YouGov Survey Data Analysis

Author Name

Introduction

In this document, I describe the analysis I have run on the YouGov survey investigating the effects of "woke" framings on support for congressional action on an a set of issues.

Respondents to the survey were shown one of the following 6 statements:

- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by Latinx communities.
- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by Hispanic/Latino communities.
- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by communities of color.
- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by racial minorities.
- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by the Black Lives Matter movement.
- Congress is negotiating a bill to address issues raised by recent protests for racial equality.

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

1. I would support Congress passing a bill to address these issues.
2. These issues are important to me.
3. These issues are important for American society.

Preliminaries:

As was the case with the Palestine survey, a subset of respondents appear to not be reading the vignettes / questions before they respond. This would decrease the observable treatment effect, and make it more likely that a significant result is due to chance alone. I run all models discussed in this analysis on all respondents, and on the subset of respondents who took more than 10 seconds to respond to the survey, to ensure that the results are not dependent on the inclusion of respondents who were not exposed to the treatment.

Table 1: Summary Statistics: Seconds spent on the survey

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
seconds_spent	4,028	32.527	33.567	3	17	36	578

I create a set of principal components which summarize responses to the three measures. The loadings for these components can be seen below:

PCA

The first principal component explains roughly 90% of the variance responses to the question, suggesting that it well explains most of the variation in the data. It is strongly negatively correlated with responses to all three questions suggesting that it encodes a respondent's general support for the proposed congressional action, where more positive values indicate respondents that are less enthusiastic about the bill.

Table 2: Prinicipal Component Loadings

	PC1	PC2	PC3
I would support Congress adressing this issue	-0.588	0.636	-0.500
These issues are important to American society	-0.571	0.112	0.813
These issues are important to me	-0.574	-0.763	-0.297

Analysis

I first analyze the effects of changing a framing from "non-woke" to "woke" across all respondents. The coefficient for "woke" is uniformly negative among both all and attentive respondents. This suggests that changing the framing of an issue from "non-woke" to "woke" is associated with a significant decrease in support. This effect can also be seen when examining responses to the three questions individually. Across all questions, changing a framing from "non-woke" to "woke" significantly decreases support and perceptions of the bill as important.

Table 3: principal component (negative = supportive) on woke framing

	Dependent variable:	
	Principal Component 1	
	(1)	(2)
Woke	0.234**	0.228**
	(0.103)	(0.105)
Intercept	−0.115	−0.088
	(0.073)	(0.075)
Observations	4,047	3,943
R^2	0.001	0.001
Adjusted R^2	0.001	0.001
Residual Std. Error	3.266 (df = 4045)	3.287 (df = 3941)
F Statistic	5.195** (df = 1; 4045)	4.760** (df = 1; 3941)
Note:		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

I then include an effect for a respondent's ideology, and allow the effect of "woke" framings to vary between respondents of different ideologies. A significant positive coefficient for a respondents' ideology indicates that liberal respondents view all congressional actions more favorably. The coefficient for the interaction between woke and a respondents' ideology is positive, but not significant at conventional levels (p<.1), suggesting that liberal respondents may respond more positively to woke framings, but the evidence is ambivalent.

Similar to the results from the Palestine survey experiment, interactions between treatment and respondents' ideology and past voting are not significant at conventional significance levels. This result is consistent across all measures of ideology and party affiliation, indicating that a respondents' party, ideology, and past voting had no effect on how they responded to a framing being "woke" or not.

Table 4: principal component (negative = supportive) on woke framing

	Dependent variable:	
	Principal Component 1	
	(1)	(2)
Woke	0.282^{***}	0.283^{***}
	(0.092)	(0.094)
Ideology	1.429^{***}	1.444^{***}
	(0.053)	(0.054)
Woke X Ideology	0.137^{*}	0.139^{*}
	(0.075)	(0.076)
Intercept	-0.136^{**}	-0.109
	(0.066)	(0.067)
Observations	3,610	3,520
R^2	0.308	0.313
Adjusted R^2	0.307	0.312
Residual Std. Error	2.771 (df = 3606)	2.780 (df = 3516)
F Statistic	534.345^{***} (df = 3; 3606)	534.085^{***} (df = 3; 3516)
Note:		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01