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In the Crowdsourced Replication Initiative (CRI)1 there were 204 researchers who volunteered to engage in a replication and expansion of a well-known study on immigration and social policy preferences2. During this project, four waves of survey data were collected in the period from August 20th, 2018 to January 20th, 2019. Survey questions with identifying features have been removed to protect participant anonymity. The data are available in the file cri\_survey\_long\_public.dta.

We speculated that researchers’ own qualities might influence their replications, research designs and expansion results. Therefore, we surveyed researchers on both objective criteria, such as experience with methods and the substantive topic, and subjective criteria, such as their own beliefs about the hypothesis and immigration in general. In addition, we asked them questions about their time commitment, constraints they faced and some other feedback about the process of crowdsourcing.

(1) Breznau, N.; Rinke, E. M.; Wuttke, A. Crowdsourced Replication Initiative: Executive Report. *SocArXiv* **2019**. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/6j9qb/>.

(2) Brady, D.; Finnigan, R. Does Immigration Undermine Public Support for Social Policy? *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **2014**, *79* (1), 17–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413513022>.

**WAVE 1: August 20th, 2018**

Fielded via Unipark, WAVE 1 was sent to all 213 persons who registered to take part in the CRI. Missing values indicated throughout the codebook by “**.a**”. Nine of the registrants did not respond at all, therefore the persistent 9 cases of missing in WAVE 1 are those survey non-respondents, meaning the WAVE 1 respondent sample is 204. This drops further in WAVE 2 to 189 after 15 participants dropped out of the project.

[Machine generated variable]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | dispcode |  | |  |
| Variable label: | Survey Completion |  | |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | | Percent |
| 12 | Invited, not completed | 9 | | 4.2% |
| 31 | Completed | 196 | | 92.0% |
| 32 | Completed after break | | 8 | 3.8% |

[Teams randomly assigned into two groups]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | u\_expgroup | | |
| Variable label: | Experimental Grouping Structure – after random assignment | | |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | Opaque Replication Group | 114 | 53.5% |
| 1 | Transparent Replication Group | 99 | 46.5% |

*In the Crowdsourced Replication Initiative, we want to ask you a few background questions to gain a general overview of the researchers participating. First, in which area of research have you received your highest degree?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | backgr\_degree |  |  |
| Variable label: | Area of Highest Degree |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Communication | 4 | 1.9% |
| 2 | Economics | 10 | 4.7% |
| 3 | Sociology | 98 | 46.0% |
| 4 | Political Science | 53 | 24.9% |
| 5 | Psychology | 17 | 8.0% |
| 6 | Other | 13 | 6.1% |
| 7 | Methods-Related Degree | 9 | 4.2% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*Please indicate whether you have published research in the following research areas and / or used multilevel regression analysis in your published research*

[question battery follows]

*On (im)migration*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_17 |  |  |
| Variable label: | On (im)migration |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No | 128 | 60.1% |
| 2 | Yes, once | 33 | 15.5% |
| 3 | Yes, more than one publication | 42 | 19.7% |
| .a |  | 10 | 4.7% |

*On statistics/methods*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_18 |  |  |
| Variable label: | On statistics/methods |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No | 119 | 55.9% |
| 2 | Yes, once | 39 | 18.3% |
| 3 | Yes, more than one publication | 44 | 20.7% |
| .a |  | 11 | 5.2% |

*On public policy / welfare state*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_19 |  |  |
| Variable label: | On public policy / welfare state | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No | 143 | 67.1% |
| 2 | Yes, once | 27 | 12.7% |
| 3 | Yes, more than one publication | 31 | 14.6% |
| .a |  | 12 | 5.6% |

*On social policy preferences / public opinion*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_20 |  |  |
| Variable label: | On social policy preferences / public opinion | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No | 125 | 58.7% |
| 2 | Yes, once | 26 | 12.2% |
| 3 | Yes, more than one publication | 51 | 23.9% |
| .a |  | 11 | 5.2% |

*Using multilevel regression*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_21 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Used multilevel regression |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No | 73 | 34.3% |
| 2 | Yes, once | 52 | 24.4% |
| 3 | Yes, more than one publication | 78 | 36.6% |
| .a |  | 10 | 4.7% |

