

### Coding Rules and Examples

As noted in chapter 3, I used topic modeling to identify a subset of *Rifleman* editorials pertaining to gun control, which are the focus of many of the book's analyses. I created the subset by adding up the proportion of each editorial comprised of the four gun control topics described above. I included an editorial in the gun control subset if the four gun control topics combined comprise two thirds or more of its content. This procedure identified 422 (of 872) editorials.

I coded the gun control editorials along a number of dimensions pertaining to the cultivation of a politicized group social identity and gun-centric political ideology: whether they explicitly discuss policy, use "identity-forming" language, frame policy in terms of its perceived impact on the group's identity, depict gun rights/gun owners as under threat, contain a call to action, connect gun rights to other issues (and, if so, which issues), and/or mention major political parties or those parties' ideologies.

I then coded all the letters to the editor along similar dimensions: whether they explicitly discuss policy, use "identity-forming" language, frame policy in terms of its perceived impact on an identity, connect gun rights to other issues (and, if so, which issues), and/or mention major political parties or those parties' ideologies. I also coded the stance each letter takes on gun control.

The book also contains some topic-specific analyses. Editorials are included in a topic-specific analysis if that topic comprises 20% or more of their content. Pro-gun letters are included if the topic comprises 25% or more of their content. (The different thresholds reflect the greater number of topics in the full *Rifleman* topic model.) Rather than categorizing documents into topics based on their "top" topic (i.e., the topic comprising the greatest proportion of the

document's content), I allow for individual documents to be included in multiple topics. This choice reflects the reality that many editorials discuss more than one topic.

The coding rules used for this process are below, as are examples of coded documents. The main text discusses the motivation for each of these measures and justifies them theoretically (especially those related to the measurement of variables related to social identity); the purpose of this section is simply to describe the coding process.

Finally, a research assistant coded a random sample of 10% of all NRA editorials, pro-, and anti-gun letters (356 documents total) based on whether they contain identity-forming language, identity frames, depictions of threat (*Rifleman* editorials only), calls to action (*Rifleman* editorials only), issue connections, and party mentions, as well as whether they are pro- or anti-gun. The overall rate of agreement was 86% with a Cohen's kappa of .73, indicating strong agreement.<sup>1</sup>

### ***Coding Rules: Rifleman Editorials***

#### **1. Policy Discussion**

1.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial discusses government gun policy/regulation of some kind, whether in broad/general or narrow/specific terms. This could include discussion of specific pieces of legislation, but might also consist of more general discussion of gun policy/regulation that does not mention a specific piece of legislation. Gun legislation/regulation does not need to be the topic of the editorial, but rather just needs to be mentioned. This includes discussion of the purpose of the Second Amendment and lawsuits aimed at gun manufacturers.

#### **2. Identity Frame for Legislation**

2.1. Within editorials that discuss policy, coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial frames legislation in social identity terms. Legislation is framed in social identity terms if it is discussed in terms of its impact on the lifestyles and/or values of gun owners (as opposed to being discussed only in terms of its estimated technical, policy impacts). For example, an editorial focused on crime that is framed in identity terms might argue that gun control reduces the ability of Americans to protect

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Richard Landis and Gary C. Koch, "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data," *Biometrics* 33, 1 (1977): 159-174.

themselves and their families from criminals, whereas a similar editorial that is not framed in identity terms might argue that a proposed law is unlikely to successfully reduce the use of guns by criminals. Editorials that use both types of arguments should be coded 1. Not included as identity-frames are discussions of inconveniences a law might cause for gun owners without accompanying discussion of: (1) how those inconveniences might threaten the values of gun owners or their ability to protect things they value, or (2) discussion of how the laws might lead to outright personal disarmament/confiscation of firearms (which goes beyond inconvenience).

### **3. Use of Identity Forming Language (In-group Positive or Out-group Negative)**

3.1. In-group positive is coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial uses positive attributes/adjectives to describe gun owners.

3.2. Out-group negative is coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial uses negative attributes/adjectives (or comparisons to negative groups) to describe members of an out-group who are portrayed as a threat to gun rights due to its support for gun regulation. Criminals who misuse guns are *not* considered an out-group.

### **4. Threat**

4.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial portrays gun rights and/or gun owners' identities as under threat.

### **5. Calls to Action**

5.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial contains a call to action on behalf of the protection of gun rights/against gun regulation. These consist of actions such as (but not limited to) contacting policymakers or speaking with others about gun rights. They can also include calls to act (or not act) in certain non-political ways because of the potential political impacts of those actions (e.g., practice gun safety while hunting this fall because if there are hunting accidents people will call for new gun control laws). Non-political calls to action that aren't in some way connected to politics as in the example above should *not* be coded 1 (e.g., practice gun safety while hunting (period).)

