Ill-Conceived, Unfair, or Racist?

Criticism as an Ideological Cue in Local Policy Debates

Kirill Zhirkov[1] and Eugenia Quintanilla[2]

[1] University of Virginia

[2] University of Michigan

[Draft. Please don't cite or circulate]

Abstract

Using an original vignette survey experiment, we explore how white Americans' evaluations of policy arguments in the local context change depending on the rhetoric used to criticize the policy. We compare the effects of different charges used by critics of a policy: inefficiency, unfairness, and racism. We find that respondents use political rhetoric as a strong ideological cue: charges of unfairness and racism make respondents perceive policy critics as more liberal and policy supporters as more conservative. The effects of charges on argument evaluations are moderated by partisanship and racial attitudes: Democrats and racially liberal respondents find rhetoric about unfairness and racism more convincing, while for Republicans and racial conservatives the effect is opposite. At the same time, there are no significant treatment effects on the respondents' support for the policy itself or readiness to engage in local political action.

Keywords: argument evaluations, ideological cues, policy positions, political rhetoric, racial attitudes

Racial identity and racial attitudes are known to profoundly shape national politics in the United States (Hutchings and Valentino 2004; McClain 2021), and, according to the argument popularized outside of academia by the 1619 Project, this phenomenon may even predate the country's founding.[1] But U.S. local politics is not immune to it either. Despite a massive social movement for racial equity since the mid-2010s, American cities remain racially segregated (Hwang and McDaniel 2022). Such segregation is maintained and reinforced by policies that concern zoning and land use (Lens 2022), but local policy areas that perpetuate the disparities between racial groups are much more numerous.

Recent controversies around policing and school curricula, which unfolded on the local level, also often implicated race. A prominent feature of such local policy arguments is the employment of racism accusations—that, somewhat surprisingly, come from both sides of the debate. For instance, in December 2021 the Alliance Defending Freedom, a conservative legal nonprofit, filed a lawsuit against the Albemarle County School Board in Virginia. The suit alleged that the district's school curriculum was "racist at its core" because it viewed individuals "through the lens of race."[2] Liberal activists and politicians push back against such accusations, sometimes using the mirroring rhetoric. Democratic candidate for the governor of Virginia Terry McAuliffe has called the conservative campaign against school curricula "a racist dog whistle" that divides parents and uses children as "political pawns."[3]

Even though there are studies of racism charges in political communication, they focus on counter-mobilization against racial appeals in electoral campaigns (Banks and Hicks 2019; Tokeshi and Mendelberg 2015), defense strategies in political scandals (Crawford 2022), or

---

[1]   https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/1619-america-slavery.html

[2]   https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2022/01/14/virginia-critical-race-theory-lawsuit/

[3]   https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/elections/virginia-republicans-see-education-curriculum-fears-path-victory-n1281676

policy areas such as the criminal justice system that are already highly racialized (Nelson, Sanbonmatsu, and McClerking 2007). No investigations exist of how charges of racism can be employed in seemingly racially neutral policy arguments, especially in local context.

In this paper, we explore the effects of racism charges in local policy arguments on white Americans' opinions. Our design has three innovative aspects. First, we study how such charges can be used in a policy debate initially framed in racially neutral terms rather than in response to racial rhetoric coming from the political right or to a racially charged event. Second, we compare the effects of racism charges to the more common left-wing rhetoric that emphasizes income inequality and calls for general fairness. Third, we deliberately focus on local political issues rather than on well-known political figures or national political controversies.

We carry out an original survey-experimental study on a diverse sample of non-Hispanic whites in the United States. The experiment presents respondents with a hypothetical story about a policy debate taking place in an unnamed locality, in which critics of a policy emphasize efficiency, fairness, or racism. We find that respondents use rhetoric as an ideological cue: when a policy is criticized for being unfair or racist, its supporters are seen as more conservative, and its critics are seen as more liberal. We also show that when the charges of unfairness or racism are used against the policy, respondents diverge in evaluations of the arguments by partisanship and racial attitudes. However, our experimental treatments have no effect on participants' support of policy itself or reported readiness to engage in local politics.

Charges of Racism as a Rhetorical Tool

An important assumption in the literature on racial appeals is that a large share of whites still harbor prejudice towards African Americans and other marginalized groups, and that this prejudice has political implications (Hutchings and Jardina 2009). Still, given the partisan sorting

based on racial attitudes (Valentino and Sears 2005), and the rise of racial liberalism among Democrats (Sides, Tesler, and Vavreck 2018), there are growing incentives for political actors on the ideological left to emphasize racial equality in their own rhetoric.

