**Appendix A: Vignette Wording**

**Prescription Opioid Addiction Vignettes**

***Control.*** The United States is in the midst of a prescription opioid overdose epidemic. In 2014, more than 28,000 people died from opioid overdose, and at least half of those deaths involved prescription opioids, such as oxycodone, hydrocodone, and fentanyl. Many more became addicted to prescription and illegal opioids.

Critics of President Barack Obama argue that the President has ignored the opioid overdose epidemic, and has missed key opportunities to enact policies to combat opioid addiction.

***Presidential Action.*** The United States is in the midst of a prescription opioid overdose epidemic. In 2014, more than 28,000 people died from opioid overdose, and at least half of those deaths involved prescription opioids, such as oxycodone, hydrocodone, and fentanyl. Many more became addicted to prescription and illegal opioids.

Critics of President Barack Obama argue that the President has ignored the opioid overdose epidemic, and has missed key opportunities to enact policies to combat opioid addiction.

Recently, President Obama announced that he will present new policies to expand access to opioid addiction treatment programs in the coming weeks.

***Commission.*** The United States is in the midst of a prescription opioid overdose epidemic. In 2014, more than 28,000 people died from opioid overdose, and at least half of those deaths involved prescription opioids, such as oxycodone, hydrocodone, and fentanyl. Many more became addicted to prescription and illegal opioids.

Critics of President Barack Obama argue that the President has ignored the opioid overdose epidemic, and has missed key opportunities to enact policies to combat opioid addiction.

Recently, President Obama announced the creation of the Presidential Commission on Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Parity, which will formulate policy proposals for the President which would expand access to opioid addiction treatment programs.

***Commission with Expertise.*** The United States is in the midst of a prescription opioid overdose epidemic. In 2014, more than 28,000 people died from opioid overdose, and at least half of those deaths involved prescription opioids, such as oxycodone, hydrocodone, and fentanyl. Many more became addicted to prescription and illegal opioids.

Critics of President Barack Obama argue that the President has ignored the opioid overdose epidemic, and has missed key opportunities to enact policies to combat opioid addiction.

Recently, President Obama announced the creation of the Presidential Commission on Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Parity, which will formulate policy proposals for the President which would expand access to opioid addiction treatment programs. The commission will be chaired by Richard Frank, a professor at Harvard Medical School who previously served as an assistant secretary in the Department of Health and Human Services.

**Cybersecurity Vignettes**

***Control.*** In recent years, hackers have illegally accessed the personal records of American citizens and businesses through a series of coordinated cyberattacks. Through these cyberattacks, hackers have gained access to trade secrets, military weapons designs, the Social Security numbers of American citizens, and other sensitive information.

Critics of President Barack Obama assert that the President has not done enough during his two terms in office to protect the United States from cyberattacks.

***Presidential Action.*** In recent years, hackers have illegally accessed the personal records of American citizens and businesses through a series of coordinated cyberattacks. Through these cyberattacks, hackers have gained access to trade secrets, military weapons designs, the Social Security numbers of American citizens, and other sensitive information.

Critics of President Barack Obama assert that the President has not done enough during his two terms in office to protect the United States from cyberattacks.

Earlier this year, President Obama presented a plan to improve America’s cybersecurity. The President’s plan includes proposals to upgrade outdated government computer systems and to launch a campaign to encourage American corporations to improve the security of consumer financial transactions and online account information.

***Commission.*** In recent years, hackers have illegally accessed the personal records of American citizens and businesses through a series of coordinated cyberattacks. Through these cyberattacks, hackers have gained access to trade secrets, military weapons designs, the Social Security numbers of American citizens, and other sensitive information.

Critics of President Barack Obama assert that the President has not done enough during his two terms in office to protect the United States from cyberattacks.

Earlier this year, President Barack Obama announced the creation of the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity, 12-member panel which will investigate the vulnerabilities in American computer networks and recommend policies to strengthen cybersecurity in both the public and private sectors.

***Commission with Expertise.*** In recent years, hackers have illegally accessed the personal records of American citizens and businesses through a series of coordinated cyberattacks. Through these cyberattacks, hackers have gained access to trade secrets, military weapons designs, the Social Security numbers of American citizens, and other sensitive information.

Critics of President Barack Obama assert that the President has not done enough during his two terms in office to protect the United States from cyberattacks.

Earlier this year, President Barack Obama announced the creation of the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity, 12-member panel which will investigate the vulnerabilities in American computer networks and recommend policies to strengthen cybersecurity in both the public and private sectors. The President appointed former National Security Advisor Tom Donilon as the chairman of the commission, and Sam Palmisano, the former CEO of IBM as the vice-chair.

