**Using citizen voice to evaluate experiments on politicians: a UK survey experiment**

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Empirical Ethics**

Both the studies of Desposato (2018) and Naurin and Öhberg (2021) are designed with the premise of empirical ethics in mind. Empirical ethics seeks to assess ethics in context and practice, recognising that adhering to procedural ethics (e.g., ethical approval from research ethics committees) does not guarantee that participants or the general public, for that matter, will perceive study practices as ethically sound (Desposato, 2018). Just as procedural research ethics has its roots in the emergence of bioethics following the human experimentation atrocities of World War II and the post-war biomedical research boom, the origins of empirical ethics can also be traced back to developments in this field (Blomquist, 1975; Borry, Schotsmans and Dierickx, 2008). One particular driver of empirical ethics came from critiques by health professionals involved in clinical ethics, who noted their approach to practicing ethical behaviour within the clinical setting seemed to differ from that of one adopting a scholarly bioethical perspective (Komesaroff, 1995; Borry, Schotsmans and Dierickx, 2008). Komesaroff (1995) argues that medical ethics encompasses more than large-scale “dramatic questions that are discussed widely in the popular media or in the philosophical texts,” and instead emphasises the relevance of ‘microethics,’ wherein one should acknowledge that “*Ethics is* *what happens in every interaction between every doctor and every patient*” (p. 68). Social scientists have attempted to extend Komesaroff’s concept of ‘microethics’ to describe and study the complex dynamics between researchers and their participants. Guillemin and Gillam (2004) suggest that this perspective can help make sense of ‘ethically important moments’ in research practice (e.g., a researcher deciding how to deal with a participant disclosing sensitive information), which are “too specific and nuanced” for procedural ethics to serve as a guiding force (2004, p. 273). With their interests in field experiments on politicians and the public, Desposato (2018) and Naurin and Öhberg (2021) attempt to provide empirical data on how to investigate these populations ethically in practice.
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**Appendix B: Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1: Scenario B1 and B2 will have higher acceptability than all other scenarios.

Hypothesis 2: Scenario D will have lower acceptability than all other scenarios.

Hypothesis 3: Scenario C will have lower acceptability than B1 and B2, but higher than A1, A2, and A3.

Hypothesis 4 Scenario A3 will have lower acceptability then A1 and A2.

Hypothesis 5: Scenario A1 will have lower acceptability than A2.

Hypothesis 6: Scenario B1 will have lower acceptability than B2.

*Exploratory hypotheses*:

We expect lower educated groups to be more supportive of measures to hold politicians to account from anti-political attitudes.

Hypothesis 7: Lower educated groups will show greater approval of Scenario A1 and A2 than other groups.

It is possible that Conservative voters will be more supportive of A1 and A2

**Appendix C: Full Wording of the Scenarios**

**Scenario 1A**

A researcher is studying how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

The researcher sends e-mails to all MPs asking about how Covid-19 has affected the economic and social life of the local area.

In the e-mails, the researcher poses as people living in the local areas of the MPs.

The researcher sometimes pretends to be a man, sometimes a woman, and other times an ethnic minority person.

The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

The MPs and their staff are not told that they are participating in a study.

The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

**Scenario 1B**

A researcher is studying how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

 The researcher sends e-mails to all MPs asking about how Covid-19 has affected the economic and social life of the local area.

 In the e-mails, the researcher poses as people living in the local areas of the MPs.

 The researcher sometimes pretends to be a man, sometimes a woman, and other times an ethnic minority person.

 The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

 The MPs and their staff are not told that they are participating in a study.

 The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

After the e-mails have been sent out, the researcher tells the MPs they were part of a study. The researcher says that if they wish they could withdraw and their replies would not be recorded.

**Scenario 1C**

A researcher is studying how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

 The researcher sends an e-mail to all MPs asking about how Covid-19 has affected the economic and social life of the local area.

 In the e-mails, the researcher poses as people living in the local areas of the MPs.

 The researcher pretends sometimes to be a man, sometimes a woman, and other times an ethnic minority person.

 The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

 The MPs and their staff are not told that they are participating in a study.

 The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

 After the e-mails have been sent out, the researcher tells the MPs they were part of a study. The researcher says that if they wish they could withdraw and their replies would not be recorded.

On finding out that they were part of a research project, many MPs complain that they had been tricked and the time of their staff had been wasted.

**Scenario 2A**

A researcher is studying how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

 The researcher recruits local people who agree to send e-mails to their Members of Parliament asking about the consequences of Covid-19 on the economic and social life of their local area.

 The local people send e-mails to their MPs with text written by the researcher.

 The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

 The MPs and their staff are not told that they are participating in a study.

 The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

**Scenario 2B**

A researcher is studying how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

The researcher recruits local people who agree to send e-mails to their Members of Parliament asking about the consequences of Covid-19 on the economic and social life of their local area.

The local people send e-mails to their MPs with text written by the researcher.

The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

The MPs and their staff are not told that they are participating in a study.

The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

After the e-mails have been sent out, the researcher tells the MPs they were part of a study. The researcher says that if they wish they could withdraw and their replies would not be recorded.

**Scenario C**

A researcher wants to study how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to their voters to see if they treat everyone alike.

 The researcher asks MPs for their permission to carry out the research study and they agree to it before it takes place.

 The researcher then sends e-mails to all MPs asking about how Covid-19 has affected the economic and social life of the local area.

 In the e-mails, the researcher poses as people living in the local areas of the MPs.

 The researcher pretends sometimes to be a man, sometimes a woman, and other times an ethnic minority person.

 The researcher can then see if MPs are more likely to reply to some kinds of people than others.

 The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university.

**Scenario D**

A newspaper journalist wants to find out how Members of Parliament (MPs) respond to questions posed by local people.

The journalist pretends to be a local voter and makes an appointment to see the MP at the weekly session when the MP meets local residents.

The journalist asks a series of questions to the MP, recording the conversation without the knowledge of the MP.

A newspaper story appears a few days later, written by the journalist. The MP’s frank views on current affairs are revealed, which causes embarrassment.

**Appendix D: Report of the Cognitive Interviews**

Cognitive interviewing (Miller et al, 2014) was undertaken to test understanding of the scenarios ahead of final development and inclusion of scenarios in the survey. Two of the researchers, utilising their personal and professional networks, purposefully recruited 11 individuals with varying backgrounds to partake in cognitive interviews. Within the interviews, participants were presented with multiple written text scenarios and corresponding questions and asked to answer these questions using the ‘Think Aloud’ method, a common feature of cognitive interviewing, in which participants verbally share their thought process for answering a question rather than just their answer. This method enables the interviewers to evaluate the participants’ comprehension and understanding of both the scenarios and questions, and in turn, make appropriate adjustments to ensure the final wordings will allow the researchers to investigate their desired study aims. Three rounds of cognitive interviewing occurred with modifications, as noted in the summaries below, made between each round to reflect the comments from previously conducted interviews. Ultimately, the interviewing process helped the researchers revise their scenarios and questions to ensure they were more ordinary-language sounding and straightforward for inclusion in the survey.
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# Cognitive Interviews – Round 1

Participants in this first round of cognitive interviewing were presented with Scenarios A1, A2, B1, B2, and C. They were asked the following 8 questions about each scenario:

1. “To what extent do you agree that it is acceptable to conduct this study?” Answer on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)
2. “Suppose you learned that a study like the one described above had been conducted in your community, and that you were one of the participants. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about being included in the study?” Answer, “I would be glad I was in the study”, “I would rather not have been in the study”, or “I would not care either way”.
3. “What do you recollect from the scenario?”
4. “Say what you think is going on here?”
5. “Are there any words you found difficult?”
6. “Do you know what a professor does?”
7. “Did you find the scenario and question easy to do or did you need to read it several times?”
8. “How did you feel about this research?”

While Question 1, 2 and 8 were designed to test those potentially to be included in the final survey, the remaining questions were used to assess the interviewees’ comprehension and understanding of the scenarios. The summaries below outline the ‘think aloud’ responses given by participants, highlight their misinterpretations or confusions related to the scenarios or questions and propose corresponding adjustments to the scenarios and questions.

## Interview KK1 - 23 Nov 2021

*Female, PhD Student, Non-White*

Generally, the interviewee appeared positive across all the scenarios. Responding to Question 1 – *To what extent do you agree that it is acceptable to conduct this study? Answer on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)* – they ranked each scenario as either ‘Strongly Agree’ [7] or ‘Agree’ [6]. They interpreted the research described in the scenarios as interesting and worthwhile to pursue, and they wondered if this type of research had ever been done before. This lack of familiarity with the research method and topic as well as potential ethical issues with its conduct was further demonstrated by the interviewee thinking-aloud and asking whether you *need* to let people know about being researched beforehand. The interviewee demonstrated good comprehension and highly accurate recollection of each scenario. They quickly recognised the first scenario (A1) involved “undercover work” and seemed readily able to determine the differences between each subsequent scenario’s research design. Weighing up how they felt about the research and scenarios, the interviewee expressed preference for Scenario A1 (arguably the scenario with the most deception) because the MPs didn’t know about their participation and thus they wouldn’t bias the results as in the other scenarios:

*“I prefer scenario, the very first one, where they didn't know, but yeah.*

Interviewer KK: *Could you say maybe kind of why you were kind of thinking that?*

*Okay, because if you know that you are about to get an email from somebody who is part of an investigation or part of a research thing, then you know that the way that you react will be different. Then, okay, if somebody sends me an email whether or not I like them or not based on whatever political views, gender, etc., their response should be the same to everybody, but I think because they would be under, they would know that they were receiving an email, so they would have to be nicer. You wouldn't get their true personality if that makes sense.”*

The interviewee generally did not find the scenarios’ wording difficult to read or understand. They defined a professor as someone who is very well-respected person with high credentials and seen as an expert in their field.

Misinterpretations/Confusions:

The two occurrences of misinterpretation and/or confusion throughout the scenarios and questions were in Question 2 and Question 4.

*Q2: Suppose you learned that a study like the one described above had been conducted in your community, and that you were one of the participants. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about being included in the study?*

* *Answer as “I would be glad I was in the study”, “I would rather not have been in the study”, or “I would not care either way”.*

The interviewee seemed to waver between answering the question as the professor and being the person receiving the emails (i.e., the MP) rather than as themselves in a hypothetical situation where this type of research took place with their MP. Thus, to them, it appeared that it was not clear what was meant by “*how you would feel about being included in the study?”*

*Q4: Say what you think is going on here.*

The interviewee didn’t really understand what the question was asking and seemed to conflate it with the previous question, *Q3: What do you recollect from the scenario?*

Proposed Solutions:

To eliminate this ambiguity, a proposed change to Question 2 was the following (changes bolded):

*Q2: Suppose you learned that a study like the one described above had been conducted in your community* ***with your MP****. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about* ***the MP*** *being included in the study?*

* *Answer as “I would be glad* ***my MP*** *was in the study”, “I would rather* ***my MP*** *was not in the study”, or “I would not care either way*

This changed was seen to clarify the question’s intention to ask the interviewee/respondent about how they would feel about their MP’s participation in this type of study.

