

Fear Itself: Causes and Consequences of Fear in America

Appendix: Methods and Findings

Christopher D. Bader, Joseph O. Baker, L. Edward Day and Ann Gordon

For readers who would like to take a deeper dive into methodological procedures, this appendix provides details on how our national surveys were conducted. It also includes additional statistical analyses that undergird our narrative. The Chapman Survey of American Fears (CSAF) is a yearly national survey that offers an unprecedented look at fear in America. As of 2019, there have been five waves of the survey. Waves 1 through 3 were conducted by GfK and Waves 4 and 5 were conducted by SSRS.

CSAF Wave 1 (2014)

The study was conducted on KnowledgePanel®, a probability-based web panel designed to be representative of the United States. The sample for this survey consisted of non-institutionalized general population adults residing in the United States.

The survey was fielded in English in two stages: The Pretest and the Main. For each survey, GfK sampled randomly age eligible adults. Selected panel members for each survey received an email invitation to complete the survey and were asked to do so at their earliest convenience.

The Pretest survey was designed to test the functionality and length of the instrument in a small sample of approximately 25 panel members. The median completion time of the Pretest survey was 22 minutes. Upon review of the Pretest results, no changes were made to the Pretest survey for the Main. The median completion time of the Main survey was 25 minutes.

Upon completion of the survey, members who joined KnowledgePanel and had existing PCs and internet access received the standard cash-equivalent post-survey incentive, an amount equivalent to \$1 to \$1.50 depending on when they joined the panel. Members who did not have PCs and internet access prior to joining KnowledgePanel received laptop PCs and internet access upon joining the panel. Because both surveys were longer than the 15-minute weekly survey experience that panel members receive, everyone who completed the Pretest and Main survey received an entry into the KnowledgePanel sweepstakes as compensation.

The study was conducted on KnowledgePanel®, a probability-based web panel designed to be representative of the United States. The sample for this survey consisted of non-institutionalized general population adults (18+ year olds) residing in the United States. KnowledgePanel's probability-based recruitment was originally based exclusively on a national RDD frame. In April 2009, in response to the growing number of cellphone-only households that are outside of the RDD frame, GfK migrated to using an ABS frame for selecting panel members. This probability-based methodology improves population coverage. Currently, approximately 40% of panel members were recruited through RDD, while 60% were recruited using ABS. For both ABS and RDD recruitment, households without an Internet connection were provided with a web-enabled device and free Internet service. After initially accepting the invitation to join the panel, participants are asked to complete a short demographic survey (the initial profile survey); answers to these questions allow efficient panel sampling and weighting for surveys. Completion of the profile survey allows participants to become panel members. These procedures were established for the

RDDrecruited panel members and continued with ABS recruited panel members. Respondents sampled from the RDD and ABS frames are provided the same privacy terms and confidentiality protections.

CSAF Wave 2 (2015)

As with wave 1, GfK conducted the survey. To sample the population, GfK sampled households from its KnowledgePanel®, a probability-based web panel designed to be representative of the United States. The survey consisted of the main survey with the study-eligible respondents. To qualify for the main survey, a panel member must have been 18+ and a resident of the United States, as determined by KnowledgePanel® Profile Surveys. There were 2,660 cases in the sample. Of the 1,541 cases completing the main survey, 1,541 cases were determined to be valid cases to be included in the final analyses, yielding a completion rate of 58%. Thus, the completion rate was As a standard, email reminders to non-responders were sent on day three of the field period. Additional email reminders to non-responders were sent on day #7 of the field period

CSAF Wave 3 (2016)

The KnowledgePanel was also employed in wave 3. The target population consisted of the following: General population adults, age 18+, English language survey takers. To sample the population, GfK sampled households from its KnowledgePanel, a probability- based web panel designed to be representative of the United States. To qualify for the main survey, a panel member must have been: age 18+ and an English language survey taker. Some 2,669 were sampled and 1,511 completed surveys, for a completion rate of 56.61% **CSAF Wave 4 (2017)**

The fourth wave was conducted by SSRS. The CSAF was conducted online via the SSRS Probability Panel and invited adults age 18 and older to participate via the web. It included 1,207 participants and data collection was conducted from June 28 to July 7, 2017. This survey was conducted using the SSRS Probability Panel. SSRS Panel members are recruited randomly from a dual-frame random digit dial (RDD) sample, through the SSRS Omnibus Survey. The SSRS Omnibus survey is a national (50-state), bilingual telephone survey designed to meet standards of quality associated with custom research studies. The SSRS Omnibus runs six waves each month. Each wave consists of 1,000 interviews, of which 600 are obtained with respondents on their cell phones, and approximately 35 interviews completed in Spanish.

This recruiting design relies on an existing, high-quality survey platform resulting in an affordable probabilistically-sourced panel. Respondents of the SSRS Omnibus represent the full U.S. adult population (English and Spanish speaking). From this base, SSRS screens for Internet access and then recruits those who have access to be part of the SSRS Probability Panel.

