Broadband Internet, Market Demographics and Hate Groups

Scott J. Savage and Bradley S. Wimmer[1]

August 4, 2025

Appendices

[1]Savage, Department of Economics, University of Colorado at Boulder, scott.savage@colorado.edu; Wimmer, Department of Economics, University of Nevada at Las Vegas, bradley.wimmer@unlv.edu.

Appendix A Hate groups and immigration

Table A1 Local hate-group chapters including other hate groups

Census Region	2000			2010			2017		
	T	C	Total	T	C	Total	T	C	Total
Northeast (NW)	19	30	49	17	34	51	12	15	27
Midwest (MW)	37	50	87	36	52	88	18	38	56
South (S)	100	61	161	134	58	192	59	59	118
West (W)	9	44	53	22	41	63	18	40	58
Border	5	6	11	2	4	6	2	2	4
NW & MW	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
NW & S	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
MW & S	4	3	7	0	1	1	1	1	2
MW & W	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0
Total	170	191	361	211	189	400	109	154	263

Traditional Groups	2000	2010	2017
	T	T	T
KKK	93	102	44
White Nationalist	77	109	65
Total	170	211	109

Contemporary Groups	2000	2010	2017
	C	C	C
Neo-Nazi	154	111	27
Racist Skinhead	35	60	10
Anti-Immigration	2	11	21
Anti-Muslim	0	6	90
Neo-Völkisch	0	1	6
Total	191	189	154

NOTES. T is traditional, C is contemporary. [+] Some hate groups are located in commuting zones that span multiple states that constitute Census-Region borders. The SPLC does not count entities that appear only in cyberspace because they are likely individual web publishers who falsely portray themselves as groups.
SOURCE. SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).

Table A2 Statewide and regional hate-group chapters including other hate groups[2]

	2000			2010			2017		
Region	Traditional	Contemporary	Total	Traditional	Contemporary	Total	Traditional	Contemporary	Total
Northeast	0	0	0	18	15	33	10	31	41
Midwest	0	0	0	24	25	49	10	42	52
South	2	1	3	55	51	102	25	73	98
West	0	1	1	20	28	48	18	47	65
Total	2	2	4	117	115	232	63	193	256

Traditional Groups	2000	2010	2017
KKK	1	103	28
White Nationalist	1	14	35
Total	2	117	63

Contemporary Groups	2000	2010	2017
Neo-Nazis	2	53	94
Racist Skinheads	0	62	60
Anti-Immigration	0	0	1
Anti-Muslim	0	0	16
Neo-Völkisch	0	0	22
Total	2	115	193

NOTES. T is traditional, C is contemporary. The SPLC does not count entities that appear only in cyberspace because they are likely individual web publishers who falsely portray themselves as groups.
SOURCE. SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).

[2] Following the SPLC's convention, these counts equal the number of states where groups without well-defined headquarters are active. This may overcount the number of groups without well-defined headquarters when these groups include members from more than one state. These data are counted at the state level.

Table A3 Home-country immigration shares 1980 to 2017

	1980			2000			2010			2017	
Rank	Country	Share	Out group	Country	Share	Out group	Country	Share	Out group	Country	Share	Out group
1	Mexico	16.2%	98.4%	Mexico	28.5%	99.1%	Mexico	28.4%	99.2%	Mexico	24.9%	99.2%
2	Germany	7.9%	4.9%	Philippines	4.1%	95.1%	India	4.3%	98.3%	India	5.5%	98.6%
3	Canada	6.6%	2.9%	Germany	3.7%	11.4%	Philippines	4.3%	95.9%	China	4.7%	98.7%
4	Italy	6.2%	1.2%	India	3.2%	97.7%	China	3.7%	98.7%	Philippines	4.2%	95.7%
5	UK	5.1%	3.9%	China	3.1%	98.2%	Vietnam	3.0%	98.7%	El Salvador	3.0%	99.2%
6	Cuba	4.5%	98.3%	Vietnam	3.1%	98.3%	El Salvador	2.9%	99.1%	Vietnam	2.9%	98.6%
7	USSR	3.5%	3.9%	Canada	2.8%	6.6%	Germany	2.8%	12.9%	Cuba	2.8%	98.8%
8	Philippines	3.5%	93.6%	USSR	2.7%	1.0%	USSR	2.8%	0.9%	USSR	2.7%	1.2%
9	Poland	3.0%	0.6%	Korea	2.7%	96.1%	Korea	2.6%	96.9%	Dom Rep	2.6%	99.1%
10	Korea	2.1%	95.6%	Cuba	2.7%	98.4%	Cuba	2.6%	98.5%	Germany	2.4%	14.5%
11	China	2.1%	94.5%	El Salvador	2.5%	98.2%	Canada	2.2%	10.6%	Korea	2.3%	96.2%
12	Japan	2.0%	69.3%	UK	2.4%	9.0%	Dom Rep	2.1%	99.4%	Guatemala	2.1%	98.9%
13	Vietnam	1.7%	97.5%	Dom Rep	2.1%	99.1%	Guatemala	2.0%	98.9%	Canada	2.0%	11.5%
14	Ireland	1.5%	0.6%	Jamaica	1.7%	97.8%	UK	2.0%	10.3%	UK	1.8%	11.6%
15	Portugal	1.5%	12.8%	Italy	1.6%	2.4%	Jamaica	1.6%	97.8%	Colombia	1.7%	98.6%
16	Greece	1.5%	1.5%	Colombia	1.6%	97.3%	Colombia	1.6%	98.4%	Jamaica	1.6%	97.9%
17	India	1.5%	92.9%	Guatemala	1.5%	97.7%	Haiti	1.4%	99.0%	Haiti	1.5%	98.8%
18	Jamaica	1.4%	95.6%	Poland	1.5%	0.6%	Honduras	1.2%	98.5%	Honduras	1.4%	98.8%
19	Dom Rep	1.2%	98.4%	Japan	1.4%	71.9%	Japan	1.1%	71.3%	Japan	1.1%	69.0%
20	Yugoslavia	1.1%	1.4%	Haiti	1.3%	98.8%	Poland	1.1%	0.4%	Africa, other	1.1%	89.9%
	Total	74.4%	48.4%		74.3%	79.4%		73.8%	84.8%		72.4%	87.0%