### **6. Issue Connections**

6.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial connects gun rights, broadly conceived, to other political issues or political issue sets (such as crime, liberty, limited government, foreign policy of some kind, etc.). **An important note:** Editorials that discuss crime but exclusively argue that gun control measures aimed it are unlikely to work should *not* be included; these editorials do not genuinely connect gun rights to crime. However, editorials that argue that more guns can help address crime (i.e., that guns are a solution to crime) should be included, as should editorials that advocate other ways to control crime (such as harsh enforcement/heavy sentencing).

### **7. Partisan/Ideological Discussion**

7.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the editorial explicitly mentions a major U.S. political party (i.e., Democratic or Republican) or a political ideology associated with a U.S. party (i.e., liberal/left or conservative). Discussion of foreign Communist parties alone does not satisfy this condition, but any mention, even brief, of a U.S. party or party ideology does. This includes noting candidates' or politicians' party when mentioning them. Lastly, it also includes use of the names of well-known party leaders (in particular presidents and presidential candidates, but also well-known Congressional leaders) to connote a party.

## *Coding Rules: Letters to the Editor*

### **1. Policy Discussion**

1.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter discusses government gun policy/regulation of some kind, whether in broad/general or narrow/specific terms. This could include discussion of specific pieces of legislation, but might also consist of more general discussion of gun policy/regulation that does not mention a specific piece of legislation. This includes discussion of the purpose of the Second Amendment and lawsuits aimed at gun manufacturers.

### **2. Identity Frame for Legislation**

2.1. Within letters that discuss policy, coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter frames legislation in social identity terms. For letters written in opposition to gun control, legislation is framed in social identity terms if it is discussed in terms of its impact on the lifestyles and/or values of gun owners (as opposed to being discussed only in terms of its estimated technical, policy impacts). For example, a letter focused on crime that is framed in identity terms might argue that gun control reduces the ability of Americans to protect themselves and their families from criminals, whereas a similar letter that is not framed in identity terms might argue that a proposed law is unlikely to successfully reduce the use of guns by criminals. Letters that use both types of arguments should be coded 1. For letters written in support of gun control, legislation is framed in identity terms if it is discussed in terms of impact on the lifestyles and/or values of the letter writers themselves (rather than, for example, exclusively in terms of their potential impact on crime rates without including mention of personal connections to crime). For example, a letter focused on crime that is framed in identity terms might talk about how the letter writer's life has been negatively impacted by gun violence, whereas a similar letter that is not framed in identity terms might only mention that studies have shown that gun control laws reduce overall levels of gun violence.

### **3. Use of Identity Forming Language (In-group Positive or Out-group Negative)**

3.1. In-group positive is coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter uses positive attributes/adjectives to describe either gun owners (in the case of pro-gun letters) or gun control advocates (in the case of anti-gun letters).

3.2. Out-group negative is coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter uses negative attributes/adjectives (or comparisons to negative groups) to describe members of an out-group who either support gun regulation (in the case of pro-gun letters) or oppose gun regulation (in the case of anti-gun letters). Criminals who misuse guns are *not* considered an out-group.

### **4. Issue Connections**

4.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter connects gun rights, broadly conceived, to other political issues or political issue sets (such as crime, liberty, limited government, foreign policy of some kind, etc.). **An important note:** Letters that discuss crime but exclusively argue that gun control measures aimed at it are unlikely to work should *not* be included; these editorials do not genuinely connect gun rights to crime. However, letters that argue that more guns can help address crime (i.e., that guns are a solution to crime) should be included, as should editorials that advocate other ways to control crime (such as harsh enforcement/heavy sentencing).

## **5. Partisan/Ideological Discussion**






5.1. Coded 1 (if yes) or 0 (if no) based on whether the letter explicitly mentions a major U.S. political party (i.e., Democratic or Republican) or a political ideology associated with a U.S party (i.e., liberal/left or conservative). Discussion of foreign Communist parties alone does not satisfy this condition, but any mention, even brief, of a U.S. party or party ideology does. This includes noting candidates' or politicians' party when mentioning them. Lastly, it also includes use of the names of well-known party leaders (in particular presidents and presidential candidates, but also well-known Congressional leaders) to connote a party.

### *Coding Examples for Chapter 3*

To supplement the coding rules described above, this section provides three example documents that illustrate the coding procedure in action. These examples pertain to the codes relevant to the analyses in chapter 3; examples relevant to chapter 4 are below. The first is a *Rifleman* editorial, the second is a pro-gun letter to the editor, and third is an anti-gun letter to the editor.

Words and phrases that are relevant to the coding dimensions described above are underlined. Following the legend depicted below, the color of the line beneath each of these words and phrases indicates the coding dimensions to which they pertain.

