Appendix A: 2008-2013 Panel Analyses

Table 4: This table summarizes key independent variables for 1,739 white respondents to the October 2012 wave of the 2007-2013 panel.

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Party ID	1.00	7.00	4.16	2.09
Education (in years)	6.00	19.00	13.60	2.30
Income	2.50	250.00	62.50	46.99
Age	23.00	91.00	51.17	15.66
Female	0.00	1.00	0.54	0.50
Married	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.48
Retired	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.43
Disabled	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.25
Co. % Black 2010	0.00	0.73	0.10	0.11
Co. % Immig. 2010	0.00	0.51	0.10	0.09
Co. % with BA 2010	0.07	0.71	0.28	0.10
Co. % Unemployed 2010	0.02	0.20	0.09	0.03
HS Co. % Black	0.00	0.69	0.08	0.10
HS Co. % Immig.	0.00	0.52	0.08	0.08
HS Co. % with BA	0.02	0.58	0.21	0.09
HS Co. % Unemployed	0.01	0.14	0.05	0.02
In Same County as HS	0.00	1.00	0.38	0.49

Table 5: Multilevel linear models with respondent random effects and individual-level independent variables predicting prejudice (0-100). Source: 2007-2013 GfK panel.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Individual Factors			
Intercept	24.83***	24.21***	24.61***
	(3.92)	(4.56)	(4.95)
GOP ID, 2012	0.93***	0.91***	0.90***
	(0.15)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Education, 2008	−1.04***	−0.96***	−0.97***
	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.20)
Income, 2008	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age, 2008	−0.09**	−0.08*	−0.08*
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Female, 2008	−2.85***	−3.17***	−3.25***
	(0.64)	(0.69)	(0.70)
Married, 2012	−1.94**	−1.87*	−1.80*
	(0.71)	(0.76)	(0.79)
Retired, 2012	2.66*	2.11	1.90
	(1.10)	(1.27)	(1.30)
Disabled, 2012	4.33**	2.71	2.85
	(1.33)	(1.43)	(1.47)
Contextual Factors			
Contemp. Co % Black	8.27**		1.30
	(3.06)		(3.99)
Contemp. Co % Immig.	1.12		−1.98
	(4.41)		(5.38)
Contemp. Co % with BA	−0.90		−0.73
	(4.20)		(4.82)
Contemp. Co % Unemployed	−10.93		−0.10
	(15.66)		(18.11)
HS Co. % Black		12.49***	12.30**
		(3.54)	(4.25)
HS Co. % Immig.		4.32	6.10
		(4.55)	(5.13)
HS Co % with BA		−3.72	−3.66
		(4.47)	(4.79)
HS Co % Unemployed		−24.31	−27.91
		(18.31)	(19.42)
Observations	7559	5896	5738
Individuals	1682	1316	1280

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$

Table 6: This table presents models of contemporary contexts (columns 1-4) and high school contexts (5-6) for the 2007-2013 panelists separately for those who live in a different county from where they went to high school (columns 1, 3, & 5) or did not (columns 2, 4, & 6). The results are again substantively quite similar when including potentially post-treatment individual-level variables (columns 3 & 4).

