Codebook for: Compton and Philips, "Does job insecurity shape policy preferences? An experimental manipulation of labor market risk"
Last updated: 3/12/23
Note: All survey data come from the post-election round of the nationally-representative US 2020 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES). Any other data sources are noted below.

- educ: Educational attainment of respondent (see variable for category descriptions)
- employ: Employment status of respondent (see variable for category descriptions)
- CUB4P05_wording: = 1 if respondent was in control group, = 2 if respondent was in the insecure treatment, = 3 if respondent was in the secure treatment
- female: = 1 if the respondent identifies as female, 0 otherwise
- partyid: = 1 if respondent identifies as Democrat, 2 if Republican, and 3 if Independent or Don't Know
- protestant: = 1 if respondent identifies as Protestant, 0 otherwise
- catholic: = 1 if respondent identifies as Catholic, 0 otherwise
- age: age of respondent in 2020
- democrat: = 1 if respondent identifies as Democrat, 0 otherwise
- republican: = 1 if respondent identifies as Republican, 0 otherwise
- latinx: = 1 if respondent identifies as Latin(o/a/x), 0 otherwise
- minority: = 1 if respondent identifies non-white, 0 otherwise
- riskacceptance: 11-point scale where 0 = "completely unwilling to take risks" and 10 = "very willing to take risks"
- altruism: 11-point scale where 0 = "completely unwilling to share" and 10 = "very willing to share"
- jobinsecurity: 7-point scale of "*do you think it is likely that you will lose your job or be laid off in the next 12 months?"* (higher = more insecure/more likely)
- benefit_pref: 7-point scale where 1 = "much lower benefit amount per week" and 7 = "much higher benefit amount per week"
- duration_pref: 7-point scale where 1 = "many fewer weeks of benefit payments" and 7 = "many more weeks of benefit payments"
- strict_pref: 7-point scale where 1 = "much more restrictive eligibility criteria" and 7 = "much less restrictive eligibility criteria"
- benefit_rank: Relative ranking of unemployment benefits, where higher = greater priority (ranking choices are: "benefit amount per week", "weeks of benefit payments", "strictness of eligibility criteria", "cost of the program")
- duration_rank: Relative ranking of duration of unemployment benefits, where higher = greater priority (ranking choices are: "benefit amount per week", "weeks of benefit payments", "strictness of eligibility criteria", "cost of the program")
- strict_rank: Relative ranking of eligibility strictness of unemployment benefits, where higher = greater priority (ranking choices are: "benefit amount per week", "weeks of benefit payments", "strictness of eligibility criteria", "cost of the program")

- cost_rank: Relative ranking of cost of unemployment benefit program, where higher = greater priority (ranking choices are: “benefit amount per week”, “weeks of benefit payments”, “strictness of eligibility criteria”, “cost of the program”)
- secure_minus_control: = 1 if CUB4P05_wording == 3 and = 0 if CUB4P05_wording == 1.
- insecure_minus_control: = 1 if CUB4P05_wording == 2 and 0 if CUB4P05_wording == 1.
- insecure_minus_secure: = 1 if CUB4P05_wording == 2 and 0 if CUB4P05_wording == 3
- region_census: Census regions of the US (New England, Midwest, Southwest, Southeast, West)
- ue_quart: Quartiles of US unemployment by state in November 2020. 1: unemployment <= 4.9, 2: unemployment > 4.9 and <= 6, 3: unemployment > 6 and <= 7.3, 4: unemployment > 7.3. Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, https://www.bls.gov/
- discountrate: 11-point scale where 0 = “completely unwilling to give up something today” and 10 = “very willing to give up something today”
- bachelors: = 1 if respondent has a Bachelors degree or higher, 0 otherwise
- rtw: = 1 if respondent lives in a right-to-work state, 0 otherwise. Source: National Right to Work Committee, https://nrtwc.org/facts/state-right-to-work-timeline-2016/