*How many undergraduate- or graduate-level courses in quantitative data analysis/applied statistics have you taught as the primary active instructor (including primary teaching responsibilities for a lab, Übung, or additional component of a course)?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | backgr\_exp\_teach\_stat |  |  |
| Variable label: | Teaching Statistics |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | 0 | 59 | 27.7% |
| 2 | 1 | 27 | 12.7% |
| 3 | 2 | 34 | 16.0% |
| 4 | 3 | 18 | 8.5% |
| 5 | 4 | 12 | 5.6% |
| 6 | 5 | 9 | 4.2% |
| 7 | 6 | 6 | 2.8% |
| 8 | 7 | 4 | 1.9% |
| 9 | 8 | 5 | 2.3% |
| 10 | 9 | 1 | 0.5% |
| 11 | 10 | 1 | 0.5% |
| 12 | 10+ | 28 | 13.1% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*How familiar are you with multilevel modelling?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | backgr\_exp\_famil\_mlm |  |  |
| Variable label: | Familiarity with multilevel modelling | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 |  | 4 | 1.9% |
| 2 |  | 14 | 6.6% |
| 3 |  | 65 | 30.5% |
| 4 |  | 82 | 38.5% |
| 5 |  | 39 | 18.3% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*The topic of the OSSC19 Crowdsourced Replication Initiative is immigration and social policy. Specifically, it wants to test a common hypothesis in the literature that a greater stock or a greater increase in the stock of foreign persons in a given society leads the general public to become less supportive of social policy, where “social policy” refers to any policy that provides basic protections, social insurance, welfare or well-being services, income replacement or active labor market programs. In short, what many scholars refer to as the ‘social welfare state’. We will replicate a study working with survey data asking questions of the public about the social welfare state, but we are also interested in what you think.*

*Is it your belief that higher levels of immigrant stock or greater increases in immigrant stock in a given country reduces public support of social welfare policies in general?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_H1\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Personal Belief about H1, general | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 6 | 2.8% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 114 | 53.5% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 70 | 32.9% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 14 | 6.6% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*Now please give us your statement on this topic more specifically. In each of these policy domains, how do you think of higher stocks of immigrants?*

*If you are unsure, please indicate your best guess.*

[question battery]

*Old age care?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_agecare\_1 | |  |  | |
| Variable label: | Old age care | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| Value | Label | | Freq. | Percent | |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | | 9 | 4.2% | |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | | 19 | 8.9% | |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | | 161 | 75.6% | |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | | 15 | 7.0% | |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | | | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | | 9 | 4.2% | |

*Unemployment?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_unempl\_1 | |  |  | |
| Variable label: | Unemployment | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| Value | Label | | Freq. | Percent | |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | | 26 | 12.2% | |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | | 115 | 54.0% | |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | | 43 | 20.2% | |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | | 20 | 9.4% | |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | | | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | | 9 | 4.2% | |

*Income redistribution?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_income\_1 | |  |  | |
| Variable label: | Income redistribution | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| Value | Label | | Freq. | Percent | |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | | 24 | 11.3% | |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | | 100 | 46.9% | |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | | 70 | 32.9% | |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | | 10 | 4.7% | |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | | | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | | 9 | 4.2% | |

*Housing?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_housing\_1 | |  |  | |
| Variable label: | Housing | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| Value | Label | | Freq. | Percent | |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | | 11 | 5.2% | |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | | 95 | 44.6% | |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | | 80 | 37.6% | |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | | 17 | 8.0% | |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | | | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | | 10 | 4.7% | |

*Active labor market programs?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_labour\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Active labor market programs | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Labe | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 9 | 4.2% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 64 | 30.0% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 85 | 39.9% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 44 | 20.7% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 2 | 0.9% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*Health care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_health\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Health care |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 9 | 4.2% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 50 | 23.5% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 135 | 63.4% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 9 | 4.2% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 1 | 0.5% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*You just indicated your beliefs about the effects of immigration on public support of social policies. How certain are you that your beliefs about this relationship are correct?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_certainty\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Certainty in belief about immigration hypothesis | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | very uncertain | 28 | 13.1% |
| 2 |  | 63 | 29.6% |
| 3 |  | 29 | 13.6% |
| 4 |  | 45 | 21.1% |
| 5 |  | 29 | 13.6% |
| 6 |  | 8 | 3.8% |
| 7 | very certain | 2 | 0.9% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*Now, we are interested in your own opinions on the substantive topic of the Crowdsourced Replication Initiative. Do you think that, in your current country of residence, laws on immigration of foreigners should be relaxed or made tougher?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | attitude\_immigration\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Personal opinion on immigration laws | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration laws should be relaxed | 37 | 17.4% |
| 2 |  | 57 | 26.8% |
| 3 |  | 49 | 23.0% |
| 4 |  | 40 | 18.8% |
| 5 |  | 10 | 4.7% |
| 6 |  | 7 | 3.3% |
| 7 | Immigration laws should be made tougher | 2 | 0.9% |
| .a |  | 11 | 5.2% |

