respondents will interpret information in line with their pre-existing beliefs about Blacks and the police (evidence of biased updating)
Summary judgments (H1)

Nearly identical to what we observed after Ferguson! (differences were very slightly smaller)
Initial conclusions

• Evidence of large differences in how respondents process the same information (H1)

• Respondents are somewhat more likely to seek congenial information (H2)

• Racial differences in information processing correspond with differences in prior beliefs about Blacks and fairness of the criminal justice system (H3)
In sum

• Blacks and Whites reach different conclusions about these incidents because they process information differently, not because the encounter different information

• These differences are partially driven by identity-related goals, but are more strongly shaped by different racial experiences

• If we want to minimize perceptual differences, interventions should seek to mitigate diverging experiences and expectations across groups
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Main approach for categorizing Protestants

• Question 1: What is your present religion if any? Are you Protestant, Roman Catholic, Mormon, Orthodox such as Greek or Russian Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, atheist, agnostic, something else, or nothing in particular?

• Question 2: Would you describe yourself as a "born again" or evangelical Christian, or not?

• Question 3: Which of the following describes your race? You can select as many as apply. White, Black or African American, Asian or Asian American or some other race.
## Attendance at religious services

% who say they attend religious services ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Same-sex marriage

% who ___ allowing gays and lesbians to marry legally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Acceptance of homosexuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discouraged by society</th>
<th>Accepted by society</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9 = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Size of government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Smaller govt. w/fewer services</th>
<th>Bigger govt. w/ more services</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Government aid to poor

**% who government aid to the poor ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does more harm than good</th>
<th>Does more good than harm</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Abortion

% who say abortion should be ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illegal in all/most cases</th>
<th>Legal in all/most cases</th>
<th>DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Party affiliation

% who identify as ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rep/lean Rep</th>
<th>Dem/lean Dem</th>
<th>Other/no lean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2016 vote intention

% who say they intended to vote for ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trump/lean Trump</th>
<th>Clinton/lean Clinton</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Prayer

% who say they pray...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily+</th>
<th>Weekly/monthly</th>
<th>Seldom/never</th>
<th>DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Importance of religion

## % who say religion is ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not too/not at all important</th>
<th>DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Belief in God

% who say they ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Believe in God w/absolute certainty</th>
<th>Believe in God, less certain</th>
<th>Don’t believe</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Religious commitment index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High religious commitment</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Biblical literalism

% who say the Bible is ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Literal word of God</th>
<th>Word of God, not literal</th>
<th>Not the word of God</th>
<th>Other/DK/Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Do you consider yourself to be:
   Read:
   1 Straight
   2 Lesbian or gay
   3 Bisexual

   Do not read:
   4 Other
   7 Don’t know/Not sure
   9 Refused

2. Do you consider yourself to be transgender?
   Y/N
   If yes, ask “Do you consider yourself to be 1. male-to-female, 2. female-to-male, or 3. gender non-conforming?”
   1 Yes, Transgender, male-to-female
   2 Yes, Transgender, female to male
   3 Yes, Transgender, gender nonconforming
   4 No

   7 Don’t know/not sure
   9 Refused
Demographic Sex Question

Are you…

1 Male
2 Female

(Note: System may populate field from household enumeration process in landline interviews).
Female Respondents by SOGI Categories

- **Female (186,437)**
  - **Do Not Know (1,960)**
  - **Refused (3,464)**
  - **Straight (175,897)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (176)
    - Yes, Female to Male (270)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (94)
    - No (174,274)
    - DNK (744)
    - Refused (339)
  - **Lesbian or Gay (1,742)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (7)
    - Yes, Female to Male (10)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (9)
    - No (1,707)
    - DNK (3)
    - Refused (6)
  - **Bisexual (2,726)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (16)
    - Yes, Female to Male (16)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (21)
    - No (2,646)
    - DNK (19)
    - Refused (8)
  - **Other (648)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (7)
    - Yes, Female to Male (6)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (9)
    - No (593)
    - DNK (26)
    - Refused (7)
  - **Other (648)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (7)
    - Yes, Female to Male (6)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (9)
    - No (593)
    - DNK (26)
    - Refused (7)
  - **Do Not Know (1,960)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (3)
    - Yes, Female to Male (8)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (2)
    - No (1,607)
    - DNK (303)
    - Refused (37)
  - **Refused (3,464)**
    - Yes, Male to Female (2)
    - Yes, Female to Male (5)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (2)
    - No (1,962)
    - DNK (1,431)

