Appendix A

Survey Questions Texas Lyceum:

- DV: Sanctuary City: In some cities, when local police or city government employees learn that someone is in the country illegally, they do not automatically turn that person over to federal immigration enforcement officers. Supporters of these so-called 'sanctuary cities' say that this improves public safety because it encourages people in immigrant communities to work with police to help arrest dangerous criminals without fear of being deported themselves. Opponents of these so-called 'sanctuary cities' say that this practice is a violation of federal law and allows some dangerous criminals who are in the country illegally to continue to commit violent crimes. Thinking about your own view, do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?
- What do you think is the most important issue facing the state of Texas today? (open ended back-end coded)
- Party ID: Do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, a Republican, or neither?
- Ideology: Generally speaking, would you say that you are liberal, moderate, or conservative?
- Race: "Would you say that you are White/Anglo, African American, Hispanic, Other?"
- Gender: Are you male or female?
- Age: In what year were you born?
- Education: What is the highest level of education you completed?
- Geo: Urban: Would you say you live in an urban area, a suburban area, a small town, or rural area?
- Income: What was your total household income for 2016?

Survey Questions University of Texas Poll:

- DV: Sanctuary Cities: Do you strongly/somewhat support (1) or strongly/somewhat oppose (0) sanctuary cities?
- Most important problem - Texas? (open ended back-end coded)
- Party ID: In general, do you consider yourself a Democrat (1), a Republican (3), or what (2)?
- Ideology: Generally speaking, would you say that you are extremely liberal (1), somewhat liberal (1), lean liberal (1), middle (2), lean conservative (3), somewhat conservative (3), or extremely conservative (3)?
- Race: "Would you say that you are White/Anglo, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Mixed, Middle Eastern, Other?"
- Age: In what year were you born?
- Education: What is the highest level of education you completed?
- Geo: Urban: Would you say you live in an urban area, a suburban area, a small town, or rural area?
- Income: What was your total household income for 2016?

Table A1: Model Variable Coding

Variable	Data Type	Code
DV: Sanctuary City Support	Dummy	1=Support, 0=Oppose
Immigration Important	Dummy	1=Yes, 0=No
Crime/Drugs Important	Dummy	1=Yes, 0=No
Party ID	Ordinal	1-3 (Democrat, Independent, Republican)
Ideology	Ordinal	1-3 (liberal, moderate, conservative)
Black	Dummy	0=Not Black, 1 = Black
Latino	Dummy	0=Not Latino, 1 = Latino (Anglo comparison)
Female	Dummy	1=Female, 0 = Male
Age	numeric	18, 95, median = 53
Education	Ordinal	1=Less HS, 2=HS, 3=Some Coll, 4=4year Coll, 5=Post grad
Geo: Urban	Dummy	1=Urban, 0=Not Urban
Income $40-150K	Dummy	1=yes, 0=no, less$40K comparison
Income 150K+	Dummy	1=yes, 0=no, less$40K comparison
Income Missing	Dummy	1=yes, 0=no, less$40K comparison
Percent Latino Growth (00-14)	Numeric	-20.67, 222.63, median=29.9
Percent Latino (10-14)	Numeric	3.23, 95.68, median=33.67
Percent Foreign-Born Growth (10-14)	Numeric	0, 32.47, median=14.19
Percent Non-Citizen (10-14)	Numeric	0, 23.82, median = 8.47
Murder Rate 2015	Numeric	0, 63.8, median=3.8
Total Crime Rate 2015	Numeric	0, 7954, median = 3471
Survey House	Dummy	1=UT, 0 = Lyceum

Table A2: Descriptive statistics of model variables: sanctuary city opinion, party id, ideology, Black, Hispanic, female age, education, urbanity, income, percent Latino growth, percent Latino, percent Black growth, percent Black, murder rate change, total crime rate change, immigration most important issue, crime/drugs most important issue, UT-poll dummy.

	Mean	StdDev
Sanctuary Approval	0.40	0.49
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	2.01	0.79
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	2.16	0.84
Black	0.12	0.33
Hispanic	0.17	0.38
Female	0.51	0.50
Age	51.00	16.40
Education (low-high)	3.35	1.05
Geo: Urban	0.27	0.45
Income: 40-150K	0.44	0.50
Income: 150K+	0.11	0.31
Income Missing	0.14	0.35
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	32.91	20.51
Pct. Latino 2014	34.38	17.70
Pct. Black Growth 2000-2014	12.11	48.91
Pct. Black 2014	11.69	7.17
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	-0.15	0.64
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	-0.33	0.22
Immigration Most Important Issue	0.19	0.39
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	0.02	0.14
UT-Poll Dummy	0.54	0.50

Table A3: Sample distribution on key demographic characteristics, weighted to population proportions: sanctuary city opinion, party id, ideology, Black, Hispanic, age, gender, education, urbanity.