From each SSRS Omnibus wave of about 1,000 respondents, approximately 85% are identified as having Internet access and are invited to participate in the Panel. Of these, approximately 45% agree to participate and provide their email address.

All sample members drawn for the CSAF were adult, English-language panelists. Sample drawn for the CSAF was stratified by education due to greater non-response by panelists with lower education.

Surveys conducted using the SSRS Probability Panel are self-administered web surveys that can be take on a mobile phone, computer or tablet. In appreciation for their participation, panelists receive a modest incentive for participation (in the form of an electronic Amazon gift card or cash sent via postal mail according to respondent preference). Depending on the field period, reminder emails are sent to panelists who do not

complete the survey after being sent the initial invitation. The median length¹ of the CSAF survey was 24 minutes.

Panelists were emailed an invitation to complete the CSAF survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique passcode-embedded link. In appreciation for their participation, panelists received a seven-dollar incentive (in the form of an electronic Amazon gift card or a cash sent via postal mail depending upon respondent preference). Panelists not responding to their first invitation received a reminder email three days after the initial invitation. Two additional rounds of reminders were then sent every two days to those who had not yet completed the survey. A total of three reminders were sent to all non-responders, as well as to any panelists who started, but did not complete, the survey.

As a standard of practice for Probability Panel surveys, several quality checks were incorporated into the survey. For CSAF, these included asking respondents to select a specific response when viewing a list of items, as well as re-asking the same factual type question later in the survey. Respondents who failed the quality checks employed were not included in the final data set.

Respondents were allowed to skip any question they did not wish to answer; however, high rates of non-response can be correlated with poor data quality. Notably, 77% of respondents answered 100% of all survey questions, with no one completing less than 89% of the entire questionnaire.

Response rates are one method used to assess the quality of a survey, as they provide a measure of how successfully the survey obtained responses from the sample. The American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has established standardized methods for calculating response rates (AAPOR, 2008). As noted previously, SSRS Panel members are recruited randomly from SSRS Omnibus. The Response Rate for SSRS Omnibus is typically 8%. As noted above, of the Omnibus respondents who are invited to join the SSRS Probability Panel, approximately 45% agree to become part of the panel. Typical cooperation (i.e., completion) rates obtained by the SSRS Probability Panel range from 15% - 20%. The CSAF completion rate is 16%.²

SSRS implemented several quality assurance procedures in data file preparation and processing. In addition to extensive testing of the web survey prior to the launching data collection, random data were generated to ensure that skip patterns were working correctly. After the soft launch, survey data were carefully checked for accuracy, completeness, and non-response to specific questions so that any issues could be identified and resolved prior to the full launch.

The data file programmer implemented a “data cleaning” procedure in which web survey skip patterns were created in order to ensure that all questions had the appropriate numbers of cases. This procedure involved a check of raw data by a program that consisted of instructions derived from the skip patterns designated on the questionnaire. The program confirmed that data were consistent with the definitions of codes and ranges and matched the appropriate bases of all questions. The CSAF survey included only two conditional questions requiring skip logic.

This study, using sample selected from the SSRS Probability Panel, was weighted to provide nationally representative and projectable estimates of the adult population 18 years of age and older. The weighting process takes into account the recruitment of panelists through the SSRS Omnibus, thus the disproportionate

¹ The mean length of the survey was 29 minutes and the modal length was 23 minutes.

² The completion rate is based on the N=1,307 who completed the survey (prior to removals based on quality control checks).

probabilities of household and respondent selection due to the number of separate telephone landlines and cellphones answered by Omnibus respondents and their households, as well as the probability associated with the random selection of an individual household member. In addition, a propensity score for joining the SSRS Probability Panel is applied for all respondents of SSRS Omnibus and used as a base-weight for those panelists that complete the survey. Following application of the above weights, the sample was post-stratified and balanced by key demographics such as age, race, sex, region, and education. The sample was also weighted to reflect the distribution of phone usage in the general population, meaning the proportion of those who are cell phone only, landline only, and mixed users.

CSAF Wave 5 (2018)

As with the previous wave, the 2018 survey was conducted by SSRS. The CSAF was conducted online via the SSRS Probability Panel and invited adults age 18 and older to participate via the web. It included 1,190 participants and data collection was conducted from June 25 to July 10, 2018.

The SSRS Probability Panel is nationally representative probability-based web panel. Given that this is a probability-based web panel, findings are statistically projectable to the adult general population. SSRS Probability Panel members are recruited randomly from a dual-frame random digit dial (RDD) sample, through the SSRS Omnibus survey. The SSRS Omnibus is a national, weekly, dual-frame bilingual telephone survey. Each weekly wave of the SSRS Omnibus consists of 1,000 interviews, of which 600 are obtained with respondents on their cell phones, and approximately 35 interviews completed in Spanish.