**Police-Involved Shootings Vignettes**

***Control.*** Following several high-profile incidents of deaths resulting from the use of force by police officers, the federal government recently called on local law enforcement agencies to require independent criminal investigations and independent prosecutors in cases where the use of force by police officers results in death or injury.

Supporters of this new policy argues that independent investigations of police officers’ use of force will help build “trust between communities and law enforcement,” which will improve officer safety and make it easier for officers to do their jobs.

***Presidential Action.*** Following several high-profile incidents of deaths resulting from the use of force by police officers, President Barack Obama recently called on local law enforcement agencies to require independent criminal investigations and independent prosecutors in cases where the use of force by police officers results in death or injury.

In announcing this new policy, President Obama argued that independent investigations of police officers’ use of force will help build “trust between communities and law enforcement,” which will improve officer safety and make it easier for officers to do their jobs.

***Commission.*** Following several high-profile incidents of deaths resulting from the use of force by police officers, President Barack Obama recently called on local law enforcement agencies to require independent criminal investigations and independent prosecutors in cases where the use of force by police officers results in death or injury.

This new policy is one of several recommendations put forth by the Task Force on 21st Century Policing, a commission created by President Obama to research how law enforcement agencies can continue to reduce crime rates while also building positive relationships with citizens and improving their local communities.

In announcing this new policy, President Obama said the task force’s report argued that independent investigations of police officers’ use of force will help build “trust between communities and law enforcement,” which will improve officer safety and make it easier for officers to do their jobs.

***Commission with Expertise.*** Following several high-profile incidents of deaths resulting from the use of force by police officers, President Barack Obama recently called on local law enforcement agencies to require independent criminal investigations and independent prosecutors in cases where the use of force by police officers results in death or injury.

This new policy is one of several recommendations put forth by the Task Force on 21st Century Policing, a commission created by President Obama to research how law enforcement agencies can continue to reduce crime rates while also building positive relationships with citizens and improving their local communities. The task force is co-chaired by Philadelphia Police Commissioner Charles H. Ramsey and Laurie Robinson, the Clarence J. Robinson Professor of Criminology, Law and Society at George Mason University.

In announcing this new policy, President Obama said the task force’s report argued that independent investigations of police officers’ use of force will help build “trust between communities and law enforcement,” which will improve officer safety and make it easier for officers to do their jobs.

**NSA Surveillance Vignettes**

***Control.*** In 2013, it was revealed that the National Security Agency (NSA) collected and stored data on the telephone records of American citizens. In response, political leaders expressed serious concerns about how these actions violated Americans’ constitutional right to privacy, though many also recognized the value of the data collection program in preventing terrorist attacks.

In January 2014, a new policy was announced that forbid the NSA from indiscriminately collecting phone records, and instead required the agency to obtain warrants for specific individuals’ records. The new policy, it was argued, would create a better balance between national security and civil liberties.

***Presidential Action.*** In 2013, it was revealed that the National Security Agency (NSA) collected and stored data on the telephone records of American citizens. In response, political leaders expressed serious concerns about how these actions violated Americans’ constitutional right to privacy, though many also recognized the value of the data collection program in preventing terrorist attacks.

In January 2014, President Barack Obama announced a new policy that forbid the NSA from indiscriminately collecting phone records, and instead required the agency to obtain warrants for specific individuals’ records. The new policy, President Obama argued, would create a better balance between national security and civil liberties.

***Commission.*** In 2013, it was revealed that the National Security Agency (NSA) collected and stored data on the telephone records of American citizens. In response, political leaders expressed serious concerns about how these actions violated Americans’ constitutional right to privacy, though many also recognized the value of the data collection program in preventing terrorist attacks.

In January 2014, President Barack Obama announced a new policy that forbid the NSA from indiscriminately collecting phone records, and instead required the agency to obtain warrants for specific individuals’ records. The new policy was based on the findings of the Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology, an advisory commission that the president created to examine the NSA’s intelligence-gathering practices. The new policy, President Obama argued, would create a better balance between national security and civil liberties.

***Commission with Expertise.*** In 2013, it was revealed that the National Security Agency (NSA) collected and stored data on the telephone records of American citizens. In response, political leaders expressed serious concerns about how these actions violated Americans’ constitutional right to privacy, though many also recognized the value of the data collection program in preventing terrorist attacks.

