

Appendix

A1. About Amazon Mechanical Turk

Amazon MTurk is an internet-based marketplace that enables businesses and researchers to crowdsource various tasks since it launched in 2005. The platform is frequently used for market research and to perform tasks that computers are unable to do. More recently, academic researchers have used the platform to distribute surveys and code data. Amazon MTurk workers around the world can respond to a HIT (Human Intelligence Task) request posted by researchers or companies. In 2015, the 300 most influential social science journals (measured by impact factor) published more than 500 articles using MTurk data (Chandler & Shapiro 2016). Researchers can place qualifications on which workers are eligible to respond to these HITs, such as requiring that at least 95% of the work previously completed by the MTurk workers was accepted by the requestor, or that the worker reside in a specific country or state.

As the prevalence of MTurk research has increased, many researchers have sought to validate the use of MTurk data by studying the ways in which MTurk workers resemble the general population. MTurk workers are likely to be younger, more liberal, and more educated than the general public (Bereinsky et al. 2012, Mullinix et al 2015, Paolacci et al 2010). They also tend to have lower incomes and be more likely to be unemployed than the general population (Shapiro et al 2013). There are more Whites and Asian Americans and fewer Latinos and African Americans than the general public (Berinsky et al 2012). MTurkers are more racially diverse than many other convenience samples (Paolacci and Chandler 2014), such as student samples or community samples recruited from college towns (Berinsky et al 2012, Krupnikov and Levine 2014). These differences in demographics mirror those found in other samples recruited online (Hillygus, Jackson & Young 2014, Paolacci and Chandler 2014).

Though MTurk workers differ significantly from the general public, they mimic the sample characteristics of new gold standards in political science research. For instance, Huff and Tingley (2015) find that MTurk and CCES have similar proportions of respondents across economic industries, and that the proportion of respondents living in different geographic categories on the rural to urban continuum is “near identical.” All in all, the considerable effort expended on debating the validity of MTurk as a recruitment tool for academic research derives from the discipline’s “near obsession” with the external validity of a sample (McDermott 2002, 334).

Despite these differences, there are many important similarities. For instance, Clifford, Jewell and Waggoner (2015) find that conservatives on MTurk look remarkably similar to conservatives in national samples, but that liberals on MTurk are more liberal than those on the ANES. Perhaps most importantly, a broad body of academic research has been replicated using MTurk samples (Mullinix, Leeper, Druckman and Freese 2015, Berinsky et al 2012, Horton, Rand and Zeckhauser 2011, Paolacci et al 2010, Weinberg et al 2014, and many others). Additionally, MTurk respondents pay as much or more attention to the task at hand than respondents from other populations (Hauser and Schwarz 2016, Paolacci et al 2010, Weinberg et al 2014).

In comparing the demographics of our respondents to the general public, we find many similarities and a few differences. Our population is slightly more male (52%). Like other researchers using MTurk, our population is disproportionately White and Asian (77.5% White compared to the national average of 63%; 7.87% Asian compared to 2.9%; 8.6% Black compared to 12.3%; 6.7% Latino compared to 12.5%). Although our sample has more Democrats than Republicans (41.8% Democrats, 29.6% Independents, and 20.6% Republicans), the number of Democrats or Democratic leaners resembles nationally representative public opinion surveys from Gallup in 2017 that found that 44% of the population identified as Democrats or Democratic leaners (Jones 2017). We have more Independents and fewer Republicans than identified by Gallup. The distribution of education among our respondents also corresponds to the national average, with 35.96% of our sample having completed a college degree (compared to the national average of 33%). Those without a high school education are underrepresented in our data (only about 1% compared to 12% nationally). The median age of our respondents was 38, very close to the national average of 37.8%

A2. Details of our survey implementation

We recruited 1,535 respondents on Amazon Mechanical Turk between 1/3/17 and 1/17/17, offering a pay of \$1.25. We accepted workers with a HIT acceptance ratio (HAR) of over 97%. Peer, Vosgerau and Acquisti (2014) show that a HAR of 95% results in higher quality data. We completed the data through multiple batches taken across this time period at different times of the day. Workers who completed the survey once were ineligible to complete it a second time. The average time it took to complete the survey was 692 seconds, or about 11.5 minutes.

