

Addendum to Public Opinion on Politician Incivility & Apologies in the United States

April, 2019

Overview

We will conduct another survey experiment for our study on politician incivility and apologies. This survey will be similar to the last one we conducted using respondents from the U.S. (hereafter, the U.S. Study), but in this additional study, we will recruit Japanese adult citizens in Japan (hereinafter, the Japan Study). See below for the fields and appendix, which we edit and add to.

B7 Date of start of study

02/28/2019; 04/18/2019

C2 What are the hypotheses to be tested/quantities of interest to be estimated?

Our hypotheses and research questions (RQs) are the same as before, except we would also like to add the following RQ:

RQ8: How are the results of our analysis different between the case of Japan and the case of the United States?

C3 How will these hypotheses be tested?

We will conduct two randomized survey experiments to test our hypotheses and examine exploratory research questions. In both experiments, we recruit respondents through the Qualtrics Panels. For our first survey, participants are United States citizens, who are 18

years old or older. For our second survey, participants will be Japanese citizens living in Japan who are 20 years old or older. They will be recruited through the Qualtrics Panel. For each experiment, we will conduct analyses using all respondents, as well as some subgroups of respondents. See the attached appendix for the survey instruments and our plan of statistical analysis.

C4 Country

United States; Japan

C5 Sample Size

1,000; 1,000

C8 IRB Number

STUDY00031356; MOD00008410, MOD00008656, MOD00008891

C9 Date of IRB Approval

10/17/2019; 01/28/2019; 02/22/2019; 04/09/2019

Certification

By submitting this form and accompanying documents with EGAP, I confirm that I have rights to put this information in the public domain and I understand that this information will remain on the EGAP registry in perpetuity, regardless of whether the research is subsequently implemented or not.

Appendix - C3

Survey Instruments

In both the survey questionnaires designed with Qualtrics, we first ask respondents' consent to participate in this study. We then ask basic pre-treatment demographic and attitudinal questions. They include age, prefecture (for the Japan Study only), state of residency (for the U.S. Study only), gender, education, race (for the U.S. Study only), ethnicity (for the U.S. Study only), and a battery of agree-or-disagree questions about ten statements, two of which we are interested in because they pertain to the two topics that we use in our experiment; specifically, immigration and sexual harassment for the U.S. Study and nuclear reactors and university discrimination against females for the Japan Study. The other eight statements are used as "fillers" to minimize a priming effect before the treatment is assigned. We will also ask them five questions to measure respondents' attitudes toward conflicts. These questions are taken from the previous studies (Druckman et al. 2018; Mutz and Reeves 2005). We follow Druckman et al. (2018) and combine these questions into one measure of whether an individual is conflict avoidant or conflict seeking. After asking about these possible moderators, we will then ask questions about respondents' political attitudes, including partisanship, ideology, and interest.

We designed a factorial experiment with six treatment groups: three (a civil comment, an uncivil comment, or an uncivil comment with an apology) by two (a hypothetical man politician or a hypothetical woman politician). Each respondent will see two different topics (whether or not it is a gendered topic), and the order of these topics is randomized.

All these six treatments for the U.S. Study include a prompt that gives a short description of a fictional politician who ran for the respondent's state senate legislature and won a seat. For the Japan Study, the six treatments include a short description of a fictional politician who is planning to announce their candidacy for the upcoming House of Councillors election in the respondent's prefecture. This short description is followed by a sentence or two that reveal/s the politician's stance on a topic (baseline in regression analysis); reveals the politician's stance on a topic and introduces an uncivil comment he/she made (a dichotomous variable labelled as *Uncivil*); or reveals the politician's stance on a topic, introduces an uncivil comment he/she made and his/her apology for it (*Uncivil & Apology*). The biography for the politician and the specific wording of an apology for the politician, if applicable, are randomized independently between two constructed sets. For each respondent in the U.S. Study, the names of the two politicians (for two different topics) are randomly chosen from a list of 123 names – 61 feminine and 62 masculine names. These names are drawn

from Butler and Homola (2017). Based on their categorization of gendered names, the treatment groups are classified as either a *Female Politician* or a male politicians (baseline in regression analysis). For Japan, we used the Japanese Local Elections Dataset to find a total of four common given names (two women and two men) among politicians. We also randomly selected four common family name and assign each family name to each chosen given name. Respondents will then see two out of those four names in the Japan Study.

