Austerity Study

Kirk Bansak Michael M. Bechtel Yotam Margalit

Jan 27, 2019

General Information

1. Tentative Title: The Mass Politics of Austerity
2. PIs: Kirk Bansak, Michael M. Bechtel, Yotam Margalit
3. Research Questions
    - 3.1. What is the level of support for austerity and what explains variation in public attitudes on this economic response to crisis? We will focus on testing several explanations for this variation: respondents' economic interest; their ideological stance; reliance on party cues; and general beliefs about government effectiveness.
    - 3.2. To what extent does support for austerity reflect its design in terms of changing government spending and tax rates?
    - 3.3. Can party endorsements affect support for austerity?
    - 3.4. To what extent do the answers to the questions above differ across subgroups, defined by (among others): partisanship, ideology, knowledge, education, age, income, policy priorities, subjective assessments of economic conditions, and objective economic factors?
4. Survey Instrument and Code

This preregistration plan also includes the survey instrument and code for analyses.

Study Design and Sampling Plan

5. Study design

The study will include closed and open questions, as well as randomized conjoint and vignette experiments.

6. Data collection procedures.

We field the online survey to a representative sample of the adult population in Spain and Italy. Respondents will be recruited via Bilendi. Subjects will be compensated. The surveys will be fielded in January 2019.

7. Sample size

About 2,000 in each country.

8. Sample size rationale

The sample size is mainly driven by power considerations. Since we include several experiments, we would like to make sure we have enough observations in the various treatment arms (see below).

9. Stopping rule

We will stop sampling once we have reached at least the targeted number of observations and the sociodemographic quotas.

10. Blinding

Respondents will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.

Analyses

Support for Austerity

The main preference question on austerity vs stimulus response to crisis will have two versions that differ slightly with respect to the description of items that "public spending" entails. The questions will be worded as follows:

"Currently there is much discussion about the way the government should resolve the financial crisis and restore economic growth. A key question is what to do with public spending (that is, money that the government spends on things like education, social services, pensions, public sector workers, or defense).

Some argue that the government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. Others argue that the government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. What is your view on this?

- ❍ The government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. (1)
- ❍ The government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. (2)
- ❍ I have no opinion. (3)

If you had to decide, which would you choose?

- ❍ The government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. (1)
- ❍ The government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. (2)

[If decrease spending is chosen] By how much do you think the government should decrease spending and reduce the debt?

- ❍ by a little (1)
- ❍ by a lot (2)

[If increase spending is chosen] By how much do you think the government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt?

- ❍ by a little (1)
- ❍ by a lot (2)"

We also ask respondents to briefly explain their choice.

"In the previous question, you indicated that you think [RESPONSE PROVIDED TO QUESTION ABOVE]. In a few sentences, could you please explain why you prefer this option?"

We will measure preferences for austerity using these questions and model this preference in a regression as a function of sociodemographic and political covariates. The dependent variable in this analysis will be a binary measure distinguishing between support for austerity vs. non-austerity and support for stimulus vs. non-stimulus.

We also plan on estimating a structural topic model on the open-ended responses.

Austerity Design Preferences

We estimate preferences over the design of austerity using a randomized conjoint experiment. The attributes and attribute levels are given below. We model measures of support for an austerity package on variables for each attribute level. We also plan on examining the sensitivity of the results across subgroups, specifically, partisanship, ideology, knowledge, sex, race, education, age, income, other sociodemographic characteristics, policy views, affectedness, and policy priorities. These subgroup analyses will be conducted by running the baseline specifications on each subgroup of interest.

In addition, we are planning on performing an eliminated effects analysis. The theoretical idea is to explore one mechanism for explaining voter preferences over economic policy is that respondents could infer the party sponsor from the policy package. For example, cutting spending and lowering taxes would be a rightist approach to economic crises while increasing spending or raising taxes would be typical of leftist parties. This allows voters to make decisions based on their partisan identification. In our conjoint design, some subgroups do not receive a party endorsement while others do. In addition, the partisan endorsement varies. This sets up an eliminated effects analysis as described in Acharya et al. (2018, Political Analysis).

“Q243 During times of financial crisis, governments often decide to impose austerity measures to keep current spending from exceeding the budget. Specifically, governments must decide what taxes to increase and what types of spending to cut. We will now provide you with several examples of what mix of tax increases and spending cuts the government could implement.

