Erschienen in:
Political Psychology 35, 2014, 431-440.

Response Latencies and Attitude-Behavior Consistency in a Direct-Democratic Setting:

Evidence from a Sub-National Referendum in Germany

Marco Meyer
University of Bamberg
Feldkirchenstrasse 21
D-96045 Bamberg
Email: marco.meyer@uni-bamberg.de

Harald Schoen
University of Bamberg
Feldkirchenstrasse 21
D-96045 Bamberg
Email: harald.schoen@uni-bamberg.de

Abstract

This paper addresses the role of response latencies in affecting the attitude-behavior consistency in a German sub-national referendum. As voters faced a comparatively easy choice in this referendum, it puts the hypothesis concerning the role of attitude accessibility in increasing attitude-behavior consistency to a particularly hard test. Utilizing data from a two-wave panel survey, the analysis examines the effect of response latencies on the attitude-behavior consistency concerning participation and vote choice. The evidence confirms hypotheses derived from attitude-consistency theory only in a limited number of cases. The institutional setting and the nature of choice thus appear to make a difference. Moreover, substantive findings depend partially upon the procedure to measure response latencies. Accordingly, sensitivity tests should be employed by default. Irrespective of operationalitzation, response latencies play a crucial role when it comes to respondents who answered that they would 'perhaps' participate. Whereas a quickly uttered 'perhaps' was indicative of a rather low likelihood of participation, a slowly given 'perhaps' indicated a considerably high probability.

1 Introduction[1]

Following Fazio et al.'s (1982) suggestion, response latencies have become some kind of standard instrument to measure attitude accessibility in survey research. Attitude accessibility is defined as the extent to which the evaluation of an attitude object is automatically retrieved from memory when the respective object is encountered (see Shiffrin/Dumais 1981: 117). The stronger an attitude object is associated with a respective evaluation, the more accessible the attitude is and the faster it will be uttered by a respondent when faced with a question concerning this object (Fazio 1995: 248). By the same token, persons lacking available evaluations, i.e. holding 'non-attitudes' (Converse 1970), have to construct evaluations 'on the spot' (Fazio 1989: 156), which requires more cognitive effort and thus takes longer than automatic retrieval (Fazio et al. 1986).[2]

What is more, high attitude accessibility is assumed to increase attitude-behavior consistency (Fazio 1986). Given a highly accessible attitude, the voter will perceive the respective object, due to automatic activation, selectively in line with the evaluation and her behavior will highly conform to her (quickly uttered) attitude. Persons lacking an attitude cannot rely on a 'default' attitude but have to form an evaluation from the information they receive. Given the situational nature of this process, a lower attitude-behavior consistency is anticipated (Fazio 1986: 211).

While initially primarily applied in social-psychology (see e.g. Fazio 1995 for an overview), this notion has also been adopted in research on political attitudes and political behavior (Fazio/Williams 1986; Bassili 1993, 1995a, 1995b; Huckfeldt et al. 1998, 1999; Burdein et al. 2006; Grant et al. 2009; Faas/Mayerl 2010; Petersen et al. 2011). Prior research on political

[1] We would like to thank the reviewers and the editor of this journal for their helpful comments and suggestions.

[2] Response latencies might also be conceived of as indicators of the mode of information processing in dual-process models (Mayerl 2009: 275). In this vein, short latencies are indicative of high accessibility whereas long latencies could indicate either a lack of accessibility in the spontaneous mode or deliberative information processing. As this paper deals with questions that hardly elicit deliberative processing, we disregard this kind of processing and focus on the spontaneous mode.

topics is heavily focused on the U.S. and Canada as well as it is limited to voting behavior in parliamentary elections, however. If findings on parliamentary elections applied to other forms of political behavior, including direct-democratic action, this focus would imply no severe limitation. This assumption cannot be taken for granted, however, because voting in parliamentary elections differs in theoretically relevant respects from other forms of political participation. In particular, in referendums, voters do not have to choose from a number of parties but are typically asked to vote ‘yes’ or ‘no’. To be sure, some referendums address complicated and technical issues and, thus, voters face a difficult choice. But referendum choices can be comparatively easy when they address down-to-earth issues over which voters hold well-founded and highly accessible preferences from daily life.

