Supplemental Appendix:

Core Values and Priming Effects in Electoral Campaigns

- **Appendix A** - Contains information on variable coding for the ANES (observational analyses) and the TESS survey (experimental analyses)
- **Appendix B** - Contains various models (see Tables B1-B3 and B5-B9) that are associated with different Tables (1-3) and Figures (1 & 2) in the main paper along with 2012/2016 ANES regression models that use candidate feeling thermometer ratings as an alternative dependent variable (Table B4).

Appendix A

Cumulative ANES

I used data from the September 10, 2019 version of the American National Election Studies (ANES) Time Series Cumulative Data File. These data and the associated codebook are made publicly available at the following link (`https://electionstudies.org/data-center/anes-time-series-cumulative-data-file/`). In the main paper, I specifically used cross-sectional data from 2012 and 2016.

Detail on Variable Coding

- **Presidential Vote Choice** is created from VCF0704. I code responses as follows: 0 = Republican; 1 = Democrat. The alternative dependent variable of Candidate Feeling Thermometer Ratings (ranges -97 to +97) is created by subtracting the Republican Candidate's thermometer rating (VCF0426) from the Democratic Candidate's thermometer rating (VCF0424).
- **Egalitarianism** is created by combining survey responses to the following questions: VCF9013, VCF9016, VCF9017, and VCF9018 into an index. This index ranges from 4-20; I re-scale it to range from 0-1. I code responses so that higher values indicate higher levels of egalitarianism.

  VCF9013 - "Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed." (1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly).

  VCF9016 - "It is not really that big a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others." (1 = Agree strongly; 2 = Agree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Disagree somewhat; 5 = Disagree strongly).

  VCF9017 - "The country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are." (1 = Agree strongly; 2 = Agree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Disagree somewhat; 5 = Disagree strongly).

  VCF9018 - "If people were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems." (1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither

agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly).

- **Traditionalism** (sometimes referred to as "Moral Traditionalism") is created by combining survey responses to the following questions: VCF0851, VCF0852, VCF0853, VCF0854 into an index. This index ranges from 4-20; I re-scale it to range from 0-1. I code responses so that higher values indicate higher levels of traditionalism.

  VCF0851 - "The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society." (1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly).

  VCF0852 - "The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes." (1 = Agree strongly; 2 = Agree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Disagree somewhat; 5 = Disagree strongly).

  VCF0853 - "This country would have many fewer problems if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties." (1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly).

  VCF0854 - "We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if they are very different from our own." (1 = Agree strongly; 2 = Agree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Disagree somewhat; 5 = Disagree strongly).

- **Partisanship** is created from VCF0301. I code responses as follows (1 = Strong Democrat; 2 = Weak Democrat; 3 = Independent-Lean Democrat; 4 = Pure Independent; 5 = Independent-Lean Republican; 6 = Weak Republican; 7 = Strong Republican).

- **Ideological Self-Placement** is created from VCF0803. I coded responses as follows (1 = Extremely Liberal; 2 = Liberal; 3 = Slightly Liberal; 4 = Moderate/Haven't Thought Much About It; 5 = Slightly Conservative; 6 = Conservative; 7 = Extremely Conservative).

- **Health Insurance Attitudes** is created from VCF0806. This question is worded as follows. "There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some people feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses for everyone. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale. Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals and through private insurance plans like Blue Cross or other company paid plans. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And of course, some people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2,3,4,5 or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?" I code responses as follows (1 =

Private insurance plan, 2, 3, 4 = midpoint, 5, 6, 7 = Government insurance plan) and re-scale this variable to range between 0 and 1.

- **Immigration Levels** is created from VCF0879. This question is worded as follows "Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a little, increased a lot, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?" I coded responses as follows (1 = decreased a lot, 2 = decreased a little, 3 = left the same as it is now, 4 = increased a little, 5 = increased a lot) and re-scale this variable to range between 0 and 1.

