**Appendix A Data quality considerations**

One of the significant threats to the quality of survey data is satisficing (Krosnick, 1991), i.e. the hypothesis that some respondents instead of providing accurate responses exert less or no cognitive effort to answering the survey. The problem of inattentive respondents may be more frequent in self-administered web surveys, than in surveys administered by an interviewer, who would create a sense of accountability in respondents (Baker et al., 2010). Finally, the frequency of inattentive respondents may be larger in nonprobability online panels due to the presence of “professionals”, i.e. respondents who do a lot of surveys and generally will participate in a survey only if there is an incentive. Some of the professional respondents are expected to rush through a survey, jeopardizing the integrity of their responses (Hillygus, Jackson, & Young, 2014).

To deal with these issues Baker et al. (2010) suggest to use data quality analysis and validation techniques to identify inattentive respondents. They refer to four commonly used techniques to identify satisficing respondents: (1) Short survey completion times, (2) Response non-differentiation ("straightlining") in grid- or matrix- questions, (3) Excessive selection of non-substantive responses or item nonresponse and (4) Gibberish answers to open-ended questions. We use the first three data quality indicators, but we cannot use the fourth, because our questionnaire does not include any open-ended questions. Instead of the open-ended questions quality indicator, we use an indicator based on the idea of instructional manipulation checks (Oppenheimer, Meyvis, & Davidenko, 2009) to measure whether or not participants have read the news article that served as the experimental stimulus.

We have implemented our four quality indicators as follows: i) completion time: most of the methods that have been used to flag short completion times employ an arbitrary selected threshold to flag short response times. We use an extension of the “scanning threshold” method (Andreadis, 2012, 2014). The method calculates a threshold taking into account the number of characters in the question and the “scanning” reading speed. With this method we find that if the time spent on the questions was less than 412 seconds, the respondents would be unable to read, comprehend the questions and provide the corresponding answers. As a result, we can assume that these responses are of low quality and we flag them accordingly, ii) straightlining: we have selected three grid questions for which it does not make sense to give the same answer to all the items in the grid. We flag respondents who have not differentiated their responses in any of these grid questions making use of the respdiff module in Stata, iii) item nonresponse: cases are flagged if the number of valid answers is less than 2/3 of the total number of answers and iv) manipulation checks: a case is flagged when most of the manipulation check responses are missing, or when most of manipulation checks have been answered, but the number of correct answers is less than or equal to the number of correct answers of someone responding randomly. The low-quality answers of inattentive respondents increase noise in a survey dataset and reduce the power of statistical tests. As a result, they should be removed. On the other hand, despite our effort to avoid false-positives, we cannot rule out the possibility of a temporary technical glitch that would make an engaged respondent appear as inattentive. Although, the probability of false - positives is very low, we wish to eliminate it. Thus, we remove a case only when it is flagged in more than one of our four indicators. This way, if we assume that the probability for a false-positive is 0.01 for each individual quality indicator, the probability for a legitimate case to be flagged as low-quality by two independent indicators would be 0.0001. Thus, if a case is flagged by two quality indicators we can be more confident that there is something wrong with it and we can remove it. In our data set this amounts to the removal of 1000, resulting in a total sample of 7286 respondents.
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**Appendix B Tests for measurement invariance**

We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to analyze the factor structure of the dependent variables persuasion and mobilization. A model without constraints indicates a good model fit (CFI = .997, RMSEA = .033), which is well within the limits proposed by Hu & Bentler (1999) with CFI ≥ .95 and RMSEA ≤ .08.

To establish measurement invariance across countries, we first tested for configural invariance by constraining the factor structure across countries. This model also revealed a good model fit (CFI = .992, RMSEA = .055). As the χ2-statistic is very sensitive to overall sample size and differences in sample sizes between groups (e.g. Hu & Bentler 1999), we rely on the alternative fit indices to evaluate the model performance. We rely on recommendations by Chen (2007), which suggest that any increase in the RMSEA above .015, in combination with a decrease in the CFI of .010 are considered evidence against a restriction and could, as such, indicate a lack of invariance. Although the change of the RMSEA is slightly above the cutoff (∆RMSEA = .022), the change in the CFI is well below the cutoff (∆CFI = -.005). Therefore, we can conclude that our dependent variables persuasion and mobilization have the same factor structure in all countries.

