The Crowdsourced Replication Initiative Participant Survey Codebook

~ ~

Nate Breznau, University of Bremen, Germany; breznau.nate@gmail.com

Eike Mark Rinke, University of Leeds, United Kingdom

Alexander Wuttke, University of Mannheim, Germany

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 preferences[2]. 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%