	Different Co.	Same Co.	Diff. Co.	Same Co.	Diff. Co.	Same Co.
Intercept	7.76*	13.24*	18.34*	31.56*	20.16*	32.01*
	(2.96)	(4.23)	(5.17)	(7.40)	(5.70)	(8.20)
Age	0.03	0.06	−0.06	−0.08	−0.06	−0.11
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.07)
Female	−3.03*	−3.46*	−3.08*	−3.58*	−3.02*	−3.77*
	(0.83)	(1.15)	(0.81)	(1.14)	(0.87)	(1.18)
Cont. Co. % Black	0.56	17.88*	0.27	18.92*		
	(3.76)	(5.99)	(3.67)	(5.94)		
Cont. Co. % Immig.	−0.05	−0.17	2.17	−1.56		
	(5.89)	(8.06)	(5.82)	(8.01)		
Cont. Co. % w BA	−2.97	−12.04	2.33	−11.19		
	(5.28)	(8.00)	(5.18)	(7.99)		
Cont. Co. Unemp.	3.42	−40.71	15.00	−44.99		
	(20.16)	(29.11)	(19.73)	(28.61)		
Partisan ID			1.17*	0.51	1.18*	0.52
			(0.20)	(0.27)	(0.21)	(0.28)
Education			−0.93*	−1.10*	−0.89*	−1.16*
			(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.23)	(0.35)
Income			0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01
			(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
Married			−1.87*	−1.80	−1.81	−1.52
			(0.92)	(1.23)	(0.97)	(1.28)
Retired			0.62	3.96*	0.56	2.90
			(1.44)	(1.89)	(1.65)	(2.10)
Disabled			−0.56	7.56*	−1.02	7.60*
			(1.86)	(2.22)	(1.94)	(2.27)
HS Co. % Black					8.15	24.74*
					(4.30)	(6.66)
HS Co. % Immig.					6.06	7.56
					(5.70)	(8.09)
HS Co. % with BA					−3.13	−10.30
					(5.44)	(8.17)
HS Co. % Unemp.					−10.87	−61.60
					(22.09)	(33.73)
Num. of Obs.	3828	2404	3808	2402	3460	2278
Num. of Resp.	853	532	849	531	775	505

$^{*}p < 0.05$

Table 7: This table presents the 2007-2013 panel results when subsetting by respondents who are under 50 (first column) or the reverse (second column). The third column presents a model with a multiplicative interaction between age and the adolescent county's percentage black.

	< 50	≥ 50	All
Intercept	8.19*	8.26	8.65**
	(3.71)	(8.45)	(2.93)
Age	0.10	0.05	0.05
	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.04)
Female	−3.71***	−2.53*	−3.19***
	(0.99)	(1.05)	(0.71)
HS Co. % Black	15.89**	10.46	15.87
	(5.04)	(5.69)	(12.67)
HS Co. % Immig.	13.97	1.13	4.69
	(8.22)	(6.34)	(4.54)
HS Co. % with BA	−11.46	−3.77	−5.65
	(7.10)	(8.80)	(4.50)
HS Co. Unemp.	−35.04	−31.75	−24.31
	(27.54)	(30.30)	(18.84)
Age x HS Co. % Black			−0.05
			(0.26)
Num. of Obs.	3046	2714	5760
Num. of Resp.	681	604	1285

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$

2007-2013 Panel Analyses: Additional Moderators

Table 8 illustrates that the results are quite stable when also including a measure of each counties' partisan context, either in high school or at the time of the survey. To measure high school partisan contexts, for every county and for all relevant elections beginning in 1948, we estimated the county's share of the two-party vote going to the Democratic candidate. We then subtracted the average county's Democratic vote share to remove election-specific shifts toward either party. Each respondent is assigned the average value of her county's Democratic surplus or deficit for two recent elections.

One strain of research on racial contexts emphasizes the role of economic competition. In Table 9, we test that prospect by examining the possibility that the effect of adolescent racial contexts is moderated by socioeconomic conditions at the same time, measured via either county-level unemployment or educational attainment. Regardless of model specification or our measure of economic insecurity, the core relationship is not markedly different in more economically distressed places.[27]

What about the effect of inter-personal encounters in micro-level contexts? Another possibility is that for some respondents, growing up or living in heavily black counties may provide opportunities to develop meaningful, prejudice-reducing relationships across racial lines (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). If so, we need to separate out those who had contact in high school and for whom the county-level racial context might have promoted tolerance from those who had limited contact. To consider those possibilities, we employ survey questions which asked respondents how frequently they had conversations with blacks during high school. Table 10 presents models which include these measures or subset the respondents on the basis of them. Contact itself is associated with reduced prejudice (-0.44, SE=0.22), and high school racial contexts become somewhat

