Codebook, "Partisan Influence in Suspicious Times"

Joshua Robison

June 25, 2021

The following provides details on the variables contained in the main data files for "Partisan Influence in Suspicious Times".

Experiment 1

- Experiment-Related Variables
  - support: Policy support; 1-7pt scale (higher = more support; 1 = extremely oppose, 4 = neither support/nor oppose, 7 = extremely support)
  - certain: Subjective opinion certainty; 1-5pt scale (1=not certain at all, 2 = slightly, 3 =somewhat, 4 =very, 5 = extremely)
  - X_in & X_out: Respondents in a party cue condition were asked how much attention they thought the two parties gave to "the opinions and needs of the following groups": the public as a whole, air travellers, special interest groups, Democrats in the mass public, Republicans in the mass public, journalists and the media, people like you, campaign donors, and experts on aviation policy. X_in entries refer to evaluations of how much attention the respondent thought their in-party gave, while X_out entries refer to their out-party. Responses range from 1-5 (1 = none at all, 2 = a little, 3 = a moderate amount, 4 = a lot, 5 = a great deal)
  - Q27: Party stereotype measure. Respondents were asked: "which political party do you believe would be more likely to sponsor a policy where oversight of air traffic control is taken from the FAA and put under the oversight of a nonprofit corporation"; 1 = Democratic Party , 2 = Republican Party, 3 = Not Sure. Only asked of those in the No Party Cue condition.
  - vignette: Screen timing data for reading the policy information and providing an opinion.
  - ratings: Screen timing data for answering the argument rating questions
  - condition: Experimental condition: "No Party Cue", "Party Cue", "Neg Process" (party cue with insinuation) and "Pos Process" (party cue with positive process treatment).
  - proponents & opponents: Argument rating data for proponents of the policy and opponents respectively. Respondents were asked how effective they found the arguments on a scale ranging from 1 (definitely not effective) to 7 (definitely effective).
- Asked on T1 survey:
  - interest: Respondent political interest on a scale from 1-5 pt scale (1 = not interested at all, 2 = slightly, 3 = moderately, 4 = very, 5 = extremely).
  - gender: 0=male, 1=female.
  - age: Age in years.
  - educ_old: Highest level of school completed: 1 = < HS, 2 = HS degree, 3 = some college but no degree, 4 = associate degree, 5 = BA degree, 6 = Masters, 7 = Doctoral, 8 = professional (JD, MD) degree
  - educ: 1 = HS degree or less; 2 = some college; 3 = BA degree; 4 = Post-BA.
  - hispanic: 0 = non-hispanic, 1 = hispanic.
  - race_cat: 1 = white, 2 = black, 3 = hispanic, 4 = asian, 5 = other
  - income: Household income. 1 = <10,000; 2=10,000-19,999; 3=20,000-29,999; 4=30,000-39,999; 5=40,000-49,999; 6=50,000-59,999; 7=60,000-69,999; 8=70,000-79,999; 9=80,000-89,999; 10=90,000-99,999; 11=100,000-149,999; 12=150,000 or more

- pid: 7-pt PID scale ranging: 1 = strong Dem, 2 = not very strong Dem, 3 = lean Dem, 4 = pure Independent ... 7 = strong Rep
- pid_3: 1 = Democrat (inc. leaners), 2 = Republican (incl. leaners), 3 = pure Independent
- pid_2: 0 = Republican, 1 = Democrat
- pid_ext: 1 = Independent, 2 = leaner, 3 = not very strong partisan, 4 = strong partisan
- pid_idstr: Respondents were asked four items tapping identity strength following work by Huddy and co-authors: (1) how important is being a X to you (1 = not at all, 4 = extremely); (2) how well does the term X describe you (1 = not at all, 4 = extremely well); (3) how often do you use "we" instead of "they" (1 = all of the time, 4 = never; reverse scaled for the index); (4) to what extent do you think of yourself as being a X (1 = a great deal, 4 = not at all; reverse scaled for the index). pid_idstr is an index formed by averaging the four items (alpha = 0.86).
- cyn_mean: Respondents were asked to agree/disagree (5pt scales) with five items tapping their level of cynicism: (1) what politicians say depeends on who is listening; (2) politicians generally have good intensions; (3) many politicians can be bought; (4) Despite what some say, most politicians try to keep their promises; (5) quite a few of the people running government are crooked. cyn_mean is the average of the five items (alpha = 0.78).
- cue_reliability: Respondents were asked the following items to assess how reliable they felt party cues to be (inspired by Lavine et al. 2012): (1) when it comes to forming your opinions about political issues, how reliable are political parties as guides; (2) to what degree does knowing the parties' positions on policy help you in deciding whether to support or oppose it; (3) Let's say that all you know about a political issue is that most Democrats support one side and that most Republicans support the other side. If you had to make a decision about the issue, how confident would you be in your decision–knowing just the parties' positions?. cue_reliability is the average of the items with higher scores indicating more perceived reliability (alpha = 0.72).
- ideol_gen: "In general, how would you describe your political views using the scale below": 1 = extemely liberal, 2 = moderately, 3 = slightly, 4 = moderate, ... 7 = extremely conservative.
- ideol_social: How would you describe your political views when it comes to social issues such as same-sex marriage and abortion? (Same scale as ideol_gen)
- ideol_econ: How would you describe your political views when it comes to economic issues such as taxes and government spending? (Same scale as ideol_gen)
- ideol_mean: The average of the three ideol_X items (alpha = 0.9)
- ideol_operational: Respondents were asked five policy questions with three response options: agree/disagree/not sure. The questions focused on: gun control, universal health care, provision of birth control by employers, the government subsidizing student loans, and minimum wage policy. Responses were rescaled such that -1 = a liberal response, 0 = not sure, and +1 = a conservative response before being averaged together (alpha = 0.82).
- nfc: Respondents were asked six questions from the need for cognition battery: (1) I would prefer complex to simple problems, (2) I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking, (3) thinking is not my idea of fun, (4) I would rather do something that requires a little thought that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities, (5) I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours, and (6) I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long term ones. Responses range from 1-5 and were rescaled so that higher values = more NFC before being averaged together (alpha = 0.89)

