Online Appendix for "American Partisans Vastly Underestimate the Diversity of Other Partisans' Policy Attitudes"

Nicholas Dias, Yphtach Lelkes, Jake Pearl

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): ylelkes@upenn.edu;

Version Date: July 15, 2024

Contents

Moments of "Typical" Perceived Distributions   **14**

Validation Checks   **15**

Question-Wise Differences in Estimates of Perceived Polarization   **21**

Robustness Check for Administration Error in Study 2   **22**

Robustness Check for Point-Estimate Question Wording   **24**

Sample Demographics

Attribute	Level	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3	Study 4	Study 5
Age	18 − 25 years old	12.4%	3.7%	6.0%	8.0%	4.2%
	26 − 34 years old	17.5%	25.1%	26.6%	31.1%	25.1%
	35 − 49 years old	28.1%	42.3%	41.1%	40.9%	42.8%
	50 − 64 years old	25.6%	21.5%	18.7%	14.8%	19.7%
	65+ years old	16.3%	7.4%	7.6%	5.2%	8.2%
Gender	Man	50.3%	51.7%	49.7%	50.0%	48.3%
	Woman	48.5%	47.6%	49.2%	48.6%	50.5%
	Another Identity	1.2%	0.7%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%
Race	Asian	6.1%	6.7%	7.1%	6.9%	6.9%
	Black or African American	14.7%	7.6%	9.7%	10.9%	9.2%
	White or Caucasian	73.4%	81.2%	78.0%	76.3%	78.1%
	Multi-Racial	4.9%	2.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.9%
	Another Identity	0.9%	1.9%	1.9%	2.7%	1.8%
Hispanic	No	82.2%	93.9%	93.2%	90.8%	93.4%
	Yes	17.8%	6.1%	6.8%	9.2%	6.6%
Education	High school degree or less	21.8%	10.8%	10.2%	12.2%	9.8%
	Associate degree	40.5%	27.7%	28.9%	26.0%	28.1%
	Bachelor's degree	25.7%	44.1%	42.3%	43.3%	43.0%
	Post-graduate degree	12.0%	17.3%	18.6%	18.5%	19.1%

Note: We did not initially collect demographics in Study 2. 81% of the participants (n = 1,534) from Study 2 returned to participate in a follow-up survey between December 23 and January 6, 2022.

Detailed Methods for Studies 1–5

This paper relies on data from five studies. We excluded participants who did not lean toward either the Republican or Democratic party (i.e., true Independents), with one exception: In Study 4, we allowed true Independents to draw non-political perceived distributions. All regressions utilized HC2 robust standard errors. Otherwise, our studies differ somewhat in their sampling approaches and questions. In the notes of our figures and tables, as well as in the text of our main paper, we specify which analyses draw upon which studies. Below, we specify the data collection procedure for each study.

Study 1.

2,069 Republicans and Democrats were recruited between June 27 and July 8, 2022, from Bovitz Forthright, which recruits online panelists via addressed-based probability sampling and online ads. Our sample was quota-matched to be representative of American adults on age, gender, education, Census region, and race. Participants were randomized to consider one of three policy issues: abortion access, border control, and gun control. They indicated their policy attitude using an 11-point scale that ranged from the most liberal to the most conservative position on the issue selected for them. Next, in random order, participants placed 20 Democrats and 20 Republicans on the same scale. Finally, participants reported how warm they felt toward Democrats and Republicans. We fielded a follow-up survey with Study 1 participants between July 28 and August 2, 2022 (n = 1,646). In this follow-up survey, we administered a three-item scale designed to measure participant numeracy (Schwartz et al. 1997).

Study 2.

1,887 Republicans and Democrats were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk between October 4 and 5, 2022. To ensure response quality, we sampled exclusively

from CloudResearch's "approved panelists," who have a proven track record and had over a 95% response approval rate. Participants were randomized to consider one of three policy issues: abortion access, border control, and gun control. They indicated their policy attitude using an 11-point scale. Thereafter, participants were randomized to one of three conditions. In the first condition, participants placed 20 Democrats and 20 Republicans on the same policy scale they had seen before, in random order. In the second condition, participants also completed the perceived distribution task, but were told they could receive cash incentives for completing this task accurately. In the third condition, participants indicated the stances of "most" Democrats and Republicans using point estimates, consistent with previous research on perceived and false polarization (for a review, see Fernbach and Van Boven 2022). Finally, participants reported how warm they felt toward Democrats and Republicans. We did not initially collect demographics in Study 2. 81% of the participants (n = 1,534) from Study 2 returned to participate in a follow-up survey between December 23 and January 6, 2022. This follow-up survey included demographic questions.