Regarding Question 4, it seems like the question might need to be reworded to express the question’s intention more clearly and distinguish it from Question 3.

## Interview PJ1 - 24 Nov 2021

*Female, Professional at NGO, White*

The interviewee appeared to comprehend and understand the scenarios and readily identified the changes between scenarios in terms of study design adjustments. They recognised the social value of the proposed research but noted their discomfort with some of the scenarios due the perceived lack of ethical conduct. Scenario A1, arguably featuring the most deception, was rated as a “1 – Strongly Disagree” for Question 1 on whether the study was acceptable (1 Strongly Disagree to 7 Strongly Agree). The interviewee did not think it was okay for Professor J to pretend to be someone in the constituency and send “fraudulent” emails to MPs. The additional of further procedural ethics practices such as providing a debrief and the option to withdraw (Scenario A2), using confederates (Scenario B1), using confederates and a debrief/option to withdraw (Scenario B2) and preapproval of the study by MPs (Scenario C) each led to increasing ratings of acceptability (4, 6, 7 and 7, respectively). Despite the raised ethical issues, the interviewee was still happy to have their MP participate in each study scenario due to wanting to know if they discriminated or not. They generally found the scenarios and its wording easy to understand. The interviewee described a professor as someone who does “research, teaches, experiments and writes stuff.”

Misinterpretations/Confusions:

There were three areas of misinterpretation and/or confusion while reading the scenarios and answering the questions. First, while the writing was generally clear, the interviewee reported the scenario’s format as a big chunk of text made it denser and harder to easily read. Second, the interviewee noted the potential misinterpretations and/or confusion that may be caused from using the words “constituents” and “professor” as some people (not herself) might not understand these terms. Third, the interviewee showed a bit of misinterpretation of the study design using confederates (Scenario B1-B2) by thinking these recruited local people were adding to the emails/text given by the Professor to then send to MPs.

Potential Solutions:

1. The scenario text could be formatted to be more readable through improved spacing between sentences rather than appearing as a single block of text.
2. The terms “constituents” and “professor” could be replaced with simpler, more colloquially used words. For example, as given by the interviewee, you could replace “constituents” with “people” or “voters,” and “professor” could maybe be expanded on or replaced with “researcher.”
3. To continue efforts to simplify the phrasing around the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.

# Cognitive Interviews – Round 2

The interview format and write-up procedures for round two remained the same. Scenarios A1, A2, B1, B2 and C and the aforementioned eight questions were tested. The only adjustment between the rounds was an edit to Question 2 (bolded text), which was changed to the following:

*Q2: Suppose you learned that a study like the one described above had been conducted in your community* ***with your MP****. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about* ***the MP*** *being included in the study?*

* *I would be glad my MP was in the study,*
* *I would rather my MP was not in the study*
* *I would not care either way*

This change aimed to clarify that the question was concerned with the interviewees’ perspective on their MPs’ participation in this hypothetical study scenario rather than their personal participation.

## Interview PJ2 - 27 Nov 2021

*Female, Administrator, White*

The interviewee was generally positive about the social value of the proposed research in the scenarios. While they recognised the presence of the potentially “dodgy” practice of the researcher pretending to be someone else, they seemed to feel the research’s social value outweighed these ethical concerns justifying the approach. The interviewee also likened the study design to “mystery shopper” practices done on businesses. With this thinking, the interviewee rated Scenario A1 (arguably with the most deception) as a 7 – strongly agree that it is acceptable. Comparatively, the other scenarios that featured more ethical safeguards (e.g. debrief and withdraw option or MP’s pre-approval) were rated lower in acceptability due to potentially affecting the validity of the results either by providing a “cop out” to MPs or a “danger that you won’t get an honest response.” The interviewee realised that these measures might be put in to minimise MP complaints or give attention to “human rights” and “data protection,” but they were more concerned with the loss of the research’s validity. Given the importance ascribed to the research, the interviewee was happy to have their MP in each of the study scenarios. Overall, the interviewee showed good comprehension of the scenarios and readily picked up on the key differences between them. They described a professor as someone who “educates people or does research or lectures or mentors people.”

Misinterpretations/Confusions/Suggestions

There were three occurrences of misinterpretation and/or confusion when reading the scenarios and answering questions. First, the interviewee felt the wording was confusing for the following sentence describing the use confederate in Scenario B1/B2: *“Professor J varies who gets to send the emails with text corresponding to the political views of the sender.”* They were unclear whether the Professor was giving the recruited people certain text depending on their political views to send or if it was up to these people to write and vary the text to send to the MPs. Second, the second and third sentences in Scenario C had writing typos or grammar errors that made them difficult to read. Third, the extent of the MP approval and awareness of their study participation was unclear in Scenario C. The interviewee wasn’t sure if MPs were just told they were getting an email, specific details about the study, or complete consent.

Solutions (and Suggestions)

1. To continue efforts to simplify the phrasing around the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.
2. Fix the second and third sentences in Scenario C:
   1. Remove the word “they” in “they MPs” in the second sentence
   2. Add the phrase “of their constituency” to the end of the third sentence
3. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C needs to be clarified as it is unclear what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entails.

Other suggestions from interviewee:

* Add ethnic minority to the ways the sender is varied as this seems important for discrimination research
* Maybe change the word “pretends” in “Professor J *pretends* to be…” to something less strong and jarring
* Professor is fine but maybe simpler to just say “researcher” in the scenarios.

## Interview KK2 - 29 Nov 2021

*Female, UG 1st Year Student, White*

Generally, the interviewee appeared positive across all the scenarios, rating them as acceptable to some extent. They interpreted the research described in the scenarios as interesting and worthwhile to pursue. The interviewee seemed to show familiarity and awareness with the role of ethics in research throughout the scenarios mentioning terms like “informed consent,” “deception,” and “ethics committee approval” in expressing their thinking and answers. The approval of the study by an ethics committee seemed to play an important part in the interviewee’s higher acceptability rating of a scenario. They noted that this approval meant that “technically it was ethical” and that someone evaluated the study to say it was worth it (i.e., “the ends justified the means”). Scenario C was seen as less preferable and worthwhile compared to the others due to it involving telling the MPs of the study ahead of its conduct, which the interviewee noted might lead the MPs to behave differently. Thus, the interviewee deviated from their usual affirmative response to having this study conducted with their MP (Q2) by expressing indifference to their MP taking part. The interviewee generally felt the scenarios were relatively easy to understand and read.

Misinterpretations/Confusions:

There were five points of misinterpretation and/or confusion in the scenarios. First, the interviewee did not know what the word “constituent” meant in the scenarios. After Scenario A1, the interviewee expressed this challenge and when asked their guess about the word’s meaning, they said that they thought “constituent” meant someone who works below the MP (e.g. a staffer). It seems that this misinterpretation affected their answering of Q1 about the scenario’s acceptability because after this definition was clarified, the interviewee’s comprehension and interpretations of subsequent scenarios appeared more accurate and they altered their perspective on acceptability.

Second, the interviewee didn’t realise that the first scenario included the study’s approval by an ethics committee. This realisation in the second and subsequent scenarios led to their acceptability rating going from [4] to [7].

Third, the idea of using confederates in Scenario B1-B2, that is, the researcher’s recruiting of local people to send the emails to MPs, seemed partially understood but not completely. The interviewee understood that the emails were being sent from recruited civilians and not just the Professor but they also seemed to think that these people were writing their own emails and not just sending a text written by the Professor:

*“Uhm, it was different 'cause it wasn't just one person impersonating different people. It was different like civilians who were sending the emails, so it was I think more fair because it wasn't just one person manipulating the emails, it was coming from different types of people.”*

Fourth, the interviewee didn’t really understand what Question 4 was asking and seemed to conflate it with the previous question, *Q3: What do you recollect from the scenario?*

Fifth, in Scenario C, the interviewee recognised that some sort of communication with the MPs occurred before the study was conducted, but it was not clear to them what this exchange entailed (i.e., was it informed consent? Did some deception still remain?):

*“****Yeah, so the MPs were informed that they were going to get emails. Or they were just informed that they were in a study.*** *And this Professor J like impersonated different people, so he like dressed up or not dressed up, like he just was different people every time he emailed, so it was one person.”*

Proposed Solutions:

1. To remove possible confusion about the word “constituent,” it is suggested to replace this word with a simpler one and/or make the phrasing more straightforward across all scenarios. For example, “constituent” could be replaced with “voter.”
2. The interviewee’s lack of awareness that the first scenario included an ethics committee’s approval could have been a combination of reading oversight and the readability of the text. The scenario text could be formatted to be more readable through improved spacing between sentences rather than appearing as a single block of text.
3. To continue efforts to simplify the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.
4. Regarding Question 4, it seems like the question might need to be reworded to express the question’s intention more clearly and distinguish it from Question 3. The question could potentially ask the respondent to demonstrate their understanding of the study’s aims and purpose of research, which would show their ability to understand the scenario and research design.
5. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C needs to be clarified as it is unclear what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entails.

## Interview KK3 - 29 Nov 2021

*Female, UG 2nd Year Student, White*

Generally, the interviewee was relatively critical of scenarios in terms of the outlined study design and the lack of formal ethics procedures. They commonly raised concerns about ethics issues mentioning “informed consent” and use of deception (“pretending to be someone…sounds like forging identity”). In their discussion of the scenarios and answering of the questions, they seemed to demonstrate a relatively high awareness of typical research practices and common ethical procedures. For scenarios without prior consent / agreement from the MPs or without debriefing of MPs (i.e. post-hoc consent), the interviewee ranked their acceptability as rather low (i.e. 2, “disagree” with Q1)whereas for those with some form of consent (asking before and/or having the debrief and withdraw option at the end), they tended to see them as slightly more acceptable (i.e. 4/5, slightly disagree/neither disagree nor agree with Q1). The interviewee expressed that a study described within the scenario would need the standard consent package – informed consent for specific study at the beginning that included option to withdraw at end – for them to rate it as more acceptable [Q1]. The interviewee generally felt that they would be glad for the study to take place as they recognised the study’s aims and potential value of its findings; they expressed that you would want MPs to be responsive to everyone regardless of background. The interviewee seemed to prefer the scenarios in which the differentiation among senders was political views rather than gender or personal details. Overall, they felt the scenarios were well-written and clear. They described a professor as someone who conducts research, works in a university and teaches lectures. At the end of the interview, they noted that they thought this interview was “going to be a lot more about politicians” but that instead “there seems to be a lot more about research,” so potentially this influenced their interpretation of the scenarios and answering of the questions.