The sub-national referendum on non-smoking measures on pubs and restaurants in Bavaria is a case in point as vote choice was heavily affected by smoker status: roughly 80 percent of smokers voted against a stricter anti-smoking policy, whereas some 80 percent of non-smokers approved of the proposal (Schoen 2010; Schoen et al. 2011). Given this easy choice, making a decision arguably required less cognitive effort than vote choice in parliamentary elections. In terms of attitude-behavior consistency theory, voters could rely on smoking status that served as some kind of stable predisposition. As a result, voters might hardly differ in attitude accessibility and attitude accessibility, in turn, might be less effective in increasing the attitude-behavior consistency. Put differently, this kind of easy referendum puts the hypothesis concerning the role of attitude accessibility in increasing attitude-behavior consistency to a particularly hard test. When it comes to participation in the referendum, however, this referendum does not differ from other referendums or elections in a theoretically meaningful way. In theoretical terms, hardly accessible attitudes should be more sensitive to situational, e.g., campaign, cues, whereas highly accessible intentions for turnout should be rather stable between the attitude mention and ultimate turnout. In sum, we expect attitude accessibility to play a considerable role in increasing attitude-behavior consistency for

the turnout intention, but weaker or even none for vote choice.

In examining these hypotheses, we additionally explore whether details in the measurement of attitude accessibility by response latencies make a difference in substantive results. It is warranted to address this methodological issue since prior research utilized diverse operationalizations (see Mayerl/Urban 2008 for an overview) but did not test substantive consequences of methodological choices.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section outlines the data and methods, with a special emphasis on the measurement of response latencies. Utilizing data from a rolling cross-section survey, the hypotheses are then tested. Only in some respects, the evidence supports the expectation that attitude accessibility increases the predictive power of intentions on actual behavior. At the same time, whether this hypothesis is borne out by the evidence partially depends on the seemingly irrelevant details in the measurement of attitude accessibility. The paper concludes by summing up key findings and discussing implications.

2 Data and measures

To test our hypotheses, we rely on data from a panel survey conducted before and after the referendum on non-smoking policy in Bavaria.[3] In the pre-referendum wave (25 May – 3 July 2010), 4,000 respondents were interviewed using CATI; in the post-referendum wave (5 July – 19 July 2010), 2,000 respondents were re-interviewed.[4]

[3] The data were gathered using a random-digit-dialed sample drawn from the voting-eligible population of Bavaria. The pre-referendum wave yielded a response rate of 22.6 percent, the post-referendum wave a response rate of 60.9 percent (AAPOR standard RR5). The sample resembles the target population quite closely in terms of gender, and age, but deviates from the target population in terms of education, with highly educated persons being overrepresented. To address this issue, redressement weights were applied. While actual turnout was 37.7 percent, in the pre-referendum wave almost 70 percent of the respondents responded they would 'probably' or 'definitely' participate in the referendum, and in the post-referendum survey more than 70 percent reported to have participated. In the referendum, 61 percent of the voters cast a 'yes' vote. In the pre-referendum survey, some 68 percent of the respondents intended to cast a 'yes' vote, in the post-referendum wave, 60 percent of the respondents reported to have voted for the initiative. In sum, the survey differed from the target population considerably in terms of turnout, while it reflected the actual distribution of votes quite closely.

[4] Panel attrition raises the issue of selective attrition and biased results. Additional analyses (available from the authors upon request) demonstrate, however, that in our analysis panelists differ only slightly from non-panelists in terms of political involvement and response latencies so that substantive results are not affected by panel attrition.

The pre-referendum wave included questions on the intention to participate in the referendum using a five-point scale running from 'definitely not' to 'definitely'. Prospective participants were also asked for the intention whether to vote 'yes' or 'no'. In the post-referendum wave, respondents were asked whether they actually participated in the referendum and whether they voted 'yes' or 'no'.[5]

To measure reaction time, interviewers were instructed to start the measurement by a keystroke after reading out the question. Once the respondent started to answer the timer was stopped also via keystroke by the interviewer (Fazio 1990: 76; Mayerl/Urban 2008: 11). As a result, response times were measured with an accuracy of hundredths of a second.

