

# Pre-Analysis Plan: Minimum Wage Survey

Zach Markovich & Ariel White

January 2019

## 1 Introduction

We have some preliminary results (based on administrative data) that suggest that people whose wages go up due to minimum-wage increases may also become more likely to vote. We could imagine several possible mechanisms for this. The policy feedback literature describes policies having both “resource” and “interpretive” effects, and we could picture both being at play here: maybe the extra income makes it feasible for people to vote and removes barriers to voting like housing instability, and/or maybe getting a raise because of a government policy changes their attitudes about whether government matters to their lives. We’d like to try to directly observe these processes via a survey of people making near the minimum wage in Massachusetts. We’ll ask about economic well-being and political attitudes both before and after a planned increase in the minimum wage.

The plan is to put a survey into the field in December 2018, pulling in a sample of Massachusetts residents currently getting paid between \$11-11.99/hour, as well as two comparison groups. First, we’ll also survey hourly workers in Massachusetts making between \$12 and \$15/hour, and then we’ll also collect responses from hourly workers in neighboring Connecticut making \$10.10-11.99/hour. We’ll collect baseline measures of people’s political attitudes and economic well-being, focusing on concepts like political efficacy and economic instability. Then, on January 1 2019, the Massachusetts minimum wage will increase from \$11/hour to \$12/hour. We’ll then attempt to re-survey the same people approximately a month later, in mid-January, to see whether their attitudes have changed. Ultimately, we plan to analyze this as a difference-in-differences: do we see bigger over-time changes in the responses of people who have received raises due to the minimum wage increase, compared to people who were not directly affected by the minimum wage increase (either because they already made just above \$12, or because they live in a state where the minimum wage did not increase)?

We should note that this is an attempt to observe several possible mechanisms by which minimum wage increases could drive voter turnout, but that we don’t really have a setup for mediation analysis. We will be able to say whether minimum wage changes appear to change people’s attitudes towards government, and also whether they seem to change people’s economic well-being, but we will not be able to say anything like “X% of the effect of

minimum wage increases on voting are due to changes in people’s political efficacy.” If we only find that economic well-being changes and not political efficacy, we would find that convincing evidence in support of a “resource effect” story, and vice versa for “interpretive effects.” But if both sets of survey responses change, we will not have much basis for distinguishing which mechanism is more important.

We are filing this pre-analysis plan in January 2019, after having run Wave 1 of the survey, and before collecting data from Wave 2.

This study has been reviewed and approved by MIT’s Committee on the Use of Humans as Experimental Subjects.

## 2 The Survey

We have contracted with Qualtrics to field this survey; they have said they have a substantial number of low-wage workers (in Massachusetts and Connecticut) in their sample, and should be able to target our survey and screen out people who do not fall into the earnings categories we have defined. This is a non-probability sample, so we will be limited in our ability to generalize to all people in our population of interest. Still, we think there is value in observing these processes even in a self-selected sample, and we note the internal validity of the difference-in-differences design.

**Wave 1** The first/baseline wave of the survey will be fielded in mid-December (beginning December 14). We planned to collect 1800<sup>1</sup> responses in this first wave: 600 will be the “treated” group, Massachusetts residents who currently earn \$11 to \$11.99 per hour (below the new minimum wage). 600 will be the “wage control” group: Massachusetts residents who currently earn just above the new minimum wage (\$12-\$15/hour). The idea here is that these low-wage workers will have many experiences in common with the “treated” group, but will not be directly affected by the minimum wage increase. Finally, 600 will be the “geographic control” group: Connecticut residents who currently make between the Connecticut minimum wage (\$10.10/hour) and the new Massachusetts minimum wage (\$12). These people should share many experiences with minimum-wage workers in Massachusetts, but because they live in a neighboring state, they will not experience a minimum-wage increase as of January. Neither of these comparisons are perfect (we discuss their drawbacks

---

<sup>1</sup>Ultimately, Qualtrics was only able to find about 1200 respondents that fell into our geographic/earnings categories. Power calculations suggest we should still be able to see reasonably-sized treatment effects as long as attrition is not too large, so we are proceeding with the second wave of the survey.

below), so we include them both as checks on each other.

