

Online Supplementary Information

Appendix 1: Details on Field Experiment

Subjects and Contexts

Recruitment, Eligibility, and Exclusion Criteria

For Experiment 1 we purchased email addresses from Care2. The overall list is composed of 78% women in which 84% are the primary purchaser for their household and 65% own their own home. Moreover, overall they exhibit high levels of civic engagement especially on traditionally liberal issues: 82% describe themselves as passionate about animal rights, 79% as passionate about the environment, and 64% as passionate on human rights. Lastly, especially important for our experiments is the fact that 78% of the Care2 list believes that petitions create lasting impact.

As noted in the main text we only sampled from the part of the list that contained women over the age of 25. Subjects were randomly assigned (at the individual level) to receive one of three messages: control, losses, gains. The messages appear below. The subject line was the same for each one: “We have a plan to tackle climate change...Take Action Now”. There were links embedded in the emails at the beginning and end, which re-directed to an online petition advocating for clean energy policies. The content of the petition was the same in all three groups.

All emails were sent on the same day in May 2016. Neither the researchers nor their colleagues at the partner organization were aware of which email address was assigned to which condition. Such knowledge, in any case, could not have influenced the outcome given the automated and impersonal nature of the email treatment format. Participants were only aware of their own condition.

Treatments: Email Text

Control group

Join us and take action to ensure a swift and just transition to 100% clean energy!

Dear [name],

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation’s and the world’s hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels – are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful and so are we. We need immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production.

That's why [**partner organization**] **is building a movement of people just like you.** Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Can you join us and sign our petition to let [state] officials know that you support the fastest and most just transition to 100% clean energy? Together we will ensure a clean energy future and a livable climate for all children.

Thanks for taking action,
[Signed by organization's communications director]

Losses frame

Join us and take action to ensure a swift and just transition to 100% clean energy!

Dear [name],

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation's and the world's hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels – are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful and so are we. We can still avoid the worst consequences of a changing climate with immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production.

Taking action will reduce the risks we face. We'd stop sea levels rising and reduce the chance of extreme weather like droughts and floods. We would be less affected by food and water shortages, and health issues that come with high temperatures. Reducing all of these risks would be a good pay-off.

That's why [**partner organization**] **is building a movement of people just like you.** Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Can you join us and sign our petition to let [state] officials know that you support the fastest and most just transition to 100% clean en-

ergy? Together we will ensure a clean energy future and a livable climate for all children.

Thanks for taking action,
[Signed by organization's communications director]

Gains frame

Join us and take action to ensure a swift and just transition to 100% clean energy!

Dear [name],

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation's and the world's hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels – are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful and so are we. By taking action now, with immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production, we all stand to benefit.

Taking action will improve our health. Using cleaner forms of energy – such as solar and wind power – will reduce air and water pollution. It'd make for a healthier society, and that would be a good pay-off.

That's why [**partner organization**] **is building a movement of people just like you.** Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Can you join us and sign our petition to let [state] officials know that you support the fastest and most just transition to 100% clean energy? Together we will ensure a clean energy future and a livable climate for all children.

Thanks for taking action,
[Signed by organization's communications director]

Other Information

The only outcome measure was a binary variable indicating whether the participant, upon receiving the email, signed the petition that is linked to in the email. We neither collected nor used any covariates in our analysis in this experiment.

The subject line for the email was identical across conditions. Therefore, a participant would have to open the email in order to be exposed to the treatment. We were unable to observe this, thus, using a simple difference in proportions test, we report the intent to treat effect (ITT), or the difference in the rates at which participants sign the petition across the conditions. There is no missing data.

Appendix 2: Details on Survey Experiment in the Main Paper

Subjects and Contexts

Recruitment, Eligibility, and Exclusion Criteria

In November 2016, 526 subjects were recruited on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to participate in Experiment 2. They randomly assigned to one of three experimental groups, control (175), gains (175), and losses (176). The text of each treatment mirrored that of experiment 1 as much as possible. Participation required a U.S.-based IP-address, and confirmation that they are over 18 years of age.

Subjects were randomized into treatments using the Qualtrics survey platform. No blocking was used. The researchers were unaware of condition assignments, and the participants were permitted to participate only once and therefore were exposed to only a single condition.

