Codebook for Timothy Ryan, "Actions Versus Consequences in Political Arguments: Insights from Moral Psychology."

manip_check_raw.csv

These are the raw responses for the external manipulation check. The variables below have a different version for each possible outcome of the random assignment. Where an asterisk appears in a variable name, it is filled in with a letter (a, b, c, or d) in the dataset. If the letter is A, then the variable measures impressions about the liberal consequentialist argument. If B, it is the liberal deontological argument. If C, it is the conservative consequentialist argument. If D, it is the conservative deontological argument.

- Mcmor*_1-mcmor*_6: Respondents' impressions of the argument they read. Responses are coded as Not at all (1), Slightly (2), Moderately (3), Much (4), and Very much (5). Variables ending in the number 1 refer to the assessment that the argument is based on "a principle." Ending in 2 is "an effort to weight the facts." Ending in 3 is "a deeply held belief." Ending in 4 is "an effort to weight pros and cons." Ending in 5 is "A moral stance." Ending in 6 is "an effort to weight pros and cons.
- Mcage*: Respondent's guess about the argument speaker's age—coded in years.
- Mctimer*_1: Time before the respondent's first click, after reading the argument, coded in seconds. (The other timing variables time subsequent clicks and are not used in this analysis.)
- Mcthink*_1-mcthink*_9: Respondent's assessment of how much the presented argument reminds her of other things. Ending in 1 refers to "the economy." Ending in 2 refers to "the future." Ending in 3 refers to "your family." Ending in 4 refers to "your job." Ending in 5 refers to "religion." Ending in 6 refers to "Mitt Romney." Ending in 7 refers to "Barack Obama." Ending in 8 refers to "The Republican Party." Ending in 9 refers to "The Democratic Party."

manip_check_working.dta

Similar to manip_check_raw.csv, several variables have a different version for each possible outcome of the random assignment. Where an asterisk appears in a variable name, it is filled in with a letter (a, b, c, or d) in the dataset. If the letter is A, then the variable measures impressions about the liberal consequentialist argument. If B, it is the liberal deontological argument. If C, it is the conservative consequentialist argument. If D, it is the conservative deontological argument.

- Mcmor*_1-mcmor*_6: Same as in the raw dataset, except rescaled to run from Not at all=0 to Very much=5.
- Mcage*: Same as in the raw dataset.
- Mctimer*_1: Same as in the raw dataset.
- Mcthink*_1-mcthink*_9: Same as in the raw dataset, but rescaled to run from Not at all=0 to Extremely=1
- Cond: Respondent's randomly assigned condition. Liberal consequentialist=0; Liberal deontological=1; Conservative consequentialist=2; Conservative deontological=3.
- Deontcond: Respondent was assigned to the consequentialist condition (=0) or the deontological condition (=1).

- Libexper: Respondent is part of the consevatives' experiment (=0) or the liberals' (=1).
- Mcmor1 – mcmor6: Same as the mcmor* variables, but collapsed across conditions.
- Deontscale: Average responses on the deontological items (mcmor variables ending in 1, 3, and 5).
- Constscale: Average responses on the consequentialist items (mcmor variables ending in 2, 4, and 6).
- Mcthink*: Same as the mcthink* variables, but collapsed across conditions.
- Mcage: Same as the mcage* variables, but collapsed across conditions.
- Mctime: Same as the mctime* variables, but collapsed across conditions.

Study1_raw.dta

These are the raw responses on the national sample collected by GfK Research. Variables are as follows:

