Appendix

Table 1A: Descriptive Statistics of Study 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| VARIABLES | N | mean | sd | min | max |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 507 | 39.05 | 12.86 | 19 | 83 |
| Democrat (and Leaners) | 507 | 0.558 | 0.497 | 0 | 1 |
| Republican (and Leaners) | 507 | 0.294 | 0.456 | 0 | 1 |
| Partisan | 507 | 0.852 | 0.355 | 0 | 1 |
| Female | 507 | 0.467 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 507 | 0.0533 | 0.225 | 0 | 1 |
| Black | 507 | 0.0592 | 0.236 | 0 | 1 |
| Asian | 507 | 0.0828 | 0.276 | 0 | 1 |
| Some College + | 507 | 0.485 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2A: Descriptive Statistics of Study 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| VARIABLES | N | mean | sd | min | max |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 504 | 38.64 | 12.64 | 18 | 99 |
| Democrat (and Leaners) | 504 | 0.552 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| Republican (and Leaners) | 504 | 0.308 | 0.462 | 0 | 1 |
| Partisan | 504 | 0.859 | 0.348 | 0 | 1 |
| Female | 504 | 0.450 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 504 | 0.0456 | 0.209 | 0 | 1 |
| Black | 504 | 0.0734 | 0.261 | 0 | 1 |
| Asian | 504 | 0.0794 | 0.271 | 0 | 1 |
| Some College + | 504 | 0.573 | 0.495 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3A: Difference-in-Proportions and Difference-in-Means Tests between 2018 ANES Pilot Study (Unweighted) and Pooled MTurk Sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Prop(MTurk) | Prop(ANES) | Diff. | Std. Error |
| Female | 0.4590 | 0.5596 | -0.1006\*\*\* | 0.0186 |
| Hispanic | 0.0495 | 0.0988 | -0.0493\*\*\* | 0.0091 |
| Black | 0.0663 | 0.1020 | -0.0357\*\*\* | 0.0099 |
| Asian | 0.0811 | 0.0184 | 0.0627\*\*\* | 0.0090 |
| Partisan | 0.8556 | 0.7940 | 0.0616\*\*\* | 0.0137 |
| Democrat | 0.5549 | 0.4544 | 0.1005\*\*\* | 0.0185 |
| Republican | 0.3007 | 0.3396 | -0.0389\*\* | 0.0173 |
| College | 0.8764 | 0.6912 | 0.1852\*\*\* | 0.0139 |
|  | Mean(MTurk) | Mean(ANES) | Diff. | Std. Error |
| Age | 38.8467 | 49.4764 | -10.6297\*\*\* | 0.5939 |

Table 4A: Multinomial Logit Testing Balance Between Groups

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| VARIABLES | Murphy | Conyers |
| Treatment 2 |  |  |
| Female | -0.171 | 0.0971 |
|  | (0.226) | (0.222) |
| Education | 0.0660 | -0.157 |
|  | (0.120) | (0.129) |
| Black | -0.913\* | -0.485 |
|  | (0.513) | (0.417) |
| Hispanic | -0.524 | 0.0416 |
|  | (0.547) | (0.495) |
| Asian | -0.0544 | -0.315 |
|  | (0.402) | (0.395) |
| Age | -0.00375 | 0.000559 |
|  | (0.00893) | (0.00901) |
| News Consumption | 0.253 | -0.312\* |
|  | (0.159) | (0.171) |
| Democrat | 0.191 | -0.327 |
|  | (0.344) | (0.327) |
| Republican | 0.323 | -0.688\* |
|  | (0.372) | (0.357) |
| Constant | -0.615 | 1.591\* |
|  | (0.815) | (0.855) |
| Treatment 3 |  |  |
| Female | -0.115 | 0.0316 |
|  | (0.225) | (0.225) |
| Education | 0.00212 | -0.0883 |
|  | (0.119) | (0.130) |
| Black | -0.295 | -0.435 |
|  | (0.431) | (0.429) |
| Hispanic | 0.196 | -0.571 |
|  | (0.461) | (0.575) |
| Asian | -0.469 | -0.814\* |
|  | (0.441) | (0.450) |
| Age | -0.00166 | -0.00523 |
|  | (0.00883) | (0.00914) |
| News Consumption | 0.196 | -0.110 |
|  | (0.157) | (0.171) |
| Democrat | -0.0418 | -0.147 |
|  | (0.328) | (0.347) |
| Republican | 0.00295 | -0.0902 |
|  | (0.359) | (0.366) |
| Constant | -0.125 | 0.876 |
|  | (0.800) | (0.866) |
| Observations | 507 | 504 |
| LR chi2(16) | 11.32 | 15.49 |
| p | 0.881 | 0.628 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Table 5A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H1 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 2.424 |
|  | (7.191) |
| Lean Republican | -21.64\*\*\* |
|  | (6.773) |
| Weak Republican | -19.71\*\*\* |
|  | (6.605) |
| Treatment 2 \* Lean Republican | -3.945 |
|  | (10.14) |
| Treatment 2 \* Weak Republican | -2.378 |
|  | (9.573) |
| Constant | 73.48\*\*\* |
|  | (4.084) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 99 |
| R-squared | 0.237 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 and Strong Republicans are the baselines.