NOTES. Country is immigrant's home country (i.e., country where immigrant was born). Share is the home-country's share of immigrant population living in the U.S. Out group is the share of home-country immigrants who are Hispanic or non-White.
SOURCE. IPUMS decennial census (1980, 2000), ACS (2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022), NTIA (2001, 2010), and FCC (2022).

Appendix B Variables

Table B1 Variable descriptions

Variable	Description and data source
Contemporary Hate	Number of unique Neo-Nazi and Racist Skinhead local chapters operating in a commuting zone; set equal to three when three or more unique chapters are present in a commuting zone. Source: SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).
Traditional Hate	Number of unique Ku Klux Klan local chapters operating in a commuting zone; set equal to two when two or more unique chapters are present in a commuting zone. Source: SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).
Any Hate	Number of unique Neo-Nazi, Racist Skinhead, and Ku Klux Klan local chapters operating in a commuting zone; set equal to five when five or more unique chapters are present in a commuting zone. Source: SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).
Internet	The share of commuting-zone residences with a fixed Internet connection over 200 kbps in the downstream or upstream direction Source: NTIA (2001, 2010), and FCC (2022).
Immigration	The share of a commuting zone's population that was not born in the United States. Source: IPUMS decennial census (1980, 2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Native Non-White	The share of a commuting zone's native population that is Black, Hispanic, Asian, or Other Race. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Uneducated Pop	The number of native-born, non-Hispanic whites without high-school degrees and age 25 and above living in a commuting zone. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Educated Pop	The number of native-born, non-Hispanic whites with at least a high-school degree and age 25 and above living in a commuting zone. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
In-Group Income	A commuting zone's median income ($1,000's) for households headed by native-born, non-Hispanic whites, in 2000 dollars. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Out-Group Income	A commuting zone's median income ($1,000's) for households headed by out-group members who are non-white, Hispanic, or were not born in the United States, in 2000 dollars. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Evangelical	The share of a commuting zone's population that is evangelical Protestant. Source: The Association of Religion Data Archives.
Protestant	The share of a commuting zone's population that is mainline Protestant. Source: The Association of Religion Data Archives.
Republican	The share of a commuting zone's total voters who voted Republican in the most-recent Presidential election. Source: David Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
Youth	The share of a commuting zone's in-group population that is aged 19 and younger. Source: IPUMS decennial census (2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Klan 1924	Equals one when a commuting zone had an active KKK chapter during the Klan's second rise from 1915 in 1924, and zero otherwise. Source: Kneebone and Torres (2015).
Confederate	Equals one if the commuting zone includes a county located in a former Confederate state, and zero otherwise.
Border	Equals one if the commuting zone includes a county located in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, or California, and zero otherwise.
Density	Number of Housing units per local road mile (S1400) in a commuting zone. Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2013), IPUMS decennial census (2000, 2010), ACS (2016, 2017, 2018).
Commercial	A commuting zone's ten-year lagged share of labor-market participants in the finance, insurance, and real estate sectors; computer and data processing services, as well as the communications

Table B1 Variable descriptions

Variable	Description and data source
	industries. Source: IPUMS decennial census (1990, 2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011), Ruggles et al. (2022).
B	Bartik Instrument that equals the sum over origin countries of the product of a commuting zone's 1980 share of immigrants from an origin country and the national number of recent immigrants from that origin country. Source: IPUMS decennial census (1980, 2000), ACS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2017, 2018), Ruggles et al. (2022).
Contemporary State Hate	Number of statewide and regional Neo-Nazi and Racist Skinhead chapters operating in a state; set equal to three when three or more unique chapters are present in a state. Source: SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).
Traditional State Hate	Number of statewide and regional Ku Klux Klan chapters operating in a state; set equal to two when two or more unique chapters are present in a commuting zone. Source: SPLC (2001, 2011, 2018b).
Year 2010	Equals one when the year is 2010, and zero otherwise.
Year 2017	Equals one when the year is 2017, and zero otherwise.

Residential Internet Penetration

We used data from the FCC and the NTIA to construct a measure of residential Internet penetration for all commuting zones in 2000, 2010 and 2017 ($Internet_{mt}$). The FCC (2010, 2017) provide public data on the number of fixed residential Internet connections and households for each county in 2010 and 2017 in their *Form 477 Data on Fixed Internet Access Services* publications.[3] We used the Form 477 data to calculate the share of residences in each county with a fixed Internet connection over 0.2 Mbps in at least the downstream or upstream direction in 2010 and 2017. County-level data on the number of fixed residential Internet connections are not available in 2000 and are interpolated. We used NTIA (2001, 2011) data on the number of fixed residential Internet connections and households to calculate Internet penetration for each metropolitan statistical area (MSA) in 2001 and 2010.[4] We then used these data to construct the ratio of 2001 to 2010 Internet penetration for each MSA and matched the MSAs to counties using the appropriate FIPs codes. About five percent of counties could not be matched to an MSA. For these counties, we constructed the ratio of 2001 to 2010 Internet penetration for each state the county is located in. We completed the interpolation by multiplying the ratios by the FCC's (2010) county-level data in 2010 to estimate the share of residences in each county with a fixed Internet connection over 0.2 Mbps in at least the downstream or upstream direction in 2000.

