

Online Appendix for Examining Native American Support for Federal Indian Policy: Evidence from the Indian Child Welfare Act

Jay N. Krehbiel*

*Department of Political Science, West Virginia University, 316 Woodburn Hall, P.O. Box 6317, Morgantown, WV, 26506, USA; jay.krehbiel@mail.wvu.edu; <https://jaykrehbiel.com>

†This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. SES-2315950. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The surveys were cleared by Institutional Review Board West Virginia University.

Appendices

A Technical Survey Details

Survey Details and Context. The survey was conducted from May 9 to May 23, 2023. In total, the survey included 2500 respondents, of which 522 self-identified as Native American and were thus used for this study. The other 1978 respondents were: White (664); Black (627); Hispanic (628); Asian (33); Two or more races (4); Other (18); Middle Eastern (4). Respondents were considered Native American if they identified as such, even if they also identified as a second race.

YouGov interviewed 2725 respondents who were then matched down to a sample of 2500 to produce the final dataset. The respondents were matched to a sampling frame on gender, age, race, and education. The sampling frame is a politically representative “modeled frame” of adults, based upon the American Community Survey (ACS) public use microdata file, public voter file records, the 2020 Current Population Survey (CPS) Voting and Registration supplements, the 2020 National Election Pool (NEP) exit poll, and the 2020 CES surveys, including demographics and 2020 presidential vote.

Survey Weights. The matched 500 cases from the oversample of Native American respondents combined with the 22 Native American cases from the matched Genpop (main) were weighted to the sampling frame using propensity scores. The matched cases and the frame were combined and a logistic regression was estimated for inclusion in the frame. The propensity score function included age, gender, years of education, and region. The propensity scores were grouped into deciles of the estimated propensity score in the frame and post-stratified according to these deciles.

B Descriptive Statistics

Table ?? provides basic descriptive statistics for each of the variables used in the paper's analyses.

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
Support for ICWA	522	0.767	0.287	0.000	1.000
Strength of Identity	522	0.762	0.283	0.000	1.000
ICWA Familiarity	521	0.407	0.341	0.000	1.000
Femle	522	1.561	0.497	1	2
Age	522	51.019	15.432	19	94
Education	522	3.540	1.418	1	6
Children in Home	522	1.780	0.415	1	2
Ideology	522	3.207	1.438	1	6
Enrolled Citizen	522	0.312	0.464	0	1
Lived on a Reservation	522	0.224	0.417	0	1
Income	522	0.245	0.431	0	1
Political Interest	515	0.728	0.322	0.000	1.000
Fed. Gov't Job Approval	522	0.319	0.288	0.000	1.000
Importance of Religion	522	0.331	0.471	0.000	1.000
Support for Affirmative Action	522	0.380	0.382	0.000	1.000
Affirmative Action Familiarity	522	0.466	0.305	0.000	1.000
Linked Fate	522	0.432	0.418	0.000	1.000

C Full Results and Additional Analyses

Below I report the full regression results for the paper’s primary analyses, followed by regression results for robustness checks that (1) use respondents’ sense of linked fate as an alternative measure for strength of Native American identity and (2) only include respondents who identified as enrolled citizens of a Native American nation. Lastly, I report the full regression results for the affirmative action analyses presented at the end of the paper. Please note that for all models I report coefficients and standard errors. Additionally, for those models that include partisanship, Democratic respondents form the reference group.

For the analyses that use respondents’ linked fate—a well established measure related to group consciousness and the extent to which members of a minority group believe that their individual fortunes are tied to those of their group (??)—I rely on the standard question wording approach of first asking respondents the yes/no question “Do you think that what happens to Native Americans in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?” If respondents answer “Yes” they then receive this follow up question: “Will it affect you a lot, some or not very much?” Responses thus range from 0 (answered no to the initial question) to 3; I then scale the variable to range from 0-1. The results of the analyses using this measure are reported in Table ??.

For the analyses limited to those respondents who identified as enrolled citizens of a Federally or state recognized nation, I sought to follow best practices by providing respondents an option to not answer the survey question regarding their enrollment. In all, 163 respondents indicated they are enrolled in a nation, 298 said they are not, and 61 preferred not to say. I erred on the side of caution and excluded those respondents who refused to answer the question (for the main analyses these respondents are coded as not being citizens).

References

- Dawson, Michael C. 1994. *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African-American Politics*. Princeton University Press.
- Sanchez, Gabriel R and Edward D Vargas. 2016. “Taking a closer look at group identity: The link between theory and measurement of group consciousness and linked fate.” *Political research quarterly* 69(1):160–174.