TESS Survey Experiment

This nationally representative survey was fielded by the Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS; `https://www.tessexperiments.org/`) between June 16 and June 21, 2005 as part of a project entitled "Value Choices in the Mass Public: Testing for Framing Effects and Hierarchical Structure." Relevant information about this study is available at the following link (`https://www.tessexperiments.org/study/jacoby339`).

An unpublished 2006 paper by William G. Jacoby explains, in great detail, the experimental design and associated research question(s) is available at the following link (`http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.567.4586&rep=rep1&type=pdf`). I use this PDF document as the "codebook" for this survey experiment.

The raw data (in SPSS format) associated with this project is available at the following link (`https://osf.io/ht243`). I imported the data into Stata in order to conduct my statistical analyses. The variables I refer to in the below sections reflect their "name" in this Stata dataset.

This TESS survey contains 649 valid responses. It also includes a a series of experimental manipulations that are intended to test the transitivity and stability of peoples' value systems. I use approximately 400 of these 649 respondents in order to test my second pair of hypotheses (2A & 2B).

On the next pages, I show how the independent (value primes) and dependent variables (value rankings) were created.

Detail on Variable Coding

- **Received Liberty Prime (0 vs. 1)**

  This variable is created from the TESS variable GROUP. It is coded 1 if respondents received the LIBERTY prime (see page 16 in the main paper) and 0 if respondents received either the EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, OR SOCIAL ORDER prime.

- **Received Equality Prime (0 vs. 1)**

  This variable is created from the TESS variable GROUP. It is coded 1 if respondents received the EQUALITY prime (see page 16 in the main paper) and 0 if respondents received either the LIBERTY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, OR SOCIAL ORDER prime.

- **Received Economic Security Prime (0 vs. 1)**

  This variable is created from the TESS variable GROUP. It is coded 1 if respondents received the ECONOMIC SECURITY prime (see page 16 in the main paper) and 0 if respondents received either the EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, OR SOCIAL ORDER prime.

- **Received Morality Prime (0 vs. 1)**

  This variable is created from the TESS variable GROUP. It is coded 1 if respondents received the LIBERTY prime (see page 16 in the main paper) and 0 if respondents received either the EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, OR SOCIAL ORDER prime.

- **Received Social Order Prime (0 vs. 1)**

  This variable is created from the TESS variable GROUP. It is coded 1 if respondents received the LIBERTY prime (see page 16 in the main paper) and 0 if respondents received either the EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, OR SOCIAL ORDER prime.

- Ranked LIBERTY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and EQUALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q4_1 and Q4_2
- Ranked LIBERTY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q7_1 and Q7_2
- Ranked LIBERTY over EQUALITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q8_1 and Q8_2
- Ranked LIBERTY over EQUALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q10_1 and Q10_2
- Ranked LIBERTY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q12_1 and Q12_2
- Ranked LIBERTY over MORALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q13_1 and Q13_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q4_1 and Q4_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over MORALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q5_1 and Q5_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over LIBERTY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q8_1 and Q8_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q9_1 and Q9_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over LIBERTY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q10_1 and Q10_2
- Ranked EQUALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q11_1 and Q11_2
- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over EQUALITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q4_1 and Q4_2
- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over MORALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q6_1 and Q6_2
- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over LIBERTY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q7_1 and Q7_2

- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over EQUALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q9_1 and Q9_2
- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over EQUALITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q11_1 and Q11_2
- Ranked ECONOMIC SECURITY over LIBERTY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q12_1 and Q12_2
- Ranked MORALITY over EQUALITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q5_1 and Q5_2
- Ranked MORALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q6_1 and Q6_2
- Ranked MORALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q7_1 and Q7_2
- Ranked MORALITY over EQUALITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q8_1 and Q8_2
- Ranked MORALITY over ECONOMIC SECURITY and EQUALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q11_1 and Q11_2
- Ranked MORALITY over LIBERTY and SOCIAL ORDER (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q13_1 and Q13_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over EQUALITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q5_1 and Q5_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over ECONOMIC SECURITY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q6_1 and Q6_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over ECONOMIC SECURITY and EQUALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q9_1 and Q9_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over EQUALITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q10_1 and Q10_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over ECONOMIC SECURITY and LIBERTY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q12_1 and Q12_2
- Ranked SOCIAL ORDER over LIBERTY and MORALITY (0 vs. 1)
  Created from Q13_1 and Q13_2

Appendix B

Table B1

This presents the full probit regression models associated with Table 1 and Figure 1 in the main paper.