Misinterpretations/Confusions

There were five occurrences of misinterpretation and/or confusion when reading the scenarios and answering the questions. First, the word “constituents” was slightly misinterpreted as “constituency” so while they knew what a “constituent” meant, their answers reflected more on a “constituency;” this answering approach also seemed to demonstrate a tendency to focus on the subject matter of the research rather than the ethical acceptability of the project and research conduct. Second, the interviewee did not realise that the first scenario A1 had ethics approval even though it was stated at the end. Third, the interviewee seemed to focus more heavily on the study design aspects (e.g. variables being tested like gender, economics, etc.) than the ethics aspects at times. Fourth, in Scenario B1/B2, they seemed to interpret the use of confederates in the design as recruiting local people to send any type of message to their MPs rather than a standardised message written by the professor – “someone might just attack the government if they are very anti-gov.” Fifth, in Scenario C, the interviewee seemed confused about whether MP “approval” meant informed consent or just “giving people notice” that a study might happen.

Proposed Solutions

1. To remove possible confusion about the word “constituent,” it is suggested to replace this word with a simpler one and/or make the phrasing more straightforward across all scenarios. For example, “constituent” could be replaced with “voter.”
2. The interviewee’s lack of awareness that the first scenario included an ethics committee’s approval could have been a combination of reading oversight and the readability of the text. The scenario text could be formatted to be more readable through improved spacing between sentences rather than appearing as a single block of text.
3. Need to try to simplify language and variables being mentioned in study design to avoid respondents being distracted and/or overwhelmed by the amount of information.
4. To continue efforts to simplify the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.
5. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C needs to be clarified as it is unclear what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entails.

## Interview KK4 - 30 Nov 2021

*Male, Football Coach, White*

Generally, the interviewee was relatively critical of scenarios in terms of the outlined study design and the lack of formal ethics procedures. They commonly raised concerns about ethics issues calling aspects of the study both “sneaky” and “on the dodgy side of normal” at times. In their discussion of the scenarios and answering Question 1 about the study’s acceptability, they were rather conservative in their rankings; Scenario A1 (arguably with the most deception) ranked rather low (i.e., 2-3, “disagree/slightly disagree) that it is acceptable) whereas all other scenarios were given slightly higher ratings (4-5, “neither agree nor disagree/slight agree) due to perceived additional effort to eliminate some of the deception (e.g., right to withdraw, use of confederates, preapproval by MPs). The interviewee expressed that none of the scenarios could go beyond that 4-5 rating though due to persistence of a “one step forward and another step backward” approach, and they gave the impression that the ideal scenario would get preapproval for the study and avoid any kind of pretending to be other people. The interviewee seemed to have a strong interest in politics and knowledge about the UK’s political system. They also appeared to demonstrate a sense of trust in the system and to their MPs, which was demonstrated by their consistent refusal to have their MP in the study due to the research’s potential ethical issues [Q2]; even in Scenario C, wherein the MPs were aware of the study before its conduct, the interviewee responded to Q2 by saying, “I’m going to defend my MP again” and not want them to participate due to uncertainty of the MPs understanding of the details of the study and the Professor’s continued use of identity deception. They described a professor as someone who “researches, lectures, sits on studies, advises government or advises opposition or lobbies, on behalf of bodies where their views match against those who they don't I would suggest.” This last characteristic seemed to show a bit of negative bias towards some professors by suggesting they regularly practice academic and professional bias, which perhaps contributed to their hesitancy to rate the research scenarios higher.

Misinterpretations/Confusions

There were four occurrences of misinterpretation and/or confusion when reading the scenarios and answering the questions. First, the interviewee wasn’t sure how MPs were being selected for participation in the study, which raised concerns about the Professor trying to “make a case” by targeting certain parties and individuals. Second, the interviewee seemed to misinterpret the aim and purpose of the study within the scenarios. They appeared to focus on MPs actual responses to the posed question around COVID within the emails rather than the true aim focused on assessing potential discrimination against senders based on MPs responsiveness to the emails. Third, the grammar of the second sentence in Scenario C was found to be confusing – “Professor gets agreement from the MPs that they MPs will be sent emails.” Fourth, focusing on the same sentence in Scenario C, the interviewee seemed confused about whether MP “approval” meant informed consent or just “giving people notice” that a study and/or email might happen.

Proposed Solutions

1. To clarify that the Professor’s emails were being sent to ALL MPs and not singling some particular individuals or parties out.
2. Need to try to make it clearer that the aim and purpose of the study is about discrimination and responsiveness from MPs not how they actually answer the question in the email. Perhaps can involve simplifying additional information and variables mentioned or using being more explicit about the aim.
3. The grammar in the second sentence of Scenario C was appropriately identified by the interviewee as confusing, so it will be adjusted to reflect the changes suggested in the solution #4.
4. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C needs to be clarified as it is unclear what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entails.

## Interview PJ3 – 30 Nov 2021

*Female, Administrator at a NGO, White*

The interviewee was generally positive toward the studies describe in the scenarios, consistently rating their acceptability in the 5-7 range (slightly agree to strongly agree that it is acceptable) [Q1]. In providing this rating and answering the other questions, they explained how they didn’t really see much wrong with the ethics of the studies but remained unsure how effective the methods/study design would be for achieving its aims and data with high validity. This belief informed their expressed indifference for whether their MP was included in the proposed study [Q2]. For example, the interviewee noted their knowledge of how the MP system works, that is, that staffers and members of the MP’s office generally will receive and respond to emails rather than the MP themselves, so they were not sure of how accurate the desired data on MP responsiveness would be. The interviewee appeared to generally comprehend the study scenarios and stated they found the scenarios relatively easy to read and understand.

Misinterpretations / Confusions

There were two occurrences of misinterpretation and/or confusion when reading the scenarios and answering the questions. First, the interviewee appeared to misinterpret the study design and aims of Scenario A1. When asked to recollect the scenario, they stated that Professor J was going to send emails staffers for their opinions before contacting MPs and that the aim of the study was to assess acceptability around COVID measures. Both of these statements were incorrect; the Professor only sent their emails to MPs and the study’s aim was on assessing potential bias and discrimination in MP responsiveness to their constituents. Second, the interviewee seemed a bit confused about the details of the confederate design in Scenarios B1/B2. They express that they were unsure of whether the emails sent by recruited local constituents to their MPs were using text solely written and copied from Professor J or if these constituents were to individually write and/or edit the provided text before sending to their MPs.

Solutions

1. Given the interviewee’s accurate comprehension of Scenario A2, which only featured an additional last sentence the Scenario A1 text, it is unlikely that their misinterpretation of Scenario A1 was due to lack of clarity in the text. It seems more likely that this inaccuracy came from being the first scenario and the formatting of the scenario as a single chunk of text, which can negatively impact readability, especially considering the interviewee was viewing the text on their mobile device (this set-up wasn’t disclosed until midway through the interview). As a result, it is suggested to focus on increasing readability of the scenario text by adding more spacing between sentences.
2. To continue efforts to simplify the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.

Other Suggestions:

* To add further variable descriptors to the emails being sent by the Professor. Instead of just using “pretends to be a man or a woman,” which is relatively binary, add other possibilities like varying ethnic background that are relevant to discrimination research.

## Interview PJ4 – 1 Dec 2021

*Female, commercial executive, Non-White*

The interviewee generally appeared to interpret the scenarios with strict perspective on procedural ethics. They expressed that they don’t like the idea of doing stuff that people don’t know about ahead of time (i.e., MPs being unaware of the study) and the approach of the Professor pretending to be other people. This perspective informed their answering of Question 1 on the acceptability of the studies in the scenarios, ascribing a 1-2 to Scenario A1 (the most deceptive), a 3 to Scenarios B1/B2 and a 5 for Scenario C, where 1 was “strongly disagree” and 7 was “strongly agree” on acceptability. Thus, the interviewee seemed to view scenarios as more acceptable when greater ethical safeguards were added (i.e., use of confederates in Scenarios B1/B2 and preapproval in Scenario C). At the same time, they did realise that the preapproval in Scenario C might impact the validity of the findings saying it could “make it too easy” for MPs as they may change their behaviour. Regardless of their views on acceptability, the interviewee always was glad to have their MP in the study because was curious about the results and their potential social value. They generally found the scenarios easy to comprehend and readily understood the key difference between the studies.

Misinterpretations/Confusions

There were four main occurrences of misinterpretations and/or confusions when reading the scenarios and answering the questions. First, the interviewee felt the scenarios were slightly difficult to read due to their format as a large chunk of text. Second, the interviewee noted the lack of flow and awkwardness of sentences appearing in three different scenarios. In Scenario A1, the sentence “*Professor J varies the kind of person wring the email, such as a woman or a man*” was a bit clunky and could be clearer. In Scenario A2, they felt the last sentence about withdrawing – “…*informs them that if they wish they could withdraw”* – was a bit of a “mouthful” and could be simplified. In Scenario B1, they thought the sentence “*Professor J varies who gets to send the emails with text corresponding to the political views of the sender*” was slightly hard to understand and could be simplified. Third, the interviewee, while understanding the general premise of the confederates, was slightly confused about what text was being sent by these recruited local people; that is, was the text written and/or edited by the people themselves or did they just send what the Professor gave them? Fourth, the interviewee was unclear about the extent of the pre-approval from MPs. They were unsure of whether the MPs just knew they were getting emails or if they knew more about the study.

Proposed Solutions

1. The scenario text could be formatted to be more readable through improved spacing between sentences rather than appearing as a single block of text.
2. Adjust the sentences outlined above to make them simpler and their meaning clearer.
3. To continue efforts to simplify the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words.
4. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C needs to be clarified as it is unclear what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entails.

## Interview PJ5 – 2 Dec 2021

*Male, Professional at NGO, White*

The interviewee was generally very positive proposed study scenarios due to their recognition of the potential social value of the studies. They liked the idea of the studies trying to hold MPs accountable. When interpreting the scenarios and answering the questions, the interviewee did not seem concerned with the varying levels of procedural ethics, and in fact, they consistently decreased their acceptability scores for the scenarios wherein the debrief and withdraw option was presented (Scenarios A2 and B2) due to thinking it would negatively affect the study findings. The interviewee felt that the method used in these studies was like “mystery shoppers,” which they had experience while in the hospitality industry, and thus did not seem to find the scenarios ethically problematic. They also explained how if they knew the shoppers hadn’t come yet then they would be “on guard,” so in the context of Scenario C with the MPs pre-approval, they assumed the MPs would potentially change their behaviour if they knew ahead of time about the study. The interviewee generally felt the scenarios were easy to read and comprehend.