A few existing studies on progressive rhetoric implicating race are inconclusive suggesting that the effectiveness of political appeals emphasizing racial equality is limited (English and Kalla 2021), but potential backlash is also weaker than often assumed (Hanania, Hawley, and Kaufmann 2020). Importantly, these studies see progressive racial rhetoric as a persuasion tactic—but it can also be used strategically to signal liberal credentials. Existing research also focuses on arguments in favor of certain policies rather than against them, while negative messaging (i.e., charges) represent an important rhetorical tool for political actors on the left. For instance, when charges of racism are employed against racial appeals, liberals mobilize in opposition to a politician using such appeals (Banks and Hicks 2019).

Still, a few questions remain. First, it is unclear how the effectiveness of racism charges compares to more traditional arguments used by the political left, such as the ones about fairness and income equality. Even if framing progressive policies in terms of race may be less effective in mobilizing *support*, charges of racism may be particularly effective in mobilizing *opposition*—especially among liberals. At the same time, charges of racism can produce backlash: for instance, reminding respondents about the norms of "political correctness" boosted rather than decreased support for Trump in the 2016 election (Conway, Repke, and Houck 2017).

Second, charges can serve as an ideological cue, and politicians framing opposition to policies in terms of race rather than class or income equality may be perceived as more progressive. Negative rhetoric can also impact evaluations of the target: politicians supporting a

policy labeled as "racist" by the critics can be seen as too conservative and, as a result, lose support—especially among liberals and Democrats.

Finally, the political effects of racism charges may be different when they are used in a context of a local policy argument rather than a national electoral campaign. Political implications of racial attitudes are powerfully shaped by the local context, such as neighborhood-level segregation (Enos 2016). Similarly, considerations related to race are often injected into opinions on the policies that are essentially local—one of the most famous examples is opposition to integration busing (Sears, Hensler, and Speer 1979). While current levels of political polarization may overshadow any effects of racism charges against high-profile policies on the national level, the influence of racism charges in the local policy context could lead to a greater effect. In addition, due to residential polarization local governments in the United States are often under firm single-party control making party labels useless as ideological cues. Therefore, negative rhetoric can become a particularly important ideological signaling tool—like charges employed in the context of primary elections (Britzman and Kantack 2022).

Data and Method

We recruited participants in December 2019 using Lucid, an online data collection platform with a subject pool known to correspond to national probability samples by several important benchmarks (Coppock and McClellan 2019). A total of 688 non-Hispanic white respondents completed the survey. The mean age was 45.1 years, 51.6% of respondents were female, 35.1% of respondents reported having a college degree or higher, and the median income was between $35,000 and $39,999. In terms of political affiliation, 37.0% of respondents were Democrats, 28.9% were Republicans, and 34.1% were independents. Respondents' demographic data, including partisanship, were provided by the Lucid panel.

Each respondent was randomly assigned to read a vignette describing an argument regarding a policy proposal being discussed at a city council (see Figure 1 for a sample vignette). The policy proposal was randomly chosen from one of three areas for which local governments are usually responsible: public transit, urban redevelopment, and school integration. Vignettes included comments from both supporters and critics of the policy. Supporters' arguments were held constant by policy area and featured potential policy benefits stated in racially neutral terms. Critics' arguments, in turn, were assigned to one of three conditions: efficiency ("ill-conceived," reference to the overall effect), fairness ("unfair," reference to the effect on the poor), or racism ("racist," reference to the effect on minority populations). Policy areas and critics' rhetoric were randomized independently thus yielding a three-by-three design (nine conditions total). To minimize the potential effect of implicit ideological cues in the treatment (city councils in the United States are often controlled by the Democratic Party), both sides of the argument were labeled as Democrats and the city council was described as having a progressive majority.

[Figure 1 about here]

After reading the treatment, participants answered a series of items that served as the dependent variables in our analyses. First, they assessed the ideology of the supporters and critics of the policy described in the vignette on the standard scale from 1 = *Extremely liberal* to 7 = *Extremely conservative*. Second, respondents were asked to provide a rating of whether the supporters or the critics were more convincing in their argument on a scale from 0 = *Supporters more convincing* to 10 = *Critics more convincing*. Third, they expressed their own personal level of support for the policy on a scale from 1 = *Strongly oppose* to 7 = *Strongly support*. Last, participants indicated in which of the seven forms of political actions, from voting to direct

protest, they would participate if a council member in their city voted on the policy in the vignette in a way that disagreed with their personal stance on the issue.