Table B1: Core Values and Voting Behavior, 2012 vs. 2016

	DV = Presidential Vote	
	(1)	(2)
Egalitarianism	2.807***	1.495***
	(0.180)	(0.244)
Egalitarianism × 2016	-0.184	-0.229
	(0.267)	(0.364)
Traditionalism	-3.358***	-1.991***
	(0.165)	(0.247)
Traditionalism × 2016	-0.031	-0.333
	(0.245)	(0.339)
2016 Election	-0.159	0.073
	(0.237)	(0.322)
Partisanship		-2.990***
		(0.125)
Ideology		-1.713***
		(0.204)
Age		0.001
		(0.002)
Female		0.007
		(0.067)
College		0.304***
		(0.073)
White		-0.768***
		(0.079)
Constant	0.332**	3.105***
	(0.153)	(0.262)
Observations	6,686	6,480
Pseudo R^2	0.354	0.670

Note: Dependent variables are self-reported vote for president (0 = Romney/Trump; 1 = Obama/Clinton). Probit coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is the Cumulative ANES (2012 and 2016), survey weights applied. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B2

This presents the full probit regression models associated with Table 2 in the main paper.

Table B2: Core Values, Issue Attitudes, and Voting Behavior, 2012 vs. 2016

	DV = Presidential Vote			
	Core Values		Issue Attitudes	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Egalitarianism	2.807***	1.495***		
	(0.180)	(0.244)		
Egalitarianism × 2016	-0.184	-0.229		
	(0.267)	(0.364)		
Traditionalism	-3.358***	-1.991***		
	(0.165)	(0.247)		
Traditionalism × 2016	-0.031	-0.333		
	(0.245)	(0.339)		
Healthcare			2.731***	1.331***
			(0.125)	(0.174)
Healthcare × 2016			-0.759***	-0.903***
			(0.176)	(0.248)
Immigration			0.885***	0.657***
			(0.131)	(0.172)
Immigration × 2016			1.272***	0.812***
			(0.211)	(0.300)
2016 Election	-0.159	0.073	-0.210*	0.045
	(0.237)	(0.322)	(0.118)	(0.160)
Partisanship		-2.990***		-2.930***
		(0.125)		(0.134)
Ideology		-1.713***		-2.196***
		(0.204)		(0.194)
Age		0.001		-0.002
		(0.002)		(0.002)
Female		0.007		0.067
		(0.067)		(0.070)
College		0.304***		0.255***
		(0.073)		(0.075)
White		-0.768***		-0.733***
		(0.079)		(0.083)
Constant	0.332**	3.105***	-1.487***	2.385***
	(0.153)	(0.262)	(0.080)	(0.208)
Observations	6,686	6,480	6,213	6,025
Pseudo R^2	0.354	0.670	0.312	0.661

Note: Dependent variables are self-reported vote for president (0 = Romney/Trump; 1 = Obama/Clinton). Probit coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is the Cumulative ANES (2012 and 2016), survey weights applied. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B3

This presents the full probit regression models associated with Table 3 in the main paper.