[3] Available at https://www.fcc.gov/form-477-county-data-internet-access-services.
[4] See the NTIA's September 2001 Internet and Computer Use supplement to the Current Population Survey and the October 2010 Internet Use supplement to the Current Population Survey.

Appendix C Linear regressions

Table C1 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and Internet-youth interactions

	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions	
	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$
$Immigration_{mt}$	0.987***	0.618*	20.929***
	(0.343)	(0.337)	(7.313)
$Native\ Non\text{-}White_{mt}$	-0.025	-0.030	3.372
	(0.146)	(0.142)	(3.394)
$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$	-0.049***	0.034	-0.509
	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.486)
$Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	0.022***	0.005	0.434*
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.232)
$In\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	-0.103	-0.057	2.441
	(0.101)	(0.099)	(2.462)
$Out\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	0.101	0.103*	1.357
	(0.062)	(0.061)	(1.477)
$Evangelical_{mt}$	0.115	0.129*	4.257**
	(0.081)	(0.070)	(1.658)
$Protestant_{mt}$	0.294***	0.298***	6.277***
	(0.084)	(0.086)	(2.151)
$Conservative_{mt}$	-0.198***	-0.158***	-5.553***
	(0.059)	(0.054)	(1.509)
$Youth_{mt}$	-1.434***	0.522	24.015
	(0.290)	(0.911)	(17.657)
$Klan_{m}$	-0.942*	-0.948*	-21.970*
	(0.508)	(0.507)	(11.971)
$Confederate_{m}$	-0.455	-0.689	-5.893
	(0.815)	(0.776)	(17.622)
$Density_{mt}$	0.462***	1.067***	4.211
	(0.114)	(0.311)	(6.227)
$Commercial_{mt}$	1.619***	8.927**	30.580
	(0.395)	(4.193)	(87.963)
$Density_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$		-0.029**	0.044
		(0.012)	(0.254)
$Commercial_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$		-0.295*	0.648
		(0.163)	(3.573)
$Density_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$			

Table C1 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and Internet-youth interactions

	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions	
	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$
$Commercial_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$			
$Density_{mt} \times Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$			
$Commercial_{mt} \times Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$			
$Year\ 2010_t$	41.214***	42.688***	1,155.782***
	(1.045)	(1.065)	(25.991)
$Year\ 2017_t$	58.613***	59.749***	1,552.545***
	(1.786)	(1.839)	(44.867)
$Border\ 2000_{mt}$	2.163**	2.551***	117.572***
	(0.890)	(0.867)	(21.055)
$Border\ 2010_{mt}$	-3.051**	-2.955**	-75.372**
	(1.353)	(1.387)	(32.274)
$Border\ 2017_{mt}$	-0.926	-0.270	-48.023
	(1.589)	(1.607)	(36.645)
Constant	9.716**	-6.735	-1,103.783***
	(3.982)	(14.335)	(313.216)
Relevance	F(2, 721) = 19.2***	F(4, 721) = 12.6***	F(4, 721) = 9.8***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
CRE	χ^2(12, 721) =15.8***	χ^2(14, 721) =10.2***	χ^2(14, 721) =8.5***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
R-Squared	0.907	0.909	0.905

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered by commuting zone, in parentheses. P-values in parentheses for all F and Chi-Squared tests. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Relevance F-Statistic tests the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the excluded exogenous variables ($Density_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}$, $Density_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$, $Density_{mt} \times Educated\ In\text{-}Group\ Pop_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt} \times Educated\ In\text{-}Group\ Pop_{mt,}$ and B_{mt}) jointly equal zero within each equation. CRE tests the null that the correlated random effects jointly equal zero within each equation.

Table C2 2SLS estimates of the linear model of market entry with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions

