Online Appendix to

Marco Meyer and Harald Schoen, 2014: Response Latencies and Attitude-Behavior Consistency in a Direct Democratic Setting: Evidence from a Subnational Referendum in Germany, *Political Psychology* 35, 431-440.

Robustness check for different treatments of missing data

In our multivariate analyses of turnout, we employed two different operationalizations of the reference category ("perhaps"). The two variants differ in the treatment of "don't know" answers and answer refusals. Variant 1 treats "don't know" answers and answer refusal as undecided, ambivalent intentions and thus, also as "perhaps" answers. By contrast, operationalization variant 2 strictly excludes those answers.

In the article, we reported only the results of variant 1. In this supplemental document, we report the results for both variants to demonstrate the robustness of our findings. The following two tables 1A and 1B report predicted probabilities for both variants (see for the respective logistic regression models tables 2A and 2B). The evidence shows that irrespective of the operationalization applied, short "perhaps" latencies decrease the likelihood of actual turnout, whereas long "perhaps" latencies have the opposite effect. For both variants, slow "perhaps" answers increase the likelihood of casting a vote by at least 21 points or even more. The only minor difference refers to the overall likelihood of casting a vote, which is somewhat higher utilizing variant 1. We thus conclude that the operationalization of the reference category does not matter for the substantive findings concerning turnout.

Table 1A: Predicted probabilities for operationalization variant 1

	Variant A		Variant B		Variant C	
	probability	CI	probability	CI	probability	CI
long latency						
definitely	87.4	[82.5 ; 92.2]	88.4	[83.6 ; 93.2]	89.9	[84.3 ; 95.5]
probably	68.9	[58.5 ; 79.3]	70.2	[59.2 ; 81.2]	77.8	[66.5 ; 89.1]
perhaps (+DK, NA)	77.0	[67.6 ; 86.3]	80.6	[71.8 ; 89.4]	81.4	[71.7 ; 91.0]
probably not	51.1	[36.6 ; 65.7]	47.6	[32.4 ; 62.8]	51.4	[34.4 ; 68.3]
definitely not	36.0	[24.2 ; 47.8]	35.3	[22.8 ; 47.8]	42.3	[26.8 ; 57.8]
short latency						
definitely * srl	93.4	[90.8 ; 96.0]	93.7	[91.0 ; 96.4]	93.9	[91.0 ; 96.8]
probably * srl	80.8	[72.7 ; 88.8]	81.1	[72.6 ; 89.5]	86.4	[78.8 ; 93.9]
perhaps (+DK, NA) * srl	55.7	[38.2 ; 73.3]	53.7	[33.9 ; 73.6]	54.6	[31.7 ; 77.4]
probably not * srl	44.6	[19.7 ; 69.5]	51.9	[26.5 ; 77.3]	40.6	[6.7 ; 74.4]
definitely not * srl	30.0	[12.6 ; 47.5]	34.5	[15.2 ; 53.9]	27.9	[6.2 ; 49.6]

Note: Cell entries in the left columns are predicted probabilities, in the right columns the corresponding confidence intervals. All other variables are held constant at their central tendency.

Table 1B: Predicted probabilities for operationalization variant 2

	Variant A		Variant B		Variant C	
	probability	CI	probability	CI	probability	CI
long latency						
definitely	87.1	[82.1 ; 92.0]	88.2	[83.3 ; 93.1]	89.7	[84.0 ; 95.4]
probably	67.8	[57.3 ; 78.3]	68.9	[57.8 ; 80.1]	76.7	[65.1 ; 88.2]
perhaps	67.3	[53.8 ; 80.8]	73.5	[60.6 ; 86.5]	76.1	[62.8 ; 89.4]
probably not	48.3	[33.8 ; 62.8]	44.6	[29.6 ; 59.6]	48.4	[31.4 ; 65.4]
definitely not	33.4	[22.0 ; 44.8]	32.7	[20.7 ; 44.7]	39.6	[24.5 ; 54.7]
short latency						
definitely * srl	93.3	[90.7 ; 96.0]	93.5	[90.8 ; 96.3]	93.8	[90.8 ; 96.8]
probably * srl	79.8	[71.5 ; 88.1]	80.0	[71.3 ; 88.7]	85.7	[77.9 ; 93.5]
perhaps * srl	40.6	[18.2 ; 62.9]	40.3	[14.8 ; 65.7]	36.2	[7.1 ; 65.2]
probably not * srl	42.2	[17.9 ; 66.6]	49.5	[24.3 ; 74.7]	39.1	[6.2 ; 72.0]
definitely not * srl	27.9	[11.1 ; 44.7]	32.3	[13.5 ; 51.0]	26.0	[5.3 ; 46.6]

Note: Cell entries in the left columns are predicted probabilities, in the right columns the corresponding confidence intervals. All other variables are held constant at their central tendency.