Misinterpretations/Confusions:

The only and main misinterpretation while reading the scenarios and answering the questions was the definition of the “ethics committee.” The interviewee seemed to think that this ethics committee was that of the House of Commons and responsible for ensuring MPs and their conduct was appropriate rather than that of the Professor’ academic institution, which would be responsible for assessing the study’s ethical design and performance as well as the researcher’s conduct. This misinterpretation potentially affected the interviewee’s answering of the questions on acceptability and/or their lack of understanding for why the debrief/withdraw or the pre-approval was used from an ethics perspective.

Proposed Solutions

1. To clarify the term “Ethics Committee” by defining it more clearly with lay language (e.g., got approval from a committee that assess the ethical standards of research at the Professor/researcher’s university).

# Cognitive Interviews – Round 3

The interview format and write-up procedures remained the same. The third round of cognitive interviewing saw the addition of Scenario B3 (confederates with debriefing and upset MPs in aftermath) and Scenario D (journalist scenario), as well as modifications to scenario and question wording that reflected the proposed solutions in the second round of interviews. These modifications included the following:

1. Made the scenario text more readable through improved spacing between sentences rather than appearing as a single block of text.
2. Clarified that the Professor’s emails were being sent to ALL MPs and not singling some particular individuals or parties out.
3. To remove possible confusion about the word “constituent,” replaced this word with “voter” in scenarios.
4. Added further variable descriptors to the emails being sent by the Professor. Instead of just using “pretends to be a man or a woman,” which is relatively binary, added other possibilities like varying ethnic background that are relevant to discrimination research (i.e., “sometimes pretends to be a man, sometimes a woman, and other times an ethnic minority person.”)
5. Simplifying the use of confederates in Scenarios B1-B2 to aid clarity in comprehension, understanding and interpretation, particularly the fact the recruited civilians are sending text written by the Professor not their own words (i.e., added the text “the local people send e-mails to their MPs with text written by the researcher.”)
6. The extent of approval and participation awareness of the MPs in Scenario C was clarified to detail what the “agreement” between the Professor and MP entailed (i.e., rephrased with more detail, “The researcher asks MPs for their permission to carry out the research study and they agree to it before it takes place.”)
7. Replaced the term “Ethics Committee” with lay language explaining the ethical approval for the hypothetical study scenario (i.e., “The study was approved by a committee that assesses the ethical standards of research at the researcher's university”).

The two interviews resulted in no major issues of comprehensions or understanding. Thus interviewing was concluded and the scenarios and questions deemed fit for the survey.

## Interview KK5 - 10 Dec 2021

*Female, 5th Year Medical Student, White*

The interviewee was generally highly positive toward the study’s research purpose and aims recognising the social value of this type of research. They were keen for their MP to be involved in the study as they think this research topic is valuable and would want their MP to be receptive of research both generally and in this particular case (i.e., discrimination / responsiveness research). The interviewee seemed to interpret the scenarios and answer the corresponding questions by weighing the potential positive impact of this research against potential ethical issues around consent. Regarding the study designs, they also acknowledged that MPs are public officials and thus should be aware that any response and/or communication they make could become public knowledge. For scenarios involving increased forms of consent (e.g., debrief and withdraw option or preapproval consent), the interviewee found the scenarios even more acceptable (i.e., from 5 “slightly agree” to 7 “strongly agree” on acceptability). While they rated these scenarios as having higher levels of acceptability, they also recognised that this change would potentially cause the study’s results to lose value and/or not be as authentic as those in scenarios without those consent measures due to MPs potentially changing behaviour or withdrawing from the study. The interviewee found the scenarios easy to read and appeared to demonstrate good comprehension and understanding of the scenarios reflecting their intended written meanings and situations.

Misinterpretations / Confusions:

There only appeared to be one occurrence of confusion when the interviewee was reading the scenarios and answering questions. When reviewing Scenario D’s Question 1 on its perceived acceptability, the interviewee was slightly confused at the phrasing:

*Q1: To what extent do you agree that it is acceptable to conduct this study? Answer on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strong Agree).*

Due to the phrase “this study,” they interpreted this question as asking about the acceptability of using this journalist’s investigation in a research study, which in their opinion would have been highly unethical [rated it a 1]. After realising that Q1 was meant to ask about the scenario’s acceptability in general, they still found it rather unacceptable but ranked it a bit higher [1-2].

Potential Solutions:

1. Replace the word “study” in Scenario D - Question 1 with “investigation.”

## Interview KK6 - 10 Dec 2021

*Female, UG 3rd Year Student, White*

The interviewee did not seem too interested in UK politics and seemed slightly unaware of the how the MP political system functioned. They repeatedly mentioned that they were unsure of whether MPs would actually respond to local residents’ emails. The interviewee seemed to interpret the scenarios and answer the corresponding questions by weighing the potential positive impact of this research against potential ethical issues around consent. They rated the acceptability of the study not just on its ethical practices but also on the perceived validity of its research. Thus, in comparing Scenario A1 (full deception) to A2 (debrief & withdraw option), they rated Scenario A1 as a “5” slightly agree that its acceptable but Scenario A2, given the withdraw potentially negatively impacting validity of findings, was moved to a “4.” A similar pattern was observed for Scenario B1 (confederates) and B2 (confederates + debrief/withdraw option), wherein B1 was given a 6 and B2 was moved to “3-4” because of concerns around the data’s validity. For further context, Scenario C (MP preapproval) was given a “5” and Scenario D (journalist) was given a “3.” The interviewee was happy to have their MP included in each scenario. The interviewee found the scenarios easy to read and appeared to demonstrate good comprehension and understanding of the scenarios reflecting their intended written meanings and situations.

Misinterpretations/Confusions

This interview did not yield any misinterpretations or confusions of note.

**Appendix E: Respondents' Understanding of the Journalist Scenario**

**Cognitive Interviews**

The journalist scenario (Scenario D) was tested in the third (final) round of cognitive interviewing and only faced one point of misinterpretation around the inclusion of the word ‘study,’ which was accordingly amended for the final survey. As all the other scenarios (A-C) dealt with a researcher, the original wording of the questions used the word ‘study.’ For example, “To what extent do you agree that it is acceptable to carry out this study? Answer on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).” One interviewee seeing the word ‘study’ interpreted the journalist scenario as a journalistic investigation that would then be included in a research study, which they saw as being highly unethical. This interpretation differed from our intention of asking about the acceptability of a covert journalist investigation published in a newspaper/media outlet, not as part of an academic study. To avoid this misconception, the wording of the final survey questions was changed to use ‘investigation’ instead of ‘study’ for all evaluative questions seen by those treated with the journalist scenario (D). No questions or comments regarding the type of journalist were made by interviewees but the lower grading of acceptability compared to the scenarios with a researcher seemed to suggest a conception of journalists having lower ethical and/or rigorous standards than researchers.

**Qualitative Responses**

In terms of the qualitative responses to Question 9, “In more than 10 words tell us how you feel about this study/investigation?”, survey respondents generally did not distinguish between types of journalism. Out of the Scenario D qualitative respondents (n=1,145), there were 174 individuals who referred to journalism in their responses, as quantified by searching for variations the keywords “[journal\*] OR [press] OR [report\*] OR [media] OR [paper\*] OR [tabloid] OR [news\*].” Only eight respondents classified this Scenario D as representing an example of ‘investigative reporting/journalism.’ A majority of these eight respondents seemed to acknowledge this type of reporting as acceptable, making the distinction that the scenario demonstrated “investigative journalism rather than deceit” and that it posed “a legitimate form to find out an MP's uncensored views, especially if it exposes hypocrisy” and could “reveal information in the interest of the general public.” One respondent remained neutral saying they “can't decide if this approach is valid and achieves anything positive;” whereas two appeared more negative with the first calling the approach “unacceptable” due to being “undertaken under [false] pretences” and the second showing a more general distain toward journalism saying, “this is called investigative journalism and unfortunately the media use this all the time.”

Regarding types of media outlets, survey respondents tended to refer to “journalists”, “journalism”, “the press”, or “the media” as a whole rather than specific formats. Only two respondents associated Scenario D with the “tabloids.” One noted that the journalist’s approach appeared “despicable and underhanded, typical of tabloid journalism in this country” and the other seemed apathetic stating, “don’t we get this happens all the time in the tabloids – info gets leaked and we hear about it from the papers.” Linking Scenario D to “newspapers” only occurred on seven occasions and appeared to express a similar disdain:

·  “I BELIEVE ONE SHOULD BE HONEST WHEN INTERVIEWING SOMEONE ELSE ESPECIALLY IF IT WILL BE IN THE NEWS/NEWSPAPERS”

·  “It's the standard of journalism in this country and why I no longer buy newspapers.”

·  “It depends on which MP and which party he belongs and which party the newspaper supports until I know this I cannot give an opinion”

·  “The newspaper acted in a duplicitous manner for commercial gain.”

·  “It unfortunately is the sneaky underhand way journalists work and then wonder why people that have any brain cells at all distrust newspapers and their appalling habits”

·  “Two things I do not trust very much M.P.s and newspapers.”

·  “Its wrong to record without the persons permission from a legal & moral stance. Also I don’t agree that pretending to be someone you are not is fair. Would the paper have printed it if the MP had only said nice things?”

The language in these quotes appears to demonstrate an overall feeling of distrust toward newspapers that echoes that ascribed to tabloids. It seems to be representative of a wider feeling of negativity and lack of faith in the current state of journalism among this sample of the Scenario D qualitative respondents. Many felt this scenario represented an “underhanded” approach, which several also described as “typical journalistic” behaviour. One respondent claimed the UK press has “no moral standards” and others mentioned how journalists will “go out of their way to trick MPs” and “twist” or “bend the truth.” While some respondents seemed to be protective of MPs in this sense, other respondents were equally critical to journalists and MPs, categorising them as “two distrusted types of people” who are “as bad as each other.” This overarching negative perspective of journalism and MPs could partially explain why Scenario D was consistently rated lower in acceptability than the researcher scenarios (A-C).