In January 2014, President Barack Obama announced a new policy that forbid the NSA from indiscriminately collecting phone records, and instead required the agency to obtain warrants for specific individuals’ records. The new policy was based on the findings of the Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology, an advisory commission that the president created to examine the NSA’s intelligence-gathering practices. The new policy, President Obama argued, would create a better balance between national security and civil liberties. The advisory commission consisted of the following five members:

Richard Clarke, former chairman of the National Security Council’s Counterterrorism Security Group

Michael Morell, former deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency

Geoffrey Stone, professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School

Cass Sunstein, professor of law at Harvard University Law School

Peter Swire, professor of law and ethics at the Georgia Institute of Technology

**Appendix B: Question Wording**

**Prescription Opioid Addiction Questions**

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the President’s handling of the opioid addiction crisis?
2. Strongly approve
3. Approve
4. Disapprove
5. Strongly disapprove
6. Over the next twelve months, do you think that the death rate associated with prescription opioid overdoses will increase, decrease, or remain the same?
7. Increase
8. Remain the same
9. Decrease
10. How likely is it that President Barack Obama’s actions will reduce the number of deaths from prescription opioid overdoses in the future?
11. Very likely
12. Fairly likely
13. Only somewhat likely
14. Not at all likely

**Cybersecurity Questions**

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the President’s handling of cybersecurity?

a. Strongly approve

b. Approve

c. Disapprove

d. Strongly disapprove

2. How confident are you that the records of your activity maintained by federal government agencies will remain private and secure?

a. Very confident

b. Somewhat confident

c. Not too confident

d. Not at all confident

3. How confident are you that the records of your activity maintained by credit card companies will remain private and secure?

a. Very confident

b. Somewhat confident

c. Not too confident

d. Not at all confident

4. How confident are you that the records of your activity maintained by your email provider will remain private and secure?

a. Very confident

b. Somewhat confident

c. Not too confident

d. Not at all confident

5. How concerned are you that computer systems of the U.S. government could be the target of a major cyber-attack, meaning that computer systems could be shut down or damaged by viruses or other hacker attacks?

a. Very concerned

b. Somewhat concerned

c. Just somewhat concerned

d. Not at all concerned

6. How concerned are you that computer systems of U.S. businesses could be the target of a major cyber-attack, meaning that computer systems could be shut down or damaged by viruses or other hacker attacks?

a. Very concerned

b. Somewhat concerned

c. Just somewhat concerned

d. Not at all concerned

7. In your opinion, what is the likelihood that the U.S. government will be subject to a major cyber-attack in the next 12 months?

a. Very likely

b. Fairly likely

c. Just somewhat likely

d. Not at all likely

8. In your opinion, what is the likelihood that U.S. businesses will be subject to a major cyber-attack in the next 12 months?

a. Very likely

b. Fairly likely

c. Just somewhat likely

d. Not at all likely

**Police-Involved Shootings Questions**

1. Do you approve or disapprove of President Obama’s handling of police-community relations?

a. Strongly approve

b. Approve

c. Disapprove

d. Strongly disapprove

2. When someone dies as a result of the use of force by police officers, how confident are you that the police department itself can conduct a fair, impartial review of the police officers’ conduct?

a. Very confident

b. Somewhat confident

c. Not very confident

d. Not at all confident

3. When someone dies as a result of the use of force by police officers, how confident are you that an independent investigator from outside of the police department can conduct a fair, impartial review of the police officers’ conduct?

a. Very confident

b. Somewhat confident

c. Not very confident

d. Not at all confident

4. When someone dies as a result of the use of force by police officers, would you prefer that the police officers’ conduct be reviewed by the police department itself, or by an independent investigator from outside of the police department?

a. Police department itself

b. Independent investigator from outside of the police department

**NSA Surveillance Questions**

1. Do you approve or disapprove of President Obama’s handling of national security?

a. Strongly approve

b. Approve

c. Disapprove

d. Strongly disapprove

2. Do you approve or disapprove of President Obama’s handling of civil liberties?

a. Strongly approve

b. Approve

c. Disapprove

d. Strongly disapprove

3. Do you agree or disagree that new restrictions on the NSA’s data collection program will make it more difficult to prevent terrorist attacks in the United States?

a. Strongly agree

b. Agree

c. Disagree

d. Strongly disagree

4. Do you agree or disagree that new restrictions on the NSA’s data collection program protects your personal information from abuse by the American intelligence community?