	Endogenous Internet		Endogenous Internet &					
			Internet × Youth		Internet × Educated Pop		Internet × Uneducated Pop	
	Contemporary$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$
Internet$_{mt}$	0.030***	0.017**	-0.028**	0.007	0.026***	0.009	0.022**	0.022***
	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.008)
Internet$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			0.002***	0.0004				
			(0.001)	(0.0004)				
Internet$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					0.00001	0.00003**		
					(0.00002)	(0.00001)		
Internet$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							0.0003**	-0.0002
							(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Immigration$_{mt}$	-0.037**	-0.038***	-0.023	-0.035***	-0.037**	-0.037**	-0.034**	-0.040***
	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.015)
Native Non-White$_{mt}$	-0.008	-0.005	-0.015**	-0.007	-0.008	-0.007	-0.011*	-0.003
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Uneducated Pop$_{mt}$	0.007***	0.001	0.005**	0.0005	0.018	0.028**	0.017***	-0.006
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.017)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Educated Pop$_{mt}$	-0.004***	-0.001*	-0.004***	-0.001	-0.006**	-0.005***	-0.007***	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)
In-Group Income$_{mt}$	-0.011*	0.006	-0.024***	0.004	-0.014**	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.007)
Out-Group Income$_{mt}$	0.005	-0.002	0.008**	-0.002	0.005	-0.002	0.006*	-0.003
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Evangelical$_{mt}$	-0.005	-0.002	-0.008***	-0.002	-0.005	-0.002	-0.004	-0.003
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Protestant$_{mt}$	-0.015***	-0.007**	-0.011**	-0.006*	-0.014***	-0.004	-0.013***	-0.009**
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Republican$_{mt}$	0.011***	0.007***	0.011***	0.007***	0.012***	0.011***	0.007**	0.009***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Youth$_{mt}$	0.059***	0.017	-0.085***	-0.007	0.054***	0.005	0.040*	0.030*
	(0.021)	(0.013)	(0.033)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.022)	(0.017)
Klan$_{m}$	0.058**	0.036**	0.053**	0.051***	0.061**	0.057***	0.066**	0.055**
	(0.026)	(0.015)	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.027)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.022)
Confederate$_{m}$	-0.060	0.050*	-0.076*	0.068**	-0.069*	0.044	-0.062	0.062*
	(0.042)	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.032)	(0.042)	(0.033)	(0.041)	(0.036)
Year 2010$_{t}$	-1.129***	-0.671**	-1.416***	-0.680**	-0.972**	-0.308	-0.867**	-0.863***
	(0.423)	(0.286)	(0.462)	(0.325)	(0.400)	(0.296)	(0.420)	(0.331)
Year 2017$_{t}$	-1.742***	-1.054***	-1.942***	-1.034**	-1.522***	-0.547	-1.313**	-1.361***
	(0.597)	(0.403)	(0.613)	(0.436)	(0.561)	(0.417)	(0.598)	(0.473)
Border 2000$_{mt}$	-0.024	-0.145***	-0.169**	-0.171***	0.010	-0.063	-0.015	-0.135***
	(0.068)	(0.050)	(0.086)	(0.063)	(0.070)	(0.058)	(0.067)	(0.051)
Border 2010$_{mt}$	0.080	0.058	0.084	0.051	0.073	0.043	0.080	0.077
	(0.075)	(0.051)	(0.076)	(0.055)	(0.077)	(0.056)	(0.072)	(0.061)
Border 2017$_{mt}$	0.002	0.025	0.077	0.031	-0.005	0.004	0.006	0.041
	(0.055)	(0.036)	(0.061)	(0.046)	(0.054)	(0.042)	(0.047)	(0.049)
Constant	-0.492**	0.421*	1.914**	-0.098	-0.443**	-0.412***	-0.306	-0.480***
	(0.210)	(0.244)	(0.922)	(0.565)	(0.196)	(0.135)	(0.198)	(0.153)
Hansen J Statistic	$\chi^2(1) = 0.741$	$\chi^2(1) = 0.075$	$\chi^2(2) = 7.36$**	$\chi^2(2) = 0.89$	$\chi^2(2) = 4.57$	$\chi^2(2) = 0.90$	$\chi^2(2) = 0.427$	$\chi^2(2) = 3.88$

Table C2 2SLS estimates of the linear model of market entry with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions

	Endogenous Internet		Endogenous Internet & Internet × Youth		Endogenous Internet & Internet × Educated Pop		Endogenous Internet & Internet × Uneducated Pop	
	Contemporary$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$
	(0.109)	(0.785)	(0.025)	(0.64)	(0.10)	(0.64)	(0.801)	(0.144)
CRE	F(12) =82.93***	F(12) =31.47***	F(14) = 71.92***	F(14) =37.88***	F(14) = 70.47***	F(14) = 21.62*	F(14) = 107.19*	F(14) = 28.23**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.08)	(0.00)	(0.013)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$	$\chi^2(1)$ =11.42***	$\chi^2(1)$ =7.28***	$\chi^2(1)$ =4.51***	$\chi^2(1)$ = 8.01***	$\chi^2(1)$ = 6.97***	$\chi^2(1)$ = 3.55*	$\chi^2(1)$ =7.51***	$\chi^2(1)$ =9.44***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.00)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			$\chi^2(2)$ = 6.38	$\chi^2(2)$ = 7.67***				
			(0.01)	(0.01)				
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			$\chi^2(2)$ = 16.66***	$\chi^2(2)$ = 8.14**				
			(0.00)	(0.02)				
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					$\chi^2(2)$ = 1.07	$\chi^2(2)$ = 11.02***		
					(0.30)	(0.00)		
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					$\chi^2(2)$ = 6.78**	$\chi^2(2)$ = 9.89**		
					(0.03)	(0.00)		
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							$\chi^2(1)$ = 6.61**	$\chi^2(1)$ = 0.81
							(0.0102)	(0.368)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							$\chi^2(2)$ = 9.57***	$\chi^2(2)$ = 9.45***
							(0.01)	(0.01)

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered by commuting zone, in parentheses. P-values in parentheses for all F and Chi-Squared tests. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Hansen J statistics test the appropriateness of the model's overidentification restrictions. Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$, *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$ and *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$ F-Statistics test the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the excluded exogenous variables (*Density*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$, and their interactions with exogenous variables (*Density*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Density*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$, *Density*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$, and *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$)) jointly equal zero in first-step equations. HW is the Hausman-Wu test: *Internet*$_{mt}$ and its interactions with exogenous variables tests the null that *Internet*$_{mt}$ and its interactions with exogenous variables are exogenous and jointly exogenous.

Table C3 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and Internet-education interactions