Experiment 2

- Experiment Related Items
  - treat_info: 1 = No party cue, 2 = Party cue, 3 = Cue + positive proces info, 4 = Cue + insinuation
  - treat_policy: 1 = liberal policy change (decrease sales tax, increase income taxes), 0 = conservative policy change (decrease income taxes, increase sales taxes)
  - treat_policy_congruence: 1 = congruent policy change, 0 = incongruent policy change
  - policy_support: Policy support on a 0-10 scale (higher = more)
  - proarg & conarg: Argument ratings for arguments in favor of and in opposition to policy change.

1 = not effective at all, 2 = slightly, 3 = moderately, 4 = very, 5 = extremely
  - arg_diff: proarg - conarg
  - timings: Screen timing for reading the vignette and giving an attitude
  - policy_stereotype: Which party the respondent things would be more likely to advance the policy they read about: 1 = Dem Party, 2 = Republican, 3 = Not Sure
- Other Items
  - sclass: "Many people say there are different social classes in society. If you were to place yourself in a social class, which would you say you belong to?". Response options: 1 = lower class, 2 = working, 3 = lower middle, 4 = middle, 5 = upper middle, 6 = upper, 7 = don't know
  - gender: "Female", "Male"
  - birth: Year of birth
  - age: Age in years
  - education: Same as educ_old in exp1
  - educ_trunc: 1 = < HS, 2 = HS degree, 3 = some college, 4 = BA degree, 5 = Post-BA degree
  - hispanic: Same as exp1
  - race_cat: Same as exp1
  - income: Same as exp1
  - pid, pid_3, pid_2, pid_ext: Same as exp1
  - pid_imp, pid_describe, pid_wethey, pid_think, pid_idstr: Same as exp1. Alpha for identity strength is: 0.87.
  - ideol_symb: Same as ideol_gen in exp1.
  - ideol_3: 1 = liberal, 2 = moderate, 3 = conservative
  - ideol_operational: Average of ten policy questions coded such that -1 = liberal response, 0 = not sure, +1 = conservative response; alpha = 0.77
  - abortion, socsecurity, birthcontrol, deathpenalty, immigration, jobs, captrade, healthcare, loans, minwage: The ten specific policy items.
  - complex, satisfaction, deliberating, puzzles, abstract, nfc: Five need for cognition items (complex to abstract) and their average (alpha = 0.86, higher = more NFC)

Experiment 3

- Experiment Items
  - cue_treat: Raw assignment indicator.
  - treat_3: No Party Cue, Party Cue, Party Cue w/Insinuation
  - treat_5: No Party Cue, Party Cue, Companies (i.e., Party Cue with insinuation about companies), Interest Groups, Labor Unions
  - change: Conservative Change, Liberal Change
  - change_stereotype: Non-Sterotypical Change, Stereotypical Change
  - tax_support: Policy support on 1-11 scale (need to subtract 1 to put on 0-10 scale)
  - proarg, conarg: Same as exp2
  - placement: Policy placement in ideological space (1 = very liberal, 4 = moderate, 7 = very conservative)
  - prox: Absolute difference of respondent ideology (ideol) and placement of policy
  - state_growth:rich: 7 inference items indicating beliefs about whether the policy would worsen or improve various outcomes (1 = worsen greatly, 2 = worsen somewhat, 3 = worsen a little, 4 = neither worsen nor improve, ... 7 = improve greatly)
  - inferences & inferences_norich: Inferences is the average of all 7 items (alpha = 0.87); inferences_norich is the average of all items save for one asking about improving the fortunes of the rich (alpha = 0.91)
  - X_trust: Respondents were asked how much they trust the two parties, major companies, labor unions, and business leaders. "How well, if at all, do you believe the following groups represent your interests and values in public debates?". 1 = not well at all, 2 = slightly well, 3 = moderately, 4 = very, 5 = extremely

