

ABSTRACT

“Terrorist Threat,” Punitive Public Policy, and the Intersectionality of Racial and Religious Prejudice

Cassidy Story

Director: Dr. Jerry Park, Sociology

Following the events of September 11, 2001, the concept of “terrorist threat” intensified and the demand for public policy protecting American citizens from subsequent attacks accompanied more overt prejudicial attitudes and discrimination towards Muslim Americans and/or those of Middle Eastern descent. The intersectionality of race and religion is especially prevalent and dangerous, since individuals are clustered together based on demographic characteristics associated with terrorist groups, regardless of obvious differences in religious ideology or race/ethnicity. This study examines stereotypes and perceived threat for three groups: Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees. After administering a survey and analyzing the data of over 1,400 Amazon Mechanical Turk respondents, I find that all three groups are viewed as equivalent in stereotyping and level of perceived threat. Furthermore, such perceived threat results in the support for punitive public policies targeting all three groups, regardless of differences in race/ethnicity and religion.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. Jerry Park, Department of Sociology

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

“TERRORIST THREAT,” PUNITIVE PUBLIC POLICY, AND THE
INTERSECTIONALITY OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Cassidy Story

Waco, Texas

May 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review and Theoretical Background.....	2
The Relationship between Race and Religion.....	2
Stereotypes.....	3
Perceived Threat.....	6
Public Policy.....	8
This Study's Contribution.....	9
Hypotheses.....	10
CHAPTER TWO.....	11
Methods.....	11
Participants and Procedure.....	11
Independent Variables.....	13
Stereotype Content.....	13
Perceived Threat.....	14
Age.....	15
Education.....	15
Gender.....	16
Political Affiliation.....	16
Race/Ethnicity.....	16
Dependent Variable: Punitive Public Policy.....	17
Analytic Strategy.....	17
CHAPTER THREE.....	19
Results.....	19

Description of Variables.....	19
The Equivalency of Target Groups' Stereotype/Threat.....	21
Target Groups' Stereotype/Threat/Policy Correlation Matrix.....	23
Target Group Stereotype/Threat and Support for Punitive Public Policy.....	24
Muslim American Logistic Regression.....	25
Arab Immigrant Logistic Regression.....	27
Middle Eastern Refugee Logistic Regression.....	29
Summary of Logistic Regression Results.....	30
CHAPTER FOUR.....	31
Discussion of Results.....	31
Conclusions and Future Research.....	34
APPENDIX.....	38
Latest Version of Mechanical Turk Survey.....	39
REFERENCES.....	60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Jerry Park for his continuous guidance, support, and patience during the writing of this thesis. I am especially grateful for his instruction that sparked my interest in a topic that has become very dear to my heart. I would also like to thank Dr. Christopher Pieper for serving as my mentor throughout my undergraduate education. His insight was a necessary contribution to this paper's foundation. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their ceaseless encouragement and time spent reading multiple drafts throughout the duration of this project.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The United States' current political climate draws attention to the plight of Muslim Americans and the persistent "terrorist threat" stereotype that looms over their daily lives. ISIS has further contributed to the paranoia of Islamic radicalism and its presence among U.S. citizens. Muslim Americans face a distinct form of stereotyping due to the intersectionality of race and religion. Although an ethnically diverse array of people practices Islam, the American general public likely associate the religion with those who have ethnic ties to the Middle East. The terms "Muslim," "Arab," and "Middle Eastern" tend to ring synonymous in many Americans' ears (McCloud 2003, Suleiman 1999, Kaplan 2006). Furthermore, the recent Syrian refugee crisis has prioritized the debate on who the government should allow into the United States whether through granting asylum or as a means of permanent residence. This paper posits that not only do the terms "Muslim American," "Arab immigrant," and "Middle Eastern refugee" equate in stereotyping and perceived threat, but such equivalency impacts public policy attitudes affecting each target group discussed (Byng 2008). Research has yet to establish the direct relationship between the equivalencies made among the aforementioned target groups and how the equivalency of such terms could result in discrimination through punitive policies. This study will address the gap in the literature and discuss the potential implications the findings may have on today's concept of "terrorist threat" and the rise of anti-Muslim prejudice.

Literature Review and Theoretical Background

The Relationship between Race and Religion:

It is easy to forget the presence of anti-Muslim prejudice prior to 9/11. Yet, in the United States, connotations between Muslim (religious) and Arab (ethnic) identities increased as radical Islamic terrorism became a threat to national security. In both Eastern and Western Europe, anti-Muslim discrimination emerged from competition for employment, a common consequence of in-group/out-group boundaries formed among the native-born toward immigrants. Yet, over time, the level of anti-Muslim prejudice rose higher than that of anti-immigrant sentiment due to a perceived threat to physical safety (Strabac and Listhaug 2008).

Some research has attempted to understand American perceptions of racial and religious differences concerning Muslim citizens. Usually, race serves as a source of group conflict since it is widely accepted as a way to distinguish groups in society and treat them unequally. Religion, however, is not nearly as recognizable, and most religious doctrines emphasize good will which tends to result in social order (Hartmann 2011). So, it follows that it is less likely for discrimination to take place as a result of clashing religious ideologies.¹ However, this is not the case with Islam in the West. To help explain this phenomenon, I rely on Herbert Blumer's theory of racial prejudice as a function of the dominant group's determination of group position (Blumer 1958). Rather than discriminating against a group solely because of their race, Blumer contends that the

¹ Of course, there are histories of religiously-based wars, but such differences are not physically visible like racial categories which, in turn, alter perceptions of visible differences between groups.

dominant group establishes which group is subordinate based on key differences between each outgroup and ingroup members. Then it displays prejudicial attitudes to protect their group position in society. Drawing upon Blumer's concept, I contend that the target groups in this study indicate subordinate group statuses due to their differences from the dominant group in race/ethnicity, religion, and nativity. Census information and numerous survey reports show that the numerically dominant group in the US is racially coded as white, non-Hispanic, native-born, and Christian (predominantly Protestant) (US Census Bureau 2015; Schildkraut 2009). Therefore, we expect that target groups identified as outside of these categories will largely be interpreted as minority or subordinate outgroups. Subordinate groups may threaten the dominant group's feeling of superiority, privilege, and advantage, resulting in an effort to maintain group position through prejudicial attitudes and discrimination. According to Blumer's theory, it would follow that all three groups, "Muslim Americans," "Arab immigrants," and "Middle Eastern refugees" signal outgroup identities and viewed as a threat to the dominant group's position. Such threat could result in discrimination through public policy. Notably while "Muslim" indicates a religious identity which was not mentioned as a feature of racial prejudice in Blumer's theory, the term "Muslim" has been racialized to indicate Middle Eastern descent, leading to an equivalence in racial prejudice (Disha et al. 2011; Kaplan 2006).

Stereotypes:

The primary stereotype placed upon Muslim Americans and Arab Americans, particularly in the United States post-9/11 is a tie to terrorism. It is commonly assumed that such groups are more prone to violence and that the majority are in support of

Islamic radicalism merely because they share religious roots or a similar ethnic background. However, this perception is misguided. According to a national sample of Muslim Americans, the Pew Research Center found that only 21 percent of Muslim Americans have a “fair amount” or a “great deal” of support for extremism and the vast majority hold extremely negative views of al Qaeda (Kohut 2011). Furthermore, there is no evident relationship between Muslim Americans’ political and religious views and support for politically motivated violence in the form of suicide bombing. The only significant association found is between Quranic authoritarianism and rejection of politically-motivated violence. In other words, the greater one believes in the authority of the Quran, the more likely he or she is to not support politically-motivated violence, which is a direct contradiction of Islamic radicalism (Acevedo and Chaudhary 2015).

