

Analysis for Palestine Experiment

Beniamino Green

Introduction

In this document I describe the analysis I have run on the YouGov survey investigating the effects of framing on support for assistance for the Palestinian Authority.

The survey asked respondents to read the following passage:

“US Secretary of State Antony Blinken visited Israel-Palestine last month after an 11-day escalation of violence. After meeting with Palestinian leaders, Blinken announced that the US would increase assistance to the Palestinian Authority.”

Respondents were also randomly shown one of the following sentences at the end of the passage:

- No ending sentence (control condition)
- “A State Department official stated that increasing US assistance to Palestinians will ‘help protect American national security interests in the region.’ (National security treatment)
- “A State Department official stated that increasing US assistance to Palestinians will ‘help prevent another humanitarian crisis and civilian suffering in the region.’ (Humanitarian crisis treatment)
- “A State Department official stated that increasing US assistance to Palestinians will ‘help preserve the principles of international law in the region.’ (International law treatment)
- “A State Department official stated that increasing US assistance to Palestinians will ‘help counter racial injustice and oppression in the region.’ (Racial justice)

Respondents were then asked to respond to the following three statements on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree.

- I would support this foreign policy decision.
- This foreign policy decision is good for American interests.
- This foreign policy decision reflects American values.

Measurement / Preliminaries

In this section I describe the scaling processing I perform on the data prior to running the data analysis.

Assessing the Attentive

A subset of respondents may not be reading the vignettes before answering as 20 percent of respondents read the vignettes and respond to all three questions in under 20 seconds. A subset of respondents not reading the treatments would bias effects towards zero those who do not read the vignettes cannot be influenced by the treatment, diminishing the power of the experiment and increase the chances of finding false positives. To compensate for this, I test all findings are consistent when analyzing the respondents of both all respondents and attentive respondents, which I define as respondents who took more than 10 seconds to answer the survey.

Table 1: Summary Statistics: seconds spent on the survey

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
seconds_spent	3,795	42.622	46.006	3	20	49	561

PCA

I create a set of composite outcomes using PCA which summarize responses to the three measures. The loadings for each principal component can be seen below.

Table 2: Principal Component Loadings

	PC1	PC2	PC3
I support this decision	-0.595	0.450	0.665
This policy reflects American Values	-0.558	-0.828	0.061
This is good for American interests	-0.578	0.335	-0.744

The first principal component explains 89% of the variance meaning that it well explains almost all of the variation in the data. PC1 is strongly negatively correlated with all three answers, suggesting that it encodes a respondent's general support / enthusiasm for the policy decision.

PCA measures across all treatments

First, I analyze the effects of the different treatments on the first principal component. The treatment effects are all insignificant except for upholding international law, suggesting that respondents on average were not moved much by the adding of a framing apart from international law. The coefficient for international law is positive, suggesting that respondents were significantly less supportive for actions taken to uphold international law than other actions.

I now investigate the effects of framings on support for aid to Palestine including the effect of respondent ideology. The coefficient for respondent ideology is significant and positive, suggesting that liberal respondents were more enthusiastic about aid to Palestine than conservative respondents.

Table 3: principal component (negative = enthusiastic) on treatment

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	principal component 1	
	All respondents	Attentive respondents
	(1)	(2)
Counter racial injustice	0.081 (0.161)	-0.021 (0.177)
National security	0.255 (0.162)	0.241 (0.178)
Prevent humanitarian crisis	-0.083 (0.158)	-0.099 (0.174)
Uphold international law	0.365** (0.164)	0.314* (0.180)
Intercept	-0.117 (0.114)	0.076 (0.126)
Observations	3,826	3,369
R ²	0.003	0.002
Adjusted R ²	0.002	0.001
Residual Std. Error	3.160 (df = 3821)	3.242 (df = 3364)
F Statistic	2.568** (df = 4; 3821)	2.050* (df = 4; 3364)

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 4: principal component (negative = enthusiastic) on treatment

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	principal component 1	
	all respondents	attentive respondents
	(1)	(2)
Counter racial justice	0.095 (0.153)	-0.041 (0.164)
National security	0.166 (0.154)	0.062 (0.165)
Prevent humanitarian crisis	-0.025 (0.151)	-0.077 (0.162)
Counter racial injustice	0.335** (0.156)	0.204 (0.167)
Ideology	1.279*** (0.040)	1.396*** (0.042)
Intercept	-0.125 (0.109)	0.125 (0.118)
Observations	3,447	3,056
R ²	0.233	0.268
Adjusted R ²	0.232	0.267
Residual Std. Error	2.839 (df = 3441)	2.840 (df = 3050)
F Statistic	209.640*** (df = 5; 3441)	223.521*** (df = 5; 3050)
<i>Note:</i>		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Repliability Measures by Effect Size