Study 3.

2,369 Republicans and Democrats were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk on December 16, 2022. To ensure response quality, we sampled exclusively from CloudResearch's approved panelists. Participants were randomized to consider one of three policy issues: abortion access, border control, and gun control. They indicated their policy attitude using an 11-point scale. Thereafter, participants were randomized to one of two conditions. In the first condition, participants placed 20 out-partisans on the same policy scale they had seen before. In the second condition, participants indicated where the "average" out-partisan stood on this issue using a point estimate. Finally, in random order, participants reported how warm they felt toward Democrats and Republicans, how comfortable they were socializing with out-partisans (three-item

scale; Cronbach's alpha = 0.86), and how likely most out-partisans would support violating democratic norms (three-item scale; Cronbach's alpha = 0.81).

Study 4.

1,000 American adults were recruited directly from CloudResearch's panel on September 19, 2023. Participants were randomized to consider one of five topics: the relative skill of the Red Sox and Yankees, preferences for the colors blue and pink, abortion access, border control, and gun control. They indicated their attitude using an 11-point scale. Next, in random order, participants placed 20 members of each of the two groups on the same scale. Those who read about the Red Sox and Yankees placed the attitudes of "die-hard Red Sox fans" and "die-hard Yankees fans." Those who read about the colors blue and pink placed the attitudes of Americans and Canadians. Finally, those who read about any of the other three topics placed the attitudes of Democrats and Republicans. Finally, in random order, participants reported how warm they felt toward Democrats and Republicans using a feeling thermometer, how comfortable they were socializing with out-partisans (three-item scale; Cronbach's alpha = 0.87), and how likely most out-partisans would support violating democratic norms (three-item scale; Cronbach's alpha = 0.79).

Study 5.

2,080 Republicans and Democrats were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk on October 10, 2023. To ensure response quality, we sampled exclusively from CloudResearch's approved panelists. Participants were randomized to consider one of three policy issues: abortion access, border control, and gun control. They indicated their policy attitude using an 11-point scale that ranged from the most liberal to the most conservative position on the issue selected for them. Then, participants were randomized to one of two conditions. In the first condition, participants placed

20 out-partisans on the same policy scale they had seen before. In the second condition, participants only indicated where the "average" out-partisan stood on this issue, using a point estimate. Next, in random order, participants reported how warm they felt toward Democrats and Republicans using a feeling thermometer and how likely most out-partisans would support violating democratic norms (three-item scale; Cronbach's alpha = 0.70). Finally, participants in the first condition indicated where the "average" out-partisan stood on this issue, using a point estimate.

Question Wording and Variable Construction

Party Identification

A participant was considered a Democrat if they responded to **Generally Identify with Party** *with "Democrat" or responded to* **Lean Toward Party** *with "Closer to Democratic Party." A participant was considered a Republican if they responded to* **Generally Identify with Party** *with "Republican" or responded to* **Lean Toward Party** *with "Closer to Republican Party."*

Generally Identify with Party

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, Republican, Independent or what? (Democrat / Republican / Independent / Other)

Lean Toward Party

Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party? (Closer to the Republican Party / Closer to the Democratic Party / Neither / Don't know)

Participant's Policy Attitude

If Policy Issue = Abortion Access: Some people think that abortion should never be forbidden, since one should not require a woman to have a child she doesn't want.

7

Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 0. Other people think that abortion should never be permitted and should be entirely illegal. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. Still others fall somewhere between these two positions. Where do you stand on this issue? Please indicate your position with the scale below. (0 - Abortion never forbidden / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Abortion never permitted)

If Policy Issue = Border Control: Some people think that there should be no border restrictions, and that anybody should be free to immigrate to the U.S. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 0. Other people think that people should welcome people to visit and work temporarily in the U.S., but that our borders should be closed to migrants who wish to immigrate here. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. Still others fall somewhere between these two positions. Where do you stand on this issue? Please indicate your position with the scale below. (0 - No border restrictions / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Border closed to immigrants)

If Policy Issue = Gun Control: Some people think that the 2nd Amendment should be repealed, or that it was not intended to apply to citizens, and that guns should be outlawed in the United States. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 0. Other people think that the 2nd Amendment protects a citizen's right to arms, and that there should be no regulation on guns whatsoever. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 10. Still others fall somewhere between these two positions. Where do you stand on this issue? Please indicate your position with the scale below. (0 - Repeal 2nd amendment / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - No restrictions on ownership of firearms)

