

Supporting Information for

Gaffe Appeal: A Field Experiment on Partisan Selective Exposure to Election Messages

Table of Contents

Manipulation Check	1
Table A1 - Manipulation Check Results.....	1
Geographical Basis for clusters.....	2
Table A2 - Geography Clusters.....	2
Alternative Models	3
Table A3 - Gaffe Manipulation.....	3
Table A4 - Consistency Manipulation	4
Table A5 - Interactive Models.....	5

Manipulation Check

To validate the advertisements we use in the study, a sample (N=156) of workers on Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk crowdsourcing service viewed either a policy advertisement or a gaffe advertisement, randomly assigned. We asked subjects to report the extent to which the ad made them think about “Public Policy,” “Politically relevant facts and figures,” and “The state of the national economy.” To examine whether our ads might manipulate other considerations, we also asked about the extent to which the ad made subjects think about the candidate’s age and race, as well as how novel the ad seemed. As the table below reports, the policy manipulation causes significant differences in terms of focus on the policy-related measures, but no large differences on the other measures.

Table A1 – Manipulation Check Results

	Gaffe condition	Policy condition
Policy measures		
Policy	0.286 (0.031)	0.421 (0.031)***
Facts	0.319 (0.034)	0.496 (0.033)***
Economy	0.483 (0.037)	0.675 (0.036)***
Other measures		
Age	0.095 (0.026)	0.128 (0.026)
Race	0.118 (0.027)	0.109 (0.027)
Novelty	0.236 (0.032)	0.208 (0.031)
N	80	76

Mean, by condition. Standard errors in parentheses
 *p<.1 **p<.05 ***p<.01, for difference of means test
 All variables scaled to run 0-1

Geographical Basis for clusters

The table below reports the state groupings we used, along with age, gender, and relationship categories, to construct clusters for random assignment.

Table A2 – Geography Clusters

<u>Group Geography=0</u>		<u>Group Geography=1</u>	
State	Population	State	Population
California	37,691,912	Texas	25,674,681
New York	19,465,197	Florida	19,057,542
Illinois	12,869,257	Pennsylvania	12,742,886
Georgia	9,815,210	Ohio	11,544,951
New Jersey	8,821,155	Michigan	9,876,187
Washington	6,830,038	North Carolina	9,656,401
Indiana	6,516,922	Virginia	8,096,604
Tennessee	6,403,353	Massachusetts	6,587,536
Maryland	5,828,289	Arizona	6,482,505
Minnesota	5,344,861	Missouri	6,010,688
Alabama	4,802,740	Wisconsin	5,711,767
Louisiana	4,574,836	Colorado	5,116,769
Oregon	3,871,859	South Carolina	4,679,230
Connecticut	3,580,709	Kentucky	4,369,356
Mississippi	2,978,512	Oklahoma	3,791,508
Kansas	2,871,238	Iowa	3,062,309
Nevada	2,723,322	Arkansas	2,937,979
New Mexico	2,082,224	Utah	2,817,222
West Virginia	1,855,364	Nebraska	1,842,641
Idaho	1,584,985	Hawaii	1,374,810
Maine	1,328,188	New Hampshire	1,318,194
Rhode Island	1,051,302	Montana	998,199
Delaware	907,135	South Dakota	824,082
Alaska	722,718	North Dakota	683,932
Vermont	626,431	Wyoming	568,158
Total population	155,147,757	Total population	155,826,137

Alternative Models

The following tables replicate tables in the paper, but with Tobit, rather than Weighted Least Squares, models. Table A4 presents results from full interactive models (both OLS and Tobit).

Table A3 – Gaffe Manipulation

	(1) All Subj.	(2) All Subj.	(3) Liberals	(4) Conservatives	(5) Non-ideol.
Gaffe ad	0.284** (0.114)	0.348*** (0.115)	0.633* (0.327)	0.396 (0.263)	0.198** (0.077)
Female	-- --	0.116 (0.113)	0.182 (0.383)	-0.036 (0.241)	-0.002 (0.090)
Geog. cluster	-- --	0.209** (0.098)	-0.130 (0.264)	0.445 (0.282)	0.162** (0.080)
Relat. cluster	-- --	0.009 (0.109)	-0.417 (0.333)	0.425 (0.277)	0.145* (0.084)
Age	-- --	0.579** (0.246)	1.412** (0.570)	-1.675** (0.812)	0.589*** (0.171)
Constant	0.588*** (0.088)	0.222 (0.157)	0.194 (0.417)	-0.193 (0.440)	0.437*** (0.112)
Sigma	1.714*** (0.177)	1.651*** (0.177)	2.423*** (0.449)	2.302*** (0.479)	0.959*** (0.124)
Observations	846	846	282	282	282

Tobit models. Dependent variable = Cluster click-through rate \times 10,000.

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A4 – Consistency Manipulation

	Policy Condition				Gaffe Condition			
	All Partisans	All Partisans	Liberals	Conservatives	All Partisans	All Partisans	Liberals	Conservatives
Consistent ad	0.104 (0.297)	0.007 (0.284)	-0.137 (0.377)	0.530 (0.373)	0.790** (0.395)	0.828** (0.332)	0.889* (0.476)	0.935** (0.367)
Female	-- --	0.388 (0.301)	0.441 (0.407)	-0.219 (0.350)	-- --	-0.051 (0.305)	-0.178 (0.499)	0.026 (0.328)
Geographic cluster	-- --	-0.127 (0.272)	-0.639* (0.345)	0.454 (0.425)	-- --	0.580* (0.299)	0.246 (0.377)	0.658* (0.372)
Relat. cluster	-- --	-0.435 (0.292)	-0.829* (0.429)	1.018** (0.474)	-- --	-0.300 (0.329)	-0.397 (0.469)	0.250 (0.352)
Age	-- --	0.035 (0.649)	0.570 (0.684)	-2.170* (1.134)	-- --	0.944 (0.718)	2.056*** (0.686)	-1.622 (1.152)
Constant	0.329 (0.298)	0.380 (0.417)	0.970** (0.447)	-0.391 (0.700)	0.332 (0.268)	-0.027 (0.412)	0.124 (0.553)	-0.295 (0.532)
Sigma	2.180*** (0.423)	2.170*** (0.462)	2.091*** (0.588)	2.007*** (0.652)	2.677*** (0.436)	2.485*** (0.462)	2.466*** (0.657)	2.359*** (0.629)
Observations	282	282	141	141	282	282	141	141

Tobit models. Dependent variable = Cluster click-through rate \times 10,000.

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A5 – Interactive Models

	OLS	OLS	Tobit	Tobit
Congenial ad	0.048 (0.201)	0.201 (0.162)	0.115 (0.334)	0.095 (0.317)
Gaffe	0.038 (0.178)	0.235 (0.148)	0.229 (0.315)	0.309 (0.290)
Congenial ad × gaffe	0.647* (0.363)	0.434* (0.254)	0.667 (0.507)	0.727 (0.457)
Female	-- --	-0.208 (0.131)	-- --	0.183 (0.229)
Geographic cluster	-- --	-0.104 (0.111)	-- --	0.314 (0.208)
Relationship status cluster	-- --	-0.260* (0.133)	-- --	-0.373 (0.237)
Age	-- --	1.802*** (0.235)	-- --	0.458 (0.424)
Constant	0.936 (0.142)	0.579*** (0.167)	0.187 (0.259)	-0.082 (0.342)
Sigma	-- --	-- --	2.482*** (0.059)	2.398*** (0.119)
Observations	564	564	564	564

Dependent variable = Cluster click-through rate × 10,000.

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed tests