*Some political topics are of greater personal importance than others. How important is the issue of immigration to you personally?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | attitude\_importance\_1 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Attitude Importance |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | not important at all | 4 | 1.9% |
| 2 | not very important | 15 | 7.0% |
| 3 | moderately important | 53 | 24.9% |
| 4 | important | 92 | 43.2% |
| 5 | very important | 40 | 18.8% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

*After all members of your team have completed this survey, you will receive data and instructions to replicate a scientific study on the effects of immigration on public opinion (later you will expand this study). The study is titled “Does Immigration Undermine Public Support for Social Policy?” by David Brady and Ryan Finnigan, published 2014 in the American Sociological Review. Do you know this study?*

[asked only of Transparent Group]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | awareness\_study |  | |  |
| Variable label: | Awareness of Original Study | | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | | Percent |
| 1 | I do not know about this study. | | 57 | 26.8% |
| 2 | I may have heard of this study. | | 25 | 11.7% |
| 3 | I know this study but I cannot remember many details. | | 11 | 5.2% |
| 4 | I know this study and I am aware of its methods and of its findings. | | 3 | 1.4% |
| .a |  | | 117 | 54.9% |

[Machine constructed variable from IP address]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | participant\_continent |  |  |
| Variable label: | IP address continent |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 3 | Europe | 161 | 75.6% |
| 4 | Asia | 4 | 1.9% |
| 5 | North America | 31 | 14.6% |
| 6 | Africa | 4 | 1.9% |
| 8 | South America | 4 | 1.9% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.2% |

**WAVE 2: September 12th, 2018**

From this wave onwards we exclude the 24 cases of non-start or drop out before completion. The leaves us with a final sample of **189 participants**. In this wave we randomly assigned remaining participants to the Deliberation or Control group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | u\_delibtreatmentgroup |  |  |
| Variable label: | Grouping Variable, random assignment to interim deliberation | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | Control Group | 96 | 50.8% |
| 1 | Deliberation Group | 93 | 49.2% |

*Regarding this first phase of the CRI: Regardless of how much your entire team spent on the replication work, how much time did you individually spend on the replication (incl. Preparation, Syntax, Submission of Results, Coordination with Team Members etc.)?*

[Open response, in hours]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_33 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Perceived individual time spent on replication | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0.0000 |  | 1 | 0.5% |
| 1.0000 |  | 2 | 1.1% |
| 1.5000 |  | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2.0000 |  | 5 | 2.6% |
| 3.0000 |  | 9 | 4.8% |
| 4.0000 |  | 16 | 8.5% |
| 5.0000 |  | 17 | 9.0% |
| 6.0000 |  | 22 | 11.6% |
| 6.5000 |  | 1 | 0.5% |
| 7.0000 |  | 20 | 10.6% |
| 8.0000 |  | 23 | 12.2% |
| 9.0000 |  | 4 | 2.1% |
| 9.5000 |  | 1 | 0.5% |
| 10.0000 |  | 25 | 13.2% |
| 11.0000 |  | 3 | 1.6% |
| 12.0000 |  | 4 | 2.1% |
| 14.0000 |  | 2 | 1.1% |
| 15.0000 |  | 7 | 3.7% |
| 16.0000 |  | 4 | 2.1% |
| 18.0000 |  | 1 | 0.5% |
| All higher values |  | 17 | 9.0% |

*How difficult did you find the replication task in this first phase?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_34 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Difficulty of Replication |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | This replication was one of the most difficult research tasks I ever completed. | 6 | 3.2% |
| 2 | This replication was difficult. | 18 | 9.5% |
| 3 | This replication was neither too easy nor too difficult. | 80 | 42.3% |
| 4 | This replication was easy. | 76 | 40.2% |
| 5 | This replication was one of the easiest research tasks I ever completed. | 2 | 1.1% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*How familiar are you with the social science literature related to the hypothesis that "a greater stock or a greater increase in the stock of foreign persons in a given society leads the general public to become less supportive of social policy"?*