a. Strongly agree

b. Agree

c. Disagree

d. Strongly disagree

**Appendix C: Random Assignment Tests of Demographic and Political Variables**

**Prescription Opioid Addiction Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Control** | **Presidential Action** | **Commission** | **Commission with Expertise** | **N** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 46.0% | 47.4% | 42.4% | 47.2% | 390 |
| Male | 53.5% | 52.6% | 57.6% | 52.3% | 462 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=3.73 (6 df), p=0.71 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Party ID** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strong Democrat | 19.1% | 17.2% | 21.8% | 24.6% | 176 |
| Not very strong Democrat | 21.9% | 30.7% | 25.3% | 21.4% | 190 |
| Lean Democrat | 14.9% | 14.9% | 12.2% | 12.3% | 116 |
| Independent | 14.9% | 15.3% | 14.0% | 13.3% | 123 |
| Lean Republican | 3.7% | 4.7% | 7.4% | 6.7% | 48 |
| Not very strong Republican | 14.9% | 14.4% | 8.7% | 10.8% | 104 |
| Strong Republican | 5.6% | 7.0% | 4.8% | 7.2% | 52 |
| NA | 5.1% | 5.1% | 5.7% | 5.1% | 45 |
| Pearson χ2=15.72 (21 df), p=0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Education** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some high school, or less | 0.9% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 6 |
| High school graduate or GED | 9.8% | 13.5% | 7.9% | 12.3% | 92 |
| Some college, no 4-year degree | 38.6% | 32.1% | 35.8% | 31.8% | 296 |
| College degree | 33.0% | 36.7% | 40.2% | 37.9% | 316 |
| Post-graduate degree | 17.2% | 16.7% | 15.3% | 17.4% | 142 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=11.75 (15 df), p=0.70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 29 | 37.7% | 34.0% | 37.1% | 36.9% | 311 |
| 30 to 49 | 42.8% | 52.1% | 50.7% | 51.8% | 421 |
| 50 to 64 | 16.3% | 14.0% | 10.0% | 8.7% | 105 |
| 65 and over | 2.8% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | 15 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=16.84 (12 df), p=0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **White/Non-White** |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 74.9% | 74.0% | 72.5% | 80.0% | 642 |
| Non-White | 74.0% | 26.0% | 27.5% | 19.5% | 210 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=6.09 (6 df), p=0.41 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ideology** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 14.9% | 14.0% | 18.8% | 23.1% | 150 |
| Somewhat liberal | 37.2% | 35.8% | 34.5% | 28.2% | 291 |
| Moderate | 24.2% | 25.1% | 24.9% | 23.1% | 208 |
| Somewhat conservative | 17.2% | 17.7% | 16.6% | 21.5% | 155 |
| Very conservative | 6.0% | 7.4% | 4.4% | 3.1% | 45 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 1.0% | 5 |
| Pearson χ2=17.30 (15 df), p=0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Income** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $25,000 | 25.1% | 22.8% | 17.9% | 23.1% | 189 |
| $25,000 to $50,000 | 28.8% | 27.9% | 30.1% | 36.4% | 262 |
| $50,000 to $75,000 | 21.4% | 21.4% | 24.0% | 19.0% | 184 |
| $75,000 to $100,000 | 14.4% | 11.6% | 15.3% | 11.3% | 113 |
| $100,000 to $200,000 | 9.3% | 15.8% | 10.5% | 7.7% | 93 |
| $200,000 or more | 0.5% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 2.1% | 9 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.4% | 0.5% | 4 |
| Pearson χ2=21.93 (18 df), p=0.24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey was fielded on MTurk on August 6-7, 2016. We obtained 1021 survey responses, but we only present findings derived from the responses of the 854 respondents who successfully completed our attention task. Inferences drawn from Pearson χ2 tests of independence are consistent when subjects with missing information are excluded. | | | | | |