For each comparison we would like to know which of the two policy options you prefer. You may like both alternatives or may not like either of them. Regardless of your overall evaluation, please indicate which option you prefer over the other.

In total, we will show you ten comparison sets. Please take your time when reading the potential policy options. People have different opinions about this issue, and there are no right or wrong answers.

Types of Cuts / Increases	Option 1	Option 2
PARTY ENDORSEMENT	**Note: Party endorsement is only shown in the second half of the profile pairs, and only for a randomly selected half of the respondents**	
Package endorsed by:	[Party A]	[Party B]
SPENDING		
Defense spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Education spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Welfare spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Public sector jobs	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Pensions	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
TAXES		
Income tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
Sales tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
Corporate tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
YOUR CHOICE:		

- ❍ Option 1 (1)
- ❍ Option 2 (2)

If you could vote on each of these options in a referendum, how likely is it that you would vote in favor or against each of the options? Please give your answer on the following scale from definitely against (1) to definitely in favor (10).

	Vote definitely against (1) (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8 (8)	9 (9)	Vote definitely in favor (10) (10)
Option 1 (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Option 2 (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Survey Instrument: Austerity Questionnaire

Welcome and thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey!

This survey is carried out in order to reach a better understanding of public opinion on current economic, social, and political issues. Findings from this study will be reported in scholarly journals, at academic seminars, and at research association meetings. If you have any questions about the study, you can contact the principal investigators at mbechtel@wustl.edu. The survey takes about 15 minutes.

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the Stanford Institutional Review Board (IRB) to speak to someone independent of the research team at (650)-723-2480 or toll free at 1-866-680-2906. You can also email irb2-manager@lists.stanford.edu or write to the Stanford IRB, Stanford University, 3000 El Camino Real, Five Palo Alto Square, 4th Floor, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

Before we continue, please indicate that you have read the study's description and agree to the following terms:

My participation is voluntary. I am free to withdraw from the study at any time. In order to analyze responses to the questionnaire, my answers will be recorded. No identifying information about me will be made public, and any views I express will be kept completely confidential. The data will be stored at a secured location and retained indefinitely.

I agree to participate in this research study conducted by researchers from Washington University in St. Louis, Tel Aviv University, and Stanford University.

Please select one of the following options. If you choose not to participate, the survey will end immediately.

- ❍ I agree to participate (1)
- ❍ I do not agree to participate (2)

Are you eligible to vote in national elections?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

Currently there is much discussion about the way the government should resolve the financial crisis and restore economic growth. A key question is what to do with public spending (that is, money that the government spends on things like education, social services, pensions, public sector workers, or defense).

Some argue that the government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. Others argue that the government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. What is your view on this?

- ❍ The government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. (1)
- ❍ The government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. (2)
- ❍ I have no opinion. (3)

[Random half of all respondents receive the same question except that order in which policy opions are introduced (increase spending or decrease spending) is reversed]
Currently there is much discussion about the way the government should resolve the financial crisis and restore economic growth. A key question is what to do with public spending (that is, money that the government spends on things like defense, public sector workers, pensions, social services, or education).

Some argue that the government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. Others argue that the government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. What is your view on this?

- ❍ The government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. (1)
- ❍ The government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. (2)
- ❍ I have no opinion. (3)

[If no opinion is chosen]
If you had to decide, which would you choose?

- ❍ The government should decrease spending and reduce the debt. (1)
- ❍ The government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt. (2)

[If decrease spending is chosen] By how much do you think the government should decrease spending and reduce the debt?

- ❍ by a little (1)
- ❍ by a lot (2)

[If increase spending is chosen] By how much do you think the government should increase spending and tolerate higher debt?

- ❍ by a little (1)
- ❍ by a lot (2)

In the previous question, you indicated that you think ${e://Field/debtpref}. In a few sentences, could you please explain why you prefer this option?

[Conjoint]

During times of financial crisis, governments often decide to impose austerity measures to keep current spending from exceeding the budget. Specifically, governments must decide what taxes to increase and what types of spending to cut. We will now provide you with several examples of what mix of tax increases and spending cuts the government could implement.

For each comparison we would like to know which of the two policy options you prefer. You may like both alternatives or may not like either of them. Regardless of your overall evaluation, please indicate which option you prefer over the other.

In total, we will show you ten comparison sets. Please take your time when reading the potential policy options. People have different opinions about this issue, and there are no right or wrong answers.

