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ONLINE SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

**Chapter 2**

**A. Spending Preferences Survey Items in the GSS:**

**Question wording and calculation of aggregate preferences**

As noted in the text, the GSS asks respondents’ preferences over national spending using the following question stem:

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount. First (READ ITEM A) . . . are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on (ITEM)?

All of the GSS items analyzed in this book are listed below. For many issues, the GSS uses two slightly different question wordings that it substitutes for ITEM in the stem above; survey respondents are assigned at random to one of the two wordings. Where this is the case, both question wordings are listed. These wordings have the same substantive meanings and did not affect responses to a substantial degree. Thus they were averaged in the calculations of aggregate preferences.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **GSS Mnemonic** | **Question wording** |
| Crime | NATCRIME/NATCRIMY | Halting the rising crime rate/Law enforcement |
| Drugs | NATDRUG/NATDRUGY | Dealing with drug addiction/Drug rehabilitation |
| Education | NATEDUC/NATEDUCY | Improving the nation's education system/Education |
| Energy | NATENRGY | Developing alternative energy sources |
| Environment | NATENVIR/NATENVIY | Improving and protecting the environment/Environment |
| Health care | NATHEAL/NATHEALY | Improving and protecting the nation's health/health |
| Military | NATARMS/NATARMSY | The military, armaments, and defense/National defense |
| Poverty | NATFAREY | Assistance to the poor |
| Social security | NATSOC | Social security |
|  | | |
| *Non-consensus issues included in analysis in Chapter 6:* | | |
| **Issue** | **GSS Mnemonic** | **Question wording** |
| Cities | NATCITY/NATCITYY | Solving the problems of the big cities/Assistance to big cities |
| Foreign aid | NATAID/NATAIDY | Foreign aid/Assistance to other countries |
| Parks | NATPARK | Parks and recreation |
| Science | NATSCI | Supporting scientific research |
| Space | NATSPACE, NATSPACY | Space exploration program |
| Transportation | NATMASS | Mass transportation |

**Chapter 3**

**B. List of search terms and issue categories for issue ownership survey questions**

As described in the text, all issue ownership questions found in the Roper Archive were included in the analyses generating the over-time estimates of issue ownership on consensus issues found in Table 3.2. The following tables list the categories into which issue ownership questions were classified. It first lists those classified as consensus issues and then those classified as non-consensus issues, with the reason for their classification as such.

