Supplementary Information

A   Sample

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of SSI Sample vs. 2016 American Community Survey

	SSI sample	2016 ACS
Gender		
Male	1,325/2,719 (48.73%)	49.20%
Female	1,390/2,719 (51.12%)	50.80%
Other	4/2,719 (0.15%)	0%
Income		
Up to $29,999	801/2,717 (29.48%)	25.48%
$30,0000-$59,999	736/2,717 (27.09%)	25.07%
$60,000-$99,999	588/2,717 (21.64%)	21.76%
$100,000-$149,999	400/2,717 (14.72%)	14.13%
More than $150,000	192/2,717 (7.07%)	13.57%
Education		
Up to high school diploma	624/2,665 (23.41%)	40.66%
Some college	620/2,665 (23.26%)	19.10%
Associate degree/Bachelor's degree	970/2,665 (36.40%)	30.96%
Advanced degree	451/2,665 (16.92%)	11.19%
Age		
18−35	1,023/2,662 (38.43%)	28.52%
36−50	691/2,662 (25.96%)	23.53%
51−75	885/2,662 (33.25%)	35.27%
75+	63/2,662 (2.37%)	7.60%
Region		
Northeast	480/2,693 (17.82%)	17.69%
Midwest	591/2,693 (21.95%)	21.68%
South and Central	995/2,693 (36.95%)	38.08%
West	627/2,693 (23.28%)	22.56%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	1,727/2,653 (65.10%)	62.00%
Black	330/2,653 (12.44%)	12.30%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	44/2,653 (1.66%)	0.70%
Asian	133/2,653 (5.01%)	5.20%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11/2,653 (0.41%)	0.20%
Other	48/2,653 (1.81%)	2.30%
Hispanic/Latino	360/2,653 (13.57%)	17.30%

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of MTurk Sample vs. 2016 ACS

	mTurk sample	2016 ACS
Gender		
Male	510/1,079 (47.27%)	49.20%
Female	569/1,079 (52.73%)	50.80%
Other	0/1,079 (0.00%)	0%
Income		
Up to $29,999	286/1,079 (26.51%)	25.48%
$30,0000-$59,999	372/1,079 (34.48%)	25.07%
$60,000-$99,999	267/1,079 (24.75%)	21.76%
$100,000-$149,999	116/1,079 (10.75%)	14.13%
More than $150,000	38/1,079 (3.52%)	13.57%
Education		
Up to high school diploma	112/1,079 (10.38%)	40.66%
Some college	245/1,079 (22.71%)	19.10%
Associate degree/Bachelor's degree	561/1,079 (51.99%)	30.96%
Advanced degree	161/1,079 (14.92%)	11.19%
Age		
18–35	622/1,078 (57.70%)	28.52%
36–50	312/1,078 (28.94%)	23.53%
51–75	143/1,078 (13.27%)	35.27%
75+	1/1,078 (0.09%)	7.60%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	876/1,078 (81.26%)	62.00%
Black	74/1,078 (6.86%)	12.30%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6/1,078 (0.56%)	0.70%
Asian	53/1,078 (4.92%)	5.20%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4/1,078 (0.37%)	0.20%
Other	17/1,078 (1.58%)	2.30%
Hispanic/Latino	48/1,078 (4.45%)	17.30%

A.1 Use of online convenience samples in social science research

We rely on two online convenience samples in this paper. One is recruited directly by us using Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk (mTurk) service and the other by the firm Survey Sampling International (SSI) with quotas on race, income, region, and education. Both mTurk and SSI have been widely used in political science and the social sciences in general. Recent work in the *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, and *Political Research Quarterly* relies on samples drawn from mTurk (Isani and Silverman 2016; McDonald, Croco, and Turitto 2019; Renshon, Dafoe, and Huth 2018; Tomz and Weeks 2013) and SSI (Barker, Hurwitz, and Nelson 2008; Bullock 2011; Jennings 2016; Kertzer and Zeitzoff 2017).