[multiple choice, multiple response battery]

*Except for the replication work I just performed, I am not at all familiar with this literature*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_35 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Not familiar with lit | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 96 | 50.8% |
| 1 | quoted | 86 | 45.5% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*I have read some of the works in this literature.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_36 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Some | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 101 | 53.4% |
| 1 | quoted | 81 | 42.9% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*I have read many of the works in this literature.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_37 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Many | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 168 | 88.9% |
| 1 | quoted | 14 | 7.4% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*I have published articles or books in this literature.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_38 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Published | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 177 | 93.7% |
| 1 | quoted | 5 | 2.6% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*I have taught courses on this subject.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_39 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Taught | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 176 | 93.1% |
| 1 | quoted | 6 | 3.2% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*I often discuss this topic with colleagues informally.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_40 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Discuss topic | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 0 | not quoted | 159 | 84.1% |
| 1 | quoted | 23 | 12.2% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*Did you enjoy this first replication task?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_41 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Enjoyment of Replication |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | This replication was extremely fun. | 20 | 10.6% |
| 2 | This replication was somewhat enjoyable. | 106 | 56.1% |
| 3 | Neutral | 41 | 21.7% |
| 4 | This replication was mostly not enjoyable. | 9 | 4.8% |
| 5 | This replication was not fun at all. | 6 | 3.2% |
| .a |  | 7 | 3.7% |

*After completing this replication task, how well do you think the original study tested Brady and Finnigan’s hypothesis question, ‘does immigration undermine public support for social policy’ across advanced welfare state democracies?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_43 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Belief in Original Study |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | The study provided a convincing test of this hypothesis | 1 | 0.5% |
| 2 | The study provided a decent test of this hypothesis. | 57 | 30.2% |
| 3 | The study somewhat tested the hypothesis. | 69 | 36.5% |
| 4 | The study provided a weak test of this hypothesis. | 38 | 20.1% |
| 5 | The study provided no convincing test of this hypothesis. | 14 | 7.4% |
| .a |  | 10 | 5.3% |

*Finally, we repeat a few questions from the first survey wave. The topic of the OSSC19 Crowdsourced Replication Initiative is immigration and social policy. Specifically, it wants to test a common hypothesis in the literature that a greater stock or a greater increase in the stock of foreign persons in a given society leads the general public to become less supportive of social policy, where “social policy” refers to any policy that provides basic protections, social insurance, welfare or well-being services, income replacement or active labor market programs. In short, what many scholars refer to as the ‘social welfare state’.*

*Is it your belief that higher levels of immigrant stock or greater increases in immigrant stock in a given country reduce public support of social welfare policies in general?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_H1\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Personal Belief about H1, general |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 99 | 52.4% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 69 | 36.5% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 10 | 5.3% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | 0.0% |
| .a |  | 9 | 4.8% |

*Now please give us your statement on this topic more specifically. In each of these policy domains, how do you think of higher stocks of immigrants?*

*If you are unsure, please indicate your best guess.*

[battery]

*Old age care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_agecare\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Old age care |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 1 | 0.5% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 22 | 11.6% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 120 | 63.5% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 33 | 17.5% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 1 | 0.5% |
| .a |  | 12 | 6.3% |

*Old age care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_unempl\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Unemployment |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 10 | 5.3% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 95 | 50.3% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 53 | 28.0% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 19 | 10.1% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | 0.0% |
| .a |  | 12 | 6.3% |

*Income redistribution?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_income\_2 | |  | |  |
| Variable label: | Income redistribution | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | |  |
| Value | Label | | Freq. | | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | | 9 | | 4.8% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | | 84 | | 44.4% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | | 71 | | 37.6% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | | 11 | | 5.8% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | | 14 | | 7.4% |

*Housing?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_housing\_2 |  | | |  |
| Variable label: | Housing |  | | |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | | | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 3 | | | 1.6% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 70 | | | 37.0% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 81 | | | 42.9% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 22 | | | 11.6% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | | 0 | 0.0% | |
| .a |  | 13 | | | 6.9% |