**Consensus issues included in analysis**

| issue categories | search term |
| --- | --- |
| crime | crime |
| crime | drug (NOT prescription drugs) |
| crime | violence |
| deficit | debt |
| deficit | deficit |
| deficit | fiscal discipline |
| deficit | fiscal responsibility |
| domestic security | america safe |
| domestic security | border security |
| domestic security | communists |
| domestic security | defend |
| domestic security | feel safe |
| domestic security | homeland security |
| domestic security | mass destruction |
| domestic security | national security |
| domestic security | protecting the country |
| domestic security | security (NOT social security) |
| domestic security | terror |
| economy | depression |
| economy | economic |
| economy | economy |
| economy | factories to produce more |
| economy | financial |
| economy | investment |
| economy | live better |
| economy | peacetime production |
| economy | prosperous |
| economy | recession |
| economy | savings and loan |
| economy | stock market |
| education | educat |
| education | school |
| energy | energy |
| energy | foreign oil |
| energy | foreign oil |
| energy | gas and oil |
| energy | gas prices |
| energy | gasoline |
| environment | enviro |
| environment | pollution |
| foreign affairs | alliances |
| foreign affairs | allies |
| foreign affairs | allies around the word |
| foreign affairs | american interests |
| foreign affairs | arms control |
| foreign affairs | at peace |
| foreign affairs | china |
| foreign affairs | control nuclear weapons |
| foreign affairs | foreign affairs |
| foreign affairs | foreign countries |
| foreign affairs | foreign leaders |
| foreign affairs | foreign nations |
| foreign affairs | foreign policy |
| foreign affairs | foreign relations |
| foreign affairs | free-enterprise economies |
| foreign affairs | global respect |
| foreign affairs | international affairs |
| foreign affairs | international drug trafficking |
| foreign affairs | keeping the peace |
| foreign affairs | lasting peace |
| foreign affairs | nuclear arms |
| foreign affairs | nuclear weapons |
| foreign affairs | other countries |
| foreign affairs | out of war |
| foreign affairs | peace |
| foreign affairs | peace in the world |
| foreign affairs | respect for the united states |
| foreign affairs | respected in the world |
| foreign affairs | SALT |
| foreign affairs | south africa |
| foreign affairs | spread of democracy |
| foreign affairs | standing in the world |
| foreign affairs | third world |
| foreign affairs | trade |
| foreign affairs | world affairs |
| foreign affairs | world peace |
| foreign affairs | world war iii |
| foreign affairs | japan |
| foreign affairs, military | afghanistan |
| foreign affairs, military | arab |
| foreign affairs, military | central america |
| foreign affairs, military | iran |
| foreign affairs, military | iraq |
| foreign affairs, military | israel |
| foreign affairs, military | korea |
| foreign affairs, military | kosovo |
| foreign affairs, military | middle east |
| foreign affairs, military | nicaragua |
| foreign affairs, military | North Korea |
| foreign affairs, military | palestin |
| foreign affairs, military | persian gulf |
| foreign affairs, military | russia |
| foreign affairs, military | soviet |
| foreign affairs, military | vietnam |
| health care | malpractice |
| health care | prescription |
| healthcare | health care |
| healthcare | health insurance |
| healthcare | health of the people |
| healthcare | healthcare |
| healthcare | health-care |
| healthcare | HMO |
| healthcare | malpractice |
| healthcare | medical |
| healthcare | Medicare |
| healthcare | patient's bill |
| healthcare | patients' rights |
| healthcare | prescription |
| immigration | immigrant |
| immigration | immigration |
| immigration, domestic security | border |
| inflation | cost of living |
| inflation | food prices |
| inflation | high prices |
| inflation | inflation |
| inflation | interest rates |
| inflation | prices down |
| jobs | job |
| jobs | unemploy |
| jobs | unemployment |
| jobs | wages |
| military | america strong |
| military | defense |
| military | intelligence |
| military | militarily |
| military | military |
| poverty | homeless |
| poverty | poor |
| poverty | poverty |
| poverty | welfare |
| poverty | welfare |
| social security | social security |
| taxes | internal revenue service |
| taxes | tax |
| trade | more competitive abroad |
| trade | trade |

**Consensus issues not included in analysis due to lack of observations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| issue category | search term |
| AIDS | aids |
| food | food safety |
| parks | national parks |
| research | research |
| technology | internet |
| technology | technology |
| transportation | roads |

**Non-consensus issues, with reason for classification as non-consensus issue**

***Refers to desired characteristics of parties or candidates***

| issue category | search term |
| --- | --- |
| accomplish | business of government |
| accomplish | changing how things work in washington |
| accomplish | effective leadership |
| accomplish | government efficiently |
| accomplish | gridlock |
| accomplish | managing the federal government |
| accomplish | managing the government |
| accomplish | relations with congress |
| accomplish | solutions |
| accomplish | willing to work with |
| accomplish | work with other party |
| choices | choices |
| commander | commander |
| community | communit |
| compassion | compassion |
| confidence | confidence from the people |
| confidence | confidence in government |
| crisis | crisis |
| disasters | disaster |
| ethics | bribery |
| ethics | corrupt |
| ethics | ethic |
| ethics | free from graft |
| ethics | honest |
| ethics | open government |
| ethics | trust in the government |
| ethics | violate the law |
| experience | experienced |
| freedom | freedom |
| future | future |
| general | future |
| general | ideas |
| general | main problems |
| general | right choices |
| general | right policies |
| giveback | give something back |
| ideas | new ideas |
| leader | leadership |
| likeyou | on your side |
| likeyou | people like me |
| likeyou | people like you |
| opportunity | opportunity |
| patriotism | patriotic |
| patriotism | pledge of allegiance |
| patriotism | proud to be americans |
| patriotism | traditional american values |
| principled | campaign promises |
| principled | what they believe |
| reform | reform |
| responsibility | responsibility |
| specialints | elites |
| specialints | special interests |
| waste | waste |