While the SSI sample is not a random probability sample in which every member of the population has an equal chance of being included, the quotas bring the demographic composition of the SSI sample closer to that of the actual distribution of those features in the population of the U.S., as Table 1 illustrates. Berinsky, Margolis, and Sances (2014) show that SSI samples respond to experimental manipulations in ways that are very similar to that of probability-based samples. Additionally, members of the SSI panel exhibit levels of political knowledge that are remarkably similar to that of probability-based sample providers like YouGov.

The demographic characteristics of mTurkers have been extensively studied (Clifford, Jewell, and Waggoner 2015; Huff and Tingley 2015; Mullinix et al. 2015). mTurk samples are shown to be more representative of the public as a whole than in-person convenience samples (e.g., samples of undergraduates), but less representative than national probability samples from firms like YouGov and tend to have higher levels of political knowledge Berinsky, Huber, and Lenz (2012). Crucially, a number of widely cited survey experiments and observational studies in political science that relied on nationally representative samples have been replicated using data drawn from mTurk (Coppock and McClellan 2019; Krupnikov and Levine 2014; Mullinix et al. 2015).

A.2 Comparing mTurk and SSI samples

As we note above, the treatment effects that we observed in the mTurk sample were generally larger and more precisely estimated than those observed in the SSI sample. While these kind of differences are not always observed between samples drawn from mTurk and other sample sources, they are not rare either. For example, Powers and Renshon (2020) compare the results of an experiment fielded independently on mTurk to data from an experiment embedded in a different part of the questionnaire that we fielded on SSI for this paper. They also find much larger effects on the study fielded on mTurk. More generally, Coppock (2019) replicated several prominent studies that were previously fielded on nationally-representative samples and found larger effects in several of the samples drawn from mTurk. Given the differences of the survey timing and selection into these convenience sample frames, it is impossible to know why the effect sizes differ in magnitude. There are, however, at least two plausible explanations.

First, differences in the demographic composition of the samples could be causing the differences in effect sizes. Our mTurk sample is younger, lower income, more liberal, and more highly educated than our SSI sample. Since these characteristics may be correlated with both climate change beliefs and sensitivity to expertise, the modal member of our mTurk sample may have been more sensitive to our manipulations than the modal member of our SSI sample. To investigate this, we balanced the samples using nearest neighbor one-to-one matching (Ho et al. 2011). We balanced on age, income, education, gender, and ideology and then re-ran our analysis of the main dependent variable. We present the results in Table 3

Our matching exercise had the effect of trimming the larger SSI sample to match the demographic composition of the mTurk sample. We find that even after matching, there remain differences in the magnitude of treatment effects. This suggests to us that the differences that we observe between the SSI sample and the mTurk sample in our main analyses cannot be attributed to observable differences in the demographic

composition of the samples.

Table 3: Effect of treatment on support for COP21 in mturk and SSI samples after balancing on gender, age, edu, income, and ideology.

	Dependent variable:	
	Support for COP21	
	mTurk	SSI
	(1)	(2)
Scholars oppose	−1.05***	−0.52***
	(0.16)	(0.15)
Scholars split	−0.60***	−0.25
	(0.16)	(0.15)
Scholars support	0.09	0.11
	(0.16)	(0.15)
Constant	5.36***	4.99***
	(0.11)	(0.10)
Observations	1,078	1,078
R^2	0.06	0.02
Adjusted R^2	0.06	0.02
Residual Std. Error (df = 1074)	1.84	1.77
F Statistic (df = 3; 1074)	22.57***	6.88***

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Second, our mTurk sample was likely more attentive than our SSI sample. Berinsky, Huber, and Lenz (2012), for example, show that respondents recruited on mTurk report the correct answer to attention checks about 30 percent more often than those recruited on SSI. Our hypothesis is that these differences in attention resulted in our treatments being more effective among the mTurkers. This attention effect may have been larger than normal in our case because our study was embedded in a particularly long survey that contained both our study and a number of others. mTurkers have strong incentives to pay close attention even to long surveys since their pay often depends on demonstrating that they did, in fact, pay close attention. In our case, however, payments were not conditional on attention levels. Importantly, while mTurkers do appear to pay closer attention than respondents drawn from other online survey sample recruitment pools, their increased attention does not induce demand effects in which respondents anticipate what researchers wish to solicit and respond accordingly (Mummolo and Peterson 2019).