  - own_trust & out_trust: Trust in a respondent's in and out-party respectively
  - broken: Do you think the tax reform process you read about shows more that our policy-making process is working as intended or more that our policy-making process is broken?. Response options: Broken, Working as Intended
  - specialinterests: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Politicians pay too much attention to what special interests and lobbyists want them to do"?. Response options: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree ... 7 = strongly agree
  - corrupt: In general, how many United States politicians do you believe are corrupt?. Response options: 1 = almost none, 2 = a few, 3 = about half, 4 = somewhat more than half, 5 = almost all
- Other Items
  - duration: Duration of survey
  - Q1: Accept or Decline participation in the survey
  - Finished: Finished the survey? (1 = yes... which occurs for all entries.)
  - gender: 1 = male, 2 = female, 3 = prefer not to say, 4 = prefer to self-describe
  - age: Age in years
  - age_cat: Same as exp1 & exp2
  - Q165: Highest level of education completed. Same categories as educ_old (exp1) and education (exp2)
  - educ: <HS, HS, Some College, Bachelor Degree, Post-Bachelor Degree
  - race_eth: African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Other, White
  - income: Same as exp1 and exp2
  - partyid, pid_2, pid_3, pid_ext: Same as experiments 1 & 2.
  - pid_imp, pid_describe, pid_think, pid_idstr, pidstr_wext: The first three items are the same pid identity strength items as in experiments 1 and 2. pid_idstr is the average of the three (alpha = 0.82). pid_idstr_wext also includes a version of pid_ext limited to just partisans. Correlation between the two questions is 0.973. Higher on all measures = stronger identities.
  - ideol: Same as ideol_gen and ideol_symb above.
  - ideol_operational: Average of six policy items (-1 = liberal, 0 = not sure, +1 = conservative response; alpha = 0.62)
  - ideol_economic: Average of four policy items focused on economic policy (alpha = 0.75)
  - complex, thinking, challenge, littlethought, abstract: Five questions from the NFC scale with higher = more NFC... in theory. The five do not form a sound scale.
  - polknow: Political knowledge. Assessed via four multiple choice items concerning the length of term for Senators, what it takes to override a Presidential veto, who breaks a tie in the Senate, and which party had more members in the House. Each item was rescaled (0=incorrect/not sure, 1=correct) and then averaged together.
  - knowl_irt: 2 paramater IRT measure of knowledge based on the foregoing four items. Correlated at r = 0.99 with polknow.

Experiment 4

- Experiment Variables
  - dem_cue and rep_cue: Which version of the cue experiment the respondent received as stored by Qualtrics embedded data
  - cue: 1 = received a party cue, 0 = did not receive a cue
  - insinuation: 1 = received an insinuation, 0 = did not
  - libchange: 1 = liberal policy change, 0 = conservative policy change
  - treat_4: 1 = no party cue, 2 = party cue, 3 = cue w/insinuation, 4 = no party cue, insinuation
  - change: 0 = stereotypical, 1 = counter-stereotypical
  - support & support01: Policy support on 0-10 scale or 0-1 scale
  - support_timing: Time to read stimulus and give opinion
  - proarg, conarg, argdiff, argdiff01: Argument ratings for pro and con side and their difference

(including on a 0-1 scale)
  - placement: Placement of policy (same as Exp 3)
  - prox and prox01: Proximity to policy (same as Exp 3)
  - special_X, policy_X, gain_X, likeyou_X: Perceived motives of supporters of the policy change (_supporters) and opponents (_opponents).
  - growth-rich, inferences: Policy inference items, same as Exp 3
  - inf_timing: How long respondents took to answer the inferences items
  - dem_party, rep_party, unions, business, professionals: Feeling thermometer scores for the respective groups
- Other Variables
  - rn: caseid
  - IP_*: Results from rIP check.
  - survey_seconds: Duration of survey in seconds
  - survey_minutes: Duration of survey in minutes
  - pid: Response to the first item in the PID branching question: Democrat, Independent, No Preference, Republican
  - leaner: Response among respondents indicating not identifying with the Democrats/Republicans on follow up question about leaning: Democrat, Neither, Republican
  - partyid, pid_3, pid_2, pid_ext: Same as earlier experiments
  - pid_imp, pid_describe, pid_think, pid_idstr: Same as earlier experiments. Alpha for identity strength scale: 0.87
  - Q17-Q22: Original responses to six policy questions
  - abortion, healthcare, loans, minwage, deathpenalty, guar_job: Recoded policy responses (-1=liberal, 0=not sure, +1=conservative)
  - op_ideol & op_ideol_mean: Sum or mean of the six policy items (alpha = 0.75)
  - symb_ideol: Same as ideol_gen, etc.
  - gender_full: Male, Female, Prefer not to say, prefer to self-describe
  - gender: 0 = male, 1 = female
  - bthyr & age: birth year and age in years
  - educ_full: Highest level of education completed. Same categories as educ_old (exp1), education (exp2).
  - educ: Same as educ_trunc.
  - hispanic, race_eth, income: Same as earlier experiments
  - FL_7_DO_pid-FL_79_DO_FL_84: Qualtrics randomization information
  - thinking, littlethought, deliberating, tasks, abstractly, nfc: NFC items (higher = more) and an index formed by averaging them (alpha = 0.79).