

Supplemental Materials for: The Pre-Political Origins & Policy Consequences of Environmental Justice Concern

matthew.motta@okstate.edu

Contents

Question Wording Information	2
Environmental Justice Concern (EJC)	2
Environmental Justice Policy Attitudes	2
National Security Climate Concerns	2
Self-Transcendence Values	2
Self-Enhancing Values	3
Racial Resentment	3
System Justification	4
Anti-Intellectualism	4
Symbolic Ideology	4
Operational Ideology	5
Social & Demographic Controls	5
Thought-Listing Manipulation Text	5
Table S1. Comparison of Lucid Study Sample Compositions to Nationally Representative Demographic Benchmarks	7
Supplemental Analyses	8
Figure S1. Full IRT Model Output (EJC)	8
Figure S2. Full IRT Model Output for Envi. Justice Policy Attitude Index	9
Table S2. RQ1 Assessment (Replication of Table 2, Adding an Interaction between Self-Enhancing Values and Household Income)	10

Question Wording Information

Environmental Justice Concern (EJC)

Please see Table 1 in the main text for detailed information about the text and administration of the questions used to build the EJC scale.

Environmental Justice Policy Attitudes

Please see Table 1 in the main text for detailed information about the text and administration of the questions that are used to measure environmental justice policy attitudes.

National Security Climate Concerns

PREAMBLE. From what you have heard or read, how likely, if at all, are each of the following to occur because of global climate change?

US military bases in coastal or island regions will be damaged by flooding or severe storms

Drought and famine will cause international military conflict for food and water resources

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

- <1> Very likely
- <2> Fairly likely
- <3> Not too likely
- <4> Not at all likely

Self-Transcendence Values

PREAMBLE. Please read the following statements, and tell us the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

It's very important to me to help the people around me. I want to care for other people.

It is important to me to be loyal to my friends. I want to devote myself to people close to me.

I think it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. I want justice for everybody, even for people I don't know.

It is important to me to listen to people who are different from me. Even when I disagree with them, I still want to understand them.

I strongly believe that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to me.

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

- <1> Strongly Disagree
- <2> Disagree
- <3> Somewhat Disagree
- <4> Neither Agree nor Disagree
- <5> Somewhat Agree
- <6> Agree
- <7> Strongly Agree

NOTE. Items are indexed together into a single scale.

Self-Enhancing Values

PREAMBLE. Please read the following statements, and tell us the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

It is important to me to be rich. I want to have a lot of money and expensive things.

It is important to me to be in charge and tell others what to do. I want people to do what I say.

It is very important to show others my abilities. I want people to admire what I do.

Being very successful is important to me. I like to impress other people.

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

- <1> Strongly Disagree
- <2> Disagree
- <3> Somewhat Disagree
- <4> Neither Agree nor Disagree
- <5> Somewhat Agree
- <6> Agree
- <7> Strongly Agree

NOTE. Items are indexed together into a single scale.

Racial Resentment

PREAMBLE. Please read the following statements, and tell us the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve. *

Irish, Italian, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.

It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.

Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class. *

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS

- <1> Disagree Strongly
- <2> Disagree
- <3> Neither Agree nor Disagree
- <4> Agree
- <5> Agree Strongly

NOTE. Items suffixed with " * " are reverse coded. Items are indexed together into a single scale.

System Justification

PREAMBLE. Please read the following statements, and tell us the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

In general, I find society to be fair

In general, the American political system operates as it should

American society needs to be radically restructured *

The United States is the best country in the world to live in

Most policies serve the greater good

Everyone has a fair shot at wealth and happiness

Our society is getting worse every year *

Society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS

<1> Disagree Strongly

<2> Disagree

<3> Neither Agree nor Disagree

<4> Agree

<5> Agree Strongly

Items suffixed with " * " are reverse coded.

Items are indexed together into a single scale.

Anti-Intellectualism

PREAMBLE. Please read the following statements, and tell us the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one.

I'd rather put my trust in the wisdom of ordinary people than the opinions of experts and intellectuals.

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

<1> Strongly Disagree

<2> Disagree

<3> Somewhat Disagree

<4> Neither Agree nor Disagree

<5> Somewhat Agree

<6> Agree

<7> Strongly Agree

Symbolic Ideology

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.

