

Appendix A. Recruitment Materials and Attention Checks

Figure A1. Sample e-mail Invite

Cayla,


You have a new survey:

Consumer Opinion Survey


START SURVEY

The purpose of the study is to gather information about Californians' opinion about policy issues. The questionnaire is being administered to a sample of adult Californians and will help shed light on what influences Californians' attitudes towards public policy.


Qualification requirements for participating in the survey include: being a resident of California and being 18 years of age or older. This survey is being conducted by researchers at the University of Georgia.


 Average time to complete


20
Minutes

 Reward earned upon completion

\$1.00

 Earn sweepstakes entries for every survey taken

 **\$100** Daily Sweeps

 **\$250** Weekly Sweeps


 **\$1,000** Monthly Sweeps

Figure A2. Screenshot of First Attention Check (TQ 1, desktop version)

English ▼

Here is a list of things people may do to express their views and influence political decision-making.

Did you do any of the following in the last 2 years? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Voted in the November 2012 General Election
- ☐ Voted in the June 2014 Statewide Direct Primary Election
- ☐ Expressed a political opinion online, in blogs, forums, or social networking sites
- ☐ Donated money to a candidate, campaign, or political organization
- ☐ Attended a meeting where political issues are discussed
- ☐ Showed support for a particular political candidate or party by distributing campaign materials, putting up a political sign or bumper sticker
- ☐ Signed a petition for a ballot initiative, for a recall election, or in support of a cause you consider important
- ☐ Volunteered to work for a candidate or political campaign
- ☐ Contacted or visited a public official - at any level of government - to express your opinion
- ☐ Joined a sit-in or attempted to block access to a building as a form of protest
- ☐ Bought or boycotted a certain product or service because of the social or political values of the company that provides it
- ☐ Took part in an organized march, protest, or demonstration
- ☐ None of these

Please enter the word "government" to continue

>>

Figure A3. Screenshot of Second Attention Check (TQ 2, desktop version)

English ▼

The federal government in Washington D.C. considered many important policy issues in recent years.

For each of the following policy issues tell us whether you support or oppose the regulation or legislation.

	Oppose	Support	I'm indifferent	I don't know
Implementing stricter carbon emission limits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Providing a path to legal status and citizenship for undocumented immigrants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limiting National Security Agency's (NSA) collection of domestic phone records	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Repealing of <i>Don't Ask, Don't Tell</i> , allowing gays to serve openly in the armed services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Restricting the sale of semi-automatic and automatic firearms, handguns, and high-capacity ammunition clips	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For quality purposes, please select "I'm indifferent"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Health Care Reform, officially called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>>

Figure A4. Screenshot of Third Attention Check (TQ 3, desktop version)

English ▼

Now we'd like you to think about the people who disagree strongly with you about political issues. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following?

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
They are not thinking clearly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
They believe some things that aren't true	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
They have good reasons, but there are better ones on the other side	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
They just don't know enough	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
They are looking out for their own interests	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reaching agreement with them is hopeless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For quality purposes, please select "Disagree Strongly"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>>

Appendix B. Supplementary Tables and Figures

Table B1: How many fail?

	N	%
Pass	1,750	64
Fail	975	36
Fail TQ 1	575	21
Fail TQ 2	229	8
Fail TQ 3	171	6

Note: The table shows the number and percentage of respondents who passed and failed trap questions (TQs).

Table B2: Who fails?

Characteristic	All TQs		TQ 1		TQ 2		TQ 3	
	Pass all	Fail any	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
Gender								
Female	64.1	35.9	78.5	21.5	89.8	10.2	90.9	9.1
Male	64.4	35.6	79.4	20.6	88.8	11.2	91.4	8.6
Education								
DNG HS	53.8	46.2	83.8	16.2	82.1	17.9	78.2	21.8
High School	53.7	46.3	75.8	24.2	82.1	17.9	86.2	13.8
Some College	65.4	34.6	78.2	21.8	91.3	8.7	91.6	8.4
College	69.4	30.6	81.6	18.4	91.7	8.3	92.8	7.2
Postgraduate	69.8	30.2	79.2	20.8	91.7	8.3	96.2	3.8
Age								
18 to 24	47.5	52.5	77.9	22.1	75.6	24.4	80.6	19.4
25 to 35	56.6	43.4	74.2	25.8	87.0	13.0	87.7	12.3
36 to 50	65.2	34.8	79.2	20.8	89.0	11.0	92.5	7.5
51 to 65	74.2	25.8	81.5	18.5	96.4	3.6	94.4	5.6
Older than 65	79.5	20.5	83.7	16.3	97.5	2.5	97.4	2.6
Region								
Bay Area	66.2	33.8	77.2	22.8	92.6	7.4	92.6	7.4
SoCal (excl. LA)	68.2	31.8	80.4	19.6	92.8	7.2	91.4	8.6
SoCal (LA)	60.9	39.1	77.6	22.4	87.1	12.9	90.2	9.8
Central/Southern Farm	63.2	36.8	79.9	20.1	87.4	12.6	90.5	9.5
North and Mountain	59.4	40.6	75.5	24.5	87.2	12.8	90.2	9.8
Central Valley	64.0	36.0	82.0	18.0	84.6	15.4	92.2	7.8
N	1,750	975	2,150	575	1,921	229	1,750	171