Legend:

- : In-group positive language
- : Out-group negative language
- : Identity frame for legislation
- : Threat
- : Calls to action

standing guard



## Wayne LaPierre

NRA Executive Vice President

Soon, U.S. Senators John McCain and Joseph Lieberman will attempt to put private sales of firearms between peaceable Americans—you, me, our families and friends—under the total control of the Federal government. And they threaten to do it through a legislative back door.

If you now legally sell, trade or buy a firearm in commerce with a relative, friend or neighbor, you are the target.

Our very culture is the target. Innocent, honest commerce between gun owners has been part of our culture since the beginnings of this nation.

To pry that back door open, the McCain-Lieberman gun control ticket—now joined by New York gun prohibitionist Senator Charles Schumer—is riding a propaganda machine with mega-bucks radio and television “advertising” paid for by their billionaire backer Andrew McKelvey through his anti-gun rights lobby, Americans for Gun Safety (AGS).

McCain has told the media that McKelvey’s advertising blitz (which features Senators McCain and Lieberman pitching their gun control scheme) is a precursor to finding a suitable piece of totally unrelated legislation as a host for his private firearm sales prohibition.

The ads, which first aired in Washington, D.C., are designed to scam the public into believing the McCain-Lieberman-Schumer scheme would prevent terrorists or criminals from obtaining firearms from private individuals—for now, at gun shows.

It is a big lie that would do Joseph Goebbels proud.

Under current, tough Federal law, there is no criminal firearm commerce anywhere in the nation that involves violent convicted criminals or illegal aliens or terrorists that is not already illegal. It is a Federal crime for such people to attempt to acquire any firearm from any source. Possession of any gun by such people is a crime. Their presence at a gun show with the intent to acquire a firearm is a Federal crime.

McCain and AGS want those gun owners who don’t attend gun shows to believe they are unaffected by this scheme. But this will ultimately touch every one of us.

The “gun show loophole” doesn’t exist—except as a propaganda tool for the anti-gun-rights crowd.

After the “gun show loophole,” there will

be the “living room loophole,” or the “gun club loophole.” Their ultimate “loophole” is the Second Amendment.

What McCain, Schumer, Lieberman and their axis are really after is lock-tight Federal control of all now-unregulated legal private commerce in firearms. This is the slippery slope to universal gun owner registration and to selective ownership bans.

No matter what they call it, the McCain-Lieberman-Schumer legislation would criminalize transfers that are now perfectly legal under existing Federal gun law between law-abiding people who buy, sell or trade guns.

Their so called “loophole” is so elastic it can include private sales in private homes where a few people might gather to buy, sell or trade guns.

You can bet the Brady Campaign (HCI), the Violence Policy Center and AGS have amendments at the ready to expand “gun show” provisions. In their world, if you buy, sell or trade a gun as a private intrastate matter—without registering with the government as part of a permanent database—you would be a criminal.

There is no doubt that if this “gun show” legislation were ever enacted, those events would fast become history—a memory.

Shutting down gun shows—events where Americans freely associate around a cause and where political discussion and political organizing is an integral activity—is no problem for McCain. It fits with his philosophy of using government to muzzle dissent and silence free speech.

With his so-called campaign finance reform law—now being challenged by NRA and a host of groups and individuals fighting to save the First Amendment—John McCain has made paid political speech by associations such as NRA aired on TV and radio against a candidate for

Federal election a criminal act—if such ads are run 30 days prior to a primary and 60 days before a general election.

So when your friends and neighbors ask or talk about the “gun show loophole,” set them straight. What our enemies are really after is the “freedom loophole.”

Every gun control group, every anti-gun-rights politician and most of the media are reading off the same page. They are demanding that Congress give John McCain another victory. But we must demand—especially in this critical election year—that any such legislation be stopped in its tracks.

Write, call or e-mail your Senators and Members of Congress and tell them: No gun control. No gun show bans. No private sales ban. No transfer ban. If you do it now and keep up the heat, we can stop the AGS-McCain-Schumer-Lieberman machine cold.



**So when your friends and neighbors ask or talk about the “gun show loophole,” set them straight. What our enemies are really after is the “freedom loophole.”**

For the latest about legislation in your NRA visit: [www.mynra.org](http://www.mynra.org)



## Pro-Gun Letter: *Chicago Tribune*, 21 July 1995:

Certainly, all persons of good conscience and character are heartened to see the decline in gun-related crimes committed in Chicago. Unfortunately, your July 6 editorial titled "A dividend of life from gun control?" ruins the good cheer by launching into a baseless anti-gun diatribe.

Amusingly, the editorial opens by criticizing politicians for accepting credit where none is due, and then proceeds to do that very thing. By linking a drop in the number of confiscated weapons with the observed drop in gun crimes, it is fatally flawed by its mistaking of coincidence for correlation. In reality, legal gun sales are nearing all-time highs, which would suggest an increase in the number of "guns on the street."