---

[27]There is a hint that the effect of high school racial contexts may be larger in counties with higher unemployment ($\beta = 16.7$, SE=4.7 vs. $\beta = 7.8$, SE=6.3), although the difference between the two is far from significant (p=0.25). Nor in separate models (not shown) do we find any interaction between contemporary levels of unemployment and adolescent racial context: economic threat in the present does not appear to trigger the effects of racial contexts from the past. The coefficient on the interaction is 53 (SE=117).

more strongly associated with prejudice accounting for contact (14.7, SE=3.7). The effect of high school racial contexts proves stronger among those who report no contact (23.7, SE=7.0) than among those who do (10.5, SE=4.4)—but in either case, the effect is sizable and statistically significant. The prejudice-inducing effects of racial contexts appear even for those who had direct contact, suggesting that larger social contexts such as counties may increase prejudice accounting for micro-level interactions.

Table 8: This table presents models including measures of county-level partisanship, whether while in high school or at the same time as the panel was administered. These results are from multi-level models clustered at the respondent level for the 2007-2013 panel data.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	10.17*	8.59*	10.56*
	(2.43)	(2.86)	(3.59)
Age	0.04	0.05	0.04
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Female	−2.69*	−3.24*	−3.30*
	(0.65)	(0.73)	(0.75)
Cont. Co. % Black	9.22*		6.10
	(3.33)		(5.10)
Cont. Co. % Immig.	0.51		−4.13
	(4.83)		(6.14)
Cont. Co. % w/ BA	−5.17		−6.25
	(4.45)		(5.36)
Cont. Co. % Unemp.	−13.86		−8.89
	(16.36)		(19.70)
Cont. Co. % Dem.	−1.26		−1.83
	(3.16)		(3.90)
HS Co. % Black		12.81*	10.70*
		(4.13)	(5.23)
HS Co. % Immig.		4.12	9.66
		(4.86)	(5.49)
HS Co. % w/ BA		−6.15	−2.44
		(4.61)	(5.03)
HS Co. % Unemp.		−19.00	−20.69
		(19.53)	(20.91)
HS Co. % Dem.		1.99	3.27
		(4.05)	(4.30)
Num. of Obs.	7584	5527	5352
Num. of Resp.	1688	1234	1194

$^*p < 0.05$

Table 9: This table considers possible heterogeneity in the relationship between high school-age racial contexts and economic conditions in the 2007-2013 panel, measured via the high school-age county's unemployment rate (left) or education level (right).

	Inter.	Low Unemp.	High Unemp.	Interact	Low Educ.	High Educ
Intercept	8.89*	6.10	11.29*	8.42*	4.15	15.35*
	(3.05)	(3.86)	(4.08)	(2.83)	(4.31)	(4.49)
Age	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.01
	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Female	−3.19*	−3.01*	−3.38*	−3.20*	−2.09*	−4.49*
	(0.72)	(1.01)	(1.01)	(0.71)	(0.97)	(1.05)
HS Co. % Black	7.91	7.79	16.66*	20.78*	10.84*	14.56*
	(12.24)	(6.32)	(4.73)	(9.71)	(5.13)	(5.47)
Cont. Co. % Unemp.	0.26					
	(18.12)					
HS Co. % Immig.	4.86	3.07	7.71	4.91	7.88	−1.73
	(4.54)	(6.68)	(6.27)	(4.51)	(5.76)	(7.78)
HS Co. % w/ BA	−5.47	1.93	−13.77*	−3.02	−2.18	−12.49
	(4.51)	(6.18)	(6.60)	(5.52)	(13.42)	(8.53)
HS Co. % Unemp.	−24.93	−19.15	−24.30	−24.31	7.14	−59.66*
	(19.25)	(27.48)	(26.60)	(18.77)	(25.05)	(29.22)
HS Co. % Black x Cont. Co. % Unemp.	53.01 (117.19)					
HS Co. % Black x HS Co. % w/ BA				−36.02 (43.93)		
Num. of Obs.	5760	2871	2889	5760	2876	2884
Num. of Resp.	1285	636	649	1285	636	649

*$p < 0.05$

Table 10: This table presents models including a measure of respondents' self-reported contact with blacks while in high school. These results are from multi-level models clustered at the respondent level for the 2007-2013 panel data.