Because the SSRS Probability Panel recruitment relies on an existing, high-quality survey platform, the result is an affordable probabilistically-sourced sample. Respondents of the SSRS Omnibus represent the full U.S. adult population (English- and Spanish-speaking). From this base, SSRS screens for Internet access and then recruits those who have Internet access³ to be part of the SSRS Probability Panel.

All sample members drawn for the CSAF were adult, English-language panelists. Sample drawn for the CSAF was stratified by education due to greater non-response by panelists with lower education.

Surveys conducted using the SSRS Probability Panel are self-administered web surveys. In appreciation for their participation, panelists receive a modest incentive for participation (in the form of an electronic Amazon gift card or cash sent via postal mail according to respondent preference). Depending on the field period, reminder emails are sent to panelists who do not complete the survey after being sent the initial invitation. The median length⁴ of the CSAF survey was 22 minutes.

Panelists were emailed an invitation to complete the CSAF survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique passcode-embedded link. In appreciation for their participation, panelists received a seven-dollar incentive (in the form of an electronic Amazon gift card). Panelists not responding to their first invitation received a reminder email one week after the initial invitation. Three additional rounds of reminders were then sent to selected respondents in underrepresented demographics who had not yet completed the survey.

³ According to a Pew Research Center report, approximately 89% of adults nationally have internet access: <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/internet-broadband/>

⁴ The mean length of the survey was 27 minutes and the modal length was 20 minutes.

Quality checks were incorporated into the survey. For CSAF, these included asking respondents to select a specific response when viewing a list of items. Respondents who failed the quality checks employed were not included in the final data set.

In addition, respondents were allowed to skip any question they did not wish to answer; however, high rates of non-response can be correlated with poor data quality. Notably, 77% of respondents answered 100% of all survey questions, with no one completing less than 91% of the entire questionnaire.

As noted previously, SSRS Panel members are recruited randomly from SSRS Omnibus. The Response Rate for SSRS Omnibus is typically 8%. As noted above, of the Omnibus respondents who are invited to join the SSRS Probability Panel, approximately 45% agree to become part of the panel. Typical cooperation (i.e., completion) rates obtained by the SSRS Probability Panel range from 15% - 20%. The CSAF completion rate is 17.48%.⁵

As with the prior study, that also used a sample selected from the SSRS Probability Panel, the survey was weighted to provide nationally representative and projectable estimates of the adult population 18 years of age and older. The weighting process takes into account the recruitment of panelists through the SSRS Omnibus, thus the disproportionate probabilities of household and respondent selection due to the number of separate telephone landlines and cellphones answered by Omnibus respondents and their households, as well as the probability associated with the random selection of an individual household member. In addition, a propensity score for joining the SSRS Probability Panel is applied for all respondents of SSRS Omnibus and used as a base-weight for those panelists that complete the survey. Following application of the above weights, the sample was post-stratified and balanced by key demographics such as age, race, sex, region, and education. The sample was also weighted to reflect the distribution of phone usage in the general population, meaning the proportion of those who are cell phone only, landline only, and mixed users.

Data Analyses

Throughout the book, we reference additional analyses that are not printed in the volume. Rather, they are available here, in the online appendix. These analyses are based upon full regressions with controls. The controls are in the table below:

Control Variables Used in Regression Analyses

Demographics
Gender (0=Female/1=Male)
Age of respondent in years.
Education ordinal variable
Is respondent married (0=NO, 1=YES)
Household income
Currently employed? (1=YES)
Race/Ethnicity (Set of dichotomous variables)

⁵ The completion rate is based on the N=1,297 who completed the survey (prior to removals based on quality control checks).

White, Black, Hispanic, Other
Region of the Country (set of dichotomous variables)
Northeast, Midwest/North Central, South, West and whether respondent lives in a metro area.
Does respondent live in a metro area (1=YES)
Political Ideology
Continuous variable. 1 = Extremely liberal, 7= Extremely conservative
Religion
Frequency of religious service attendance. Continuous.
Dichotomous. Is respondent a Biblical literalist? (1=YES)
Religious Preference
Set of dichotomous variables for religious preference (Protestant, Catholic, Christian, Jewish, Other, Non-affiliated, no opinion). We included all variables except for CTL_REL_ATHEIST which is contrast category. Note: We asked religion differently in Waves 3 and 4, so the Religious Tradition controls vary.
As with Wave 3, Atheist is used as the contrast category. Categories included: Protestant, Catholic, Christian, Jewish, Other, Agnostic, Nothing, Atheist).