Some readers may wish to draw substantive conclusions from the different effect sizes obtained in the mTurk and SSI samples. We stress that such a comparison is fundamentally not identified. However, if the differences are due primarily to differences in attention levels, then one interpretation might be that the SSI results are more likely to obtain when there is cursory or incidental exposure to the information that contains the views of experts and thus may be more plausible estimates of the likely impact of exposure to this kind of information in the real world.

A.3 Results tables

Table 4: Manipulation check. Estimated effect of treatment on perceived support for joining COP21 by community without demographic controls.

	Avg. Effect	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	Avg. Effect	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-11.06**	-16.41**	-7.26**	-9.87**	-29.06**	-30.63**	-28.47**	-24.91**
	(1.43)	(2.58)	(2.24)	(2.37)	(2.15)	(3.75)	(3.19)	(3.17)
Split	-2.23	0.28	-2.85	-3.67	-8.21**	-8.37*	-7.12*	-9.03**
	(1.43)	(2.62)	(2.23)	(2.39)	(2.13)	(3.61)	(3.11)	(3.25)
Support	1.84	1.27	2.57	1.19	3.04	4.62	1.96	4.88
	(1.43)	(2.54)	(2.29)	(2.35)	(2.15)	(3.76)	(3.12)	(3.24)
Constant	63.61**	72.99**	61.45**	56.55**	70.50**	82.90**	69.81**	56.73**
	(0.98)	(1.77)	(1.57)	(1.62)	(1.53)	(2.63)	(2.19)	(2.37)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2700	876	952	872	1104	389	341	374
R^2	0.033	0.066	0.021	0.028	0.200	0.211	0.248	0.229

Standard errors in parentheses
$^{+} p < 0.10$, $^{*} p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < .01$

Table 5: Manipulation check. Estimated effect of treatment on perceived support for joining COP21 by community with demographic controls.