Covariate balance

In order to ensure that random assignment was successful, we conducted a balance test. For this test, we compared our three experimental groups using the following characteristics: proportion female (coded 1=female, 0=male), age (ranging from 18 to 78), education (coded from 0 to 1), income (coded from 0 to 1), Party ID (coded from 0 [strong Republican] to 1 [strong Democrat]), nonwhite (1= nonwhite, 0 otherwise), not working full time (1= not working full time; 0 otherwise), and parent (1=have kids, 0=no kids).

Table 1 shows the averages for each experimental group along with the results from a one-way ANOVA test that compares the means. In no case do we find evidence of imbalance. Based on these results, we are confident that random assignment was successful and that, as a result, we can make meaningful comparisons across groups.

Table 1 also shows, in the final row, that our measure of health hardship described in the main text was balanced across all three experimental groups.

Treatments

Control group

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation’s and the world’s hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels –

Table 1: Balance statistics across experimental groups

	Control	Losses	Gains	One-way ANOVA test
Female (N)	0.56 (174)	0.60 (176)	0.64 (175)	0.34
Age (N)	35.3 (175)	35.2 (176)	35.8 (175)	0.88
Education (N)	0.74 (174)	0.74 (176)	0.72 (175)	0.40
Income (N)	0.58 (175)	0.59 (176)	0.57 (174)	0.76
Party ID (N)	0.59 (175)	0.57 (176)	0.58 (174)	0.92
Nonwhite (N)	0.23 (175)	0.26 (176)	0.26 (175)	0.78
Not Working Full Time (N)	0.42 (175)	0.42 (175)	0.47 (175)	0.50
Parent (N)	0.39 (175)	0.46 (175)	0.46 (175)	0.30
No Health Hardship (N)	0.64 (175)	0.56 (176)	0.57 (175)	0.25

The one-way ANOVA test column reports the p-value for the null hypothesis that the mean value of the variable is equal across the three treatments. In all cases, we fail to reject the null hypothesis at any conventional level of significance.

are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful. We need immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production.

Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Losses Frame

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation's and the world's hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels – are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful. We can still avoid the worst consequences of a changing climate with immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production.

We have a lot to lose if we don't act now. Yet taking action will reduce the health risks we face. We'd stop sea levels rising and reduce the chance of extreme weather like droughts and floods. We would be less affected by food and water shortages, and health issues that come with higher temperatures. Reducing all of these risks would be a good payoff.

Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Gains Frame

Climate change is real, and we need to take action. According to the U.S. National Climate Assessment, the most recent decade was the nation's and the world's hottest on record, and human activities – like burning fossil fuels – are the primary cause of these changes.

Fortunately, the National Climate Assessment is hopeful. By taking action now, with immediate public policy that promotes cleaner methods of energy production, we all stand to benefit.

We have a lot to gain from taking action now, especially for our health. Using cleaner forms of energy – such as solar and wind power – will reduce air and water pollution. It'd make for a healthier society and that would be a good pay-off.

Last year the Environmental Protection Agency published a Clean Power Plan requiring states to reduce carbon emissions from power plants. Yet it's up to state officials to create policies to implement the plan. Those that promote clean energy the most will have the biggest benefit.

Survey experiment questions

Political action question

350.org is an organization working to build a movement of people that will advocate for policies that promote cleaner methods of energy production.

Would you be willing to join? If you join, then you will have the opportunity to contact elected officials and tell them why we need to pass public policy that

would promote clean energy.

Becoming a member is free and easy – it just involves joining 350.org’s email list. Then, you will start receiving instant updates about climate change-related topics as well as opportunities to engage in mass action with others that share your concerns.

If you indicate “yes” below, then at the very end of this study you will be directed to 350.org’s website to sign up. [*Subjects were then presented with two response options: Yes, No.*]

Health hardship questions

In the past year, have you personally experienced a health emergency?

In the past year, have any family members living with you experienced a health emergency?

Results

Outcome Measures and Covariates

The outcome measure was a binary variable indicating whether the participant, upon receiving the treatment, elected to become a member of 350.org, an environmental organization. This is the *Political action question* described above. The very small differences between the sample sizes in the analysis are due to missing covariates, the observations for which were list-wise deleted.