This wave of the survey includes screening questions (state, hourly wages), demographic information, and baseline questions about political efficacy and economic well-being. We also ask some exploratory questions about people’s beliefs about inequality and their preferred policy approaches to economic inequality for a separate research topic (discussed in section 4 below). The full survey instrument for this wave is included in Appendix A.

**Wave 2** After the minimum wage increase takes effect January 1, we’ll try to recontact (again through Qualtrics) the respondents from the first wave of the study. Ideally, we’d wait a few weeks after the increase to increase the probability that people have received a paycheck reflecting the new wage, but we’re trading that off against the need to recontact people quickly enough that we don’t get terrible attrition. The current plan is to field Wave 2 around January 11.<sup>2</sup>

We will attempt to recontact everyone from the first wave of the survey. We’ve done power calculations assuming that we’ll see retention rates somewhere between 30% and 75% (based on Qualtrics’ reports of past recontact attempts at about the one-month mark). If we experience extremely high attrition (fewer than 30% of wave 1 respondents returning for wave 2), we will abandon our within-subjects approach and will draw a new cross-section for wave 2. This would introduce noise and reduce our statistical power, but our difference-in-differences approach should still be valid (barring dramatic shifts in the Qualtrics survey pool over a month).

In this wave, we will ask almost the same set of questions as in Wave 1<sup>3</sup>, plus a question intended to check whether people experienced the minimum wage increase and are aware of it. This question<sup>4</sup> will appear either early in the survey or at the end of the survey: respondents will be randomized into these two conditions with equal probability. This will let us explore whether being given information about the minimum wage increase changes responses to the other survey questions.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that most workers are paid either weekly or every other week, and January 11 is the second Friday of the month, so we hope that most people will have been paid under the new rate by this point.

<sup>3</sup>There are two differences: first, the wage questions will be asked but will not be used to screen anyone out. Also, we will drop the final question from Wave 1, about whether the person expects a raise soon.

<sup>4</sup>“As you may know, the minimum wage in Massachusetts increased from \$11/hour to \$12/hour on January 1, 2019. Did this change directly affect how much you are paid at work?”

### 3 Analysis

We plan to analyze this as a two-period difference-in-differences setup; we'll compare the over-time change in a given outcome measure among people "treated" by the minimum wage increase to the same over-time change among the untreated. In a regression context, this means regressing our outcome measure (such as political efficacy) on indicator variables for whether the person would be affected by the minimum-wage increase and whether the survey response was collected before or after January 1, plus the interaction between those two dummies (which is what we're interested in).

#### 1 Main Outcome Measures

We are focused on two main dependent variables: political efficacy and economic instability. We've included multiple questions for each of these concepts, and will combine those into an index measure of each concept.

For political efficacy, we will average responses to the questions "How much do government officials care what people like you think?" and "How much can people like you affect what government does?". Both these questions have five-point response scales (from "A great deal" to "None at all") so assigning each response a value from 1 to 5 and averaging the two questions should yield a measure that runs from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5.

For economic instability, we will average responses to the composite question "Thinking ahead to the next year, how likely do you think it is that you or someone in your household will experience the following things". The five scenarios in this question include several negative economic outcomes (going without healthcare, being late paying bills, skipping meals) and several positive ones (paying off a debt, moving to better housing), with people being asked to place the probability of experiencing them on a 0 to 100% scale. We will then use principal components analysis (PCA) to combine responses to these questions into a single measure of economic pessimism. Each question will be rescaled and recentered before the PCA is conducted. The dimension reduction will be conducted using both the wave 1 and wave 2 data so that responses in both waves can be interpreted on the same scale. Our main analysis will then be conducted on the first principal component.