Types of Cuts / Increases	Option 1	Option 2
PARTY ENDORSEMENT	**Note: Party endorsement is only shown in the second half of the profile pairs, and only for a randomly selected half of the respondents**	
Package endorsed by:	[Party A]	[Party B]
SPENDING		
Defense spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Education spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Welfare spending	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Public sector jobs	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
Pensions	Cut by [0 - 30]%	Cut by [0 - 30]%
TAXES		
Income tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
Sales tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
Corporate tax	Increase by [0 - 30]%	Increase by [0 - 30]%
YOUR CHOICE:		

- ❍ Option 1 (1)
- ❍ Option 2 (2)

If you could vote on each of these options in a referendum, how likely is it that you would vote in favor or against each of the options? Please give your answer on the following scale from definitely against (1) to definitely in favor (10).

	Vote definitely against (1) (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8 (8)	9 (9)	Vote definitely in favor (10) (10)
Option 1 (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Option 2 (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

[Respondents will be shown 10 of the tables above with the values in [] being randomly assigned]

How positively or negatively has the financial crisis affected you?

- ❍ Very positively (1)
- ❍ Somewhat positively (2)
- ❍ Neither positively nor negatively (3)
- ❍ Somewhat negatively (4)
- ❍ Very negatively (5)

[Random half receives same question with polarity of answer categories reversed]

--

Over the past five years, have you been laid off?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

Is there a particular political party you feel closer to than all the other parties? Which one?

- ❍ Movimento Cinque Stelle (1)
- ❍ Lega Nord (2)
- ❍ Partito Democratico (3)
- ❍ Forza Italia (4)
- ❍ Fratelli d'Italia (5)
- ❍ Liberi e Uguali (6)
- ❍ Noi con l'Italia-Udc (7)
- ❍ Piu' Europa (8)
- ❍ Altro (14) _____
- ❍ Non lo so (15)

--

[In Spain] Is there a particular political party you feel closer to than all the other parties? Which one?

- Partido Popular (PP) (1)
- Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE) (2)
- Unidos Podemos (3)
- Ciudadanos (Cs) (4)
- Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya–Catalunya Sí (ERC–CatSí) (6)
- Partit Demòcrata Europeu Català (PDeCAT) (7)
- Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV), Euzko Alderdi Jeltzalea (8)
- Partido Animalista Contra el Maltrato Animal (PACMA) (10)
- Euskal Herria Bildu (EH Bildu) (11)
- Coalición Canaria (CC–PNC) (12)
- Otro (20) _____
- No lo sé (21)

How close do you feel to this party? Do you feel that you are...

- very close (1)
- quite close (2)
- not close (3)
- not at all close (4)

--

In politics people often talk of “left” and “right”. On this scale from 0 (left) to 10 (right), where would you classify your own political views?

- ❍ Political Views (1)
- ❍ 1 (2)
- ❍ 2 (3)
- ❍ 3 (4)
- ❍ 4 (5)
- ❍ 5 (6)
- ❍ 6 (7)
- ❍ 7 (8)
- ❍ 8 (9)
- ❍ 9 (10)
- ❍ 10 right (11)

--

[In Italy]
Which party did you vote for in the last national election in 2018?

- ❍ Non ha votato (1)
- ❍ Movimento Cinque Stelle (2)
- ❍ Lega Nord (3)
- ❍ Partito Democratico (4)
- ❍ Forza Italia (5)
- ❍ Fratelli d'Italia (6)
- ❍ Liberi e Uguali (7)
- ❍ Noi con l'Italia-Udc (8)
- ❍ Piu' Europa (9)
- ❍ Altro (15) _____
- ❍ Ha votato scheda bianca (16)
- ❍ Non lo so (17)

--

[In Spain] Which party did you vote for in the last national election in 2016?

- ❍ No votó (1)
- ❍ Partido Popular (PP) (2)
- ❍ Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE) (3)
- ❍ Unidos Podemos (4)
- ❍ Ciudadanos (Cs) (5)
- ❍ Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya–Catalunya Sí (ERC–CatSí) (6)
- ❍ Partit Demòcrata Europeu Català (PDeCAT) (7)
- ❍ Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV), Euzko Alderdi Jeltzalea (8)
- ❍ Partido Animalista Contra el Maltrato Animal (PACMA) (9)
- ❍ Euskal Herria Bildu (EH Bildu) (10)
- ❍ Coalición Canaria (CC–PNC) (11)
- ❍ Otro (19) _____
- ❍ Votó en blanco (20)
- ❍ No lo sé (21)

--

What is your favorite color?