Although your liberal interpretation of statistics is troublesome, the most disturbing aspect of the editorial is that, like most anti-gun arguments, it fails to draw a distinction between criminals and law-abiding citizens. On the behalf of law-abiding, gun-owning citizens everywhere, I will take this opportunity to draw that distinction.

A guy who is about to do a drive-by shooting, hold up a liquor store or commit capital murder is hardly impressed by the fact that possessing an unregistered weapon is a felony. In fact, he probably can't even spell felony. Is he worried about having his vehicle confiscated? Doubtful, as it is probably stolen anyway. Is he worried about going to jail for possessing the unregistered gun? Why would he be? If our friend is arrested for some violent crime, felony possession of a firearm will probably reside well down on the list of his offenses.

On the other hand, the law-abiding gun owner is interested mainly in protecting his/her home and family. However, due to the Illinois legislature's cowardly denial to allow free exercise of the innate right of self-defense, our law-abiding citizen now must fear the police as well if he/she ventures out in public while armed. Upstanding citizens should not have to make the choice between risking jail in the name of self-defense and risking injury or death at the hands of a criminal. However, the fact that the law-abiding citizen will probably choose to remain law-abiding is just what the criminal is banking on. The law-abiding will remain law-abiding, while the lawless will remain lawless. Therein lies the distinction.

In denying the connection between toughened gun laws and the apparent drop in Chicago's gun crimes rate, I gladly place myself in the category of, as the editorialist puts it, a "perverter of the 2nd Amendment." Rather than attribute the drop to silly, unenforceable gun laws, I'd like to hope that people are just deciding not to kill, or that the most violent offenders have managed to kill each other off, or maybe that good police work is to be credited.

I am even more hopeful that what we are seeing is the beginning of the triumph of the law-abiding citizen over the lawless elements in our society. Gun sales to law-abiding citizens are at an all-time high. Concealed-carry and "three-strike" laws are passing in state after state. Pistol ranges are packed, and purveyors of self-defense training are doing a land-office business. Maybe the crooks are just scared?



Anti-Gun Letter: *Chicago Tribune*, 13 May 2000:

I would like to respond to Christopher Morley's May 10 letter, "Moms against guns," criticizing the Million Mom March, which is planned for Sunday to support stricter gun control.

Mr. Morley offered up much of the same misinformation we always hear from America's gun culture, namely that gun ownership makes us safer.

Although I have sympathy for Mr. Morley as a victim of crime, and wouldn't challenge his claim that he successfully defended himself with a firearm, numerous studies show his case to be the exception, not the rule.

Guns kept for self-defense are more likely to result in tragedy for their owners and their families than for the criminals they are intended to defend against.

Mr. Morley asks why gun-control literature is disseminated in schools. But there is no conspiracy here. Schools are where the victims are. America's children pay a heavy price in death and serious injury for the gun lobby's misguided interpretations of the 2nd Amendment. In four years of teaching in a Chicago Public School on the South Side, three of my students were killed in incidents involving guns; two were murdered by other children, and one was killed while playing with a gun.

Other students shared tragic stories of injuries, lost loved ones and the general mayhem of gun violence, which makes their neighborhoods unlivable.

During a gun-control rally at the Daley Center a couple of years ago, the family members of those who lost loved ones to gun violence brought pairs of shoes belonging to the victims, placing them on display for all to see. The large number of shoes belonging to children provided a shocking and powerful statement on this issue.

It is time that Americans organize and demand stronger restrictions on the manufacture, sale and possession of deadly weapons. Illinois citizens support stricter gun laws. But in return for campaign contributions from the gun lobby, many politicians continue to oppose sensible gun laws.

That is why we must continue the fight for legislation like the Safe Neighborhoods Act, waiting periods, trigger locks, background checks, the licensing of gun ownership, and an eventual ban on concealable handguns and assault weapons.


I hope that the Million Mom March will bring out the all the moms, families, teachers, doctors, police officers, social workers, ministers, youth counselors and other concerned citizens who have had enough with America's mad devotion to guns.

### *Coding Examples for Chapter 4*

To supplement the coding rules described above, this section provides three example documents that illustrate the coding procedure in action. These examples pertain to the codes relevant to the analyses in chapter 4. The first is a *Rifleman* editorial, the second is a pro-gun letter to the editor, and third is an anti-gun letter to the editor.

Words and phrases that are relevant to the coding dimensions described above are underlined. Following the legend depicted below, the color of the line beneath each of these words and phrases indicates the coding dimensions to which they pertain.

Legend:

: Issue connection

: Party/ideology connection

standing guard



## Wayne LaPierre

NRA Executive Vice President

With the coming elections in November, we must keep one thing in sight above all: If the rabidly anti-gun-rights Democrat leadership takes control of the United States House of Representatives and keeps control of the U.S. Senate, our worst enemies will hold all the power. The truth is that

while there are pro-gun Democrats whom we support, virtually all of those in line to chair key committees and hold down leadership posts are deeply committed to the gun-ban cause. And if they come to power, it will guarantee that we will face a host of gun-control schemes already suffered by our English-speaking cousins in Great Britain.