Table 6A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H2 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 3 | 1.338 |
|  | (6.691) |
| Lean Republican | -25.59\*\*\* |
|  | (7.020) |
| Weak Republican | -22.09\*\*\* |
|  | (6.447) |
| Treatment 3 \* Lean Republican | 0.349 |
|  | (9.555) |
| Treatment 3 \* Weak Republican | 5.736 |
|  | (8.535) |
| Constant | 75.90\*\*\* |
|  | (5.507) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 103 |
| R-squared | 0.287 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 2 and Strong Republicans are the baselines.

Table 7A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H3 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 1.840 |
|  | (4.390) |
| Weak Democrat | -11.10\*\* |
|  | (4.848) |
| Lean Democrat | -29.10\*\*\* |
|  | (5.085) |
| Treatment 2 \* Weak Democrat | -2.628 |
|  | (6.558) |
| Treatment 2 \* Lean Democrat | 8.836 |
|  | (8.131) |
| Constant | 74.81\*\*\* |
|  | (3.066) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 188 |
| R-squared | 0.213 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 and Strong Democrats are the baselines

Figure 1A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H1 Extension, Study 1)



Figure 2A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H2 Extension, Study 1)



Figure 3A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H3 Extension, Study 1)



Table 8A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H1 Extension, Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 2.106 |
|  | (4.793) |
| Weak Democrat | -15.57\*\*\* |
|  | (4.640) |
| Lean Democrat | -16.26\*\*\* |
|  | (5.299) |
| Treatment 2 \* Weak Democrat | 4.017 |
|  | (6.749) |
| Treatment 2 \* Lean Democrat | -21.24\*\*\* |
|  | (7.561) |
| Constant | 71.74\*\*\* |
|  | (3.152) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 197 |
| R-squared | 0.257 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 and Strong Democrats are the baselines.

Table 9A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H2 Extension, Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 3 | -3.982 |
|  | (4.930) |
| Weak Democrat | -11.55\*\* |
|  | (4.613) |
| Lean Democrat | -37.50\*\*\* |
|  | (5.077) |
| Treatment 3 \* Weak Democrat | 3.192 |
|  | (6.808) |
| Treatment 3 \* Lean Democrat | 10.18 |
|  | (7.438) |
| Constant | 73.84\*\*\* |
|  | (3.399) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 177 |
| R-squared | 0.324 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 2 and Strong Democrats are the baselines.

Table 10A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by Strength of Partisanship (H3 Extension, Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | -4.725 |
|  | (9.945) |
| Weak Republican | -2.725 |
|  | (6.639) |
| Strong Republican | 20.89\*\*\* |
|  | (7.083) |
| Treatment 2 \* Weak Republican | 17.89 |
|  | (11.90) |
| Treatment 2 \* Strong Republican | 7.448 |
|  | (12.15) |
| Constant | 54.06\*\*\* |
|  | (5.079) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 101 |
| R-squared | 0.227 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 2 and Strong Republicans are the baselines.