Creating response latencies from these raw measures, which range from 0 to much more than 60 seconds, includes several methodological choices. First, to correct for respondent or interviewer errors, outliers, i.e. implausibly quick and slow answers, have to be identified and removed. As Mayerl and Urban (2008: Figure 9) demonstrate, prior research adopted a wide range of definitions of the 'valid range'. To test whether the choice of the valid range makes a difference in substantive findings, we utilized three different definitions of the valid range that were employed in prior studies. First, we employed the sometimes so-called 'standard procedure' (Mulligan et al. 2003: 293; Mayerl/Urban 2008: 60): accordingly, valid responses lie within the range ± two standard deviations from the mean (Variant A). Variant B includes only those responses given within 0.3 to 8 seconds. This definition rests on the assumption that answering a question requires at least three tenth of a second and not more than 8 seconds (for the lower bound see Devine et al. 2002). Variant C is even more restrictive and sets the lower bound to 0.1 seconds and the upper bound to 5, as applied by Maio/Olson (1995, for the lower bound see also Huckfeldt et al. 1999: 894).

[5] Obviously, reported behavior is plagued with methodological problems. For example, the turnout rate in our survey considerably exceeds the actual turnout rate in the referendum. Still, reported turnout is the best available measure and even if it is biased, this bias is unlikely to affect the substantive findings on the role of attitude accessibility in increasing attitude-behavior consistency.

As Table 1 shows, the first measure results in a valid range from a hundredth of a second to about 13 (turnout intention) and 23 (voting intention) seconds. The standard procedure thus leads to a quite large valid range. Variants B and C lead to the defined minima and maxima that can be conceived of as more plausible in terms of the required time for answering the two questions.

--- Table 1 and 2 about here ---

Having identified valid response times, individual differences in the baseline speed of responding have to be taken into account. Otherwise, differences in response latencies on an item would not only capture item-specific speed but also respondents' general speed in answering survey questions. To measure the baseline speed, we utilize response times for 14 items other than turnout intention and voting intention (Fazio 1990; see also Bassili 2003; Mayerl/Urban 2008).[6] As Table 2 indicates, baseline speeds are mildly correlated with raw reaction times.

Baseline speeds were then used to correct raw reaction times using the so-called residual index. Accordingly, raw reaction time was regressed on baseline speed. Residuals from this regression were then used as corrected response latencies that are by definition uncorrelated with the baseline speed (Mayerl/Urban 2008: 73-75).[7] Finally, following prior research (e.g. Huckfeldt et al. 1998: 280; Fazio/Williams 1986: 509), response latencies were transformed into binary variables using a median split. In effect, relatively short response latencies are contrasted with relatively long latencies.

[6] When creating these filler latencies, we employed the above criteria to identify valid measures. Given a considerable number of missing cases, listwise deletion would have resulted in a drastic decrease in the number of cases. Therefore, for respondents with at least eight valid measures we employed mean imputation.
Most of these filler items do not refer to the substantive content of the referendum. Moreover, additional analyses demonstrate that baseline speed is mildly, if at all, correlated with political knowledge, political efficacy, political interest, and feelings of citizen duty.

[7] The distribution of residuals is only slightly skewed, so that a logarithmic transformation of response latencies does not alter the substantive findings.

3 Findings

We start our analysis with the role of attitude accessibility, as measured by response latencies, in increasing attitude-behavior consistency concerning the turnout in the anti-smoking referendum. As mentioned above, respondents were offered five options when asked for their turnout intention: ‘definitely not’, ‘probably not’, ‘perhaps’, ‘probably’, ‘definitely’. According to attitude accessibility theory, short response latencies are anticipated to increase the likelihood of turnout among respondents who answered ‘definitely’ or ‘probably’. By the same token, short response latencies should decrease the likelihood of turnout of respondents who answered ‘probably not’ or ‘definitely not’ in the pre-referendum interview. Concerning those respondents choosing ‘perhaps’ we have no clear-cut expectation because they might comprise persons with different motives. Some respondents might choose this response because they are ambivalent and attempt to deliberate carefully about participation while others could use it as a device for satisficing in an interview (Krosnick 1991).