One of the most glaring examples of stereotyping against Muslim Americans takes place within the job market. Although some have posited that secularization theory, defined as the privatization of religion, bears little to no relationship to employment discrimination based on religion, some research has shown that Muslim job applicants face the most discriminatory treatment in comparison to all other religiously-affiliated people (Wallace, Wright, and Hyde 2014). Interpersonal discrimination towards Muslim job applicants is particularly prevalent. King and Ahmad (2010) argue that individuals apply a justification-suppression model to affirm commonly held stereotypes, such as Muslims lacking warmth. The justification-suppression model contends that stereotyping is justified if a targeted individual does not explicitly contradict a commonly-held stereotype. For example, when Muslim applicants do not speak of volunteer work, a commonly “warm” action, non-Muslim employers feel justified in applying a stereotype

of coldness to those applicants if no information contradicts their assumption. Another example of employment discrimination appears when religion is visible. Some Muslim women wear a hijab, or headscarf, that is meant to signify women's submission according to a particular interpretation of Islam. However, the headscarf has been transformed into a symbol of threat and Islamic radicalism to the general non-Muslim western public (Gole 2003). Such prejudice is evident when women of diverse ethnic backgrounds are interpersonally discriminated against in job interviews when wearing a hijab (Ghumman and Ryan 2013). This experiment reinforces the claim that while physiological features indicate a race or ethnicity they are not the sole source of discrimination towards those who are racial and religious minorities.

Research has established a common set of demographics that increase the odds of stereotyping against Arabs and Muslims. Individuals who are politically conservative, older, less educated, and exhibit high levels of religiosity and authoritarianism hold the most discriminatory beliefs (Cribbs and Dmark 2011, Ogan et al 2014). Socioeconomic status is not a consistent predictor of stereotypical views due to contradictory study results. Although those of lower socioeconomic status tend to hold the most anti-Muslim prejudice, white individuals with higher socioeconomic status view minority groups, including the discussed target groups, as more threatening since they have the "most to lose" (Taylor and Mateyka 2011).

Although painted as such, stereotypes are not inherently negative. Psychologist Susan Fiske developed a stereotype content model that measures positive and negative stereotypes assigned to groups with two separate scales. Positive stereotypes are defined by perceived warmth and competency, while negative stereotypes are defined by

perceived coldness or incompetency. In Fiske's original study, Arabs were rated extremely low in warmth, but moderately high in competence (Fiske et al 2002). When using the same warmth/cold model to survey the American public about religious groups, 41 percent of those surveyed rated Muslims as the coldest on the warmth versus cold scale (Cooperman et al 2014). Immigrants were also rated as low in warmth and competence (Caprariello et al 2009). Although these studies show an overlap of warmth stereotypes between Arabs, Muslims, and immigrants, the stereotype content model (SCM) does not address stereotyping against Muslim *Americans*, Arab *immigrants*, or Middle Eastern refugees specifically. This study modifies previously examined outgroup labels in SCM research. Specifically, I incorporate different nativity statuses with the terms "Muslim," "Arab," and "Middle Eastern. To my knowledge, this is the first study to examine the conflation of the refined target groups in an empirical quantitative study.

Perceived Threat:

An increasingly common factor relating to hate crime and discriminatory sentiment is the perception of Muslim Americans as a numerical threat. Many individuals overestimate the number of Muslim Americans due to high concentrations of the group's population in certain areas. Yet, based on recent Pew survey and demographic research, there are currently 3.45 million Muslim Americans in the United States, making up only 1.1 percent of the US population (Mohamed 2018). The media also plays a significant role in exaggerating the presence of both Muslims and those of Middle Eastern descent, especially after September 11, 2001 (Gallagher 2003). That event led to an increase in the number of hate crimes toward Arabs and Muslims (Kaplan 2006). Although the number of hate crimes generally increased after 9/11, in regions with a higher percentage of

Muslim Americans, each individual in those regions had a lower likelihood of facing general discrimination due to an increase in contact with the ingroup (Disha, Cavendish, and King 2011; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). Exposure to the outgroup dramatically decreases prejudice from the dominant ingroup, but a high concentration of a minority group can intensify the perception of numerical threat to the dominant group (Taylor and Mateyka 2011). Interestingly, only about 38 percent of Americans know someone who is Muslim (Cooperman et al 2014). This rarity of contact can greatly exacerbate negative attitudes when the majority relies on the media for their understanding of Muslim Americans. One study found that reliance on the media resulted in support for harmful group-specific policies, stereotyping, and negative emotions, whereas reliance on direct contact conveyed the complete opposite. Individuals were significantly less prejudicial when they were able to utilize personal experiences with the specified group rather than solely base their opinion on what the media decided to show the public (Saleem, Yang, and Ramasubramanian 2016).

Several theories concerning intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes are applicable to the perceived threat of Muslim and Arab Americans and the dominant group. Realistic group threat theory asserts that when two groups are in competition for scarce resources, the potential success of one group threatens the well-being of the other, resulting in negative outgroup attitudes (Riek et al 2006). This follows the concept of zero-sum integration. In contrast, symbolic threat theory focuses on conflicting values and beliefs. A study by Brendan R. Watson and Daniel Riffe on perceived threat and its relationship to immigration policy support found a strong association between higher perceived threat level of immigrants and subsequent support of punitive public policy. To

explain this relationship, Watson and Riffe utilized realistic and symbolic group threat theories where realistic threat was defined as a threat to political clout and resources and symbolic threat was defined as a threat to the subjective definition of “American” which is usually associated with Christian values, being born in the United States, and speaking English (2013). This relates to a perceived threat to cultural values from immigrants, such as individuals that migrated from the Middle East, or religious values in the case of Muslim Americans. To encompass all types of potential threat, integrated threat theory combines realistic group threat and symbolic threat theory to make the case that both contribute to intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes. This study applies integrated threat theory to help explain higher perceived threat towards Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees and its relationship to the support for punitive public policy. The literature has not yet examined the types of threat associated with the aforementioned target groups, nor the possible synonymous links between the terms, nor their relationship to punitive public policy.

Public Policy:

Based on past research, both stereotypes and types of threat should be associated with the support for punitive public policy against the target groups. Ryan King and Darren Wheelock’s study about punitive policies against African Americans showed that feeling a threat to economic resources and to physical safety serve as main indicators of support for punitive policies (2007). A threat to values also tends to result in moral disgust and Muslims are rated almost as threatening as atheists, who hold the highest level of value-related threat due the widely-held belief that atheism implies a lack of morality (Cook, Cottrell, and Webster 2015).

September 11, 2001 played a significant role in the increasing intolerance of Muslim Americans. Although the majority of Americans are supportive of the protection of civil liberties, such sentiment is less present towards Muslims. Initiatives such as the U.S. Patriot Act and other national security measures have sparked the question of how important it is to protect those prone to be associated with terrorism (Sullivan and Hendricks 2009). Post-9/11 efforts that were helpful in fighting hate crime included “leadership in the form of effective intervention by the U.S. President, decisive law enforcement intervention on the federal and local levels, grassroots outreach to Muslims by religious, civic and educational groups, and moral ambiguity in the rapid dissolution of American consensus over the War on Terror following the invasion of Iraq” (Kaplan 2006). Other groups have however been subject to Islamophobia including Arab Americans (most of whom are not Muslim), and refugees from the Middle East (many of whom are also not Muslim). This study seeks to establish if Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees are viewed as synonymous based on stereotyping and perceived threat, and if such synonymy results in equal levels of discrimination through public policy.

This Study's Contribution:

U.S. politics has manipulated the concept of “terrorist threat” as a means of bipartisan debate and has consequently isolated American citizens through racial/ethnic and religious profiling. Muslims and those of Arab or Middle Eastern descent tend to be viewed as synonymous and simultaneously foreign. This could result in similar negative stereotyping, high levels of perceived threat, and discriminatory public policy toward these minority groups. In order to address such an issue, it is important to understand

what shapes American public opinion. This study intends to establish a more direct relationship between stereotyping, perceived threat, and punitive public policy. The target groups “Muslim Americans,” “Arab immigrants,” and “Middle Eastern refugees,” are specifically being studied to address various combinations of race/ethnicity, religion, and nativity commonly associated with the “terrorist threat.” These results will improve our understanding of the intersectional relationship between ethnic, racial, nativist, and religious stereotypes and perceived threat and their relationship to punitive policy attitudes.

Hypotheses

Based on the previous review of extant research on prejudice and stereotyping, I hypothesize the following:

H1: The terms “Muslim American,” “Arab immigrant,” and “Middle Eastern refugee” will be viewed as equivalent in stereotyping characteristics and perceived threat.

H2(a): Stereotypes of perceived coldness and incompetence against Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees will similarly predict support for punitive public policy against each target group.

H2(b): Greater perceived threat towards Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees will similarly predict support for punitive public policy against each target group.