	Model w/ Contact	No Contact	Some Contact
Intercept	9.14*	8.34	9.18*
	(2.78)	(4.70)	(3.56)
Age	0.04	0.04	0.03
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.04)
Female	−3.16*	−3.65*	−2.83*
	(0.70)	(1.17)	(0.88)
HS Co. % Black	14.70*	23.68*	10.53*
	(3.70)	(6.97)	(4.44)
HS Co. % Immig.	4.84	9.56	1.97
	(4.44)	(7.48)	(5.54)
HS Co. % w/ BA	−4.17	−4.16	−4.42
	(4.43)	(8.14)	(5.33)
HS Co. % Unemp.	−21.16	−14.99	−22.09
	(18.51)	(28.98)	(24.39)
Talked to Blacks	−0.44*		−0.13
in HS	(0.22)		(0.39)
Num. of Obs.	5891	2251	3640
Num. of Resp.	1315	502	813

$^{*}p < 0.05$

Table 11: This table presents models including a measure of the percent Black in the surrounding counties. These results are from multi-level models clustered at the respondent level for the 2007-2013 panel data.

	Prejudice	Prejudice	Prejudice
Intercept	8.69*	7.47*	7.67*
	(2.87)	(2.91)	(2.94)
Age	0.05	0.05	0.05
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Female	−3.27*	−3.23*	−3.23*
	(0.74)	(0.73)	(0.74)
HS Co. % Black	12.59*	1.92	0.64
	(4.15)	(6.10)	(6.67)
HS Co. % Immig.	4.18	4.77	5.07
	(4.88)	(4.88)	(4.92)
HS Co. % with BA	−6.33	−5.32	−5.13
	(4.64)	(4.65)	(4.67)
HS Co. % Unemp.	−19.88	−13.15	−13.68
	(19.66)	(19.82)	(19.86)
HS Co. % Dem. Support	2.29	4.04	4.05
	(4.07)	(4.13)	(4.13)
HS Multi-County % Black		16.62*	13.70
		(6.97)	(9.29)
HS Co. % Black x			13.11
HS Multi-County % Black			(27.61)
Num. of Obs.	5483	5483	5483
Num. of Resp.	1225	1225	1225

$^*p < 0.05$

Table 12: This table presents the basic model fit to the 2007-2013 panel separately for respondents who grew up in the South (Column 1) or elsewhere (Column 2).

	Grew Up In South	Grew Up Elsewhere
Intercept	7.76	7.50*
	(9.44)	(3.05)
Age	0.06	0.05
	(0.11)	(0.04)
Female	−4.21	−3.12*
	(2.36)	(0.77)
HS Co. % Black	12.49	6.94
	(10.12)	(5.36)
HS Co. % Immig.	0.99	7.51
	(29.50)	(4.89)
HS Co. % with BA	−7.26	−4.12
	(16.52)	(4.85)
HS Co. % Unempl.	23.27	−12.17
	(75.73)	(20.07)
Num. of Obs.	828	4655
Num. of Resp.	182	1043

*$p < 0.05$

Appendix B: YPSPS Analyses

Table 13: For the 871 white respondents to the YPSPS analyzed here, this table presents the Pearson's correlations between various elements of their adolescent context. Note that "classmates' attitudes" indicates the share of each respondent's classmates reporting that discrimination *is* a major problem.

	Parents' Prejudice	Classmates' Attitudes	School % Black	County % Black
Parents' Prejudice	1.00			
Classmates' Attitudes	-0.22	1.00		
School % Black	0.04	0.09	1.00	
County % Black	0.09	-0.14	0.15	1.00

Table 14: This table summaries key independent variables for 871 white respondents to the YPSPS who participated in the 1997 wave.