**Cybersecurity Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Control** | **Presidential Action** | **Commission** | **Commission with Expertise** | **N** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 42.8% | 53.3% | 41.4% | 47.7% | 391 |
| Male | 57.2% | 46.3% | 58.6% | 52.3% | 446 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=10.74 (6 df), p=0.10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Party ID** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strong Democrat | 22.5% | 22.4% | 22.7% | 7.0% | 181 |
| Not very strong Democrat | 21.4% | 18.5% | 16.4% | 18.0% | 156 |
| Lean Democrat | 10.7% | 12.0% | 10.9% | 18.6% | 96 |
| Independent | 12.8% | 14.7% | 16.8% | 12.2% | 121 |
| Lean Republican | 2.7% | 5.0% | 7.7% | 12.8% | 45 |
| Not very strong Republican | 15.5% | 15.1% | 13.2% | 5.8% | 126 |
| Strong Republican | 9.1% | 7.3% | 10.0% | 16.9% | 73 |
| NA | 5.3% | 5.0% | 2.3% | 8.7% | 40 |
| Pearson χ2=16.14 (21 df), p=76 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Education** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some high school, or less | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 4 |
| High school graduate or GED | 13.9% | 11.6% | 14.1% | 8.7% | 102 |
| Some college, no 4-year degree | 35.3% | 32.8% | 30.9% | 36.6% | 282 |
| College degree | 37.4% | 44.8% | 41.4% | 40.7% | 347 |
| Post-graduate degree | 12.3% | 10.8% | 13.2% | 12.8% | 102 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=14.28 (15 df), p=0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 29 | 31.6% | 34.0% | 35.5% | 34.9% | 285 |
| 30 to 49 | 46.5% | 46.7% | 49.1% | 47.7% | 398 |
| 50 to 64 | 18.2% | 16.6% | 10.0% | 14.5% | 124 |
| 65 and over | 3.7% | 2.7% | 5.5% | 2.9% | 31 |
| Pearson χ2=8.96 (9 df), p=0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **White/Non-White** |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 78.1% | 75.3% | 77.7% | 76.2% | 643 |
| Non-White | 21.9% | 24.3% | 22.3% | 23.8% | 194 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=2.77 (6 df), p=0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ideology** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 20.9% | 18.1% | 17.3% | 18.0% | 155 |
| Somewhat liberal | 29.4% | 29.0% | 27.7% | 20.9% | 227 |
| Moderate | 20.3% | 27.4% | 27.3% | 35.5% | 230 |
| Somewhat conservative | 20.3% | 18.5% | 20.5% | 20.9% | 167 |
| Very conservative | 8.6% | 6.9% | 7.3% | 4.7% | 58 |
| NA | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=17.33 (15 df), p=0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Income** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $25,000 | 21.9% | 22.0% | 17.3% | 22.7% | 175 |
| $25,000 to $50,000 | 36.4% | 28.6% | 37.3% | 29.7% | 275 |
| $50,000 to $75,000 | 19.3% | 20.8% | 23.2% | 22.7% | 180 |
| $75,000 to $100,000 | 9.1% | 17.0% | 10.0% | 12.8% | 105 |
| $100,000 to $200,000 | 12.3% | 10.4% | 11.4% | 9.9% | 92 |
| $200,000 or more | 1.1% | 1.2% | 0.5% | 2.3% | 10 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=20.06 (18 df), p=0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey was fielded on MTurk on January 18-20, 2017. Collection of responses ceased on January 20 at 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time. We obtained 998 survey responses, but we only present findings derived from the responses of the 838 respondents who successfully completed our attention task. With the exception of gender, inferences drawn from Pearson χ2 tests of independence are consistent when subjects with missing information are excluded; when the single subject who did not respond to our gender question is excluded, the p-value associated with our Pearson χ2 test of independence (p=0.04) leads us to reject the null hypothesis that the distributions of gender among the treatment groups are not distinguishable. Accordingly, as we report in endnote 10, we reran our analyses using an ordered logistic regression framework, including gender as a control variable, and obtained substantively similar results. | | | | | |