Where would you place yourself on this scale?

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

- <1> Extremely Liberal
- <2> Liberal
- <3> Slightly Liberal
- <4> Moderate; Middle of the Road
- <5> Slightly Conservative
- <6> Conservative
- <7> Extremely Conservative

Operational Ideology

Below is a list of federal programs. For each one, please tell us whether you would like to see spending increased, decreased, or kept the same.

Social Security

Public Schools

Tightening Border Security

Dealing with Crime

Welfare Programs

Building & Repairing Highways

Aid to the Poor

Protecting the Environment

ROTATE RESPONSE OPTIONS:

- <1> Increased a lot
- <2> Increased a little
- <3> Kept about the same
- <4> Decreased a little
- <5> Decreased a lot

Social & Demographic Controls

Respondents' educational attainment, racial identity, gender identity, partisan identification, and household income are measured as part of Lucid's initial inventory survey for all opt-in panelists, and are automatically passed through to the present study via embedded data fields. Additional information about Lucid's initial inventory survey can be found here <https://support.lucidhq.com/s/article/Standard-Qualifications> (download the "Marketplace Standard Quals" spreadsheet file and navigate to ENG-US for a full list).

Thought-Listing Manipulation Text

Please read the following passage carefully.

Imagine that you are a single parent of three children, working two jobs, and living in a major city on an uncharacteristically hot summer day (105 degrees F). The air conditioning window unit in your two bedroom apartment is not working, and you have no access to air conditioning in your apartment complex.

Taking the perspective of this single parent, briefly describe (2-3 sentences) how you would go about trying to keep you and your family cool on an abnormally hot summer day. (A bulleted list is acceptable).

<OPEN FIELD TEXT ENTRY>

Table S1. Comparison of Lucid Study Sample Compositions to Nationally Representative Demographic Benchmarks

Variable	Our Data (Raw)	Our Data (Weighted)	Benchmark	Benchmark Source
Wave One				
Female	52%	51%	51%	CPS 2018
College Degree	40%	33%	31%	CPS 2018
Black	12%	12%	13%	CPS 2018
White	68%	62%	62%	CPS 2018
Hispanic	10%	18%	18%	CPS 2018
Democrat	40%	39%	34%	ANES (Wgt.)
Republican	33%	25%	28%	ANES (Wgt.)
Independent	33%	36%	32%	ANES (Wgt.)
Mean Age	45	48	47	ANES (Wgt.)
Median Income	\$ 35 - 39,999	\$ 60 - 64,999	\$ 55-59,999	ANES (Wgt.)

Note. Comparison of our data to known population benchmarks. CPS = Current Population Survey (US Census, 2018). ANES = American National Election Study (2016). We prefer to rely on CPS given its sample size and representativeness, but make use of weighted ANES data whenever it was not possible to use CPS (e.g., CPS does not ask questions about Party ID). Weights in column two adjust for gender, education, race, age, and income. Party ID is **not included** in our weighting formula, and is shown only due to the potential interests of those who might use or otherwise consume this data.

Figure S2. Full IRT Model Output for Envi. Justice Policy Attitude Index

Graded response model Number of obs = 2,006
 Log likelihood = -9155.8281

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	

ejp1						
Discrim	3.376407	.1360034	24.83	0.000	3.109846	3.642969
Diff						
>=2	-1.544361	.052845	-29.22	0.000	-1.647936	-1.440787
>=3	-.9744048	.0385313	-25.29	0.000	-1.049925	-.8988849
>=4	-.0760681	.0298705	-2.55	0.011	-.1346132	-.017523
=5	.7521583	.0363904	20.67	0.000	.6808345	.8234821

ejp2						
Discrim	4.044204	.1753894	23.06	0.000	3.700447	4.387961
Diff						
>=2	-1.475182	.048856	-30.19	0.000	-1.570938	-1.379426
>=3	-.9221931	.0362775	-25.42	0.000	-.9932957	-.8510905
>=4	-.1144282	.0288562	-3.97	0.000	-.1709853	-.0578711
=5	.7369651	.0346601	21.26	0.000	.6690327	.8048976