*Active labor market programs?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_labour\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Active labor market programs | |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 3 | 1.6% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 60 | 31.7% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 79 | 41.8% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 32 | 16.9% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 3 | 1.6% |
| .a |  | 12 | 6.3% |

*Health care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_health\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Health care |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 37 | 19.6% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 123 | 65.1% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 15 | 7.9% |
| 5 | Immigration strongly increases support of social policies. | 0 | 0.0% |
| .a |  | 12 | 6.3% |

*You just indicated your beliefs about the effects of immigration on public support of social policies. How certain are you that your beliefs about this relationship are correct?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_certainty\_2 |  |  |
| Variable label: | very uncertain - very certain |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 |  | 11 | 5.8% |
| 2 |  | 44 | 23.3% |
| 3 |  | 44 | 23.3% |
| 4 |  | 33 | 17.5% |
| 5 |  | 40 | 21.2% |
| 6 |  | 7 | 3.7% |
| .a |  | 10 | 5.3% |

**WAVE 3: November 24th, 2018**

From variable **v\_51** to variable **v\_66** there is a skip pattern. These are from questions only given to the Deliberation Group (N=93), teams randomly assigned to participate in a preliminary deliberation over the optimal methods for testing the hypothesis. Therefore, for these questions the Control Group (N=96) are omitted.

*Before you conducted your analysis you had the opportunity to use Kialo, an online deliberation platform. Did you use Kialo?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_51 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Logging into Kialo (Treatment Reception, Complier Status) | | |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No, I never logged into Kialo. | 7 | 7.5% |
| 2 | I logged into Kialo 1-2 times. | 30 | 32.3% |
| 3 | I logged into Kialo 3-5 times. | 27 | 29.0% |
| 4 | I logged into Kialo more than 5 times. | 13 | 14.0% |
| .a |  | 16 | 17.2% |

*While logged into Kialo, did you discuss the research design with other CRI participants on the Kialo platform? Did you post pro and con arguments?*

[skip pattern, not asked if v\_51 == 1 or v\_51 == .a]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_52 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Participation in Deliberation |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | I did not post anything in Kialo. | 38 | 40.9% |
| 2 | I posted once. | 11 | 11.8% |
| 3 | I posted a few times. | 16 | 17.2% |
| 4 | I was a regular contributor to the discussions. | 5 | 5.4% |
| .a |  | 23 | 24.7% |

*Did you vote on the main theses (e.g., measurement of the dependent variable in Kialo)?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_53 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Participation in Voting |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | I did not vote. | 13 | 14.0% |
| 2 | I voted on a few of the Theses in one of the Kialos (e.g., measurement of the DV). | 8 | 8.6% |
| 3 | I voted on a few of the Theses in more than one of the four Kialos. | 25 | 26.9% |
| 4 | I voted on all of the Theses in each of the four Kialos, but did not use the “Guided Voting" function in Kialo. | 10 | 10.8% |
| 5 | I voted on all of the Theses in each of the four Kialos, with the help of the “Guided Voting" function in Kialo. | 14 | 15.1% |
| .a |  | 23 | 24.7% |

*In order to learn from this experience and to improve crowdsourced research, we would like to understand why you did not use Kialo more often. Please indicate how much these reasons for not engaging more frequently in Kialo apply to you personally.*

[battery]

*I did not expect Kialo to help me much with my tasks in the CRI.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_54 |  |  |
| Variable label: | I did not expect Kialo to help me much with my tasks in the CRI. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all. | 32 | 34.4% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little. | 19 | 20.4% |
| 3 | Reason somewhat applies to me. | 9 | 9.7% |
| 4 | Reason applies to me a lot. | 5 | 5.4% |
| .a |  | 28 | 30.1% |

*I had too many other responsibilities at the time.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_55 |  |  |
| Variable label: | I had too many other responsibilities at the time. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all. | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little. | 10 | 10.8% |
| 3 | Reason somewhat applies to me. | 20 | 21.5% |
| 4 | Reason applies to me a lot. | 35 | 37.6% |
| .a |  | 28 | 30.1% |

*I thought that discussion and debate is not an appropriate element of crowdsourced research.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_56 |  |  |
| Variable label: | I thought that discussion and debate is not an appropriate element of crowdsourced research. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all. | 50 | 53.8% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little. | 11 | 11.8% |
| 3 | Reason somewhat applies to me. | 2 | 2.2% |
| 4 | Reason applies to me a lot. | 2 | 2.2% |
| .a |  | 28 | 30.1% |