## 2 Initial Check: Did Priming Matter?

Before we proceed to our main observational difference-in-differences analysis, we will check whether an experimental treatment embedded in our second survey wave made any difference. Respondents to wave 2 of the survey will be randomized into two conditions: half of them will see a question<sup>5</sup> about being personally affected by the minimum wage increase early in the survey, and half of them will only see it at the end of the survey. We intend for this question to “amplify” the minimum-wage-increase treatment, ensuring that people who have received a raise but have not yet realized it or have not thought of it as a result of policy will be aware of the minimum wage increase. We think this reminder question should act much the way politician statements about minimum-wage increases could operate in upcoming elections, making the wage increase salient again and reminding people that it is a direct result of government action.

We will test (within the “Minimum-wage-affected” group, of Massachusetts residents earning under \$12/hour before the wage increase) whether explicitly reminding people of the minimum wage change affected their survey responses in wave 2. We will run two simple tests of whether the experimental prime changed people’s responses on our main outcome measures, political efficacy and economic pessimism. We will simply calculate the difference in means (on our “political efficacy” and “economic pessimism” indices) between people who got the minimum wage reminder question early in the survey, and those who saw it at the end. If we do not see any difference between the question-first and question-at-end groups, we will conclude that the minimum wage increase was likely very well-understood and salient already, and that reminders would not change that.<sup>6</sup> If we do see a difference, this will suggest to us that political “reminders” to affected voters of the minimum wage increases could matter for the political importance of the change. We discuss this possibility further in the next section.

## 3 Main Analysis

Our main question for this project is: does an increase in the minimum wage change political efficacy or perceptions of economic insecurity in the short term for affected people? To address this question, we will run our difference-in-differences design, using two different

---

<sup>5</sup>“As you may know, the minimum wage in Massachusetts increased from \$11/hour to \$12/hour on January 1, 2019. Did this change directly affect how much you are paid at work?”

<sup>6</sup>We can further examine how much the question changed people’s knowledge or recollection of the minimum wage increase by comparing the treated and control group’s accuracy on a factual question near the end of the survey: “What is the current minimum wage in your state (in dollars per hour?)”.

outcome measures and two different comparisons, for a total of four tests.

First, for political efficacy, we will use the “political efficacy” index described above. We will compare over-time changes in this measure between “treated” and “control” groups, using two different treated/control comparisons. First, we will compare Massachusetts residents who were and were not affected by the minimum wage increases, because their pre-2019 hourly wage was either just above or just below the new minimum wage; we call this Political Efficacy Test 1. This comparison is useful because everyone lives in the same state and are working similar low-wage jobs, so treated and untreated people should have similar trends in political efficacy and should be similarly affected by any concurrent changes in the state political landscape (such as a major speech by the governor or some other political development). If we find that treated people’s political efficacy increases more over time than untreated people’s, we would tentatively conclude that the minimum wage increase had interpretive effects.

However, we might worry that this within-state comparison could actually understate the effects of the minimum wage increase. It’s possible that even people already making more than the minimum wage would still see the wage increase as a political victory for people like them, and would thus become more likely to say that government is responsive to “people like you.” If our “untreated” group were also responsive to the minimum-wage increase, our comparison might be understating the effects of the change on minimum-wage workers. In order to address this concern, we introduce a different comparison, this one across state lines. Here, we run the same difference-in-differences comparison, this time using the Connecticut sample of low-wage workers as the “untreated” group; we call this Political Efficacy Test 2. The idea here is that low-wage people in another state should be less likely to have heard of or been swayed by Massachusetts’ minimum wage increase, so our “untreated” group is more likely to be genuinely untreated. Of course, the downside to using a comparison group from a different state is that we might worry about other time-varying confounders that could shape political efficacy: perhaps something else will happen in Connecticut between December and January that will affect our “untreated” group and make our parallel trends assumption untenable. This concern makes us think it is worthwhile to run and present both comparisons (across-wage and across-state) along with their assumptions, so that readers can decide which they trust more.

Second, we will do the same two comparisons (across-wage within MA and across-state) with the “economic insecurity” measure described above, calling these Economic Insecurity Test 1 and Economic Insecurity Test 2. These four tests represent the main analyses for this

project.