- CaseID: Unique sequential identifier for each respondent.
- Weight: Post-stratification weight provided by GfK.
- Tm_start: Date respondent started the study.
- Tm_finish: Date respondent finished the study.
- Q1: Response to the main Social Security question. Response codes: Strongly oppose decreasing Social Security benefits = 1; Somewhat oppose decreasing Social Security benefits = 2; Slightly oppose decreasing Social Security benefits = 3; I don't have an opinion one way or the other on this issue = 4; Slightly support decreasing Social Security benefits = 5; Somewhat support decreasing Social Security benefits = 6; Strongly support decreasing Social Security benefits = 7.
- Q2: Perceived importance of the Social Security issue. Codes: Not at all = 1; Slightly = 2; Moderately = 3; Very = 4; Extremely = 5.
- Q3: Personal relevance of the Social Security issue. Codes: Not at all = 1; Slightly = 2; Moderately = 3; Very = 4; Extremely = 5.
- Q4: Extent to which Social Security attitude is a reflection of core moral beliefs and conviction. Codes: Not at all = 1; Slightly = 2; Moderately = 3; Much = 4; Very much = 5.
- Q4_1: Extent to which Social Security attitude is deeply connected to beliefs about right and wrong. Codes: Not at all = 1; Slightly = 2; Moderately = 3; Much = 4; Very much = 5.
- Condition_1 – Condition_16: Respondent's randomly assigned condition. Codes: Conservatives assigned to the consequentialist argument = A1. Conservatives assigned to the deontological argument = B1. Liberals assigned to the consequentialist argument = A2. Liberals assigned to the deontological argument = B2. Subjects assigned to the control condition = C. These codes are spread over 16 variables that correspond to blocks for a blocked random assignment. There are Condition variables for each of 4 levels of religious observance crossed with each of four levels of education.
- Q5: Perceived quality of ideas raised in the news clipping. Codes: Very low = 1; Somewhat low = 2; Moderately high = 3; Very high = 4; Extremely high = 5.
- PARTY7: Respondent's party identification. (GfK Panel data.) Codes: Strong Republican = 1; Not strong Republican = 2; Leans Republican = 3; Undecided / Independent / Other = 4; Leans Democrat = 5; Not strong Democrat = 6; Strong Democrat = 7.

- IDEO: Respondent's ideology. (GfK Panel data.) Codes: Refused = -1; Extremely liberal = 1; Liberal = 2; Slightly liberal = 3; Moderate = 4; Slightly conservative = 5; Conservative = 6; Extremely conservative = 7.
- PPAGE: Respondent's age, coded in years. (GfK Panel data.)
- PPEDUC: Respondent's highest education. (GfK Panel data.) Codes: No formal education = 1; 5th or 6th grade = 3; 7th or 8th grade = 4; 9th grade = 5; 10th grade = 6; 11th grade = 7; 12th grade = 8; High school diploma = 9; Some college = 10; Associate degree = 11; Bachelor's degree = 12; Master's degree = 13; Professional or doctorate degree = 14.
- PPETHM: Respondent's ethnicity. (GfK Panel data.) Codes: White, non-Hispanic = 1; Black, Non-Hispanic = 2; Other, Non-Hispanic = 3; Hispanic = 4; Two or more races, Non-Hispanic = 5.
- PPGENDER: Respondent's gender. (GfK Panel data.) Codes: 1 = male; 2 = female.

Study1_working.dta

Variables with the same name as in Study1_raw are identical. Additional variables:

- Socsecop2: Same as Q1, but coded from Strongly oppose decreasing Social Security benefits = 0 to Strongly support decreasing Social Security benefits = 6.
- Extfold: Extremity of the respondent's Social Security opinion, coded from neutral = 0 to extreme = 1.
- Imp: Personal importance of the respondent's Social Security opinion, coded from not at all important = 0 to extremely important = 1.
- Relev: Personal relevance of the respondent's Social Security opinion, coded from not at all relevant = 0 to extremely relevant = 1.
- Mor1: Extent to which Social Security attitude is a reflection of core moral beliefs and conviction, coded from not at all = 0 to very much = 1.
- Mor2: Extent to which Social Security attitude is a connected to beliefs about right and wrong, coded from not at all = 0 to very much = 1.
- Mor: Average of the responses to the two moral conviction questions.
- Qual: Perceived quality of the Social Security argument, scaled from low-quality = 0 to high-quality = 1.
- Agebin: Respondent's age, categorized as 18-28 = 0; 29-38=1; 39-48=2; 49-58-3; 59-68=4; 69-92=5.
- Female: Codes: Respondent is male = 0; Female = 1.
- Pidr: Respondent's partisanship, coded from Strong Democrat = 0 to Strong Republican = 1.
- Ideol: Respondent's ideology, coded from Extremely liberal = 0 to Extremely conservative = 1.
- Educ: Respondent's education, coded No diploma = 0; High school diploma = 1; Some college = 2; Bachelor's degree = 3; Graduate degree = 4.
- Race: Respondent's race, coded White = 0; Black = 1; Other = 4.
- Conseq: Respondent's random assignment, coded deontological = 0; consequentialist = 1.
- Issside: Codes what side of the Social Security issue the respondent took, coded liberal = 1; conservative = 2; neutral = missing value.