Respondents in our survey were given a list of 73 different groups in a randomized order, and tasked to rate how powerful and deserving they perceived those groups to be (see the specific question wording below, in Appendix 3). The politically relevant social groups in the survey were largely derived from previous academic work on the social constructions of target groups. However, we divided some groups into subgroups. For instance, whereas Schneider and Ingram (2007) included one hypothetical placement of “Gay/Lesbians,” we included separate placements for gays, lesbians, and transgender people. Finally, we added a handful of groups that we perceived to be relevant to the contemporary politics, including abortion providers, Muslim men, and Black Lives Matter.

A3. Survey Question Wording for Power and Deserving

Measuring Power

Some groups in society have relatively more political power and resources than others. By political resources we mean that some groups are more united, easy to mobilize, wealthy, skilled, focused on their goals, or accustomed to voting or directly contacting public officials.

Based on what you know about the groups listed below, how politically powerful would you say each of these groups are, generally speaking. Here, 0 means that most people in that group are very powerless. 100 means that most people in that group are incredibly powerful.

Measuring Deservingness

Some groups, on average, are viewed as people who contribute to the general welfare of society and worthy, and thus are deserving of sympathy, pity, or help. Typically, we describe members of this group as good, smart, hardworking, loyal, disciplined, generous, caring of others, respectful, and creative.

Meanwhile, there are many other groups that are viewed as a burden to the general welfare of society, and are believed to be underserving of sympathy, pity, or help. Typically, we describe members of this group as greedy, disrespectful, disloyal, immoral, disgusting, dangerous, lazy, and expect others to care for them.

Based on what you know about these groups, how deserving or underserving would you say each of these groups are, generally speaking. Here, 0 means most people in that group are completely undeserving. 100 means most people in that group are very deserving.

A4. Point Estimates and Standard Deviations of All Groups

Group	Power Ranking (lowest=1)	Power Estimate	Power Std.	Deserving Ranking (lowest=1)	Deserving Estimate	Deserving Std.
abortionproviders	59	31.81	24.97	72	45.46	33.37
africanamericans	47	35.87	23.99	47	61.51	29.24
americanindians	25	22.55	21.56	42	67.26	28.92
attorneys	40	67.08	23.33	50	37.77	29.33
autoindustry	49	64.44	24.06	30	35.20	27.60
bigbanks	17	85.22	19.60	25	23.24	27.04
bigcorporations	11	86.52	18.18	31	25.01	27.63
blacklivesmatter	65	34.30	25.49	73	45.94	34.49
ceos	19	82.36	19.71	44	29.64	28.96
children	13	12.56	19.10	28	76.60	27.52
collegestudents	33	31.25	22.72	23	62.35	26.92
congress	18	84.26	19.71	32	27.75	27.84
criminals	15	15.44	19.22	5	17.70	23.69
disabled	20	19.06	19.80	26	75.04	27.27
doctors	52	61.19	24.32	48	61.32	29.30
DREAMERs	43	25.81	23.50	62	51.23	31.34
elderly	64	33.66	25.47	8	76.33	24.26
environment	54	41.37	24.43	56	60.92	30.50
ex-felons	4	11.87	15.83	34	31.22	27.97
farmers	38	37.09	23.15	13	69.19	25.31
feminists	57	37.93	24.75	65	50.17	31.71
forprofcolleges	68	54.93	26.75	33	28.10	27.93
gaymen	48	33.40	24.05	59	56.70	31.12
gunmanuf	67	64.32	26.57	35	27.18	28.16
hackers	71	43.69	28.73	11	20.59	24.59
homeless	1	7.37	13.42	64	63.47	31.61
homeowners	42	43.94	23.41	16	62.53	25.69
illegalaliens	14	13.64	19.17	69	35.45	32.32
insuranceco	34	74.63	22.78	19	25.02	26.55
jobcreators	58	61.17	24.79	39	62.36	28.76
laborunions	61	57.16	25.10	57	48.01	30.59
latino	36	31.96	22.92	46	57.94	29.17
lesbians	51	31.41	24.10	63	56.54	31.37
marijuanasmoker	24	24.38	21.46	58	38.91	30.84
media	31	74.76	22.39	24	28.47	27.04
mentallyhandicapped	7	11.32	16.89	37	73.78	28.31
middleclass	21	44.14	20.88	7	67.44	24.18