Statistical Analysis

Table 2 displays more details from the activism results reported in the main text. The first model only includes indicator variables for our two treatments. The second more precisely captures our theoretical expectations by modeling interactions between the treatments and whether respondents are facing a health hardship. The third includes control variables.

In the main text we present marginal effects estimated using the set of results in the middle column. The third model includes control variables that may be related to both experiencing a health hardship and climate change activism, which is important in this case given that health hardships are not randomly assigned.

Appendix 3: Supplementary survey experiment

In May 2018 we conducted a second MTurk study in order to investigate the impact of our three frames on various attitudinal measures. A primary goal was to provide more direct evidence that the loss-framed arguments can remind people about a health-related material constraint (consistent with the argument we presented in the main text). We should stress, however, that this supplementary experiment does not facilitate a true mediation test (in fact, it does not include an activism opportunity like the previous study). Testing for mediation would require that there are no post-treatment confounders that causally affect the primary mediators and the outcome (Imai et al. 2011). In practice we believe that any survey-based experiment that included post-treatment measures of activism and also activism-related attitudes would likely violate this key assumption— i.e. that there would be several post-treatment confounders that are themselves affected by the frames and that also might affect whether people say that the frames remind them of a health-related material constraint.

Although we definitely see the value in formal mediation tests when possible, in our case we decided to follow other researchers with similar post-treatment confound concerns (e.g. Levendusky and Malhotra 2016) and focus on whether we observe effects on attitudes that we would expect to find given our theory. We are especially interested in whether people who receive the loss-framed argument and have experienced a health hardship are more likely to say that the information reminds them of a health-related material constraint, and whether others are not.

We also measured the effect of our frames on two other attitudes. One tests a possible confound, which arises from the fact that the loss-framed argument (unlike the gain-framed argument) also mentioned the uncertainty associated with action (because it referred to reducing the risk of something bad happening, rather than the *certain* reduction of something bad happening). Recall that we chose this language because it closely mirrored the “dominant justification” for clean energy policy in the climate change communication literature (?), but nevertheless it is worth verifying that this attribute per se was not responsible for the activism patterns we observed. With that in mind, for this supplementary study we crafted a post-treatment attitudinal question that directly taps into whether people would be less likely to support organizations advocating for new public policies to address climate change because the outcome is uncertain.

Our final post-treatment question verifies a core assumption underlying the loss-framed argument, which is that people viewed the argument as indicating that they had something to lose. We expect that, regardless of whether people have faced health hardships or not, the loss-framed argument will still remind people of something they have to lose (i.e. put differently, even most people who have faced health hardships could still “lose” more health, in the sense that their health could still get worse). We asked people how much they agree or dis-

agree with the idea that the information they read reminded them of something they have to lose. Here we expected that people who received the loss-framed argument would be more likely to agree regardless of whether they had faced a health hardship or not. We did not expect to observe that the gain-framed argument would have this effect.

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of three experimental groups that mirrored the text from the other survey experiment as much as possible. The only difference was that, owing to the fact that this study took place in 2018, we changed the first sentence of the last paragraph of each treatment to read “The Environmental Protection Agency has published a Clean Power Plan...”. After the passage respondents received our three post-treatment attitudinal questions, and then the same series of demographic questions that appeared in the previous experiment.

Questions for supplementary survey experiment

Respondents were asked to state how much they agree or disagree with the following three statements:

The information I read made me think about how sometimes I cannot do things I want to do because of my own health and/or the health of family members living with me.

Based on the information I read, I would avoid joining an organization advocating for new public policies to address climate change because the outcome is so uncertain.

The information I read reminds me about something that I could lose.

Health hardship questions (same as Experiment 2)

In the past year, have you personally experienced a health emergency?

In the past year, have any family members living with you experienced a health emergency?

Sample characteristics in supplementary experiment

In order to ensure that random assignment was successful, we conducted a balance test similar to the previous MTurk experiment. For this test, we again compared our three experimental groups using the following characteristics: proportion female (coded 1=female, 0=male), age (ranging from 18 to 77), education (coded from 0 to 1), income (coded from 0 to 1), Party ID (coded

from 0 [strong Republican] to 1 [strong Democrat]), nonwhite (1= nonwhite, 0 otherwise), not working full time (1= not working full time; 0 otherwise), and parent (1=have kids, 0=no kids).