Study2_raw.csv

These are the raw responses on the instrument used for Study 2. Variables are as follows:

- Caseid: Unique case number for each respondent.
- Cond: Records what set of response options the respondent was randomly assigned to. Strong = s; Effective = e.
- Gender: Respondent's gender, coded male = 1, female = 2.
- Respondent's partisanship, coded from Strong Democrat = 1 to Strong Republican = 7.
- Sy1: Response to the Syria question, coded from Strongly oppose military action = 1 to Strongly favor = 7.
- Sy2: Personal importance of the Syria issue, coded Not at all = 1 to Very = 5.
- Sy3: Personal relevance of the Syria issue, coded Not at all = 1 to Very much = 5.
- Sy4: Extent to which Syria is reflection of core moral beliefs and convictions, coded Not at all = 1 to Very much = 5.
- Sy5: Extent to which Syria is connected to beliefs about fundamental right and wrong, coded Not at all = 1 to Very much = 5.
- Sy8: Agreement with the statement, "As a matter of right and wrong, America has no right to interfere with the internal politics of another nation," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy9: Agreement with the statement, "It is wrong to put American troops in harm's way for a conflict that does not directly affect Americans," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy10: Agreement with the statement, "Military action is simply not likely to be effective, since the Syrian government could continue to develop and use chemical weapons in secret," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy11: Agreement with the statement, "It is not prudent for America to conduct an expensive military operation in Syria, giving its looming debt problems," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy12: Agreement with the statement, "America has a fundamental obligation to thwart the use of chemical weapons," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy13: Agreement with the statement, "As a model of democracy, America has an obligation to oppose authoritarian dictators," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy14: Agreement with the statement, "If America does not engage in military action, it is likely to embolden dictators elsewhere," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- Sy15: Agreement with the statement, "There would be costs to military action in Syria, but the benefits that could come from it are worth the costs," coded Not at all strong/effective to Extremely effective = 5.
- SS1: Response to the Social Security question, coded from Strongly favor decreasing Social Security benefits = 1 to Strongly oppose = 7.
- SS2-SS5: Similar to Sy2-Sy5, but for the Social Security issue.
- SS8-SS15: Similar to Sy8-Sy15. In order, the arguments being evaluated are: "Cutting back

on Social Security has some costs, but also benefits: it will free up some money for people to invest and create jobs; It is wrong to give away (through taxing and spending) money that people have worked hard to earn; People have a fundamental obligation and responsibility to make provisions for their own retirement; Many Social Security benefits go to people in the middle or upper class who can get by without, and could be spent elsewhere; Having an assured income in retirement makes people happier and more productive workers earlier in life, which is good for everyone; Society has a core obligation to provide everyone with a safety net; It is wrong to cut back on benefits for future retirees when they have already been paying into the system; Many people don't have enough information or experience to handle the private investing that would be necessary if Social Security were to be scaled back."