**Police-Involved Shootings Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Control** | **Presidential Action** | **Commission** | **Commission with Expertise** | **N** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 45.4% | 42.3% | 42.2% | 35.3% | 362 |
| Male | 54.6% | 57.7% | 57.8% | 64.7% | 512 |
| Pearson χ2=4.96 (3 df), p=0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Party ID** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strong Democrat | 24.6% | 19.1% | 26.0% | 19.5% | 195 |
| Not very strong Democrat | 21.7% | 25.1% | 22.1% | 25.1% | 205 |
| Lean Democrat | 12.9% | 15.8% | 9.3% | 17.7% | 122 |
| Independent | 12.9% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 12.6% | 114 |
| Lean Republican | 7.1% | 4.7% | 3.9% | 4.7% | 45 |
| Not very strong Republican | 8.8% | 11.2% | 11.3% | 11.6% | 93 |
| Strong Republican | 8.3% | 7.9% | 8.8% | 4.7% | 65 |
| NA | 3.8% | 2.8% | 5.4% | 4.2% | 35 |
| Pearson χ2=19.23 (21 df), p=0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Education** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some high school, or less | 0.8% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.9% | 6 |
| High school graduate or GED | 7.5% | 9.8% | 10.3% | 10.7% | 83 |
| Some college, no 4-year degree | 32.5% | 32.1% | 34.8% | 31.2% | 285 |
| College degree | 42.9% | 47.0% | 42.2% | 40.0% | 376 |
| Post-graduate degree | 16.3% | 11.2% | 11.8% | 17.2% | 124 |
| Pearson χ2=9.55 (12 df), p=0.66 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 29 | 47.9% | 46.0% | 39.7% | 40.9% | 383 |
| 30 to 49 | 40.4% | 44.2% | 47.1% | 47.9% | 391 |
| 50 to 64 | 10.0% | 8.8% | 12.7% | 9.3% | 89 |
| 65 and over | 1.3% | 0.9% | 0.5% | 1.8% | 10 |
| NA | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=10.45 (12 df), p=0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **White/Non-White** |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 75.8% | 72.1% | 71.1% | 73.5% | 640 |
| Non-White | 24.2% | 27.9% | 28.9% | 26.5% | 234 |
| NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson χ2=1.46 (3 df), p=0.69 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ideology** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 18.8% | 18.1% | 26.5% | 23.7% | 189 |
| Somewhat liberal | 33.8% | 37.2% | 28.4% | 33.0% | 290 |
| Moderate | 24.2% | 21.9% | 20.6% | 20.0% | 190 |
| Somewhat conservative | 17.9% | 17.2% | 16.2% | 19.1% | 154 |
| Very conservative | 5.4% | 5.6% | 7.8% | 4.2% | 50 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=14.67 (15 df), p=0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Income** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $25,000 | 22.9% | 20.5% | 23.5% | 20.9% | 192 |
| $25,000 to $50,000 | 32.1% | 38.6% | 32.8% | 31.6% | 295 |
| $50,000 to $75,000 | 19.2% | 19.5% | 19.1% | 21.4% | 173 |
| $75,000 to $100,000 | 11.3% | 14.4% | 12.7% | 10.7% | 107 |
| $100,000 to $200,000 | 12.5% | 6.0% | 11.3% | 13.5% | 95 |
| $200,000 or more | 2.1% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 1.9% | 11 |
| NA | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=18.14 (18 df), p=0.45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey was fielded on MTurk on August 9-10, 2016. We obtained 1012 survey responses, but we only present findings derived from the responses of the 874 respondents who successfully completed our attention task. Inferences drawn from Pearson χ2 tests of independence are consistent when subjects with missing information are excluded. | | | | | |

**NSA Surveillance Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Control** | **Presidential Action** | **Commission** | **Commission with Expertise** | **N** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 45.5% | 43.7% | 44.2% | 40.3% | 389 |
| Male | 54.1% | 55.9% | 55.8% | 59.7% | 503 |
| NA | 0.4% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=3.32 (6 df), p=0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Party ID** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strong Democrat | 19.0% | 20.7% | 18.0% | 21.8% | 177 |
| Not very strong Democrat | 24.0% | 19.2% | 22.3% | 23.8% | 200 |
| Lean Democrat | 13.2% | 16.9% | 16.3% | 12.1% | 131 |
| Independent | 15.3% | 14.1% | 16.3% | 16.0% | 138 |
| Lean Republican | 4.1% | 7.0% | 6.9% | 3.4% | 48 |
| Not very strong Republican | 13.2% | 13.6% | 11.2% | 13.1% | 114 |
| Strong Republican | 7.0% | 5.2% | 2.6% | 4.9% | 44 |
| NA | 4.1% | 3.3% | 6.4% | 4.9% | 42 |
| Pearson χ2=17.47 (21 df), p=0.68 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Education** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some high school, or less | 0.4% | 1.4% | 0.4% | 1.5% | 8 |
| High school graduate or GED | 10.3% | 9.4% | 12.9% | 8.3% | 92 |
| Some college, no 4-year degree | 32.2% | 35.2% | 34.3% | 29.1% | 293 |
| College degree | 47.1% | 44.1% | 37.3% | 49.5% | 397 |
| Post-graduate degree | 9.9% | 9.9% | 15.0% | 11.7% | 104 |
| Pearson χ2=14.20 (12 df), p=0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 to 29 | 41.3% | 39.0% | 45.9% | 36.9% | 366 |
| 30 to 49 | 50.8% | 50.2% | 44.2% | 51.9% | 440 |
| 50 to 64 | 6.2% | 8.5% | 7.8% | 9.2% | 70 |
| 65 and over | 1.7% | 2.3% | 2.1% | 1.9% | 18 |
| Pearson χ2=5.86 (9 df), p=0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **White/Non-White** |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 71.9% | 78.4% | 75.1% | 77.2% | 675 |
| Non-White | 27.7% | 21.6% | 24.9% | 22.3% | 217 |
| NA | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 2 |
| Pearson χ2=4.90 (6 df), p=0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ideology** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 19.0% | 17.8% | 14.6% | 18.4% | 156 |
| Somewhat liberal | 32.2% | 33.8% | 31.3% | 33.5% | 292 |
| Moderate | 27.3% | 22.5% | 35.2% | 21.8% | 241 |
| Somewhat conservative | 16.5% | 20.7% | 16.7% | 22.3% | 169 |
| Very conservative | 5.0% | 5.2% | 2.1% | 3.9% | 36 |
| Pearson χ2=17.44 (12 df), p=0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Income** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $25,000 | 19.0% | 19.2% | 21.0% | 19.4% | 176 |
| $25,000 to $50,000 | 33.9% | 29.6% | 39.9% | 30.6% | 301 |
| $50,000 to $75,000 | 21.9% | 23.0% | 19.7% | 24.8% | 199 |
| $75,000 to $100,000 | 12.4% | 15.5% | 9.4% | 13.6% | 113 |
| $100,000 to $200,000 | 11.6% | 11.7% | 9.9% | 11.7% | 100 |
| $200,000 or more | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| NA | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Pearson χ2=16.44 (18 df), p=0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey was fielded on MTurk on September 27-28, 2016. We obtained 1018 survey responses, but we only present findings derived from the responses of the 894 respondents who successfully completed our attention task. Inferences drawn from Pearson χ2 tests of independence are consistent when subjects with missing information are excluded. | | | | | |