Table 3 shows the averages for each experimental group along with the results from a one-way ANOVA test that compares the means. In no case do we find evidence of imbalance. Based on these results, we are confident that random assignment was successful and that, as a result, we can make meaningful comparisons across groups.

Table 3 also shows, in the final row, that the experience of health hardships was also balanced across all three experimental groups.

Results in supplementary experiment

The main results for each of our three outcome measures is shown in Table 4, which includes models that estimate the impact of receiving the loss- and gain-framed arguments relative to the control message, both for people facing health hardships and those who are not.

First, we find evidence consistent with our hypothesized mechanism, which is that the same set of people that were demobilized in the previous experiment (i.e. those who received the loss-framed argument and had faced a health hardship) were also more likely to report that the information reminded them of a health-related material constraint. That is, the loss-framed argument was more likely to remind them about how sometimes they cannot do things that they want to do because of their own health and/or the health of family members living with them (diff=0.11, p=0.04). We do not find evidence that the loss-framed argument had this effect among those who had not experienced a health hardship (diff=-0.01, p=0.80), and nor do we find evidence that people who received the gain frame were affected, either if they had experienced a health hardship (diff=0.07, p=0.19) or if they had not (diff=-0.05, p=0.16).

Second, we do not find evidence that the mere mention of uncertainty in the loss-framed argument (again, given that the losses it referred to were degrees of risk reduction) would account for the demobilization pattern we observed. The loss-framed argument did not make people more likely to say that they would avoid joining an organization advocating for new public policies to address climate change because the outcome is so uncertain. This was the case for respondents regardless of whether they had faced a health hardship or not.

Third, we also examined whether the treatments reminded people about something they could lose. The premise of the loss-framed argument is that people would see themselves as standing to lose something – i.e. that their health could get worse due to the risks posed by climate change. Our contention is that this applies even to people who have recently experienced health hardships.

The results in the third column of Table 4 are consistent with this claim. The loss frame increased the likelihood that people were reminded of a possible loss if they recently faced a health hardship (diff=0.16, p=0.01) or if they did not (diff=0.07, p=0.06). Such patterns did not arise with the gain-framed argument.

Appendix 4: Details on broader political context during our two main experiments

In this appendix we describe the broader political context when our two main studies (i.e. the two described in the main text) were conducted. Our field experiment was in the field for seven days from May 13-19, 2016 and our main survey experiment was in the field for one day (November 14, 2016). During both of these time periods climate change was not a salient issue for most of the public. To demonstrate this point, we examined two types of data: responses to Gallup’s most important problem poll, and information searches on Google.

The first thing to note is that the environment generally, and climate change in particular, were not top political priorities for the vast majority of people. This is evident in the polling done by Gallup and other organizations, which regularly gauge the priorities facing Americans with nationally representative surveys. Gallup asks an open-ended question “What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?” Table 5 displays the top 13 responses to this question during the two time periods of our data collection. The left side comes from a May 2016 survey ([***http://news.gallup.com/poll/191513/economy-continues-rank-top-problem.aspx](http://news.gallup.com/poll/191513/economy-continues-rank-top-problem.aspx)) and the right side comes from a November 9-13, 2016 survey, the period mere days before before we collected our Study 2 data ([***http://news.gallup.com/poll/197786/economy-elections-top-problems-facing.aspx](http://news.gallup.com/poll/197786/economy-elections-top-problems-facing.aspx)). Looking at both columns it is fair to say that “climate change” and other environmental concerns were not top priorities for most Americans during our two periods of data collection.

Second, we turn to Google Trends search data, comparing trends in searches for the term “climate change” with several other top search terms during the time periods of our two main experiments. These data show that climate change is, compared to top searches, a relatively little searched-for term, and we do not observe unusual patterns in the search trends for “climate change” itself during these time periods.