***Refers to constituency groups***

| issue category | search term |
| --- | --- |
| business | business |
| business | companies |
| business | corporat |
| business | small businesses |
| children | children |
| consumer | consumer |
| disabled | disabilities |
| family | families |
| family | family |
| farmers | farm |
| homeowners | homeowner |
| homeowners | mortage |
| housing | homeowner |
| housing | housing |
| housing | mortgage |
| investors | investment |
| investors | retirement |
| investors | stock market |
| investors | stockholders |
| investors | wall street |
| labor | labor |
| labor | strikes |
| labor | working people |
| middleclass | middle class |
| middleclass | middle income |
| middleclass | middle-class |
| minorities | affirmative action |
| minorities | black people |
| minorities | civil rights |
| minorities | colored people |
| minorities | minorities |
| minorities | minority |
| minorities | race relations |
| minorities | racial |
| minorities | whites and negroes |
| seniors | elderly |
| seniors | retire |
| upperclass | wealthy |
| urban | big cities |
| urban | urban |
| veteran | veterans |
| women | sexual harassment |
| women | women |
| youth | young people |

***Fails the* ceteris paribus *criterion***

| issue category | search term |
| --- | --- |
| abortion | abortion |
| affirmaction | affirmative action |
| budget | budget |
| civilrights | civil rights |
| court | judicial |
| court | supreme court |
| deathpenalty | death penalty |
| gayrights | gay |
| gayrights | homosex |
| gayrights | same sex marriage |
| gayrights | same-sex marriage |
| guncontrol | gun |
| inequality | inequality |
| media | violence in the media |
| morality | moral |
| morality | values |
| prayer | school prayer |
| protests | protests |
| rights | constitutional rights |
| rights | privacy |
| rights | rights of individual |
| sandl | savings and loan |
| socialprograms | social programs |
| spending | government expense |
| spending | government expenses |
| spending | spending |
| stemcell | stem cell |
| stemcell | stem-cell |
| tobacco | tobacco |
| vouchers | school vouchers |

**C. Issue Ownership on Consensus Issues, 1972-2010**

**(Robustness Check for Table 3.2 using Macropartisanship and Policy Mood Variables)**

*Net percentages of Americans saying that Republicans can do a better job*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s | average |
| domestic security | 16.2\*\*\* | 27.1\*\*\* | 13.8\* | 16.2\*\*\* | 18.6\*\*\* |
| military | 3.3 | 14.7\*\*\* | 24.6\*\*\* | 11.6\*\*\* | 12.5\*\*\* |
| crime | 19.9\*\*\* | 3.8 | 6.2\*\*\* | 9.9\*\*\* | 9.5\*\*\* |
| immigration |  | 8.9\*\*\* | 15.4\*\*\* | 2.9\* | 7.6\*\*\* |
| inflation | 4.8 | 20.6\*\*\* | 15.0\*\*\* | -2.1 | 7.5 |
| trade |  | 0.5 | 0.8 | 13.9\*\*\* | 5.5\*\* |
| foreign affairs | 8.1\* | 4.0\* | 16.2\*\*\* | -3.8\*\* | 4.9\*\*\* |
| taxes | 2.6 | 5.5\* | 8.3\*\*\* | 3.0\*\*\* | 4.1\*\* |
| deficit |  | 3.4 | 6.4\*\*\* | -0.4 | 2.6\* |
| economy | -0.3 | 9.2\*\*\* | 1.6 | -2.7\*\*\* | 1.1 |
| energy | 4.2 | 2.2 |  | -10.3\*\*\* | -3.7 |
| education | 9.4\*\* | -10.3\*\*\* | -12.0\*\*\* | -5.1\*\*\* | -7.1\*\* |
| social security |  | -20.4\*\*\* | -9.5\*\*\* | -8.3\*\*\* | -11.5\*\*\* |
| jobs | -16.1\* | -11.9\*\*\* | -12.3\*\*\* | -5.4\*\*\* | -12.6\*\*\* |
| health care | -10.7 | -8.5 | -17.2\*\*\* | -13.1\*\*\* | -16.5\*\*\* |
| environment | -5.6 | -16.8\*\*\* | -19.4\*\*\* | -22.2\*\*\* | -18.0\*\*\* |
| poverty | -20.6\*\*\* | -35.3\*\*\* | -14.4\*\*\* | -10.6\* | -19.6\*\*\* |
| adjusted R-squared: |  |  |  |  |  |
| in full model | .36 | .46 | .46 | .53 |  |
| in model without issue indicator terms | .22 | .04 | .03 | .10 |  |
| N: | 147 | 873 | 1,491 | 3,435 | 5,946 |