Table A2: Full Regression Results for ICWA Support Analyses

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Strength of Identity	0.336** (0.0699)		0.311** (0.0678)
Party ID: Republican		-0.0536 (0.0520)	0.0439 (0.0472)
Party ID: Independent		-0.0564 (0.0498)	-0.0422 (0.0460)
Party ID: Other		-0.00361 (0.0758)	0.0381 (0.0546)
Party ID: Not Sure		-0.110 (0.104)	0.0733 (0.0861)
Fed. Gov't Job Approval			-0.0199 (0.0532)
Ideology			-0.0352** (0.0130)
Political Interest			-0.00758 (0.0584)
Enrolled Citizen			-0.0345 (0.0353)
Lived on a Reservation			-0.0351 (0.0456)
ICWA Familiarity			0.145** (0.0451)
Age			0.00183 (0.00115)
Children in Household			0.0132 (0.0370)
Female			0.0194 (0.0324)
Income			-0.0584 (0.0393)
Education			-0.00662 (0.0106)
Born Again Christian			-0.0590* (0.0335)
Constant	0.495** (0.0575)	0.787** (0.0381)	0.543** (0.118)
<i>N</i>	522	522	514

Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table A3: Regression Results for ICWA Support Analyses Using Linked Fate as IV

	Model 1A	Model 3A
Linked Fate	0.150** (0.0429)	0.0916* (0.0479)
Party ID: Republican		0.0377 (0.0566)
Party ID: Independent		-0.0224 (0.0506)
Party ID: Other		0.0398 (0.0618)
Party ID: Not Sure		0.0903 (0.0956)
Fed. Gov't Job Approval		-0.00305 (0.0651)
Ideology		-0.0371** (0.0158)
Political Interest		-0.0340 (0.0654)
Enrolled Citizen		-0.00923 (0.0376)
Lived on a Reservation		-0.0488 (0.0463)
ICWA Familiarity		0.181** (0.0559)
Age		0.00255* (0.00138)
Children in Household		0.0156 (0.0416)
Female		0.0431 (0.0352)
Income		-0.0775** (0.0386)
Education		-0.00806 (0.0114)
Born Again Christian		-0.0652* (0.0367)
Constant	0.682** (0.0265)	0.669** (0.128)
<i>N</i>	522	514

Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table A4: Regression Results for ICWA Support Analyses Including Only Enrolled Citizens

	Model 1B	Model 2B	Model 3B
Strength of Identity	0.290* (0.152)		0.261* (0.148)
Party ID: Republican		0.0901 (0.0775)	0.0556 (0.0779)
Party ID: Independent		-0.0136 (0.0908)	-0.0684 (0.0861)
Party ID: Other		0.149 (0.103)	0.0135 (0.102)
Party ID: Not Sure		-0.0961 (0.193)	-0.0204 (0.169)
Fed. Gov't Job Approval			-0.126 (0.0943)
Ideology			-0.0223 (0.0234)
Political Interest			-0.0885 (0.110)
Lived on a Reservation			-0.118* (0.0602)
ICWA Familiarity			0.143** (0.0668)
Age			0.00104 (0.00255)
Children in Household			-0.0143 (0.0597)
Female			-0.0382 (0.0635)
Income			-0.133** (0.0659)
Education			-0.00722 (0.0207)
Born Again Christian			-0.0504 (0.0563)
Constant	0.502** (0.131)	0.739** (0.0703)	0.831** (0.253)
<i>N</i>	163	163	161

Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table A5: Full Regression Results for Affirmative Action Analyses

	Model 1C	Model 2C	Model 3C
Strength of Identity	0.143* (0.0815)		0.0923 (0.0765)
Party ID: Republican		-0.306** (0.0571)	-0.117** (0.0582)
Party ID: Independent		-0.233** (0.0490)	-0.150** (0.0492)
Party ID: Other		-0.227** (0.0786)	-0.0751 (0.0656)
Party ID: Not Sure		-0.342** (0.100)	-0.130 (0.0938)
Fed. Gov't Job Approval			0.282** (0.0779)
Ideology			-0.0674** (0.0140)
Political Interest			-0.0247 (0.0732)
Enrolled Citizen			-0.0379 (0.0412)
Lived on a Reservation			-0.0516 (0.0476)
Affirm. Action Familiarity			0.0684 (0.0804)
Age			-0.00325** (0.00156)
Children in Household			0.0365 (0.0387)
Female			-0.000670 (0.0346)
Income			-0.0266 (0.0380)
Education			0.0273** (0.0123)
Born Again Christian			-0.00159 (0.0440)
Constant	0.275** (0.0666)	0.572** (0.0363)	0.579** (0.168)
<i>N</i>	522	522	515

Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$