Figure 4A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H1 Extension, Study 2)



Figure 5A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H2 Extension, Study 2)



Figure 6A: Plot of Interaction Between Strength of Party Identification and Treatment (H3 Extension, Study 2)



Table 11A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Republicans (H1 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 0.179 |
|  | (5.226) |
| Very Closely Follow News | 13.49\*\* |
|  | (6.272) |
| Treatment 2 \* Very Closely Follow News | -14.89\* |
|  | (8.555) |
| Constant | 57.28\*\*\* |
|  | (3.813) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 99 |
| R-squared | 0.063 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Table 12A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Republicans (H2 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 3 | 7.126 |
|  | (4.971) |
| Very Closely Follow News | -1.405 |
|  | (5.632) |
| Treatment 3 \* Very Closely Follow News | 4.613 |
|  | (8.078) |
| Constant | 57.45\*\*\* |
|  | (3.460) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 103 |
| R-squared | 0.053 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Table 13A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Democrats (H3 Extension, Study 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 1.013 |
|  | (4.163) |
| Very Closely Follow News | -1.827 |
|  | (4.611) |
| Treatment 2 \* Very Closely Follow News | 7.191 |
|  | (6.596) |
| Constant | 64.85\*\*\* |
|  | (3.008) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 188 |
| R-squared | 0.015 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Figure 7A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H1 Extension, Study 1)



Figure 8A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H2 Extension, Study 1)



Figure 9A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H3 Extension, Study 1)



Table 14A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Democrats (H1 Extension, Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | -3.094 |
|  | (4.076) |
| Very Closely Follow News | 4.194 |
|  | (5.107) |
| Treatment 2 \* Very Closely Follow News | -1.457 |
|  | (7.150) |
| Constant | 61.24\*\*\* |
|  | (2.783) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 197 |
| R-squared | 0.010 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Table 15A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Democrats (H2 Extension, Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 3 | -0.428 |
|  | (4.338) |
| Very Closely Follow News | 2.737 |
|  | (4.948) |
| Treatment 3 \* Very Closely Follow News | 1.974 |
|  | (7.337) |
| Constant | 58.15\*\*\* |
|  | (2.945) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 177 |
| R-squared | 0.006 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Table 16A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer by News Consumption Among Republicans (H3 Extension , Study 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer |
|  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 6.373 |
|  | (5.813) |
| Very Closely Follow News | -2.157 |
|  | (6.769) |
| Treatment 2 \* Very Closely Follow News | 6.348 |
|  | (9.930) |
| Constant | 59.91\*\*\* |
|  | (3.525) |
|  |  |
| Observations | 101 |
| R-squared | 0.038 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Figure 10A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H1 Extension, Study 2)



Figure 11A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H2 Extension, Study 2)



Figure 12A: Plot of Interaction Between Following News and Treatment on Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H3 Extension, Study 2)



Table 17A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H1, Study 1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer | Republican Thermometer(No Pittsburgh Media Market) |
|  |  |  |
| Treatment 2 | -1.870 | -1.891 |
|  | (2.686) | (2.707) |
| Republican | 45.96\*\*\* | 45.58\*\*\* |
|  | (3.347) | (3.383) |
| Treatment 2 \* Republican | -3.167 | -2.986 |
|  | (4.604) | (4.638) |
| Age | 0.0814 | 0.0818 |
|  | (0.0862) | (0.0866) |
| Education | -0.424 | -0.376 |
|  | (1.144) | (1.151) |
| Female | 0.294 | 0.00818 |
|  | (2.224) | (2.242) |
| Black | -2.392 | -2.469 |
|  | (4.934) | (4.950) |
| Hispanic | -6.384 | -6.586 |
|  | (5.073) | (5.089) |
| Asian | -3.343 | -3.525 |
|  | (4.081) | (4.096) |
| Constant | 14.90\*\* | 15.01\*\* |
|  | (6.558) | (6.606) |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 287 | 284 |
| R-squared | 0.590 | 0.586 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 is the baseline.

Table 18A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H2, Study 1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer | Republican Thermometer(No Pittsburgh Media Market) |
|  |  |  |
| Treatment 3 | 0.842 | 0.714 |
|  | (2.645) | (2.654) |
| Republican | 43.31\*\*\* | 43.16\*\*\* |
|  | (3.148) | (3.159) |
| Treatment 3 \* Republican | 7.694\* | 7.825\* |
|  | (4.445) | (4.453) |
| Age | -0.0285 | -0.0280 |
|  | (0.0851) | (0.0852) |
| Education | -0.450 | -0.467 |
|  | (1.092) | (1.093) |
| Female | 2.145 | 2.050 |
|  | (2.191) | (2.197) |
| Black | 6.878 | 6.824 |
|  | (5.059) | (5.065) |
| Hispanic | -3.654 | -3.724 |
|  | (5.046) | (5.052) |
| Asian | -2.843 | -2.934 |
|  | (4.428) | (4.434) |
| Constant | 16.03\*\*\* | 16.28\*\*\* |
|  | (6.109) | (6.126) |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 292 | 291 |
| R-squared | 0.619 | 0.618 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 2 is the baseline.