- GC1: Response to the stem gun control question, coded from Strongly support stricter gun laws = 1 to Strongly oppose = 7.
- GC2-GC5: Similar to the same numbers for other issues.
- GC8-GC15: Argument evaluations. In order, the arguments are: If it is harder to purchase the most dangerous types of guns, then the number of accidental deaths from guns is likely to decrease; It is wrong for private citizens to own a tool whose only purpose is to kill; There are costs to gun control, such as to hobbyists, but the benefits of less violence are worth this tradeoff; Citizens only have a right to own guns whose primary purpose is recreation (such as target shooting or hunting); Measures that restrict what kind of guns can be sold simply aren't likely to be effective, since there are so many guns already on the streets; Citizens have a fundamental right to protect themselves, and guns are a crucial way to do that; Increased gun control would have benefits, but would also require paying for more regulation, enforcement, and background checks. We don't need those extra costs in our current economic situation; It's a matter of fundamental liberties. The government has no right to intrude on what individual citizens buy and sell from each other.
- CB1: Response to the stem Collective bargaining question, coded from Strongly support limiting collective bargaining = 1 to Strong oppose = 7.
- CB2-CB5: Similar to the same numbers for other issues.
- CB8-CB15: Argument evaluations. In order, the arguments are: Laws that enshrine collective bargaining require that workers pay fees to a union whether they want to or not,. Taking away the right to choose is wrong; Collective bargaining is a way for government workers to boost their salaries beyond what they have a right to receive; In practice, collective bargaining raises expenses for government, which is not prudent in our current circumstances; There are benefits to collective bargaining, but also important costs: When unions succeed in raising compensation for themselves, it can lead to unemployment for other people; The ability of people to bargain collectively is an inviolable right; As a matter of right and wrong, people are entitled to fair compensation; In the past, claims about government shortfalls have been exaggerated. It's likely to be true this time, too; To allow collective bargaining carries a cost to taxpayers, but these are outweighed by the benefits it creates for workers, making it a prudent policy.
- NU1: Response to the stem Nuclear energy question, coded from Strongly oppose investing in nuclear energy = 1 to Strongly favor = 7.
- NU2-NU5: Similar to similar numbered questions for other issues.
- NU8-NU15: Argument evaluations. In order, the arguments are: Nuclear energy requires thinking about both potential risks and benefits. For the time being, the risk of a meltdown is too big to take on; Even if nuclear power has some advantages relative to alternative ways

to produce energy, it is wrong to take on any risk of a nuclear meltdown; Even if investing in nuclear power would provide some benefits, it's not a high enough priority to spend money when we face so many problems in education, health, and other areas; Nuclear energy generates radioactive waste, and it is wrong that anybody should have to store that material; Nuclear energy requires thinking about both potential risks and benefits. The technology has now advanced far enough that the risk of a meltdown is minor; As oil reserves continue to deplete, we have an obligation to the next generation to develop sustainable energy alternatives; The risks the come along with nuclear energy are minor when compared to the benefit of decreased air pollution; When the people of a particular area decide that they want to construct a nuclear power plant and take on the risks that come with it, they have a right to do so.

Study2_working_long.dta

Coded data for Study 2, in long format (five rows per respondent, one for each issue).

- Caseid: Respondent's case identifier.
- Effective: Respondent's random assignment, coded Strong responses = 0 and Effective = 1.
- Extfold, Imp, Relev, Mor: Respondent's attitude intensity measures, coded from low intensity = 0 to high intensity = 1. (Similar to Study 1.)
- Dpref: Respondent's preference for deontological versus consequentialist arguments, coded from strongly prefer consequentialist arguments = -1 to strong prefer deontological arguments = 1.
- Issue: Issue the attitudes correspond to, coded CB=1; Gun control=2; Nuclear energy=3; Social Security=4; Syria=5.