- ❑ Red (1)
- ❑ Yellow (2)
- ❑ Orange (3)
- ❑ Green (4)
- ❑ Blue (5)
- ❑ Violet (6)
- ❑ Don't Know (7)

--

Next, we would like you to think more broadly about the purposes of government. Where would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means you think the government should do only those things necessary to provide the most basic government functions, and 5 means you think

the government should take active steps in every area it can to try and improve the lives of its citizens? You may use any number from 1 to 5.

- ❍ 1 - The government should do only those things necessary to provide the most basic government functions (1)
- ❍ 2 (2)
- ❍ 3 (3)
- ❍ 4 (4)
- ❍ 5 - The government should take active steps in every area it can to try and improve the lives of its citizens (5)

--

Some people think that the income differences between the rich and the poor ought to be reduced, perhaps by raising the taxes of wealthy families or by giving income assistance to the poor. Others think that the government should not concern itself with reducing this income difference between the rich and the poor. Where would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means that the government should reduce the income differences between rich and poor, and 5 means that the government should not concern itself with reducing income differences? What score between 1 and 5 comes closest to the way you feel?

- ❍ 1 - The government should reduce the income differences between rich and poor (1)
- ❍ 2 (2)
- ❍ 3 (3)
- ❍ 4 (4)
- ❍ 5 - The government should not concern itself with reducing income differences (5)

--

On a scale from 1 (does NOT describe you well) to 5 (describes you well) how would you rate the following statements?

I am often touched by the things that I see happen.

- ❍ 1 - Does NOT describe me well (1)
- ❍ 2 (2)
- ❍ 3 (3)
- ❍ 4 (4)
- ❍ 5 - Describes me well (5)

When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them.

- 1 - Does NOT describe me well (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 - Describes me well (5)

--

Generally speaking, when looking back over the past several decades, how much of the time do you think the government has been **trying to do the right thing for the country as a whole**?

- 1 (never) (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (always) (10)

--

Irrespective of whether you believe that the government tries to do the right thing for the country as a whole, how much of the time do you think the government is **competent in pursuing its objectives**?

- 1 (never) (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (always) (10)

Now we like to ask you some questions about policy and the economy. Please answer these questions from memory, without using any tools or looking up the answers. Many citizens cannot answer every question, and we would be very grateful if you answer the questions even if you are not sure about the correct answer.

From what you have read or heard, what is a "tariff"?

- A tax exemption for low earners (1)
- A tax exemption for buyers of locally produced goods (2)
- A tax imposed on imported goods and services (3)
- A tax imposed on luxury goods (4)
- Don't know (5)

Which of the following served a period as Prime Minister of [HOME COUNTRY]?

- A (1)
- B (2)
- C (3)
- D (4)
- E (5)

What is currently the unemployment rate in[HOME COUNTRY]?

- ❍ 2 (1)
- ❍ 4 (2)
- ❍ 6 (3)
- ❍ 8 (4)
- ❍ 10 (5)

--

From what you have read or heard, what does "inflation" mean when used in an economic context?

- ❍ increase in the general price level of goods and services within an economy (1)
- ❍ increase in the exchange rate of the national currency relative to a foreign currency (2)
- ❍ increase in the amount of imports relative to the previous year (3)
- ❍ increase in employment levels within an economy (4)
- ❍ increase in the number of overvalued stocks on the stock market (5)
- ❍ none of the above (6)

--

What is the length in years of a single term of office for a member of parliament in[HOME COUNTRY]?

- ❍ 2 (1)
- ❍ 3 (2)
- ❍ 4 (3)
- ❍ 5 (4)
- ❍ 6 (5)

--

Please specify your gender

- ❍ Male (1)
- ❍ Female (2)

--

In what year were you born?

▼ 2000 (1) ... 1900 (101)

--

Now we would like to ask you some final questions about your living conditions. Which of these options best describes your situation (in the last seven days)?

- ❍ Paid employee (including temporary leave of absence due to maternity/paternity, accident, illness or vacation) (1)
- ❍ Self-employed (e.g. freelancer, independent contractor, or family-owned business) (2)
- ❍ Student (excluding employer-sponsored education) (3)
- ❍ Unemployed, actively searching for a job (4)
- ❍ Unemployed, not actively searching (5)
- ❍ Chronic illness or permanent disability (6)
- ❍ Retired (7)
- ❍ Working at home, caring for children or others (8)

Which of the following statements about occupational status apply to you?