CHAPTER TWO

Methods

Participants and Procedure:

This study is based on responses from 1,404 US citizens who completed an online Qualtrics survey administered by Amazon Mechanical Turk. Mechanical Turk (or MTurk) is a platform for individual respondents (termed “workers”) to be compensated for taking surveys online. These surveys are submitted by researchers (called “requesters”) from a variety of fields from business, marketing to the social sciences. While MTurk is not strictly representative of the population, it is more diverse than the typical sample of college students used in numerous social and psychological studies (Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling 2011). For this survey, we required that respondents be U.S. citizens and reside currently in the US. In order to compensate for the disproportional presence of college-educated and younger workers found in previous research on MTurk worker characteristics (Huff and Tingley 2015; Paolacci, Chandler, and Iperotis 2010), additional requirements were established at several stages of data collection. By the midpoint or third wave (termed “batch”) of data collection we ascertained that the sample was both disproportionately young and highly-educated. To address this issue, we added an age minimum requirement (36 years) in addition to the aforementioned citizenship and residency requirements for the next two waves. This requirement was added in the introduction of the survey, and if respondents chose an age under 35 years old for the first question, the respondent was removed from the survey.

This requirement did not address the education skew, so we replaced the age requirement with an education requirement blocking individuals with a four-year college degree or more in the last batch of data collection.

Surveys were administered in waves of about 300 or more over a six-week period. After each batch, responses were vetted for survey completion and workers received compensation within three days. Each participant entered the randomized unique survey code found at the end of their survey into the Mechanical Turk system to identify their completion and resultant data. MTurk workers are compensated based on amounts determined by clients. Using the national minimum wage as our benchmark, we compensated workers at \$0.75 per survey. Our pre-test of the survey instrument showed an average of six minutes per survey. Workers were notified that the survey was short, but to ensure completion, workers were given up to 30 minutes to complete 33 questions and enter their survey code into Mechanical Turk. To minimize missing data, we required workers to answer nearly every question in order to receive the survey completion authentication code. However, some workers did not provide the code at the end of their surveys, so their participation could not be confirmed. In order to ensure that all workers were compensated, survey responses were deleted if the participant's code did not match to a worker's ID. This decreased our sample size from approximately 2,000 respondents to 1,404 compensated workers. Each participant received \$0.75 for their survey response and were prevented from participating again by blocking their Worker ID number from completing the survey an additional time.

Independent Variables

Stereotype Content:

Target group labels “Muslim Americans,” “Arab immigrants,” and “Middle Eastern refugees” were ranked on the stereotype characteristics drawing from work from Fiske et al. (2002). Fiske et al.’s research found that most assessments of outgroups rest on two characteristics, perceived warmth and perceived competence. Put together, these two characteristics present two continuums or axes forming a matrix where various outgroups are positioned. Fiske’s study included target outgroups such as Muslims and immigrants, which are of particular interest to this study. To create the warmth and competence scales we replicated Fiske et al.’s method by asking our respondents to report their level of agreement to a set of terms associated with each target group. Survey questions read: “As viewed by society how [characteristic] are the following groups?” (see appendix for an example of the survey instrument and exact question wording).” We used the characteristics “sincere” and “warm” to gauge warmth and “intelligent” and “competent” to gauge competence. Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Not at all and 5 = Extremely.

We presented respondents with three target groups: Muslim Americans, Middle Eastern refugees, and Arab immigrants. We presented one stereotype at a time while rotating the target groups to address potential ordering effects. We also rotated the stereotype characteristics as well to further reduce potential bias in responses. From these responses we created two additive scales measuring perceived warmth and perceived competence. Each 9-point scale ranged from strong agreement on a given stereotype to strong agreement on the converse stereotype (i.e. cold (2) and warmth (10); incompetence

(2) and competence (10) scales. Overall, each target group had two scales measuring warmth and competence stereotypes.

Perceived Threat:

Threat perceptions were taken from established questions utilized in previous research and modified for our specific purposes. Cottrell et al. found that threats vary across numerous domains and we limited ours to focus on four that measured both realistic and symbolic threat: threat to economic opportunity, physical safety, values, and personal freedoms (Cottrell, Richards, and Nichols 2010). The threat to economic opportunity question read as followed: “(target group) take economic opportunities away from people like me.” The threat to physical safety question read: “(target group) endanger the physical safety of people like me.” The threat to values question read: “(target group) hold values that are morally inferior to the values of people like me.” The threat to personal freedoms question read: “(target group) want to limit the personal freedoms of people like me.” Each type of threat was measured based on responses to a single item (see appendix). We replicated each set of threats with our main three target groups (Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees). Respondents report their level of agreement with each statement on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 4 = Strongly agree). To account for potential ordering effects, we rotated the order of threats per target group and we also rotated the order of the target groups. To analyze perceived threat for each target group, we condensed all four types of threat per target group into 13-point additive scales (three scales in total with 4 = the strongest disagreement and 16 = the strongest agreement).

Age:

The age survey question was treated as an interval-ratio variable, so respondents were able to manually input their age. As previously mentioned in the “Participants and Procedure” section, prospective workers under the age of 36 were unable to complete the survey after three waves of data collection in an effort to diversify the age distribution. We were marginally successful in achieving a more normal distribution on age but discovered a higher-than-expected number of respondents who reported their age as one year older than the cutoff. Given that some portion of this specific response category were truthful and some portion were not, we created two dummy variables that account for the possibility that respondents were more likely under 36 (0 = 35 and younger, 1 = 36 and older) or more likely older than 35 (0 = 36 and younger, 1 = 37 and older). We ran our models using the original age variable and these dummy-coded versions, and none bore any significant relationship to our dependent measures.

Education:

We asked respondents to report their highest educational degree attained using a 7-point scale (12th grade or less, no high school diploma = 1, high school graduate = 2, technical, trade, vocational or business school or program after high school = 3, some college but no degree = 4, two year associate’s degree from a college, university, or community college = 5, four year bachelor’s degree from a college or university = 6, and postgraduate or professional degree = 7). As mentioned previously, respondents who had a Bachelor’s degree or more were unable to complete the survey after the fifth wave of data collection in an effort to normalize the educational attainment distribution. For the purposes of this study, a dummy variable was created to divide individuals who have less

than a Bachelor's degree (No B.A. = 0) and those who have obtained a Bachelor's degree or more (B.A. or more = 1).

Gender:

Respondents were able to choose from the categories: male, female, and other. Since there was a small number of respondents identifying as "other," [N = 3] the responses were removed from future analysis. A dummy variable was created for gender with female = 1 and male = 0.

Political Affiliation:

Political affiliation was measured on a 7-point scale ranging from "strong Republican = 1" to "strong Democrat" = 7. Individuals who identified as Republican regardless of strength of salience (1-3) were grouped together and recoded as "Republican." We repeated this strategy for Democrat affiliates (5-7). Dummy variables were then created with Independents (originally 4) as the reference category.

Race/Ethnicity:

Respondents chose from multiple racial/ethnic groups with the ability to identify as more than one. The categories included: "White," "Hispanic, Latino or Spanish," "Black or African American," "Asian, Middle Eastern or North African," "Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander," and "American Indian or Alaska Native." For the purposes of this study, respondents were then reclassified into the following groups: single-race non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish, and non-Hispanic other (which included Asian, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and American Indian or Alaska Native, and all respondents

who selected multiple racial labels. These four categories were then recoded into dummy variables with “other” as the reference category.

Dependent Variable: Punitive Public Policy

Our main dependent variable consists of responses to a theoretical public policy issue gauging support for punitive measures against each of the target groups. The question asked: “if there were a mass terrorist attack in the U.S. with foreign Arab or Middle-Eastern suspects, would you support or oppose allowing the government to detain the following groups in camps until it can be determined whether they have links to “terrorist organizations.” This question was worded to explicitly suggest a terrorist attack similar to the events of September 11, 2001 and replicate a punitive policy issue that the United States has supported in the past (i.e. Japanese American internment camps in response to the WWII attack on Pearl Harbor). In addition, the question only mentions race/ethnicity (“Arab or Middle Eastern”) and nativity (“foreign”). It purposefully does not include a tie to Islam in order to test a conflation of terms. Respondents could choose either support (1) or oppose (0) per target group. The order of the target groups was rotated for each respondent. In the results section, Table 1 displays the descriptive information for the variables used in this study.