Distribution of Partisans' Attitudes (Studies 1–2)

If 20 [Democrats / Republicans] were asked the previous question, how do you think each would respond? You have 20 tokens, each representing one [Democrat / Republican]. Place a token in a bin to rate how you think that [Democrat / Republican] would respond. *(Participant completes perceived distribution task. Scale endpoints match **Participant's Policy Attitude** and **Point-Estimate of Partisans' Attitudes** questions.)*

Distribution of Partisans' Attitudes (Studies 3–5)

Written above is the question you just answered. If 20 [Democrats / Republicans] were asked this question, how do you think each would respond? You have 20 tokens, each representing one [Democrat / Republican]. Place a token in a bin to rate how you think that [Democrat / Republican] would respond. *(Participant completes perceived distribution task. Scale endpoints match **Participant's Policy Attitude** and **Point-Estimate of Partisans' Attitudes** questions.)*

Point-Estimate of Partisans' Attitudes (Study 2)

Where do you think most [Democrats / Republicans] stand on this issue? Please indicate your position with the scale below.

If Policy Issue = Abortion Access: (0 - Abortion never forbidden / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Abortion never permitted)

If Policy Issue = Border Control: (0 - No border restrictions / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Border closed to immigrants)

If Policy Issue = Gun Control: (0 - Repeal 2nd amendment / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - No restrictions on ownership of firearms)

Point-Estimate of Partisans' Attitudes (Studies 3-5)

Written above is the question you just answered. How do you think the average [Democrat / Republican] would respond to this question?

If Policy Issue = Abortion Access: (0 - Abortion never forbidden / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Abortion never permitted)

If Policy Issue = Border Control: (0 - No border restrictions / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - Border closed to immigrants)

If Policy Issue = Gun Control: (0 - Repeal 2nd amendment / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10 - No restrictions on ownership of firearms)

Attention Check (Study 2)

Which policy was asked about in the previous question? (Abortion / Guns / Immigration / Marijuana / Same-sex Marriage)

Attention Checks (Study 4)

Stimulus: Iowa Man Arrested After Shooting A Woman at a Neighborhood Board Meeting

Steven Wright, 65, was arrested for attempted murder this afternoon in Des Moines. The Iowa local allegedly pulled a pistol on a group of residents who were meeting in a neighboring house. Following a confrontation, Wright reportedly shot one of the attendees in the chest.

Two witnesses reported that Wright was upset that his neighbors had posted multiple notices to his front door, asking him to mow his overgrown front lawn and pull his garbage cans off the street. After aggressively arguing for several minutes, Wright reportedly aimed his pistol at the woman and fired while calling her "a maniac bent on ruling the neighborhood."

When deputies arrived, Wright was sitting on a couch next to a shotgun and stated that he was not coming out, the report states. Deputies were able to take him into custody without further incident. They located a pistol on his person with a magazine and six rounds of ammunition, the report continues.

Check Name: What was the last name of the suspect? (Wright / Colton / Stewart / Harrison / Knox / White / Lacy)

Check State: In what state did the attack occur? (South Carolina / Tennessee / Michigan / Texas / Maine / Oregon / Iowa)

Check Weapon: What kind of weapon was used in the attack? (Pistol / Knife / Semi-automatic rifle / Hunting rifle / Sword / Shotgun / Bomb)

Warmth Toward the Parties

We would now like you to rate how you feel toward different groups of people, using a "feeling thermometer." Ratings from 0–49 degrees mean you feel unfavorable and cold toward the group. Ratings from 51–100 degrees mean you feel favorable and warm toward the group. To provide your rating for each group, click on the light blue ball next to the group's name and drag it. Note that you have to move the light blue ball, even if you want to select 50 degrees. *(0–100 sliders for Democrats and Republicans, displayed in random order)*

Perception that Out-Party Supports Violating Democratic Norms (Studies 3–5)

*We measured Perception that Out-Party Supports Violating Democratic Norms by averaging each participant's responses to **Out-Party on Judges**, **Out-Party on Voting Stations**, and **Out-Party on Violence**.*

11

Out-Party on Judges

Would most [Democrats / Republicans] support ignoring controversial court rulings by [Republican / Democratic] judges? (3. Definitely / 2. Probably / 1. Probably not / 0. Never)

Out-Party on Voting Stations

Would most [Democrats / Republicans] support reducing the number of voting stations in towns that support [Republicans / Democrats]? (3. Definitely / 2. Probably / 1. Probably not / 0. Never)