Response to sex question
Response to sexual orientation question
Response to gender identity question
Male Respondents by SOGI Categories

- Male (133,593)
  - Straight (126,613)
    - Yes, Male to Female (423)
    - Yes, Female to Male (116)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (93)
    - No (124,750)
    - DNK (648)
    - Refused (283)
  - Lesbian or Gay (2,386)
    - Yes, Male to Female (16)
    - Yes, Female to Male (5)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (6)
    - No (2,347)
    - DNK (11)
    - Refused (1)
  - Bisexual (1,516)
    - Yes, Male to Female (40)
    - Yes, Female to Male (5)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (23)
    - No (1,421)
    - DNK (17)
    - Refused (10)
  - Other (3)
  - Do Not Know (984)
    - Yes, Male to Female (13)
    - Yes, Female to Male (11)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (4)
    - No (361)
    - DNK (12)
    - Refused (3)
  - Refused (2,003)
    - Yes, Male to Female (6)
    - Yes, Female to Male (132)
    - Yes, Nonconforming (132)
    - No (1,104)
    - DNK (194)
    - Refused (848)

Response to sex question
Response to sexual orientation question
Response to gender identity question
General Health Indicators By SOGI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF DAYS PHYSICAL HEALTH NOT GOOD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DAYS MENTAL HEALTH NOT GOOD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DAYS POOR HEALTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>Gay/Lesiban/ Other</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Is Answering DNK or Refusing? (Transgender/ NE Straight Only)

- **Mean age = 59.3**
  - DNK sexual orientation question = 62.5*
  - DNK gender identity question = 63.3*
  - Refusal sexual orientation question = 59.8
  - Refusal gender identity question = 59.7*

- **Percent male total = 38.9**
  - DNK sexual orientation question = 39.1
  - DNK gender identity question = 39.8
  - Refusal sexual orientation question = 37.44
  - Refusal gender identity question = 37.0

- **Percent married = 47.2**
  - DNK sexual orientation question = 42.1*
  - DNK gender identity question = 38.6
  - Refusal sexual orientation question = 51.2*
  - Refusal gender identity question = 51.8*

- **Percent white = 67.3**
  - DNK sexual orientation question = 60.2
  - DNK gender identity question = 60.9
  - Refusal sexual orientation question = 68.4
  - Refusal gender identity question = 68.6
Summary of Crosstab Results

- No pattern of answering sex, sexual orientation and gender identity
- Refusal rates high
  - Both male and females
  - People may respond DNK or refuse Sexual Orientation and then indicate that they are transgender
- DNK rates higher than other questions
  - Do they understand the question
- Older, respondents more likely to provide DNK/refusal
- Married respondents more likely to refuse to answer
- Differences in general health outcomes by SOGI group
A Few Lessons Learned

- Don’t make assumptions based on traditional sex questions
  - Consider changes in the traditional sex demographic question
- Don’t introduce a skip pattern—the transgender questions should be asked of all respondents
- Populations are small (and dispersed) so we still have problems with weighting/predictive models
- Differences in health outcomes is unexplored territory
- Watch the translation process
Recap

• **RACE:**
  - Large differences in how respondents process the same information
  - Respondents somewhat more likely to seek congenial information, and
  - Racial differences in information processing correspond with differences in prior beliefs

• **RELIGION:**
  - Among respondents who identify as "evangelical", religiosity measures look similar, but…
  - Differences by race: social issues, partisanship, and vote
    - Whites—more Republican, more conservative on social issues, vote Trump
    - Blacks—more Democrat, more mod./liberal on social issues, vote Clinton

• **SOGI:**
  - SO—Refusal rates are high, people may respond DNK or refuse but also identify as transgender
    - Don’t introduce a skip pattern—the transgender question should be asked of all respondents
  - DNK rates higher than other questions
    - Do they understand the question? (Spanish translation revision, 2018?)
    - DNK responses more likely for older respondents and married respondents
  - Differences in general health outcomes by SOGI group—unexplored territory