We examined these hypotheses using logistic regression. The dependent variable is reported participation in the post-referendum survey. Responses to the turnout intention question were included as dummy variables, with the option ‘perhaps’ as reference category. The dummy variable capturing the length of response latencies was also included. Finally, response latencies were interacted with the responses in the pre-referendum wave. Table 3 reports the results of these analyses.

The results reported in the left-hand columns indicate that respondents who said they would ‘probably’ or ‘definitely’ participate are much or somewhat more likely to actually cast a vote than respondents who chose ‘perhaps’. For respondents who chose ‘probably not’ or ‘definitely not’ the opposite applies. But does attitude accessibility as measured by response latencies make a difference in attitude-behavior consistency? The logistic regression models with the appropriate interaction terms are reported in the right-hand columns of Table 3. As

logistic regression models, in particular those with several interaction terms, are not easily accessible we calculated predicted probabilities of turnout from these models (Table 4).

Looking at the respondents who answered that they would 'probably' or 'definitely' participate in the referendum, the findings fit nicely with the expectation that quickly uttered intentions translate more easily into behavior. Irrespective of which operationalization is applied, a quick answer increases the likelihood of actual turnout about among probable and definitive prospective participants by some 12 and 6 points, respectively. Though not overwhelmingly strong, short latencies increase attitude-behavior consistency, and the operationalization does not matter.[8]

--- Table 3 and 4 about here ---

Turning to probable and definite prospective non-participants, the evidence is more mixed. Utilizing variants A and C, we find small effects in line with the hypothesis that short latencies increase the likelihood of abstention. Employing variant B, the evidence is completely at odds with the expectation derived from attitude accessibility theory, especially for probable non-participants. In sum, the evidence on prospective abstainers is not particularly supportive of our hypothesis, with Variant C yielding the most supportive results.

Finally, we turn to those respondents who gave a 'perhaps' when asked for turnout in the pre-referendum wave. As the respective coefficients in Table 3 indicate, we find a consistent pattern across operationalizations: short response latencies decrease, rather than, increase the likelihood of actual turnout. These statistically significant effects are also substantively relevant. The probabilities in Table 4 show that a slow answer increases the likelihood of participation by some 21 (indicator A) to some 27 points (indicators B and C). As a result, quick respondents have a likelihood of participation that does not exceed 60 percent, slow

[8] These patterns – as all other substantive findings – apply even after controlling for the timing of the first interview and the interval between the first and the second interview.

respondents, by contrast, exhibit a turnout rate of about 80 percent – resembling those respondents who answered ‘probably’ in the pre-referendum wave. The substantive meaning of ‘perhaps’ thus appears to depend on response latencies.

--- Table 5 about here ---

In attempt to explore the mechanisms underlying these patterns, we studied slow and fast respondents in more depth. As the results reported in Table 5 indicate, slow respondents deem the smoking referendum more important than quick respondents. This finding suggests that uninvolved voters quickly utter ‘perhaps’ to satisfice whereas a slow ‘perhaps’ indicates that highly involved voters are ambivalent. The remaining findings, however, do not fit into this pattern.[9] As a result, to some extent a quickly uttered ‘perhaps’ might indicate satisficing by low-involvement voters whereas a slow ‘perhaps’ might indicate ambivalence of involved voters. But it would be premature to draw clear conclusions from these moderate tendencies.

Turning to vote choice, we expect attitude accessibility being less effective in increasing attitude-behavior consistency. Confining the analysis to those respondents who reported to have voted in the referendum and using logistic regression, we regressed actual vote choice (0 = no vote; 1 = yes vote) on pre-referendum voting intention, response latencies and the interaction of both as well as on a number of controls. The results reported in the left-hand columns of Table 6 show that the pre-referendum intention makes a large difference in actual behavior. Moreover, smoking status proves to be a strong predictor of vote choice.

--- Table 6 about here ---

[9] Both groups do also not differ in terms of demographics, education, and smoking status.