**Appendix D: Experimental Results**

**Prescription Opioid Addiction Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Treatment Group | Mean Response | 95% Confidence Interval | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from control) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from presidential action) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from commission) |
| Question 1: Approval of Presidential Handling | Control | 2.39 | [2.28, 2.49] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.70 | [2.61, 2.79] | 4.52 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.79 | [2.70, 2.87] | 5.90 | 1.38 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.75 | [2.64, 2.86] | 4.84 | 0.76 | 0.47 |
| Question 2: Death Rate (3-point scale, from 1 to 3) | Control | 1.68 | [1.59, 1.76] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 1.93 | [1.84, 2.02] | 3.93 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.04 | [1.95, 2.13] | 5.71 | 1.66 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 1.96 | [1.86, 2.05] | 4.29 | 0.42 | 1.21 |
| Question 3: Effectiveness | Control | 1.79 | [1.68, 1.89] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.19 | [2.09, 2.29] | 5.45 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.25 | [2.14, 2.36] | 5.95 | 0.78 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.23 | [2.12, 2.34] | 5.63 | 0.54 | 0.21 |
| For each question, we present the mean response and the 95% confidence interval on the appropriate scale (4-point scale from 1 to 4 unless otherwise specified) for subjects in each treatment group. We also present the |*t*| statistics from difference-in-means tests (assuming unequal variances) which compare the mean response in the control group to the mean response in each of the other treatment conditions, and which compare the mean responses among the treatment groups. | | | | | | |

**Cybersecurity Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Treatment Group | Mean Response | 95% Confidence Interval | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from control) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from presidential action) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from commissions) |
| Question 1: Approval of President's Handling | Control | 2.42 | [2.31, 2.54] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.77 | [2.68, 2.87] | 4.68 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.67 | [2.56, 2.77] | 3.12 | 1.45 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.80 | [2.69, 2.92] | 4.64 | 0.40 | 1.70 |
| Question 2: Confidence in Gov. Records | Control | 2.28 | [2.15, 2.40] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.33 | [2.23, 2.43] | 0.67 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.19 | [2.08, 2.30] | 1.02 | 1.89 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.29 | [2.16, 2.41] | 0.12 | 0.54 | 1.16 |
| Question 3: Confidence in Credit Card Company (4-point scale) | Control | 2.40 | [2.28, 2.51] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.39 | [2.30, 2.49] | 0.06 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.29 | [2.17, 2.40] | 1.36 | 1.41 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.35 | [2.23, 2.47] | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.75 |
| Question 4: Confidence in Email Provider | Control | 2.26 | [2.14, 2.38] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.20 | [2.09, 2.30] | 0.81 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.25 | [2.13, 2.36] | 0.18 | 0.62 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.31 | [2.18, 2.44] | 0.58 | 1.37 | 0.76 |
| Question 5: Concern for Gov. Attack | Control | 2.89 | [2.77, 3.01] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.98 | [2.88, 3.08] | 1.18 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.98 | [2.87, 3.09] | 1.16 | 0.02 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.93 | [2.81, 3.05] | 0.49 | 0.63 | 0.62 |
| Question 6: Concern for Business Attack | Control | 2.94 | [2.82, 3.06] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.91 | [2.81, 3.02] | 0.33 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.99 | [2.88, 3.09] | 0.56 | 0.96 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 3.00 | [2.88, 3.12] | 0.69 | 1.07 | 0.17 |
| Question 7: Likelihood of Gov. Attack | Control | 2.66 | [2.55, 2.78] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.71 | [2.61, 2.81] | 0.61 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.72 | [2.60, 2.84] | 0.72 | 0.16 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.75 | [2.62, 2.88] | 1.00 | 0.48 | 0.31 |
| Question 8: Likelihood of Business Attack | Control | 2.86 | [2.74, 2.98] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.81 | [2.71, 2.92] | 0.57 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.78 | [2.65, 2.90] | 0.94 | 0.46 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.94 | [2.81, 3.06] | 0.91 | 1.58 | 1.86 |
| For each question, we present the mean response and the 95% confidence interval on the appropriate scale (4-point scale from 1 to 4 unless otherwise specified) for subjects in each treatment group. We also present the |*t*| statistics from difference-in-means tests (assuming unequal variances) which compare the mean response in the control group to the mean response in each of the other treatment conditions, and which compare the mean responses among the treatment groups. | | | | | | |