Racial attitudes were measured using the ANES racial resentment battery (Kinder and Sanders 1996). For full survey items and all experimental vignettes, see Supplementary Material.

Results

We start from estimating the average treatment effects with results presented in Figure 2. Since all dependent variables are on different scales, the estimated effects are standardized in all figures (for unstandardized results, see Supplementary Material). Invoking fairness or racism rhetoric affects how respondents perceive the ideology of supporters and critics of the policy. When critics use unfairness or racism charges against the policy, it leads respondents to see supporters as more conservative and critics as more liberal compared with the efficiency condition. There are no significant average treatment effects on evaluation of policy arguments, policy support, or willingness to engage in political action.

[Figure 2 about here]

We also test whether assessments of councilmembers' ideology are driven by a specific policy area. To do so, we estimate treatment effects independently for public transit, urban redevelopment, and school integration vignettes. Results are presented in Figure 3. Despite a decrease in statistical power due to splitting the sample, the effects of critics invoking pro-equality rhetoric show up in the public transit and urban redevelopment conditions. In the school integration condition, all effects are not significant and very close to zero—likely, because this policy area is already highly ideologically and racially charged.

[Figure 3 about here]

Next, we compare treatment effects on argument evaluations (policy critics being rated as more convincing than supporters) and policy support for Democrats and Republicans (leaners included as partisans, true independents excluded). Results are presented in Figure 4. Treatments do not change respondents' evaluations of the policy itself, even when the sample is split by party. However, they change how partisans evaluate the two sides in the argument: when critics of the policy invoke fairness or racism rhetoric, Democrats find their arguments more convincing and Republicans less convincing. Interestingly, positive change among Democrats is most pronounced in the fairness condition whereas backlash among Republicans is strongest in the racism condition.

[Figure 4 about here]

Finally, we explore racial resentment as a potential moderator of treatment effects on argument evaluations. The interaction is presented graphically in Figure 5. When critics use either fairness or racism rhetoric, evaluations of their arguments improve among respondents with low levels of racial resentment and worsen among those with high levels of racial resentment. Among those with average levels of racial resentment, treatments have no effect.

[Figure 5 about here]

Conclusion

Recent findings indicate that charges of racism in the context of a political campaign can mobilize liberals to oppose candidates who employ racial appeals (Banks and Hicks 2019). In this paper, we extend this line of research by exploring the political effects of racism charges in the context of local policy debates. Our original survey experiment compares the effects of different charges (ill-conceived, unfair, racist) on perceptions about policy critics' and

supporters' ideology, evaluations of their arguments, opinions about the policy, and readiness to act to achieve the preferred policy outcome.

Our results suggest that respondents mainly use charges of racism in local policy debates as ideological cues. When critics levy charges of unfairness or racism against a policy, they are perceived as more politically liberal, compared to when they use charges of policy inefficiency. Rhetoric used by policy critics impacts perceived ideology of their opponents, even though policy supporters' arguments are kept constant across the experimental conditions. As a result, unfairness and racism charges result in respondents estimating the policy debate in our treatments as more ideologically polarized—an effect that parallels the current U.S. political climate. This effect is found despite experimental treatments uniformly describing both supporters and critics as Democrats, thus suggesting that using charges in policy debates as ideological cues can be particularly relevant in contexts with limited or no party competition.

This finding highlights the potential strategic reasons for using the racism charges by conservative groups and candidates, which is a relatively new phenomenon in U.S. local politics. Our results suggest that conservative politicians who accuse opponents of racism may be seen by as more moderate. The use of unfairness rhetoric for the same purpose may be less appealing to conservative candidates who want to maintain the image of being opposed to income redistribution. Establishing a non-trivial effect of using unfairness and racism charges on ideological perceptions about local politicians is an important contribution of our work.

We have shown that respondents' partisanship and racial attitudes condition the effects of rhetoric on argument evaluation in local policy debates. Democrats tend to side with critics over supporters in the unfairness condition, whereas Republicans move in the opposite direction in the racism condition. Respondents low on racial resentment react to both unfairness and racism

charges by siding with the policy critics whereas those high on racial resentment respond to these charges by siding with policy supporters.