**Appendix F: The Codebook**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Questionary*** | | ***Var Manipulation*** | |
| *Subject* | *Var name* | *Labels* | *Var* | *Labels* |
| **Demographic variables** | |  |  |  |
| Gender | *Gender* | Which of the following best describes how you think of yourself? | *Female* |  |
|  | *1* | Male | *1* | Female |
|  | *2* | Female | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *3* | In another way |  |  |
|  | *4* | Prefer not to answer |  |  |
| Age | *Age* | How old are you? | *Age squared* | |
|  |  | Continuous |  | (Age)2 |
| Region | *Region* | Where do you live? |  |  |
|  | *1* | Northern Ireland |  |  |
|  | *2* | Scotland |  |  |
|  | *3* | North-West |  |  |
|  | *4* | North-East |  |  |
|  | *5* | Yorkshire & Humberside |  |  |
|  | *6* | Wales |  |  |
|  | *7* | West Midlands |  |  |
|  | *8* | East Midlands |  |  |
|  | *9* | South-West |  |  |
|  | *10* | South-East |  |  |
|  | *11* | Eastern |  |  |
|  | *12* | London |  |  |
| Social grade | *SocGrade* | Social Grade |  |  |
|  | *1* | AB |  |  |
|  | *2* | C1 |  |  |
|  | *3* | C2 |  |  |
|  | *4* | DE |  |  |
| Ethnicity | *PJx1* | To which of these groups do you consider you belong? | *White* |  |
|  | *1* | White British | *1* | Withe British & Any other withe background |
|  | *2* | Any other white background |  |
|  | *3* | White and Black Caribbean | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *4* | White and Black African |  |  |
|  | *5* | White and Asian |  |  |
|  | *6* | Any other mixed background |  |  |
|  | *7* | Indian |  |  |
|  | *8* | Pakistani |  |  |
|  | *9* | Bangladeshi |  |  |
|  | *10* | Any other Asian background |  |  |
|  | *11* | Black Caribbean |  |  |
|  | *12* | Black African |  |  |
|  | *13* | Any other black background |  |  |
|  | *14* | Chinese |  |  |
|  | *15* | Other ethnic group |  |  |
|  | *16* | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| Education | *PJx2* | What is the highest educational or work-related qualification you have? | *Degree* |  |
|  | *1* | No formal qualifications | *1* | University diploma & University or CNAA first degree (e.g. BA, B.Sc, B.Ed) & University or CNAA higher degree (e.g. M.Sc, Ph.D) |
|  | *2* | Youth training certificate/skillseekers |  |
|  | *3* | Recognised trade apprenticeship completed |  |
|  | *4* | Clerical and commercial |  |
|  | *5* | City & Guilds certificate |  |
|  | *6* | City & Guilds certificate - advanced | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *7* | ONC | *.* | Don't know |
|  | *8* | CSE grades 2-5 |  |  |
|  | *9* | CSE grade 1, GCE O level, GCSE, School Certificate |  |  |
|  | *10* | Scottish Ordinary/ Lower Certificate |  |  |
|  | *11* | GCE A level or Higher Certificate |  |  |
|  | *12* | Scottish Higher Certificate |  |  |
|  | *13* | Nursing qualification (e.g. SEN, SRN, SCM, RGN) |  |  |
|  | *14* | Teaching qualification (not degree) |  |  |
|  | *15* | University diploma |  |  |
|  | *16* | University or CNAA first degree (e.g. BA, B.Sc, B.Ed) |  |  |
|  | *17* | University or CNAA higher degree (e.g. M.Sc, Ph.D) |  |  |
|  | *18* | Other technical, professional, or higher qualification |  |  |
|  | *19* | Don't know |  |  |
|  | *20* | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| Income | *PJx3* | What is your gross household income? |  |  |
|  | *1* | Under £5,000 per year |  |  |
|  | *2* | £5,000 to £9,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *3* | £10,000 to £14,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *4* | £15,000 to £19,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *5* | £20,000 to £24,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *6* | £25,000 to £29,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *7* | £30,000 to £34,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *8* | £35,000 to £39,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *9* | £40,000 to £44,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *10* | £45,000 to £49,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *11* | £50,000 to £59,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *12* | £60,000 to £69,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *13* | £70,000 to £99,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *14* | £100,000 to £149,999 per year |  |  |
|  | *15* | £150,000 and over |  |  |
|  | *16* | Don't know |  |  |
|  | *17* | Prefer not to answer |  |  |
| Religion | *PJx4a* | Do you consider yourself as belonging to a church, denomination, or a religious community? | *Religious* |  |
|  | *1* | No | *1* | Yes |
|  | *2* | Yes | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *3* | Don't know | *.* | Don't know |
|  | *PJx4b* | Which one? |  |  |
|  | *1* | Protestant |  |  |
|  | *2* | Roman Catholic |  |  |
|  | *3* | Eastern Orthodox |  |  |
|  | *4* | Islamic |  |  |
|  | *5* | Jewish |  |  |
|  | *6* | Buddhist |  |  |
|  | *7* | Hindu |  |  |
|  | *8* | Other [Please specify] |  |  |
|  | *9* | Do not know |  |  |
|  | *10* | Prefer not to answer |  |  |
| **Attitudinal variables** | |  |  |  |
| Vote pref. | *Vote2019* | Past Vote in General Election 2019 |  |  |
|  | *1* | Conservative |  |  |
|  | *2* | Labour |  |  |
|  | *3* | Lib Dem |  |  |
|  | *4* | SNP |  |  |
|  | *5* | BXP / UKIP |  |  |
|  | *6* | Green Party |  |  |
|  | *7* | Others |  |  |
|  | *8* | DNV |  |  |
|  | *9* | DK/Ref |  |  |
|  | *VoteIntFull* | Vote intention | *cons\_vote\_21* | |
|  | *1* | Conservative | *1* | Conservative |
|  | *2* | Labour | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *3* | Lib Dem |  |  |
|  | *4* | UK Independence Party (UKIP) |  |  |
|  | *5* | Reform UK |  |  |
|  | *6* | SNP |  |  |
|  | *7* | Plaid Cymru |  |  |
|  | *8* | Green Party |  |  |
|  | *9* | Others |  |  |
|  | *10* | WNV |  |  |
|  | *11* | DK/Ref |  |  |
|  | *Copartisan* | Whether the respondent vote for the same party as their MP |  | |
|  | *1* | Co-partisan |  | |
|  | *0* | Otherwise |  | |
| Scenario | *Scenario* | Scenario Shown | *scen\_dum\_(1 to 7)* | |
|  | *1* | Scenario 1 (A1) | *1* | if scenario (1 -7) |
|  | *2* | Scenario 2 (A2) | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *3* | Scenario 3 (A3) | *confederates* | |
|  | *4* | Scenario 4 (B1) | *1* | B1 & B2 |
|  | *5* | Scenario 5 (B2) | *0* | Otherwise |
|  | *6* | Scenario 6 (C) | *deception\_A* | |
|  | *7* | Scenario 7 (D) | *1* | A1 & A2 & A3 |
|  |  |  | *0* | Otherwise |
|  |  |  | *deception\_AC* | |
|  |  |  | *1* | A1 & A2 & A3 & C |
|  |  |  | *0* | Otherwise |
|  |  |  | *journalist* | |
|  |  |  | *1* | D |
|  |  |  | *0* | Otherwise |
| Political interest | *PJ1* | How interested would you say you are in politics? | *pol\_int\_dmmy* | |
|  | *1* | Very interested | *1* | Very interested & Fairly interested |
|  | *2* | Fairly interested | *0* | Not very interested & Not at all interested |
|  | *3* | Not very interested | *.* | Don't know |
|  | *4* | Not at all interested |  |  |
|  | *5* | Don't know |  |  |
| Efficacy | *PJ2* | How strongly do you agree or disagree with following statements (PJ2\_1 to PJ26) | *efficacy* |  |
|  | *1* | Strongly agree | *Continuous variable from the predicted scores of the Principal Components Analisis of variables PJ2\_1 to PJ2\_6* | |
|  | *2* | Agree |
|  | *3* | Nether agree nor disagree |
|  | *4* | Disagree |  |  |
|  | *5* | Strongly disagree |  |  |
|  | *6* | Don't know |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_1* | Politicians don't care what people like me think |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_2* | It is often difficult for me to understand what is going on |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_3* | People like me have no say in what government does |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_4* | The main political parties in Britain are pretty much all the same |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_5* | UK parties/politicians fight each other rather than further public interest |  |  |
|  | *PJ2\_6* | Politicians ignore the issues I really care about |  |  |
| Acceptability | *PJ3\_1* | To what extent do you agree or disagree that it is acceptable to carry out this study (Scenario A-D)? |  |  |
|  |  | 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) |  |  |
|  | *999* | Don't know |  |  |
| Views of participation of MPs | *PJ4* | How would you feel about the MP being included in the study (Scenario A-D)? |  |  |
|  | *1* | I would be glad my MP was in the study |  |  |
|  | *2* | I would rather my MP was not in the study |  |  |
|  | *3* | I would not care either way |  |  |
|  | *4* | Don't know |  |  |
|  | *PJ5\_1* | To what extent do you think the study shows how a MP would be likely to answer real e-mails from local residents? |  |  |
|  |  | 1 (Very Likely) to 7 (Not At All Likely) |  |  |
|  | *999* | Don't know |  |  |
| Manipulation Checks | *PJ6* | From what you remember, which of the following were in the scene we showed you?  (answer for PJ6\_1 to PJ6\_8) |  |  |
|  | *0* | Not selected |  |  |
|  | *1* | Selected |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_1* | Researcher e-mailing pretending to be a local resident |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_2* | Telling the MPs afterwards that they were part of a study and they could withdraw |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_3* | Researcher recruiting local residents to be part of the study to send the e-mails to their MPs |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_4* | The MPs agree to the study being carried out beforehand |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_5* | MPs complain about the study |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_6* | A journalist poses as a local resident |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_7* | None of the above |  |  |
|  | *PJ6\_8* | Don't know |  |  |
|  | *PJ9\_1* | To what extent do you think that this study is worthwhile to carry out? |  |  |
|  |  | 1 (Highly Worthwhile) to 7 (Not At All Worthwhile) |  |  |
|  | *999* | Don't know |  |  |
| Weights | *w8* | Standard Nat-Rep Weight Variable |  |  |