The massive forfeiture of long guns and all privately owned handguns from law-abiding, ordinary Britons is the end game of anti-gun-rights forces in America; the step-by-step loss of freedom in England is their model, their roadmap for taking our liberty.

The destruction of liberty in Britain is so relevant to our own country, this election, that I felt it critical to share with you the vision of what could happen if avowed enemies of our freedom like John Conyers, Nancy Pelosi and Henry Waxman—all rated “F” by NRA, all members of the “F” Troop—find themselves in power due to a takeover of the House leadership by the Democratic party.

When you hear any proposals that involve any form of gun control, always think about England and the tragic loss of firearms freedom there. What happened to good Britons in the name of “gun safety” defines the aims of those in America who use those words as camouflage to hide their true goals.

The war in Britain against firearms ownership was lost a step at a time—with each step being called “common sense” or “reasonable”—first with licensing and registration of firearms owners, then with a series of “safety” measures that included “home storage” rules, complete with local police approval and home inspections.

Then came changes in the law making continued possession of whole classes of registered long guns by licensees—including all semi-automatic and pump rifles, and certain classes of semi-automatic and pump shotguns—a dire criminal offense.

When those long guns were removed from the homes of good honest Britons, the government turned on licensed handgun owners—who were forced to undergo even

more strict police supervision. Licensed owners of handguns larger than .22 caliber were ordered to forfeit their registered pistols and revolvers under what was called a “buy-back scheme.” The government produced lists of guns it was going to remove and set the price. It did the same for accoutrements like scopes, holsters, sights and shooting rests.

Licensed handgun owners were allowed to keep their registered .22-caliber handguns—but not in their homes. Those firearms had to be removed to government-inspected gun clubs and were locked down. This is something that John Conyers (D-Mich.)—who will become the all-powerful Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee if the “F” Troop takes power—proposed as an alternative to his demand for a total confiscatory ban on handgun ownership for Americans.

With all small-caliber handguns under government-controlled lock and key, a second handgun “buyback” scheme was dictated, and those remaining guns were taken. This was gun control—total control. where private property of ordinary, law-abiding Britons became government property. This theft of liberty was touted worldwide as the very model of “strict gun control.”

When the last legal handgun was taken by government, armed crime by the violent criminal underclass exploded. Britain—where good people are disarmed and evil people are armed to the teeth—is today the most dangerous nation in the developed world, declared so by the United Nations. Britain’s permanent, violent criminal underclass has grown into the single most powerful force in British society. According to a UN study reported in the *Independent*, over half of the citizens in Great Britain have become victims of crime and violence.

Oh, yes, pacifism is the only weapon allowed ordinary Britons to fend off armed rapists, muggers, or murderers. Self defense with a firearm is a crime in Great Britain.

England—always touted by America’s gun-control crowd as their vision of our future—is the ultimate proving ground. And it is the very model for what our enemies in the Congress of the United States have in store for all of us, were they to take full control of the Congress this fall. Keep that in mind when you convince others to vote in November. This election is absolutely critical to the future of our firearm rights.

England is a living laboratory demonstrating that gun control in any permutation does great harm to the public and only emboldens violent, armed criminals.

Don’t let it happen in America. Don’t let the “F” Troop—the worst of our enemies in Congress—gain ground and take full control over your rights—your freedom—on November 5.



**The massive forfeiture of long guns and all privately owned handguns from law-abiding, ordinary Britons is the end game of anti-gun-rights forces in America.**

For the latest about legislation in your NRA visit: [www.mynra.org](http://www.mynra.org)



## Democrats use Sarah Brady for sympathy vote

■ As I watched the beginning of the Democratic hoopla last Monday evening, I was more than a little concerned about the usual misrepresentation.

First, I will say that as a handicapped individual, I found it demoralizing for them to parade several handicapped individuals on stage to appeal to the sympathy vote. I have basically, in my 44 years, grown up with the philosophy that I don't want or need sympathy, just the acknowledgement due my achievements in life.

To address the gun control issue as presented by Sarah Brady, it seemed they were attempting to make the point that by making guns unobtainable by felons, etc., they would eliminate violent crime and even domestic violence. If someone wanted a weapon badly enough, they will find a way to get one, legally or illegally. Legislation against weapons isn't enough to turn the tide. The next question that follows is, who makes the determination of who is worthy to be permitted to own firearms? The government determines this. It comes closer to dictatorship, not democracy.

On the other hand, reliable statistics have shown that in areas where there has been an increase in concealed weapon carriers, there has been a marked decrease in the amount of violent crime.

