

Supporting Information

Gromet et al. 10.1073/pnas.1218453110

Table S1. Linear regressions predicting how much participants favored investment in energy-efficient technology and how much they valued three features of energy efficiency (reduced carbon emissions, reduced dependence on foreign oil, and lower energy costs) from the ideology composite (centered: $M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.42$), demographic controls, the order in which participants provided their political ideology, and the order in which they answered the moral obligation and benefit questions

Predictor variables	Favor investment	Standard error	Carbon emission reduction	Standard error	Foreign oil reduction	Standard error	Cost reduction	Standard error
Ideology composite	-0.28***	(0.04)	-0.45***	(0.05)	-0.11***	(0.04)	-0.16***	(0.04)
Age	0.004	(0.00)	0.08*	(0.00)	0.01***	(0.00)	0.01**	(0.00)
Sex (male = 0; female = 1)	0.13	(0.09)	0.36***	(0.01)	0.10	(0.08)	0.20*	(0.08)
Education level	-0.01	(0.03)	-0.04	(0.04)	-0.03	(0.03)	-0.05	(0.03)
Income level	0.04	(0.05)	0.00	(0.06)	0.03	(0.05)	-0.00	(0.05)
Ideology order (first = -1; last = 1)	0.05	(0.04)	0.02	(0.05)	0.01	(0.04)	0.03	(0.04)
Question order (benefit first = -1; moral first = 1)	-0.01	(0.04)	0.02	(0.05)	0.10*	(0.04)	0.08*	(0.04)
Sex × ideology composite	0.09	(0.06)	0.15*	(0.07)	0.01	(0.06)	0.04	(0.06)
Ideology order × ideology composite	-0.03	(0.03)	0.01	(0.03)	-0.03	(0.03)	0.00	(0.03)
Question order × ideology composite	-0.03	(0.03)	0.00	(0.03)	0.08**	(0.03)	0.02	(0.03)
Ideology order × question order	-0.11*	(0.04)	-0.10*	(0.05)	-0.06	(0.04)	-0.10*	(0.04)
Ideology order × question order × ideology composite	-0.02	(0.03)	-0.03	(0.03)	0.01	(0.03)	0.02	(0.03)
Constant	5.53***	(0.22)	5.24***	(0.25)	5.33***	(0.21)	5.56***	(0.20)

Unstandardized regression coefficients (with SE in parentheses) are reported. Ideology composite: Higher numbers indicate greater conservatism. Note: 31 participants were excluded from these analyses because they did not provide their income level (remaining $n = 626$). The results do not differ if these participants are included in the analyses. In the significant sex by ideology interaction for carbon emission reduction, the ideology slope was steeper for males than for females, but both slopes were negative and significant (males: $B = -0.27$, $SE = 0.04$, $t(320) = -6.82$, $P < 0.001$; females: $B = -0.17$, $SE = 0.04$, $t(333) = -3.83$, $P < 0.001$). In these analyses, age is treated as linear term. Additional analyses examined a quadratic term for age, which was not a significant predictor for any of the four measures ($ts < 1$).

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$.

Table S2. Bootstrap mediation analyses of the relationship between the political ideology composite and support for investment in energy-efficient technology based on participants' energy-related values (reduced carbon emissions, reduced dependence on foreign oil, and lower energy costs)

Variables	Bootstrapped coefficient	SE	95% confidence interval	
			Lower	Upper
Carbon emissions	-0.11	0.02	-0.15	-0.07
Foreign oil	-0.03	0.01	-0.05	-0.01
Cost	-0.03	0.01	-0.06	-0.01
Carbon emission vs. foreign oil	-0.08	0.02	-0.12	-0.04
Carbon emission vs. cost	-0.08	0.02	-0.13	-0.03
Foreign oil vs. cost	0.00	0.02	-0.03	0.04

Age, sex, education level, and income are included as control variables.

Table S3. Differences in ratings of incandescent and fluorescent light bulbs

Measures	Incandescent	Fluorescent	<i>P</i> value
Function	4.85 (1.29)	5.09 (1.08)	0.01
Savings	3.06 (1.86)	5.54 (1.62)	<0.001
Environmental benefit	2.12 (1.16)	6.11 (1.09)	<0.001

SDs are in parentheses.