Analytic Strategy

To address Hypothesis 1, the study includes a correlation matrix (Table 2) to examine the hypothesized equivalency in stereotyping and perceived threat of the target groups: Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees. After establishing this relationship, this study used logistic regressions to identify how the primary independent variables (warmth stereotype, competence stereotype, and perceived

threat) impact punitive public policy stances when controlling for demographic variables: race/ethnicity, age, gender, education, and political affiliation. Tables 3-5 utilize the same punitive public policy question as the dependent variable, with results for each target group per table. For each table, Model 1 analyzes Muslim American competence, warmth, and threat, Model 2 analyzes Arab immigrant competence, warmth, and threat with control variables, and Model 3 analyzes Middle Eastern refugee competence, warmth, and threat. Each model provides the beta value, odds ratio, standard error, and statistical significance.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

Description of Variables:

Beginning with the dependent variable in Table 1, punitive public policy, the detainment question is divided by target group which creates three separate dependent variables. The primary independent variables are listed next by target group stereotypes (warmth and competence scales) and perceived threat. These scale variables were created on a scale and their scale ranges, N of respondents, mean, and standard deviation can be found in Table 1. Finally, this study included several demographic variables: age, education, gender, race/ethnicity and political affiliation. Their coding, N of respondents, percentage, and standard deviation can be found in Table 1. The majority of the sample are older than 36 years old, hold less than a Bachelor's degree, are female, white, and identify as Democratic.

Table 1: Description of Variables

Variable	Range	N	Mean or %	SD
<i>Dependent</i>				
Muslim Detain	1 = Support for detaining Muslim Americans, 0 = Oppose	1393	34.1%	0.475
Arab Detain	1 = Support for detaining Arab immigrants, 0 = Oppose	1393	36.0%	0.481
Refugee Detain	1 = Support for detaining Middle Eastern refugees, 0 = Oppose	1393	37.7%	0.486

Primary Independent

Muslim Competence	Scale (2 = Highest degree of incompetence, 10 = Highest degree of competence)	1392	6.59	2.064
Muslim Warmth	Scale (2 = Highest degree of cold, 10 = Highest degree of warmth)	1392	5.65	2.282
Muslim Threat	Scale (4 = Lowest degree of threat, 16 = Highest degree of threat)	1393	7.46	3.635
Arab Competence	Scale (2 = Highest degree of incompetence, 10 = Highest degree of competence)	1392	6.47	2.099
Arab Warmth	Scale (2 = Highest degree of cold, 10 = Highest degree of warmth)	1392	5.55	2.278
Arab Threat	Scale (4 = Lowest degree of threat, 16 = Highest degree of threat)	1393	7.40	3.68
Refugee Competence	Scale (2 = Highest degree of incompetence, 10 = Highest degree of competence)	1392	6.31	2.148
Refugee Warmth	Scale (2 = Highest degree of cold, 10 = Highest degree of warmth)	1392	5.56	2.261
Refugee Threat	Scale (4 = Lowest degree of threat, 16 = Highest degree of threat)	1393	7.50	3.745

Demographics

Age	Age in years (18 to 85), 1 = 37 -85, 0 = 18-36	1399	53.5%	0.499
Educational Attainment	Level completed (1 = BA or more, 0 = Less than BA)	1399	42.7%	0.495
Gender(female)	1 = Female, 0 = Male	1401	53.6%	0.499
Democrat	1 = Democrat, 0 = Not Democrat	1404	45.3%	0.498
Republican	1 = Republican, 0 = Not Republican	1404	30.7%	0.461

Independent	1 = Independent, 0 = Not Independent	1404	23.5%	0.424
White	1 = White, 0 = Not white	1404	76.5%	0.424
African American	1 = Black/African American, 0 = Not Black/African American	1404	8.7%	0.282
Hispanic/Latino	1 = Hispanic/Latino/Spanish, 0 = Not Hispanic/Latino/Spanish	1404	5.3%	0.224
Asian	1 = Asian, 0 = Not Asian	1404	5.1%	0.221
Other Race	1 = Other race, 0 = Not Other race	1404	2.8%	0.166

Note: N = number; SD = standard deviation;
BA = bachelor's degree

When asked the punitive public policy question, more than one-third of respondents supported the detainment of Muslim Americans (34.1%), Arab immigrants (36.0%), and Middle Eastern refugees (37.7%). Respondents rated Muslim American, Arab immigrant, and Middle Eastern refugee competence at nearly the same levels (6.59, 6.47, and 6.31 respectively). The groups' warmth was also rated similarly (5.65, 5.55, and 5.56). Respondents tended to rate competence higher than warmth. Finally, Muslim American, Arab immigrant, and Middle Eastern refugee threat were nearly equal (7.46, 7.40, and 7.50). Overall, responses to the target groups were similar for the warmth and competence scales and the perceived threat scale.

The Equivalency of Target Groups' Stereotype/Threat

Table 2 displays a correlation matrix of the primary independent variables: Muslim American, Arab immigrant, and Middle Eastern refugee warmth/competence scales and perceived threat for each group. It also includes the dependent variable measuring support for punitive public policy: Muslim Detain, Arab Detain, and Refugee

Detain. The stereotype scales are again broken down into two variables: “(target group) warmth” and “(target group) competence.” Each variable is associated with a code number as indicated in the first column and correspond with the same number at the top of the following columns (i.e. Muslim Competence = 1). When comparing Muslim American competence (1), Arab immigrant competence (4) and Middle Eastern refugee competence (7), the correlations are highly significant and strong, ranging from .87 to .92. On the warmth/cold scale, perceived Muslim American warmth (2), Arab immigrant warmth (5), and Middle Eastern refugee warmth (8) show similar correlations ranging from .89 to .93. When comparing Muslim American threat (3), Arab immigrant threat (6), and Middle Eastern refugee threat (9), the correlations are again strong and range from .89 to .93. Therefore, respondents rated the groups almost equally in relation to primary independent variables. Finally, the strong correlation of dependent variables (ranging from .83 to .90) are also significant when showing an equivalency of terms, since only the target group was altered in the survey question. These findings indicate the equivalences individuals make comparing stereotyping and perceived threat of each target group. Based on these findings, I find support for Hypothesis 1.

Table 2: Target Groups' Stereotype, Threat, and Policy Correlation Matrix (N = 1392)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
(1) Muslim Competence											
(2) Muslim Warmth	.71*										
(3) Muslim Threat	-.40*	-.41*									
(4) Arab Competence	.90*	.67*	-.37*								
(5) Arab Warmth	.67*	.90*	-.38*	.72*							
(6) Arab Threat	-.40*	-.41*	.92*	-.39*	-.41*						
(7) Refugee Competence	.87*	.67*	-.35*	.92*	.71*	-.37*					
(8) Refugee Warmth	.67*	.89*	-.38*	.69*	.93*	-.40*	.73*				
(9) Refugee Threat	-.40*	-.41*	.89*	-.39*	-.41*	.93*	-.39*	-.42*			
(10) Muslim Detain	-.07	-.09*	.29*	-.06	-.08*	.30*	-.03	-.09*	.30*		
(11) Arab Detain	-.04	-.08*	.28*	-.06	-.09*	.30*	-.03	-.10*	.30*	.87*	
(12) Refugee Detain	-.05	-.08*	.29*	-.06	-.09*	.30*	-.05	-.11*	.31*	.83*	.90*

*p < 0.01

Target Group Stereotyping/Perceived Threat and Support for Punitive Public Policy

To address Hypothesis 2a and 2b, Tables 3-5 each consist of three logistic regression models predicting the effect target group stereotyping and perceived threat has on support for punitive public policy, specifically the detainment of the target groups in the event of a mass terrorist attack with foreign, Arab or Middle Eastern suspects. Table 3 presents results for Muslim Americans as the target group. Table 4 presents results for Arab immigrants as the target group. Finally, Table 5 presents results for Middle Eastern refugees as the target group. Model 1's primary independent variables are perceived Muslim competence, Muslim warmth, and Muslim threat. Model 2's primary independent variables are perceived Arab competence, Arab warmth, and Arab threat. Model 3's primary independent variables are perceived Middle Eastern refugee competence, refugee warmth, and refugee threat. All demographic variables are controlled for in each model, and each model provides the unstandardized beta, standard error, odds ratio, and level of significance (p-value).