To test for metric invariance, factor loadings for all items are constrained to be equal across countries. The model also revealed an acceptable model fit (CFI = .977, RMSEA = .070). When dealing with large numbers of groups, scholars suggest that changes in CFI of -.020 and RMSEA of .030 are most appropriate for tests of metric invariance (Rutkowski & Svetina, 2014). Both the change in the CFI (∆CFI = -.015) and RMSEA (∆RMSEA = .015) are well within the suggested cutoff by Rutkowski and Svetina (2014). Therefore, the factor loadings of our dependent variables persuasion and mobilization are equal across all countries.

Table B.1

*Scale invariance fit measures*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | χ2 | df | CFI | RMSEA | ΔCFI | ΔRMSEA |
| Model without constraints | 35.291 | 4 | .997 | .033 |  |  |
| Configural invariance | 147.935 | 60 | .992 | .055 | -.005 | .022 |
| Metric invariance | 342.794 | 102 | .977 | .070 | -.015 | .015 |

*Note*. χ2 = Chi-Square of the model estimation; df = Degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative fit index; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation. n = 7219.
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**Appendix C Country results**
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Figure captions

Figure C.1. *Impact of identity frames on persuasion*

Figure C.2. *Impact of identity frames on mobilization*

Figure C.3. *Impact of identity frames on persuasion, moderated by relative deprivation*
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**Appendix D: Respondents’ background characteristics entire sample vs. cleaned sample)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Gender**  (female) | | **Age**  (M, N, SD) | | **Education**  (lower, medium, higher) | | **Political interest**  (M, N, SD,  1-7 point scale) | | **Ideology**  (M, SD, N,  1-10 point scale) | |
|  | **Entire sample** | **Cleaned sample** | **Entire sample** | **Cleaned sample** | **Entire sample** | **Cleaned sample** | **Entire sample** | **Cleaned sample** | **Entire sample** | **Cleaned sample** |
| Austria | 51.2% | 52.0% | M=43.20  N=566  SD=14.12 | M=43.58  N=529  SD=14.01 | L=10.1%  M=50.0%  H=39.9% | L=9.6%  M=49.5%  H=40.8% | M=4.43  N=565  SD=1.73 | M=4.44  N=529  SD=1.72 | M=4.93  N=505  SD=2.30 | M=4.92  N=475  SD=2.29 |
| France | 53.0% | 52.8% | M=47.70  N=547  SD=15.96 | M=48.01  N=512  SD=15.93 | L=15.3%  M=26.6%  H=58.0% | L=15.2%  M=26.4%  H=58.4% | M=4.32  N=595  SD=1.77 | M=4.39  N=528  SD=1.74 | M=5.22  N=507  SD=2.99 | M=5.21  N=457  SD=3.02 |
| Germany | 48.3% | 48.3% | M=40.01  N=501  SD=13.15 | M=40.94  N=414  SD=13.36 | L=31.9%  M=34.9%  H=33.1% | L=31.2%  M=36.5%  H=32.4% | M=4.99  N=501  SD=1.56 | M=5.02  N=414  SD=1.53 | M=4.81  N=457  SD=2.15 | M=4.66  N=378  SD=2.10 |
| Greece | 28.1% | 28.1% | M=45.54  N=555  SD=14.67 | M=45.52  N=548  SD=14.70 | L=3.4%  M=40.7%  H=55.9% | L=3.5%  M=40.9%  H=55.7% | M=5.73  N=553  SD=1.46 | M=5.71  N=546  SD=1.46 | M=4.85  N=528  SD=2.56 | M=4.87  N=521  SD=2.54 |
| Ireland | 52.3% | 50.8% | M=42.19  N=461  SD=15.92 | M=43.80  N=378  SD=16.27 | L=10.0%  M=50.4%  H=39.6% | L=9.1%  M=51.6%  H=39.3% | M=4.62  N=479  SD=1.73 | M=4.66  N=384  SD=1.69 | M=5.39  N=407  SD=2.35 | M=5.27  N=326  SD=2.26 |
| Israel | 49.7% | 50.3% | M=43.03  N=491  SD=16.27 | M=43.15  N=455  SD=16.20 | L=18.1%  M=46.0%  H=35.9% | L=18.0%  M=46.4%  H=35.6% | M=4.60  N=507  SD=1.59 | M=4.62  N=461  SD=1.59 | M=5.91  N=495  SD=2.42 | M=5.85  N=454  SD=2.41 |
| Italy | 51.7% | 52.7% | M=48.55  N=515  SD=16.05 | M=50.15  N=438  SD=15.80 | L=13.1%  M=72.1%  H=14.8% | L=14.4%  M=71.9%  H=13.7% | M=5.14  N=527  SD=1.57 | M=5.14  N=446  SD=1.57 | M=5.07  N=476  SD=2.88 | M=4.95  N=411  SD=2.91 |
| Netherlands | 50.0% | 48.8% | M=45.73  N=445  SD=13.61 | M=46.86  N=373  SD=13.22 | L=21.3%  M=39.8%  H=38.9% | L=20.2%  M=40.8%  H=39.0% | M=4.54  N=465  SD=1.50 | M=4.59  N=377  SD=1.52 | M=5.00  N=426  SD=2.51 | M=5.01  N=351  SD=2.53 |
