Codebook for RR_BJPOLS_2022.dta

Anne Rasmussen & Stefanie Reher, "(Inequality in) Interest Group Involvement and the Legitimacy of Policy-Making", *British Journal of Political Science*

12 April 2022

Variable name	Description	Coding
id	Respondent ID	
country	Country	1 = UK 2 = US 3 = Germany
issue	Experiment	1 = hybrid car tax reduction 2 = sugar content restrictions
group	Order of the experiments (randomly assigned)	1 = hybrid cars, then sugar restrictions 2 = sugar restrictions, then hybrid cars
repres	Numerical representation of interest group types in consultation (randomly assigned)	1 = None 2 = Equal representation 3 = More cause groups 4 = More business groups
attain	Policy attainment of interest groups (randomly assigned)	1 = Against both group types' positions 2 = In line with both group types 3 = In line with business groups only 4 = In line with cause groups only
public	Public support for policy decision (randomly assigned)	0 = 70% against the decision 1 = 55% against 2 = 55% support for the decision 3 = 70% support
leg_fair	"The process that led to the policy decision was fair."	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_right	"Legislators made the right decision."	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_actors	"When making the decision, policy-makers took the views of all relevant actors into account."	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_citizens	"Legislators made the decision that is best for the citizens of [country]."	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree

		3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_democratic	"The process that led to the decision was democratic"	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_affected	"Legislators made the best decision for those who are affected by the policy."	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
leg_proc	Procedural legitimacy: mean of leg_fair, leg_actors and leg_democratic (if values on one or two items are missing, value is mean of remaining items)	0 = low legitimacy to 4 = high legitimacy
leg_subs	Substantive legitimacy: mean of leg_right, leg_citizens and leg_affected (if values on one or two items are missing, value is mean of remaining items)	0 = low legitimacy to 4 = high legitimacy
outfav	Outcome favourability: measure of support for the debated policy if accepted by policy-makers; inverse if not accepted	0 = strongly against policy decision 1 = somewhat against policy decision 2 = neither in favour nor against policy decision 3 = somewhat in favour of policy decision 4 = strongly in favour of policy decision
res_econ_bus	Agreement that business groups have high levels of economic resources	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
res_econ_env	Agreement that environmental groups have high levels of economic resources	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
res_econ_con	Agreement that consumer organisations have high levels of economic resources	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
res_repres_bus	Agreement that business groups represent society as a whole	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
res_repres_env	Agreement that environmental groups represent society as a whole	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat

		4 = strongly agree
res_repres_con	Agreement that consumer organisations represent society as a whole	0 = strongly disagree 1 = disagree somewhat 2 = neither agree nor disagree 3 = agree somewhat 4 = strongly agree
res_econ_difference	Relative difference in perceived economic resources between business and cause groups, calculated by subtracting measure of perceived resources of cause group mentioned in the experiment (environmental groups (res_econ_env) for hybrid car issue, consumer organisations (res_econ_con) for sugar restrictions issue) from measure of perceived resources of business groups (res_econ_bus)	- 4 = cause groups have high levels; business groups have low levels to 4 = business groups have high levels; cause groups have low levels
res_repres_difference	Relative difference in representativeness of society as a whole between business and cause groups, calculated by subtracting measure of perceived representativeness of cause group mentioned in the experiment (environmental groups (res_repres_env) for hybrid car issue, consumer organisations (re_repres_con) for sugar restrictions issue) from measure of perceived representativeness of business groups (res_repres_bus)	- 4 = Cause groups have high levels; business groups have low levels to 4 = Business groups have high levels; cause groups have low levels
age	Respondent age	
female	Respondent gender	0 = male 1 = female
ideology	Respondent left-right ideology	0 = left to 10 = right
failedattention	Respondent failed at least one of two attention checks	0 = did not fail 1 = failed
failedmanipulation	Respondent failed at least 5 out of 8 manipulation checks	0 = did not fail 1 = failed