Table 3: Logistic Regression for Muslim American Detainment

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio
<i>Variable:</i>						
Muslim Competence	.072 (.044)	1.074				
Muslim Warmth	.008 (.040)	1.008				
Muslim Threat	.174 (.020)	1.19***				
Arab Competence			.060 (.044)	1.062		
Arab Warmth			.033 (.041)	1.033		
Arab Threat			.179 (.020)	1.197***		
Refugee Competence					.156 (.044)	1.168***
Refugee Warmth					-.042 (.042)	.959
Refugee Threat					.181 (.020)	1.198***
-2 log likelihood	1644.152		1637.398		1630.061	
Pseudo R^2	.136		.142		.149	

Note: Control variables include education, age, gender (female), race/ethnicity (ref. other race), political affiliation (ref. independent)

* $p < 0.1$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors in parentheses

Muslim American Detainment:

Table 3's dependent variable is the support for Muslim American detainment (Muslim Detain). According to Model 1, neither measure of stereotyping is statistically significant, while perceived Muslim threat is significant. Respondents who perceive Muslim Americans as highly threatening were more likely to support the detainment of Muslim Americans in the event of a terrorist attack with foreign, Arab or Middle Eastern suspects. Model 2 presents the relationship between Arab immigrant stereotypes and perceived threat with Muslim detainment. Similar to the findings on Muslim stereotypes, there are no significant relationships between Arab immigrant stereotype components and punitive policy toward Muslim Americans. Further, those who view Arab immigrants as highly threatening are more likely to support detaining Muslim Americans. Model 3 replaces Arab immigrant stereotypes and perceived threat with perceptions of Middle Eastern refugees. Although stereotype measures did not matter in Models 1 and 2, Model 3 shows Refugee competence to be a positive predictor of support for Muslim American detainment. But similar to Models 1 and 2, perceived threat of Middle Eastern refugees increased the likelihood of support for punitive measures against Muslim Americans. With one exception, stereotypes attributed to Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees bear no significant relationship to support for punitive policies directed at Muslim Americans in the event of a terrorist attack. Perceived threat toward Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees show the same predictive relationship on support for punitive policies for Muslim Americans in the event of a terrorist attack by a foreign Arab or Middle Eastern group, net of other controls for age, gender, race, educational attainment, political party affiliation.

Table 4: Logistic Regression for Arab Immigrant Detainment

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio
<i>Variable:</i>						
Muslim Competence	.111 (.044)	1.118**				
Muslim Warmth	-.010 (.040)	.990				
Muslim Threat	.168 (.020)	1.183***				
Arab Competence			.077 (.043)	1.080*		
Arab Warmth			.004 (.040)	1.004		
Arab Threat			.173 (.020)	1.189***		
Refugee Competence					.165 (.044)	1.179***
Refugee Warmth					-.061 (.041)	.941
Refugee Threat					.177 (.020)	1.193***
-2 log likelihood	1678.334		1669.593		1658.849	
Pseudo R^2	.132		.139		.149	

Note: Control variables include education, age, gender(female), race/ethnicity (ref. other race), political affiliation (ref. independent)

*p < 0.1 **p < 0.05 ***p < 0.01. Standard Errors in parentheses

Arab Immigrant Detainment:

As shown above, Table 4 uses the same primary independent variables as well as the same control measures, but the dependent variable is now support for Arab immigrant detainment (Arab Detain). Models 1, 2 and 3 all show statistically significant relationships for perceived Muslim American, Arab immigrant and Middle Eastern refugee competence. These results indicate that those who perceive Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees as highly competent will be more likely to support the detainment of Arab immigrants. Similar to results in Table 4, all models show perceived threat of each target group as a predictor of support for Arab immigrant detainment in the event of a terrorist attack with foreign, Arab or Middle Eastern suspects, as predicted by Hypothesis 2a.

:

Table 5: Logistic Regression for Middle Eastern Refugee Detainment

<i>Variable:</i>	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio	β / (SE)	Odds Ratio
Muslim Competence	.105 (.043)	1.111**				
Muslim Warmth	-.004 (.039)	.996				
Muslim Threat	.173 (.020)	1.188***				
Arab Competence			.079 (.043)	1.083*		
Arab Warmth			.001 (.040)	1.001		
Arab Threat			.176 (.019)	1.192***		
Refugee Competence					.150 (.043)	1.162***
Refugee Warmth					-.062 (.041)	.940
Refugee Threat					.180 (.020)	1.197***
-2 log likelihood	1705.021		1696.648		1685.667	
Pseudo R^2	.130		.137		.147	

Note: Control variables include education, age, gender (female), race/ethnicity (ref. other race), political affiliation (ref. independent)

* $p < 0.1$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$. Standard Errors in parentheses

Middle Eastern Refugee Detainment:

In Table 5, support for Middle Eastern refugee detainment is the dependent variable (Refugee Detain) while the independent variables remain the same. Again, there is a statistically significant, positive relationship between all target groups' perceived competence and support for refugee detainment. Individuals who view Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and/or Middle Eastern refugees as highly competent are more likely to support punitive policy directed at Middle Eastern refugees in the event of a terrorist attack from a foreign Arab or Middle Eastern group. Finally, as predicted in Hypothesis 2a, Muslim, Arab, and Refugee threat all predict support for Middle Eastern refugee detainment similar to findings shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Summary of Logistic Regression Results

Overall, perceived threat of each target group predicts support for the detainment of all target groups. The competence/incompetence scale suggests some variation in predicting support for punitive policies toward the target groups, and the warmth/cold scale is never significant in all nine models. In addition, the regressions' Pseudo R² values conveyed that between 13.2% and 14.9% of the variation could be explained with the tested independent variables.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion of Results

Results of the correlation matrix (Table 2) and the logistic regressions testing all three target groups against each dependent variable (Tables 3-5), support Hypothesis 1 which predicted cognitive equivalences for three target groups. Although Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees all suggest different identities (i.e. race/ethnicity, religion, nationality, and citizenship), respondents tended to react to all groups in a similar fashion. Stereotyping and perceived threat against the groups did not vary significantly, as exemplified through Table 2 and some of the primary independent variables serving as predictors for support of punitive public policy in the logistic regressions (Tables 3-5). If the groups shared a demographic, or even a similar one like Arab versus Middle Eastern, it could be argued that there is an equivalence of terms. Yet, the public policy question clearly establishes the suspects in the hypothetical terrorist attack as Arab or Middle Eastern and foreign. There is no mention of religion, and yet perceived threat always predicted support to detain Muslim Americans if that event was to occur, regardless of the target group used for the primary independent variables. This further conveys an equivalence in terms, providing substantial support for Hypothesis 1. These findings are unique since, to my knowledge, past research has not empirically studied the racialization of religion by specifically comparing target groups against one another.

In reference to Hypothesis 2a, stereotyping did not always predict support for punitive public policy. Fiske et al.'s research was only partially supported as seen in the

inconsistent stereotype effects with the target groups (2009). As shown in Tables 3-5, the warmth/coldness scale never predicts support for any of the target groups' detainment, even though the correlation matrix (Table 2) indicated a negative relationship between a target group's warmth and support for detaining the target group. The contact hypothesis can be used in understanding why the warmth/coldness scale was not significant in the regressions (Pettigrew & Tropp 2006). Most respondents do not regularly encounter the target groups, which ultimately results in how warm or cold the respondents view groups. If a respondent never encounters an individual belonging to one of the target groups, it is more likely that he/she will be more neutral on rating the target group's warmth/coldness. Future research should include measures of contact with US Muslims, Arabs and Middle Easterners to empirically determine whether warmth stereotypes are linked to contact, and if this relationship has bearing on punitive attitudes.