- ❍ Permanent full time (1)
- ❍ Permanent part time (2)
- ❍ Fixed term (3)
- ❍ Other (4) _____

Do you have job tenure?

(Job tenure is a guaranteed job contract that means you cannot be fired without just cause.)

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ Not currently, but expect to have soon (2)
- ❍ No (3)

--

How confident are you about being able to keep your current job over the next three years?

- ❍ Very confident (1)
- ❍ Somewhat confident (2)
- ❍ Neither confident nor unconfident (3)
- ❍ Somewhat unconfident (4)
- ❍ Very unconfident (5)

--

Are you a member of have you ever been part of a trade union or trade association?

- ❍ Yes, currently (1)
- ❍ Yes, in the past (2)
- ❍ No (3)

--

[In Italy]
What is the highest level of education you have successfully completed?

- ❍ Senza titolo (1)
- ❍ Licenza elementare (2)
- ❍ Avviamento professionale (3)
- ❍ Licenza media (4)
- ❍ Qualifica professionale regionale post-obbligo (5)
- ❍ Diploma di qualifica di istituto professionale (2 o 3 anni), compreso diploma di maestro d'arte, diplomadi Scuola magistrale e qualifica di infermiere (vecchio ordinamento) (6)
- ❍ Diploma di scuola media superiore (5 anni), istituto tecnico o professionale, compreso il diploma quinquennale dell'Istituto d'arte. (7)
- ❍ Diploma di scuola media superiore (4 o 5 anni), liceo classico, scientifico, linguistico o psico-pedagogico, musicale, compresi i diplomi di maturità magistrale e artistica (8)
- ❍ Specializzazione post-diploma, qualifica professionale regionale post-diploma, certificato di specializzazione tecnica superior (9)
- ❍ Diploma universitario vecchio ordinamento (2 o 3 anni), compresi diplomi ISEF, di servizio sociale e di statistica (10)
- ❍ Diploma di istruzione terziaria non universitaria: conservatorio di musica, Accademia di Belle Arti e simili (11)
- ❍ Laurea triennale o di primo livello (12)
- ❍ Master di 1° livello (13)
- ❍ Laurea vecchio ordinamento, laurea specialistica o magistrale, laurea a ciclo unico (14)
- ❍ Master di 2° livello (15)
- ❍ Specializzazioni post laurea magistrale (1 o 2 anni) (16)
- ❍ Specializzazioni post laurea magistrale (3 o 4 anni), comprese le specializzazioni mediche (17)
- ❍ Dottorato di ricerca (18)

[In Spain] What is the highest level of education you have successfully completed?

- ❍ Sin estudios (1)
- ❍ Estudios primarios sin completar (2)
- ❍ Certificado de Estudios Primarios (3)
- ❍ Hasta 5° de EGB (4)
- ❍ Educación Primaria (LOGSE), Grado Elemental en Música y Danza (5)
- ❍ F.P. de Iniciación (6)
- ❍ Bachillerato Elemental (7)
- ❍ EGB (8)
- ❍ ESO (9)
- ❍ F.P. Oficialía (10)
- ❍ F.P. de 1er Grado (11)
- ❍ Bachillerato Superior, BUP (12)
- ❍ PREU, COU (13)
- ❍ Bachillerato (LOGSE) (14)
- ❍ C.F. de Grado Medio (Técnico Medio), C.F. de Grado Medio en Artes Plásticas y Diseño, Grado Medio en Música y Danza (15)
- ❍ F.P. Maestría (16)
- ❍ F.P. de 2° Grado (17)
- ❍ C.F. de Grado Superior (Técnico Superior), C.F. de Grado Superior en Escuelas de Arte (18)
- ❍ Peritaje, Enfermeria, Magisterio, Asistente Social (19)
- ❍ Diplomado, Ingeniero o Arquitecto Técnico, 3 años de licenciatura, Grado (Bolonia), Títuolo Superior en Diseño (20)
- ❍ Licenciado, Ingeniero Superior, Arquitecto, Máster (Bolonia), Título Superior en Música, Danza o Arte Dramático (21)
- ❍ Doctorado (22)

--

What is your monthly net household income? The household income consists of the sum of income from wages, salaries, self-employment, retirement or pension, in each case after deducting taxes and social contributions. Please also add all the fixed income from public assistance, income from rental, leasing, housing benefit, child benefit and other fixed income.

