

## Online Appendices

### 1. Survey Experiment Instrument

Note: For these questions, half of the sample was randomly assigned to the treatment group and received a “No Opinion” option. The other half was randomly assigned to the control group and did not receive this answer option. Within each group, the order of questions was randomized.

#### 1. Do you favor or oppose increasing trade with other nations, or haven't you thought much about this issue?

- Strongly favor
- Somewhat favor
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose
- No opinion [Treatment Group Only]

#### 2. In the future, how willing should the United States be to use military force to solve international problems, or haven't you thought much about this issue?

- Very willing
- Somewhat willing
- Somewhat unwilling
- Very unwilling
- No opinion [Treatment Group Only]

#### 3. "It will be best for the future of the country if we take an active part in world affairs." Do you agree or disagree with this statement, or haven't you thought much about this issue?

- Agree strongly
- Agree somewhat
- Disagree somewhat
- Disagree strongly
- No opinion [Treatment Group Only]

## 2. Alternative Models for Estimating DKNO and Affirmative Responses

Estimating the effect of education, partisanship, and gender on both DKNO and affirmative responses is an important methodological issue in the paper. We use a multinomial logit model for this purpose but other approaches are possible. This appendix presents two alternative models of the relationship between DKNO and affirmative responses. The first is a censored probit selection model of the choice to respond, then the choice between affirmative responses. Berinsky (2004) employs this approach. The second is simply two separate logit models of these two choices. None of these models is perfect. The fact that they produce the same inferences about our major independent variables, in spite of their different shortcomings, gives us greater confidence in our results.

The two alternative models imply similar accounts of the process generating survey responses. Both treat it as hierarchical. Respondents first decide whether to give an affirmative response or instead to say they don't know. Next, if they have an opinion, they choose among the affirmative responses. As we noted in the paper, we prefer the multinomial logit model because it does not imply a hierarchical process. It suggests instead that respondents simply offer an answer to the question, with DKNO as a coequal response option. The principal difference between these two hierarchical approaches is that the selection model captures the potential dependence between the choice to give an affirmative rather than a DKNO response, and the choice between affirmative responses. This advantage comes at a price, however, since these models have some important identification problems (Brandt and Schneider, n.d.). The independent logit models do not share these problems, but instead assume that the two parts of the process are independent.

Tables A1 and A2 presents the results of a censored probit selection model and independent logit models of the survey questions about trade, the use of force, and foreign policy internationalism. All models include the same independent variables used in the primary analysis presented in the paper.

Table A3 presents the marginal effects drawn from these two modeling approaches. It is comparable to Table 4 in the paper, though with some additional marginal effects. The selection model permits the calculation of probabilities for the affirmative responses that are either conditional on being "selected" (i.e., giving an affirmative response rather than a DKNO) or unconditional probabilities of giving these answers. The conditional probabilities are most comparable to those from the independent logit model of the affirmative response categories. The unconditional probabilities are comparable to those from the multinomial logit models. The most important fact about the marginal effects is that they are very similar to those produced by the multinomial logit model.

**Table A1.**  
**Censored Probit Model of Foreign Policy Question**

	Trade		Use of Force		Internationalism	
	Respond	Support	Respond	Support	Respond	Support
Education						
High school	0.34*	0.33*	0.32*	-0.20	0.30*	0.13
	(0.14)	(0.154)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Some college	0.46*	0.57*	0.68*	-0.12	0.74*	0.49*
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.18)	(0.14)	(0.14)
College	0.71*	0.92*	0.92*	-0.40*	1.11*	0.85*
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.14)
Wald test	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 9.47*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 22.79*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 17.14*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 4.17*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 26.60*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 27.79*
Democrat	0.37*	0.19*	0.30*	-0.11	0.25*	0.34*
	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.10)
Republican	0.18	-0.13	0.30*	0.66*	0.32*	0.26*
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.10)
Male	0.44*	0.58*	0.38*	0.08	0.36*	0.14
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)
Age	0.02*	0.01*	0.02*	0.003	0.02*	0.02*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Constant	-0.82*	-1.39*	-0.59*	0.22	-0.79*	-1.08*
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.31)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Rho	0.99		-0.53		0.96	
	(0.01)		(0.28)		(0.08)	
N	1448		1448		1448	

\*p<0.05.

**Table A2.**  
**Independent Logistic Regressions Predicting DKNO v. Response and Support v. Oppose**

	<b>Trade</b>		<b>Use of Force</b>		<b>Internationalism</b>	
	DKNO	Support	DKNO	Support	DKNO	Support
Education						
High school	-0.58*	0.31	-0.50*	-0.23	-0.50*	-0.03
	(0.24)	(0.29)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.28)
Some college	-0.81*	0.75*	-1.32*	0.04	-1.20*	0.35
	(0.24)	(0.30)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.28)
College	-1.23*	1.35*	-1.65*	-0.38	-2.03*	0.85*
	(0.24)	(0.30)	(0.28)	(0.26)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Wald test	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 9.83*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 13.15*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 18.09*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 2.98*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 23.62*	$\chi^2$ (3 d.f.) = 9.96*
Democrat	-0.59*	0.02	-0.57*	-0.09*	-0.45	0.53*
	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.23)	(0.15)	(0.23)	(0.19)
Republican	-0.27	-0.52*	-0.71*	1.20*	-0.66*	0.29
	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.27)	(0.18)	(0.27)	(0.19)
Male	-0.76*	0.86*	-0.68*	0.24*	-0.64*	-0.02
	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.13)
Age	-0.03*	0.01*	-0.03*	0.001	-0.03*	0.02*
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Constant	1.32*	-0.76*	1.14*	-0.38	1.33*	-0.32
	(0.29)	(0.36)	(0.32)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.34)
N	1435	1111	1434	1226	1433	1211