**Police-Involved Shootings Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Treatment Group | Mean Response | 95% Confidence Interval | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from control) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from presidential action) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from commissions) |
| Question 1: Approval of President's Handling | Control | 2.82 | [2.72, 2.92] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 3.10 | [3.00, 3.20] | 3.85 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.97 | [2.86, 3.08] | 2.01 | 1.69 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 3.11 | [3.02, 3.20] | 4.31 | 0.20 | 1.98 |
| Question 2: Confidence in Department Review | Control | 2.09 | [1.98, 2.20] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.00 | [1.88, 2.13] | 1.01 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.07 | [1.95, 2.19] | 0.22 | 0.74 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.03 | [1.91, 2.14] | 0.74 | 0.27 | 0.48 |
| Question 3: Confidence in Independent Review | Control | 2.98 | [2.89, 3.07] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 3.05 | [2.96, 3.14] | 1.19 | - | - |
| Commission | 3.02 | [2.93, 3.11] | 0.69 | 0.49 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.94 | [2.85, 3.03] | 0.56 | 1.77 | 1.25 |
| Question 4: Prefer Independent to Department Review (binary choice) | Control | 0.91 | [0.88, 0.95] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 0.92 | [0.88, 0.95] | 0.14 | - | - |
| Commission | 0.88 | [0.84, 0.93] | 1.04 | 1.15 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 0.90 | [0.86, 0.94] | 0.37 | 0.5 | 0.66 |
| For each question, we present the mean response and the 95% confidence interval on the appropriate scale (4-point scale from 1 to 4 unless otherwise specified) for subjects in each treatment group. We also present the |*t*| statistics from difference-in-means tests (assuming unequal variances) which compare the mean response in the control group to the mean response in each of the other treatment conditions, and which compare the mean responses among the treatment groups. | | | | | | |

**NSA Surveillance Experiment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Treatment Group | Mean Response | 95% Confidence Interval | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from control) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from presidential action) | Difference-in-means *|t|* (from commission) |
| Question 1: Approval of President's Handling of National Security | Control | 2.81 | [2.72, 2.91] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.96 | [2.85, 3.07] | 1.97 | - | - |
| Commission | 3.00 | [2.90, 3.10] | 2.78 | 0.57 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.91 | [2.81, 3.01] | 1.45 | 0.61 | 1.28 |
| Question 2: Approval of President's Handling of Civil Liberties | Control | 2.75 | [2.65, 2.85] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.92 | [2.81, 3.04] | 2.30 | - | - |
| Commission | 3.00 | [2.89, 3.10] | 3.42 | 0.92 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.95 | [2.84, 3.05] | 2.69 | 0.28 | 0.66 |
| Question 3: Agree New Policy Makes It Difficult to Prevent Attacks | Control | 2.32 | [2.22, 2.41] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.25 | [2.14, 2.36] | 0.88 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.23 | [2.13, 2.34] | 1.17 | 0.23 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.28 | [2.17, 2.39] | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.65 |
| Question 4: Agree New Policy Protects Personal Information | Control | 2.65 | [2.55, 2.76] | - | - | - |
| Presidential Action | 2.72 | [2.62, 2.83] | 0.93 | - | - |
| Commission | 2.76 | [2.65, 2.86] | 1.37 | 0.43 | - |
| Commission with Expertise | 2.81 | [2.70, 2.91] | 2.02 | 1.09 | 0.66 |
| For each question, we present the mean response and the 95% confidence interval on the appropriate scale (4-point scale from 1 to 4 unless otherwise specified) for subjects in each treatment group. We also present the |*t*| statistics from difference-in-means tests (assuming unequal variances) which compare the mean response in the control group to the mean response in each of the other treatment conditions, and which compare the mean responses among the treatment groups. | | | | | | |