This item was submitted to Loughborough's Research Repository by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Suplementary information files for Projection in the face of centrism: voter inferences about candidates' party affiliation in low-information context

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

LICENCE

CC BY-NC 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Kevins, Anthony, and Seonghui Lee. 2022. "Suplementary Information Files for Projection in the Face of Centrism: Voter Inferences About Candidates' Party Affiliation in Low-information Context". Loughborough University. https://doi.org/10.17028/rd.lboro.20368098.v1.

Online Appendix

S1. Sample characteristics

TABLE S1.1. Sample characteristics

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Male					
Canada	1352	0.491	0.500	0	1
UK	1403	0.485	0.500	0	1
US	2236	0.499	0.500	0	1
Age					
Canada	1352	47.44	15.72	18	76
UK	1403	45.28	15.70	18	76
US (age category)	2236	4.65	1.67	2	7
Race/Ethnicity = White					
Canada	1352	0.763	0.425	0	1
UK	1403	0.929	0.256	0	1
US	2236	0.746	0.435	0	1
Social class					
Canada	1352	1.963	1.070	1	5
UK	1403	1.824	1.122	1	5
US	2236	2.573	0.961	1	5
Went to public school					
Canada	1352	0.871	0.335	0	1
UK	1403	0.855	0.353	0	1
US	2236	0.746	0.435	0	1
Immigration background					
Canada	1352	0.325	0.469	0	1
UK	1403	0.175	0.380	0	1
US	2236	0.157	0.364	0	1
Ideology					
Canada (left-right)	1183	5.223	2.699	0	10
UK (left-right)	1218	5.034	2.795	0	10
US (liberal-conservative)	2002	3.052	1.137	1	5

NB: Fieldwork was carried out in Canada and the UK in December 2017, and in the US in July 2018.

S2. Key variables

TABLE S2.1. Assumed party of candidate

	N	Percent
Canada		
NDP	317	23.45
Liberal	361	26.70
Conservative	323	23.89
Green	83	6.14
Other	47	3.48
Don’t Know	221	16.35
UK		
Labour	349	24.88
Liberal Democrats	386	27.51
Conservative	314	22.38
Greens	54	3.85
Other	51	3.64
Don’t Know	249	17.75
US		
Democrats	735	32.96
Republican	526	23.59
Green	93	4.17
Other	196	8.79
Don’t Know	680	30.49

TABLE S2.2. Descriptive statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Projection					
Canada	993	0.386	0.487	0	1
UK	1060	0.311	0.463	0	1
US	1845	0.444	0.497	0	1
Counter-projection					
Canada	594	0.182	0.386	0	1
UK	894	0.160	0.367	0	1
US	1845	0.190	0.393	0	1
Shared Class					
Canada	993	0.367	0.482	0	1
UK	1060	0.410	0.492	0	1
US	1845	0.354	0.478	0	1
Shared Race/Ethnicity					
Canada	993	0.464	0.499	0	1
UK	1060	0.453	0.498	0	1
US	1845	0.486	0.500	0	1

S3. Main Results

TABLE S3.1. The effects of shared characteristics on projection

	(1) Canada	(2) UK	(3) USA	(4) Canada	(5) UK	(6) USA
Class	0.412**	0.462**	0.402**			
	(0.137)	(0.136)	(0.100)			
Race/Ethnicity	-0.109	0.140	0.194*			
	(0.133)	(0.135)	(0.095)			
Age	-0.210	0.165	0.215+			
	(0.177)	(0.161)	(0.129)			
Male	0.172	0.036	0.267**			
	(0.132)	(0.135)	(0.096)			
Immigration	0.117	0.264	0.297*			
	(0.141)	(0.176)	(0.129)			
Schooling	0.188	-0.093	0.170+			
	(0.133)	(0.136)	(0.096)			
Ideology	0.519**	0.295+	0.070			
	(0.162)	(0.170)	(0.103)			
Similarity Score				0.175**	0.128+	0.230**
				(0.063)	(0.055)	(0.046)
Constant	-0.873**	-1.167**	-0.790**	-0.775**	-0.999**	-0.604**
	(0.152)	(0.157)	(0.108)	(0.130)	(0.131)	(0.090)
N	993	1060	1845	993	1060	1845
Pseudo R^2	0.020	0.015	0.019	0.006	0.003	0.010
Log likelihood	-648.616	-647.386	-1243.165	-658.227	-655.669	-1254.790

Note: Cells contain logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01. All variables (save for the similarity score) are dichotomous and indicate an overlap between the described candidate and the respondent.

TABLE S3.2. The effects of in-group/out-group divisions on counter-projection

	(1) Canada	(2) UK	(3) US
Contrasting Characteristic			
Class	0.219	0.145	0.498**
	(0.228)	(0.188)	(0.132)
Race/Ethnicity	-0.115	0.118	0.161
	(0.213)	(0.184)	(0.120)
Constant	-1.589**	-1.813**	-1.872**
	(0.213)	(0.182)	(0.130)
N	594	894	1845
Pseudo R^2	0.002	0.001	0.009
Log likelihood	-281.054	-392.500	-889.463

Note: Cells contain logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01.

S4. Additional analysis for testing H4

As a robustness test of the results reported in Table 2, we ran the same model but with a narrower sample to reduce the risk that respondents' perceptions of the candidate's partisanship could be driven by stereotyping rather than counter-projection.

Specifically, we remove cases from the sample where counter-projection and stereotyping would align: for example, when a lower-status Democrat read about a higher-status candidate, both counter-projection and stereotyping could lead to perceiving the candidate as a Republican. Results are reported in Models 2, 4, and 6 in Table S3 below. For comparison, models 1, 3, and 5 are the results reported in Table 2.

TABLE S4.1. The effects of in-group/out-group divisions on counter-projection (original sample versus subsample)

	(1) Canada	(2) Canada Subsample	(3) UK	(4) UK Subsample	(5) US	(6) US Subsample
Contrasting Characteristic						
Class	0.219	0.029	0.145	-0.452	0.498**	0.556**
	(0.228)	(0.271)	(0.188)	(0.266)	(0.132)	(0.150)
Race/Ethnicity	-0.115	0.219	0.118	0.074	0.161	0.306*
	(0.213)	(0.273)	(0.184)	(0.248)	(0.120)	(0.151)
Constant	-1.589**	-1.756**	-1.813**	-1.788**	-1.872**	-1.954**
	(0.213)	(0.236)	(0.182)	(0.204)	(0.130)	(0.142)
N	594	400	894	588	1845	1224
Pseudo R2	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.007	0.009	0.015
Log likelihood	-281.054	-178.808	-392.500	-224.780	-889.463	-570.752

Note: The results in (1), (3), and (5) are identical to Appendix TABLE S3.2; Standard errors in parentheses; *p<0.05, ** 0<0.01.