ejp3						
Discrim	3.718267	.1557049	23.88	0.000	3.413091	4.023443
Diff						
>=2	-1.435709	.0485438	-29.58	0.000	-1.530853	-1.340565
>=3	-.8542628	.0356264	-23.98	0.000	-.9240892	-.7844363
>=4	-.0029173	.0293903	-0.10	0.921	-.0605212	.0546866
=5	.8493917	.0372128	22.83	0.000	.7764559	.9223274

ejp4						
Discrim	4.167957	.183808	22.68	0.000	3.8077	4.528214
Diff						
>=2	-1.418939	.0471775	-30.08	0.000	-1.511405	-1.326473
>=3	-.8671424	.0351043	-24.70	0.000	-.9359456	-.7983392
>=4	-.0469247	.0287275	-1.63	0.102	-.1032295	.0093801
=5	.8003378	.0354367	22.58	0.000	.730883	.8697925

Table S2. RQ1 Assessment (Replication of Table 2, Adding an Interaction between Self-Enhancing Values and Household Income)

	Food	Relocation	Health	Pollution	EJC Index
Symb. Conservatism (H1a)	-0.87*	-0.88*	-1.06*	-0.88*	-0.21*
	(0.24)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.03)
System Justification (H1b)	-1.09*	-0.53	-0.57	-0.31	-0.04
	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.05)
Anti-Expert. (H1c)	0.42	-0.10	-0.07	-0.25	-0.06*
	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.03)
Racial Resentment (H1d)	-1.16*	-1.68*	-1.79*	-1.75*	-0.25*
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.04)
Self-Trans. (H2a)	3.68*	3.35*	3.93*	3.50*	0.47*
	(0.42)	(0.41)	(0.42)	(0.44)	(0.05)
Self-Enhance (H2b)	-1.38*	-1.55*	-1.77*	-1.29*	-0.17*
	(0.53)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.48)	(0.05)
Household Income	-0.10	-0.54	-0.72	-0.23	-0.03
	(0.52)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.06)
SE X Income	0.04	1.16	1.05	0.19	0.11
	(0.87)	(0.79)	(0.77)	(0.75)	(0.09)
Op. Conservatism	-2.86*	-3.83*	-3.24*	-3.82*	-0.44*
	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.44)	(0.42)	(0.05)
25-44	0.40+	0.02	0.39+	-0.10	0.03
	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.03)
45-64	0.52+	-0.08	0.22	-0.27	0.03
	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.28)	(0.03)
65+	0.38	-0.11	0.11	-0.42	-0.00
	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.29)	(0.03)
Racial ID = Black	-0.22	-0.16	0.06	-0.19	-0.03
	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.03)
Ethnicity ID = Hispanic	-0.13	0.03	-0.08	-0.13	-0.00
	(0.22)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.02)
College Degree	-0.10	0.04	-0.10	0.01	-0.02
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.02)
Gender ID = Female	0.07	0.47*	0.24+	0.36*	0.05*
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.02)
β_0	-	-	-	-	0.73*
					(0.07)
τ_1	-3.59*	-4.35*	-3.84*	-4.24*	-
	(0.53)	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.52)	
τ_2	-1.64*	-2.47*	-2.08*	-2.35*	-
	(0.53)	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.52)	
τ_3	0.15	-0.56	-0.36	-0.68	-
	(0.53)	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.52)	
N	1914	1913	1913	1918	1924

* p < 0.05; two-tailed

Note. Ordered logistic (columns 1-4) and OLS (column 5) regression parameters presented with standard errors in parentheses. Please refer to Table 1 for a description of all outcome variables.

Table S3. Discriminant Validation Assessment

	Naive Model	Full Model
Envi. Justice Concern	0.40* (0.02)	0.09* (0.01)
General Clim. Change Concern	-	0.71* (0.02)
β_0	0.37* (0.01)	0.12* (0.01)
N	2005	2005
R ²	0.24	0.61

Note. OLS coefficients presented with standard errors in parentheses. Outcome variable is an index measuring concern about the effects that climate change on national security. Please refer to the main text for additional information about the motivation behind these analyses, and independent variable measurement.