We have not found direct effects of charges' content on respondents' policy support or readiness to participate in local politics. There are several potential explanations for this. Due to political polarization in the United States, policy positions can be simply too difficult to move. Although we vary policy area in our treatments, it is likely that respondents' existing partisan perspectives on the policy areas attenuated our treatment effects. Additionally, respondents' willingness to participate could be stronger if vignettes feature their own localities, instead of a hypothetical example. At the same time, the null effect on policy preferences and behavior can be genuine: for instance, white millennials, while opposing racism and bigotry as individual acts, demonstrate stagnating attitudes towards racially progressive policies (DeSante and Smith 2020).

Our results demonstrate that ostensibly non-racial (unfairness) and explicitly racial (racism) charges have mostly similar effects across the analyses. This contrasts with a recent study that reports significant backlash against framing policy arguments in racial terms (English and Kalla 2021). The reasons for this discrepancy are unclear. It is possible that the effect of pro-egalitarian racial rhetoric depends on whether it is used to support or oppose a policy. Another possibility is that, since poverty in the United States is racialized (Gilens 1999), mentioning it in our treatments still primes racial considerations.

Results of our study also allow sketching some prospects for future research. For instance, our treatments do not vary the partisanship of policy supporters and critics. We also do not provide information about their race or ethnicity. An obvious extension of our work is to explore how the credibility of racism charges against a policy may be affected by critics' racial and ethnic identity as well as by their partisanship or ideology (Crawford 2022; Nelson,

Sanbonmatsu, and McClerking 2007; Tokeshi and Mendelberg 2015). Additionally, our treatments explore the effects of racism charges on citizens' evaluations of new policy proposals. It will be interesting to see how similar charges affect support for the status quo and readiness to act against it—especially considering current developments in American politics.

References

Banks, Antoine J., and Heather M. Hicks. 2019. "The Effectiveness of a Racialized Counterstrategy." *American Journal of Political Science* 63 (2): 305–322.

Britzman, Kylee J., and Benjamin R. Kantack. 2022. "Do Ideological Attacks Change How Voters Evaluate Primary Election Candidates? *American Politics Research* 50 (5): 657–67.

Conway, Lucian Gideon, III, Meredith A. Repke, and Shannon C. Houck. 2017. "Donald Trump as a Cultural Revolt Against Perceived Communication Restriction: Priming Political Correctness Norms Causes More Trump Support." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 5 (1): 244–59.

Coppock, Alexander, and Oliver A. McClellan. 2019. "Validating the Demographic, Political, Psychological, and Experimental Results Obtained from a New Source of Online Survey Respondents." *Research and Politics* 6 (1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168018822174

Crawford, Nyron N. 2022. "'It's a Racist Plot': An Experimental Test of the Racial Defense." *Urban Affairs Review* 58 (5): 1277–304.

DeSante, Christopher D., and Candis Watts Smith. 2020. *Racial Stasis: The Millennial Generation and the Stagnation of Racial Attitudes in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

English, Micah, and Joshua Kalla. 2021. "Racial Equality Frames and Public Policy Support: Survey Experimental Evidence." Unpublished manuscript. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/tdkf3

Enos, Ryan D. 2016. "What the Demolition of Public Housing Teaches Us about the Impact of Racial Threat on Political Behavior." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (1): 123–42.

Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hanania, Richard, George Hawley, and Eric Kaufmann. 2020. "Losing Elections, Winning the Debate: Progressive Racial Rhetoric and White Backlash." Unpublished manuscript. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/uzkvf

Hutchings, Vincent L., and Ashley E. Jardina. 2009. "Experiments on Racial Priming in Political Campaigns." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12: 397–402.

Hutchings, Vincent L., and Nicholas A. Valentino. 2021. "The Centrality of Race in American Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 383–408.

Hwang, Jackelyn, and Tyler W. McDaniel. 2022. "Racialized Reshuffling: Urban Change and the Persistence of Segregation in the Twenty-First Century." *Annual Review Sociology* 48: 397–419.

Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lens, Michael C. 2022. "Zoning, Land Use, and the Reproduction of Urban Inequality." *Annual Review Sociology* 48: 421–39.

McClain, Paula D. 2021. "Crises, Race, Acknowledgement: The Centrality of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics to the Future of Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 19 (1): 7–18.