	Frequency
Sanctuary Oppose	0.58
Sanctuary Support	0.42
Democrat	0.31
Independent	0.39
Republican	0.30
Liberal	0.21
Moderate	0.38
Conservative	0.41
No Black	0.88
Black	0.12
Not Hispanic	0.71
Hispanic	0.29
Age 18-40	0.41
Age 41-60	0.34
Age 61+	0.25
Male	0.47
Female	0.53
Less than high school	0.04
High school	0.25
Some college	0.32
4-year college degree	0.27
Post-graduate degree	0.13
Suburb/Exurb/Small Town/Rural	0.70

Urban	0.30

Appendix B

Table B1: Minimum to Maximum change in predicted probability in supporting sanctuary cities. Negative values indicate that as the independent variable moves from its minimum to its maximum, attitudes towards sanctuary cities become less favorable. Results based off disaggregated split-sample models to demonstrate the core relationships between key IVs and DV is similar for the two surveys. Models include all control variables.

Variable	Lyceum Δ Max-Min	UT Poll Δ Max-Min
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	-0.34	-0.34
Pct. Latino 2014	-0.14	-0.19
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	-0.08	-0.16
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	-0.14	0.40
Immigration Most Important Issue	-0.14	-0.23
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue		-0.14

Table B2: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" The table demonstrates that when Murder rate and Total crime rate 2015 are included, core findings remain unchanged. (Murder rate and Total crime rate 2015 included)

	Dependent variable:	
	sanc_approve	
	Crime Both Change and 2015	Crime 2015
	(1)	(2)
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	−1.035***	−1.036***
	(0.098)	(0.098)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.068***	−1.070***
	(0.083)	(0.083)
Black	−0.418**	−0.415**
	(0.178)	(0.177)
Hispanic	0.473***	0.465***
	(0.170)	(0.169)
Female	0.033	0.030
	(0.120)	(0.120)
Age	−0.016***	−0.016***
	(0.004)	(0.004)
Education (low-high)	0.216***	0.218***
	(0.061)	(0.060)
Geo: Urban	0.214	0.219
	(0.136)	(0.135)
Income: 40-150K	0.172	0.170
	(0.140)	(0.140)
Income: 150K+	0.284	0.280
	(0.219)	(0.218)
Income Missing	−0.060	−0.062
	(0.202)	(0.202)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.011**	−0.011**
	(0.004)	(0.004)
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.009*	−0.009*
	(0.005)	(0.005)
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.107	
	(0.100)	
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	0.101	
	(0.288)	
Murder rate (2015)	0.005	0.0004
	(0.020)	(0.020)
Total Crime Rate (2015)	−0.0001	−0.0001
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−0.920***	−0.916***
	(0.176)	(0.176)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.843*	−0.832*
	(0.458)	(0.457)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.454***	−0.459***
	(0.124)	(0.124)
Constant	4.897***	4.904***
	(0.516)	(0.508)
Observations	2,042	2,042
Log Likelihood	−918.417	−919.004
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,878.834	1,876.009
Note:		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table B3: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" The table demonstrates that our core findings remain unchanged when we 1) drop total crime rate, 2) drop murder rate, or 3) drop immigration threat, respectively. (Murder only; Total crime only; No Latino variables models)

	Dependent variable:		
	sanc_approve		
	Murder	Total Crime	No Hispanic Context
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	−1.031***	−1.032***	−1.030***
	(0.098)	(0.098)	(0.098)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.067***	−1.069***	−1.066***
	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.083)
Black	−0.425**	−0.428**	−0.415**
	(0.176)	(0.176)	(0.176)
Hispanic	0.481***	0.480***	0.458***
	(0.169)	(0.169)	(0.159)
Female	0.035	0.034	0.035
	(0.119)	(0.120)	(0.119)
Age	−0.016***	−0.016***	−0.016***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Education (low-high)	0.216***	0.220***	0.225***
	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.060)
Geo: Urban	0.186	0.186	0.188
	(0.132)	(0.132)	(0.130)
Income: 40-150K	0.177	0.176	0.185
	(0.140)	(0.140)	(0.139)
Income: 150K+	0.285	0.284	0.323
	(0.218)	(0.218)	(0.218)
Income Missing	−0.063	−0.062	−0.049
	(0.202)	(0.202)	(0.202)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.010**	−0.010**	
	(0.004)	(0.004)	
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.010**	−0.010**	
	(0.005)	(0.005)	
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.111		−0.123
	(0.092)		(0.096)
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)		−0.048	0.089
		(0.251)	(0.276)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−0.919***	−0.918***	−0.912***
	(0.175)	(0.175)	(0.175)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.841*	−0.831*	−0.832*
	(0.459)	(0.459)	(0.460)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.458***	−0.461***	−0.442***
	(0.124)	(0.124)	(0.123)
Constant	4.713***	4.714***	4.014***
	(0.478)	(0.479)	(0.382)
Observations	2,042	2,042	2,042
Log Likelihood	−918.891	−919.618	−922.090
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,873.782	1,875.235	1,878.180