Table B3: Core Values and Voting Behavior by Interest in the Elections, 2012 vs. 2016

	DV = Presidential Vote			
	Low/Avg Interest		High Interest	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Egalitarianism	2.915***	1.655***	2.762***	1.398***
	(0.258)	(0.315)	(0.250)	(0.361)
Egalitarianism × 2016	-0.214	-0.370	-0.197	-0.169
	(0.409)	(0.521)	(0.354)	(0.507)
Traditionalism	-3.109***	-2.005***	-3.602***	-1.991***
	(0.219)	(0.274)	(0.254)	(0.451)
Traditionalism × 2016	-0.151	-0.182	0.115	-0.499
	(0.363)	(0.460)	(0.343)	(0.527)
2016 Election	-0.161	-0.045	-0.131	0.288
	(0.357)	(0.439)	(0.325)	(0.482)
Partisanship		-2.894***		-3.110***
		(0.164)		(0.190)
Ideology		-1.700***		-1.679***
		(0.283)		(0.291)
Age		0.003		-0.000
		(0.003)		(0.004)
Female		-0.005		0.013
		(0.087)		(0.105)
College		0.280***		0.351***
		(0.095)		(0.113)
White		-0.769***		-0.777***
		(0.109)		(0.115)
Constant	0.198	2.978***	0.408*	3.186***
	(0.206)	(0.315)	(0.230)	(0.413)
Observations	3,021	2,936	3,662	3,541
Pseudo R^2	0.289	0.598	0.414	0.737

Note: Dependent variables are self-reported vote for president (0 = Romney/Trump; 1 = Obama/Clinton). Probit coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Interest in the elections is measured pre-election. Source is the Cumulative ANES (2012 and 2016), survey weights applied. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B4

Shows the relationship between core values and voting behavior with different dependent variables, vote choice (0 vs. 1) vs. candidate feeling thermometer differences. This is associated with Footnote 12 in the main paper.

Table B4: Core Values and Voting Behavior (Vote Choice vs. Candidate Affect), 2012 vs. 2016

	DV = Vote Choice		DV = Candidate FT Ratings	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Egalitarianism	2.807***	1.495***	93.970***	28.480***
	(0.180)	(0.244)	(4.371)	(3.462)
Egalitarianism × 2016	-0.184	-0.229	-5.477	-3.011
	(0.267)	(0.364)	(7.207)	(5.170)
Traditionalism	-3.358***	-1.991***	-102.461***	-36.852***
	(0.165)	(0.247)	(3.893)	(3.306)
Traditionalism × 2016	-0.031	-0.333	6.298	3.001
	(0.245)	(0.339)	(6.207)	(4.734)
2016 Election	-0.159	0.073	-10.257	-4.909
	(0.237)	(0.322)	(7.141)	(5.197)
Partisanship		-2.990***		-92.415***
		(0.125)		(2.308)
Ideology		-1.713***		-34.695***
		(0.204)		(3.172)
Age		0.001		-0.009
		(0.002)		(0.032)
Female		0.007		2.784***
		(0.067)		(1.003)
College		0.304***		3.695***
		(0.073)		(0.994)
White		-0.768***		-16.469***
		(0.079)		(1.303)
Constant	0.332**	3.105***	7.806*	82.296***
	(0.153)	(0.262)	(4.407)	(3.788)
Observations	6,686	6,480	8,949	8,633
Pseudo R^2/R^2	0.354	0.670	0.345	0.657

Note: Dependent variables are self-reported vote for president (0 = Romney/Trump; 1 = Obama/Clinton) and difference in pre-election candidate feeling thermometers (-97 to +97, higher values = warmer feelings toward Obama/Clinton vs. Romney/Trump). Probit and OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is the Cumulative ANES (2012 and 2016), survey weights applied. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Tables B5-B9

This presents the full regression models (30 total; 6 for each of the five values in the TESS experiment) associated with Figure 2 in the main paper. Table B5 = Liberty prime models; Table B6 = Equality prime models; Table B7 = Economic Security prime models; Table B8 = Morality prime models; Table B9 = Social Order prime models.