Sears, David O., Carl P. Hensler, and Leslie K. Speer. 1979. "Whites' Opposition to 'Busing': Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics?" *American Political Science Review* 73 (2): 369–84.

Sides, John, Michael Tesler, and Lynn Vavreck. 2018. *Identity Crisis: The 2016 Presidential Campaign and the Battle for the Meaning of America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tokeshi, Matthew, and Tali Mendelberg. 2015. "Countering Implicit Appeals: Which Strategies Work?" *Political Communication* 32 (4): 648–72.

Valentino, Nicholas A., and David O. Sears. 2005. "Old Times There Are Not Forgotten: Race and Partisan Realignment in the Contemporary South." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 672–88.

Supplementary Material

Racial resentment
"Below are several statements regarding position of blacks in American society. For each one, we would like to know how strongly you agree or disagree."
- Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.
- Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.
- It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.
- Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

Statement order randomized.
Answers coded from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 7 = *Strongly agree*.

Vignette: intro
(same for all vignettes)
"The following is an excerpt from a story about a city council meeting. Please read the paragraph carefully, and answer the questions following to the best of your ability:"

Vignette: public transit, efficiency
"After many complaints from residents about traffic congestion and parking shortages, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves improvement of public transit through expansion of the city's tram system. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved traffic and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'ill-conceived,' claiming that the new routes will be too far from many neighborhoods, so that their residents will be effectively excluded from using the tram."

Vignette: public transit, fairness
"After many complaints from residents about traffic congestion and parking shortages, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves improvement of public transit through expansion of the city's tram system. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved traffic and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'unfair,' claiming that the new routes will be too far from many low-income neighborhoods, so that their residents will be effectively excluded from using the tram."

Vignette: public transit, racism
"After many complaints from residents about traffic congestion and parking shortages, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves improvement of public transit through expansion of the city's tram system. However, the

proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved traffic and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'racist,' claiming that the new routes will be too far from many minority neighborhoods, so that their residents will be effectively excluded from using the tram."

Vignette: urban redevelopment, efficiency
"After many complaints from residents about failing infrastructure and high crime rates, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves a massive redevelopment of major city buildings, public spaces, and roads. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved crime rates and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'ill-conceived,' claiming that current residents of the renovated neighborhoods will have to move due to rising housing costs."

Vignette: urban redevelopment, fairness
"After many complaints from residents about failing infrastructure and high crime rates, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves a massive redevelopment of major city buildings, public spaces, and roads. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved crime rates and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'unfair,' claiming that current residents of the renovated low-income neighborhoods will have to move due to rising housing costs."

Vignette: urban redevelopment, racism
"After many complaints from residents about failing infrastructure and high crime rates, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves a massive redevelopment of major city buildings, public spaces, and roads. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved crime rates and incentivized newcomers to move in. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'racist,' claiming that current residents of the renovated minority neighborhoods will have to move due to rising housing costs."

Vignette: school integration, efficiency
"After many complaints from residents about achievement gaps in the school system, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves an effort to reduce educational inequality through a busing system and district rezoning. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs,

citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved community cohesion and led to better education outcomes. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'ill-conceived,' claiming that the changes will negatively impact students by placing them in unfamiliar and potentially unwelcoming environments."

Vignette: school integration, fairness
"After many complaints from residents about achievement gaps in the school system, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves an effort to reduce educational inequality through a busing system and district rezoning. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved community cohesion and led to better education outcomes. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'unfair,' claiming that the changes will negatively impact low-income students by placing them in unfamiliar and potentially unwelcoming environments."

Vignette: school integration, racism
"After many complaints from residents about achievement gaps in the school system, the city council announced a new policy proposal at its most recent meeting. The plan involves an effort to reduce educational inequality through a busing system and district rezoning. However, the proposal divided the progressive majority in the council that is firmly controlled by Democrats. Democratic council members who support the policy argue that the project is worth the costs, citing information about how similar changes in other cities improved community cohesion and led to better education outcomes. Critics of the proposal among council's Democrats are calling the plan 'racist,' claiming that the changes will negatively impact minority students by placing them in unfamiliar and potentially unwelcoming environments."

Ideology guess
"Given information from the story, where would you place supporters and critics of the proposed policy on a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative?"
- Supporters of the policy
- Critics of the policy

Answers coded from 1 = *Extremely liberal* to 7 = *Extremely conservative*.