Note: The table shows the percentage of respondents, within each demographic group, who passed or failed trap questions. Bold numbers indicate a statistically significant relationship (at a 95% confidence level) between the demographic attribute and the failure rate based on a Chi-squared test. "DNG HS" stands for "did not graduate from high school."

Table B3: How do failers behave?

Behavior	All TQs		TQ 1		TQ 2		TQ 3	
	Pass all	Fail any	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
Average response speed (s)	35.8	22.2	31.9	27.2	33.9	15.8	35.8	14.2
Non-attitudes rate (%)	18.6	23.7	20.2	21.4	19.3	27.0	18.6	26.9
Straightlining (%)					17.0	34.9	16.1	25.7
Preference consistency								
Incomplete preferences (%)	10.4	20.4	13.2	17.0	12.0	23.1	10.4	28.1
Intransitive preferences (%)	16.3	21.5	17.4	20.5	17.1	19.9	16.3	27.6
N	1,750	975	2,150	575	1,921	229	1,750	171

Note: “Average speed” indicates the average number of seconds it took respondents to answer four political knowledge questions located early in the questionnaire. “Non-attitudes rate” is the percentage of questions where respondents reported “I don’t know” or did not provide a response, among four political knowledge questions, three questions on attitudes toward public deliberation, and a check-all-that-apply question about participation in political activities. “Straightlining” gives the proportion of respondents choosing the same option (“Support”, “Oppose”, “I’m indifferent”, or “I don’t know”) on questions presented on a grid about support for six national policies. “Preference consistency” gives the proportion of respondents reporting incomplete and intransitive sets of strict pairwise preferences over a set of policy options aimed at preventing legislative gridlock in the state legislature. Since we focus on strict orderings, respondents selecting “I’m indifferent” for any pair of policies are coded as having incomplete preferences. The proportion of respondents reporting intransitive preferences is calculated among those who report complete strict preferences only. Bold numbers indicate a statistically significant difference in means (at a 95% confidence level) between respondents that pass and fail.

Table B4: Linear regression analysis of overall political knowledge

Coefficient	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	1.87	0.03	0.76	0.12	0.48	0.12
Fail TQ 1	-0.31	0.06	-0.22	0.06		
Fail TQ 2	-0.74	0.09	-0.53	0.09		
Fail TQ 3	-0.70	0.10	-0.49	0.10		
Education			0.30	0.02	0.31	0.02
Age			0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Female			-0.38	0.05	-0.38	0.05
SoCal (excl. LA)			-0.21	0.07	-0.20	0.07
SoCal (LA)			-0.11	0.07	-0.13	0.07
Central/Southern						
Farm			-0.30	0.09	-0.31	0.09
North and Mountain			0.06	0.11	0.04	0.11
Central Valley			0.07	0.10	0.06	0.10
Adjusted R2	0.04		0.14		0.12	
N	2695		2695		2695	

Note: The table presents linear regression results. Dependent variable: 0-4 political knowledge scale. Geographical area used as baseline for the region indicator: Bay Area. The F-statistic for Model 2 relative to Model 1 is 41.8, and the one for Model 3 relative to Model 2 is 19.4. 30 respondents are dropped from all linear regressions due to missing region variable.