military	63	65.35	25.25	55	64.10	30.49
millennials	41	38.40	23.39	40	52.65	28.86
mothers	62	41.77	25.13	9	74.56	24.42
muslimmen	37	25.91	23.08	68	47.64	31.92
muslims	32	25.35	22.67	70	49.48	32.45
opiodaddict	3	10.53	15.26	61	33.42	31.30
pharmaceuticalcompa nies	27	80.24	21.62	21	24.82	26.79
police	44	64.51	23.76	52	59.92	30.05
pollutingindustries	70	61.07	27.70	3	12.05	19.76
poorfamilies	6	14.14	16.67	27	69.42	27.49
primarycarephysicians	56	54.27	24.61	38	61.03	28.38
prisoners	2	8.65	14.51	20	25.19	26.68
richpeople	12	84.30	18.75	51	32.53	29.79
scientists	46	53.26	23.97	36	66.57	28.18
sexoffender	5	10.79	16.61	2	9.55	18.80
smallbusiness	28	39.43	22.10	17	68.02	25.69
smokers	23	24.19	21.12	49	32.69	29.33
soldiers	66	44.95	25.89	15	74.32	25.55
students	26	28.03	21.62	18	64.33	26.55
superpacs	72	72.52	29.22	10	19.67	24.53
taxpayers	53	41.96	24.35	14	71.60	25.34
teachers	50	40.35	24.09	12	74.45	24.65
teaparty	69	45.65	26.82	43	29.70	28.94
teenagers	10	16.64	18.07	41	55.05	28.90
terrorists	73	30.62	29.55	1	5.84	15.27
transgender	35	23.74	22.79	71	55.95	32.92
unemployed	8	14.96	17.11	54	58.41	30.18
uninsured	9	15.92	17.89	66	57.65	31.75
vegans	39	27.40	23.19	60	47.08	31.27
veterans	55	38.78	24.53	6	79.01	24.02
wallstreetbrokers	30	76.55	22.24	29	25.25	27.55
welfarecheats	22	17.29	20.90	4	12.27	21.59
welfaremothers	16	16.83	19.55	67	58.28	31.77
whitemen	60	68.36	24.97	45	53.94	29.06
whitewomen	45	49.98	23.90	22	62.48	26.79
youngblackmen	29	25.04	22.20	53	58.35	30.16

Works Cited in Appendices

- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20, 351-368.
- Chandler, J., & Shapiro, D. (2016). Conducting clinical research using crowdsourced convenience samples. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*.
- Clifford, S., Jewell, R. M., & Waggoner, P. D. (2015). Are samples drawn from Mechanical Turk valid for research on political ideology?. *Research & Politics*, 2(4).
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2016). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavior research methods*, 48(1), 400-407.
- Hillygus, D. S., Jackson, N., & Young, M. (2014). Professional respondents in nonprobability online panels. In M. Callegaro, R. Baker, J. Bethlehem, A. S. Göritz, J. A. Krosnick, & P. J. Lavrakas (Eds.), *Online panel research* (pp. 219-237). John Wiley.
- J. (2011). The online laboratory: Conducting experiments in a real labor market. *Experimental economics*, 14(3), 399-425.
- Huff, C., & Tingley, D. (2015). "Who are these people?" Evaluating the demographic characteristics and political preferences of MTurk survey respondents. *Research & Politics*, 2(3).
- Krupnikov, Y., & Levine, A. S. (2014). Cross-sample comparisons and external validity. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1, 59-80.
- McDermott R (2002) Experimental methodology in political science. *Political Analysis* 10(4): 325-342
- Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., & Freese, J. (2015). The generalizability of survey experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 2, 109-138.
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1626226). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- Shapiro, D. N., Chandler, J., & Mueller, P. A. (2013). Using Mechanical Turk to study clinical populations. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 1(2), 213-220.

Weinberg, J., Freese, J., & McElhattan, D. (2014). Comparing data characteristics and results of an online factorial survey between a population-based and a crowdsource-recruited sample. *Sociological Science*, 1, 292-310.