When it comes to the impact of response latency on the consistency of attitude and behavior, the findings are more mixed. To be sure, all coefficients have the expected signs. But looking at prospective 'yes' voters, none of the interaction terms is statistically significant – irrespective of the method to identify outliers. For prospective 'no' voters, the effect of response latency turns out to be statistically significant and substantively relevant only when indicator B is applied. In sum, short response latencies increase attitude-behavior consistency only in a subsection of the electorate, if at all. The findings suggest that smoking status served as a strong cue that decreased the impact of attitude accessibility on attitude-behavior consistency.

4 Conclusion

This paper examined the impact of attitude accessibility, as measured by response latencies, on the attitude-behavior consistency in a sub-national referendum in Germany. According to the evidence, it cannot be taken for granted that response latencies make a difference in attitude-behavior consistency in referendums. While response latencies played a considerable role in increasing attitude-behavior consistency of turnout, the evidence on vote choice, by and large, does not support the hypothesis.[10] The evidence thus suggests that the nature of choice matters for the role attitude accessibility plays in affecting the link from attitude to political behavior. In the sub-national referendum under study, voters had a small choice set and could rely on smoking status that served as some kind of predisposition. Attitudes might thus translate into corresponding behavior irrespective of attitude accessibility. As a result, our analysis suggests that it is appropriate to take the nature of choice into account when analyzing the role of attitude accessibility in affecting attitude-behavior consistency.

[10] It might be objected that some of the disconfirming findings are due to ceiling effects. In substantive terms, however, those effects might indicate a high level of attitude-behavior consistency that might be typical of 'easy' referendums.

The evidence also demonstrated that substantive findings on the role of response latencies in affecting attitude-behavior consistency are not completely insensitive to the definition of outliers. For example, the effect of response latency on the attitude-behavior consistency among prospective non-voters depends upon this methodological choice. We thus suggest paying special attention to this seemingly minor question in future analyses of substantive issues concerning effects of response latencies. In particular, it does not appear to be too wise to focus on the so-called standard procedure which often results in huge valid ranges.[11] Instead, scholars should, first, explore the ranges resulting from different data cleaning procedures and consider carefully which ranges are plausible given the nature of the stimuli of interest. Then, they should explore the robustness of substantive findings across several plausible ranges of valid values.

In terms of turnout intention, the evidence suggests that response latencies make a considerable difference when dealing with respondents who state they would 'perhaps' participate in a referendum. As it turned out, respondents who slowly uttered 'perhaps' were virtually as likely to participate in the referendum as 'probable' prospective participants. Respondents who rather quickly gave a 'perhaps', by contrast, resembled quite closely 'probable' non-participants in terms of actual turnout. This finding suggests that response latencies might be a viable instrument to identify the 'true' behavioral intentions of respondents who choose the middle-category 'perhaps' when asked for turnout in a referendum. Yet, our analysis could only give some hints at the underlying mechanisms. Given the huge potential pay-off of a sound understanding of the mechanisms and their implications for measuring turnout in surveys, this issue warrants further in-depth analyses.

[11] Moreover, this procedure rests on the assumption of a distribution being normal. Most studies, however, report considerably skewed distributions of reaction times (see e.g. Huckfeldt et al. 1999: 894; Mulligan et al. 2003: 293).

References

Bassili, John N. (1993). Response Latency Versus Certainty as Indexes of the Strength of Voting Intentions in a CATI Survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 57, 54-61.

Bassili, John N. (1995a). Response Latency and the Accessibility of Voting Intentions: What Contributes to Accessibility and How It Affects Vote Choice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 686-695.

Bassili, John N. (1995b). On the psychological reality of party identification: Evidence from the accessibility of voting intentions and of partisan feelings. Political Behavior, 17, 339-358.

Bassili, John N. (2003). The minority slowness effect: Subtle inhibitions in the expression of views not shared by others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84, 261-276.

Burdein, Inna/Lodge, Milton/Taber, Charles (2006). Experiments on the Automaticity of Political Beliefs and Attitudes. Political Psychology, 27, 359-371.