**Appendix G: Sample Characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main variables** | **Values** | **Freq.** | **Percent** |
| Gender | male | 3950 | 49.29 |
|  | female | 4063 | 50.71 |
| Age | Mean (46.8) SD (17.2) | - | - |
| Degree | no degree | 5620 | 70.94 |
|  | degree | 2302 | 29.06 |
| White British | other no white | 1055 | 13.12 |
|  | white | 6985 | 86.88 |
| Social Grade | AB | 2313 | 28.77 |
|  | C1 | 1698 | 21.12 |
|  | C2 | 1121 | 13.94 |
|  | DE | 2908 | 36.17 |
| Religious | yes | 2421 | 30.63 |
|  | no | 5483 | 69.37 |
| Voting Intention | Conservative | 1966 | 24.45 |
|  | Labour | 2679 | 33.32 |
|  | Lib Dem | 492 | 6.12 |
|  | UK Independence Party (UKIP) | 183 | 2.28 |
|  | Reform UK | 193 | 2.40 |
|  | SNP | 291 | 3.62 |
|  | Plaid Cymru | 53 | 0.66 |
|  | Green Party | 403 | 5.01 |
|  | Others | 189 | 2.35 |
|  | WNV | 416 | 5.17 |
|  | DK/Ref | 1175 | 14.61 |
| Region | Northern Ireland | 160 | 1.99 |
|  | Scotland | 649 | 8.07 |
|  | North-West | 910 | 11.32 |
|  | North-East | 349 | 4.34 |
|  | Yorkshire & Humberside | 703 | 8.74 |
|  | Wales | 406 | 5.05 |
|  | West Midlands | 715 | 8.89 |
|  | East Midlands | 589 | 7.33 |
|  | South-West | 709 | 8.82 |
|  | South-East | 1148 | 14.28 |
|  | Eastern | 677 | 8.42 |
|  | London | 1025 | 12.75 |
| Income | Mean value (6.9) is category £25,000 to £29,999 py. | - | - |

**Appendix H: Weighted Tables**

**Table H1: Comparing Results in Figure 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |  |  |
| Scenario | *Unweighted* | *Weighted* | *Diff* | *N* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| A1 | 5.66 | 5.59 | 0.07 | 1,147 |
|  | (0.05) | (0.07) |  |  |
| A2 | 5.64 | 5.48 | 0.16 | 1,148 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.08) |  |  |
| A3 | 5.53 | 5.41 | 0.12 | 1,147 |
|  | (0.05) | (0.09) |  |  |
| B1 | 5.59 | 5.39 | 0.2 | 1,147 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.07) |  |  |
| B2 | 5.61 | 5.56 | 0.05 | 1,151 |
|  | (0.05) | (0.07) |  |  |
| C | 5.68 | 5.63 | 0.05 | 1,155 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.06) |  |  |
| D | 4.66 | 4.55 | 0.11 | 1,145 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.10) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 7,019 | 7,019 |  | 8,040 |

Standard errors in parentheses

**Table H2: Views of MPs Participation in Studies with Identity Deception or Use of Confederates, probit models, with weights**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | *No weights* | *Weights* |
| Female | 0.076\*\* | 0.131\*\*\* |
|  | (0.031) | (0.050) |
|  |  |  |
| Age | 0.023\*\*\* | 0.016\*\* |
|  | (0.005) | (0.008) |
| Age squared | -0.000\*\*\* | -0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) |
|  |  |  |
| White | 0.025 | -0.208\*\*\* |
|  | (0.049) | (0.079) |
|  |  |  |
| Degree | 0.101\*\*\* | 0.023 |
|  | (0.036) | (0.054) |
|  |  |  |
| Religious | 0.024 | -0.075 |
|  | (0.035) | (0.059) |
|  |  |  |
| Scenarios with deception | 0.130\* | 0.275\*\*\* |
|  | (0.071) | (0.098) |
|  |  |  |
| Social grade |  |  |
| C1 | 0.047 | 0.029 |
|  | (0.044) | (0.070) |
|  |  |  |
| C2 | -0.070 | -0.048 |
|  | (0.051) | (0.082) |
| DE | -0.026 | -0.036 |
|  | (0.042) | (0.064) |
|  |  |  |
| Political interest |  |  |
| Fairly interested | -0.278\*\*\* | -0.214\*\* |
|  | (0.062) | (0.092) |
|  |  |  |
| Not very interested | -0.753\*\*\* | -0.685\*\*\* |
|  | (0.074) | (0.108) |
|  |  |  |
| Not at all interested | -1.161\*\*\* | -1.156\*\*\* |
|  | (0.105) | (0.154) |
|  |  |  |
| Deception & Fairly interested | 0.008 | -0.136 |
| (0.083) | (0.118) |
|  |  |  |
| Deception & Not very interested | 0.205\*\* | 0.048 |
| (0.097) | (0.136) |
|  |  |  |
| Deception & Not at all interested | 0.209 | 0.248 |
| (0.131) | (0.193) |
| Observations | 7349 | 7349 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

**Figure H1: Replication of Figure 2: Weights vs No Weights**



**Appendix I: Balance Tests (probit models)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *(A1)* | *(A2)* | *(A3)* | *(B1)* | *(B2)* | *(C)* | *(D)* |
| Female | 0.048 | 0.027 | 0.074 | 0.024 | -0.003 | -0.019 | -0.137\*\* |
|  | (0.051) | (0.058) | (0.053) | (0.055) | (0.052) | (0.061) | (0.059) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | -0.006 | -0.012 | 0.012 | -0.008 | 0.005 | 0.021\*\* | -0.007 |
|  | (0.009) | (0.011) | (0.009) | (0.010) | (0.009) | (0.010) | (0.009) |
| Age squared | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000\* | 0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 0.183\*\* | -0.059 | -0.254\*\*\* | 0.005 | -0.054 | 0.183\* | 0.026 |
|  | (0.086) | (0.107) | (0.094) | (0.092) | (0.091) | (0.096) | (0.097) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | -0.065 | -0.026 | -0.012 | 0.029 | 0.044 | 0.088 | -0.042 |
|  | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.066) | (0.057) | (0.059) | (0.070) | (0.064) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Religious | 0.015 | 0.068 | -0.014 | -0.029 | 0.020 | -0.003 | -0.074 |
|  | (0.064) | (0.068) | (0.063) | (0.064) | (0.062) | (0.082) | (0.063) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scotland | 0.130 | -0.036 | 0.025 | -0.346\* | -0.015 | 0.002 | 0.256 |
|  | (0.231) | (0.252) | (0.246) | (0.207) | (0.257) | (0.217) | (0.223) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North-West | 0.102 | -0.035 | 0.041 | -0.147 | 0.093 | -0.174 | 0.142 |
|  | (0.219) | (0.224) | (0.219) | (0.196) | (0.228) | (0.191) | (0.200) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North-East | 0.353 | -0.205 | -0.014 | -0.213 | -0.112 | -0.074 | 0.276 |
|  | (0.229) | (0.243) | (0.234) | (0.211) | (0.248) | (0.213) | (0.228) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yorkshire & Humberside | 0.087 | 0.032 | -0.003 | -0.193 | -0.082 | -0.024 | 0.213 |
| (0.216) | (0.230) | (0.226) | (0.202) | (0.231) | (0.192) | (0.206) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wales | 0.130 | -0.077 | -0.059 | -0.034 | 0.029 | -0.055 | 0.088 |
|  | (0.239) | (0.236) | (0.236) | (0.214) | (0.245) | (0.228) | (0.213) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Midlands | 0.088 | -0.131 | -0.006 | -0.204 | -0.127 | -0.029 | 0.436\*\* |
| (0.219) | (0.236) | (0.225) | (0.205) | (0.230) | (0.197) | (0.220) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Midlands | 0.192 | -0.285 | 0.061 | -0.228 | -0.077 | 0.028 | 0.337 |
|  | (0.227) | (0.236) | (0.227) | (0.200) | (0.240) | (0.204) | (0.207) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-West | 0.048 | -0.059 | 0.005 | -0.220 | -0.088 | 0.070 | 0.256 |
|  | (0.224) | (0.228) | (0.229) | (0.197) | (0.231) | (0.237) | (0.210) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South-East | 0.031 | -0.063 | 0.039 | -0.249 | 0.024 | -0.114 | 0.359\* |
|  | (0.213) | (0.218) | (0.219) | (0.192) | (0.228) | (0.189) | (0.201) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastern | 0.126 | -0.143 | -0.036 | -0.062 | -0.187 | -0.143 | 0.459\*\* |
|  | (0.221) | (0.230) | (0.232) | (0.198) | (0.237) | (0.197) | (0.207) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| London | 0.171 | -0.269 | -0.023 | -0.117 | -0.034 | -0.042 | 0.344\* |
|  | (0.220) | (0.223) | (0.228) | (0.200) | (0.232) | (0.203) | (0.203) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | -0.146\* | 0.120 | 0.047 | 0.071 | 0.046 | -0.089 | -0.034 |
|  | (0.076) | (0.079) | (0.079) | (0.077) | (0.072) | (0.093) | (0.082) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | -0.213\*\* | 0.183\* | -0.001 | 0.141 | 0.109 | -0.071 | -0.153\* |
|  | (0.088) | (0.096) | (0.091) | (0.089) | (0.090) | (0.101) | (0.090) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DE | -0.141\* | 0.146\*\* | 0.097 | 0.092 | -0.032 | -0.136 | 0.004 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.070) | (0.066) | (0.067) | (0.083) | (0.079) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Voting Intention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labour | -0.009 | 0.054 | -0.009 | 0.051 | -0.087 | 0.010 | -0.003 |
|  | (0.073) | (0.084) | (0.072) | (0.074) | (0.075) | (0.078) | (0.081) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lib Dem | -0.042 | -0.057 | 0.220\* | 0.035 | -0.076 | 0.001 | -0.093 |
|  | (0.105) | (0.130) | (0.129) | (0.129) | (0.124) | (0.127) | (0.150) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UKIP | 0.017 | 0.174 | -0.148 | 0.183 | -0.147 | 0.080 | -0.190 |
|  | (0.188) | (0.161) | (0.215) | (0.143) | (0.156) | (0.194) | (0.179) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reform UK | 0.051 | -0.080 | 0.146 | 0.027 | -0.160 | 0.099 | -0.098 |
|  | (0.213) | (0.177) | (0.202) | (0.166) | (0.156) | (0.240) | (0.165) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SNP | -0.038 | 0.002 | 0.020 | 0.619\*\*\* | -0.151 | -0.344\* | -0.188 |
|  | (0.184) | (0.213) | (0.200) | (0.231) | (0.219) | (0.199) | (0.196) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plaid Cymru | 0.169 | -0.500\* | 0.305 | 0.054 | -0.229 | -0.204 | 0.240 |
|  | (0.445) | (0.277) | (0.399) | (0.283) | (0.380) | (0.267) | (0.318) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Party | 0.059 | 0.101 | -0.149 | -0.044 | -0.075 | 0.108 | -0.020 |
|  | (0.117) | (0.181) | (0.115) | (0.125) | (0.130) | (0.132) | (0.131) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others | 0.199 | 0.042 | -0.087 | -0.069 | -0.261 | 0.095 | 0.062 |
|  | (0.201) | (0.217) | (0.210) | (0.182) | (0.228) | (0.175) | (0.185) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WNV | 0.147 | -0.064 | -0.191\* | 0.127 | -0.020 | -0.014 | -0.003 |
|  | (0.102) | (0.105) | (0.104) | (0.094) | (0.117) | (0.111) | (0.103) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DK/Ref | -0.060 | 0.036 | 0.070 | 0.070 | -0.214\*\* | 0.058 | 0.016 |
|  | (0.089) | (0.094) | (0.091) | (0.085) | (0.087) | (0.113) | (0.095) |
| Observations | 7770 | 7770 | 7770 | 7770 | 7770 | 7770 | 7770 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

**Appendix J: Manipulation Check**

This question after presenting the scenarios: ‘What was in the scene we just showed you, with statements respondents could tick. Respondents could tick any that applied. Table J1 shows the results, those who correctly identified, but also those who misattributed the characteristics, when in fact it did not appear.