Study2_working_wide.dta

Coded data for Study 2 in wide format (one row per respondent). Where variables repeat, they are the same as in Study2_raw.csv. Remaining variables:

- Effective: Respondent's random assignment, coded Strong responses = 0 and Effective = 1.
- Syextfold: Attitude extremity on the Syria issue, coded from neutral = 0 to extreme = 1.
- Syimp: Attitude importance on the Syria issue, coded low = 0 to high = 1.
- Syrelev: Attitude relevance on the Syria issue, coded low = 0 to high = 1.
- Symor1: Extent to which Syria is reflection of core moral beliefs and convictions, coded Not at all = 0 to Very much = 1.
- Symor2: Extent to which Syria is connected to beliefs about fundamental right and wrong, coded Not at all = 0 to Very much = 1.
- Ssextfold-Numor2: Similar to the variables above, but for the other issues. (Collective bargaining = CB; Gun control = GC Nuclear energy = NU; Social Security =SS.)
- Symor-Numor: Average moral conviction on each of the five issues, coded low = 0 to high = 1.
- Syd: Average evaluation of deontological Syria arguments, coded low = 0 to 1 = high.
- Syc: Average evaluation of consequentialist Syria arguments, coded low = 0 to 1 = high.

- Sydpref: Deontological argument preference minus consequentialist argument preference for Syria.
- Ssd-Nudpref: Similar to the three variables above, repeated for each issues.

Study3_raw.csv

These are the raw responses on the instrument used for Study 3. Variables are as follows:

- Caseid: Respondent's unique case identifier
- Female: Is respondent female? Codes: No=0; Yes=1.
- Demstrong: Asked of Democrats, does the respondent identify as a strong Democrat, or a not strong Democrat? Codes: Strong = 1; Not strong =2.
- Repstrong: Same as Demstrong, but for Republicans.
- Partclose: Asked of respondents who do not identify as Democratic or Republican, does the respondent lean toward either party? Codes: Lean Republican = 1; Lean Democratic = 2; Don't lean toward either party = 3.
- Gcext: Respondent's answer to the stem gun control question. Coded from strongly support stricter gun laws = 1 to strongly oppose = 7.
- Gcimp: Attitude importance for the gun control issue. Coded from not at all important = 1 to very important = 5.
- Gcrelev: Personal relevance of the gun control issue, coded from not at all = 1 to very much = 5.
- Gcsmor1: Is gun control opinion a matter of core moral beliefs and convictions? Coded from 1 = Not at all to 5 = very much.
- Gcmor2: Is gun control opinion a matter of beliefs about right and wrong? Coded from 1 = Not at all to 5 = very much.
- Gcreveald: Asked of people with a liberal gun control opinion, what would opinion be if undermined by new information? Same codes as Gcext.
- Gcrevealr: Asked of people with a conservative gun control opinion, what would opinion be if undermined by new information? Same codes as Gcext.
- Ssext – txrevealr: Same as corresponding variables above, but for the other issues. (SS = Social Security; II = Iran; NU = Nuclear energy; TX = Taxation.)

Study3_working_long.dta

Coded data for Study 3, in long format (five rows per respondent, one for each issue). Repeated variables are the same as study3_raw. New variables:

- Extfold, Imp, Relev, Smor: Attitude extremity, importance, relevance, and moral conviction, coded form low = 0 to high = 1.
- Change: Attitude change from the first extremity question to the second, coded from maximum backfire = -.5 to maximum persuasion = 1.
- Pidr2: Respondent's party identification, coded from Strong Democrat = 0 to Strong Republican = 6.

- Issue: What issue does this row correspond to? Gun control = 1; Social Security = 2; Iran = 3; Nuclear energy = 4; Taxation = 5.

Study3_working_wide.dta

Coded data for Study 3 in wide format (one row per respondent). Where variables repeat, they are the same as in Study3_raw.csv. Remaining variables:

- Gcsmor – Txsmor: Respondent's moral conviction for each issue, coded from low = 0 to high = 1. (SS = Social Security; II = Iran; NU = Nuclear energy; TX = Taxation.)
- SSchange – Iichange: Attitude change from the first extremity question to the second, coded from maximum backfire = -.5 to maximum persuasion = 1.
- Pidr2: Respondent's party identification, coded from Strong Democrat = 0 to Strong Republican = 6.