*I just do not enjoy engaging in online discussions and debate.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_57 |  |  |
| Variable label: | I just do not enjoy engaging in online discussions and debate |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all. | 19 | 20.4% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little. | 23 | 24.7% |
| 3 | Reason somewhat applies to me. | 16 | 17.2% |
| 4 | Reason applies to me a lot. | 7 | 7.5% |
| .a |  | 28 | 30.1% |

*I found the Kialo process too burdensome.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_58 |  |  |
| Variable label: | I found the Kialo process too burdensome. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all. | 16 | 17.2% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little. | 17 | 18.3% |
| 3 | Reason somewhat applies to me. | 24 | 25.8% |
| 4 | Reason applies to me a lot. | 8 | 8.6% |
| .a |  | 28 | 30.1% |

*We would like to know how you perceived your experience with Kialo. On the following dimensions, how would you evaluate the overall process of discussion and debate on the Kialo platform?*

[battery self-explanatory questions based on value label anchors]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_62 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Helpful |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Not helpful for exchanging ideas and knowledge | 2 | 2.2% |
| 2 |  | 13 | 14.0% |
| 3 |  | 25 | 26.9% |
| 4 |  | 26 | 28.0% |
| 5 | Very helpful for exchanging ideas and knowledge | 5 | 5.4% |
| .a |  | 22 | 23.7% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_63 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Implementation |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Poorly implemented | 3 | 3.2% |
| 2 |  | 10 | 10.8% |
| 3 |  | 24 | 25.8% |
| 4 |  | 31 | 33.3% |
| 5 | Carefully implemented | 3 | 3.2% |
| .a |  | 22 | 23.7% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_64 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Others’ arguments |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | The arguments of the other participants were useful in forming my own position. | 2 | 2.2% |
| 2 |  | 22 | 23.7% |
| 3 |  | 19 | 20.4% |
| 4 |  | 23 | 24.7% |
| 5 | The arguments of the other participants were not useful in forming my own position. | 5 | 5.4% |
| .a |  | 22 | 23.7% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_65 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Atmosphere |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Hostile atmosphere | 9 | 9.7% |
| 2 |  | 3 | 3.2% |
| 3 |  | 7 | 7.5% |
| 4 |  | 24 | 25.8% |
| 5 | Respectful atmosphere | 28 | 30.1% |
| .a |  | 22 | 23.7% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_66 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Changed mind |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Did not change my mind on the research | 16 | 17.2% |
| 2 |  | 16 | 17.2% |
| 3 |  | 25 | 26.9% |
| 4 |  | 13 | 14.0% |
| 5 | Changed my mind on the research substantially | 1 | 1.1% |
| .a |  | 22 | 23.7% |

*We would like to ask you a few questions on the “expansion phase”, i.e., the specification of the research design, the discussions you may have had about it, and the analysis you finally conducted. In your own view, how successful was your team in conducting a proper test of the hypothesis in question?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_success |  |  |
| Variable label: | very unsuccessful - very successful |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | very unsuccessful | 3 | 1.6% |
| 2 |  | 11 | 5.8% |
| 3 |  | 17 | 9.0% |
| 4 |  | 27 | 14.3% |
| 5 |  | 52 | 27.5% |
| 6 |  | 35 | 18.5% |
| 7 | very successful | 6 | 3.2% |
| .a |  | 38 | 20.1% |

*When you consider the entire process of crafting your initial research design from the first thoughts to the final submission, how often did you make substantial changes and revisions to your analysis plans?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_changemind |  |  |
| Variable label: | Changing minds |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Never | 9 | 4.8% |
| 2 | Once or twice | 82 | 43.4% |
| 3 | Three to five times | 53 | 28.0% |
| 4 | More than five times | 8 | 4.2% |
| .a |  | 37 | 19.6% |

*During the CRI, you designed and conducted analyses involving individuals nested in cross-sectional country data at different time points in order to test a substantive hypothesis. Looking back at your CRI experience thus far, did you learn something new (e.g., about methods or analytical choices you were not aware of previously)?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_learn |  |  |
| Variable label: | Learning |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | I did not learn anything | 9 | 4.8% |
| 2 |  | 15 | 7.9% |
| 3 |  | 18 | 9.5% |
| 4 |  | 12 | 6.3% |
| 5 |  | 59 | 31.2% |
| 6 |  | 28 | 14.8% |
| 7 | I learned a great deal | 11 | 5.8% |
| .a |  | 37 | 19.6% |