Table B5: Linear regression analysis of political participation

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1	
Coefficient	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	2.88	0.05	0.12	0.21	-0.21	0.20
Fail TQ 1	-0.51	0.10	-0.34	0.10		
Fail TQ 2	-0.69	0.15	-0.27	0.15		
Fail TQ 3	-1.27	0.17	-0.88	0.17		
Education			0.54	0.04	0.56	0.04
Age			0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00
Female			-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.08
SoCal (excl. LA)			0.06	0.12	0.06	0.12
SoCal (LA)			0.01	0.12	0.00	0.12
Central/Southern						
Farm			0.21	0.15	0.21	0.15
North and Mountain			0.25	0.19	0.23	0.19
Central Valley			0.13	0.17	0.14	0.17
Adjusted R2	0.03		0.11		0.10	
N	2695		2695		2695	

Note: The table presents linear regression results. Dependent variable: 0-12 political participation scale. Geographical area used as baseline for the region indicator: Bay Area. The F-statistic for Model 2 relative to Model 1 is 34.0, and the one for Model 3 relative to Model 2 is 11.7. 30 respondents are dropped from all linear regressions due to missing region variable.

Table B6: Linear regression analysis of strength of ideological leanings

Coefficient	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	2.99	0.05	2.37	0.22	1.94	0.21
Fail TQ 2	-0.83	0.14	-0.68	0.14		
Fail TQ 3	-1.24	0.16	-1.09	0.16		
Education			0.19	0.04	0.23	0.04
Age			0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Female			0.09	0.08	0.10	0.08
SoCal (exc LA)			-0.53	0.13	-0.54	0.13
SoCal (LA)			-0.29	0.13	-0.33	0.13
Central/Southern						
Farm			-0.70	0.16	-0.73	0.16
North and Mountain			-0.65	0.21	-0.69	0.21
Central Valley			-0.17	0.18	-0.20	0.18
Adjusted R2	0.04		0.07		0.04	
N	2097		2097		2097	

Note: The table presents linear regression results. **Dependent variable:** 0-6 ideology strength scale (absolute value of ideology scale presented in Figure 3). **Geographical area used as baseline for the region indicator:** Bay Area. The F-statistic for Model 2 relative to Model 1 is 8.648, and the one for Model 3 relative to Model 2 is 31.193. **Total number of observations:** 2,097. 598 respondents are dropped due to missing responses to at least one of the six policy questions used to construct the ideology scale (in addition to 30 missing region variable).

Table B7: Organizations included in double-list experiment

Item type	List A	List B
Non-sensitive	<i>Californians for Disability Rights</i> (organization advocating for people with disabilities)	<i>American Legion</i> (veterans service organization)
	<i>California National Organization for Women</i> (organization advocating for women's equality and empowerment)	<i>Equality California</i> (gay and lesbian advocacy organization)
	<i>American Family Association</i> (organization advocating for pro-family values)	<i>Tea Party Patriots</i> (conservative group supporting lower taxes and limited government)
	American Red Cross (humanitarian organization)	<i>Salvation Army</i> (charitable organization)
Sensitive, X condition	<i>Organization X</i> (organization advocating for immigration reduction and measures against undocumented immigration)	
Sensitive, Y condition	<i>Organization Y</i> (citizen border patrol group combating undocumented immigration)	

Note: The table lists items displayed to respondents in the double list experiment on support for anti-immigrant organizations. Displayed information included both organization names and descriptions. The first column gives organizations listed in list A; including non-sensitive items (displayed to all respondents) and sensitive items X and Y (displayed to respondents in the corresponding treatment group for list A). The second column gives organizations listed in list B; including non-sensitive items (displayed to all respondents) and sensitive items X and Y (displayed to respondents in the corresponding treatment group for list B).

Table B8: Number of respondents in each experimental condition

Sensitive item	Experimental condition		Total
	Control A – Treatment B	Treatment A – Control B	
Organization X	525 (24.4%)	545 (25.4%)	1,070 (49.8%)
Organization Y	542 (25.2%)	537 (25.0%)	1,079 (50.2%)
Total	1,067 (49.6%)	1,082 (50.4%)	2,149 (100%)

Note: The table shows the number and percentage of respondents assigned to each combination of experimental condition (columns) and sensitive item displayed to respondents in the treatment group (rows).