Out-Party on Violence

Would most [Democrats / Republicans] support using violence to block major [Republican / Democratic] laws? (3. Definitely / 2. Probably / 1. Probably not / 0. Never)

Comfort Socializing with Out-Party (Studies 3–4)

*We measured Comfort Socializing with Out-Party by averaging each participant's responses to **Out-Party Friend**, **Out-Party Neighbor**, and **Out-Party Marriage**.*

Out-Party Friend

How comfortable are you having close personal friends who are [Democrat / Republican]? (4. Extremely comfortable / 3. Very comfortable / 2. Somewhat comfortable / 1. Not too comfortable / 0. Not at all comfortable)

Out-Party Neighbor

How comfortable are you having neighbors on your street who are [Democrat / Republican]? (4. Extremely comfortable / 3. Very comfortable / 2. Somewhat comfortable / 1. Not too comfortable / 0. Not at all comfortable)

Out-Party Marriage

Suppose a son or daughter of yours was getting married. How upset would you feel if he or she married a [Democrat / Republican]? (0. Extremely upset / 1. Very upset / 2. Somewhat upset / 3. Not too upset / 4. Not at all upset)

Numeracy (Study 1)

Coin Flip

Imagine that we flip a fair coin 1,000 times. What is your best guess about how many times the coin would come up heads in 1,000 flips? *(Open-end)*

Lottery

In the BIG BUCKS LOTTERY, the chance of winning a $10 prize is 1%. What is your best guess about how many people would win a $10 prize if 1000 people each buy a single ticket to BIG BUCKS? *(Open-end)*

Sweepstakes

In ACME PUBLISHING SWEEPSAKES [sic], the chance of winning a car is 1 in 1,000. What percent of tickets to ACME PUBLISHING SWEEPSAKES [sic] win a car? *(Open-end)*

Moments of "Typical" Perceived Distributions

Supplementary Table 2 Moments of "Typical" Perceived Distributions by Study

Study	Policy Issue	Mean (Democrats)	SD (Democrats)	Mean (Republicans)	SD (Republicans)
Study 1	Gun Control	3.27	2.69	8.31	1.65
Study 1	Border Control	3.20	2.18	8.43	1.65
Study 1	Abortion Access	1.54	1.61	7.29	3.27
Study 2	Gun Control	2.64	1.95	8.38	1.50
Study 2	Border Control	3.14	1.79	8.44	1.55
Study 2	Abortion Access	1.62	1.50	8.21	1.53
Study 3	Gun Control	2.62	2.09	8.75	1.29
Study 3	Border Control	1.88	1.54	8.81	1.28
Study 3	Abortion Access	1.50	1.56	8.47	1.60
Study 4	Gun Control	2.25	1.69	8.44	1.55
Study 4	Border Control	2.64	1.95	8.60	1.24
Study 4	Abortion Access	1.50	1.22	8.33	1.54
Study 5	Gun Control	2.00	1.47	8.69	1.25
Study 5	Border Control	1.93	1.44	8.71	1.21
Study 5	Abortion Access	1.40	1.24	8.33	1.54

Note: Each "typical" distribution is generated by averaging the number of tokens participants collectively placed at each scale point.

Validation Checks

Non-Political Perceived Distributions

Supplementary Table 3 Moments of Non-Political Perceived Distributions

Question	Group	Mean	SD
Blue vs. Pink	Americans	4.40	3.22
Blue vs. Pink	Canadians	4.71	3.10
Red Sox vs. Yankees	Die-Hard Red Sox Fans	0.40	0.63
Red Sox vs. Yankees	Die-Hard Yankees Fans	9.69	0.60

This table includes data from Study 4.

Effect of Numeracy on Perceived Distribution Moments

We fielded a follow-up survey with Study 1 participants between July 28 and August 2, 2022 (n = 1,646). In this follow-up survey, we administered a three-item scale designed to measure participant numeracy (Schwartz et al. 1997).