	Avg. Effect	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	Avg. Effect	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support	EC Support
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-11.26**	-17.03**	-8.51**	-9.03**	-30.24**	-32.11**	-28.73**	-26.32**
	(1.45)	(2.65)	(2.26)	(2.39)	(2.15)	(3.73)	(3.30)	(3.17)
Split	-2.14	-0.25	-3.52	-2.20	-8.33**	-8.31*	-5.90+	-9.74**
	(1.45)	(2.67)	(2.23)	(2.43)	(2.13)	(3.62)	(3.18)	(3.28)
Support	1.82	0.01	3.11	2.44	2.50	4.06	3.80	3.79
	(1.44)	(2.60)	(2.29)	(2.39)	(2.16)	(3.79)	(3.18)	(3.29)
Education								
Up to HS diploma	-7.14**	-3.84	-11.35**	-6.05*	1.03	-5.68	2.12	4.93
	(1.82)	(3.32)	(2.84)	(3.05)	(3.14)	(5.14)	(4.82)	(5.04)
Some college	-6.18**	-2.28	-7.02*	-9.05**	2.67	4.70	2.18	-0.15
	(1.76)	(3.23)	(2.75)	(2.90)	(2.59)	(4.32)	(4.11)	(3.85)
Associate/Bachelor	-3.55*	-0.22	-7.68**	-2.98	0.60	4.74	0.51	-2.63
	(1.55)	(2.82)	(2.42)	(2.57)	(2.23)	(3.79)	(3.56)	(3.28)
Advanced degree	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Age	0.11**	0.18**	0.08	0.05	0.25**	0.09	0.28**	0.25*
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Gender								
Male	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Female	-0.66	1.59	-0.60	-2.55	-0.79	-0.19	-0.50	0.92
	(1.05)	(1.92)	(1.63)	(1.75)	(1.52)	(2.66)	(2.32)	(2.25)
Not listed	-4.72		15.28	-31.37				
	(15.22)		(17.22)	(24.82)				
Ideology	-0.76*	-0.34	-0.50	-1.18*	-1.08*	-0.65	-0.67	-1.82**
	(0.31)	(0.56)	(0.48)	(0.51)	(0.45)	(0.78)	(0.69)	(0.67)
Race/Ethnicity								
White	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Black	1.77	-3.29	3.58	4.37	-0.26	0.90	-4.09	-1.62
	(1.64)	(2.94)	(2.51)	(2.83)	(3.01)	(4.89)	(4.41)	(5.06)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-2.40	-17.39*	6.28	1.06	-0.26	-11.90	-6.77	8.57
	(4.08)	(7.43)	(5.82)	(7.63)	(10.16)	(14.89)	(21.09)	(15.08)
Asian	-3.60	-2.97	-3.93	-3.89	3.18	5.98	-3.43	5.67
	(2.41)	(4.28)	(3.76)	(4.07)	(3.52)	(6.18)	(5.44)	(5.05)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2.71	-47.74+	2.74	16.92+	8.22	5.76	-0.13	-2.87
	(7.98)	(27.34)	(14.09)	(9.42)	(12.43)	(17.98)	(21.00)	(21.71)
Other	-3.83	-5.57	-4.64	-1.74	4.05	-2.32	-0.56	0.71
	(4.03)	(7.16)	(5.70)	(7.88)	(6.05)	(8.57)	(10.54)	(10.81)
Hispanic/Latino	1.83	3.06	4.48+	0.71	-6.00	-7.20	-3.43	-3.77
	(1.63)	(3.17)	(2.53)	(2.58)	(3.71)	(6.08)	(6.78)	(5.11)
Income quartile	1.11*	0.41	1.27	2.16*	-0.25	-2.36	2.34+	-0.38
	(0.55)	(0.99)	(0.85)	(0.92)	(0.82)	(1.45)	(1.24)	(1.19)
Constant	63.96**	67.51**	64.23**	57.91**	65.85**	85.95**	55.49**	56.78**
	(3.04)	(5.48)	(4.69)	(5.12)	(4.35)	(7.17)	(6.82)	(6.72)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2594	847	922	825	1078	378	331	369
R^2	0.055	0.092	0.065	0.075	0.230	0.261	0.287	0.283

Standard errors in parentheses
+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6: Estimated effect of treatment on support for joining COP21 by epistemic community without demographic controls.

	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-0.57**	-0.66**	-0.67**	-0.37*	-0.98**	-1.17**	-1.00**	-0.80**
	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.27)
Split	-0.18+	0.11	-0.43**	-0.19	-0.55**	-0.44+	-0.69*	-0.53+
	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.26)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Support	0.10	0.37*	-0.20	0.14	0.14	0.43	-0.17	0.14
	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Constant	4.83**	4.70**	4.97**	4.82**	5.31**	5.17**	5.47**	5.30**
	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.20)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2721	887	957	877	1106	389	343	374
R^2	0.019	0.040	0.019	0.011	0.056	0.091	0.045	0.042

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+ p < 0.10$, $^* p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < .01$

Table 7: Estimated effect of treatment on support for joining COP21 by epistemic community with demographic controls.