Argument evaluation
"Do you find supporters or critics of the policy more convincing? For your answer, use the rating scale from 0 to 10. Ratings close to 0 mean that you find supporters of the policy much more convincing. Ratings close to 10 mean that you find critics of the policy much more convincing. Ratings close to 5 mean that you find supporters and critics of the policy approximately equally convincing."

Policy support
"Would you personally support or oppose the policy?"
Answers coded from 1 = *Strongly oppose* to 7 = *Strongly support*.

Political action

"Imagine that a council member in your city voted on this policy in a way that disagreed with your stance on the issue. Which of the following would you be willing to do to voice your opinion?"

- Vote in the next council election
- Work for a challenger candidate
- Donate to a challenger candidate
- Talk to people in your community
- Contact your council member
- Sign a petition
- Participate in a protest

Item order randomized.

Responses coded from 0 = *No action chosen* to 7 = *All actions chosen*.

Table S1. Experimental results: means across conditions and estimated treatment effects for all dependent variables

	Scale	Mean			Effect	
		Efficiency	Fairness	Racism	Fairness	Racism
Ideology guess	1–7					
Supporters		3.71	4.06	3.85	0.35*	0.15
					(0.14)	(0.15)
Critics		4.51	4.06	4.10	−0.45**	−0.41**
					(0.15)	(0.15)
Difference		−0.80	−0.01	−0.27	0.80***	0.53*
					(0.22)	(0.22)
Critics convincing	0–10	5.10	5.09	4.98	−0.01	−0.12
					(0.22)	(0.23)
Policy support	1–7	3.60	3.69	3.67	0.09	0.07
					(0.15)	(0.15)
Participation intent	0–7	1.92	1.88	1.81	−0.04	−0.10
					(0.13)	(0.13)

Note. Effect = named condition mean minus efficiency condition mean. Ideological difference = supporters' ideology minus critics' ideology. For ideology, higher values mean more conservative. Standard errors in parentheses (effects only)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (effects only)

Table S2. Experimental results: means across conditions and estimated treatment effects on ideological assessment of policy supporters and critics by vignette policy area

	Mean			Effect	
	Efficiency	Fairness	Racism	Fairness	Racism
Supporters' ideology					
Public transit	3.67	4.22	3.82	0.56*	0.16
				(0.26)	(0.26)
Urban redevelopment	3.82	4.30	4.04	0.48*	0.22
				(0.23)	(0.23)
School integration	3.61	3.65	3.70	0.04	0.09
				(0.26)	(0.26)
Critics' ideology					
Public transit	4.47	4.00	4.01	−0.47	−0.46
				(0.28)	(0.28)
Urban redevelopment	4.54	4.00	3.91	−0.54*	−0.63*
				(0.25)	(0.25)
School integration	4.52	4.17	4.36	−0.35	−0.16
				(0.24)	(0.24)
Ideological difference					
Public transit	−0.80	0.24	−0.21	1.04*	0.60
				(0.41)	(0.41)
Urban redevelopment	−0.71	0.30	0.13	1.02**	0.85*
				(0.37)	(0.37)
School integration	−0.91	−0.56	−0.74	0.35	0.17
				(0.35)	(0.36)

Note. Effect = named condition mean minus efficiency condition mean. Ideological difference = supporters' ideology minus critics' ideology. Standard errors in parentheses (effects only). Ideology scale from 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (effects only)

Table S3. Experimental results: means across conditions and estimated treatment effects on argument evaluation and policy opinion by respondents' party

	Scale	Mean			Effect	
		Efficiency	Fairness	Racism	Fairness	Racism
Critics convincing	0–10					
Democrats		4.28	5.02	4.90	0.75*	0.62
					(0.37)	(0.38)
Republicans		5.97	5.63	5.21	−0.34	−0.76*
					(0.35)	(0.34)
Policy support	1–7					
Democrats		3.43	3.65	3.33	0.22	−0.10
					(0.24)	(0.25)
Republicans		3.75	3.65	3.83	−0.11	0.08
					(0.25)	(0.24)

Note. Effect = named condition mean minus efficiency condition mean. Standard errors in parentheses (effects only)
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (effects only)

Table S4. Full non-standardized results of the interactive model

	Estimate
Fairness condition	2.18***
	(0.63)
Racism condition	1.69*
	(0.66)
Racial resentment	0.47***
	(0.10)
Fairness * Resentment	-0.54***
	(0.14)
Racism * Resentment	-0.44**
	(0.15)

Note. Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$