\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

- \*\* PROJECT: "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication", American Journal of Political Science
- \*\* AUTHORS: David Broockman, Daniel M. Butler
- \*\* DESCRIPTION: Stata code (Do File) to replicate figures and tables in paper and the appendices

\*\* DATE: 21 October 2015

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Variable names and descriptions from each data set.

## STUDY 1: Study1\_data.dta

serial - researcher created id variable used to merge the pre- and post-surveys

date - date that post-survey was conducted

time - time of day when post-survey conducted

ncalls - number of call attempts needed to reach survey respondent

operator - Id for individual conducting survey

duration - length of the call in seconds

q1\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] We'd like to ask about your State Representative, [LEGISLATOR A]. Would you say you have a positive and warm impression of [LEGISLATOR A], a negative and cold impression of [LEGISLATOR A], or have you not heard of him before?

- 1. 1. Positive impression of him
- 2. 2. Negative impression of him
- 3. 3. Have not heard of him before
- 4. 4. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

q2\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Would you say you have a strongly positive impression of him or not so strongly positive?

- 1. 1. Strongly positive impression of him
- 2. 2. Not so strong positive impression of him

q3\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Would you say you have a strongly negative impression of him or not so strongly negative?

- 1. 1. Strongly negative impression of him
- 2. 2. Not so strong negative impression of him

q4\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Now I'd like to ask your opinion about a few political issues here in [STATE]. One proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] is to increase funding for private school voucher programs, where the state helps pay children's private school tuition. Do you favor an increase in funding for private school tuition vouchers, not favor it, or do you have no opinion?

- 1. 1. Favor the plan to increase funding for private school vouchers
- 2. 2. Not favor the plan to increase funding for private school vouchers
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know
- 4. 4. Refused to answer

q5\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Another proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] would reduce the state income tax by about 1 tenth of 1 percentage point. Would you say that you support this reduction, oppose it, or do you have no opinion?

- 1. 1. Support the plan to reduce the tax credit program
- 2. 2. Disapprove the plan to reduce the tax credit program
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

q6\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] To tell you about another issue, the state currently forbids cities in [STATE] from increasing property taxes. Do you think school districts and cities in [STATE] should be allowed to raise property tax rates, not allowed, or do you have no opinion?

- 1. 1. Should be allowed
- 2. 2. Not allowed
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

q7\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] This is our last question. As you may know, [MATERIAL] is being [EXTRACTED] here in [STATE]. One proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] would have the state and not local governments regulate [MINERAL EXTRACTION] in their areas. What do you think? Should local governments be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION], should only the state regulate it, or do you have no opinion?

Local governments should be able to regulate sand mining:

- Local governments should be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION]
- 2. 2. Local governments should NOT be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION]
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

q8\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Do you happen to recall if you've received anything in the mail from [LEGISLATOR A] this year?

- 1. 1. Yes
- 2. 2. No
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

q9\_post - [FROM POST-SURVEY] Do you happen to recall if you've ever met [LEGISLATOR A] in person?

- 1. 1. Yes
- 2. 2. No
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

voterbase\_registration\_status - Registration status from TargetSmart Communications voter file.

voterbase\_age - Constituent age from TargetSmart Communications voter file.

voterbase\_gender - Constituent gender from TargetSmart Communications voter file

voterbase\_race - Constituent race from TargetSmart Communications voter file

fdisp - [FROM PRE-SURVEY] First, I'd like to ask about your opinion of President Barack Obama. Would you say you have a positive impression of him or a negative impression of him?

- 01 Positive impression of him
- 02 Negative impression of him
- 03 Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- q1 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] We'd like to ask a couple questions about [LEGISLATOR A]. Would you say you have a positive and warm impression of [LEGISLATOR A], a negative and cold impression of [LEGISLATOR A], or have you not heard of him before?
  - 1. 1. Positive impression of him
  - 2. 2. Negative impression of him
  - 3. 3. Have not heard of him before
  - 4. 4. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- q2 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] Would you say you have a strongly positive impression of him or not so strongly positive impression of him?
  - 1. 1. Strongly positive impression of him
  - 2. 2. Not so strong positive impression of him
- q3 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] Would you say you have a strongly negative impression of him or not so strongly negative impression of him?
  - 1. 1. Strongly negative impression of him
  - 2. 2. Not so strong negative impression of him:
- q4 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] Now I'd like to ask your opinion about a few political issues here in [STATE]. One proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] is to increase funding for private school voucher programs, where the state helps pay children's private school

tuition. Do you favor an increase in funding for private school tuition vouchers, not favor it, or do you have no opinion?