Supplementary Table 4 Effect of Numeracy on Perceived Distribution SDs

	Error in Perceived Distribution SD	Perceived Distribution SD (Democrats)	Perceived Distribution SD (Republicans)
(Intercept)	1.172***	1.710***	1.530***
	(0.091)	(0.153)	(0.144)
Numeracy	−0.028	0.006	−0.111
	(0.051)	(0.084)	(0.084)
Policy Issue is Border Control	−0.085*	−0.058	−0.081
	(0.033)	(0.057)	(0.057)
Policy Issue is Abortion Access	0.318***	0.022	0.170**
	(0.039)	(0.063)	(0.062)
Participant is Republican	0.119**	−0.231***	−0.015
	(0.039)	(0.065)	(0.066)
Participant is a Woman	0.033	−0.061	0.001
	(0.031)	(0.051)	(0.051)
Participant is Another Gender	−0.018	0.041	−0.065
	(0.125)	(0.208)	(0.206)
Participant is Black	0.062	−0.105	0.029
	(0.074)	(0.122)	(0.121)
Participant is White	0.060	−0.137	−0.025
	(0.062)	(0.102)	(0.101)
Participant is Multi-Racial	0.117	0.038	−0.125
	(0.091)	(0.167)	(0.153)
Participant is Another Race	−0.076	−0.158	0.191
	(0.198)	(0.301)	(0.307)
Participant is Hispanic	0.003	−0.020	0.042
	(0.043)	(0.072)	(0.072)
Participant has an Associate's Degree	−0.067	0.086	0.081
	(0.042)	(0.071)	(0.069)
Participant has a Bachelor's Degree	−0.006	−0.056	0.054
	(0.046)	(0.077)	(0.072)
Participant has a Post-graduate Degree	−0.092+	0.022	0.147+
	(0.054)	(0.090)	(0.086)
Participant is 26–34 years old	0.071	−0.099	−0.160
	(0.056)	(0.098)	(0.098)
Participant is 35–49 years old	0.264***	−0.321***	−0.376***
	(0.053)	(0.094)	(0.091)
Participant is 50–64 years old	0.327***	−0.389***	−0.416***
	(0.054)	(0.097)	(0.093)
Participant is 65+ years old	0.372***	−0.436***	−0.495***
	(0.058)	(0.102)	(0.098)
Conservatism of Participant's Policy Attitude	−0.004	0.016	−0.004
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Perceived Distribution Represents Republicans' Attitudes	0.055+		
	(0.029)		
Num.Obs.	3152	1576	1576
R2	0.075	0.046	0.042
R2 Adj.	0.069	0.035	0.030
AIC	7735.6	4373.5	4334.9
BIC	7868.9	4486.1	4447.5
RMSE	0.82	0.96	0.94

Note: The reference categories for factor variables are as follows: gun control (policy issue), Democrat (partisanship), man (gender), Asian (race), not Hispanic (whether Hispanic), high school degree or less (education), 18–25 years old (age), and Democrat (subject of perceived distribution). This table includes data from Study 1.

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Supplementary Table 5 Effect of Numeracy on Perceived Distribution Means

	Error in Perceived Distribution Mean	Perceived Distribution Mean (Democrats)	Perceived Distribution Mean (Republicans)
(Intercept)	2.108***	3.569***	5.378***
	(0.165)	(0.335)	(0.381)
Numeracy	−0.487***	−0.854***	1.219***
	(0.092)	(0.203)	(0.204)
Policy Issue is Border Control	−0.112+	0.200	0.364**
	(0.062)	(0.142)	(0.136)
Policy Issue is Abortion Access	0.229***	−0.334*	−0.119
	(0.068)	(0.152)	(0.152)
Participant is Republican	0.197**	−0.832***	−0.300*
	(0.070)	(0.164)	(0.148)
Participant is a Woman	0.061	0.250*	−0.082
	(0.055)	(0.124)	(0.123)
Participant is Another Gender	−0.336+	−0.745*	1.000**
	(0.193)	(0.369)	(0.337)
Participant is Black	0.202	0.169	−0.001
	(0.134)	(0.267)	(0.314)
Participant is White	−0.104	−0.154	0.545*
	(0.113)	(0.225)	(0.258)
Participant is Multi-Racial	−0.057	−0.347	0.571
	(0.154)	(0.313)	(0.364)
Participant is Another Race	−0.093	0.507	0.725
	(0.359)	(0.803)	(0.640)
Participant is Hispanic	0.049	0.095	−0.267
	(0.074)	(0.159)	(0.175)
Participant has an Associate's Degree	−0.249***	−0.159	0.147
	(0.075)	(0.172)	(0.167)
Participant has a Bachelor's Degree	−0.205*	−0.284	0.349+
	(0.084)	(0.194)	(0.187)
Participant has a Post-graduate Degree	−0.277**	−0.157	0.298
	(0.099)	(0.220)	(0.221)
Participant is 26–34 years old	0.138	0.164	−0.268
	(0.099)	(0.210)	(0.230)
Participant is 35–49 years old	0.218*	−0.038	−0.233
	(0.093)	(0.196)	(0.217)
Participant is 50–64 years old	0.201*	−0.070	0.090
	(0.095)	(0.204)	(0.218)
Participant is 65+ years old	0.136	−0.398+	0.131
	(0.102)	(0.222)	(0.233)
Conservatism of Participant's Policy Attitude	0.013	0.222***	0.139***
	(0.012)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Perceived Distribution Represents Republicans' Attitudes	−0.018		
	(0.052)		
Num.Obs.	3152	1576	1576
R2	0.046	0.132	0.094
R2 Adj.	0.040	0.121	0.083
AIC	11 367.2	7161.5	7135.1
BIC	11 500.4	7274.1	7247.7
RMSE	1.46	2.32	2.30