We also implement block randomization. Specifically, for the U.S. Study, we use the following pre-treatment variables and make 72 strata: gender (man; woman; or non-binary), age (18–25; or 26 or older), education (a holder of Bachelor’s or graduate degree; or otherwise), partisanship (supporters of the Democratic Party including those who lean to the Democratic Party; supporters of the Republican Party including including those who lean to the Republican Party; otherwise), and race (white; or non-white). For the Japan Study, we make 72 strata as well based on the following pre-treatment variables: gender (man; woman), age (20–46; or 46 or older), partisanship (supporters of LDP; supporters of opposition party; supporters of no party), education (pursuing or holding a college or graduate degree; not pursuing or holding a college or graduate degree), and region (within Tokyo, within Kanto region but not Tokyo, outside of the Kanto region). For both surveys, we then randomly assign respondents *within each stratum* to one of the six treatment groups.

After the treatment is assigned, for each biography/topic, we will ask questions on politician evaluation (*Evaluation*). These questions act as each respondent’s evaluation of a (hypothetical) politician, and the order of these questions (on the same screen) is randomized.

Specifically, in the U.S. Study, we include the following questions:

- How likely or unlikely would you be to vote for [name] if the election were held today?
- How good or bad of a job do you think [name] will do as a U.S. state senator?
- How favorably or unfavorably would you describe your attitude toward [name]?

In the Japan Study, the following questions (translated to Japanese) are included:

- If there was an election held today, would you be likely or unlikely to vote for [name]?
- If [name] won the election, how likely or unlikely do you think that [name] will perform their duty appropriately?
- Do you feel friendly or unfriendly towards [name]?

In addition, we ask two open-ended questions to gauge respondents’ engagement and emotional response: one asking how respondents feel about the politician, and another asking

about their opinions on the topic. The order of these questions (on the same screen) is randomized. Specifically, in the U.S. Study, we include the following questions:

- Thinking about the passage about [name] you read, how do you feel about [name]? Please type your answer in the box below.
- What are your views on [immigration/sexual harassment]? Please type your answer in the box below.

In the Japan Study, we include the following questions (translated to Japanese):

- After reading the text about [name], how do you feel about [name]? Any opinions are fine, so please feel free to fill in the blanks below.
- What do you think about [the use of renewable energy including nuclear power / about the active use of diverse human resources] which [name] is discussing? Any opinions are fine, so please feel free to fill in the blanks below.

Statistical Analysis

For our hypotheses and exploratory research questions relevant to respondents' evaluation of politicians, we will run the following regression model. We use either a full sample or a subset of respondents (by gender or partisanship; or by conflict-avoidant vs. conflict seeking attitudes) for each analysis. Note that taking advantage of the block randomization, the model includes 71 dummy variables for the 72 prestratified strata: $v_{k,i}$, where $k = \{1, \dots, 71\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Evaluation}_i &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{Uncivil}_i \\
 &+ \beta_2 \cdot \text{Uncivil \& Apology}_i \\
 &+ \beta_3 \cdot \text{Female Politician}_i \\
 &+ \beta_4 \cdot \text{Female Politician}_i \cdot \text{Uncivil}_i \\
 &+ \beta_5 \cdot \text{Female Politician}_i \cdot \text{Uncivil \& Apology}_i \\
 &+ v_{k,i} \\
 &+ u_i
 \end{aligned}$$

We will run this regression model with the dependent variable being a combined score of politician evaluation based off of the mean of the three politician evaluation questions, as well as using each question individually. Furthermore, we will look to see if there is any difference in politician evaluation by topic (gendered/ungendered).

For our hypotheses and exploratory research questions relevant to respondents' engagement in this study, we will run regressions with our treatments as our independent variables and examine if these variables predict how many words respondents typed in response to the open-ended questions. For hypotheses and exploratory research questions relevant to respondents' emotional response, we will do supervised text analysis to classify each comment as angry or not, and then run regressions with our treatments as our independent variables. Similar to what we do for our analyses involving politician evaluation, we will also do these analyses using the open-ended question on various subsets of respondents and in interactions with the topics.

References

- Butler, Daniel M., and Jonathan Homola. 2017. "An Empirical Justification for the Use of Racially Distinctive Names to Signal Race in Experiments." *Political Analysis* 25(1): 122–130.
- Druckman, James N., S. R. Gubitz, Ashley M. Lloyd, and Matthew S. Levendusky. 2018. "How Incivility on Partisan Media (De)Polarizes the Electorate." *The Journal of Politics*, 000–000.
- Mutz, Diana C., and Byron Reeves. 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *The American Political Science Review* 99(1): 1–15.