	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions
	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt} \times Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$
$Immigration_{mt}$	0.946***	317.610	1.001***	21.271*
	(0.353)	(298.336)	(0.344)	(12.071)
$Native\ Non\text{-}White_{mt}$	-0.022	13.783	-0.025	9.712***
	(0.146)	(45.733)	(0.147)	(3.330)
$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$	-0.066***	-915.038***	-0.096*	-73.001***
	(0.019)	(70.805)	(0.053)	(7.347)
$Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	0.039***	95.722***	0.021***	7.269***
	(0.013)	(31.655)	(0.008)	(0.858)
$In\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	-0.082	180.175**	-0.085	-27.362***
	(0.103)	(80.444)	(0.105)	(5.056)
$Out\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	0.103*	6.160	0.101	-1.729
	(0.062)	(20.900)	(0.063)	(1.469)
$Evangelical_{mt}$	0.118	35.147*	0.116	0.592
	(0.079)	(20.500)	(0.081)	(0.651)
$Protestant_{mt}$	0.280***	9.910	0.294***	-1.272
	(0.085)	(38.556)	(0.084)	(2.057)
$Conservative_{mt}$	-0.189***	-219.369***	-0.204***	2.312*
	(0.061)	(30.704)	(0.059)	(1.329)
$Youth_{mt}$	-1.438***	1.589	-1.429***	34.448***
	(0.292)	(152.254)	(0.292)	(8.757)
$Klan_{m}$	-1.298***	-282.840***	-1.248**	-26.577***
	(0.499)	(85.625)	(0.508)	(9.159)
$Confederate_{m}$	-0.382	405.014**	-0.657	2.387
	(0.782)	(175.514)	(0.809)	(18.856)
$Density_{mt}$	0.616***	-146.903	0.476***	29.779***
	(0.150)	(137.620)	(0.117)	(7.647)
$Commercial_{mt}$	1.596***	175.042	1.543***	-15.389
	(0.443)	(274.820)	(0.437)	(10.916)
$Density_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$				
$Commercial_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$				
$Density_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	-0.0003**	0.921**		
	(0.0001)	(0.375)		
$Commercial_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	0.00001	-0.089		

Table C3 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and Internet-education interactions

	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions	Endogenous Internet	Endogenous Internet and interactions
	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$×$Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$	$Internet_{mt}$×$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$
	(0.001)	(2.138)		
$Density_{mt}$×$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$			-0.000	-0.001
			(0.000)	(0.059)
$Commercial_{mt}$×$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$			0.005	3.408***
			(0.006)	(0.843)
$Year\ 2010_t$	41.009***	-1,100.418**	41.168***	179.253***
	(1.063)	(461.042)	(1.053)	(31.620)
$Year\ 2017_t$	58.204***	-905.527	58.562***	66.614
	(1.848)	(755.020)	(1.801)	(45.304)
$Border\ 2000_{mt}$	1.803**	-1,553.767**	2.055**	73.617**
	(0.883)	(714.345)	(0.906)	(34.331)
$Border\ 2010_{mt}$	-3.384**	281.801	-3.159**	-46.310
	(1.332)	(478.514)	(1.347)	(31.229)
$Border\ 2017_{mt}$	-1.135	524.967	-1.054	-22.285
	(1.595)	(484.593)	(1.605)	(25.465)
Constant	7.049*	2,336.426***	7.877*	-32.870
	(3.920)	(901.335)	(4.064)	(84.915)
Relevance	F(4, 721) =12.6***	F(4, 721) = 1.8	F(4, 721) = 11.9***	F(4, 721) = 12.3***
	(0.00)	(0.13)	(0.00)	(0.00)
CRE	F(14, 721) =15.4***	χ^2(14, 721) =55.4***	χ^2(14, 721) = 16.8***	χ^2(14, 721) = 109.2***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0)	(0.00)
R-Squared	0.909	0.977	0.908	0.966

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered by commuting zone, in parentheses. P-values in parentheses for all F and Chi-Squared tests. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Relevance F-Statistic tests the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the excluded exogenous variables ($Density_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}$, $Density_{mt}$×$Youth_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}$×$Youth_{mt}$, $Density_{mt}$×$Educated\ In\text{-}Group\ Pop_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}$ ×$Educated\ In\text{-}Group\ Pop_{mt,}$ and B_{mt}) jointly equal zero within each equation. CRE tests the null that the correlated random effects jointly equal zero within each equation.

Table C4 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and immigration

	$Internet_{mt}$	$Immigration_{mt}$
$Native\ Non\text{-}White_{mt}$	0.064	0.085***
	(0.141)	(0.014)
$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$	-0.064***	-0.015***
	(0.015)	(0.004)
$Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	0.026***	0.004**
	(0.008)	(0.002)
$In\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	-0.052	0.054***
	(0.099)	(0.010)
$Out\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	0.099	-0.002
	(0.062)	(0.006)
$Evangelical_{mt}$	0.105	-0.011**
	(0.077)	(0.005)
$Protestant_{mt}$	0.248***	-0.048***
	(0.082)	(0.011)
$Republican_{mt}$	-0.205***	-0.004
	(0.061)	(0.005)
$Youth_{mt}$	-1.309***	0.103***
	(0.297)	(0.028)
$Density_{mt}$	0.519***	0.056***
	(0.117)	(0.018)
$Commercial_{mt}$	1.586***	-0.028
	(0.396)	(0.034)
B_{mt}	28.342	21.049***
	(20.701)	(2.174)
$Klan_{m}$	-1.009**	-0.128
	(0.513)	(0.205)
$Confederate_{m}$	-0.370	0.348
	(0.828)	(0.365)
$Year\ 2010_{t}$	42.019***	0.751***
	(1.075)	(0.094)
$Year\ 2017_{t}$	59.699***	0.959***
	(1.871)	(0.158)
$Border\ 2000_{mt}$	2.303**	1.133**
	(0.919)	(0.511)
$Border\ 2010_{mt}$	-2.325*	1.643***
	(1.348)	(0.517)
$Border\ 2017_{mt}$	0.559	2.211***

Table C4 First-step OLS estimates of the Internet and immigration

	$Internet_{mt}$	$Immigration_{mt}$
	(1.666)	(0.539)
Constant	7.374*	-6.794***
	(3.989)	(1.821)
Relevance	F(3, 721) =14.0***	F(3, 721) =34.0***
	(0.00)	(0.00)
CRE	χ^2(12, 721) =13.8***	χ^2(12, 721) =17.2***
	(0)	(0.00)
R-Squared	0.906	0.758

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered by commuting zone, in parentheses. P-values in parentheses for all F and Chi-Squared tests. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Relevance F-Statistic tests the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the excluded exogenous variables ($Density_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}$, $Density_{mt}\times Youth_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}\times Youth_{mt}$, $Density_{mt}\times$*Educated In-Group Pop*$_{mt}$, $Commercial_{mt}\times$*Educated In-Group Pop*$_{mt,}$ and B_{mt}) jointly equal zero within each equation. CRE tests the null that the correlated random effects jointly equal zero within each equation.