First we present data for the time period covering our field experiment. Table 6 shows the top-25 search terms for the time period of one month preceding its launch (April 13, 2016) until the end of it (May 19, 2016). In addition, Figure 1 displays normalized Google search data from all U.S.-based searches during the time period of our studies. Panel (a) contains normalized data for the search terms: “climate change”, “Prince” (the 10th most frequent search during this time period, with such searches peaking on April 21st, the day in which Prince the musician unexpectedly died), and “NBA” (the 14th most-frequently searched term during that time period). The data is normalized such that the maximum frequency of search for any of these terms—in this case, “Prince” on April 21—is set to 100, and all other values are relative to that. We chose “Prince” and “NBA” as comparison points because they were the first search

terms that were clearly searches for information, rather than for searches for particular websites, with “Facebook” being by far the most searched-for term. Panel (a) demonstrates that “climate change” is not a very frequently searched term during the time period of interest. We were unable to determine the search ranking for “climate change,” but as the table shows it is definitely not in the top-25. Because “climate change” searches are dwarfed by even the tenth and fourteenth most frequent searches in (a), panel (b) plots searches only for “Climate change”, normalized by setting the maximum daily searches for the term “climate change” during the time period equal to 100. This panel helps justify that we do not observe an unusual pattern in the relative frequency of searches for “climate change” in isolation around the time to our study (which, again, was the final week of this time series).

Figure 1: Select Google searches in the United States during data collection for Experiment 1 in the main text. The musician Prince died on April 21st, causing searches for this term to peak on this day (all other numbers are normalized relative to this peak).

Next we present data for the time period covering the survey experiment in the main text. Here we again take a time period from one month before the commencement of the study (October 14th, 2016) until the conclusion of the study (November 14th, 2016). Table 7 displays the top-25 search terms during this time. Given that this time period overlaps the momentous 2016 election, if we used our previous criteria for deciding which search items to display in a figure over time (i.e. terms that clearly indicate searches for information rather than particular websites) then we would use “election” (#3) and “Trump” (#5). However, they would even further dwarf the relatively-infrequently searched “climate change.”

Instead, in Figure 2 we compare “climate change” to two search terms that are comparable in terms of content and ranking to “Prince” and “NBA”. These are “Cubs” (#10, in which the peak in the plot is November 3, as the Cubs won the World Series in the late hours of November 2, 2016) and “NFL” (#13). These are the terms used to plot normalized searches in panel (a) of Figure 2. As above, panel (b) of the figure contains searches for “climate change” on its own scale. Once again we find that climate change was not frequently searched. Moreover, while the normalized number of searches for climate change are a bit higher on November 14 relative to the month prior, they are far from their peak during that time period. A similar analysis replaced the term “climate change” with “global warming” and the observed pattern of results was approximately identical.

Overall, our analysis of the broader political context before and during our two main fielding periods suggests that the climate change was not especially salient

in the mass public during either time. We thus do not have reason to believe that there was a broader contextual confound during this time.

Figure 2: **Select Google searches in the United States during data collection for Experiment 2 in the main text.** The Chicago Cubs won the World Series late on November 2 causing searches for that term to peak on November 3rd (all other numbers are normalized relative to this peak).

Table 2: Effect of loss and gain frames on political action

	Join? Coef.	Join? (s.e.)	Join? Coef.	(s.e.)	Coef.	(s.e.)
Losses	-0.06	(0.15)	-0.52**	(0.23)	-0.51**	(0.24)
Losses*No Health Hardship			0.74**	(0.30)	0.77**	(0.31)
Gains	0.27**	(0.14)	0.05	(0.22)	0.10	(0.23)
Gains*No Health Hardship			0.38	(0.29)	0.35	(0.30)
No Health Hardship			-0.50**	(0.21)	-0.48**	(0.22)
Female					-0.00	(0.13)
Age					-0.00	(0.01)
Education					-0.16	(0.31)
Party ID					0.76***	(0.19)
Income					0.11	(0.29)
Nonwhite					-0.28*	(0.15)
Not Working Full Time					-0.28**	(0.13)
Parent					0.28**	(0.14)
Constant	-0.69***	(0.10)	-0.38**	(0.16)	-0.70*	(0.38)
N	540	526	520			
Pseudo R^2	0.01	0.02	0.07			

Notes: * $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests). Maximum likelihood estimation. All variables are coded from 0-1 (losses, gains are indicators; no health hardship takes on a value of 1 if people do not report either a personal or family health emergency in the past year; action coded as 1 if respondents join).