	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21	Support COP21
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-0.51**	-0.61**	-0.69**	-0.32*	-0.98**	-1.22**	-0.71**	-0.89**
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.23)
Split	-0.18*	0.01	-0.40*	-0.23	-0.48**	-0.33	-0.40+	-0.67**
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.24)
Support	0.13	0.27+	-0.12	0.15	0.05	0.38	-0.10	-0.01
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.24)
Education								
Up to HS diploma	-0.26*	-0.24	-0.39*	-0.15	-0.14	-0.14	-0.40	0.31
	(0.12)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.31)	(0.35)	(0.37)
Some college	-0.19+	-0.30	-0.40*	0.09	0.10	0.40	-0.06	-0.18
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.26)	(0.30)	(0.28)
Associate/Bachelor	-0.17+	-0.23	-0.29+	-0.03	-0.01	0.25	-0.15	-0.22
	(0.10)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.23)	(0.26)	(0.24)
Advanced degree	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Age	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01+	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01+	-0.01	ref.
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Gender								
Male	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Female	-0.05	0.08	-0.20+	-0.02	0.18+	-0.17	0.46**	0.30+
	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.16)
Not listed	0.23		0.88	-1.46				
	(0.97)		(1.20)	(1.64)				
Ideology	-0.43**	-0.40**	-0.38**	-0.52**	-0.58**	-0.53**	-0.60**	-0.60**
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Race/Ethnicity								
White	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Black	0.10	0.18	0.33+	-0.24	0.06	0.18	0.37	-0.27
	(0.10)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.30)	(0.32)	(0.37)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-0.42	-0.92*	0.01	-0.58	-0.49	-0.51	-0.94	-0.56
	(0.26)	(0.46)	(0.41)	(0.48)	(0.63)	(0.91)	(1.52)	(1.10)
Asian	0.06	0.31	0.13	-0.31	0.24	0.24	0.01	0.40
	(0.15)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.22)	(0.38)	(0.39)	(0.37)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	-0.32	-3.79*	-1.65+	0.69	-0.85	-0.31	0.67	-4.38**
	(0.51)	(1.71)	(0.98)	(0.62)	(0.77)	(1.10)	(1.52)	(1.58)
Other	0.18	-0.40	0.40	0.57	0.49	0.37	0.55	0.37
	(0.26)	(0.45)	(0.40)	(0.52)	(0.38)	(0.52)	(0.76)	(0.79)
Hispanic/Latino	0.07	-0.09	0.28	0.02	-0.56*	-0.94*	-0.33	-0.06
	(0.10)	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.37)	(0.49)	(0.37)
Income quartile	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.04	ref.	-0.14	0.07	0.12
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Constant	6.94**	6.86**	7.12**	7.00**	7.41**	7.73**	7.32**	7.00**
	(0.19)	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(0.27)	(0.44)	(0.49)	(0.49)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2595	847	922	826	1078	378	331	369
R^2	0.192	0.198	0.178	0.252	0.356	0.388	0.409	0.362

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+ p < 0.10$, $^* p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < .01$

Table 8: Estimated effect of the interaction between scholar treatment and respondent ideology with demographic controls.

	Dependent variable:	
	Support for COP21	
	mTurk	SSI
	(1)	(2)
Liberal	1.462***	0.864***
	(0.258)	(0.156)
Conservative	−1.228***	−1.076***
	(0.288)	(0.160)
Oppose	−0.910***	−0.635***
	(0.294)	(0.163)
Split	−0.320	−0.267
	(0.302)	(0.167)
Support	0.351	0.138
	(0.319)	(0.164)
Liberal:Oppose	−0.516	−0.076
	(0.350)	(0.229)
Conservative:Oppose	0.556	0.430*
	(0.394)	(0.227)
Liberal:Split	−0.347	0.027
	(0.356)	(0.228)
Conservative:Split	−0.001	0.207
	(0.391)	(0.232)
Liberal:Support	−0.591	−0.075
	(0.369)	(0.227)
Conservative:Support	0.013	0.139
	(0.413)	(0.229)
Constant	4.987***	4.933***
	(0.316)	(0.183)
Observations	1,078	2,595
R^2	0.339	0.184
Adjusted R^2	0.325	0.177
Residual Std. Error	1.558 (df = 1056)	1.687 (df = 2572)
F Statistic	25.744*** (df = 21; 1056)	26.330*** (df = 22; 2572)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Demographic controls included in model (age, gender, income, and, race), but excluded from table.

Table 9: Estimated effect of climate scholar treatment on COP21 approval (conservatives only).