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
HS Co. % Black	0.00	0.71	0.09	0.12
HS Co. % w/ BA	0.06	0.39	0.20	0.07
HS Co. % Unemp.	0.01	0.11	0.04	0.02
Co. % Black '82	0.00	0.70	0.09	0.11
Co. % w/ BA '82	0.10	0.65	0.33	0.10
Co. % Unemp. '82	0.01	0.17	0.07	0.03
Co. % Black '97	0.00	0.64	0.10	0.11
Co. % w/ BA '97	0.07	0.64	0.25	0.10
Co. % Unemp. '97	0.02	0.14	0.05	0.02
HS Classmates' Tolerance	0.26	1.00	0.61	0.16
Parents' Prejudice '65	-84.00	99.00	20.11	23.28
HS % Black	0.00	62.50	4.06	8.34
Attended College	0.00	1.00	0.72	0.45
Graduated from College	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.50
Party ID '65	1.00	7.00	3.58	1.94
Male	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50
Age in '65	16.00	24.00	18.12	0.56
Fathers' Education	0.00	20.00	11.76	3.51
Catholic in '65	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.43
Jewish in '65	0.00	1.00	0.05	0.22

Table 15: This table reports the results of OLS models where the dependent variable is a prejudice scale calculated by subtracting white respondents' feeling thermometer ratings of blacks from whites. The data set includes 871 white respondents to the YPSPS who participated in the 1997 wave of the panel. Father's education is coded in years.

	Prej. 65	Prej. 82	Prej. 97	Prej. 82	Prej. 97	Prej. 82	Prej. 97
Intercept	19.36	43.23	25.98	43.10	23.56	47.25*	25.94
	(26.23)	(23.47)	(29.45)	(23.89)	(30.12)	(23.87)	(30.24)
HS Co. % Black	34.01*	17.04*	11.98			17.19*	10.10
	(6.63)	(5.91)	(7.09)			(6.85)	(8.12)
HS Co. % w/ BA	−39.47*	−17.83	−17.24			−16.81	−11.08
	(11.87)	(10.53)	(12.58)			(11.88)	(13.48)
HS Co. % Unemp.	−68.25	−78.10	14.82			−57.91	17.52
	(44.82)	(40.02)	(48.39)			(46.12)	(50.96)
Party ID '65	0.58	−0.21	0.27	−0.17	0.08	−0.18	0.12
	(0.41)	(0.37)	(0.44)	(0.37)	(0.45)	(0.37)	(0.45)
Male	2.08	0.92	0.24	1.08	−0.19	1.03	−0.12
	(1.54)	(1.39)	(1.65)	(1.41)	(1.69)	(1.41)	(1.69)
Age '65	0.61	−0.99	−0.64	−0.97	−0.56	−1.08	−0.69
	(1.41)	(1.27)	(1.59)	(1.28)	(1.63)	(1.28)	(1.63)
Fathers' Education	−0.59*	−0.16	−0.02	−0.19	−0.05	−0.19	−0.03
	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.26)	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.22)	(0.26)
Catholic '65	−4.53*	−3.12	−1.67	−3.15	−2.17	−2.78	−1.74
	(1.92)	(1.71)	(2.05)	(1.72)	(2.04)	(1.76)	(2.10)
Jewish '65	−10.74*	−1.74	−3.07	−1.12	−2.61	−1.46	−2.66
	(3.75)	(3.39)	(4.04)	(3.47)	(4.19)	(3.47)	(4.20)
Attended College		0.03	−1.58	0.03	−1.20	−0.13	−1.40
		(1.91)	(2.28)	(1.94)	(2.32)	(1.94)	(2.34)
Graduated from College		−6.80*	−3.81	−6.26*	−4.32*	−6.68*	−4.35*
		(1.73)	(2.06)	(1.75)	(2.09)	(1.75)	(2.10)
Co. % Black '82				11.87		1.07	
				(6.32)		(7.31)	
Co. % w/ BA '82				−9.43		−2.61	
				(7.76)		(8.81)	
Co. % Unemp. '82				−58.00*		−38.93	
				(28.98)		(32.86)	
Co. % Black '97					11.27		5.93
					(8.20)		(9.26)
Co. % w/ BA '97					−9.14		−7.40
					(9.12)		(9.58)
Co. % Unemp. '97					29.43		36.57
					(48.79)		(50.93)
Num. of Obs.	805	791	787	779	757	779	757

$^*p < 0.05$

Table 16: This table reports the results for contemporary contexts (left) and high school-age contexts (right) for respondents who did or did live in a different county in high school.