Interestingly, the competence/incompetence scale was significant when predicting support for detainment with some variation. If an individual viewed the target group as highly competent, he/she would be more likely to support the detainment of the target group. A possible explanation could be that competency is better understood by the respondents in comparison to warmth. Although both stereotype measures are on a 9-point scale, competence/incompetence consistently has a higher mean than warmth/coldness across all target groups. It follows that it may be easier to consider the target groups as more competent if they are perceived as threatening. In addition, the concept of "terrorist threat" would support the belief that the group needs to be perceived as competent enough to successfully complete a high-scale terrorist attack (as described in the dependent variable). Furthermore, if one believes a group to have a high degree of

competence and threat, supporting the group's detainment would seem like a valid solution. Yet, Table 2 shows a negative correlation between competence and threat, indicating that one who believes a group to be highly competent is less likely to view them as highly threatening. Furthermore, while threat is positively correlated to punitive public policy, competence is not. The competence/incompetence measure is not correlated with punitive policy attitudes but is a significant predictor in the logistic regressions, net of controls. This suggests that while our respondents' fundamental perception of these target groups is one that associates threat with lower competence. But when faced with a hypothetical situation involving a threat the relationship between perceived threat and competence changes. This may be an indication that perceived competence is not always associated with positive behaviors and attitudes from the ingroup as suggested in previous research that examined "cold but competent" outgroups. Such groups elicit feelings of envy due to their perceived higher competence and in turn may lead to more punitive behaviors and attitudes.

Assuming that competency is a more accurate measure, Arab immigrants and Middle Eastern refugee competency ratings support punitive public policy, while Muslim American perceived competence exhibits more variation. This may be because of the public policy question's wording specifically stating "foreign suspects," not Americans. It is important to note that assuming the competence/incompetence measure is more significant for the Arab immigrant and Middle Eastern refugee primary variable, the fact that Muslim American competence is ever significant supports Hypothesis 1, since Muslim Americans could be viewed as part of the American ingroup, yet they are still stereotyped as competent, like immigrants and refugees. Overall, support for Hypothesis

2a is not entirely evident due to the lack of significance with the warmth/coldness measure and the variation of significance with the competence/incompetence measure.

There is considerable support for Hypothesis 2b as indicated in Tables 3-5. As predicted, a higher level of perceived threat significantly increases the likelihood of supporting punitive public policy. The variable was consistently a predictor, regardless of the target group threat set as the primary independent variable and the target group used as the dependent variable. Not only are all three groups viewed as nearly equally threatening (Table 2), but the equivalence of perceived threat results in an equivalence in support for punitive public policy. It certainly follows that those who view Arab immigrants and Middle Eastern refugees as threatening will support punitive public policies against them when the suspects in the hypothetical attack are foreign and of Arab or Middle Eastern descent. However, this association does not explain why Muslim American threat predicts the same support of the public policy. These findings not only further establish the relationship between perceived threat and punitive public policy as found in Watson and Riffe (2013), but it extends the findings that support Hypothesis 1 that the equivalency of terms affects other outcomes such as punitive policy.

Conclusions and Future Research

Following the events of 9/11, the continuous rise of Islamophobia has led to the conflation of several minority groups into a group assumed to be prone to terrorism merely based on their religion, race/ethnicity, or nationality. The findings presented support the claim that Muslim Americans, Arab immigrants, and Middle Eastern refugees are stereotyped against and perceived as threatening at equivalent levels. Individuals do

not make the distinction between race/ethnicity and religion, leading to misguided prejudicial attitudes and discrimination.

The perceived threat of all three target groups predicts support for the detainment of each group in the event of a hypothetical mass terrorist attack. It should be concerning that, regardless of perceived threat, Americans are willing to detain individuals, especially American citizens, if an attack was to occur. This finding exemplifies that we have not learned from our mistakes following the events of Pearl Harbor and the bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Not only were Japanese non-citizens placed in internment camps, but Japanese Americans were subject to the same discrimination, despite their supposed protection under the U.S. Constitution. Based on this study, it seems that many Americans are willing to support this form of political action again. More than a third of respondents supported the detainment of all three target groups, even with a higher Democratic and educational attainment skew in the sample. Future research should examine whether these relationships are reflective of the US as a whole.

Further research could expand on the equivalency of target group stereotyping and perceived threat. Due to the limited nature of this project, such concepts could be more thoroughly measured with their relation to public policy. Our survey only included two characteristics from Fiske's stereotype content model ("welcoming" and "warm" for warmth, and "intelligent" and "competent" for competence). Furthermore, although our survey measured two types of realistic threat (a threat to economic opportunity and physical safety) and two types of symbolic threat (a threat to values and a threat to freedoms). Other studies could use more stereotype characteristics or types of perceived threat to create larger, and potentially more accurate, scales.

A concern related to this study's primary focus could be the double-barreling of terms with the target groups themselves. Results may vary if the groups were matched on one characteristic. For example, instead of "Muslim American," "Arab immigrant," and "Middle Eastern refugee," further research could use terms like "Muslim immigrant," and "Arab immigrant" where part of the target group's identity matches that of another target group. This study combined terms to make the study more relevant to contemporary issues like the Syrian refugee crisis and caps on immigration. Our findings support previous research that contends Muslim identity is not perceived as a possible subcategory of being native-born American, as seen in the near-identical effects when the target group is "Muslim American" in contrast to "Arab immigrant" and "Middle Eastern refugee" Future research might consider replicating this with alterations to the nativity of Muslim, Arab, and Middle Eastern target groups.

Prior research has analyzed other primary independent variables not addressed in this study, such as media consumption (Watson and Riffe 2013) and the concept of the "American identity" (Schildkraut 2009). Potential biases in media consumption, or the amount of general knowledge accrued about the target groups could impact the way in which individuals stereotype or to what degree they perceive the group as threatening. Furthermore, the "American identity" is usually associated with the belief that true Americans are white, Protestant, and born in the United States. It is possible that these beliefs would influence how one feels towards the target groups. Both media consumption and the "American identity" variables could be predictors of support for punitive public policy.

The goal of this study and its findings is to spread an awareness of a problem that is consistently ignored by society. Empirically demonstrating the intersectionality of race and religion in the case of Muslims and Arabs provides insight to how groups are unjustly discriminated against. The pervasive concept of “terrorist threat” dominates not only individual stereotyping and perceived threat of such groups, but also the support of punitive public policy that could lead to unnecessary consequences, as history has shown us. Herbert Blumer states that racial prejudice will decline and group position will dissolve when “events touching on relations are not treated as ‘big events’ and hence do not set crucial issues in the arena of public discussion; or when the elite leaders or spokesmen do not define such big events vehemently or adversely... (1958). Rather than focusing on rebuilding relationships and emphasizing the need for unity following the events of September 11, 2001, American rhetoric allowed for the division of its people due to the cry of “terrorism” toward individuals based on their race and religion. Our “big event” was used to discriminate against Muslims and Arabs, not to publicly discuss race relations. Furthermore, U.S. politicians have defined the event vehemently, but they use it as a talking point on the bully pulpit about national security, not about its impounding effects on the country’s racial divide. This sentiment does not only spark a sense of patriotism. Instead, it serves as a reminder of why Muslims and Arabs are subordinate and why discriminatory political action must take place – to preserve the dominant group’s position.

APPENDIX

Latest Version of Survey Taken by Mechanical Turk Sample

Start of Block: Introduction

Hello,

Thank you for choosing to participate in this survey. The average survey completion time is 6 minutes. HOWEVER, the time allotted to complete the survey and enter your survey code into Mechanical Turk is 30 minutes.

If you have already taken a HIT titled "Answer a Survey about Contemporary Social Attitudes", please DO NOT take this survey again. Contact us if you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter.

In order to complete this survey and to be compensated for your participation, you must meet the following requirements:

1. You are a U.S. citizen. 2. You are currently residing in the U.S. 3. You have NOT taken this survey before. 4. You have completed less than a four year bachelor's degree from a college or university. (e.g., BS, BA, AB)

If you meet these requirements, please proceed to the first question. If you do not meet one or more of these requirements, please terminate your participation in this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Core Questions

Q1 What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- ☐ 12th grade or less, no high school diploma (1)
- ☐ High school graduate (Grade 12 with diploma or GED certificate) (2)
- ☐ Technical, trade, vocational or business school or program after high school (3)
- ☐ Some college – college, university, or community college - but no degree (4)
- ☐ Two year associate's degree from a college, university, or community college (5)
- ☐ Four year bachelor's degree from a college or university (e.g., BS, BA, AB) (6)
- ☐ Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical, or law degree (e.g., MA, MS, PhD, MD, JD) (7)

Skip To: End of Survey If What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received? = Four year bachelor's degree from a college or university (e.g., BS, BA, AB)

Skip To: End of Survey If What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received? = Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical, or law degree (e.g., MA, MS, PhD, MD, JD)

Q2 What is your age?