Table C5 2SLS estimates of the linear model of market entry with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions and census division-year fixed effects

Variables	Endogenous Internet		Endogenous Internet & Interactions					
			Internet × Youth		Internet × Educated Pop		Internet × Uneducated Pop	
	$Contemporary_{mt}$	$Traditional_{mt}$	$Contemporary_{mt}$	$Traditional_{mt}$	$Contemporary_{mt}$	$Traditional_{mt}$	$Contemporary_{mt}$	$Traditional_{mt}$
$Internet_{mt}$	0.023**	0.017**	-0.034**	0.006	0.017*	0.007	0.014	0.022***
	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.008)
$Internet_{mt} \times Youth_{mt}$			0.002***	0.0004				
			(0.001)	(0.0004)				
$Internet_{mt} \times Educated\ Pop_{mt}$					0.000003	0.00003**		
					(0.00002)	(0.00001)		
$Internet_{mt} \times Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$							0.0003***	-0.0001
							(0.0001)	(0.0001)
$Immigration_{mt}$	-0.037**	-0.042***	-0.036*	-0.039***	-0.031*	-0.040**	-0.033**	-0.045***
	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.014)
$Native\ Non\text{-}White_{mt}$	-0.014**	-0.009*	-0.020***	-0.010**	-0.013**	-0.007	-0.018***	-0.008
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.005)
$Uneducated\ Pop_{mt}$	0.005**	-0.001	0.004**	-0.001	0.008	0.027**	0.018***	-0.006
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.005)
$Educated\ Pop_{mt}$	-0.004***	-0.001**	-0.004***	-0.001*	-0.005*	-0.005***	-0.007***	0.0001
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)
$In\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	-0.018***	0.000	-0.026***	-0.001	-0.018***	-0.003	-0.007	-0.005
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)
$Out\text{-}Group\ Income_{mt}$	0.007**	-0.003	0.007*	-0.002	0.007**	-0.002	0.008***	-0.003
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
$Evangelical_{mt}$	-0.003	-0.002	-0.003*	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
$Protestant_{mt}$	-0.011***	-0.006*	-0.008*	-0.004	-0.009**	-0.003	-0.008*	-0.007**
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
$Republican_{mt}$	0.007***	0.007***	0.008***	0.007***	0.007**	0.009***	0.003	0.008***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
$Youth_{mt}$	0.020	0.008	-0.119***	-0.013	0.015	-0.012	0.010	0.013
	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.035)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.014)
$Klan_{m}$	0.037	0.045**	0.037	0.044**	0.034	0.047**	0.046**	0.047**
	(0.023)	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.019)	(0.023)	(0.019)	(0.023)	(0.021)
$Confederate_{m}$	-0.022	0.059	-0.031	0.069*	-0.022	0.058	-0.020	0.060
	(0.056)	(0.042)	(0.057)	(0.041)	(0.052)	(0.040)	(0.051)	(0.043)
$Year\ 2010_{t}$	-0.889**	-0.616**	-1.401***	-0.596*	-0.619	-0.216	-0.477	-0.841**
	(0.424)	(0.312)	(0.490)	(0.358)	(0.377)	(0.316)	(0.423)	(0.365)
$Year\ 2017_{t}$	-1.355**	-1.161***	-1.854***	-1.096**	-0.966*	-0.624	-0.776	-1.480***
	(0.619)	(0.442)	(0.664)	(0.477)	(0.539)	(0.440)	(0.610)	(0.517)
$Border\ 2000_{mt}$	-0.029	-0.154***	-0.240**	-0.190***	-0.010	-0.099	-0.021	-0.153***
	(0.084)	(0.057)	(0.108)	(0.072)	(0.083)	(0.061)	(0.083)	(0.057)
$Border\ 2010_{mt}$	0.033	0.026	0.057	0.017	0.023	-0.002	0.026	0.037
	(0.075)	(0.059)	(0.079)	(0.058)	(0.076)	(0.058)	(0.070)	(0.063)
$Border\ 2017_{mt}$	-0.034	0.022	0.099	0.035	-0.031	-0.004	-0.015	0.020
	(0.054)	(0.046)	(0.066)	(0.049)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.052)
Hansen J Statistic	$\chi^2(1) = 1.03$	$\chi^2(1) = 0.108$	$\chi^2(2) = 6.90$**	$\chi^2(2) = 1.73$	$\chi^2(2) = 5.44$*	$\chi^2(2) = 1.52$	$\chi^2(2) = 1.50$	$\chi^2(2) = 3.84$

Table C5 2SLS estimates of the linear model of market entry with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions and census division-year fixed effects