**Table J1: Respondent Attributions of the Scenarios**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | % correct when assigned this treatment | N treated | % selection this option when not treated | N of non-treated |
| Researcher e- mailing pretending to be a local resident | 47.97 | 4597 | 18.27 | 3443 |
| Telling the MPs afterwards that they were part of a study, and they could withdraw | 39.26 | 3446 | 9.80 | 4594 |
| Researcher recruiting residents to be part of the study to send the e-mail to their MPs | 44.08 | 2298 | 13.78 | 5742 |
| The MPs agree to the study being carried out beforehand | 34.03 | 1155 | 12.81 | 6885 |
| MPs complain about the study | 38.45 | 1147 | 7.75 | 6893 |
| A journalist poses as a local resident | 61.92 | 1145 | 13.27 | 6895 |

**Appendix K: Analysis of Qualitative Data**

We developed a code-frame for the question ‘In more than 10 words, tell us how you feel about this study?’. We worked with a small sample to develop the categories: see Table K1.

**Table K1: Initial Code-frame**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Description** |
| Ethical | refers to scenario as ethical or ethically acceptable |
| Unethical | refers to scenario as unethical or ethically unacceptable |
| General positive sentiment | refers to scenario in a positive way - valuable, worthwhile, interesting, good, etc. |
| General negative sentiment | refers to scenario in a negative way - pointless, unethical, waste of time, etc. |
| Deception as justified | recognises the use of deception but notes it is acceptable or justified |
| Negative response to deception | refers to deception in a negative light without saying it is justified - using words like trick, lie, dodgy, fraud, sneaky, etc. |
| Mystery Shopper | references the practice of mystery shoppers as a parallel to scenario |
| Honest response from MPs | refers to scenario as a way to get an honest / genuine response from MPs |
| Anti-government/anti-politics | refers to MPs / government / politics in a negative way |
| Protective of MPs | seems to communicate protective nature of MPs / trust in MPs |
| Indifference | text where no preference is given toward scenarios or topic |
| Don’t understand/confused | text where stated lack of understanding / confusion |
| Valuable-holding MPs accountable | refers to scenario as valuable because provides way to hold MPs accountable |
| Waste of MPs time | refers to scenario as a waste of MPs time (protective of MPs) |
| Pointless/Waste of time b/c seen as not valuable study | refers to scenario as a waste of time / pointless because don't see study as valuable (NOT about protecting MPs) |
| Distrust in journalism | refers to journalist scenario in a negative light |
| Unsure/Against MP withdrawal | refers to scenario with MP withdrawal in negative way |
| Unsure/Against ex ante consent for MPs | refers to scenario with MP consent beforehand in negative way |
| Interested in potential results of study | refers to study/scenario was something interesting and would want to see its results |
| Apathy/hopelessness related to politics | refers to study/scenario as pointless/not worthwhile because won't cause MPs to change or address roots of problem in politics, etc. |

Then two coders carried out pilots of 2 x 100 randomly selected entries. There was an amendment of code-frame after each pilot to increase Inter-Coder Reliability. Inter coder reliability in first pilot: 48 per cent, in second pilot 69 per cent. This process created the final code-frame. Inter-Coder-Reliability between the two coders was 82.5 per cent. Coders then met to resolve cases, with final results reported in Table K2.

**Table K2: Codes after 2,000 Resolved Cases**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Code* | *N* | *Per cent* |
| General Positive Sentiment | 472 | 23.60% |
| Honest Response from MP/Holding MPs accountable | 366 | 18.30% |
| Thought question referred to current study | 242 | 12.10% |
| Indifference/Don't know what they think/No Opinion | 238 | 11.90% |
| Negative response to deception | 123 | 6.15% |
| Other | 117 | 5.85% |
| Anti/Apathy-government/politics | 93 | 4.65% |
| Interested in potential results of study | 80 | 4.00% |
| Don’t Understand/Confused | 64 | 3.20% |
| Waste of time/No Impact | 64 | 3.20% |
| General Negative Sentiment | 59 | 2.95% |
| Deception is justified | 56 | 2.80% |
| Distrust in journalism | 12 | 0.60% |
| Unsure/Against MP withdrawal | 8 | 0.40% |
| Unsure/Against ex ante consent | 6 | 0.30% |
|  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 2000 |  |

**Appendix L: T-Tests Between the Scenarios**

**Table L1: Acceptability Scenario Against the Rest**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Scenario* | *Diff of means* |
| A1 vs rest | -0.204\*\*\* (-3.89) |
| A2 vs rest | -0.190\*\*\* (-3.60) |
| A3 vs rest | -0.0611 (-1.15) |
| B1 vs rest | -0.126\* (-2.39) |
| B2 vs rest | -0.156\*\* (-2.94) |
| C vs rest | -0.237\*\*\* (-4.54) |
| D vs rest | 0.965\*\*\* (18.87) |

*t* statistics in parentheses

\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

**Table L2: Acceptability Scenarios One-by-One**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C | D | Confederates |
| A1 | -0.0115 | -0.122 | -0.0661 | -0.0405 | 0.0282 | -1.000\*\*\* |  |
|  | (-0.18) | (-1.85) | (-1.03) | (-0.62) | (-0.45) | (-13.42) |  |
| A2 |  | -0.111 | -0.0546 | -0.0289 | 0.0398 | -0.988\*\*\* |  |
|  |  | (-1.70) | (-0.87) | (-0.45) | (-0.64) | (-13.39) |  |
| A3 |  |  | 0.0561 | 0.0817 | 0.150\* | -0.878\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (-0.86) | (-1.23) | (-2.32) | (-11.56) |  |
| B1 |  |  |  | 0.0256 | 0.0943 | -0.934\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  | (-0.4) | (-1.51) | (-12.60) |  |
| B2 |  |  |  |  | 0.0687 | -0.959\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (-1.08) | (-12.80) |  |
| C |  |  |  |  |  | -1.028\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (-14.01) |  |
| Deception |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.0275 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (-0.70) |

Differences in means; *t* statistics in parentheses

\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

**Appendix M: Regression on Acceptability of the Study (Probit Model)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (1) |
|  | *Acceptability* |
| Female | -0.021 |
|  | (0.060) |
|  |  |
| Age | 0.004 |
|  | (0.010) |
| Age squared | -0.000 |
|  | (0.000) |
|  |  |
| Social grade |  |
| C1 | -0.075 |
|  | (0.081) |
|  |  |
| C2 | -0.097 |
|  | (0.097) |
|  |  |
| DE | 0.052 |
|  | (0.075) |
|  |  |
| White | -0.095 |
|  | (0.095) |
|  |  |
| Degree | -0.013 |
|  | (0.063) |
|  |  |
| Religious | -0.008 |
|  | (0.074) |
|  |  |
| Political interest | -0.219\*\*\* |
|  | (0.042) |
|  |  |
| Efficacy | -0.061\*\*\* |
|  | (0.019) |
| Observations | 6621 |

Standard errors in parentheses

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

**Appendix N: Interaction Analysis of Approval of Deception**

Table N1 presents several specifications, using probit models, of respondents indicating that they are glad their MP is in the study as against other responses, using key predictor variables (income was not used because of too many missing cases) and interactions between the scenarios using deception. Models show the covariates behaving as expected: men are more willing to approve of their MP in the study as are older, educated, religious people, with lower social grades (C2 and DE) more willing to hold MPs to account. Note that the probability of being ‘glad the MP was in the study’ is negatively associated with being white British in all scenarios, meaning that white British people have less likelihood to accept this sort of studies, compared to rest of ethnic groups. Inclusion of regional dummies make no impact of the modelling, so these were dropped in all models. Model 1 has religious orientation as an interaction, which is not significant. Model II examines the interaction of interest in politics, which is significant, not consistent with the anti-politics or stealth politics hypothesis. Model III uses a battery of classic assessments of statement that tap into efficacy first used by Almond and Verba (1963): ‘politicians don’t care what people like me think’; ‘it is often difficult for me to understand what is going on’; ‘people like me have no say in what government does’; ‘the main political parties in Britain are pretty much all the same’; ‘UK parties/politicians fight each other rather than further public interest’; and ‘politicians ignore the issues I really care about’. We extracted a common value using principal components (eigenvalue = 2.9) and included it into the regression, and model III shows efficacy does not predict greater willingness to hold politicians to account. Model IV tests for the interaction using each social class point, show that skilled manual workers (class C2) as more likely to favour deception when offered it. Model V tests for Conservative voters as deception favourers, but there is no evidence for this. Education in model VI shows no impact of the use of deception.