▼ 18 (18) ... 100 (100)

Q3 Were you born in the U.S. or are you a U.S. citizen?

- ☐ Yes, born in the U.S. (1)
- ☐ Not born in the U.S., but a citizen of the U.S. (country of origin) (2)
-
- ☐ Neither U.S. born nor U.S. citizen (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Were you born in the U.S. or are you a U.S. citizen? = Neither U.S. born nor U.S. citizen

Q4 Which U.S. state or territory do you currently reside in?

▼ I am not currently residing in the U.S. (82) ... US Territory (Puerto Rico, Guam, Mariana Islands, Virgin Islands, Samoa) (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Which U.S. state or territory do you currently reside in? = I am not currently residing in the U.S.

Q5 What is your gender?

- ☐ Male (1)
- ☐ Female (2)
- ☐ Other (3)
-

Q6 Which of the following describes your race/ethnicity? Please mark all that apply.

☐ White (1)

☐ Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish (Mexican, Mexican American, Salvadoran, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Cuban, Columbian, etc.) (53)

☐ Black or African American (African American, Nigerian, Jamaican, Ethiopian, Haitian, Somalian, etc.) (2)

☐ Asian (Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Korean, Asian Indian, Japanese, etc.) (14)

☐ Middle Eastern or North African (Lebanese, Syrian, Iranian, Moroccan, Egyptian, Algerian, Arab, Jewish/Israeli, etc.) (16)

☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)

☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)

Q7 Which of the following BEST describes the place where you live now?

☐ A large city (1)

☐ A suburb near a large city (2)

☐ A small city or town (3)

☐ A rural area (4)

Q8 Do you think of yourself as Republican, Democrat, or Independent?

- ☐ Strong Republican (1)
- ☐ Moderate Republican (2)
- ☐ Leaning Republican (3)
- ☐ Independent (4)
- ☐ Leaning Democrat (5)
- ☐ Moderate Democrat (6)
- ☐ Strong Democrat (7)

Q9 With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify?

▼ Adventist (1) ... I don't know (41)

Religious Family Answer Choices:

Adventist	Christian & Missionary Alliance	Jewish
African Methodist	Christian Reformed	Latter-day Saints (Mormon)
Anabaptist	Christian Science	Lutheran
Asian Folk Religion	Church of Christ	Mennonite
Assemblies of God	Church of God	Methodist
Atheist	Church of the Nazarene	Muslim
Baha'i	Congregational	Orthodox (Eastern, Russian, Greek)
Baptist	Disciples of Christ	Pentecostal
Bible Church	Episcopal/Anglican	Presbyterian
Brethren	Hindu	Quaker/Friends
Buddhist	Holiness	Reformed Church in America/Dutch Reformed
Catholic/Roman Catholic	Jehovah's Witness	

Salvation Army	United Church of Christ	Other
Seventh-Day Adventist	Non-denominational Christian	I don't know
Sikh		
Unitarian Universalist	No religious affiliation	

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Asian Folk Religion

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Baha'i

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Buddhist

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Hindu

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Jewish

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Muslim

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Sikh

Skip To: Q11 If With what religious family, if any, do you most closely identify? = Atheist

Q10 Which of these would you say best describes your religious identity?

- ☐ Fundamentalist (1)
- ☐ Evangelical (2)
- ☐ Mainline Protestant (3)
- ☐ Liberal (4)
- ☐ None of these (5)
- ☐ I don't know (6)

Q11 How often do you attend or visit a religious gathering, such as a church, mosque, or temple?

- ☐ Never (1)
 - ☐ Less than once per year (2)
 - ☐ Once or twice per year (3)
 - ☐ Several times per year (4)
 - ☐ Once per month (5)
 - ☐ Two to three times per month (6)
 - ☐ About once per week (7)
 - ☐ Several times per week (8)
-

Q12 How religious do you consider yourself to be?

- ☐ Not religious (1)
 - ☐ Slightly religious (2)
 - ☐ Moderately religious (3)
 - ☐ Very religious (4)
-



Q13 If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes."

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ I don't know (4)

Skip To: End of Survey If If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes." = No

Skip To: End of Survey If If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes." = I don't know



Q14 How many of your friends fit the following labels:

	None (1)	One (2)	A few (3)	Most (4)	All (5)	I don't know (6)
White (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Black or African American (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab/Middle Eastern (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Asian (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hispanic or Latino (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mixed-race or some other race (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q15 How many of your friends fit the following labels:

	None (1)	One (2)	A few (3)	Most (4)	All (5)	I don't know (6)
Catholic (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Christian/Protestant (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jewish (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hindu (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Buddhist (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sikh (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some other religion (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not religious (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q16 Please choose answer choice "yes" if you work and have co-workers at your place of employment. Please choose answer choice "no" if you do not work and/or do not have co-workers at your place of employment.

- ☐ Yes, I do have co-workers. (1)
- ☐ No, I do not have co-workers. (2)

Skip To: End of Block If Please choose answer choice "yes" if you work and have co-workers at your place of employment. Pl... = No, I do not have co-workers.



Q17 How many of your co-workers fit the following labels:

	None (1)	One (2)	A few (3)	Most (4)	All (5)	I don't know (6)
White (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Black or African American (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab/Middle Eastern (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Asian (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hispanic or Latino (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mixed-race or some other race (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q18 How many of your co-workers fit the following labels:

	None (1)	One (2)	A few (3)	Most (4)	All (5)	I don't know (6)
Catholic (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Christian/Protestant (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jewish (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hindu (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Buddhist (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sikh (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some other religion (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not religious (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Core Questions

Start of Block: Morality and Politics

Q19 Some people think that the United States is a Christian nation and some people think that the United States is not a Christian nation. Which statement comes closest to your view?

- ☐ The United States has always been and currently is a Christian nation. (1)
- ☐ The United States was a Christian nation in the past, but is not now. (2)
- ☐ The United States has never been a Christian nation. (3)

End of Block: Morality and Politics

Start of Block: Terrorist Threat/Perceptions



Q20 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree (1)	Somewhat agree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Muslim Americans hold values that are morally inferior to the values of people like me. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim Americans want to limit the personal freedoms of people like me. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim Americans take economic opportunities from people like me. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim Americans endanger the physical safety of people like me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q21 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree (1)	Somewhat agree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Arab immigrants hold values that are morally inferior to the values of people like me. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab immigrants want to limit the personal freedoms of people like me. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab immigrants take economic opportunities from people like me. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab immigrants endanger the physical safety of people like me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q22 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree (1)	Somewhat agree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
Middle Eastern refugees hold values that are morally inferior to the values of people like me. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees want to limit the personal freedoms of people like me. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees take economic opportunities away from people like me. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees endanger the physical safety of people like me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Terrorist Threat/Perceptions

Start of Block: Public Policy

Q23 Would you approve or disapprove of a U.S. plan to increase the number of the following refugees admitted into the U.S. from Syria?

	Approve (1)	Disapprove (2)
Christian refugees (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muslim refugees (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q24 If there were a mass terrorist attack in the U.S. with foreign Arab or Middle-Eastern suspects, would you support or oppose allowing the government to detain the following groups in camps until it can be determined whether they have links to terrorist organizations:

	Support (1)	Oppose (2)
Muslim Americans (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab immigrants (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q25 If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes."

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ I don't know (4)

Skip To: End of Survey If If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes." = No

Skip To: End of Survey If If you are paying attention, please choose the answer choice "yes." = I don't know

End of Block: Public Policy

Start of Block: American Identity

Q26 Would you say that these are very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or very unimportant in making someone a true American?

	Very important (1)	Somewhat important (2)	Somewhat unimportant (3)	Very unimportant (4)
Being born in America (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being a Christian (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being white (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q27 As viewed by society, how *competent* are members of the following groups?

	Extremely (1)	Very (2)	Moderately (3)	Slightly (4)	Not at all (5)
Muslim Americans (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab Immigrants (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q28 As viewed by society, how *intelligent* are members of the following groups?

	Extremely (1)	Very (2)	Moderately (3)	Slightly (4)	Not at all (5)
Muslim Americans (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab Immigrants (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q29 As viewed by society, how *sincere* are members of the following groups?