Estimates are derived from the coefficients on issue indicator terms in the following equation generating estimates from ownership questions asked about issues *i* in year *j* by polling firm *p*:



Source for macropartisanship: General Social Survey cumulative file (annual % of Americans identifying as Republicans – % identifying as Democrats; missing values supplied via linear interpolation). Data available from 1972 through 2010. Source for public mood: James Stimson’s website (<http://www.unc.edu/~cogginse/Policy_Mood_files/Mood.2.13.12.xls>), accessed January 7, 2013. Cells are left blank where lack of adequate data precludes estimation. Estimates significantly different from zero at +*p*<.10; \**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001 (two-tailed tests, robust standard errors).

**Chapter 4**

**D. ANES Variable Numbers for Self-Placement Items on Policy Scales**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **year** | **question** | **ANES var #** | **year** | **question** | **ANES var #** |
| 1970 | crime vs rights | V700120 | 1986 | central america | V860428 |
| 1970 | govt action on inflation | V700113 | 1986 | defense spending | V860405 |
| 1970 | health insurance plan | V700134 | 1988 | defense spending | V880310 |
| 1970 | pollution | V700127 | 1988 | get along with russia | V880368 |
| 1970 | campus unrest | V700099 | 1988 | guaranteed job | V880323 |
| 1970 | urban unrest | V700085 | 1988 | health insurance plan | V880318 |
| 1970 | vietnam | V700092 | 1990 | defense spending | V900439 |
| 1972 | campus unrest | V720678 | 1992 | defense spending | V923707 |
| 1972 | crime vs rights | V720621 | 1992 | guaranteed job | V923718 |
| 1972 | govt action on inflation | V720190 | 1994 | guaranteed job | V940930 |
| 1972 | guaranteed job | V720172 | 1994 | health insurance plan | V940950 |
| 1972 | health insurance plan | V720208 | 1996 | crime | V960519 |
| 1972 | tax rates | V720178 | 1996 | defense spending | V960463 |
| 1972 | urban unrest | V720670 | 1996 | environment/regulation | V960537 |
| 1972 | vietnam | V720184 | 1996 | guaranteed job | V960483 |
| 1974 | guaranteed job | V742265 | 1996 | health insurance plan | V960479 |
| 1974 | urban unrest | V742273 | 1998 | environment/regulation | V980497 |
| 1976 | crime vs rights | V763248 | 2000 | defense spending | V000581 |
| 1976 | guaranteed job | V763241 | 2000 | environment/regulation | V000771 |
| 1976 | health insurance plan | V763273 | 2000 | guaranteed job | V000615 |
| 1976 | tax rates | V763779 | 2002 | Bush tax cuts | V023077x |
| 1976 | urban unrest | V763767 | 2002 | estate tax | V025135 |
| 1978 | crime vs rights | V780365 | 2004 | defense spending | V043142 |
| 1978 | guaranteed job | V780357 | 2004 | diplomacy/military force | V045124 |
| 1978 | health insurance plan | V780381 | 2004 | guaranteed job | V043152 |
| 1980 | defense spending | V800281 | 2008 | defense spending | V083112 |
| 1980 | get along with russia | V801078 | 2008 | emissions standards | V083157x |
| 1980 | guaranteed job | V801110 | 2008 | guaranteed job | V083128 |
| 1980 | tax cuts | V800323 | 2008 | health insurance plan | V083119 |
| 1982 | defense spending | V820407 | 2008 | universal health care | V083124x |
| 1982 | guaranteed job | V820425 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | central america | V840388 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | defense spending | V840395 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | get along with russia | V840408 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | guaranteed job | V840414 |  |  |  |