*In hindsight, how would you evaluate the expansion phase in the following dimensions?*

[battery self-explanatory questions based on value label anchors]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_gooddifficulty |  |  |
| Variable label: | Difficulty |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Too difficult | 1 | 0.5% |
| 2 |  | 14 | 7.4% |
| 3 |  | 28 | 14.8% |
| 4 |  | 71 | 37.6% |
| 5 | Good match with my capabilities | 37 | 19.6% |
| .a |  | 38 | 20.1% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_enjoy |  |  |
| Variable label: | No fun at all - Enjoyable |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No fun at all | 6 | 3.2% |
| 2 |  | 29 | 15.3% |
| 3 |  | 33 | 17.5% |
| 4 |  | 63 | 33.3% |
| 5 | Enjoyable | 20 | 10.6% |
| .a |  | 38 | 20.1% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | delib\_notcontrolling |  |  |
| Variable label: | Controlling instructions |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Instructions were too controlling | 9 | 4.8% |
| 2 |  | 21 | 11.1% |
| 3 |  | 60 | 31.7% |
| 4 |  | 44 | 23.3% |
| 5 | Instructions were not controlling at all | 16 | 8.5% |
| .a |  | 39 | 20.6% |

*In the last section of the survey, we repeat a few questions from the first survey wave. The topic of the OSSC19 Crowdsourced Replication Initiative is immigration and social policy. Specifically, it wants to test a common hypothesis in the literature that a greater stock or a greater increase in the stock of foreign persons in a given society leads the general public to become less supportive of social policy, where “social policy” refers to any policy that provides basic protections, social insurance, welfare or well-being services, income replacement or active labor market programs. In short, what many scholars refer to as the ‘social welfare state’. Is it your belief that higher levels of immigrant stock or greater increases in immigrant stock in a given country reduce public support of social welfare policies in general?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_H1\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Personal Belief about H1, general |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 48 | 25.4% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 85 | 45.0% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 10 | 5.3% |
| .a |  | 44 | 23.3% |

*Now please give us your statement on this topic more specifically. In each of these policy domains, how do you think of higher stocks of immigrants?*

*If you are unsure, please indicate your best guess.*

[battery]

*Old age care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_agecare\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Old age care |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 1 | 0.5% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 13 | 6.9% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 113 | 59.8% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 17 | 9.0% |
| .a |  | 45 | 23.8% |

*Unemployment?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_unempl\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Unemployment |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 7 | 3.7% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 62 | 32.8% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 62 | 32.8% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 14 | 7.4% |
| .a |  | 44 | 23.3% |

*Income redistribution?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_income\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Income redistribution |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 5 | 2.6% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 53 | 28.0% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 77 | 40.7% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 11 | 5.8% |
| .a |  | 43 | 22.8% |

*Housing?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_housing\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Housing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 6 | 3.2% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 36 | 19.0% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 86 | 45.5% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 17 | 9.0% |
| .a |  | 44 | 23.3% |

*Active labor market programs?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_labour\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Active labor market programs |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 5 | 2.6% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 46 | 24.3% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 76 | 40.2% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 19 | 10.1% |
| .a |  | 43 | 22.8% |

*Health care?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_health\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Health care |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Immigration strongly reduces support of social policies. | 3 | 1.6% |
| 2 | Immigration somewhat reduces support of social policies. | 24 | 12.7% |
| 3 | Immigration has no effect on support of social policies. | 105 | 55.6% |
| 4 | Immigration somewhat increases support of social policies. | 13 | 6.9% |
| .a |  | 44 | 23.3% |

*You just indicated your beliefs about the effects of immigration on public support of social policies. How certain are you that your beliefs about this relationship are correct?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | belief\_certainty\_3 |  |  |
| Variable label: | very uncertain - very certain |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | very uncertain | 7 | 3.7% |
| 2 |  | 25 | 13.2% |
| 3 |  | 25 | 13.2% |
| 4 |  | 27 | 14.3% |
| 5 |  | 42 | 22.2% |
| 6 |  | 15 | 7.9% |
| 7 | very certain | 3 | 1.6% |
| .a |  | 45 | 23.8% |