	Dependent variable:	
	Support for COP21	
	mTurk	SSI
	(1)	(2)
Climate scholars oppose	−0.412	−0.099
	(0.614)	(0.324)
Climate scholars favor	−0.100	0.460
	(0.526)	(0.347)
Climate scholars support	0.995*	0.627*
	(0.597)	(0.328)
Constant	4.686***	3.977***
	(1.216)	(0.562)
Observations	106	273
R²	0.106	0.149
Adjusted R²	−0.020	0.110
Residual Std. Error	1.932 (df = 92)	1.899 (df = 260)
F Statistic	0.842 (df = 13; 92)	3.808*** (df = 12; 260)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Demographic controls included in model (age, gender, income, and, race), but excluded from table.

Table 10: Estimated effect of treatment on perceived knowledge of COP21 by epistemic community without demographic controls.

	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge
Treatment						
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	0.01	-0.11	-0.04	-0.10	-0.29*	0.14
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Split	0.19$^+$	ref.	0.04	0.04	-0.15	0.03
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Support	0.08	-0.01	-0.03	0.14	-0.05	0.05
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Constant	3.91**	3.49**	3.45**	4.54**	4.01**	3.61**
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	868	947	870	387	341	373
R^2	ref.4	ref.2	ref.1	ref.9	0.017	ref.3

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+$ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 11: Estimated effect of treatment on perceived knowledge of COP21 by each epistemic community with demographic controls.

	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge	Issue knowledge
Treatment						
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	0.04	-0.10	-0.01	-0.12	-0.30*	0.15
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Split	0.17	-0.01	0.08	0.07	-0.10	0.01
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Support	0.06	ref.	-0.02	0.13	0.02	0.06
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
Education						
Up to HS diploma	-0.20	-0.33**	-0.27*	0.17	-0.01	0.01
	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.22)
Some college	0.09	-0.26*	-0.07	0.13	-0.19	-0.15
	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Associate/Bachelor	0.03	-0.13	-0.18	0.20	-0.02	-0.18
	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Advanced degree	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Age	0.01**	ref.$^+$	ref.	ref.	0.01*	-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Ideology	-0.06*	-0.04$^+$	-0.04$^+$	-0.04$^+$	-0.08**	-0.06*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Race/Ethnicity						
White	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Black	-0.07	-0.08	0.06	-0.05	0.04	-0.14
	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.22)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-0.74*	0.17	-0.22	-0.67	0.34	-2.09**
	(0.31)	(0.26)	(0.34)	(0.50)	(0.85)	(0.65)
Asian	-0.12	-0.01	-0.19	-0.04	-0.27	-0.08
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1.42	0.78	0.09	0.43	-0.53	-0.86
	(1.15)	(0.62)	(0.42)	(0.60)	(0.85)	(0.94)
Other	0.06	-0.26	-0.23	0.20	0.18	0.39
	(0.31)	(0.25)	(0.35)	(0.29)	(0.43)	(0.47)
Hispanic/Latino	-0.03	0.13	0.06	-0.26	-0.47$^+$	-0.07
	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.27)	(0.22)
Income quartile	0.04	-0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.04	-0.02
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Gender						
Male	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Female	0.17*	0.11	0.02	0.09	-0.07	-0.10
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Not listed		1.07	-0.55			
		(0.76)	(1.10)			
Constant	3.62**	3.63**	3.53**	4.44**	3.98**	4.11**
	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.28)	(0.29)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	839	917	823	376	331	368
R^2	0.051	0.028	0.019	0.047	0.088	0.059

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+$ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 12: Estimated effect of treatment on perceptions of COP21 helping U.S. without demographic controls

	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-0.34**	-0.43**	-0.22	-0.39*	-0.64**	-0.86**	-0.63*	-0.42+
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.24)	(0.26)	(0.25)
Split	0.04	0.40*	-0.04	-0.22	-0.32*	-0.35	-0.38	-0.21
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.23)	(0.25)	(0.26)
Support	0.09	0.27+	0.16	-0.16	0.32*	0.36	0.19	0.41
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.26)
Constant	4.56**	4.45**	4.49**	4.75**	4.81**	4.88**	4.83**	4.71**
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.19)
Sample	SSI	SSI	SSI	SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2700	876	952	872	1104	389	341	374
R^2	ref.9	0.031	ref.6	ref.7	0.043	0.067	0.035	0.033

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+ p < 0.10, ^* p < 0.05, ^{**} p < .01$

Table 13: Estimated effect of treatment on perceptions of COP21 helping U.S. with demographic controls.