Table S4. Logistic regression predicting light-bulb choice (blank-label, unequal-cost condition)

Predictor variables	B	SE	Wald	<i>P</i> value	e^B
Ideology composite (linear)	0.15	0.34	0.19	0.661	1.16
Ideology composite (quadratic)	-0.38	0.41	0.86	0.354	0.69
Constant	0.67	0.40	2.74	0.098	1.95

The ideology composite comprises standardized political ideology and party affiliation scores ($M = -0.01$, $SD = 0.83$). Higher numbers indicate greater conservatism.

Table S5. Logistic regression predicting light-bulb choice (environmental-label, unequal-cost condition)

Predictor variables	B	SE	Wald	<i>P</i> value	e^B
Ideology composite (linear)	-1.11	0.53	4.33	0.037	0.33
Ideology composite (quadratic)	0.99	0.47	4.44	0.035	2.70
Constant	-0.67	0.41	2.71	0.10	0.51

The ideology composite comprises standardized political ideology and party affiliation scores ($M = -0.01$, $SD = 0.83$; higher numbers indicate greater conservatism).

Table S6. Floodlight regressions of light bulb choice based on label across the linear ideology composite from -1 to 1 (unequal-cost condition only)

Ideology value	B	SE	Wald	P value	e ^B (odds ratio)
-1	1.29	0.88	2.14	0.144	3.63
-0.8	0.54	0.67	0.65	0.420	1.72
-0.6	-0.09	0.55	0.28	0.868	0.91
-0.4	-0.62	0.52	1.41	0.234	0.54
-0.2	-1.03	0.54	3.68	0.055	0.36
0	-1.34	0.57	5.45	0.020	0.26
0.2	-1.54	0.60	6.48	0.011	0.22
0.4	-1.62	0.62	6.82	0.009	0.20
0.6	-1.60	0.64	6.36	0.012	0.20
0.8	-1.47	0.66	4.96	0.026	0.23
1	-1.23	0.72	2.90	0.089	0.29

We conducted floodlight regression analyses that assessed whether light bulb choice based on label varied significantly across the political ideology composite from -1 to 1 in increments of 0.2. For each regression, new linear and quadratic ideology terms were calculated for the specific level investigated. Thus, we conducted the 11 logistic regressions predicting light bulb choice at each level of the ideology composite listed in the table. The blank label was coded as 0, and the environmental label was coded as 1. Each regression predicting light bulb choice contained all the predictors listed in Table 2.

Table S7. Linear regression predicting participants' assessment of light bulb function, savings, and environmental benefit, and participants' ratings of identity (expressed and affirmed) by choosing the compact fluorescent light (CFL) bulb (only for when the CFL bulb is more expensive)

Predictor variables	Function			Savings			Environmental benefit				
	Incandescent	Fluorescent	Standard error	Incandescent	Fluorescent	Standard error	Incandescent	Fluorescent	Standard error	Identity composite	Standard error
Label (-1 = blank label; 1 = environmental label)	0.15	0.02	(0.18)	0.22	-0.04	(0.25)	0.24	-0.09	(0.16)	-0.03	(0.22)
Ideology composite (linear)	0.18	0.12	(0.18)	0.03	-0.06	(0.25)	0.23	-0.10	(0.16)	-0.21	(0.22)
Label × ideology composite (linear)	0.09	-0.32*	(0.18)	0.38	-0.30	(0.25)	0.09	-0.01	(0.16)	-0.10	(0.22)
Ideology composite (quadratic)	0.04	-0.08	(0.18)	-0.09	0.13	(0.25)	-0.19	0.12	(0.16)	0.07	(0.22)
Label × ideology composite (quadratic)	-0.18	0.13	(0.18)	-0.41	0.25	(0.25)	-0.08	-0.02	(0.16)	0.27	(0.22)
Constant	4.75***	5.07***	(0.18)	3.50***	4.97***	(0.25)	2.28***	6.00***	(0.16)	3.24***	(0.22)

Unstandardized regression coefficients (with SE in parentheses) are reported. The ideology composite comprises standardized political ideology and party affiliation scores ($M = -0.01$, $SD = 0.83$); higher numbers indicate greater conservatism. The only significant result is the ideology composite (linear) by label interaction for perceived functionality of the CFL bulb. The ideology composite predicted participants' ratings only when there was no label ($\beta = 0.44$, $SE = 0.19$, $t(52) = 2.33$, $P = 0.024$), so that the more conservative participants were, the higher was the evaluation they gave of the CFL bulb's function. There was no effect of ideology on perceived functionality of the CFL bulb with the environmental label ($t < 1$).

* $P < 0.05$.