	Grew Up in Same County	Grew Up in Different County	Grew Up in Same County	Grew Up in Different County
Intercept	51.32	20.38	54.30	20.57
	(28.60)	(25.80)	(28.50)	(25.68)
Cont. Co. % Black	31.43*	7.11		
	(9.84)	(5.91)		
Cont. Co. % w/ BA	−7.15	−10.35		
	(10.48)	(7.27)		
Cont. Co. % Unemp.	−38.36	−24.93		
	(39.02)	(33.50)		
Attended College	−2.69	1.55	−2.63	1.08
	(2.30)	(2.06)	(2.31)	(2.04)
Graduated from College	−4.32	−6.08*	−4.36	−6.39*
	(2.36)	(1.67)	(2.36)	(1.68)
Party ID '65	−0.15	0.00	−0.07	−0.03
	(0.49)	(0.36)	(0.49)	(0.36)
Male	3.90*	−1.29	3.74*	−1.18
	(1.85)	(1.37)	(1.85)	(1.36)
Age in 1965	−1.67	−0.12	−1.80	−0.14
	(1.54)	(1.38)	(1.54)	(1.38)
Fathers' Education	−0.24	−0.03	−0.13	−0.05
	(0.30)	(0.20)	(0.30)	(0.20)
Catholic '65	−6.63*	−1.10	−5.75*	−0.97
	(2.28)	(1.66)	(2.29)	(1.70)
Jewish '65	−11.03	1.37	−9.02	0.63
	(5.76)	(3.10)	(5.70)	(3.07)
HS Co. % Black			28.95*	10.96*
			(10.12)	(5.33)
HS Co. % w/ BA			−23.45	−12.18
			(14.30)	(10.24)
HS Co. % Unemp.			−26.63	−32.92
			(49.53)	(41.23)
Num. of Obs.	556	980	556	980
Num. of Resp.	2	2	2	2

$^*p < 0.05$

Table 17: This table presents models of prejudice among YPSPS respondents. They consider whether the conditional correlation between white respondents' high school county percent black and prejudice is higher or lower in counties with more economic distress, measured by unemployment (left) or education (right).