Table 19A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H3, Study 1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer | Democratic Thermometer(No Pittsburgh Media Market) |
|  |  |  |
| Treatment 2 | -1.240 | -0.902 |
|  | (4.288) | (4.312) |
| Democrat | 39.07\*\*\* | 39.18\*\*\* |
|  | (3.838) | (3.869) |
| Treatment 2 \* Democrat | 5.667 | 5.176 |
|  | (5.278) | (5.305) |
| Age | -0.0676 | -0.0636 |
|  | (0.0988) | (0.0990) |
| Education | 1.659 | 1.756 |
|  | (1.311) | (1.316) |
| Female | 6.730\*\*\* | 6.987\*\*\* |
|  | (2.550) | (2.564) |
| Black | 6.981 | 7.222 |
|  | (5.657) | (5.662) |
| Hispanic | -0.281 | 0.0158 |
|  | (5.816) | (5.821) |
| Asian | -2.936 | -2.596 |
|  | (4.679) | (4.686) |
| Constant | 16.39\*\* | 15.34\* |
|  | (7.793) | (7.869) |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 287 | 284 |
| R-squared | 0.503 | 0.503 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 is the baseline.

Table 20A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H1, Study 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market or Conyers Race Correct) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment 2 | 0.0910 | 0.113 | 0.996 | 1.119 |
|  | (4.480) | (4.527) | (5.602) | (5.648) |
| Democrat | 42.15\*\*\* | 41.62\*\*\* | 39.01\*\*\* | 40.10\*\*\* |
|  | (3.667) | (3.714) | (4.728) | (4.795) |
| Treatment 2 \* Democrat | -3.598 | -2.021 | -1.401 | -1.886 |
|  | (5.455) | (5.531) | (6.903) | (6.946) |
| Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -7.213 |  |
|  |  |  | (5.955) |  |
| Treatment 2 \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -6.151 |  |
|  |  |  | (9.516) |  |
| Democrat \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 6.135 |  |
|  |  |  | (7.541) |  |
| Treatment 2 \* Democrat \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 2.974 |  |
|  |  |  | (11.67) |  |
| Age | -0.0749 | -0.0635 | -0.00715 | 0.0677 |
|  | (0.106) | (0.107) | (0.111) | (0.150) |
| Education | 0.188 | 0.0830 | 0.384 | -0.221 |
|  | (1.528) | (1.544) | (1.567) | (2.068) |
| Female | 4.435\* | 5.012\* | 4.134 | 5.216 |
|  | (2.593) | (2.633) | (2.673) | (3.321) |
| Black | -10.20\*\* | -10.64\*\* | -10.22\*\* | -13.50\*\* |
|  | (4.863) | (4.872) | (4.879) | (6.137) |
| Hispanic | -8.108 | -8.323 | -6.045 | -19.23\*\* |
|  | (5.919) | (5.921) | (6.011) | (9.369) |
| Asian | 3.465 | 2.669 | 3.325 | 6.601 |
|  | (4.466) | (4.538) | (4.547) | (5.991) |
| Constant | 21.30\*\* | 21.32\*\* | 20.91\*\* | 20.18\* |
|  | (8.943) | (9.025) | (9.307) | (11.63) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 298 | 288 | 288 | 181 |
| R-squared | 0.449 | 0.451 | 0.461 | 0.434 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 1 is the baseline.