	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.	All	Climate Science	Int'l Relations	Int'l Econ.
	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.	COP21 Helps U.S.
Treatment								
Control	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Oppose	-0.31**	-0.38*	-0.23	-0.37*	-0.60**	-0.87**	-0.31	-0.46*
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.22)
Split	0.02	0.31*	-0.02	-0.27+	-0.23+	-0.16	-0.17	-0.22
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.23)
Support	0.10	0.18	0.23	-0.14	0.26*	0.36+	0.19	0.32
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)
Education								
Up to HS diploma	-0.26*	-0.21	-0.33+	-0.32	0.14	-0.25	-0.08	0.98**
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.29)	(0.33)	(0.36)
Some college	-0.22*	-0.34+	-0.38*	0.01	0.24	0.21	0.36	0.10
	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.15)	(0.25)	(0.29)	(0.27)
Associate/Bachelor	-0.15	-0.16	-0.31+	-0.06	0.11	0.01	0.13	0.18
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.13)	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.23)
Advanced degree	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Age	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.02**	-0.01+	ref.
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Gender								
Male	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Female	0.05	0.17	-0.08	0.09	0.36**	0.10	0.56**	0.46**
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Not listed	-1.11		-2.00+	0.07				
	(0.93)		(1.14)	(1.59)				
Ideology	-0.35**	-0.34**	-0.33**	-0.39**	-0.45**	-0.43**	-0.47**	-0.44**
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Race/Ethnicity								
White	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Black	0.12	0.02	0.32+	-0.00	0.32+	0.42	0.31	0.35
	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.28)	(0.31)	(0.36)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-0.54*	-1.41**	0.41	-0.92+	-0.71	-0.36	-1.05	-1.11
	(0.25)	(0.44)	(0.38)	(0.49)	(0.60)	(0.85)	(1.47)	(1.07)
Asian	0.05	0.16	0.31	-0.38	-0.09	0.25	-0.42	-0.11
	(0.15)	(0.26)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.21)	(0.35)	(0.38)	(0.36)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	-0.13	-1.54	0.31	-0.10	0.40	0.65	0.54	-1.41
	(0.49)	(1.63)	(0.93)	(0.60)	(0.74)	(1.03)	(1.46)	(1.54)
Other	0.34	0.33	0.28	0.40	0.40	0.48	0.63	-0.43
	(0.25)	(0.43)	(0.38)	(0.51)	(0.36)	(0.49)	(0.73)	(0.77)
Hispanic/Latino	0.18+	0.07	0.21	0.27	-0.30	-0.52	0.31	-0.25
	(0.10)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.35)	(0.47)	(0.36)
Income quartile	0.03	0.02	ref.	0.06	-0.02	-0.15+	0.04	0.09
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.08)
Constant	6.49**	6.45**	6.60**	6.55**	6.52**	7.38**	6.29**	5.61**
	(0.19)	(0.33)	(0.31)	(0.33)	(0.26)	(0.41)	(0.47)	(0.48)
Sample	SSI	SSI		SSI	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk	mTurk
Obs.	2594	847	922	825	1078	378	331	369
R^2	0.160	0.174	0.158	0.193	0.289	0.343	0.332	0.276

Standard errors in parentheses
$^+ p < 0.10$, $^* p < 0.05$, $^{**} p < .01$

A.4   Debrief

Thank you for your participation!