Variables	Endogenous Internet		Endogenous Internet & Interactions					
			Internet × Youth		Internet × Educated Pop		Internet × Uneducated Pop	
	Contemporary$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$
	(0.309)	(0.742)	(0.03)	(0.42)	(0.07)	(0.47)	(0.472)	(0.147)
Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$	$\chi^2(2, 721) = 19.10$ (0.00)	$\chi^2(2, 721) = 19.10$ (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 10.44$ (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 10.44$ (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 12.68$*** (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 12.68$*** (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) =10.41$*** (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 10.41$*** (0.00)
Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			$\chi^2(4, 721) = 9.69$ (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 9.69$ (0.00)				
Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					$\chi^2(4, 721) = 1.99$* (0.09)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 1.99$* (0.09)		
Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							$\chi^2(4, 721) = 9.82$*** (0.00)	$\chi^2(4, 721) = 9.82$*** (0.00)
CRE	F(12) =82.93*** (0.00)	F(12) = 34.74*** (0.00)	F(14) = 78.79*** (0.00)	F(14) = 42.45*** (0.00)	F(14) = 85.49*** (0.00)	F(14) = 20.16 (0.12)	F(14) = 114.26*** (0.00)	F(14) = 33.0 (0.00)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$	$\chi^2(1) =7.75$*** (0.005)	$\chi^2(1) =7.81$*** (0.005)	$\chi^2(1) =3.02$* (0.08)	$\chi^2(1) =7.30$*** (0.01)	$\chi^2(1) = 3.85$** (0.05)	$\chi^2(1) = 2.95$* (0.08)	$\chi^2(1) = 4.05$** (0.044)	$\chi^2(1) = 8.02$*** (0.00)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			$\chi^2(1) = 4.78$ ** (0.03)	$\chi^2(2) = 7.17$*** (0.01)				
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Youth*$_{mt}$			$\chi^2(2) = 79.69$*** (0.00)	$\chi^2(2) = 7.33$** (0.03)				
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					$\chi^2(1) = 0.31$ (0.58)	$\chi^2(1) = 9.74$*** (0.002)		
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Educated Pop*$_{mt}$					$\chi^2(2) = 3.75$ (0.15)	$\chi^2(2) = 10.54$*** (0.005)		
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							$\chi^2(1) = 5.554$** (0.018)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.826$*** (0.36)
HW: *Internet*$_{mt}$ & *Internet*$_{mt}$×*Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$							$\chi^2(2) = 6.44$ ** (0.04)	$\chi^2(2) = 8.17$** (0.02)

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Robust standard errors, clustered by commuting zone, in parentheses. P-values in parentheses for all F and Chi-Squared tests. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Hansen J statistics test the appropriateness of the model's overidentification restrictions. Relevance: *Internet*$_{mt}$, *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$ and *Internet*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$ F-Statistics test the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the excluded exogenous variables (*Density*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$, and their interactions with exogenous variables (*Density*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Youth*$_{mt}$, *Density*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$, *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Educated Pop*$_{mt}$, *Density*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$, and *Commercial*$_{mt}$ × *Uneducated Pop*$_{mt}$)) jointly equal zero in first-step equations. HW are Hausman-Wu tests: *Internet*$_{mt}$ and its interactions with exogenous variables tests the null that *Internet*$_{mt}$ and its interactions with exogenous variables are exogenous and jointly exogenous. Census Division Controls indicates whether the equation includes controls for each of the nine Census division for each year in our data (*e.g.*, *Division D*$_m$×*Year 2000*$_t$, *Division D*$_m$ ×*Year 2010*$_t$, and *Division D*$_m$ × *Year 2017*$_t$, where D$_m$ is an indicator variable that identifies each Census division). Division 1: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; Division 2: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania; Division 3: Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin; Division 4: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota; Division 5: Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia; Division 6: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee; Division 7: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; Division 8: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming; Division 9: California, Oregon, and Washington (Hawaii and Alaska are included in Division 9, but are not included in our data).

Appendix D Robustness tests of market entry

Table D1 Ordered probit estimates of market entry with alternative hate group definitions

	Hate-Group Definition[+]		Two Years of Hate Data[++]		Expanded Bins[+++]	
	Contemporary$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$	*Contemporary*$_{mt}$	*Traditional*$_{mt}$
Internet$_{mt}$	0.081**	0.047	0.110**	0.061	0.098**	0.079*
	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.045)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.042)
Immigration$_{mt}$	-0.071	-0.100	-0.125	-0.161*	-0.130	-0.239**
	(0.071)	(0.082)	(0.091)	(0.085)	(0.089)	(0.102)
Native Non-White$_{mt}$	-0.063**	-0.046	-0.070*	-0.041	-0.052	-0.061*
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.037)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Uneducated Pop$_{mt}$	0.006	0.002	0.015**	0.003	0.006	0.001
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Educated Pop$_{mt}$	-0.001	0.000	-0.006**	-0.002	-0.006***	-0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)
In-Group Income$_{mt}$	-0.035	0.027	-0.072**	0.028	-0.064*	0.039
	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.032)
Out-Group Income$_{mt}$	0.046**	-0.020	0.046**	-0.034	0.057**	-0.028
	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.021)
Evangelical$_{mt}$	-0.009	-0.011	-0.007	-0.014	-0.012	-0.013
	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.015)
Protestant$_{mt}$	-0.036	-0.014	-0.050	-0.001	-0.056*	-0.025
	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.031)	(0.031)
Republican$_{mt}$	0.011	0.026**	0.034**	0.029*	0.025*	0.035**
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.016)
Youth$_{mt}$	0.137*	-0.062	0.178*	0.054	0.179**	0.045
	(0.083)	(0.071)	(0.098)	(0.081)	(0.088)	(0.093)
Klan 1924$_{m}$	0.431***	0.257**	0.454***	0.307**	0.494***	0.353***
	(0.122)	(0.108)	(0.126)	(0.124)	(0.130)	(0.126)
Confederate$_{m}$	0.125	0.482***	0.088	0.446***	-0.122	0.380**
	(0.168)	(0.156)	(0.172)	(0.161)	(0.174)	(0.176)
Year 2010$_{t}$	-0.088	-0.718**	-0.220	-0.374	-0.137	-0.650
	(0.252)	(0.356)	(0.262)	(0.319)	(0.260)	(0.669)
Year 2017$_{t}$	0.226	0.190	0.143	0.308	0.279	0.532*
	(0.283)	(0.229)	(0.312)	(0.265)	(0.304)	(0.289)
Border 2000$_{mt}$	0.402	0.435*	0.322	0.234	-0.193	0.346
	(0.282)	(0.256)	(0.584)	(0.775)	(1.765)	(0.775)
Border 2010$_{mt}$	-3.360**	-2.090	-4.421**	-2.485	-3.971**	-3.210*
	(1.602)	(1.464)	(1.919)	(1.707)	(1.767)	(1.807)