- 1. 1. Favor the plan to increase funding for private school vouchers
- 2. 2. Not favor the plan to increase funding for private school vouchers
- 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know
- 4. 4. Refused to answer
- q5 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] Another proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] would reduce the state income tax by about 1 tenth of 1 percentage point. Would you say that you support this reduction, oppose it, or do you have no opinion?
  - 1. 1. Support the plan to reduce the tax credit program
  - 2. 2. Disapprove the plan to reduce the tax credit program
  - 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- q6 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] To tell you about another issue, the state currently forbids cities in [STATE] from increasing property taxes. Do you think school districts and cities in [STATE] should be allowed to raise property tax rates, not allowed, or do you have no opinion?
  - 1. 1. Should be allowed
  - 2. 2. Not allowed
  - 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- q7 [FROM PRE-SURVEY] This is our last question. As you may know, [MATERIAL] is being [EXTRACTED] here in [STATE]. One proposal in [STATE CAPITAL] would have the state and not local governments regulate [MINERAL EXTRACTION] in their areas. What do you think? Should local governments be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION], should only the state regulate it, or do you have no opinion?
  - Local governments should be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION]
  - 2. 2. Local governments should NOT be able to regulate [MATERIAL EXTRACTION]
  - 3. 3. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer

disagree\_vouchers - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

disagree\_incometax - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

disagree propertytax - Researcher coded variable.

1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.

### Otherwise

disagree\_frack - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

indifferent vouchers - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Indifferent on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

indifferent incometax - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Indifferent on this issue in pre-survey.
- Otherwise

indifferent\_propertytax - Researcher coded variable.

- Indifferent on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

indifferent frack - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Indifferent on this issue in pre-survey.
- Otherwise

agree\_vouchers - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Agreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

agree\_incometax- Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Agreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- Otherwise

agree\_propertytax- Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Agreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

agree\_frack- Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Agreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

movable vouchers - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - Otherwise

movable incometax - Researcher coded variable.

1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).

### 0. Otherwise

movable\_propertytax - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

movable\_frack - Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

disagree\_total - The number of issues (in the pre-survey) on which the constituent disagreed with Legislator A.

indifferent\_total - The number of issues (in the pre-survey) on which the constituent did not have an opinion.

agree\_total - The number of issues where the voter agreed with Legislator A in the pre-survey.

movable\_total - The number of issues (in the pre-survey) on which the constituent could be moved (either because they disagreed with Legislator A or did not have an opinion on the issue).

policy letter treat - Treatment randomly assigned by the researchers.

- 0. Assigned to control. Received no letter.
- 1. Assigned to issue letter. Received an issue letter.

issue\_1\_name - First randomly chosen issue. If they were assigned to receive the policy letter this issue was included in the letter.

issue\_2\_name - Second randomly chosen issue. If they were assigned to receive the policy letter this issue was included in the letter.

# STUDY 2: Study2\_data.dta

obama\_positivePRE - [FROM PRE-SURVEY] First, I'd like to ask about your opinion of President Barack Obama. Would you say you have a positive impression of him or a negative impression of him?

- -1. Negative impression of him
- 0. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- 1. Positive impression of him

legislator\_positivePRE - [FROM PRE-SURVEY] We'd like to ask a couple questions about [LEGISLATOR]. Would you say you have a positive and warm impression of [LEGISLATOR], a negative and cold impression of [LEGISLATOR], or have you not heard of [him/her] before?