This information is very important for the scientific validity of the study. Your information will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous.

- ❍ Country-specific Decile 1 (1)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 2 (2)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 3 (3)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 4 (4)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 5 (5)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 6 (6)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 7 (7)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 8 (8)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 9 (9)
- ❍ Country-specific Decile 10 (10)

--

Do you currently have money invested in stocks, bonds, mutual funds, money market funds or other listed securities?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

--

Please consider the income of all household members and any income which may be received by the household as a whole. What is the main source of income in your household?

- ❍ Wages or salaries (1)
- ❍ Income from self-employment (excluding farming) (2)
- ❍ Income from farming (3)
- ❍ Pensions (4)
- ❍ Unemployment/redundancy benefit (5)
- ❍ Any other social benefits or grants (6)
- ❍ Income from investments, savings, etc. (7)
- ❍ Income from other sources (8)

--

Do you have a mortgage?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

--

How many children have you had? Please count all that were born at any time (including any you had from a previous marriage).

▼ 0 (1) ... > 10 (12)

Only for Italian respondents

Premier Conte and deputy premier Di Maio and Salvini have announced in recent days that they want to find an agreement with the EU on the maneuver. The hypothesis put forward is to maintain the objectives set (in particular "quota 100" for pensions, citizenship income and measures for the protection of savers), recovering additional resources for investments and reducing the estimated deficit estimates, as requested by the EU . In your opinion…

- it is a mistake to give in to European demands: the government must keep the maneuver as it is
- all in all it is right to give in, but keeping the system of the maneuver and the main measures

- the concessions to Europe are still too few: the Italian accounts remain at risk even with these changes

--
Next, we would like to ask you about your views on new applicants for immigration visas.
These new applicants are people who were born overseas and are living outside Italy but are in the process of applying for a visa to enter and stay in Italy for a long period. To stay in Italy, new applicants for immigration status must apply for a visa. If their application is denied, they cannot come to live in Italy.
Since 2014, Italy has approved hundreds of thousands of new visas for immigration applicants who are living abroad. The new applicants differ in terms of their professional skill levels.
Please consider the group of new applicants for immigration visas who are:
- [Low-skilled / High-skilled]
- [Currently living in country / Currently living abroad]
In your view, how many of those applicants should [COUNTRY] approve?

- Approve none (1)
- Approve few (2)
- Approve about half (3)
- Approve most (4)
- Approve all (5)

Note that [A / B] notation below implies content randomization.

Next, we would like to ask you about your views on resident alien immigrants.
Resident aliens are people who were born overseas but are now living officially in Italy as non-citizens. To stay in Italy, resident aliens must apply for a visa renewal before it expires. If their application is denied, they must leave Italy.
Since 2014, Italy has approved hundreds of thousands of applications for visa extension by immigrants residing in Italy. The resident aliens applying for visa renewal differ in terms of their professional skill levels.
Please consider the group of resident aliens applying for visa renewal who are:
- [Low-skilled / High-skilled]
- [Currently living in country / Currently living abroad]
In your view, how many of those applicants should [COUNTRY] approve?

- Approve none (1)
- Approve few (2)
- Approve about half (3)
- Approve most (4)
- Approve all (5)

--
Thank you very much for your patience! Is there something you want to tell us to conclude?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