\*p<0.05

**Table A3.**  
**Marginal Effects for Censored Probit and Independent Logit Models of Treatment Group**

Marginal Effect	Censored Probit				Independent Logit Models	
	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{DKNO})$	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{Oppose})$	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{Support})$	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{Support} \text{Response})$	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{DKNO})$	$\Delta\text{Pr}(\text{Support} \text{Response})$
<b>Trade question:</b>						
Lowest to highest education	-0.26*	-0.09	+0.35*	+0.29*	-0.27*	+0.30*
Female to Male	-0.14*	-0.09*	+0.22*	+0.16*	-0.14*	+0.16*
Weak party ID to strong Democrat	-0.12*	+0.04	+0.08*	-0.003	-0.11*	+0.01
Weak party ID to strong Republican	-0.06	+0.11*	-0.05	-0.12*	-0.05	-0.12*
<b>Use of force question:</b>						
Lowest to highest education	-0.28*	+0.23*	+0.06	-0.06	-0.29*	-0.09
Female to Male	-0.08*	-0.01	+0.09*	+0.06*	-0.07*	+0.06*
Weak party ID to strong Democrat	-0.07*	+0.06	+0.01	-0.02	-0.06*	-0.02
Weak party ID to strong Republican	-0.07*	-0.22*	+0.28*	+0.29*	-0.07*	+0.29*
<b>Internationalism question:</b>						
Lowest to highest education	-0.33*	+0.003	+0.33*	+0.13	-0.34*	+0.18*
Female to Male	-0.08*	+0.03	+0.05*	-0.002	-0.08*	-0.01
Weak party ID to strong Democrat	-0.06*	-0.07*	+0.13*	+0.10*	-0.06*	+0.10*
Weak party ID to strong Republican	-0.07*	-0.03	+0.10*	+0.06	-0.08*	+0.06

Note: The comparison category a 48-year old female respondent with some college and no strong party identification.

\* $p < 0.05$

### 3. Ordered choice models and DKNO responses

A few analysts deal with DKNO responses by treating them as a neutral middle category, then estimating an ordered choice model, such as ordered logit or ordered probit. This approach is problematic, so we do not treat it at length in the main text of the paper. Theoretically, treating DKNO as a middle category implies that these responses represent ambivalence rather than ignorance. This is a strong assumption, and is probably not correct in most cases. Ambivalence is most likely when respondents have enough information about the subject at hand to experience a conflict between two or more relevant considerations. Ignorance, on the other hand, implies that respondents can think of no relevant considerations, or lack sufficient information about the subject to relate them to the question. The probability of a DKNO response is negatively related to education, political interest, ideological self-identification, and other variables suggesting that the respondent is intellectually engaged with politics. These correlations suggest that ignorance is a more common cause of DKNO responses than ambivalence.

A related but more technical problem arises from the fact that substantively important variables like those we considered in the paper have different effects on the choice between DKNO and "support" or "oppose" response categories, than they do on the choice between "support" and "oppose." This result is clearly visible in the marginal effects displayed in Figures 1-3 in the paper. When DKNO is treated as a middle category, this difference in the impact of major independent variables violates the parallel regression assumption. Put another way, the differences make it difficult for a single coefficient to capture the effect of these variables on a move from one category of the dependent variable to another.

To illustrate the importance of this problem, Table A4 presents Brant tests of three ordered choice models using the foreign policy questions examined in the paper. The Brant statistic follows a chi-squared distribution. Rejection of the null hypothesis provides evidence that the parallel regression assumption has been violated. The first set employs the three categories considered in the paper, treating DKNO as a neutral, middle response. The second set of Brant statistics tests the parallel regression assumption in 5-category ordered choice models, once again using DKNO as a middle category. The third set drops the DKNO responses and estimates a 4-category ordered choice model on the remaining observations.

As we expected, the statistics in Table A4 provide evidence that treating DKNO as a middle category causes a violation of the parallel regression assumption. This result holds up whether one uses a three-category dependent variable, as we did in the paper, or a 5-category dependent variable. (This alternative is worth considering here because researchers employ ordered choice models most often when there are more than two categories indicating shades of opinion, as is the case here.) The fact that dropping the DKNO responses removes evidence of this problem suggests that the treatment of these responses is indeed the source of the trouble. DKNO simply does not behave like a middle category. If there are large efficiency losses from estimating the substantial number of parameters required for an unordered choice model with many response categories, then dropping the DKNO responses might be justified. Nevertheless, this approach still entails the potential problems associated with dropping these responses.

**Table A4.**  
**Brant Test Statistics from Ordered Choice Models**

	Trade	Use of Force	Internationalism
<b>3-category ordered logit model</b> (DKNO treated as middle category)			
Brant test statistic	15.32* (7 d.f.)	134.05* (7 d.f.)	115.22 (7 d.f.)
Observations	1435	1434	1433
<b>5-category ordered logit model</b> (DKNO treated as middle category)			
Brant test statistic	80.02* (21 d.f.)	153.59* (21 d.f.)	129.50* (21 d.f.)
Observations	1435	1434	1433
<b>4-category ordered logit model</b> (DKNO responses dropped)			
Brant test statistic	17.50 (14 d.f.)	20.33 (14 d.f.)	12.49 (14 d.f.)
Observations	1111	1226	1211

Note: The models use the independent variables listed in Table 3 of the paper. The Brant test statistic follows a chi-squared distribution. Rejection of the null hypothesis provides evidence that the parallel regression assumption has been violated. The asterisk indicates statistical significance at the  $p < 0.05$  level.