#### 4 Robustness/Supplemental Tests

**Splitting the sample by experimental condition** As noted above, we embedded a small priming experiment in our second survey wave, where some people were explicitly reminded of the minimum wage increase early in the survey, and others were only reminded at the end. Section 2 above discussed our main test for whether the placement of this question affected our outcome measures.

But we should also consider what this treatment means for our main observational difference-in-differences analysis. When we pool all of our data together (without respect to experimental treatment condition) and calculate the effect of being in the group affected by the minimum wage increase in the period after the increase takes effect, we are essentially estimating a treatment effect that averages together the effect for people who did and did not get the extra “push” of being reminded of the minimum wage increase. That is, some people received only the treatment of “getting a raise on January 1” and others received a treatment of “getting a raise on January 1 and also being reminded about it in our survey”. One might worry that any effects we find would be due to effects among the second group of people, who received both the real-world treatment and the experimental prime. So we will also split our sample and repeat our difference-in-differences analyses separately for people in the two experimental conditions. We worry that we may not be fully powered to compare the sizes of these treatment effects, but we can at least see whether there still seems to be an effect among people who were not primed until the end of the survey.

If we find an effect in the pooled data, but it appears to have been driven entirely by people who were primed by the minimum-wage reminder question at the beginning of the survey, we will conclude that the minimum-wage increase could matter for real-world political outcomes, but only if people are reminded of the change (such as by media coverage of it, or politician statements) shortly before an election.

**Looking for Anticipation** Wave 1 of the survey includes a question about whether respondents expect to receive a raise soon (“Do you expect your hourly pay to increase in the next month or so?”), with a followup question for people who answer yes (“Why do you expect your pay to increase? Is there some particular reason you will receive a raise?” with free-text response). This should allow us to assess whether people anticipated the minimum wage increase in a way that could have affected even our December baseline measures of their

political attitudes. Especially if we find null effects, it will be important to explore whether it is possible that people had already adjusted their opinions to incorporate knowledge of the upcoming minimum wage increase. These questions should allow us to estimate how many “treated” people in our sample knew that a minimum wage increase was coming and would affect them.

We will first calculate the proportion of “treated” respondents who answered “yes” to the upcoming-raise question, compared to untreated respondents. Then, we will examine the free-text responses of people who said they expected a raise; we expect it should be easy to use keyword searches for phrases like “minimum wage” or even manual inspection to code whether people’s responses suggested they knew a minimum wage increase was coming, to calculate what proportion of the treated group could potentially have anticipated the change.

**Comparing Sample to Population** We are fielding this survey on a sample of respondents that may or may not be representative of the population we’re really interested in (people making near the minimum wage in MA or CT). We’ll use demographic data from our survey, as well as Census ACS data on income, to get a sense of how similar our respondents are to the population of interest on characteristics like age, gender, and race, and will report those comparisons in an appendix.

## 4 Separate questions: politics of inequality?

We have also included a set of questions in this survey that should help us begin to explore a separate question. We want to know whether implementing progressive economic policies like minimum wage increases can actually change public opinion about 1) whether economic inequality is a problem that government should do something about, and 2) support for specific economic policies, including but not limited to the minimum wage. We could imagine this working in a few different ways: on the one hand, maybe a minimum wage increase makes people update their ideas about what is possible, and actually leads them to increase their preferred minimum wage rate or their support for other economically progressive policies. Alternatively, maybe attitudes react thermostatically, so increasing the minimum wage makes people generally more economically conservative going forward.

To begin exploring these possibilities, we will conduct several other analyses of this survey, separate from the main analysis described above. We note that this question is a general one about the responses of all residents of a state, not only low-wage workers, so our sample is not ideal for it, but it offers a starting point. If we find something interesting here, we

would then seek to replicate and extend it in a broader sample.

First, we will ask whether the January minimum wage increase in Massachusetts appears to have changed Massachusetts residents' beliefs about the ideal minimum wage rate. Both waves of the survey ask people what they thought their state's hourly minimum wage ought to be. We will compare MA respondents' preferred minimum wage rate from December to their preferences in January to see whether they increase in the wake of the state's minimum wage increase.<sup>7</sup> In addition to this before-after comparison, we can use a difference-in-differences approach that compares the over-time change among MA residents to the over-time change among CT residents, who will not have seen their state increase the minimum wage.