**WAVE 4: January 20th, 2019**

*To improve future crowdsourced research projects, we seek to understand your motivation to participate in the CRI. We list potential reasons that may or may not apply to you personally. Please indicate to which degree these statements apply to your motivation to participate in the CRI.*

[battery]

*I was very interested in the substantive topic.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_88 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Interest |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 10 | 5.3% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 30 | 15.9% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 22 | 11.6% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 51 | 27.0% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 45 | 23.8% |
| .a |  | 31 | 16.4% |

*Colleagues asked me to join their team.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_89 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Colleagues |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 63 | 33.3% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 15 | 7.9% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 4 | 2.1% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 33 | 17.5% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 41 | 21.7% |
| .a |  | 33 | 17.5% |

*The prospect of a scientific publication was appealing.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_90 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Scientific publication |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 10 | 5.3% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 19 | 10.1% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 24 | 12.7% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 66 | 34.9% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 38 | 20.1% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*I expected the project to be an enjoyable experience.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_91 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Expected enjoyment |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 4 | 2.1% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 15 | 7.9% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 76 | 40.2% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 60 | 31.7% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*I was very interested in the replication aspect of the project.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_93 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Replication |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 3 | 1.6% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 4 | 2.1% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 61 | 32.3% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 86 | 45.5% |
| .a |  | 33 | 17.5% |

*I expected to learn and to develop as a researcher.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_94 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Develop as researcher |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 2 | 1.1% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 14 | 7.4% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 19 | 10.1% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 74 | 39.2% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 46 | 24.3% |
| .a |  | 34 | 18.0% |

*The CRI seemed like a valuable addition to my CV.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_95 |  |  |
| Variable label: | CV |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 31 | 16.4% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 43 | 22.8% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 43 | 22.8% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 32 | 16.9% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 8 | 4.2% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*I joined because I know one or more of the organizers.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_96 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Know organizers |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Reason does not apply to me apply at all | 108 | 57.1% |
| 2 | Reason applies to me a little | 9 | 4.8% |
| 3 | Neither nor | 13 | 6.9% |
| 4 | Reason somewhat applies to me | 19 | 10.1% |
| 5 | Reason applies to me a lot | 8 | 4.2% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*During the CRI many participants mentioned constraints to their work. How much did the following constraints prevent you from submitting your ideal work?*

[battery]

*Not enough time*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_98 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Not enough time |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Did not constrain me | 8 | 4.2% |
| 2 | Constrained me only a little | 26 | 13.8% |
| 3 | Constrained me somewhat | 51 | 27.0% |
| 4 | Constrained me considerably | 71 | 37.6% |
| .a |  | 33 | 17.5% |

*Inadequate materials (e.g., software or computing power)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_99 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Inadequate materials |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Did not constrain me | 110 | 58.2% |
| 2 | Constrained me only a little | 27 | 14.3% |
| 3 | Constrained me somewhat | 13 | 6.9% |
| 4 | Constrained me considerably | 7 | 3.7% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*Not enough methods skills*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_100 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Methods skills |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Did not constrain me | 65 | 34.4% |
| 2 | Constrained me only a little | 53 | 28.0% |
| 3 | Constrained me somewhat | 30 | 15.9% |
| 4 | Constrained me considerably | 9 | 4.8% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*Not enough software programming skills*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_101 |  | |  |
| Variable label: | Software programming skills |  | |  |
| Value label: | v\_98 |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | | Percent |
| 1 | Did not constrain me | 110 | | 58.2% |
| 2 | Constrained me only a little | 35 | | 18.5% |
| 3 | Constrained me somewhat | 12 | | 6.3% |
| 4 | Constrained me considerably | | 0 | 0.0% |
| .a |  | 32 | | 16.9% |

*Having strict deadlines was a problem for me*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_102 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Strict deadlines |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | Did not constrain me | 40 | 21.2% |
| 2 | Constrained me only a little | 49 | 25.9% |
| 3 | Constrained me somewhat | 48 | 25.4% |
| 4 | Constrained me considerably | 20 | 10.6% |
| .a |  | 32 | 16.9% |

*Lastly, what is your gender?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | v\_110 |  |  |
| Variable label: | Gender |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Value | Label | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | male | 106 | 56.1% |
| 2 | female | 50 | 26.5% |
| 3 | other | 0 | 0.0% |
| .a |  | 33 | 17.5% |