Important Information About Our Study
As part of this study, you may have seen some survey results related to what scholars think about different policy issues. These results were not real. While surveys of scholars on various issues have been conducted in the past, the specific survey results that you may have seen were fictional and not necessarily representative of the views of scholars at U.S. colleges and universities.

Why We Included Fictional Information
By randomly providing fictional information about the views of scholars to some participants and not others and by randomly varying the level of agreement among scholars, we are able estimate the average effect, if any, that this kind of information has the views of Americans. Understanding how people interpret information about expert opinion and how it affects their own preferences and attitudes helps us make sense of how people form opinions when they are asked to participate in surveys.

To Learn More
While we do not know about how all scholars feel about different types of international agreements, there is some limited information about how particular types of scholars feel about particular types of agreements. You can read about the views of international relations scholars on the Foreign Policy magazine website, the views of economists on the IGM Economic Experts website, and the views of climate scientists on NASA's Climate Change Scientific Consensus website.

References

Barker, David, Jon Hurwitz, and Traci Nelson. 2008. "Of crusades and culture wars:"Messianic" militarism and political conflict in the United States". *The Journal of Politics* 70 (2): 307–322.

Berinsky, Adam J, Gregory A Huber, and Gabriel S Lenz. 2012. "Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon. com's Mechanical Turk". *Political Analysis* 20 (3): 351–368.

Berinsky, Adam J, Michele F Margolis, and Michael W Sances. 2014. "Separating the shirkers from the workers? Making sure respondents pay attention on self-administered surveys". *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (3): 739–753.

Bullock, John. 2011. "Elite influence on public opinion in an informed electorate". *American Political Science Review* 105 (3): 496–515.

Clifford, Scott, Ryan Jewell, and Philip Waggoner. 2015. "Are samples drawn from Mechanical Turk valid for research on political ideology?" *Research & Politics* 2 (4): 2053168015622072.

Coppock, Alexander. 2019. "Generalizing from survey experiments conducted on Mechanical Turk: A replication approach". *Political Science Research and Methods* 7 (3): 613–628.

Coppock, Alexander, and Oliver A McClellan. 2019. "Validating the demographic, political, psychological, and experimental results obtained from a new source of online survey respondents". *Research & Politics* 6 (1): 2053168018822174.

Ho, Daniel E, et al. 2011. "MatchIt: nonparametric preprocessing for parametric causal inference". *Journal of Statistical Software, http://gking. harvard. edu/matchit.*

Huff, Connor, and Dustin Tingley. 2015. ""Who are these people?" Evaluating the demographic characteristics and political preferences of MTurk survey respondents". *Research & Politics* 2 (3): 2053168015604648.

Isani, Mujtaba, and Daniel Silverman. 2016. "Foreign policy attitudes toward Islamic actors: An experimental approach". *Political Research Quarterly* 69 (3): 571–582.

Jennings, Jay T. 2016. "Mixed Reactions." *Political Research Quarterly* 69 (2).

Kertzer, Joshua D, and Thomas Zeitzoff. 2017. "A bottom-up theory of public opinion about foreign policy". *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3): 543–558.

Krupnikov, Yanna, and Adam Seth Levine. 2014. "Cross-sample comparisons and external validity". *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1 (1): 59–80.

McDonald, Jared, Sarah E Croco, and Candace Turitto. 2019. "Teflon Don or Politics as Usual? An Examination of Foreign Policy Flip-Flops in the Age of Trump". *The Journal of Politics* 81 (2): 757–766.

Mullinix, Kevin, et al. 2015. "The generalizability of survey experiments". *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2 (2): 109–138.

Mummolo, Jonathan, and Erik Peterson. 2019. "Demand effects in survey experiments: An empirical assessment". *American Political Science Review* 113 (2): 517–529.

Renshon, Jonathan, Allan Dafoe, and Paul Huth. 2018. "Leader influence and reputation formation in world politics". *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (2): 325–339.

Tomz, Michael R, and Jessica LP Weeks. 2013. "Public opinion and the democratic peace". *American political science review* 107 (4): 849–865.