Note: The reference categories for factor variables are as follows: gun control (policy issue), Democrat (partisanship), man (gender), Asian (race), not Hispanic (whether Hispanic), high school degree or less (education), 18–25 years old (age), and Democrat (subject of perceived distribution). This table includes data from Study 1.

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Effect of Monetary Incentives on Perceived Distribution Moments

The text of the accuracy incentives treatment read as follows: "There will be a drawing to reward correct answers. The closer your guess is to the actual distribution of [Democrats'/Republicans'] positions, the more likely you are to win a $100 bonus payment." This text was placed immediately before the perceived distribution task.

Supplementary Table 6 Group-Average Marginal Effects of Monetary Incentives on Perceived Distribution SDs

Policy Issue	Participant's Party	Which Party's Perceived Distribution?	Estimate	SE
Gun Control	Democrat	Democrat	−0.10	0.09
Gun Control	Democrat	Republican	0.06	0.11
Gun Control	Republican	Democrat	−0.10	0.15
Gun Control	Republican	Republican	0.04	0.11
Border Control	Democrat	Democrat	−0.08	0.08
Border Control	Democrat	Republican	0.13	0.09
Border Control	Republican	Democrat	−0.10	0.12
Border Control	Republican	Republican	0.10	0.11
Abortion Access	Democrat	Democrat	−0.14	0.09
Abortion Access	Democrat	Republican	−0.09	0.11
Abortion Access	Republican	Democrat	0.29	0.21
Abortion Access	Republican	Republican	0.17	0.15

Note: Estimates come from a fully moderated model with the following predictors: whether incentives were offered, policy issue, participant's partisanship, and perceived distribution subject. This table includes data from Study 2. n = 1,887.

Supplementary Table 7 Group-Average Marginal Effects of Monetary Incentives on Perceived
Distribution Means

Policy Issue	Participant's Party	Which Party's Perceived Distribution?	Estimate	SE
Gun Control	Democrat	Democrat	1.45	0.28
Gun Control	Democrat	Republican	−0.74	0.36
Gun Control	Republican	Democrat	0.45	0.46
Gun Control	Republican	Republican	−0.84	0.35
Border Control	Democrat	Democrat	0.89	0.24
Border Control	Democrat	Republican	−0.46	0.25
Border Control	Republican	Democrat	0.33	0.44
Border Control	Republican	Republican	−1.78	0.33
Abortion Access	Democrat	Democrat	1.31	0.29
Abortion Access	Democrat	Republican	−0.02	0.35
Abortion Access	Republican	Democrat	0.76	0.43
Abortion Access	Republican	Republican	−0.73	0.37

Note: Estimates come from a fully moderated model with the following predictors: whether
incentives were offered, policy issue, participant's partisanship, and perceived distribution subject.
This table includes data from Study 2. n = 1,887.

Correlations Between Perceived Distribution Means and

Documented Consequences of Misperceptions

Supplementary Table 8 Correlations Between Perceived Distribution Means and
Documented Consequences of Misperceptions

Correlation	SE	Degrees of Freedom	Dependent Variable
0.23	0.03	1250	Perception that Out-Party Supports Violating Democratic Norms
-0.20	0.03	1136	Comfort Socializing with Out-Party
-0.22	0.02	3950	Warmth Toward Out-Party

Note: This table includes data from Studies 1–5.