Table A1: OLS Regression Predicting Scores on Anti-Vaccine Index

Variables	b	β
Gender	.011	.002
Age	-.016**	-.078
Education	-.213***	-.131
Income	-.080***	-.101
Married	.367	.052
Employed	.150	.021
Black ^a	1.282***	.115
Hispanic ^a	1.208***	.123
Other races ^a	1.281***	.096
Midwest ^b	-.265	-.031
Northeast ^b	.171	.019
West ^b	-.226	-.027
Metro	.053	.006
Political liberalism	-.441***	-.189
Church Attendance	-.068	-.048
Biblical literalist	.008	.002
Protestant ^c	.479	.054
Catholic ^c	1.334***	.157
Other Christian ^c	.946***	.116
Jewish ^c	.290	.012
Other religions ^c	1.382***	.112
Model stats		
Constant	17.520	
N	1420	
Adjusted R ²	.125	

Dependent Variable: Sum of agreement that vaccines cause autism, vaccines do *not* protect children, drug companies lie about vaccines, kids get too many vaccines, friends concerned about vaccines, and parents should be able to decide whether kids get vaccines

Source: 2015 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: No religion is comparison

Table A2: OLS Regression Predicting the Sum of All Fears

Variables	b	β
Gender	-2.870***	-.218
Age	-.065***	-.173
Education	-.231***	-.067
Income	-.592*	-.110
Married	-.662	-.050
Employed	-1.195**	-.090
Black ^a	2.026**	.098
Hispanic ^a	1.848*	.076
Other races ^a	1.324*	.072
Midwest ^b	-1.659**	-.102
Northeast ^b	.424	.024
West ^b	-1.082*	-.070
Metro	-.120	-.007
Politics	.036	.008
Religious attendance	1.534***	.644
Attendance squared	-.181***	-.743
Biblical literalist	.679	.036
Protestant ^c	-.143	-.009
Catholic ^c	1.317	.078
Other Christian ^c	.281	.016
Jewish ^c	1.086	.028
Other religions ^c	.169	.006
Nothing ^c	.115	.007
Agnostic ^c	.022	.001
Model stats		
Constant	5.600	
N	976	
Adjusted R ²	.198	

Dependent Variable: Sum of agreement that vaccines cause autism, vaccines do *not* protect children, drug companies lie about vaccines, kids get too many vaccines, friends concerned about vaccines, and parents should be able to decide whether kids get vaccines

Source: 2017 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A3: OLS Regression Predicting Right-Wing Fears

Variables	b	β
Gender	-.603	-.051
Age	.047***	.134
Education	-.140	-.046
Income	.139	.029
Married	-.432	-.037
Employed	.031	.003
Black ^a	-1.745**	-.087
Hispanic ^a	-.564	-.024
Other races ^a	-.603	-.037
Midwest ^b	-.068	-.005
Northeast ^b	-.043	-.003
West ^b	.626	.045
Metro	-1.572***	-.107
Politically conservative	1.446***	.395
Church Attendance	-.035	-.016
Biblical literalist	1.296*	.076
Protestant ^c	-.376	-.029
Catholic ^c	-.470	-.031
Other Christian ^c	-.572	-.035
Jewish ^c	.306	.008
Other religions ^c	-.728	-.029
Nothing ^c	-.580	-.039
Agnostic ^c	-.730	-.030
Local newspaper	-.031	-.009
National newspaper	-.115	-.032
Nightly news	-.033	-.010
Fox News	.590***	.184
MSNBC	-.399***	-.107
Local news	.193	.055
Talk radio	.187*	.057
Online news	.004	.001
Social media news	-.056	-.018
Daytime talk shows	.179	.039
Model stats		
Constant	8.872	
N	789	
Adjusted R ²	.439	

Dependent Variable: Sum of fears about Islamic extremists, animal rights groups, environmental activists, whites no longer being the majority, illegal immigrants, and Obamacare

Source: 2017 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A3: OLS Regression Predicting Left-Wing Fears

Variables	B	β
Gender	-.245	-.022
Age	.038*	.113
Education	.166	.057
Income	-.151	-.033
Married	-.820	-.074
Employed	-1.196*	-.107
Black ^a	.910	.052
Hispanic ^a	2.831***	.136
Other races ^a	-.685	-.045
Midwest ^b	-.360	-.027
Northeast ^b	-.707	-.046
West ^b	-.431	-.032
Metro	.608	.043
Politically conservative	-.707***	-.202
Church Attendance	-.127	-.063
Biblical literalist	-.111	-.007
Protestant ^c	-3.440**	-.266
Catholic ^c	-3.542**	-.247
Other Christian ^c	-2.771*	-.189
Jewish ^c	-2.234	-.060
Other religions ^c	-.448	-.018
Nothing ^c	-2.723*	-.201
Agnostic ^c	-2.591	-.111
Local newspaper	.230	.067
National newspaper	.154	.045
Nightly news	.245	.077
Fox News	-.619***	-.203
MSNBC	.380*	.110
Local news	.171	.053
Talk radio	-.014	-.005
Online news	-.152	-.046
Social media news	.296*	.105
Daytime talk shows	.315	.072
Model stats		
Constant	17.205	
N	549	
Adjusted R ²	.282	