R CODE FOR ANALYSIS

```
library(sandwich)
library(lmtest)
library(rddtools)
library(psych)
library(texreg)


# Loading data ------------------------------------------------------------

svyx <- #Conjoint data (respondent-profile rows)
svyz <- #Respondent data (respondent rows)


# Variable transforms -----------------------------------------------------

svyz$ideo5 <- cut(svyz$ideo11, breaks = c(0,2,4,5,7,10),include.lowest = T,
                  labels =
                    c("Far Left","Left","Center","Right","Far Right"))
svyz$ideo5 <- relevel(svyz$ideo5, ref = "Center")

svyz$age_cat <- cut(svyz$age, breaks = c(0,30,40,50,60,1000),
                    include.lowest = T, right = F,
                    labels = c("18-29","30-39","40-49","50-59","60+"))

svyz$inc_quintile <- cut(svyz$inc_decile, breaks = c(1,2,4,6,8,10),
                         include.lowest = T,
                         labels = c("Quintile 1","Quintile 2","Quintile 3",
                                    "Quintile 4","Quintile 5"))


# Data subsets ------------------------------------------------------------

svyz.it <- subset(svyz,svyz$cty == "Italy")
svyz.sp <- subset(svyz,svyz$cty == "Spain")


# Pooled regressions ------------------------------------------------------

#aust_pref is binary, where (1) indicates preference for austerity

mod1 <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
             inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
```

```
          own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff + cty, svyz)
coeftest(mod1, vcov = vcovHC(mod1,"HC2"))

mod2 <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
          inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
          own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff + cty +
          voted + ideo5, svyz)
coeftest(mod2, vcov = vcovHC(mod2,"HC2"))

mod3 <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
          inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
          own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff + cty +
          voted + ideo5 +
          gov_int + gov_red + gov_doright + gov_competent +
          empathy + know_inf + know_term, svyz)
coeftest(mod3, vcov = vcovHC(mod3,"HC2"))


# Italy regressions ----------------------------------------------------

mod1.it <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
             inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
             own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff, svyz.it)
coeftest(mod1.it, vcov = vcovHC(mod1.it,"HC2"))

mod2.it <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
             inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
             own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff +
             voted + ideo5, svyz.it)
coeftest(mod2.it, vcov = vcovHC(mod2.it,"HC2"))

mod3.it <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
             inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
             own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff +
             voted + ideo5 +
             gov_int + gov_red + gov_doright + gov_competent +
             empathy + know_inf + know_term, svyz.it)
coeftest(mod3.it, vcov = vcovHC(mod3.it,"HC2"))


# Spain regressions ----------------------------------------------------

mod1.sp <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
             inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
```

```
            own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff, svyz.sp)
coeftest(mod1.sp, vcov = vcovHC(mod1.sp,"HC2"))

mod2.sp <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
            inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
            own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff +
            voted + ideo5, svyz.sp)
coeftest(mod2.sp, vcov = vcovHC(mod2.sp,"HC2"))

mod3.sp <- lm(aust_pref ~ age_cat + female + EISCED + num_child +
            inc_quintile + employed + factor(union_mem) +
            own_stocks + public_inc + mort + layoff +
            voted + ideo5 +
            gov_int + gov_red + gov_doright + gov_competent +
            empathy + know_inf + know_term, svyz.sp)
coeftest(mod3.sp, vcov = vcovHC(mod3.sp,"HC2"))


# Conjoint data merge and variable transforms ----------------------------

svyx <- merge(svyx,svyz[,c("ResponseId","cty","ideo11","party_vote_lr")],
           by = "ResponseId", all.x = T, all.y = F)

spend.vars <- c("att_defe","att_educ","att_welf","att_jobs","att_pens")
tax.vars <- c("att_inct","att_salt","att_cort")

for (i in 1:length(spend.vars)){
  svyx[,paste0(spend.vars[i],"_cat")] <-
    cut(-svyx[,spend.vars[i]],breaks = c(0,5,10,15,20,25,30),
        right = T, include.lowest = T,
        labels = c("Cut by 0-5%","Cut by 6-10%","Cut by 11-15%",
                   "Cut by 16-20%","Cut by 21-25%","Cut by 26-30%"))
}

for (i in 1:length(tax.vars)){
  svyx[,paste0(tax.vars[i],"_cat")] <-
    cut(svyx[,tax.vars[i]],breaks = c(0,5,10,15,20,25,30),
        right = T, include.lowest = T,
        labels = c("Increase by 0-5%","Increase by 6-10%","Increase by 11-15%",
                   "Increase by 16-20%","Increase by 21-25%","Increase by 26-30%"))
}


# Conjoint data subsetting -----------------------------------------------
```

```
#First 5 tasks:
profs1 <- c("A1","A2","B1","B2","C1","C2","D1","D2","E1","E2")
svyx1 <- subset(svyx,svyx$profs %in% profs1)
#Second 5 tasks:
profs2 <- c("F1","F2","G1","G2","H1","H2","I1","I2","J1","J2")
svyx2 <- subset(svyx,svyx$profs %in% profs2)
#No party in second 5 tasks:
svyx2.np <- subset(svyx2,svyx2$conj_trt == "AC" | svyx2$conj_trt == "BC")