	Interaction	Low Unemp.	High Unemp.	Interaction	Low Educ.	High Educ.
Intercept	36.12	65.17*	11.08	35.91	40.83	44.59
	(19.15)	(29.38)	(26.48)	(19.13)	(32.21)	(24.69)
HS Co. % Black	35.16	4.14	16.25	35.54*	21.10*	12.44
	(19.55)	(7.73)	(8.92)	(13.96)	(8.80)	(6.87)
HS Co. % Unemp.	5.79	28.82	−51.64	−27.42	32.20	−23.90
	(40.93)	(132.71)	(54.74)	(34.11)	(65.31)	(42.43)
HS Co. % w/ BA	−13.65	2.10	−11.74	−2.44	8.31	−29.66
	(8.96)	(15.49)	(11.92)	(10.62)	(23.54)	(18.94)
Cont. Co. % Black	5.20	−5.76	7.75	3.34	8.68	1.48
	(5.71)	(8.20)	(8.82)	(5.79)	(8.61)	(8.19)
Cont. Co. % w/ BA	−6.38	8.40	−13.76	−5.79	4.33	−18.99*
	(6.36)	(9.26)	(8.94)	(6.32)	(9.03)	(9.28)
Cont. Co. % Unemp.	−17.21	21.74	−24.38	−13.80	−35.38	2.42
	(27.11)	(43.72)	(36.46)	(27.11)	(37.23)	(40.01)
Attended	−0.51	0.40	−1.56	−0.80	−2.16	−2.31
College	(1.51)	(2.27)	(2.08)	(1.51)	(2.16)	(2.19)
Graduated from	−5.54*	−6.41*	−4.54*	−5.41*	−3.17	−5.58*
College	(1.36)	(2.06)	(1.91)	(1.36)	(2.01)	(1.89)
Party ID	−0.03	−0.27	−0.00	−0.06	−1.29*	1.31*
	(0.29)	(0.43)	(0.41)	(0.29)	(0.41)	(0.42)
Male	0.44	−0.52	1.05	0.39	0.64	−0.48
	(1.10)	(1.59)	(1.57)	(1.10)	(1.57)	(1.55)
Age '65	−0.85	−2.67	0.43	−0.92	−1.18	−1.11
	(1.02)	(1.56)	(1.43)	(1.02)	(1.72)	(1.28)
Fathers' Education	−0.12	−0.40	0.43	−0.09	−0.14	−0.08
	(0.17)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.17)	(0.25)	(0.23)
Catholic '65	−2.20	−5.44*	−0.91	−2.57	−8.22*	2.76
	(1.37)	(1.92)	(2.01)	(1.36)	(2.08)	(1.86)
Jewish '65	−2.07	−5.17	−4.21	−2.16	−4.45	0.78
	(2.71)	(4.01)	(4.66)	(2.71)	(5.64)	(3.16)
HS Co. % Black x	−529.40					
HS Co. % Unemp.	(446.98)					
HS Co. % Black x				−104.83		
HS Co. % w/ BA				(59.78)		
Num. of Obs.	1536	732	762	1536	754	767
Num. of Respondents	2	2	2	2	2	2

*$p < 0.05$

Table 18: This table reports the results of multi-level models with respondent random effects fit to the YPSPS data separately for those who grew up in the South (left) or elsewhere (right).

	Grew Up In South	Grew Up Elsewhere
Intercept	46.13	40.65
	(45.34)	(21.43)
HS Co. % Black	13.73	10.50
	(12.19)	(6.21)
HS Co. % w/ BA	−6.62	−4.07
	(24.57)	(10.24)
HS Co. % Unemp.	−109.18	−8.25
	(100.69)	(37.21)
Cont. Co. % Black	−0.30	5.02
	(11.55)	(6.81)
Cont. Co. % w/ BA	8.68	−8.30
	(12.99)	(7.36)
Cont. Co. % Unemp.	−60.76	6.19
	(65.23)	(30.67)
Attended College	−0.36	−1.91
	(3.56)	(1.70)
Graduated from College	−12.51*	−3.52*
	(2.85)	(1.55)
Party ID '65	−1.73*	0.55
	(0.65)	(0.33)
Male	0.55	0.16
	(2.55)	(1.22)
Age in 1965	−0.93	−1.30
	(2.38)	(1.16)
Fathers' Education	0.44	−0.26
	(0.36)	(0.19)
Catholic '65	−11.73*	−0.80
	(5.27)	(1.45)
Jewish '65	−10.51	−0.11
	(10.82)	(2.87)
Num. of Obs.	293	1243
Num. of Resp.	2	2

$^{*}p < 0.05$

Table 19: To consider self-selection, this table presents OLS models in which YPSPS respondents' 1997 racial contexts are the outcome measure and respondents' 1965 racial prejudice is the key predictor variable. Column three omits respondents who were residents of the South in 1965. Column 1 indicates that respondents who were more prejudiced in 1965 lived in counties with *larger* Black population shares on average.