Dependent Variable: Sum of fears about sovereign citizens, militias, white supremacists, anti-immigration groups, anti-abortion groups, anti-tax groups, and Trumpcare

Source: 2017 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A4: Binary Logistic Regression Predicting Belief in South Dakota Crash Conspiracy

Variables	b	Odds Ratio	Wald Score
Gender	-.037	.964	.012
Age	-.014	.986	1.389
Education	-.301**	.740	9.357
Income	-.215	.806	2.064
Married	.075	1.078	.045
Employed	.308	1.360	.692
Black ^a	1.730**	5.639	7.117
Hispanic ^a	.967	2.631	2.960
Other races ^a	-.491	.612	1.245
Midwest ^b	1.061*	2.888	6.000
Northeast ^b	.314	1.369	.415
West ^b	.779	2.179	3.117
Metro	.253	1.288	.394
Political conservatism	.035	1.036	.103
Religious attendance	.029	1.030	.164
Biblical literalist	.866*	2.378	3.877
Protestant ^c	.127	1.135	.018
Catholic ^c	-.395	.674	.174
Other Christian ^c	-.128	.880	.017
Jewish ^c	-1.968	.140	1.135
Other religions ^c	-1.502	.223	1.556
Nothing ^c	-.053	.948	.004
Agnostic ^c	-.943	.389	.663
Sum of All Fears	.019***	1.019	20.230
Model stats			
Constant	-3.287	0.037	5.076
N	390		
Nagelkerke R ²	.432		

Dependent Variable: Belief in (fake) South Dakota Crash conspiracy theory

Source: 2017 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A5: Ordinal Logistic Regression Predicting InfoWars Ideology Count

Variables	b	Wald Score
Gender	.066	.316
Age	.003	.665
Education	.034	.276
Income	-.071***	23.381
Married	.057	.218
Employed	.312*	6.108
Black ^a	.117	.348
Hispanic ^a	.128	.537
Other races ^a	-.419	3.288
Midwest ^b	-.092	.385
Northeast ^b	-.025	.023
West ^b	-.015	.011
Metro	-.123	.621
Political conservatism	.039	.812
Religious attendance	-.048	2.929
Biblical literalist	.443**	7.947
Protestant ^c	-.092	.105
Catholic ^c	.083	.090
Other Christian ^c	.108	.156
Jewish ^c	.372	.662
Other religions ^c	.112	.119
Nothing	.682*	5.499
Agnostic	-.042	.016
Phobias	.028***	13.109
Satan causes evil	.179**	7.681
Paranormal beliefs	.096***	78.359
Xenophobia	.105***	71.290
Model stats		
Cut 1	1.614	12.556
Cut 2	2.496	29.638
Cut 3	3.531	57.990
Cut 4	4.476	90.696
N	1170	
Nagelkerke R ²	.292	

Dependent Variable: Belief in JFK assassination, Illuminati, 9/11 Truther, and mass shooting conspiracies

Source: 2016 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A6: OLS Regression Predicting Conspiracy Theory Belief Index

Variables	b	β
Gender	-.110	-.010
Age	-.024	-.072
Education	-.322***	-.103
Income	-.115	-.054
Married	-.018	-.002
Employed	-.146	-.013
Black ^a	1.953***	.106
Hispanic ^a	.933*	.061
Other races ^a	.469	.023
Midwest ^b	-.322	-.023
Northeast ^b	.436	.029
West ^b	-.483	-.037
Metro	.153	.011
Political conservatism	-.017	-.005
Religious attendance	-.050	-.024
Biblical literalist	1.769	.107
Protestant ^c	-1.311†	-.096
Catholic ^c	-1.119	-.078
Other Christian ^c	-1.089	-.069
Jewish ^c	.027	.001
Other religions ^c	-.756	-.029
Nothing ^c	.384	.028
Agnostic ^c	-.074	-.003
Local newspaper	-.129	-.037
National newspaper	.005	.001
Nightly news	.058	.017
Fox News	.085	.026
CNN	.320*	.088
MSNBC	-.218	-.060
Local news	-.179	-.054
Talk radio	.032	.010
Online news	-.134	-.039
Social media news	.163†	.052
Daytime talk shows	.312*	.072
Internet hours	-.345*	-.077
Smart phone hours	.217†	.057
Phobias	.052*	.066
Satan causes evil	.579***	.111
Paranormal beliefs	.515***	.504
Xenophobia	.024	.024

Model stats

Constant	12.609
N	913
Adjusted R ²	.481

Dependent Variable: Belief in alien, South Dakota crash, moon landing, JFK assassination, Illuminati, 9/11 Truther, and mass shooting conspiracies

Source: 2018 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 †p < .1 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A7: OLS Regression Predicting Islamophobia