I do empathize with the Bradys that an event, such as a presidential assassination attempt, can indeed change the rest of their lives. So can a car accident, an airplane catastrophe, or a sports accident, and I have yet to hear of anyone trying to outlaw football ownership or airline tickets because they could be potentially life-threatening.

— Lynn Dahnke  
Glendale

### LETTERS POLICY

Letters are welcome and should include your name, address and a daytime phone number. Letters should be 200 words or fewer and are subject to editing. Write to:

Letters to the Editor,  
The Arizona Republic,  
P.O. Box 2244,  
Phoenix, AZ 85002  
Fax: 602-271-8933  
E-mail: Opinions@aol.com

him for the cause of Southern independence. It is also the symbol of the Confederate States Army, an army that included upwards of 90,000 African-Americans and thousands of Hispanics, Jews, Catholics, and other people who would have been excluded from membership in the Klan and most of the extremists militia groups.

Pictures and statements that associate the Confederate Battle Flag with racists and other bigots perpetuate the myth that all persons who fly the flag are extremists and/or bigots and contribute to incidents such as the January 1995 murder of Michael David Westerman, who was gunned down in cold blood for the "crime" of flying a Confederate flag on his pickup truck.

It is the job of the media to seek the truth, not to spread misinformation. In associating the Confederate Battle Flag with extremists and racial hate groups, your newspaper is promoting ignorance and anti-Southern bigotry.

— Robert Perkins, Commander  
Sons of Confederate Veterans  
Arizona Division  
Phoenix

Bosnian smiles revealing

Bosnia and looked into children injured by tools of men of savagery. Those lost children will forever be in my soul.

### Cartoon shows hatred

■ I am appalled at the "Bosnian" cartoon of Aug. 16. I truly could not believe my eyes when I saw the tasteless cartoon of former President Reagan's death.

How can Steve Benson, who is suffering from such a disease? Despite his short tenure, President Reagan contributed to the greatness of our nation.

This pompous cartoonist is an embodiment of cruelty and I imagine that the *Republic* staff, I can only conclude that the newspaper is not one that I will support any longer.

### View of Kolbe will

■ It was heartening to hear the words of encouragement from Kolbe from his fellow Republican. His recent "coming-out" was what a fine man and legislator. How his being gay is not going to change their view of him were just remarks made by legislative House Speaker Newt Gingrich. These words of encouragement made by the same legislator are an inordinate amount of railing and lambasting against a homosexual agenda.

I'm sorry, but his being

allow the proposed Canyon Forest Village to build a more "environmentally sustainable" development.

What these supposed environmental groups should understand is that the best thing for the greater Grand Canyon environment is not to allow any development at all.

Don't build and more wells won't be needed. Don't build and the last piece of open space before entering Grand Canyon won't be bladed.

No matter how "environmentally sustainable" a development like Canyon Forest Village purports to be, it will never be as environmentally friendly as the proper course of action the Forest Service should take: No commercial development at all.

— **Mary Jean Bublitz**  
Flagstaff

## Web sites vs. gun sights

■ In another display of conservative pretzel logic, Sen. John McCain and his Republican cohorts have missed the mark and the opportunity to save the lives of thousands of American children. Sen. McCain recently voted against a bill mandating "that all handguns sold in the United States include safety locks designed to prevent accidents."

At the same time, *The Republic* identified our distinguished senator as the sponsor of a proposal that "would require schools and libraries to install filtering technology on computers used by students."

It appears that Mr. McCain, in his effort to protect the Second Amendment, has murdered the First. It seems also that Arizona's most promising presidential candidate in decades believes that Web sites are more dangerous than gun sights. We can only assume that Mr. McCain is hoping to prevent children everywhere from being accidentally killed while surfing the Net.

— **Brad Michaelson**  
Scottsdale

## Electricity in Snowflake

■ I find it amazing that Robert Welch of Snowflake (Letters to the Editor, July 25) thinks Rep. J.D. Hayworth and/or the federal government is responsible for supplying electricity to Snowflake ("this backward area," his words).

If these folks really want electricity, they should call the electric company to see what kind of a deal they can make. Then they can decide if they can afford the installation costs and then the costs associated with using electricity supplied by the electric company.

I just do not see that this is any business of the federal government. I do not want my taxes to be spent in any way to provide electricity to Snowflake. These liberal "pork barrel" projects need to be stopped now. Snowflake is a good place to start.

— **Dave Vredenburgh**  
Flagstaff

## Model Outputs for Online Appendix

### Chapter 3

<b>TABLE 3A1. Logistic Regression Predicting Calls to Action</b>				
	B (SE)		z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	-3.007	(0.551)	-5.454	<0.001
Threat	1.975	(0.324)	6.104	<0.001
Identity-Building Language	0.439	(0.366)	1.200	0.230
Policy Discussion	0.627	(0.496)	1.265	0.206
Null deviance: 551.58 on 421 degrees of freedom. Residual deviance: 475.88 on 418 degrees of freedom. AIC: 483.88.				