**Table N1: Views of MPs Participation in Studies with Identity Deception or Use of Confederates, Probit Models (all respondents)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | *Religious* | *Int. in Politics* | *Efficacy* | *Social grade* | *Conservative vote* | *Degree* |
| Female | 0.022 | 0.105\*\* | 0.013 | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.022 |
|  | (0.049) | (0.050) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.050) | (0.049) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 0.008 | 0.014\* | 0.004 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.008 |
|  | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.009) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Age squared | 0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -0.204\*\* | -0.202\*\* | -0.221\*\*\* | -0.204\*\* | -0.204\*\* | -0.204\*\* |
|  | (0.080) | (0.079) | (0.082) | (0.080) | (0.080) | (0.080) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | 0.106\* | 0.042 | 0.096\* | 0.108\* | 0.107\* | 0.102 |
|  | (0.057) | (0.055) | (0.058) | (0.056) | (0.057) | (0.076) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Religious | -0.013 | -0.061 | -0.017 | -0.023 | -0.023 | -0.023 |
|  | (0.079) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenarios with deception | 0.227\*\*\* | 0.355\*\*\* | 0.213\*\*\* | 0.231\*\* | 0.223\*\*\* | 0.220\*\*\* |
| (0.057) | (0.085) | (0.050) | (0.096) | (0.057) | (0.057) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | -0.026 | 0.014 | -0.040 | 0.018 | -0.026 | -0.026 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.100) | (0.073) | (0.072) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | -0.105 | -0.069 | -0.133 | -0.107 | -0.105 | -0.105 |
|  | (0.083) | (0.082) | (0.083) | (0.115) | (0.083) | (0.083) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DE | -0.140\*\* | -0.061 | -0.145\*\* | -0.164\* | -0.139\*\* | -0.140\*\* |
|  | (0.065) | (0.064) | (0.065) | (0.090) | (0.066) | (0.065) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest in politics |  | 0.637\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.077) |  |  |  |  |
| Efficacy |  |  | -0.034 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.022) |  |  |  |
| Conservative Vote |  |  |  |  | 0.013 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.082) |  |
| INTERACTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & religious | -0.018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| (0.113) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Int. in politics |  | -0.192\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.102) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & efficacy |  |  | -0.012 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.032) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C1 |  |  |  | -0.077 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.138) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C2 |  |  |  | 0.005 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.158) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade DE |  |  |  | 0.042 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.121) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & conservative |  |  |  |  | -0.006 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.110) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & degree |  |  |  |  |  | 0.008 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.103) |
| Observations | 7356 | 7349 | 7155 | 7356 | 7356 | 7356 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

Table J2L

**Table N2: Views of MPs Participation in Studies with Identity Deception or Use of Confederates, probit models (subset of respondents who passed manipulation checks) (see # of observations)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | *Religious* | *Int. in Politics* | *Efficacy* | *Social grade* | *Conservative vote* | *Degree* |
| Female | -0.006 | 0.068 | -0.006 | -0.004 | -0.015 | -0.006 |
|  | (0.064) | (0.065) | (0.065) | (0.063) | (0.064) | (0.064) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 0.020\* | 0.024\*\* | 0.016 | 0.019\* | 0.020\* | 0.020\* |
|  | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.012) | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.011) |
| Age squared | -0.000 | -0.000\* | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -0.198\* | -0.207\* | -0.196\* | -0.198\* | -0.190\* | -0.197\* |
|  | (0.107) | (0.106) | (0.111) | (0.106) | (0.107) | (0.107) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | 0.091 | 0.038 | 0.066 | 0.098 | 0.086 | 0.051 |
|  | (0.070) | (0.070) | (0.071) | (0.069) | (0.070) | (0.101) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Religious | -0.018 | -0.040 | 0.008 | -0.002 | 0.008 | 0.000 |
|  | (0.105) | (0.072) | (0.073) | (0.071) | (0.071) | (0.071) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenarios with deception | 0.260\*\*\* | 0.405\*\*\* | 0.272\*\*\* | 0.333\*\*\* | 0.238\*\*\* | 0.253\*\*\* |
| (0.077) | (0.115) | (0.064) | (0.119) | (0.074) | (0.076) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | -0.028 | 0.021 | -0.025 | 0.087 | -0.036 | -0.030 |
|  | (0.089) | (0.090) | (0.090) | (0.136) | (0.089) | (0.089) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | -0.160 | -0.124 | -0.164 | -0.088 | -0.165 | -0.160 |
|  | (0.108) | (0.107) | (0.110) | (0.153) | (0.107) | (0.108) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DE | -0.035 | 0.023 | -0.029 | -0.072 | -0.043 | -0.034 |
|  | (0.081) | (0.081) | (0.083) | (0.124) | (0.081) | (0.081) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest in politics |  | 0.580\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.104) |  |  |  |  |
| Efficacy |  |  | -0.030 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.028) |  |  |  |
| Conservative Vote |  |  |  |  | -0.198\* |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.108) |  |
| INTERACTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & religious | 0.033 |  |  |  |  |  |
| (0.139) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Int. in politics |  | -0.232\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.136) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & efficacy |  |  | 0.028 |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.037) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C1 |  |  |  | -0.199 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.176) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C2 |  |  |  | -0.121 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.205) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade DE |  |  |  | 0.067 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.152) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & conservative |  |  |  |  | 0.111 |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.145) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & degree |  |  |  |  |  | 0.073 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.133) |
| Observations | 4349 | 4348 | 4257 | 4349 | 4349 | 4349 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

**Summary of Impact of Sub-setting on Inferences from the Regressions Between Tables N1 and N2**

* **Age** becomes more significant across models (except in model 3). However. Age squared is not significant (except in model 2)
* **White** remains significant a negative across models.
* **Degree** losses significance across models.
* **Religious** remains non-significant.
* **Scenarios with deception** remain positive and significative.
* **Social grade**
  + C1 remains non-significant
  + C2 remains non-significant
  + DE losses all significance
* **Interest in politics** remains positive and significant
* **Efficacy** remains non-significant
* **Conservative vote** becomes negative and significant

Interactions

* **Deception** &
  + **Religious** remains non-significant
  + **Interest in politics** remains negative and significant
  + **Efficacy** remains non-significant
  + **C1** remains non-significant
  + **C2** remains non-significant
  + **DE** remains non-significant
  + **Conservative vote** remains non-significant
  + **Degree** remains non-significant

**Appendix N3: Views of MPs Participation in Studies with Identity Deception or Use of Confederates, probit models (Model 7 with co-partisans added)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|  | *Religious* | *Int. in Politics* | *Efficacy* | *Social grade* | *Conservative vote* | *Degree* | *Co-partisan* |
| Female | 0.022 | 0.105\*\* | 0.013 | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.021 |
|  | (0.049) | (0.050) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.050) | (0.049) | (0.049) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | 0.008 | 0.014\* | 0.004 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.007 |
|  | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.009) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.008) |
| Age squared | 0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -0.204\*\* | -0.202\*\* | -0.221\*\*\* | -0.204\*\* | -0.204\*\* | -0.204\*\* | -0.196\*\* |
|  | (0.080) | (0.079) | (0.082) | (0.080) | (0.080) | (0.080) | (0.079) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | 0.106\* | 0.042 | 0.096\* | 0.108\* | 0.107\* | 0.102 | 0.114\*\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.055) | (0.058) | (0.056) | (0.057) | (0.076) | (0.057) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Religious | -0.013 | -0.061 | -0.017 | -0.023 | -0.023 | -0.023 | -0.021 |
|  | (0.079) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenarios with deception | 0.227\*\*\* | 0.355\*\*\* | 0.213\*\*\* | 0.231\*\* | 0.223\*\*\* | 0.220\*\*\* | 0.207\*\*\* |
| (0.057) | (0.085) | (0.050) | (0.096) | (0.057) | (0.057) | (0.063) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | -0.026 | 0.014 | -0.040 | 0.018 | -0.026 | -0.026 | -0.033 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.100) | (0.073) | (0.072) | (0.072) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | -0.105 | -0.069 | -0.133 | -0.107 | -0.105 | -0.105 | -0.108 |
|  | (0.083) | (0.082) | (0.083) | (0.115) | (0.083) | (0.083) | (0.083) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DE | -0.140\*\* | -0.061 | -0.145\*\* | -0.164\* | -0.139\*\* | -0.140\*\* | -0.131\*\* |
|  | (0.065) | (0.064) | (0.065) | (0.090) | (0.066) | (0.065) | (0.065) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest in politics |  | 0.637\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.077) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficacy |  |  | -0.034 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.022) |  |  |  |  |
| Conservative Vote |  |  |  |  | 0.013 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.082) |  |  |
| Co-partisan |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.106 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.074) |
| INTERACTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & religious | -0.018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (0.113) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Int. in politics |  | -0.192\* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.102) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & efficacy |  |  | -0.012 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.032) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C1 |  |  |  | -0.077 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.138) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade C2 |  |  |  | 0.005 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.158) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & Soc. grade DE |  |  |  | 0.042 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.121) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & conservative |  |  |  |  | -0.006 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.110) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deception & degree |  |  |  |  |  | 0.008 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.103) |  |
| Deception & Co-partisan |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.041 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.100) |
| Observations | 7356 | 7349 | 7155 | 7356 | 7356 | 7356 | 7356 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

**Appendix O: Exploring Disapproval of the Journalist Scenario**

**Table O1: Predicting Relative Support for Placing MPs in the Journalist Scenario, probit models**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|  | *Gender* | *Age* | *Social grade* | *Conservative vote* | *Efficacy* | *Political interest* | *Degree* |
| Scenario D & Female | 0.039 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (0.091) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & Age |  | -0.016\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.003) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & C1 |  |  | 0.148 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.131) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D &C2 |  |  | 0.079 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.150) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & DE |  |  | -0.142 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.113) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & Conservative vote |  |  |  | -0.265\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.103) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & Efficiency |  |  |  |  | -0.052\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.027) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario D & Political interest |  |  |  |  |  | 0.030 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.100) |  |
| Scenario D & Degree |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.123 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.100) |
| Observations | 6811 | 6811 | 6811 | 6811 | 6627 | 6804 | 6811 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

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

The table shows that the Journalist Scenario D, combined with age, conservative vote and efficacy, reduce with statistical significance the support for placing their MP in the study. This time age, social grade, education, and political interest do not impact on support for placing the MP into the scenario as shown in Model 6.

**Appendix P: Reporting standards recommended by the APSA Organized Section on Experimental Research⎯Checklist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Did the author(s) report who was eligible to participate in the study? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report dates defining the periods of recruitment and when the experiments were conducted? | Yes |
| (If a survey:) Did the author(s) identify the survey firm used and describe how it recruits respondents? | Yes |
| (If a survey:) Did the author(s) provide the response rate and how it was calculated? | N/a (Quotas used) |
| Did the author(s) report whether random assignment was used? | Yes |
| If random assignment was used, did the author(s) report the unit of randomization? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report baseline means and standard deviations for pretreatment measures by experimental group? | N/a |
| Did the author(s) report what treatment was given to each of the treatment and control groups? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) make complete treatment materials available? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report how the outcome variables are measured and coded? | Yes |
| (If an index was used:) Did the author(s) report exactly how it was constructed? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report how all other variables included in the statistical models are measured and coded? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report the number of subjects initially assessed for eligibility for the study? | N/a |
| Did the author(s) report exclusions prior to random assignment and the reasons for the exclusions? | N/a |
| Did the author(s) report the number of subjects assigned to each experimental group? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report the proportion of each group that received its allocated intervention and the reasons why some did not? | N/a |
| Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that do not have outcome data? | No |
| Did the author(s) report the number of subjects in each group that are included in the statistical analysis, and the reasons for any exclusions? | Yes |
| Did the author(s) report sample means, standard deviations, and Ns for the outcome variables using intent-to-treat analysis? | No (complete for first outcome) |