#Party included in second 5 tasks:
svyx2.p <- subset(svyx2,svyx2$conj_trt == "AT" | svyx2$conj_trt == "BT")

#All observations with no party:
svyx.np <- rbind(svyx1,svyx2.np)
#All observations with party:
svyx.p <- svyx2.p
#All observations with party AND respondent-level party vote data
#(party_vote_lr indicates the left-right score of the party respondent voted for)
svyx.p.wlr <- subset(svyx.p, !is.na(svyx.p$party_vote_lr))

#Observations without party for Spain
svyx.np.sp <- subset(svyx.np,svyx.np$cty == "Spain")
#Observations without party for Italy
svyx.np.it <- subset(svyx.np,svyx.np$cty == "Italy")

#Observations with party for Spain
svyx.p.sp <- subset(svyx.p,svyx.p$cty == "Spain")
#Observations with party for Italy
svyx.p.it <- subset(svyx.p,svyx.p$cty == "Italy")

#Observations without party for different LR ideology bins
svyx.np.left <- subset(svyx.np,svyx.np$ideo11 < 5)
svyx.np.center <- subset(svyx.np,svyx.np$ideo11 == 5)
svyx.np.right <- subset(svyx.np,svyx.np$ideo11 > 5)

#Observations with party for different LR ideology bins
svyx.p.left <- subset(svyx.p,svyx.p$ideo11 < 5)
svyx.p.center <- subset(svyx.p,svyx.p$ideo11 == 5)
svyx.p.right <- subset(svyx.p,svyx.p$ideo11 > 5)


# Conjoint Regressions ----------------------------------------------------

#No party, categorical attributes, pooled
```

```
mod.np.cat <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                  att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                  att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                 data = svyx.np)
coeftest(mod.np.cat, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat, cluster = svyx.np$ResponseId))


#With party, categorical, pooled
mod.p.cat <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                  att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                  att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                data = svyx.p)
coeftest(mod.p.cat, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.p.cat, cluster = svyx.p$ResponseId))


#No party, categorical, Italy
mod.np.cat.it <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                     att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                     att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                   data = svyx.np.it)
coeftest(mod.np.cat.it,vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat.it, cluster = svyx.np.it$ResponseId))


#No party, categorical, Spain
mod.np.cat.sp <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                     att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                     att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                   data = svyx.np.sp)
coeftest(mod.np.cat.sp,vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat.sp, cluster =
svyx.np.sp$ResponseId))


#NOTE: Conjoint regressions will also be performed With party,
#categorical attributes, for Italy and Spain separately

#No party, categorical, left
mod.np.cat.left <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                       att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                       att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                     data = svyx.np.left)
coeftest(mod.np.cat.left, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat.left, cluster =
svyx.np.left$ResponseId))
```

```
#No party, categorical, center
mod.np.cat.center <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                        att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                        att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                      data = svyx.np.center)
coeftest(mod.np.cat.center, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat.center, cluster =
svyx.np.center$ResponseId))


#No party, categorical, right
mod.np.cat.right <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                       att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                       att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat,
                     data = svyx.np.right)
coeftest(mod.np.cat.right, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.np.cat.right, cluster =
svyx.np.right$ResponseId))

#NOTE: Conjoint regressions will also be performed Without party,
#categorical attributes, for Left, Center, Right separately for Italy,
#and separately for Spain.

#NOTE: Conjoint regressions will also be performed with party,
#categorical attributes, for Left, Center, and Right separately,

#NOTE: Conjoint regressions will also be performed With party,
#categorical attributes, for Left, Center, Right separately for Italy,
#and separately for Spain.

#With party, categorical, using distance from party as attribute
#(Distance is computed as the absolute distance between the left-right score of the party
#the respondent voted for and the left-right score of the party shown in the conjoint profile)
svyx.p.wlr$lr_distfrom_party <- cut(abs(svyx.p.wlr$party_vote_lr - svyx.p.wlr$att_party_lr),
                                   breaks = c(-1,0,2,4,6,10), right = T)
mod.p.cat.wlr <- lm(pref ~ att_defe_cat + att_educ_cat + att_welf_cat +
                    att_jobs_cat + att_pens_cat +
                    att_inct_cat + att_salt_cat + att_cort_cat +
                    lr_distfrom_party,
                  data = svyx.p.wlr)
coeftest(mod.p.cat.wlr, vcov = vcovCluster(mod.p.cat.wlr, cluster = svyx.p.wlr$ResponseId))


#NOTE: Conjoint regressions will also be performed with party,
#categorical attributes, using distance from party as attribute,
#for Italy and Spain separately.
```