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table B4: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" Core findings remain unchanged when subsetting to registered voters only. (Registered Voters Only)

	Dependent variable:
	sanc_approve
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	−1.042***
	(0.100)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.070***
	(0.084)
Black	−0.462**
	(0.180)
Hispanic	0.436**
	(0.175)
Female	0.037
	(0.122)
Age	−0.015***
	(0.004)
Education (low-high)	0.222***
	(0.062)
Geo: Urban	0.155
	(0.136)
Income: 40-150K	0.206
	(0.144)
Income: 150K+	0.343
	(0.223)
Income Missing	−0.045
	(0.207)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.011**
	(0.004)
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.010**
	(0.005)
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.092
	(0.098)
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.026
	(0.264)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−0.951***
	(0.180)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.824*
	(0.459)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.414***
	(0.128)
Constant	4.663***
	(0.494)
Observations	1,971
Log Likelihood	−879.526
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,797.051
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table B5: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" Core results remain unchanged when subsetting to voters in smaller counties. (Voters in counties with populations below mean county)

	Dependent variable:
	sanc_approve
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	−1.050***
	(0.128)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.158***
	(0.109)
Black	−0.308
	(0.265)
Hispanic	0.320
	(0.231)
Female	0.084
	(0.159)
Age	−0.017***
	(0.005)
Education (low-high)	0.289***
	(0.082)
Geo: Urban	0.123
	(0.205)
Income: 40-150K	0.019
	(0.185)
Income: 150K+	−0.152
	(0.300)
Income Missing	−0.239
	(0.275)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.011***
	(0.004)
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.008
	(0.005)
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.105
	(0.098)
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	0.080
	(0.298)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−1.079***
	(0.248)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.460
	(0.634)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.463***
	(0.166)
Constant	4.911***
	(0.588)
Observations	1,249
Log Likelihood	−524.943
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,087.887
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table B6: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" Core results remain unchanged when including Black contextual variables, which rules the possibility that anti-sanctuary attitudes are a function of minority threat, writ large (Black contextual variables).

	Dependent variable:
	sanc_approve
Party ID (Dem-Ind-Rep)	−1.024***
	(0.098)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.075***
	(0.083)
Black	−0.389**
	(0.180)
Hispanic	0.492***
	(0.170)
Female	0.028
	(0.120)
Age	−0.016***
	(0.004)
Education (low-high)	0.220***
	(0.061)
Geo: Urban	0.194
	(0.135)
Income: 40-150K	0.182
	(0.140)
Income: 150K+	0.312
	(0.220)
Income Missing	−0.051
	(0.202)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.010**
	(0.004)
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.011**
	(0.005)
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.122
	(0.096)
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.012
	(0.273)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−0.912***
	(0.175)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.824*
	(0.460)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.460***
	(0.124)
Pct. Black Growth 2000-2014	−0.002
	(0.002)
Pct. Black 2014	−0.007
	(0.009)
Constant	4.825***
	(0.498)
Observations	2,042
Log Likelihood	−917.602
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,877.205
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table B7: Model predictors of approval for sanctuary cities: "Do you support or oppose 'sanctuary cities'?" Core results remain unchanged when party identification is dummied (Party ID dummied).