| Norway | 50.5% | 49.7% | M=49.33  N=503  SD=16.34 | M=49.88  N=433  SD=16.27 | L=10.7%  M=46.9%  H=42.3% | L=9.2%  M=47.3%  H=43.4% | M=4.49  N=503  SD=1.48 | M=4.58  N=433  SD=1.46 | M=5.63  N=452  SD=2.64 | M=5.67  N=397  SD=2.65 |
| Poland | 47.1% | 48.1% | M=42.52  N=665  SD=13.02 | M=42.41  N=548  SD=13.22 | L=33.7%  M=31.7%  H=34.6% | L=32.4%  M=30.6%  H=37.0% | M=4.07  N=681  SD=1.86 | M=4.15  N=549  SD=1.84 | M=5.17  N=545  SD=2.69 | M=5.15  N=447  SD=2.65 |
| Romania | 67.1% | 66.3% | M=40.81  N=750  SD=13.72 | M=41.34  N=659  SD=13.86 | L=9.3%  M=41.9%  H=48.9% | L=8.8%  M=41.6%  H=49.6% | M=3.84  N=750  SD=1.83 | M=3.93  N=659  SD=1.80 | M=5.22  N=606  SD=2.75 | M=5.28  N=538  SD=2.73 |
| Spain | 52.2% | 52.2% | M=49.07  N=491  SD=14.52 | M=49.50  N=466  SD=14.45 | L=36.0%  M=25.2%  H=38.8% | L=35.2%  M=25.6%  H=39.2% | M=4.97  N=500  SD=1.65 | M=5.02  N=469  SD=1.61 | M=4.42  N=470  SD=2.76 | M=4.41  N=442  SD=2.76 |
| Sweden | 46.5% | 46.6% | M=50.16  N=522  SD=15.30 | M=50.13  N=515  SD=15.27 | L=8.1%  M=66.0%  H=25.9% | L=8.2%  M=66.1%  H=25.7% | M=5.21  N=533  SD=1.35 | M=5.22  N=519  SD=1.35 | M=4.95  N=516  SD=2.47 | M=4.95  N=503  SD=2.48 |
| Switzerland | 53.6% | 53.4% | M=48.65  N=542  SD=17.23 | M=48.76  N=503  SD=17.19 | L=10.4%  M=63.1%  H=26.5% | L=9.6%  M=63.9%  H=26.6% | M=4.55  N=565  SD=1.70 | M=4.59  N=511  SD=1.68 | M=5.13  N=525  SD=2.23 | M=5.15  N=481  SD=2.25 |
| United Kingdom | 50.3% | 49.6% | M=48.23  N=516  SD=15.80 | M=49.26  N=449  SD=15.76 | L=29.7%  M=34.5%  H=35.8% | L=28.4%  M=34.9%  H=36.7% | M=4.32  N=553  SD=1.83 | M=4.44  N=458  SD=1.74 | M=5.11  N=459  SD=2.31 | M=5.11  N=390  SD=2.28 |

**Appendix E Robustness check: results replicated with complete dataset**

Table E1.

*The impact of identity frames on persuasion*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Model 1 | | Model 2 |
| Intercept | | 4.754 (0.024)\*\*\* | | 4.745 (0.029)\*\*\* |
|  | |  | |  |
| Anti-elite | | 0.044 (0.023) | | 0.062 (0.048) |
| Anti-immigrant | | -0.113 (0.036)\*\* | | -0.096 (0.045) |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant | |  | | -0.036 (0.070) |
|  |  | |
| *Country dummies* |  | |
| Austria | | 0.454 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.454 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| France | | 0.884 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.884 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Germany | | 0.102 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.102 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Ireland | | 0.212 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.212 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Israel | | 0.280 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.279 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Italy | | 0.815 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.815 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Netherlands | | 0.027 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.027 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Spain | | 0.764 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.764 (0.001)\*\*\* |
| Sweden | | -0.808 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.808 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Switzerland | | -0.109 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.109 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| United Kingdom | | 0.207 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.207 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Norway | | -0.103 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.103 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Romania | | 0.590 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.590 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Greece | | 1.402 (0.001)\*\*\* | | 1.402 (0.001)\*\*\* |
| R2 | | 0.1389 | | 0.1389 |

Note. Linear regression analysis with robust standard errors clustered on the country level. Poland is the reference category. Clustered robust standard errors in parentheses. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001. n = 8170.