Next, we will ask whether Massachusetts' minimum wage increase appears to have changed state residents' beliefs about how big a problem economic inequality is, and whether government should attempt to reduce it. Both waves of the survey will include two questions<sup>8</sup> on whether economic inequality is a problem. We will average responses to these questions to generate a measure of concern about economic inequality, and will then analyze them much like the preferred-minimum-wage measure above (looking at MA attitudes before and after the wage increase, and then comparing that change to the same change in CT). Similarly, we have included a question about government's role in reducing inequality ("do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to reduce income differences between the rich and the poor?") and will ask whether support for government action increases in Massachusetts in the wake of the minimum wage increase.

Finally, we are curious about whether one economically-progressive policy can build (or undermine) support for others. To this end, both waves of the survey include a question on a proposed "millionaire's tax" that a number of states have considered implementing.<sup>9</sup> As in the analyses above, we will ask whether MA respondents' support for this tax proposal increased after the minimum wage went up, comparing to baseline opinion and to the comparable over-time change in Connecticut.

---

<sup>7</sup>Our preferred-minimum-wage question allows people to type in what they think the hourly minimum wage should be; our pilot suggests that a very small percentage of people may give nonsense answers. We will exclude any answers above \$100 per hour, assuming that they represent confusion about the meaning of the question.

<sup>8</sup>"Would you say the income differences between rich and poor people in this country are too small, too big, or just about right?", with five possible responses, and "Today it's really true that the rich just get richer while the poor get poorer.", with seven responses.

<sup>9</sup>"Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose increasing state income taxes on people making over one million dollars per year?"

## A Wave 1 Survey Questions

**consent\_Qt**

We are a team of researchers at MIT doing research on public attitudes. We are writing to invite your participation in a survey about what you think of different issues.

*This survey is part of a MIT scientific research project. Your decision to complete this survey is voluntary. We will not have access to identifying information like your name or contact information, and will not have any way of linking survey responses back to individual people. The results of the research may be presented at scientific meetings or published in scientific journals. Clicking on the 'SUBMIT' button on the bottom of this page indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and agree to complete this survey voluntarily.*

**geography**

In which state do you currently reside?

What zip code do you live in?

**incomescreener**

First, we would like to ask you a few questions about work. How many jobs did you work at over the last month?

We'd like to ask you a few questions about each of your jobs.

We'd like to ask you a few questions about your jobs. We'll ask you about three different jobs, so please think about the three jobs where you work the most.

At your job, are you paid an hourly wage or are you paid in some other way, such as a salary, commission, or tips?

- Hourly wage
- Other (salary, commission, mostly tips)

On average, about how many hours per week do you work at that job?

How much are you paid per hour at this job (not including overtime or tips)?

Thinking about your first job, are you paid an hourly wage or are you paid in some other way, such as a salary, commission, or tips?

- Hourly wage
- Other (salary, commission, mostly tips)

On average, about how many hours per week do you work at that job?

How much are you paid per hour at this job (not including overtime or tips)?

Thinking about your second job, are you paid an hourly wage or are you paid in some other way, such as a salary, commission, or tips?

- Hourly wage
- Other (salary, commission, mostly tips)

On average, about how many hours per week do you work at that job?

How much are you paid per hour at this job (not including overtime or

tips)?

Thinking about your third job, are you paid an hourly wage or are you paid in some other way, such as a salary, commission, or tips?

- Hourly wage
- Other (salary, commission, mostly tips)

On average, about how many hours per week do you work at that job?

How much are you paid per hour at this job (not including overtime or tips)?

## Demographics

What is your age?

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other:

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- Grade school (did not graduate high school)
- High School or GED
- Some College
- College graduate
- Post-graduate

What racial or ethnic group best describes you?

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Middle Eastern
- Mixed
- Other

Thinking back over the last year, what was your family's annual income?

Do you or anyone else in your household belong to a labor union?