Converse, Philip E. (1970). Attitudes and non-attitudes: Continuation of a dialogue. In: Tufte, Edward R. (Ed.), The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems (pp. 168-189). Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Devine, Patricia G./Plant, E. Ashby/Amodio, David M./Harmon-Jones, Eddie/Vance, Stephanie L. (2002). The Regulation of Explicit and Implicit Race Bias: The Role of Motivations to Respond Without Prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82, 835-848.

Faas, Thorsten/Mayerl, Jochen (2010). Michigan reloaded: Antwortlatenzzeiten als Moderatorvariablen in Modellen des Wahlverhaltens. In: Faas, Thorsten/Arzheimer, Kai/Roßteutscher, Sigrid (Eds.), Information – Wahrnehmung – Emotion: Politische Psychologie in der Wahl- und Einstellungsforschung (pp. 259-276). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Fazio, Russell H. (1986). How do attitudes guide behavior? In: Sorrentino, Richard M./Higgins, E. Tory (Eds.), The handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundation of social behavior (pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford Press.

Fazio, Russell H. (1989). On the power and functionality of attitudes: The role of attitude accessibility. In: Pratkanis, Anthony R./Breckler, Steven J./Greenwald, Anthony G. (Eds.), Attitude structure and function (pp. 153-180). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fazio, Russell H. (1990). A Practical Guide to the Use of Response Latency in Social Psychological Research. In: Hendrick, Clyde/Clark, Margaret S. (Eds.), Research methods in personality and social research (pp. 74-97). Newbury: Sage.

Fazio, Russell H. (1995). Attitudes as Object-Evaluation Associations: Determinants, Consequences, and Correlates of Attitude Accessibility. In: Krosnick, Jon A./Petty, Richard E. (Eds.), Attitude Strength: Antecedents and Consequences (pp. 247-282). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fazio, Russell H./Chen, Jeaw-Mei/McDonel, Elizabeth C./Sherman, Steven J. (1982). Attitude accessibility, attitude-behavior consistency, and the strength of the object-evaluation association. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18, 339-357.

Fazio, Russell H./Sanbonmatsu, David M./Powell, Martha C./Kardes, Frank R. (1986). On the automatic activation of attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 229-238.

Fazio, Russell H./Williams, Carol J. (1986). Attitude Accessibility as a Moderator of the Attitude-Perception and Attitude-Behavior Relations: An Investigation of the 1984 Presidential Election. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 505-514.

Grant, J. Tobin/Mockabee, Stephen T./Monson, J. Quin (2009). Campaign Effects on the Accessibility of Party Identification. Political Research Quarterly OnlineFirst, published on May 15, 2009.

Huckfeldt, Robert/Levine, Jeffrey/Morgan, William/Sprague, John (1998). Election Campaigns, Social Communication, and the Accessibility of Perceived Discussant Preference. Political Behavior, 20, 263-294.

Huckfeldt, Robert/Levine, Jeffrey/Morgan, William/Sprague, John (1999). Accessibility and the Political Utility of Partisan and Ideological Orientations. American Journal of Political Science, 43, 888-911.

Krosnick, Jon A. (1991). Response Strategies for Coping with the Cognitive Demands of Attitude Measures in Surveys. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5, 213-236.

Maio, Gregory R./Olson, James M. (1995). The effect of attitude dissimulation on attitude accessibility. Social Cognition, 13, 127-144.

Mayerl, Jochen (2009). Kognitive Grundlagen sozialen Verhaltens: Framing, Einstellungen und Rationalität. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Mayerl, Jochen/Urban, Dieter (2008). Antwortreaktionszeiten in Survey-Analysen: Messung, Auswertung und Anwendung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Mulligan, Kenneth/Grant, J. Tobin/Mockabee, Stephen T./Monson, Joseph Q. (2003). Response Latency Methodology for Survey Research: Measurement and Modeling Strategies. Political Analysis, 11, 289-301.

Petersen, Michael B./Slothuus, Rune/Stubager, Rune/Togeby, Lise (2011). Deservingness versus values in public opinion on welfare: The automaticity of the deservingness heuristic. European Journal of Political Research, 50, 24-52.