Table E2.

*The impact of identity frames on mobilization*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | | Model 2 |
| Intercept | 4.288 (0.024)\*\*\* | | 4.332 (0.033)\*\*\* |
|  |  | |  |
| Anti-elite | -0.000 (0.032) | | -0.089 (0.052) |
| Anti-immigrant | -0.241 (0.047)\*\*\* | | -0.033 (0.071)\*\*\* |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant |  | | 0.176 (0.096) |
|  |  |
| *Country dummies* |  |
| Austria | -0.199 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.198 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| France | -0.459 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.459 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Germany | -0.154 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.154 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Ireland | -0.156 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.157 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Israel | -0.542 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.541 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Italy | 0.325 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.325 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Netherlands | -0.779 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.779 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Spain | 0.179 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.179 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Sweden | -1.799 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -1.799 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Switzerland | -0.379 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.379 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| United Kingdom | -0.629 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -0.628 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Norway | -1.090 (0.000)\*\*\* | | -1.090 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Romania | 0.450 (0.000)\*\*\* | | 0.449 (0.000)\*\*\* |
| Greece | -0.352 (0.001)\*\*\* | | -0.353 (0.001)\*\*\* |
| R2 | 0.1071 | | 0.1125 |

Note. Linear regression analysis with robust standard errors clustered on the country level. Poland is the reference category. Clustered robust standard errors in parentheses. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001. n = 8125.

Table E3.

*The impact of identity frames on persuasion, moderated by relative deprivation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
| Intercept | 3.359 (0.104)\*\*\* | 3.486 (0.106)\*\*\* | | 3.559 (0.127)\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | |  | |
| Anti-elite | 0.029 (0.025) | -0.139 (0.092) | | -0.285 (0.148) | |
| Anti-immigrant | -0.100 (0.032)\*\* | -0.187 (0.125) | | -0.329 (0.161) | |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant |  |  | | 0.286 (0.241) | |
|  |  |  | |  | |
| Relative deprivation | 0.291 (0.024)\*\*\* | 0.261 (0.024)\*\*\* | | 0.242 (0.027)\*\*\* | |
|  |  | |  | |
| Anti-elite \* relative deprivation |  | 0.039 (0.018)\* | | 0.077 (0.028)\* | |
| Anti-immigrant \* relative deprivation |  | 0.020 (0.027) | | 0.058 (0.031) | |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant \* relative deprivation |  |  | | -0.075 (0.049) | |
|  |  | |  | |
| *Country dummies* |  | |  | |
| Austria | 0.638 (0.015)\*\*\* | 0.639 (0.016)\*\*\* | | 0.639 (0.015)\*\*\* | |
| France | 0.870 (0.001)\*\*\* | 0.872 (0.002)\*\*\* | | 0.872 (0.002)\*\*\* | |
| Germany | 0.248 (0.012)\*\*\* | 0.249 (0.012)\*\*\* | | 0.248 (0.012)\*\*\* | |
| Ireland | 0.304 (0.008)\*\*\* | 0.306 (0.009)\*\*\* | | 0.308 (0.008)\*\*\* | |
| Israel | 0.430 (0.013)\*\*\* | 0.431 (0.013)\*\*\* | | 0.432 (0.013)\*\*\* | |
| Italy | 0.743 (0.006)\*\*\* | 0.742 (0.006)\*\*\* | | 0.742 (0.006)\*\*\* | |
| Netherlands | 0.280 (0.021)\*\*\* | 0.279 (0.021)\*\*\* | | 0.280 (0.021)\*\*\* | |
| Spain | 0.713 (0.004)\*\*\* | 0.714 (0.004)\*\*\* | | 0.715 (0.004)\*\*\* | |
| Sweden | -0.244 (0.047)\*\*\* | -0.245 (0.047)\*\*\* | | -0.245 (0.047)\*\*\* | |
| Switzerland | 0.237 (0.029)\*\*\* | 0.237 (0.029)\*\*\* | | 0.235 (0.029)\*\*\* | |
| United Kingdom | 0.332 (0.011)\*\*\* | 0.333 (0.011)\*\*\* | | 0.334 (0.011)\*\*\* | |
| Norway | 0.274 (0.032)\*\*\* | 0.277 (0.033)\*\*\* | | 0.276 (0.033)\*\*\* | |
| Romania | 0.523 (0.006)\*\*\* | 0.524 (0.005)\*\*\* | | 0.524 (0.005)\*\*\* | |
| Greece | 1.632 (0.021)\*\*\* | 1.634 (0.021)\*\*\* | | 1.635 (0.021)\*\*\* | |
| R2 | 0.2321 | 0.2328 | | 0.2333 | |

