Hi Simon,

I just read through your research design (final paper). Grade is: A-.

It is nicely written and the analyses are well-done. The figures are very pretty (political scientists, myself included, love pretty pictures these days).

In terms of improvement:

* Your literature review is out-of-date. I realize most of this work was written a while ago. But there is new work on this topic, including:

  - http://www.amazon.com/Hidden-Agenda-Political-Mind-Self-Interest/dp/0691161119/ref=sr_1_7?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1462668207&sr=1-7&keywords=self-interest+politics

  - Hacker, Jacob S., Philipp Rehm, and Mark Schlesinger. 2013. The Insecure American: Economic Experiences, Financial Worries, and Policy Attitudes. Perspectives on Politics 11(1): 23-49.

  - Rehm, Philipp, Jacob S. Hacker, and Mark Schlesinger. 2012. Insecure Alliances: Risk, Inequality, and Support for the Welfare State. *The American Political Science Review* 106(2): 386-406.

* In terms of the empirical analysis, party ID should be formally included in the regression analysis.

* Given that the PID results vary with income (and perhaps the other IVs), you should include interaction terms between each of the key variables and party ID. OK (even preferable) to show the models with and without the interaction terms.

* It is usual to include some control variables in the regression analysis. If you wish to show the unadulterated results, you can have some simple models and then some with the controls.

* It's important with empirical work to be consistent throughout the paper. Thus, you should incorporate the variable you bring in at the end (high income families pay their fair share) into the earlier analyses. I.e., conduct the formal regression analysis with this variable as a 2nd DV.

Interesting paper. With some improvements, seems suitable for publication. Good luck!

-Liz