Table 2A: Effect from Turnout Intention on Reported Turnout (Variant 1)

	Variant A		Variant B		Variant C	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	-2.22***	-1.99**	-2.16**	-1.80**	-1.71*	-1.41
	(0.57)	(0.58)	(0.62)	(0.63)	(0.75)	(0.76)
definitely	1.36***	0.73*	1.35***	0.61	1.34***	0.71
	(0.25)	(0.32)	(0.26)	(0.34)	(0.32)	(0.40)
probably	0.10	-0.41	0.07	-0.57	0.34	-0.22
	(0.26)	(0.33)	(0.27)	(0.35)	(0.33)	(0.42)
probably not	-0.99**	-1.16**	-1.08**	-1.52***	-1.19**	-1.42**
	(0.31)	(0.37)	(0.33)	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.44)
definitely not	-1.60***	-1.78***	-1.63***	-2.03***	-1.61***	-1.78***
	(0.29)	(0.34)	(0.30)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.41)
definitely * srl		1.69**		1.94***		1.85**
		(0.50)		(0.55)		(0.64)
probably * srl		1.61**		1.87**		1.88**
		(0.54)		(0.59)		(0.69)
probably not * srl		0.71		1.45		0.85
		(0.71)		(0.74)		(0.96)
definitely not * srl		0.71		1.24		0.65
		(0.62)		(0.66)		(0.79)
short response latency (srl)		-0.97*		-1.28**		-1.29*
		(0.43)		(0.47)		(0.55)
Political Interest	0.22**	0.23**	0.22*	0.23**	0.25*	0.25*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Citizen duty	0.16*	0.15*	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.04
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Issue Importance	0.33***	0.32***	0.33***	0.32***	0.29**	0.29**
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Knowledge	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.13
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Smoker	-0.23	-0.21	-0.28	-0.25	-0.45*	-0.45*
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Education low	-0.04	-0.02	-0.06	-0.05	-0.37	-0.32
	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Education high	0.01	0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.17	-0.16
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
McFadden‘s R^2	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.30
N	1862	1862	1709	1709	1229	1229

Note: Cell entries are logit coefficients; robust standard errors in parentheses; Significance levels: *: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $p < 0.001$.

Table 2B: Effect from Turnout Intention on Reported Turnout (Variant 2)

	Variant A		Variant B		Variant C	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	-2.40***	-2.11***	-2.16***	-1.74**	-1.66*	-1.29
	(0.59)	(0.60)	(0.63)	(0.64)	(0.76)	(0.77)
definitely	1.84***	1.19***	1.78***	0.99*	1.70***	1.00*
	(0.30)	(0.36)	(0.32)	(0.39)	(0.37)	(0.45)
probably	0.55	0.02	0.46	-0.22	0.66	0.03
	(0.30)	(0.36)	(0.31)	(0.39)	(0.37)	(0.45)
probably not	-0.58	-0.79*	-0.75*	-1.24**	-0.91*	-1.22**
	(0.34)	(0.39)	(0.35)	(0.42)	(0.40)	(0.46)
definitely not	-1.20***	-1.41***	-1.30***	-1.74***	-1.33***	-1.58***
	(0.31)	(0.37)	(0.33)	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.43)
definitely * srl		1.83**		2.08**		2.28**
		(0.60)		(0.67)		(0.79)
probably *srl		1.73**		2.00**		2.32**
		(0.63)		(0.70)		(0.82)
probably not * srl		0.86		1.61		1.35
		(0.77)		(0.82)		(1.05)
definitely not* srl		0.84		1.40		1.10
		(0.70)		(0.75)		(0.91)
short reponse latency (srl)		-1.10*		-1.42*		-1.73*
		(0.54)		(0.61)		(0.71)
Political Interest	0.22*	0.21*	0.20*	0.21*	0.23*	0.22*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Citizen duty	0.16*	0.15*	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.05
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Issue Importance	0.27***	0.26***	0.27***	0.26**	0.24*	0.23*
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Knowledge	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.10	0.11
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Smoker	-0.19	-0.17	-0.26	-0.23	-0.44*	-0.45*
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Education low	0.01	0.03	-0.03	-0.01	-0.35	-0.28
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Education high	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.20	-0.17
	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
McFadden‘s R^2	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.29	0.31
N	1800	1800	1651	1651	1195	1195

Note: Cell entries are logit coefficients; robust standard errors in parentheses; Significance levels: *: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $p < 0.001$.