- Yes, I am a member of a union
- Yes, someone else in my household is a member
- No

**economics**

Next, we would like to ask you some questions about future, uncertain outcomes. In each case, try to think about the whole range of possible outcomes and think about how likely they are to occur during the next 12 months. The sliders here go from 0% to 100% probability, where 0% means "absolutely will not happen" and 100% means "absolutely will happen."

Thinking ahead to the next year, how likely do you think it is that you or someone in your household will experience the following things:

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Going without health insurance or medical care because it is too expensive

Being able to fully pay off a debt, like a credit card or old medical bills

Being late paying a rent or utility bill

Cutting the size of meals or skipping meals because there isn't enough money for food

Moving to a better housing situation than the one you're in now

Over the last month, approximately how much money did you spend on the following expenses?

Groceries/ food	<input type="text"/>
Rent	<input type="text"/>
Heating, gas, and electric utilities	<input type="text"/>
Transportation	<input type="text"/>
Entertainment or leisure	<input type="text"/>
Durable goods (cars, furniture, household appliances, etc)	<input type="text"/>
Saving	<input type="text"/>
Healthcare	<input type="text"/>

## PolEfficacy

Next, we'd like to ask you some questions about government and politics.

How much do government officials care what people like you think?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

How much can people like you affect what the government does?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

**party**

In general, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?

- Very Liberal
- Liberal
- Moderate
- Conservative
- Very Conservative

Do you identify as Democrat, Republican, or Independent?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent

Would you describe yourself as a strong Democrat or not very strong Democrat?

- strong Democrat
- not very strong Democrat

Would you describe yourself as a strong Republican or not very strong Republican?

- strong Republican
- not very strong Republican

Would you say you lean towards the Democrats, the Republicans, or neither?

- Democrats
- Republicans
- Neither

**ApprovalMA**

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Charlie Baker is handling his job as governor of Massachusetts?

- Approve
- Disapprove

Do you disapprove strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you approve strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the Massachusetts state legislature has been handling its job?

- Approve
- Disapprove

Do you approve strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you disapprove strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Donald Trump is handling his job as President?

- Approve
- Disapprove

Do you approve strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you disapprove strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

## ApprovalCT

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the Connecticut state legislature has been handling its job?

- Approve
- Disapprove

Do you approve strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you disapprove strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Donald Trump is handling his job as President?

- Approve
- Disapprove

Do you approve strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

Do you disapprove strongly, or not strongly?

- strongly
- not strongly

### **Politicsnow**

If the 2020 presidential election were held today and you were voting, do you think it is more likely that you would vote for president Donald Trump or the Democratic nominee?

- Donald Trump
- Democratic nominee

Do you plan to vote in the 2020 presidential election?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Might or might not
- Probably not
- Definitely not

### **minwage**

Would you say the income differences between rich and poor people in this country are too small, too big, or just about right?

- Much too small
- Too small
- About right
- Too big
- Much too big

We're interested in whether you agree or disagree with the following statement:

"Today it's really true that the rich just get richer while the poor get poorer."

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

What do you think the minimum wage in your state should be? (in dollars per hour)

What is the current minimum wage in your state (in dollars per hour)? We're interested in your best guess here, so please don't look up outside information.

Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose increasing state income taxes on people making over one million dollars per year?

- Strongly favor
- Favor somewhat
- Neither favor nor oppose
- Oppose somewhat
- Strongly oppose

On the whole, do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to reduce income differences between the rich and the poor?

- Should be the government's responsibility
- Should not be the government's responsibility

Have you been involved in efforts like the "Fight for \$15" to organize for an increase in the minimum wage? This could include things like going to rallies, taking part in strikes, donating money, or signing up volunteers.

- Yes, I have been involved
- No, I have not

In the last year, have you talked with co-workers about trying to improve working conditions or pay at your job?

- Yes, have talked with co-workers
- No, have not

### **MWanticipation**

Do you expect your hourly pay to increase in the next month or so?

- Yes
- No

Why do you expect your pay to increase? Is there some particular reason you will receive a raise?

Powered by Qualtrics