Variables	b	β
Gender	.364**	.072
Age	.027***	.187
Education	-.064	-.046
Income	.032	.034
Married	-.098	-.019
Employed	-.133	-.026
Black ^a	-.246	-.030
Hispanic ^a	.035	.005
Other races ^a	.344	.038
Midwest ^b	-.073	-.012
Northeast ^b	.117	.018
West ^b	-.018	-.003
Metro	-.469**	-.073
Political conservatism	.577***	.365
Religious attendance	-.071*	-.077
Biblical literalist	.790***	.107
Protestant ^c	1.023***	.169
Catholic ^c	.593*	.094
Other Christian ^c	.844**	.120
Jewish ^c	.830	.050
Other religions ^c	.402	.035
Nothing ^c	.402	.066
Agnostic ^c	.187	.017
Local newspaper	-.029	-.019
National newspaper	-.121*	-.079
Nightly news	.075	.051
Fox News	.163***	.113
CNN	-.106	-.065
MSNBC	-.223***	-.138
Local news	.103*	.070
Talk radio	.021	.015
Online news	.000	.000
Social media news	.059	.043
Daytime talk shows	.085	.045
Internet hours	-.058	-.030
Smart phone hours	-.021	-.013
Model stats		
Constant	2.849	
N	946	
Adjusted R ²	.436	

Dependent Variable: Agreeing that Muslims are more likely to be terrorists, there should be extra screening at airports for Muslims, and *not* wanting a Mosque in one's neighborhood

Source: 2018 CSAF

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$ (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A8: OLS Regression Predicting Fear of Crime

Variables	b	β
Victim of crime	.389	.033
Gender	-6.388***	-.222
Age	-.056	-.066
Education	.024	.003
Income	.234	.044
Married	-.692	-.024
Employed	.097	.003
Black ^a	3.170†	.069
Hispanic ^a	4.469***	.119
Other races ^a	5.008***	.093
Midwest ^b	.532	.014
Northeast ^b	3.177*	.086
West ^b	-.298	-.009
Metro	-1.414	-.039
Political conservatism	.292	.032
Religious attendance	-.983***	-.188
Biblical Literalist	-5.773***	-.135
Protestant ^c	.683	.020
Catholic ^c	1.974	.055
Other Christian ^c	-1.936	-.048
Jewish ^c	2.097	.023
Other religions ^c	-1.888	-.030
Nothing ^c	1.263	.037
Agnostic ^c	-2.419	-.038
Local newspaper	.201	.023
National newspaper	.565†	.066
Nightly news	-.201	-.024
Fox News	.881**	.108
CNN	.977*	.107
MSNBC	.049	.005
Local news	.791*	.095
Talk radio	-.245	-.030
Online news	-.150	-0.017
Social media news	.237	.030
Daytime talk shows	1.027*	.097
Internet hours	.306	.027
Smart phone hours	.614	.063
Satan causes evil	3.778***	.286
Model stats		
Constant	20.357	

N

772

Adjusted R²

.299

Dependent Variable: Fear of being a victim of mugging, stalking, murder by a stranger, murder by someone you know, drunk driving, police brutality, sexual assault by a stranger, sexual assault by someone you know, hate crime, mass shooting, break in, theft, gang violence, kidnapping, identity theft, credit card fraud, financial fraud, terrorism

Source: 2018 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 †p < .1 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A9: OLS Regression Predicting Civic Engagement Count

Variables	b	β
Gender	.088	.017
Age	-.004	-.027
Education	.159***	.140
Income	.078***	.138
Marries	-.063	-.013
Employed	.326*	.063
Black ^a	-.171	-.022
Hispanic ^a	-.369	-.052
Other races ^a	.058	.006
Midwest ^b	.029	.005
Northeast ^b	-.309	-.047
West ^b	-.165	-.028
Metro	.141	.021
Political liberalism	-.013	-.008
Religious attendance	.186***	.185
Biblical literalism	.045	.018
Protestant ^c	-.151	-.024
Catholic ^c	-.165	-.027
Other Christian ^c	-.103	-.018
Jewish ^c	-.094	-.006
Other religions ^c	.570*	.065
Fear of crime	.085***	.409
Fear of crime squared	-.001**	-.371
Model stats		
Constant	.314	
N	1393	
Adjusted R ²	.106	

Dependent Variable: Count of giving blood, attending a club meeting, socializing with coworkers, attended public event, had friends over, met with community leader, attended local school board meeting, visited someone in a different neighborhood, and volunteered during last year

Source: 2015 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: No religion is comparison