Predictions from Perceived Distribution Averages and Standard Deviations

Supplementary Table 9 Predicting Documented Consequences of Misperceptions with Perceived Distribution Moments

	Warmth Toward Out-Party	Comfort Socializing with Out-Party	Perception that Out-Party Supports Violating Democratic Norms
(Intercept)	0.444***	−0.265	0.021
	(0.097)	(0.189)	(0.179)
Perceived Extremity of Average Out-Partisan's Policy Attitude (in Direction of Party Stereotype)	−0.166***	−0.101*	0.185***
	(0.020)	(0.044)	(0.050)
Perceived Out-Party Attitude Diversity	0.137***	0.146***	−0.159***
	(0.018)	(0.038)	(0.041)
Partisan Identity Strength	−0.078***	−0.188***	0.076**
	(0.015)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Policy Issue is Border Control	−0.061	−0.070	0.181**
	(0.038)	(0.067)	(0.067)
Policy Issue is Abortion Access	−0.014	0.012	0.077
	(0.039)	(0.067)	(0.069)
Participant is Republican	0.179***	0.435***	−0.041
	(0.035)	(0.059)	(0.060)
Participant is a Woman	0.054+	0.002	−0.100+
	(0.031)	(0.055)	(0.055)
Participant is Another Gender	−0.405***	−0.669*	0.141
	(0.118)	(0.268)	(0.287)
Participant is Black	0.093	0.131	0.109
	(0.076)	(0.139)	(0.136)
Participant is White	−0.014	0.192	−0.053
	(0.061)	(0.118)	(0.107)
Participant is Multi-Racial	−0.071	0.146	0.140
	(0.094)	(0.195)	(0.169)
Participant is Another Race	0.004	0.187	−0.077
	(0.152)	(0.228)	(0.243)
Participant is Hispanic	0.158**	0.064	0.065
	(0.053)	(0.108)	(0.130)
Participant has an Associate's Degree	−0.012	0.031	−0.012
	(0.049)	(0.099)	(0.100)
Participant has a Bachelor's Degree	−0.015	−0.150	−0.100
	(0.048)	(0.097)	(0.095)
Participant has a Post-graduate Degree	0.108+	0.012	−0.094
	(0.058)	(0.106)	(0.106)
Participant is 26–34 years old	0.021	0.378***	−0.204+
	(0.059)	(0.106)	(0.104)
Participant is 35–49 years old	0.031	0.432***	−0.271**
	(0.057)	(0.105)	(0.104)
Participant is 50–64 years old	−0.086	0.487***	−0.312**
	(0.060)	(0.117)	(0.115)
Participant is 65+ years old	−0.104	0.731***	−0.492***
	(0.067)	(0.144)	(0.135)
Extremity of Participant's Policy Attitude (in Direction of In-Party Stereotype)	−0.078***	−0.061***	0.040***
	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.012)
Study is Study 2	−0.077+		
	(0.045)		
Study is Study 3	0.050		
	(0.044)		
Study is Study 4	0.136**	0.080	−0.020
	(0.047)	(0.054)	(0.057)
Study is Study 5	0.079		−0.005
	(0.093)		(0.091)
Num.Obs.	3751	1138	1252
R2	0.147	0.205	0.110
R2 Adj.	0.141	0.190	0.094
AIC	10 141.2	3014.8	3455.5
BIC	10 309.4	3135.7	3583.8
RMSE	0.93	0.89	0.94

Note: The reference categories for factor variables are as follows: gun control (policy issue), Democrat (partisanship), man (gender), Asian (race), not Hispanic (whether Hispanic), high school degree or less (education), 18–25 years old (age), and Study 1 (study).

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Question-Wise Differences in Estimates of Perceived Polarization

Supplementary Table 10 Estimates of Perceived Polarization by Policy Issue and Question Type

Policy Issue	Question Type	Perceived Distance Between "Average" Democrat and Republican	SE	n	Reality
Gun Control	Distribution	4.92	0.17	209	3.61
Gun Control	Point Estimate	6.31	0.16	201	3.61
Border Control	Distribution	4.78	0.15	220	3.03
Border Control	Point Estimate	5.74	0.17	200	3.03
Abortion Access	Distribution	5.24	0.17	203	3.73
Abortion Access	Point Estimate	6.41	0.16	237	3.73

This table includes data from Study 2.

Robustness Check for Administration Error in Study 2

After 960 participants had completed Study 2, we realized that responses to the incentivized version of the out-party distribution question were not being recorded. We paused the experiment, corrected this error, and then continued collecting data. Yet, those participants who completed our survey later (after we had corrected the error) may be different on some relevant characteristic (e.g., demographics). To ensure that our main findings are not qualitatively affected by this error, we re-run our models on only the 927 participants who completed our experiment after this error was corrected (hereafter late participants).

We note two minor differences in our results, neither of which change our main paper's conclusions: First, monetary incentives affected perceived distributions means to a lesser extent. Second, monetary incentives significantly increased Republicans' estimates of the diversity of other Republicans' attitudes—but only about the issue of abortion access ($b = 0.57$, SE $= 0.21$, $p < .01$).