	Pct. Black '97	Pct. Black '97	Pct. Black '97	Pct. Black '97
Intercept	−3.58	0.09	7.55	−2.93
	(12.49)	(12.40)	(13.22)	(12.55)
Prejudice '65	0.03*	0.02	0.02	0.02
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Co. % Black '65	35.73*	31.53*	25.57*	31.63*
	(3.26)	(3.40)	(3.81)	(3.40)
Co. % BA '65	−14.42*	−8.70	−10.50	−7.96
	(5.66)	(5.79)	(6.07)	(5.82)
Party ID '65	−0.15	−0.06	−0.17	−0.03
	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.20)
Attended Coll.	0.29	−0.02	−0.12	−0.04
	(1.02)	(1.01)	(1.09)	(1.02)
Coll. Graduate	0.60	0.61	0.19	0.69
	(0.91)	(0.90)	(0.98)	(0.92)
Male '65	0.66	0.64	0.68	0.42
	(0.74)	(0.74)	(0.79)	(0.74)
Age '65	0.51	0.19	−0.15	0.36
	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.72)	(0.68)
Fathers' Ed.	0.23*	0.26*	0.27*	0.24*
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.11)
Catholic '65	−0.29	0.36	0.55	0.67
	(0.92)	(0.92)	(0.93)	(0.93)
Jewish '65	5.73*	6.50*	7.62*	6.55*
	(1.79)	(1.78)	(1.78)	(1.82)
South '65		4.38*		4.54*
		(1.10)		(1.11)
Prejudice '82				−0.02
				(0.02)
Adj. R^2	0.20	0.21	0.12	0.21
Observations	765	765	617	747

$^*p < 0.05$

Table 20: *OLS models predicting racial prejudice in 1965, 1982, and 1997 using 1965 racial contexts.*

	Prejudice 1965	Prejudice 1982	Prejudice 1997
Intercept	47.79	60.52*	38.49
	(27.42)	(25.57)	(33.46)
Co. % Black '65	35.06*	17.91	15.29
	(9.34)	(9.80)	(11.67)
Co. % BA '65	9.01	4.02	−3.91
	(14.02)	(13.89)	(16.06)
Parents' Prejudice	0.15*	0.04	0.03
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Classmates' Concern	−43.12*	−13.56*	−3.57
about Discrimination	(6.44)	(6.03)	(7.50)
HS % Black '65	−0.07	0.01	−0.41*
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.16)
Party ID '65	0.37	−0.48	0.03
	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.52)
Male '65	2.19	0.33	−1.46
	(1.65)	(1.55)	(1.89)
Age '65	−0.61	−1.91	−1.08
	(1.45)	(1.36)	(1.78)
Fathers' Ed.	−0.28	−0.09	0.10
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.30)
Catholic '65	−0.56	−1.73	−1.21
	(2.13)	(1.99)	(2.45)
Jewish '65	−3.18	−0.30	0.71
	(4.73)	(4.52)	(5.64)
Co. % Black '82		−9.14	
		(8.38)	
Co. % BA '82		1.25	
		(8.49)	
Attended Coll.		−2.20	−3.47
		(2.15)	(2.62)
Coll. Graduate		−5.72*	−5.38*
		(1.94)	(2.34)
Co. % Black '97			8.97
			(9.60)
Co. % BA '97			−10.60
			(10.17)
Adj. R^2	0.17	0.04	0.03
Num. obs.	622	600	584

*$p < 0.05$

Appendix C: Survey Item Wording

White Racial Prejudice (waves 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8). Whites rated whites and blacks on three scales, ranging from hardworking to lazy, intelligent to unintelligent, and trustworthy to untrustworthy. "Next are some questions about various groups in our society. Below are left-right scales on which you can rate characteristics of people in different groups. For the first item below, the far left side of the scale means that you think most of the people in that group are extremely "hard working." Placing the slider on the far right side means that you think most of the people in that group are extremely "lazy." The middle means that you think the people in this group are not particularly towards one end or the other." As practice, respondents were first asked, "Where would you rate physicians in general on this scale?" Immediately after, respondents were asked to rate either whites or blacks, and later in the survey asked about the other group (with the order randomized). "Where would you rate Whites in general on these scales?" "Where would you rate Blacks in general on these scales?"