Note. Linear regression analysis with robust standard errors clustered on the country level. Poland is the reference category. Clustered robust standard errors in parentheses. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001. n = 8099.

Table E4.

*The impact of identity frames on mobilization, moderated by relative deprivation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
| Intercept | 3.187 (0.135)\*\*\* | 3.446 (0.124)\*\*\* | | 3.571 (0.151)\*\*\* | |
|  |  |  | |  | |
| Anti-elite | -0.008 (0.036) | -0.263 (0.105)\* | | -0.518 (0.131)\*\*\* | |
| Anti-immigrant | -0.221 (0.043)\*\*\* | -0.486 (0.105)\*\*\* | | -0.727 (0.186)\*\* | |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant |  |  | | 0.493 (0.254) | |
|  |  |  | |  | |
| Relative deprivation | 0.228 (0.030)\*\*\* | 0.168 (0.026)\*\*\* | | 0.148 (0.032)\*\*\* | |
|  |  | |  | |
| Anti-elite \* relative deprivation |  | 0.059 (0.024)\* | | 0.098 (0.028)\*\* | |
| Anti-immigrant \* relative deprivation |  | 0.061 (0.019)\*\* | | 0.098 (0.039)\* | |
| Anti-elite \* anti-immigrant \* relative deprivation |  |  | | -0.075 (0.061) | |
|  |  | |  | |
| *Country dummies* |  | |  | |
| Austria | -0.054 (0.019)\* | -0.051 (0.019)\* | | -0.051 (0.019)\* | |
| France | -0.466 (0.001)\*\*\* | -0.461 (0.002)\*\*\* | | -0.461 (0.002)\*\*\* | |
| Germany | -0.040 (0.015)\* | -0.040 (0.015)\* | | -0.041 (0.015)\* | |
| Ireland | -0.089 (0.010)\*\*\* | -0.084 (0.010)\*\*\* | | -0.083 (0.010)\*\*\* | |
| Israel | -0.423 (0.015)\*\*\* | -0.423 (0.016)\*\*\* | | -0.422 (0.016)\*\*\* | |
| Italy | 0.269 (0.007)\*\*\* | 0.268 (0.008)\*\*\* | | 0.268 (0.008)\*\*\* | |
| Netherlands | -0.581 (0.026)\*\*\* | -0.582 (0.026)\*\*\* | | -0.581 (0.026)\*\*\* | |
| Spain | 0.146 (0.005)\*\*\* | 0.148 (0.005)\*\*\* | | 0.149 (0.006)\*\*\* | |
| Sweden | -1.357 (0.057)\*\*\* | -1.356 (0.057)\*\*\* | | -1.355 (0.057)\*\*\* | |
| Switzerland | -0.108 (0.035)\*\* | -0.107 (0.035)\*\* | | -0.108 (0.036)\*\* | |
| United Kingdom | -0.531 (0.013)\*\*\* | -0.529 (0.013)\*\*\* | | -0.527 (0.013)\*\*\* | |
| Norway | -0.794 (0.038)\*\*\* | -0.788 (0.040)\*\*\* | | -0.789 (0.040)\*\*\* | |
| Romania | 0.380 (0.007)\*\*\* | 0.401 (0.007)\*\*\* | | 0.400 (0.007)\*\*\* | |
| Greece | -0.140 (0.025)\*\*\* | -0.136 (0.026)\*\*\* | | -0.135 (0.026)\*\*\* | |
| R2 | 0.1451 | 0.1466 | | 0.1475 | |

Note. Linear regression analysis with robust standard errors clustered on the country level. Poland is the reference category. Clustered robust standard errors in parentheses. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001. n = 8067.