Table 3: Balance statistics across experimental groups

	Control	Losses	Gains	One-way ANOVA test
Female (N)	0.40 (177)	0.42 (177)	0.41 (176)	0.91
Age (N)	37.7 (177)	38.4 (177)	38.3 (176)	0.86
Education (N)	0.73 (177)	0.71 (176)	0.75 (176)	0.20
Income (N)	0.59 (175)	0.59 (175)	0.59 (176)	0.98
Party ID (N)	0.56 (176)	0.59 (176)	0.57 (175)	0.76
Nonwhite (N)	0.17 (177)	0.20 (176)	0.22 (176)	0.47
Not Working Full Time (N)	0.40 (177)	0.34 (177)	0.38 (176)	0.47
Parent (N)	0.37 (177)	0.41 (177)	0.42 (176)	0.62
No Health Hardship (N)	0.68 (177)	0.72 (177)	0.70 (176)	0.72

The one-way ANOVA test column reports the p-value for the null hypothesis that the mean value of the variable is equal across the three treatments. In all cases, we fail to reject the null hypothesis at any conventional level of significance.

Table 4: Effect of loss and gain frames on various attitudes

	Constraint Reminder?	Avoid due to Uncertainty?	Stand to Lose?			
	Coef.	(s.e.)	Coef.	(s.e.)	Coef.	(s.e.)
Losses	0.11**	(0.06)	-0.08	(0.06)	0.16***	(0.06)
Losses*No Health Hardship	-0.12*	(0.07)	0.06	(0.07)	-0.08	(0.07)
Gains	0.07	(0.05)	-0.06	(0.06)	0.09	(0.06)
Gains*No Health Hardship	-0.12*	(0.07)	0.06	(0.07)	-0.09	(0.07)
No Health Hardship	-0.07	(0.05)	-0.06	(0.05)	-0.02	(0.05)
Constant	0.36***	(0.04)	0.41***	(0.04)	0.50***	(0.04)
N	530	529	530			
Pseudo R^2	0.06	0.00	0.02			

Notes: * $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests). Ordinary least squares estimation. All variables are coded from 0-1 (losses, gains are indicators; no health hardship takes on a value of 1 if people do not report either a personal or family health emergency in the past year. All three outcome measures re-scaled to 0-1 interval).

May, 2016

November 9-13, 2016 |

“Most important problem”		“Most important problem”	
	%		%
Economy in general	18	Economy in general	14
Dissatisfaction with government	13	Elections/Election reform	11
Unemployment/Jobs	9	Race relations/Racism	10
Immigration	7	Healthcare	10
Race relations/Racism	5	Unemployment/Jobs	9
Federal Budget Deficit	5	Dissatisfaction with government	8
Elections/Election Reform	5	Unifying the country	6
Terrorism	4	Immigration/Illegal aliens	5
Healthcare	4	Lack of respect for each other	5
National Security	4	Federal budget deficit/Federal debt	3
Education	4	Ethics/Moral/Religious/Family decline	3
Poverty/Hunger/Homelessness	4	Environment/Pollution	3
Gap between rich and poor	4	National Security	3

Table 5: Responses to Gallup’s “What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?” item near the dates of data collection for Study 1 (left) and Study 2 (right)

Search Term	Normalized Score
facebook	100
you	77
google	71
craigslist	52
youtube	47
weather	46
news	32
amazon	24
yahoo	22
prince	21
walmart	18
gmail	17
food	17
nba	17
drive	15
facebook login	14
calculator	12
translate	12
ebay	12
maps	10
twitter	10
instagram	10
target	9
home depot	8
yahoo mail	8

Table 6: **Top-25 Google Search Terms in the U.S.: 4/13/2016 - 5/19/2016** (highest normalized to 100)

Search Term	Normalized Score
facebook	100
google	86
election	65
youtube	55
trump	54
craigslist	52
news	49
weather	41
amazon	30
cubs	26
yahoo	26
nfl	24
walmart	23
clinton	23
halloween	23
polls	22
election results	21
games	20
2016 election	18
gmail	17
donald trump	16
world series	16
apple	15
classroom	14
translate	14

Table 7: **Top-25 Google Search Terms in the U.S.: 10/14/2016 - 11/14/2016** (highest normalized to 100)