Table B5

Table B5: Effect of Liberty Prime on Value Triad Rankings, 2005

	L > ES & E	L > ES & M	L > E & M	L > E & SO	L > ES & SO	L > M & SO
Liberty Prime	0.014	0.032	0.016	-0.075	-0.007	0.011
	(0.062)	(0.059)	(0.062)	(0.063)	(0.063)	(0.062)
Constant	0.398***	0.314***	0.382***	0.550***	0.450***	0.406***
	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Observations	394	390	395	393	392	394
R^2	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.000

Note: Shows the effect of receiving the LIBERTY prime (relative to the EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, or SOCIAL ORDER prime) on the probability of ranking that value as the most important in a triad. L = Liberty; E = Equality; ES = Economic Security; M = Morality; SO = Social Order. OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is a 2005 TESS survey. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B6

Table B6: Effect of Equality Prime on Value Triad Rankings, 2005

	E > ES & L	E > M & SO	E > L & M	E > ES & SO	E > L & SO	E > ES & M
Equality Prime	0.057	0.072	0.016	-0.007	0.109*	0.019
	(0.054)	(0.062)	(0.054)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.053)
Constant	0.199***	0.339***	0.227***	0.324***	0.245***	0.209***
	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.023)
Observations	394	394	395	394	393	395
R^2	0.003	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000

Note: Shows the effect of receiving the EQUALITY prime (relative to the LIBERTY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, MORALITY, or SOCIAL ORDER prime) on the probability of ranking that value as the most important in a triad. L = Liberty; E = Equality; ES = Economic Security; M = Morality; SO = Social Order. OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is a 2005 TESS survey. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B7

Table B7: Effect of Economic Security Prime on Value Triad Rankings, 2005

	ES > E & L	ES > M & SO	ES > L & M	ES > E & SO	ES > E & M	ES > L & SO
Econ Security Prime	-0.013	-0.087	-0.049	-0.060	-0.049	-0.010
	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.056)	(0.062)	(0.059)	(0.061)
Constant	0.391***	0.429***	0.315***	0.492***	0.362***	0.392***
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Observations	394	397	390	394	395	392
R^2	0.000	0.005	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.000

Note: Shows the effect of receiving the ECONOMIC SECURITY prime (relative to the LIBERTY, EQUALITY, MORALITY, or SOCIAL ORDER prime) on the probability of ranking that value as the most important in a triad. L = Liberty; E = Equality; ES = Economic Security; M = Morality; SO = Social Order. OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is a 2005 TESS survey. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B8

Table B8: Effect of Morality Prime on Value Triad Rankings, 2005

	M > E & SO	M > ES & SO	M > ES & L	M > E & L	M > ES & E	M > L & SO
Morality Prime	0.040	-0.031	0.032	0.038	0.031	-0.026
	(0.064)	(0.063)	(0.063)	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Constant	0.479***	0.452***	0.368***	0.377***	0.429***	0.442***
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Observations	394	397	390	395	395	394
R^2	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000

Note: Shows the effect of receiving the MORALITY prime (relative to the LIBERTY, EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, or SOCIAL ORDER prime) on the probability of ranking that value as the most important in a triad. L = Liberty; E = Equality; ES = Economic Security; M = Morality; SO = Social Order. OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is a 2005 TESS survey. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.

Table B9

Table B9: Effect of Social Order Prime on Value Triad Rankings, 2005

	SO > E & M	SO > ES & M	SO > ES & E	SO > E & L	SO > ES & L	SO > L & M
Social Order Prime	-0.008	-0.005	0.006	0.040	0.049	0.063
	(0.046)	(0.044)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.050)
Constant	0.161***	0.145***	0.197***	0.190***	0.151***	0.142***
	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Observations	394	397	394	393	392	394
R^2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.003	0.005

Note: Shows the effect of receiving the SOCIAL ORDER prime (relative to the LIBERTY, EQUALITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, or MORALITY prime) on the probability of ranking that value as the most important in a triad. L = Liberty; E = Equality; ES = Economic Security; M = Morality; SO = Social Order. OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. Source is a 2005 TESS survey. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, two-tailed.