**E. Control of the Presidency and Congress and Change in National Conditions, 1975-2010**

**(Robustness Check for Table 4.6 incorporating Congressional control)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | | Long-run effect of  Democratic control – Republican control  multiplier estimated with error correction models) | | |
|  | | *estimate* | *se* | *p-value* |
| **Improved more**  **under G.O.P.** | GDP (% change) | -1.43 | (.31) | <.01 |
| Murders (per 100,000 population) | .66 | (.32) | .04 |
| Taxes (Effective rate paid by median household) | .36 | (.21) | .08 |
| Poverty (% below poverty line) | 5.87 | (3.90) | .13 |
| Inflation (% change in CPI) | 1.88 | (1.26) | .14 |
| Violent crimes (per 100,000 population) | .33 | (.27) | .22 |
| Uninsured (%) | .73 | (.62) | .24 |
| Budget surplus or deficit (as % of GDP) | -5.39 | (4.69) | .25 |
| Unemployment (%) | 5.89 | (6.15) | .34 |
| Carbon monoxide emissions (thousand short tons) | 8820.42 | (16863.98) | .60 |
| Self-reported health status (% “excellent”/ “good”) | -.16 | (1.28) | .90 |
| Greenhouse gas emissions (Tg CO2 Eq.) | 45589.19 | (11000000.00) | 1.00 |
| Improved m**ore**  **u**nder Democrats | College attainment (% of 25-year-olds with degree) | .09 | (.57) | .88 |
| Support for U.S. at U.N. (-1 to 1 scale) | .54 | (1.16) | .64 |
| Unauthorized immigrants living in U.S. (millions) | -.69 | (.99) | .48 |
| Energy prices (dollars per million BTU) | -1.24 | (1.58) | .43 |
| Reading scores (% of 13-year-olds w/ basic skills) | .59 | (.24) | .01 |
| Exports of goods and services (as % of GDP) | .99 | (.35) | <.01 |

**F. Change in National Conditions, Control of the Presidency and Congress, and Issue Ownership**

**(Robustness Check for Figure 4.5 incorporating Congressional control)**

*Correct classifications: dark circles; incorrect classifications: hollow circles*

**

**Chapter 5**

**G. Coding of Most Important Problem Verbatim Answers into Issue Categories for Convention Delegates**

**1972**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MIP code number** | **Issue category (= recodes where indicated)** |
| 10 | jobs |
| 20 | education |
| 33 | medicare = health care |
| 40 | health care |
| 42 | mental health = health care |
| 50 | housing = poverty |
| 60 | poverty |
| 150 | conservation = environment |
| 152 | environment |
| 231 | minimum wage = poverty |
| 360 | public disorder = crime |
| 361 | negro riots = crime |
| 364 | violence = crime |
| 366 | crime |
| 370 | domestic security |
| 370 | control extremists = crime |
| 371 | control extremists = crime |
| 383 | youth problems: collapse into crime |
| 390 | other racial/public order problems = crime |
| 400 | inflation |
| 405 | wage/price controls = inflation |
| 411 | taxes |
| 415 | redistribution of wealth=poverty |
| 432 | deficit |
| 435 | interest rates=inflation |
| 710-744; 771-790 | all coded as military: disarmament, armed forces, draft, civilian control of military, weapons, space race, desertion, general national defense |

**1980**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MIP code number** | **Issue category (= recodes where indicated)** |
| 1 | inflation |
| 2 | unemployment |
| 4 | energy |
| 5 | environment |
| 9 | crime |
| 10 | drug abuse = crime |
| 11 | poverty |
| 12 | veterans’ benefits = military |
| 13 | trade |
| 14 | taxes |
| 15 | social security |
| 16 | education |
| 18 | extremism = domestic security |
| 19 | military |
| 22 | political terrorism = domestic security |
| 25 | poor intelligence = military |
| 29 | deficit |
| 30 | housing = poverty |
| 31 | insurance = health care |

**1984**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MIP code number** | **Issue category (= recodes where indicated)** |
| 1 | inflation |
| 2 | unemployment |
| 4 | energy |
| 5 | environment |
| 9 | crime |
| 10 | drug abuse = crime |
| 11 | poverty |
| 12 | veterans’ benefits = military |
| 13 | trade |
| 14 | taxes |
| 15 | social security |
| 16 | education |
| 18 | extremism = domestic security |
| 19 | military |
| 22 | political terrorism = domestic security |
| 25 | military |
| 29 | deficit |
| 30 | housing = poverty |
| 31 | insurance = health care |
| 37 | welfare dependence = poverty |