Table D1 Ordered probit estimates of market entry with alternative hate group definitions

Border 2017$_{mt}$	-4.911**	-3.625*	-7.169***	-4.050*	-6.408***	-5.100**
	(2.253)	(2.077)	(2.691)	(2.393)	(2.485)	(2.531)
One Group (μ_{i1})	3.160***	1.544	2.234**	2.399**	3.067***	2.630**
	(0.877)	(0.956)	(0.971)	(0.967)	(0.960)	(1.027)
Two Groups (μ_{i2})	4.240***	2.520***	3.227***	3.463***	4.151***	3.815***
	(0.883)	(0.953)	(0.976)	(0.965)	(0.966)	(1.015)
Three Groups (μ_{i3})	4.869***		3.994***		4.840***	4.764***
	(0.888)		(0.987)		(0.982)	(1.034)
Four Groups (μ_{i4})					5.380***	
					(0.975)	
Five Groups (μ_{i5})					6.059***	
					(0.987)	
Estimated v_{mt}	-0.076**	-0.049	-0.101**	-0.068*	-0.090**	-0.084**
	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.045)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.042)
Estimated ρ	0.195***		0.128**		0.095	
	(0.058)		(0.061)		(0.065)	

NOTES. 2,166 observations. Estimated regressions include Mundlak controls for unobserved heterogeneity. Robust standard errors for estimated coefficients, clustered by commuting zone and bootstrapped with 1,000 iterations, in parentheses. P-value of the Chi-Squared statistic for the Wald test reported in parentheses. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level. Joint Control Function tests the null that the control function coefficients jointly equal zero across equations. Control Function tests the null that the control function coefficients jointly equal zero within each equation. Joint CRE tests the null that the correlated random effects jointly equal zero across equations. CRE tests the null that the correlated random effects jointly equal zero within each equation. Coefficient Equality tests the null that all the payoff coefficients are the same across the contemporary and traditional equations. +Differences in estimated coefficients from the Contemporary and Traditional Hate Group equations ($C - T$). Robust standard errors for differences in estimated coefficients, clustered by commuting zone and bootstrapped with 1,000 iterations, in parentheses.

Table D2 Cross-partial effects of the Internet on the probability of market entry from linear specifications with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions

	A: By Share In-Group Youth			B: By Educated In-Group Size			C: By Uneducated In-Group Size		
Contemporary Groups	Percentiles								
	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}
Marginal Effect	0.019**	0.029***	0.038***	0.026***	0.027***	0.034**	0.022**	0.024**	0.041***
	(0.008)	(0.01)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.016)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)
	Differences in Percentiles								
	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 5^{th}$
	0.009***	0.01***	0.019***	0.007	0.0005	0.008	0.017**	0.002**	0.019**
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.0008)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.009)
Traditional Groups	Percentiles								
	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}	5^{th}	50^{th}	95^{th}
Marginal Effect	0.014**	0.016**	0.017**	0.009	0.010	0.030**	0.022***	0.021***	0.010
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)
	Differences in Percentiles								
	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 50^{th}$	$50^{th} – 5^{th}$	$95^{th} – 5^{th}$
	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.020**	0.001**	0.021**	-0.011	-0.001	-0.012
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.0005)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.009)

NOTES. Estimated marginal effects are for an increase in $Internet_{mt}$ on the probability of observing an additional entrant in the average market, evaluated at the 5^{th}, 50^{th}, and 95^{th} percentiles for *Youth* and the *Educated* (*In-Group*) *Population.* Standard errors for the estimated effects derived using the delta method, in parentheses. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level.

Table D3 Cross-partial effects of the Internet on the probability of market entry from linear specifications with Internet-youth and Internet-education interactions and census division-year fixed effects

	A: By Share In-Group Youth			B: By Educated In-Group Size			C: By Uneducated In-Group Size		
Contemporary Groups	Percentiles								
	5th	50th	95th	5th	50th	95th	5th	50th	95th
Marginal Effect	0.016*	0.027***	0.037***	0.017*	0.017**	0.019	0.014	0.016*	0.037***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.015)	(0.01)	(0.010)	(0.012)
	Differences in Percentiles								
	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th
	0.010***	0.011***	0.021***	0.002	0.0002	0.003	0.021***	0.002***	0.024***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.0008)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.009)
Traditional Groups	Percentiles								
	5th	50th	95th	5th	50th	95th	5th	50th	95th
Marginal Effect	0.013**	0.015**	0.017**	0.007	0.009	0.028***	0.021***	0.021***	0.012
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	Differences in Percentiles								
	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th	95th – 50th	50th – 5th	95th – 5th
	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.019**	0.001**	0.020**	-0.01	-0.001	-0.010
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.0005)	(0.008)	(0.01)	(0.001)	(0.001)

NOTES. Estimated marginal effects are for an increase in $Internet_{mt}$ on the probability of observing an additional entrant in the average market, evaluated at the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentiles for *Youth* and the *Educated* (*In-Group*) *Population.* Standard errors for the estimated effects derived using the delta method, in parentheses. ***Significant at the 0.01 level; **significant at the 0.05 level; *significant at the 0.1 level.