Table 21A: Democratic Party Feeling Thermometer (H2, Study 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| VARIABLES | Democratic Thermometer | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Democratic Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market or Conyers Race Correct) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment 3 | 4.629 | 4.742 | 1.978 | 1.733 |
|  | (4.561) | (4.554) | (5.320) | (5.137) |
| Democrat | 37.43\*\*\* | 38.06\*\*\* | 36.44\*\*\* | 36.50\*\*\* |
|  | (4.215) | (4.245) | (5.123) | (4.994) |
| Treatment 3 \* Democrat | -3.924 | -4.120 | -2.403 | -2.369 |
|  | (5.670) | (5.691) | (6.973) | (6.726) |
| Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -13.90\* |  |
|  |  |  | (7.555) |  |
| Treatment 3 \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 9.125 |  |
|  |  |  | (10.20) |  |
| Democrat \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 8.526 |  |
|  |  |  | (8.837) |  |
| Treatment 3 \* Democrat \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -6.469 |  |
|  |  |  | (12.25) |  |
| Age | -0.0663 | -0.0600 | -0.00877 | 0.0357 |
|  | (0.112) | (0.112) | (0.115) | (0.145) |
| Education | 1.749 | 1.626 | 1.901 | 2.742 |
|  | (1.555) | (1.583) | (1.606) | (2.054) |
| Female | 3.717 | 3.564 | 2.812 | 2.573 |
|  | (2.717) | (2.730) | (2.750) | (3.303) |
| Black | -11.34\*\* | -9.677\* | -9.210 | -9.406 |
|  | (5.658) | (5.769) | (5.767) | (7.500) |
| Hispanic | -4.208 | -5.122 | -2.698 | -6.607 |
|  | (6.563) | (6.488) | (6.599) | (10.81) |
| Asian | 11.85\*\* | 10.87\*\* | 11.02\*\* | 12.88\*\* |
|  | (5.535) | (5.478) | (5.477) | (6.422) |
| Constant | 14.25 | 15.05 | 15.93 | 10.66 |
|  | (9.275) | (9.357) | (9.729) | (11.88) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 273 | 264 | 264 | 164 |
| R-squared | 0.402 | 0.415 | 0.427 | 0.448 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 2 is the baseline.

Table 22A: Republican Party Feeling Thermometer (H3, Study 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| VARIABLES | Republican Thermometer | Republican Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Republican Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market) | Republican Thermometer(No Detroit Media Market or Conyers Race Correct) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment 2 | -3.717 | -3.844 | -6.584\* | -6.805\* |
|  | (2.894) | (2.979) | (3.793) | (3.948) |
| Republican | 40.85\*\*\* | 40.34\*\*\* | 37.47\*\*\* | 36.59\*\*\* |
|  | (3.383) | (3.460) | (4.408) | (4.612) |
| Treatment 2 \* Republican | 10.73\*\* | 10.55\*\* | 13.92\*\* | 14.65\*\* |
|  | (5.032) | (5.153) | (6.435) | (6.681) |
| Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -9.661\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (4.527) |  |
| Treatment 2 \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 8.882 |  |
|  |  |  | (6.247) |  |
| Republican \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | 8.771 |  |
|  |  |  | (7.030) |  |
| Treatment 2 \* Republican \* Conyers Race Correct |  |  | -11.34 |  |
|  |  |  | (10.88) |  |
| Age | -0.204\*\* | -0.202\*\* | -0.166 | -0.285\* |
|  | (0.0974) | (0.0994) | (0.103) | (0.145) |
| Education | -3.890\*\*\* | -3.923\*\*\* | -3.832\*\*\* | -3.682\* |
|  | (1.410) | (1.438) | (1.461) | (1.990) |
| Female | 2.705 | 3.391 | 2.683 | 2.377 |
|  | (2.393) | (2.453) | (2.492) | (3.194) |
| Black | -0.886 | -1.209 | -1.686 | -3.423 |
|  | (4.486) | (4.539) | (4.548) | (5.903) |
| Hispanic | 4.289 | 4.187 | 5.513 | -10.21 |
|  | (5.460) | (5.517) | (5.604) | (9.012) |
| Asian | -3.743 | -4.558 | -3.947 | -10.66\* |
|  | (4.120) | (4.228) | (4.239) | (5.763) |
| Constant | 44.27\*\*\* | 44.45\*\*\* | 45.99\*\*\* | 51.36\*\*\* |
|  | (7.960) | (8.127) | (8.396) | (11.05) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 298 | 288 | 288 | 181 |
| R-squared | 0.553 | 0.547 | 0.555 | 0.527 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

Note: Treatment 3 is the baseline.

**Recruitment Procedure and Data Audit**

For Study 1, I posted a HIT on MTurk on November 17, 2017 asking for participants to complete a 3 minute survey about political attitudes. Participants were required to be in the United States, have a HIT Approval Rate greater or equal to 95%, and have more than 1000 HITs approved. Participants were paid $.40 to complete the study—slightly higher than the federal minimum wage $7.25/hour, or about $8/hour if workers finished the task in the time estimated. I fielded the survey over two days November 17-18th (135 on the 17th and 401 on the 18th). There were no significant differences of demographic characteristics between the respondents from the 17th to the 18th in a two-tailed test.