	Extremely (1)	Very (2)	Moderately (3)	Slightly (4)	Not at all (5)
Muslim Americans (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab Immigrants (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q30 As viewed by society, how *welcoming* are members of the following groups?

	Extremely (1)	Very (2)	Moderately (3)	Slightly (4)	Not at all (5)
Muslim Americans (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arab Immigrants (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Eastern refugees (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Q31 In the past 12 months, have you done any of the following regarding the topics listed below:
(please check all that apply)

	Immigration (1)	Terrorism (2)	The refugee crisis (3)	Some other topic (4)	I have not done this in the past 12 months. (5)
...listened to a message, seminar, lecture, or discussion at a religious gathering dealing with ... (4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...listened to a message, seminar, lecture, or discussion at a non-religious gathering dealing with... (9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...participated in a social media discussion (e.g. Facebook, reddit) dealing with... (13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...participated in a discussion at work or in your neighborhood community dealing with... (17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Read a book or news story dealing with... (18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Watched a documentary or news story, listened to a podcast or talk news radio dealing with... (19)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Q32 In the past 12 months, have you participated in any of the following at a **religious gathering or in a religious group**: (please check all that apply)

	Yes (1)	No (2)
...a program to help immigrants with finding jobs, medical care, housing, learning English, legal issues, or other forms of assistance? (8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...a program to encourage greater understanding among different racial or ethnic groups? (16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...a program to encourage greater understanding among different religious groups? (22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Q33 In the past 12 months, have you participated in any of the following at a non-religious gathering or in a non-religious group: (please check all that apply)

	Yes (1)	No (2)
...a program to help immigrants with finding jobs, medical care, housing, learning English, legal issues, or other forms of assistance? (11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...a program to encourage greater understanding among different racial or ethnic groups? (18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...a program to encourage greater understanding among different religious groups? (24)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

End of Block: American Identity

Start of Block: Block 5

CODE

Please input the Qualtrics code below on Mechanical Turk.

`${e://Field/MTurk}`

End of Block: Block 5

REFERENCES

- Acevedo, Gabriel A. and Ali R. Chaudhary. 2015. "Religion, Cultural Clash, and Muslim American Attitudes About Politically Motivated Violence." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54(2):242–60.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *The Pacific Sociological Review* 1:3–7.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T. and Gosling, S. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1).
- Byng, Michelle D. 2008. "Complex Inequalities: The Case of Muslim Americans After 9/11." *American Behavioral Scientist* 51(5):659–74.
- Caprariello, Peter A., Amy J. C. Cuddy, and Susan T. Fiske. 2009. "Social Structure Shapes Cultural Stereotypes and Emotions: A Causal Test of the Stereotype Content Model." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 12(2):147–55.
- Cook, Corey L., Catherine A. Cottrell, and Gregory D. Webster. 2015. "No Good without God: Anti-atheist Prejudice as a Function of Threats to Morals and Values." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 7(3):217–26.
- Cooperman, Alan, Greg Smith, Besheer Mohamed, Jessica Martinez, and Elizabeth Sciupac. 2014. *How Americans Feel About Religious Groups: Jew, Catholics and Evangelicals Rated Warmly, Atheists and Muslims More Coldly*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center.
- Cottrell, Catherine A., David A. R. Richards, and Austin Lee Nichols. 2010. "Predicting Policy Attitudes from General Prejudice versus Specific Intergroup Emotions." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(2):247–54.
- Cribbs, Sarah E. and Dmark Austin. 2011. "Enduring Pictures in Our Heads: The Continuance of Authoritarianism and Racial Stereotyping." *Journal of Black Studies* 42(3):334–59.
- Disha, Ilir, James C. Cavendish, and Ryan D. King. 2011. "Historical Events and Spaces of Hate: Hate Crimes against Arabs and Muslims in Post-9/11 America." *Social Problems* 58(1):21–46.
- Fiske, Susan T., Amy J. C. Cuddy, Peter Blick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82(6):878–902.

- Gallagher, Charles A. 2003. "Miscounting Race: Explaining Whites' Misperceptions of Racial Group Size." *Sociological Perspectives* 46(3):381–96.
- Ghumman, Sonia and Ann Marie Ryan. 2013. "Not Welcome Here: Discrimination Towards Women Who Wear the Muslim Headscarf." *Human Relations* 66:671–98.
- Gole, Nilufer. 2003. "The Voluntary Adoption of Islamic Stigma Symbols." *Social Research* 70(3):809–28.
- Hartmann, Douglas, Daniel Winchester, Penny Edgell, and Joseph Gerteis. 2011. "How Americans Understand Racial and Religious Differences: A Test of Parallel Items from a National Survey." *Sociological Quarterly* 52(3):323–45.
- Huff, C. and Tingley, D. (2015). "Who are these people?" Evaluating the demographic characteristics and political preferences of MTurk survey respondents. *Research & Politics*, 2(3).
- Kaplan, Jeffrey. 2006. "Islamophobia in America?: September 11 and Islamophobic Hate Crime." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 18(1):1–33.
- King, Eden B. and Afra S. Ahmad. 2010. "An Experimental Field Study of Interpersonal Discrimination Toward Muslim Job Applicants." *Personnel Psychology* 63(4):881–906.
- King, Ryan D. and Darren Wheelock. 2007. "Group Threat and Social Control: Race, Perceptions of Minorities and the Desire to Punish." *Social Forces* 85(3):1255–1280.
- Kohut, Andrew. 2011. *Muslim Americans: No Signs of Growth in Alienation or Support for Extremism*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- McCloud, Aminah Beverly. 2003. "Islam in America: The Mosaic." Pp. 159–74 in, *Religion and Immigration: Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Experiences in the United States*, edited by Y. Y. Haddad, J. I. Smith, and J. L. Esposito. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.
- Mohamed, Besheer. "New Estimates Show U.S. Muslim Population Continues to Grow." *Pew Research Center*, Pew Research Center, 3 Jan. 2018, www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/03/new-estimates-show-u-s-muslim-population-continues-to-grow/.
- Ogan, Christine, Lars Willnat, Rosemary Pennington, and Manaf Bashir. 2014. "The Rise of Anti-Muslim Prejudice Media and Islamophobia in Europe and the United States." *International Communication Gazette* 76(1):27–46.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.

- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on amazon mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(5), 411.
- Riek, Blake M., Eric W. Mania, and Samuel L. Gaertner. 2006. "Intergroup Threat and Outgroup Attitudes: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10(4):336–53.
- Saleem, Muniba, Grace S. Yang, and Srividya Ramasubramanian. 2016. "Reliance on Direct and Mediated Contact and Public Policies Supporting Outgroup Harm." *Journal of Communication* 66(4):604–24.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2009. "The Dynamics of Public Opinion on Ethnic Profiling After 9/11." *American Behavioral Scientist*. Retrieved February 4, 2018 (<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002764209338786>).
- Strabac, Zan and Ola Listhaug. 2008. "General Theories and Research on Prejudice: Anti-Muslim Prejudice in Europe: A Multilevel Analysis of Survey Data from 30 Countries." *Social Science Research* 37(1):268–86.
- Suleiman, Michael W. 1999. "Islam, Muslims and Arabs in America: The Other of the Other of the Other..." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 19(1):33–47.
- Sullivan, John L. and Henriët Hendriks. 2009. "Public Support for Civil Liberties Pre- and Post-9/11." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 5(1):375–91.
- Taylor, Marylee C. and Peter J. Mateyka. 2011. "Community Influences on White Racial Attitudes: What Matters and Why?" *The Sociological Quarterly* 52:220–43.
- US Census Bureau. "U.S. Census Bureau Section 1: Population." *Census.gov*, U.S. Department of Commerce, 23 Nov. 2015. www.census.gov/library/publications/2011/compendia/statab/131ed/population.html.
- Wallace, Michael, Bradley R. E. Wright, and Allen Hyde. 2014. "Religious Affiliation and Hiring Discrimination in the American South: A Field Experiment." *Social Currents* 1:189–207.
- Watson, Brendan R. and Daniel Riffe. 2013. "Perceived Threat, Immigration Policy Support, and Media Coverage: Hostile Media and Presumed Influence." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 25(4):459–79.