- -1. Negative impression
- 0. Have nor heard of them/Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- 1. Positive impression

issue1name - Issue assigned as "issue 1" for the purpose of the dataset for this respondent. (coded for people who finished 2nd survey

issue2name - Issue assigned as "issue 2" for the purpose of the dataset for this respondent.

issue3name - Issue assigned as "issue 3" for the purpose of the dataset for this respondent.

issue4name - Issue assigned as "issue 4" for the purpose of the dataset for this respondent.

issue1pre - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue2pre - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue3pre - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue4pre - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

disagree1PRE - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.

### 0. Otherwise

disagree2PRE - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

disagree3PRE - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

disagree4PRE - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Disagreed with legislator A on this issue in pre-survey.
- 0. Otherwise

disagreePRE\_num\_issues legislator - The number of issues (in the pre-survey) on which the constituent disagreed with their legislator.

moveable1 - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

moveable2 - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

moveable3 - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

moveable4 - [BASED ON PRE-SURVEY] Researcher coded variable.

- 1. Is movable on this issue (either disagrees with legislator A or has no opinion on this issue in pre-survey).
  - 0. Otherwise

moveable\_total - The number of issues (in the pre-survey) on which the constituent could be moved (either because they disagreed with Legislator A or did not have an opinion on the issue).

voterbase\_age - Constituent age from TargetSmart Communications voter file.

voterbase\_gender - Constituent gender from TargetSmart Communications voter file

voterbase\_race - Constituent race from TargetSmart Communications voter file lettertreatment - Treatment condition in Study 2.

issuetreatmentnumber - Which issue they were randomly assigned to receive in their letter (Individuals assigned to the no issue control group are coded as missing).

issuetreatmentname - Is the topic that was covered in the issue letter for those assigned to receive a letter with issue content.

issue1post - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue2post - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue3post - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue4post - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's position on this issue in relation to the legislator's position.

- -1. Disagreed with legislator
- 0. No opinion on issue
- 1. Agreed with legislator

issue1know - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's belief about what the legislator's position was on this issue (Note that this question was only asked to a random sample of respondents).

- -1. Incorrectly gave the opposite of the legislator's actual position (i.e., said the legislator agreed with the position when in fact the legislator disagreed with the position).
  - 0. Did not know the legislator's position on the issue.
  - 1. Correctly identified the legislator's position.

issue2know - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's belief about what the legislator's position was on this issue (Note that this question was only asked to a random sample of respondents).

- -1. Incorrectly gave the opposite of the legislator's actual position (i.e., said the legislator agreed with the position when in fact the legislator disagreed with the position).
  - 0. Did not know the legislator's position on the issue.
  - 1. Correctly identified the legislator's position.

issue3know - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's belief about what the legislator's position was on this issue (Note that this question was only asked to a random sample of respondents).

- -1. Incorrectly gave the opposite of the legislator's actual position (i.e., said the legislator agreed with the position when in fact the legislator disagreed with the position).
  - 0. Did not know the legislator's position on the issue.
  - 1. Correctly identified the legislator's position.

issue4know - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Respondent's belief about what the legislator's position was on this issue (Note that this question was only asked to a random sample of respondents).

- -1. Incorrectly gave the opposite of the legislator's actual position (i.e., said the legislator agreed with the position when in fact the legislator disagreed with the position).
  - 0. Did not know the legislator's position on the issue.
  - 1. Correctly identified the legislator's position.

obama\_positivePOST - [FROM POST-SURVEY] First, I'd like to ask about your opinion of President Barack Obama. Would you say you have a positive impression of him or a negative impression of him?

- -1. Negative impression of him
- 0. Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- 1. Positive impression of him

legislator\_positivePOST - [FROM POST-SURVEY] We'd like to ask a couple questions about [LEGISLATOR]. Would you say you have a positive and warm impression of [LEGISLATOR], a negative and cold impression of [LEGISLATOR], or have you not heard of [him/her] before?

- -1. Negative impression
- 0. Have nor heard of them/Undecided/Don't know/Refused to answer
- 1. Positive impression

letter\_recallPOST - [BASED ON POST-SURVEY] Do you happen to recall if you've received anything in the mail from [LEGISLATOR A] this year?

- 0. No/Don't know
- 1. Yes