	Dependent variable:
	sanc_approve
Democrat	1.250***
	(0.160)
Republican	0.233
	(0.144)
Ideology (Lib-Mod-Cons)	−1.254***
	(0.080)
Black	−0.243
	(0.178)
Hispanic	0.514***
	(0.167)
Female	−0.038
	(0.118)
Age	−0.017***
	(0.004)
Education (low-high)	0.232***
	(0.060)
Geo: Urban	0.196
	(0.131)
Income: 40-150K	0.118
	(0.138)
Income: 150K+	0.180
	(0.214)
Income Missing	−0.066
	(0.201)
Pct. Latino Growth: 2000 - 2014	−0.010**
	(0.004)
Pct. Latino 2014	−0.009*
	(0.005)
Murder rate Change (2000-2015)	−0.111
	(0.094)
Total Crime Rate Change (2000-2015)	0.069
	(0.271)
Immigration Most Important Issue	−0.927***
	(0.173)
Crime/Drugs Most Important Issue	−0.825*
	(0.461)
UT-Poll Dummy	−0.422***
	(0.125)
Constant	2.595***
	(0.456)
Observations	2,042
Log Likelihood	−944.961
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,929.921
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

A Appendix C

Robustness Checks

In this section we evaluate several threats to the validity of our analysis. First, we investigate whether including the crime measures from 2015 affect the analysis. Table B2 presents two models, the first column (titled "Crime Both Change and 2015") includes additional covariates for Murder Rate (2015) and Total Crime Rate (2015). The inclusion of these covariates does not affect our substantive findings. The second column (Crime 2015) drops the crime change variables and just includes crime rates from 2015. Again, the results do not change our core findings.

[INSERT TABLE B2 ABOUT HERE]

Second, another potential validity threat is the possibility that our two crime variables are collinear, indeed total crime rate does include murder in the calculation. While the variance inflation factor for the baseline model does not indicate the presence of multi-collinearity, as no VIF scores are higher than 2.5, we nonetheless estimate discrete models for our two crime measures. As column 1 and 2 in Table B3 demonstrates, our substantive results remain unchanged.

In addition, we might be concerned that the crime variables are masked by the Latino variables; and otherwise the crime indicators may show some relationship to attitudes about sanctuary cities. Column 3 in Table B3 evaluates this possibility by dropping the two contextual Latino variables. The coefficients for the two crime contextual variables remain statistically insignificant.

[INSERT TABLE B3 ABOUT HERE]

Third, we use county-level data to measure crime context and cultural/racial context primarily because county-level data are available, but also because research indicates that –

in the main – county-level ethnic change tends to have a broader impact on attitudes than does zip code or tract-level change (Newman and Johnson, 2012; Newman and Velez, 2014). That said, because county is a fairly broad unit of analysis, we do open ourselves up to the potential of ecological fallacy (Collingwood et al., 2016; King, 2013; Schwartz, 1994). That is, some respondents may live in certain high-populated counties like Harris County (Houston) where some county-level indicators may show high crime and high growth, but the respondent lives in a part of the county that is neither of these things. This type of situation is most likely to occur in highly diverse large counties. To guard against this possibility, we subset our analysis to respondents living in counties below the mean population size. The logic is that – on average – researchers are less likely to draw an ecological fallacy based on smaller and more homogeneous populations and so our county measures are less prone to bias in this subsetted analysis. Results are presented in Table B5 in the appendix. Our substantive results do not change, as our main variable of interest – Latino growth – maintains both statistical and substantive significance.

[INSERT TABLE B5 ABOUT HERE]

Finally, part of the challenge with joining observational data with contextual (i.e., county) data is that context – in this case our "treatment" – is not randomly assigned. People living in areas that have undergone rapid Latino growth over the last 15 years may have already exhibited attitudinal and behavioral differences from people who happened to live in areas that did not undergo rapid Latino growth (i.e., perhaps the areas were already high Latino). High Latino growth counties tend to be those places that began the period with a relatively low Latino population, and it may be that people living in those areas were already most negative towards Latinos (which is why they lived where they did). While we doubt this is the case as research generally indicates the opposite – that racial threat is a byproduct of increased diversity (Campbell et al., 2006; Key, 1949; Tolbert and Grummel, 2003), we nonetheless evaluate this possibility by performing a genetic matched analysis (Diamond and Sekhon, 2013; Sekhon, 2011).

In our match we control for a series of demographic predictors that might explain why someone ends up in a high-growth county in the first place, including existing levels of Percent Hispanic (2000).[28] We then assign "treatment" to respondents who now live in a county that receives more than the mean Latino growth (1=treatment), versus respondents who did not (0=control). In this way, people in our treatment and control are close to identical before the "treatment". While our analysis is not perfect, we do find that respondents in the treatment (high Latino growth) condition are more opposed to sanctuary cities than those in the control (low growth) condition (Diff. $\%\text{Oppose} = 7.1, chi - 2 = 6.42, p - value = 0.01$). This is consistent with our main set of findings.

[28]We also include party id, ideology, respondent race, gender, age, education, and geo:urbanity.