Table A10: OLS Regression Predicting Social Trust Index

Variables	b	β
Gender	-.049	-.008
Age	.026***	.153
Education	-.104	-.036
Income	.121***	.187
Married	-.501**	-.086
Employed	.129	.022
Black ^a	-.736*	-.077
Hispanic ^a	-1.138***	-.144
Other races ^a	-.207	-.018
Midwest ^b	.145	.021
Northeast ^b	-.051	-.007
West ^b	.168	.025
Metro	-.129	-.017
Political conservatism	.052	.027
Religious attendance	.107*	.092
Biblical literalist	-.446†	-.062
Protestant ^c	1.231**	.163
Catholic ^c	.791†	.117
Other Christian ^c	1.289***	.198
Jewish ^c	.756	.037
Other religions ^c	.566	.052
Nothing ^c	.705†	.072
Agnostic ^c	.263	.020
Read newspaper	.091†	.058
Nightly news	.072	.045
Cable news	-.054	-.033
Local news	-.038	-.023
Talk radio	.047	.028
Online news	-.066	-.041
Social media news	.185***	.117
Phobias	-.012	-.034
Xenophobia	-.138***	-.263
Satan causes evil	.116	.043
Conspiracy beliefs	-.023†	-.055
Fear of crime	-.007	-.034
Model stats		
Constant	7.680	
N	1078	
Adjusted R ²	.188	

Dependent Variable: Sum of trust people in general, strangers, police, Muslims, Christians, and atheists

Source: 2016 CSAF

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$ † $p < .1$ (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A11: OLS Regression Predicting Willingness to Help a Stranger

Variables	b	β
Gender	.419***	.273
Age	.005***	.122
Education	-.062**	-.082
Income	-.006	-.039
Married	-.007	-.004
Employed	-.021	-.013
Black ^a	-.041	-.017
Hispanic ^a	.016	.008
Other races ^a	.111	.039
Midwest ^b	.081	.043
Northeast ^b	.080	.040
West ^b	.113*	.063
Metro	.073	.034
Political conservatism	-.023	-.045
Religious attendance	.022*	.072
Biblical literalism	.023	.012
Protestant ^c	-.127	-.063
Catholic ^c	-.127	-.070
Other Christian ^c	-.044	-.025
Jewish ^c	-.101	-.019
Other religions ^c	-.141	-.050
Nothing ^c	.001	.001
Agnostic ^c	-.264*	-.085
Newspaper	.019	.044
Nightly news	.001	.002
Cable news	-.013	-.030
Local news	-.030*	-.070
Talk radio	.039**	.086
Online news	.011	.025
Social media news	.031*	.073
Fear of crime	-.008***	-.154
Property crime victim	.110**	.071
Violent crime victim	.099	.043
Model stats		
Constant	2.111	
N	1358	
Adjusted R ²	.157	

Dependent Variable: Agreement with whether respondent who stop to help a stranger who is out of gas on the side of the road

Source: 2016 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A12: OLS Regression Predicting Willingness to Receive Help From a Stranger

Variables	b	β
Gender	.427***	.268
Age	.005***	.107
Education	-.027	-.034
Income	-.003	-.015
Married	.030	.019
Employed	.049	.030
Black ^a	-.160	-.063
Hispanic ^a	.033	.015
Other races ^a	.153	.052
Midwest ^b	.093	.048
Northeast ^b	.096	.046
West ^b	.150**	.080
Metro	.038	.017
Political conservatism	-.037*	-.070
Religious attendance	.026**	.082
Biblical literalism	-.036	-.018
Protestant ^c	-.213*	-.102
Catholic ^c	-.194	-.103
Other Christian ^c	-.114	-.063
Jewish ^c	-.116	-.021
Other religions ^c	-.221	-.075
Nothing ^c	-.116	-.044
Agnostic ^c	-.332**	-.103
Newspaper	-.007	-.016
Nightly news	.014	.032
Cable news	-.020	-.045
Local news	-.031*	-.071
Talk radio	.049***	.104
Online news	.010	.023
Social media news	.032*	.072
Fear of crime	-.010***	-.173
Property crime victim	.109***	.068
Violent crime victim	.002	.001
Model stats		
Constant	2.156	
N	1357	
Adjusted R ²	.175	

Dependent Variable: Agreement with whether respondent who stop to help a stranger who is out of gas on the side of the road

Source: 2016 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 †p < .1 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A13: OLS Regression Predicting Health and Well-Being Index

Variables	b	β
Gender	-.281	-.034
Age	.017*	.072
Education	.203***	.108
Income	.133***	.143
Married	.741**	.089
Employed	-.182	-.021
Black ^a	-.038	-.003
Hispanic ^a	.291	.025
Other races ^a	-.379	-.024
Midwest ^b	.026	.003
Northeast ^b	-.757*	-.070
West ^b	-.117	-.012
Metro	.007	.001
Political liberalism	-.212**	-.076
Religious attendance	.022	.013
Biblical literalism	-.317*	-.075
Protestant ^c	-.022	-.002
Catholic ^c	.364	.036
Other Christian ^c	-.198	-.020
Jewish ^c	-.214	-.008
Other religions ^c	-.617	-.043
Sum of All Fears	-.020***	-.204
Model stats		
Constant	19.732	
N	1269	
Adjusted R ²	.152	

Dependent Variable: Sum of respondent's satisfaction with life overall, family life, finances, mental health, physical health, personal appearance, and social life

Source: 2015 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: No religion is comparison