### Chapter 4

<b>TABLE 4A1. Regressions Predicting Views on Court System</b>												
	1974		1982		1989		1998		2006		2014	
	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value	Coef. (s.e.)	P-value
(Intercept)	0.823 (0.095)	0.000	0.653 (0.062)	0.000	1.005 (0.061)	0.000	0.691 (0.053)	0.000	0.431 (0.061)	0.000	0.587 (0.069)	0.000
Gun Ownership	0.111 (0.046)	0.017	0.077 (0.030)	0.011	0.101 (0.036)	0.005	0.061 (0.030)	0.050	0.124 (0.034)	0.000	0.101 (0.053)	0.055
White	0.017 (0.084)	0.845	0.238 (0.057)	0.000	-0.094 (0.058)	0.104	0.116 (0.046)	0.012	0.135 (0.048)	0.005	-0.002 (0.058)	0.971
Male	-0.031 (0.043)	0.463	-0.046 (0.028)	0.108	-0.160 (0.036)	0.000	-0.090 (0.031)	0.003	-0.120 (0.036)	0.001	-0.142 (0.045)	0.002
Age	0.055 (0.025)	0.028	0.021 (0.015)	0.155	0.029 (0.019)	0.124	0.005 (0.016)	0.765	0.056 (0.018)	0.002	0.044 (0.024)	0.066
Education	0.007 (0.025)	0.762	0.006 (0.017)	0.724	0.040 (0.027)	0.130	-0.015 (0.017)	0.357	0.020 (0.020)	0.330	-0.008 (0.022)	0.725
Party ID	0.029 (0.020)	0.136	-0.008 (0.015)	0.595	0.042 (0.015)	0.005	-0.001 (0.015)	0.942	-0.012 (0.020)	0.536	0.045 (0.028)	0.107
Ideology	0.079 (0.029)	0.006	0.040 (0.018)	0.025	0.029 (0.018)	0.121	0.048 (0.016)	0.003	0.063 (0.021)	0.002	0.098 (0.027)	0.000
Region: Midwest	-0.042 (0.051)	0.412	0.010 (0.038)	0.795	-0.114 (0.047)	0.016	-0.054 (0.045)	0.224	0.061 (0.056)	0.282	-0.073 (0.069)	0.288
Region: South	-0.128 (0.059)	0.030	-0.093 (0.042)	0.029	-0.048 (0.043)	0.266	-0.031 (0.040)	0.439	0.100 (0.053)	0.062	-0.098 (0.065)	0.131
Region: West	-0.233 (0.080)	0.004	-0.024 (0.051)	0.647	-0.087 (0.052)	0.092	0.038 (0.045)	0.395	0.018 (0.060)	0.766	-0.197 (0.072)	0.006
Grew up in rural area/small town	0.020 (0.046)	0.664	0.043 (0.033)	0.187	-0.034 (0.040)	0.403	0.040 (0.037)	0.276	0.113 (0.042)	0.008	0.005 (0.069)	0.948
N	625		817		905		1612		1765		1401	
R <sup>2</sup>	.073		.072		.067		.029		.071		.056	
Note: Note: The figure depicts original analyses of the General Social Survey. The depicted models use standardized independent variables that are weighted to be nationally representative. The bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Separate models were estimated for each year. Years were selected based on proximity to presidential elections and variable availability. Gun ownership in the depicted models is based on whether a respondent lives in a household with a gun (which is the only gun ownership variable available in the 1974 data); the results are substantively the same when personal gun ownership is used for 1982 and forward. The dependent variable asks, "In general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals?" with response including "too harsh," "about right," and "not harsh enough."												

*Chapter 6*

**TABLE 6A1. Regression Predicting View of Media’s Role in Democracy Among Gun Owners**

	B (SE)		p-value
(Intercept)	1.711	(0.092)	0.000
NRA Membership	-0.139	(0.057)	0.015
White	0.011	(0.056)	0.848
Male	0.050	(0.043)	0.240
Age	-0.050	(0.020)	0.013
Income	-0.020	(0.023)	0.383
Education	0.016	(0.020)	0.403
Party ID	-0.233	(0.024)	0.000
Ideology	0.018	(0.024)	0.457
News Consumption	0.021	(0.021)	0.311
Region: Midwest	-0.018	(0.084)	0.832
Region: South	0.048	(0.079)	0.535
Region: West	0.065	(0.082)	0.427
Grew up in rural area/small town	-0.077	(0.040)	0.057
N = 1188; R <sup>2</sup> = .239			
<p>Note: Table depicts an original analysis of data collected by the Pew Research Center in 2017, with standardized independent variables weighted to be nationally-representative. Because the question about gun owner identity was only asked of gun owning respondents, the analysis excludes non-gun owners. A description of the study and all data are available at the following URL: <a href="http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/">http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/</a>.</p>			