Study4_raw.csv

These are the raw responses on the instrument used for Study 4. Variables are as follows:

- Age: Respondent's age, coded in years.
- GCExt1: Respondent's opinion on the gun control issue, coded from Strongly favor stricter gun laws = 1 to Strongly oppose = 9.
- Gcimp: Personal importance of the gun control issue, coded from Not at all = 1 to Extremely = 5.
- Gcrelev: Personal relevance of the gun control issue, coded from Not at all = 1 to very much = 5.
- Gcmc1: Is gun control opinion a matter of core moral beliefs and convictions? Coded from 1 = Not at all to 5 = very much.
- Gcmc2: Is gun control opinion a matter beliefs about right and wrong? Coded from 1 = Not at all to 5 = very much.
- Ssext1: Respondent's opinion on Social Security issue, coded from Strongly oppose decreasing benefits = 1 to Strongly favor = 9.
- Ssimp – Ssmc2: Same as corresponding GC variables.
- Ssconc1t1_1: Time the conservative, consequentialist Social Security argument (presented to people with a liberal Social Security opinion) was read. Coded in seconds. (Respondents were randomly assigned to a consequentialist or deontological argument.)
- Sscond1t1_1: Same as above, but if respondent was randomly assigned to the deontological argument.
- Sslibc1t1_1, Sslibd1t1_1: Same as the two variables above, but liberal arguments, presented to Social Security conservatives.
- Gcconc1t1_1, Gccond1t1_1, Gclibc1t1_1, Gclibd1t1_1: Same as the corresponding Social Security questions, but for gun control.
- Gcext, Ssext2: Attitudes about gun control and Social Security, the second time the question was asked. Codes same as for GCExt1 and Ssext1.

- Female: Is respondent female? Codes: Male = 0; Female = 1.
- Race: What is the respondent's race? Codes: White non-Hispanic = 1; Black = 2; Asian = 3; Other = 4; Prefer not to say = 5.
- Educ: Respondent's education, coded Less than high school = 1; High school diploma = 2; Some college = 3; College degree = 4; Advanced degree = 5.
- Caseid: Unique respondent identifier.

Study4_working_long.dta

Coded data for Study 4, in long format (two rows per respondent, one for each issue). Repeated variables are the same as study4_raw. New variables:

- Imp, relev, extfold, more: Attitude extremity, importance, relevance, and moral conviction, coded form low = 0 to high = 1.
- Deont: Was this issue randomly assigned to the consequentialist condition (=0) or deontological =1)?
- Move3: Attitude movement in the direction of the counter-attitudinal argument. Coded from maximum backfire = -.5 to maximum persuasion = 1.
- Issue: What issue does the row correspond to? Gun control = 1; Social Security = 2.
- Costsarg: The inverse of the Deont variable, for analytical convenience. Codes: deontological condition = 0; consequentialist condition = 1.

Study4_working_wide.dta

Coded data for Study 4, in wide format (one rows per respondent). Repeated variables are the same as study4_raw. New variables:

- Gcextfold: Extremity of the respondent's gun control attitude, coded from neutral = 0 to extreme = 1.
- Gcmor: Moral conviction of the respondent's gun control attitude, coded from low = 0 to high = 1.
- Ssextfold, Ssmor: Same as corresponding GC variables, for gun control.
- Ssdeont: Random assignment for the Social Security issue. Codes: consequentialist = 0; deontological =1.
- Gcdeont: Same as above, for gun control.
- Gcconseq, Ssconseq: Same as *deont variables, but inverted.
- Sslibarg: Did respondent see a liberal Social Security argument? Codes: No = 0; Yes = 1.
- Ssconsarg: Did respondent see a conservative Social Security argument? Codes: No = 0; Yes = 1.
- Gclibarg; Gcconsarg: Same as above, but for gun control.
- Gcmove, Ssmove: For each issue, movement in a conservative direction. Coded from maximum liberal movement = -1 to maximum conservative movement = 1.
- Gcmove3, Ssmove3: For each issue, movement in the direction of the presented argument, coded from maximum backfire = -.5 to maximum persuasion = 1.

- Agebin: Respondent's age category. Codes: 28 and under = 0; 29-38=1; 39-48 = 2; 49-58=3; 60-68=4; 69 and up = 5.