Table A14: OLS Regression Predicting Anxiety Index

Variables	b	β
Gender	-.062	-.005
Age	-.037**	-.100
Education	-.268	-.042
Income	-.090	-.063
Married	-.738	-.057
Employed	-.024	-.002
Black ^a	-2.492**	-.118
Hispanic ^a	-.185	-.011
Other races ^a	-.320	-.013
Midwest ^b	.223	.014
Northeast ^b	-.846	-.049
West ^b	-.540	-.036
Metro	-1.417**	-.082
Political conservatism	-.266*	-.063
Religious attendance	-.188*	-.073
Biblical literalist	-1.385*	-.087
Protestant ^c	.309	.018
Catholic ^c	.142	.009
Other Christian ^c	1.054	.073
Jewish ^c	.634	.014
Other religions ^c	.895	.038
Nothing ^c	-.011	-.001
Agnostic ^c	-.381	-.013
Newspaper	-.057	-.016
Nightly news	.214	.060
Cable news	.091	.025
Local news	-0.055	-.015
Talk radio	.079	.021
Online news	.036	.010
Social media news	.251*	.072
Phobias	.194***	.239
Xenophobia	-.054	-.046
Satan causes evil	.053	.009
Conspiracy beliefs	.105***	.115
Fear of crime	.092***	.201
Model stats		
Constant	7.351	
N	1078	
Adjusted R ²	.278	

Dependent Variable: Sum frequency of feeling anxious, worrisome, restless, irritable, that something awful will happen, unsafe trusting others, paranoid, that something awful will happen, and having trouble sleeping during the past two weeks

Source: 2016 CSAF

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$ (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A15: OLS Regression Predicting Fear of Gun Control

Variables	b	β
Gender	.165*	.070
Age	-.002	-.032
Education	-.006	-.010
Income	-.025	-.059
Married	-.007	-.003
Employed	.011	.005
Black ^a	-.386***	-.104
Hispanic ^a	-.042	-.013
Other races ^a	-.232	-.055
Midwest ^b	.014	.005
Northeast ^b	-.109	-.035
West ^b	.126	.047
Metro	-.260**	-.088
Political conservatism	.170***	.235
Religious attendance	-.006	-.014
Biblical Literalist	-.114	-.034
Protestant ^c	.264	.094
Catholic ^c	-.029	-.010
Other Christian ^c	.412*	.128
Jewish ^c	.610*	.080
Other religions ^c	.205	.038
Nothing ^c	.323*	.114
Agnostic ^c	.183	.037
Local newspaper	.001	.001
National newspaper	-.043	-.060
Nightly news	-.009	-.014
Fox News	.005	.007
MSNBC	-.029	-.038
Local news	.024	.035
Talk radio	.039	.057
Online news	.048*	.069
Social media news	.010	.016
Daytime talk shows	-.084**	-.095
Internet hours	-.073*	-.080
Smart phone hours	.045	.058
Phobias	-.001	-.006
Satan causes evil	.040	.037
Xenophobia	.050***	.243
Conspiracy beliefs	.029***	.140
Fear of Crime	.014***	.175
Model stats		

Constant	.268
N	903
Adjusted R ²	.363

Dependent Variable: How afraid respondent is of federal government placing restrictions on firearms and ammunition

Source: 2018 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

Table A16: Binary Logistic Regression Predicting Buying a Gun Because of Fear

Variables	b	Odds ratio	Wald Score
Gender	.538**	1.713	6.883
Age	-.003	.997	.196
Education	-.034	.966	.100
Income	.028	1.028	1.197
Married	.117	1.125	.318
Employed	.103	1.108	.225
Black ^a	.349	1.418	1.081
Hispanic ^a	-.129	.879	.172
Other races ^a	-.809	.445	3.066
Midwest ^b	-.008	.992	.001
Northeast ^b	-.365	.694	1.474
West ^b	.115	1.122	.220
Metro	.341	1.406	1.598
Political conservatism	.223**	1.250	8.730
Religious attendance	-.074	.928	2.656
Biblical literalist	-.175	.839	.476
Protestant ^c	.942	2.566	2.511
Catholic ^c	.959	2.608	2.645
Other Christian ^c	.883	2.418	2.333
Jewish ^c	.440	1.553	.227
Other religions ^c	.930	2.535	1.980
Nothing ^c	.624	1.866	1.011
Agnostic ^c	-.118	.889	.025
Phobia	.010	1.010	.404
Xenophobia	.102***	1.108	23.813
Conspiracy beliefs	.030*	1.030	4.130
Fear of crime	.002	1.002	.062
Model stats			
Constant	-6.383		
N	1307		
Nagelkerke R ²	.160		

Dependent Variable: Whether respondent has purchased a gun because of their fears

Source: 2016 CSAF

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05 (two-tailed tests)

Notes: a: White is comparison; b: South is comparison; c: Atheist is comparison