Supplementary Table 11 Group-Average Marginal Effects of Monetary Incentives on Perceived Distribution SDs (Late Participants)

Policy Issue	Participant's Party	Which Party's Perceived Distribution?	Estimate	SE
Gun Control	Democrat	Democrat	−0.12	0.13
Gun Control	Democrat	Republican	0.02	0.12
Gun Control	Republican	Democrat	0.07	0.18
Gun Control	Republican	Republican	−0.17	0.19
Border Control	Democrat	Democrat	−0.21	0.11
Border Control	Democrat	Republican	0.07	0.10
Border Control	Republican	Democrat	0.00	0.15
Border Control	Republican	Republican	0.13	0.15
Abortion Access	Democrat	Democrat	−0.12	0.12
Abortion Access	Democrat	Republican	−0.08	0.12
Abortion Access	Republican	Democrat	0.39	0.23
Abortion Access	Republican	Republican	0.57	0.21

Note: Estimates come from a fully moderated model with the following predictors: whether incentives were offered, policy issue, participant's partisanship, and perceived distribution subject. This table includes data from Study 2. n = 927.

Supplementary Table 12 Group-Average Marginal Effects of Monetary Incentives on Perceived Distribution Means (Late Participants)

Policy Issue	Participant's Party	Which Party's Perceived Distribution?	Estimate	SE
Gun Control	Democrat	Democrat	0.46	0.31
Gun Control	Democrat	Republican	−0.66	0.41
Gun Control	Republican	Democrat	0.75	0.50
Gun Control	Republican	Republican	0.70	0.50
Border Control	Democrat	Democrat	−0.46	0.23
Border Control	Democrat	Republican	−0.28	0.30
Border Control	Republican	Democrat	0.26	0.51
Border Control	Republican	Republican	−0.48	0.31
Abortion Access	Democrat	Democrat	−0.01	0.27
Abortion Access	Democrat	Republican	−0.30	0.37
Abortion Access	Republican	Democrat	1.08	0.43
Abortion Access	Republican	Republican	−0.11	0.49

Note: Estimates come from a fully moderated model with the following predictors: whether incentives were offered, policy issue, participant's partisanship, and perceived distribution subject. This table includes data from Study 2. n = 927.

Robustness Check for Point-Estimate Question Wording

Supplementary Table 13 Effect of Question Wording on
Perceived Extremity of Average Out-Partisan's Policy Attitude

	Perceived Extremity of Average Out-Partisan's Policy Attitude (in Direction of Party Stereotype)
(Intercept)	8.060***
	(0.403)
Use of "Most" Wording	0.104
	(0.102)
Policy Issue is Border Control	0.108
	(0.109)
Policy Issue is Abortion Access	−0.424***
	(0.124)
Participant is Republican	−0.336**
	(0.109)
Participant is a Woman	0.152
	(0.099)
Participant is Another Gender	−0.294
	(0.504)
Participant is Black	−0.313
	(0.265)
Participant is White	0.014
	(0.200)
Participant is Multi-Racial	0.136
	(0.355)
Participant is Another Race	0.271
	(0.439)
Participant is Hispanic	0.022
	(0.224)
Participant has an Associate's Degree	0.270
	(0.214)
Participant has a Bachelor's Degree	0.111
	(0.207)
Participant has a Post-graduate Degree	−0.233
	(0.230)
Participant is 26–34 years old	−0.024
	(0.269)
Participant is 35–49 years old	0.165
	(0.263)
Participant is 50–64 years old	0.135
	(0.270)
Participant is 65+ years old	−0.201
	(0.315)
Extremity of Participant's Policy Attitude (in Direction of In-Party Stereotype)	0.023
	(0.022)
Num.Obs.	1824
R2	0.032
R2 Adj.	0.022
AIC	7793.3
BIC	7909.0
RMSE	2.03

Note: The reference categories for factor variables are as follows: gun control (policy issue), Democrat (partisanship), man (gender), Asian (race), not Hispanic (whether Hispanic), high school degree or less (education), and 18–25 years old (age). This table includes data from Studies 2, 3, and 5.

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

References

Fernbach, Philip M and Leaf Van Boven. 2022, February. "False polarization: Cognitive mechanisms and potential solutions". *Curr Opin Psychol* 43 : 1–6.

Schwartz, L M, S Woloshin, W C Black, and H G Welch. 1997, December. "The role of numeracy in understanding the benefit of screening mammography". *Ann. Intern. Med.* 127 (11): 966–972.