Schoen, Harald (2010). Eine eindeutige Entscheidung nach resonanzarmer Kampagne. Überlegungen zum Volksentscheid über den Nichtraucherschutz in Bayern. Zeitschrift für Politikberatung, 3, 457-461.

Schoen, Harald/Glantz, Alexander/Teusch, Rebecca (2011). Raucher oder Nichtraucher – ist das die Frage? Wahlbeteiligung und Abstimmungsverhalten beim Volksentscheid über das Rauchverbot in Bayern. Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen, 42, 492-502.

Shiffrin, Richard M./Dumais, Susan T. (1981). The development of automatism. In: Anderson, John R. (Eds.), Cognitive skills and their acquisition (pp. 111-140). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge that this research was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under grant SCHO 1358/3. Correspondences concerning this article should be sent to Marco Meyer, Lehrstuhl für Politische Soziologie, Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Feldkirchenstrasse 21, D-96047 Bamberg. Email: marco.meyer@uni-bamberg.de

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the reaction times of the turnout and voting intention (different variants)

	Turnout intention			Voting intention		
	Variant A	Variant B	Variant C	Variant A	Variant B	Variant C
Minimum	0.17	0.30	0.17	0.13	0.42	0.13
Maximum	12.61	7.88	5.00	23.41	8.00	5.00
Mean	2.91	2.55	2.15	5.39	3.28	2.56
Median	2.33	2.24	2.03	3.53	2.94	2.41
Stand. deviation	2.20	1.50	1.08	4.82	1.74	1.08
N	1865	1688	1228	1448	1111	726

Table 2: Correlations between baseline speed and uncorrected reaction time

	Variant A	Variant B	Variant C
Turnout intention	0.15***	0.16***	0.17***
Voting intention	0.15***	0.22***	0.25***

Note: Cell entries are pearsons r coefficients. Significance level: ***: $p < 0.001$.

Table 3: Effect from turnout intention on reported turnout (Logistic regression)

	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 parenthesis; Significance levels: *: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $p < 0.001$.

Table 4: Predicted probabilities of turnout based on logistic regression in Table 3

	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	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 * 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 5: Mean difference between short and long ‘perhaps’ respondents (Variant A)

	Political Interest		Citizen Duty		Issue Importance		Knowledge	
	long	short	long	short	long	Short	long	short
Mean	0.50	0.48	0.79	0.83	0.45	0.34	0.46	0.45
Difference	$0.02^{n.s.}$		$0.04^{n.s.}$		0.11^{+}		$0.01^{n.s.}$	

Differences tested with t-tests for independent samples; n.s.: not statistically significant; $^{+}$: $p < 0.10$. All variables running from 0 to 1; N(long)=95; N(short)=34.

Table 6: Effect from voting intention on reported voting behavior (Logistic regression)

	Variant A		Variant B		Variant C	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	-1.52*	-1.36	-1.47	-1.02	-1.85	-1.76
	(0.75)	(0.76)	(0.86)	(0.87)	(1.13)	(1.11)
Intention in favor	4.00***	3.82***	3.94***	3.61***	4.55***	4.43***
	(0.28)	(0.36)	(0.32)	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.54)
Intention in favor * srl		0.37		0.86		0.29
		(0.53)		(0.61)		(0.76)
Short response latency (srl)		-0.43		-1.13*		-0.22
		(0.43)		(0.51)		(0.63)
Political Interest	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.03
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.20)
Issue Importance	0.24*	0.24*	0.26	0.27	0.11	0.11
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.20)	(0.21)
Knowledge	-0.03	-0.02	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.08
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Smoker	-1.61***	-1.60***	-1.86***	-1.87***	-1.70***	-1.68***
	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.31)	(0.33)	(0.42)	(0.44)
Education low	-0.62	-0.62	-0.40	-0.38	-0.26	-0.25
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.51)	(0.51)
Education high	0.45	0.46	0.60*	0.66*	1.03**	1.05**
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Age	-0.02*	-0.02	-0.03*	-0.03**	-0.03*	-0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
McFadden's R^2	0.56	0.56	0.57	0.57	0.61	0.61
N	1169	1169	919	919	633	633

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