**TABLE 6A2. Regression Predicting Partisan Identification**

	B (SE)		p-value
(Intercept)	1.564	(0.094)	0.000
Gun Ownership	0.271	(0.071)	0.000
White	0.735	(0.074)	0.000
Male	0.157	(0.065)	0.016
Age	-0.037	(0.029)	0.208
Income	0.057	(0.031)	0.064
Education	-0.042	(0.031)	0.174
Ideology	0.515	(0.038)	0.000
News Consumption	-0.010	(0.029)	0.731
Region: Midwest	0.018	(0.089)	0.837
Region: South	0.080	(0.086)	0.350
Region: West	-0.052	(0.089)	0.561
Grew up in rural area/small town	0.079	(0.060)	0.191
N = 3663; R <sup>2</sup> = .317			
<p>Note: Table depicts an original analysis of data collected by the Pew Research Center in 2017, with standardized independent variables weighted to be nationally-representative. A description of the study and all data are available at the following URL:  <a href="http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/">http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/</a>.</p>			

**TABLE 6A3. Regression Predicting Gun Identity Among Gun Owners Using Evangelical Identity**

	B (SE)		p-value
(Intercept)	1.889	(0.186)	0.000
Evangelical	0.240	(0.103)	0.020
White	0.230	(0.142)	0.105
Male	0.024	(0.104)	0.814
Age	-0.149	(0.050)	0.003
Income	-0.059	(0.055)	0.283
Education	-0.132	(0.055)	0.016
Party ID	0.194	(0.070)	0.006
Ideology	0.218	(0.064)	0.001
News Consumption	0.080	(0.054)	0.140
Region: Midwest	0.100	(0.142)	0.482
Region: South	0.134	(0.137)	0.330
Region: West	0.124	(0.143)	0.386
Grew up in rural area/small town	-0.054	(0.092)	0.558
N = 1200; R <sup>2</sup> = .176			
Note: Table depicts an original analysis of data collected by the Pew Research Center in 2017, with standardized independent variables weighted to be nationally-representative. Because the question about gun owner identity was only asked of gun owning respondents, the analysis excludes non-gun owners. A description of the study and all data are available at the following URL: <a href="http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/">http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/</a> .			

<b>TABLE 6A4. Regressions Predicting Trump Job Approval Using Gun Related Variables</b>						
	<b>Coefficient (s.e.)</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>Coefficient (s.e.)</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>Coefficient (s.e.)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
(Intercept)	2.095 (0.082)	0.000	2.320 (0.198)	0.000	2.167 (0.196)	0.000
Gun Ownership	0.169 (0.064)	0.008	–	–	–	–
Gun Identity	–	–	0.192 (0.054)	0.000	–	–
NRA Membership	–	–	–	–	0.458 (0.105)	0.000
White	0.143 (0.065)	0.028	0.212 (0.139)	0.126	0.255 (0.143)	0.074
Male	0.082 (0.053)	0.125	-0.064 (0.104)	0.539	-0.050 (0.101)	0.622
Age	0.083 (0.025)	0.001	0.104 (0.044)	0.017	0.079 (0.044)	0.071
Income	-0.018 (0.029)	0.537	0.098 (0.061)	0.106	0.075 (0.057)	0.190
Education	-0.100 (0.029)	0.001	-0.110 (0.057)	0.054	-0.129 (0.056)	0.021
Party ID	0.798 (0.036)	0.000	0.807 (0.077)	0.000	0.828 (0.076)	0.000
Ideology	0.195 (0.034)	0.000	0.208 (0.065)	0.001	0.225 (0.068)	0.001
News Consumption	0.023 (0.025)	0.367	-0.068 (0.043)	0.112	-0.042 (0.043)	0.334
Region: Midwest	-0.156 (0.074)	0.035	-0.171 (0.150)	0.254	-0.177 (0.143)	0.218
Region: South	-0.200 (0.075)	0.007	-0.147 (0.156)	0.345	-0.124 (0.149)	0.405
Region: West	-0.297 (0.076)	0.000	-0.405 (0.170)	0.018	-0.362 (0.159)	0.023
Grew up in rural area/small town	0.073 (0.053)	0.174	0.041 (0.093)	0.661	0.027 (0.091)	0.769
N	3624		1186		1186	
R <sup>2</sup>	.570		.559		.560	

Note: Table depicts an original analysis of data collected by the Pew Research Center in 2017, with standardized independent variables weighted to be nationally-representative. Because questions about gun owner identity and NRA membership were only asked of gun owning respondents, those analyses exclude non-gun owners. A description of the study and all data are available at the following URL: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/06/22/guns-report-methodology/>.