Table B9: Attentiveness and difference-in-means estimates

		Mean response (control)	Mean response (Org. X)	Mean response (Org. Y)	Diff.-in- means (Org. X)	Diff.-in- means (Org. Y)
List A	Attentive	2.32	2.68	2.54	0.36	0.22
	Std. error	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)
	Inattentive	1.93	1.90	2.03	-0.03	0.10
	Std. error	(0.11)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.20)	(0.20)
	Difference	0.39	0.78	0.51	0.39	0.13
	Std. error	(0.12)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.21)	(0.22)
List B	Attentive	2.17	2.42	2.45	0.25	0.28
	Std. error	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.08)
	Inattentive	1.58	2.18	2.11	0.60	0.53
	Std. error	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.20)
	Difference	0.58	0.24	0.34	-0.35	-0.25
	Std. error	(0.10)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.22)
List B – List A:						
	Attentive				-0.11	0.06
	Std. error				(0.13)	(0.14)
	Inattentive				0.62	0.43
	Std. error				(0.34)	(0.35)

Note: The first three columns show mean responses under control, X-treatment, and Y-treatment conditions for attentive and inattentive respondents for list A (top) and list B (middle). The last two columns show the difference in mean responses under treatment (X or Y) and under control for attentives and inattentives in list A and in list B. The differences between attentives and inattentives in terms of mean responses and difference-in-means estimates are also calculated. The bottom section (“List B – List A”) shows the differences across lists in terms of difference-in-means estimates for attentives and inattentives respectively. Bootstrapped standard errors are provided between parentheses.

Table B10: Number of selected items in double-list experiment

List A:

Response	Attentive			Inattentive		
	Control	Org. X	Org. Y	Control	Org. X	Org. Y
0	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.25	0.31	0.27
1	0.16	0.11	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.14
2	0.22	0.21	0.20	0.27	0.25	0.21
3	0.25	0.24	0.27	0.11	0.11	0.16
4	0.24	0.15	0.12	0.23	0.09	0.10
5		0.17	0.14		0.12	0.12
Observations	880	444	426	187	101	111
Mean	2.32	2.68	2.54	1.93	1.9	2.03
Std. deviation	1.34	1.57	1.54	1.47	1.71	1.69

List B:

Response	Attentive			Inattentive		
	Control	Org. X	Org. Y	Control	Org. X	Org. Y
0	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.28	0.22	0.20
1	0.19	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.15	0.18
2	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.29	0.22	0.30
3	0.34	0.26	0.27	0.12	0.19	0.08
4	0.11	0.15	0.16	0.11	0.08	0.11
5		0.09	0.08		0.14	0.13
Observations	870	425	455	212	100	87
Mean	2.17	2.42	2.45	1.58	2.18	2.11
Std. deviation	1.16	1.47	1.39	1.31	1.67	1.63

Note: Respondents fall into six categories according to attentiveness and the condition they are assigned to (control, X-treatment or Y-treatment). The table shows for each category the distribution of number of items selected by respondents, the standard deviation as well as the average. The table also shows the difference-in-means estimates for organization X and Y for attentives and inattentives respectively, and the difference in these estimates between attentives and inattentives. Results for list A and B are displayed on the top and on the bottom respectively.

Table B11: Transition matrices between two lists

X-treatment for list A (row) and control for list B (column):

Attentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	N
0	0.60	0.19	0.15	0.06	0.00	53
1	0.16	0.45	0.25	0.12	0.02	51
2	0.03	0.27	0.38	0.24	0.07	94
3	0.02	0.15	0.25	0.53	0.05	107
4	0.00	0.05	0.18	0.48	0.29	65
5	0.01	0.03	0.18	0.43	0.35	74

Inattentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	N
0	0.84	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.00	31
1	0.08	0.62	0.23	0.00	0.08	13
2	0.04	0.40	0.32	0.12	0.12	25
3	0.09	0.09	0.73	0.09	0.00	11
4	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.78	0.00	9
5	0.00	0.08	0.25	0.08	0.58	12

Y-treatment for list A (row) and control for list B (column):

Attentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	N
0	0.53	0.37	0.08	0.00	0.02	51
1	0.12	0.52	0.22	0.12	0.02	65
2	0.05	0.26	0.43	0.24	0.02	84
3	0.00	0.05	0.39	0.51	0.04	114
4	0.00	0.08	0.19	0.58	0.15	53
5	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.41	0.37	59

Inattentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	N
0	0.77	0.03	0.10	0.07	0.03	30
1	0.19	0.56	0.19	0.00	0.06	16
2	0.13	0.22	0.52	0.13	0.00	23
3	0.06	0.17	0.56	0.11	0.11	18
4	0.00	0.09	0.36	0.18	0.36	11
5	0.00	0.08	0.23	0.31	0.38	13

Table B11: Transition matrices between two lists (ctnd.)