I received a total of 536 responses. I eliminated five respondents retook the survey with the same MTurk worker ID, and 9 participants whose GPS coordinates (provided by Qualtrics) were outside of the United States. In addition, I used the getIPinfo function from the rIP package in R to test if any IP addresses were associated with VPS or if any additional IPs not flagged by Qualtrics were located outside of the United States, as these respondents have been shown to be of low quality and potentially fraudulent data sources (Kennedy et al. 2020). This package uses three different sources IP Intel, IP Hub and Proxy Check to determine if IP addresses are these potentially fraudulent cases. I used both IP Hub and Proxy Check, which had quite similar results. Using these, I eliminated an additional 15 respondents (14 whose IPs were associated with VPS and one additional IP located outside of the US). The final total of valid responses was 507.

For Study 2, I followed with a similar procedure, posting a HIT on MTurk on March 2, 2018 asking for participants to complete a 3 minute survey about political attitudes. Participants needed to have the same qualifications (in the United States, have a HIT Approval Rate greater or equal to 95%, and have more than 1000 HITs approved), and were paid the same (40 cents). Those who participated in Study 1 were prohibited from participating in Study 2. The survey was completed on the same day that it was fielded (March 2, 2018).

I recruited 539 people in total. I eliminated three participants who did not finish the survey after they indicated they were not US citizens. As in Study 1, I eliminated the participants whose GPS coordinates (provided by Qualtrics) were outside of the United States, 15 in total. I then used the getIPinfo function again, analyzing the IP addresses with IP Hub and Proxy Check. I removed an additional 17 respondents, (16 whose IPs were associated with VPS and one additional IP located outside of the US). The final total of valid responses was 504.

Other work (Ahler, Sood, and Roush 2018), has suggested that duplicate IP addresses or duplicate GPS coordinates may also be fraudulent data. I followed Kennedy et al (2020), who do not eliminate duplicate IP addresses and duplicate GPS coordinates that were not flagged by IP Hub and Proxy Check. Nevertheless, I checked the robustness of my results by (1) eliminating duplicate IPs, and (2) removing duplicate IPs and duplicate GPS coordinates.

After eliminating respondents whose GPS coordinates were outside of the United States from Qualtrics and using the IP Hub and Proxy Check packages, I found 16 respondents had an IP address that they shared with at least one other person, and 45 respondents had duplicate GPS coordinates in Study 1. Eliminating these participants drops the dataset down by 48 respondents. H1 finds support at p < .1 in a one-tailed test when I drop duplicate IPs (M1: 62.1 and M2: 56.3), but when I drop duplicate GPS coordinates and duplicate IPs, H1 is not supported. H2 remains robust to only dropping duplicate IPs (M1: 56.3 and M2: 65.4, p < .05 in a one-tailed test) and duplicate GPS coordinates (M1: 57.2 and M2: 64.6, p < .05 in a one-tailed test). H3 falls just short of significance when I drop duplicate IPs (M1: 63.9 and M2: 68.1, p = .1001 in a one-tailed test), and dropping both duplicate IPs and GPS coordinates (M1: 63.6 and M2: 68.0, p = .1019 in a one-tailed test).

In Study 2, I found six respondents had an IP address that they shared with at least one other respondent, and 44 respondents had duplicate GPS coordinates. Eliminating these participants drops the dataset down by 44 respondents (the duplicate IPs were all nested within duplicate GPS coordinates) to N = 460. H1 and H2 still find no support after eliminating duplicate IP addresses, and both duplicate IP addresses and GPS coordinates. H3 still retains support at p < .05 in a one-tailed test when I eliminate duplicate IPs (M1: 59.3 M2: 67.3), but falls shy of statistical significance (p = .102 in a one-tailed test) eliminating GPS coordinates and duplicate IPs (M1: 61.0 M2: 67.0).

In sum, even after dropping additional potentially fraudulent respondents, H2 retains support in Study 1, and in one of two specifications H3 retains support in Study 2. This is consistent with the least conservative approach to tackling potential fraud in MTurk—only eliminating respondents’ whose GPS coordinates were shown to be out of the United States from Qualtrics.
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