Control for list A (row) and X-treatment for list B (column):

Attentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N
0	0.64	0.16	0.10	0.07	0.02	0.02	58
1	0.11	0.41	0.32	0.07	0.07	0.01	71
2	0.07	0.14	0.37	0.30	0.10	0.03	103
3	0.01	0.06	0.12	0.46	0.28	0.06	93
4	0.02	0.06	0.16	0.27	0.23	0.26	100

Inattentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N
0	0.68	0.14	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.07	28
1	0.07	0.43	0.36	0.14	0.00	0.00	14
2	0.04	0.20	0.44	0.32	0.00	0.00	25
3	0.11	0.00	0.33	0.22	0.33	0.00	9
4	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.25	0.21	0.50	24

Control for list A (row) and Y-treatment for list B (column):

Attentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N
0	0.56	0.29	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.00	55
1	0.11	0.39	0.29	0.10	0.06	0.06	70
2	0.05	0.20	0.37	0.25	0.11	0.02	92
3	0.01	0.08	0.25	0.42	0.18	0.06	123
4	0.00	0.02	0.18	0.32	0.29	0.19	115

Inattentives:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	N
0	0.83	0.11	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	18
1	0.08	0.69	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	13
2	0.00	0.12	0.65	0.15	0.04	0.04	26
3	0.09	0.00	0.36	0.09	0.45	0.00	11
4	0.00	0.11	0.16	0.05	0.21	0.47	19

Note: The matrices are the transition matrices for respondents' choices between two lists, separately for attentive and inattentive respondents in each experimental condition.

Table B12: Attentiveness and difference-in-means estimates for Eady (2017)

	Mean response (control)	Mean response (treated)	Diff.-in- means
Pass	1.61	2.49	0.88
Std. error	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Fail	1.51	2.26	0.75
Std. error	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.05)
Difference	0.10	0.23	0.13
Std. error	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)

Note: The table shows mean responses under control and under treatment for respondents who passed and failed the screener question in Eady (2017). The last column shows the difference in mean responses under control and under treatment for respondents who passed and failed the screener question. The differences between for respondents who passed and failed the screener question in terms of mean responses and difference-in-means estimates are also calculated and reported in the bottom row.

Table B13: Linear regression analysis of support for anti-immigrant organizations

	Term	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
		Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Condition	Control						
	Organization X	0.38	0.08	0.73	0.38	0.71	0.38
	Organization Y	0.22	0.08	-0.19	0.37	-0.17	0.36
Trap	Pass						
	Fail	-0.35	0.12	-0.38	0.12	-0.28	0.12
List	List A						
	List B	-0.15	0.07	-0.14	0.07	-0.14	0.07
Interactions	Org. X x Fail	-0.42	0.20	-0.41	0.20	-0.39	0.20
	Org. Y x Fail	-0.13	0.19	-0.12	0.20	-0.11	0.19
	Org. X x List B	-0.13	0.12	-0.16	0.12	-0.15	0.11
	Org. Y x List B	0.06	0.12	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.11
	Fail x List B	-0.23	0.16	-0.24	0.16	-0.24	0.16
	Org. X x Fail x List B	0.84	0.28	0.88	0.28	0.83	0.27
	Org. Y x Fail x List B	0.39	0.28	0.43	0.28	0.44	0.27
	Intercept	2.31	0.05	2.64	0.21	2.38	0.21
Demographics		No		Yes		Yes	
Additional Controls		No		No		Yes	
Adj. R-squared		0.03		0.04		0.08	
N		2096 x 2		2096 x 2		2096 x 2	

Note: The table shows linear regression results for three specifications. The dependent variable is the number of items selected by a respondent for all linear regression models. Independent variables for the baseline specification are condition dummies (control, X-treatment or Y-treatment), attentiveness dummy (pass or fail the trap questions), list dummy (list A or list B) and all interaction terms. Model 2 also includes demographic variables (gender, education, age and region) and their interactions with treatment dummies. Model 3 further includes three additive measures of political knowledge, political participation, and ideological leaning. The baseline demographic group for the last two linear regressions is female, without a high school degree, aged below 25, and from Bay Area. Standard errors are clustered at respondent level. 53 respondents are dropped due to missing values for Model 3 variables.