**Chapter 6**

**H. Responsiveness of Members of Congress to Constituency Opinion**

**(Robustness Check for Table 6.2. Uses alternate measure of roll-call voting**

**derived from the first factor yielded by factor analyzing roll-call votes in each policy domain.)**

*Multilevel mixed-effects linear model estimated via restricted maximum likelihood.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **DV: MC*i*’s Estimated Position on Issue*j*** |
| ***tests of issue-ownership hypothesis*** |  |
| district*i* opinion on issue*j* | .09 |
|  | (.25) |
| district*i* opinion x MC’s party owns issue*j* | -1.67\*\*\* |
|  | (.31) |
| district*i* opinion x Democratic MC | .30 |
|  | (.31) |
| district*i* opinion x MC’s party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | .77+ |
|  | (.43) |
| ***additional coefficients estimated in model*** |  |
| MC*i*’s party owns issue*j* | .76\*\*\* |
|  | (.16) |
| MC*i*’s party owns issue x Democratic MC | -.54\* |
|  | (.21) |
| district*i* opinion x neither party owns issue*j* | 1.38\*\*\* |
|  | (.35) |
| district*i* opinion x neither party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | -1.14\* |
|  | (.45) |
| Democratic MC | -.67\*\*\* |
|  | (.16) |
| neither party owns issue*j* | -.72\*\*\* |
|  | (.18) |
| neither party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | .40+ |
|  | (.23) |
| intercept | .67\*\* |
|  | (.06) |
| Standard deviations of: |  |
| District intercepts | .09 |
| Issue intercepts | .13 |
| Issue opinion slopes | .08 |
| N | 3,195 |

MC positions and district opinion scaled zero (liberal) to one (conservative) by issue. For additional details of model estimation, see text. Estimates significantly different from zero at +*p*<.10; \**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001 (two-tailed tests).

**Responsiveness calculations:**

Democrats: issues owned: -.06 (.07) issues not owned: .26 (.06)

Republicans: issues owned: -.11 (.06) issues not owned: .28 (.08)

**I. Responsiveness of Members of Congress to Constituency Opinion**

**(Robustness Check for Table 6.2. Uses interval-level measure of issue ownership.)**

*Multilevel mixed-effects linear model estimated via restricted maximum likelihood.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **DV: MC*i*’s Estimated Position on Issue*j*** |
| ***tests of issue-ownership hypothesis*** |  |
| district*i* opinion on issue*j* | .08+ |
|  | (.04) |
| district*i* opinion x extent to which MC’s party owns issue*j* | -.01+ |
|  | (.00) |
| district*i* opinion x Democratic MC | .02 |
|  | (.03) |
| district*i* opinion x extent to which MC’s party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | .00 |
|  | (.01) |
| ***additional coefficients estimated in model*** |  |
| extent to which MC’s party owns issue*j* | .01\*\* |
|  | (.00) |
| extent to which MC’s party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | -.01\*\* |
|  | (.00) |
| district*i* opinion x neither party owns issue*j* | .29\*\*\* |
|  | (.08) |
| district*i* opinion x neither party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | -.04 |
|  | (.06) |
| Democratic MC | -.53\*\*\* |
|  | (.02) |
| neither party owns issue*j* | -.16\*\* |
|  | (.05) |
| neither party owns issue*j* x Democratic MC | .08\* |
|  | (.03) |
| intercept | .73\*\*\* |
|  | (.03) |
| Standard deviations of: |  |
| District intercepts | .11 |
| Issue intercepts | .06 |
| Issue opinion slopes | .10 |
| N | 5,808 |

MC positions and district opinion scaled zero (liberal) to one (conservative) by issue. For additional details of model estimation, see text. Estimates significantly different from zero at +*p*<.10; \**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001 (two-tailed tests).

**Responsiveness calculations:**

On issue opposing party owns by 10 percentage points: .15 (.04)

On issue a party owns by 10 percentage points: .02 (.04)

Difference: .14 (.03) *p* < .001 (two-tailed test)

**J. Responsiveness of Federal Outlays to National Spending Preferences**

**(Robustness Check for Table 6.3. Uses interval-level measure of issue ownership.)**

*Multilevel mixed-effects linear model estimated via restricted maximum likelihood.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **DV: change in % of all federal outlays spent on issue *j* in year *t***  **(standardized)** |
| ***tests of issue-ownership hypothesis*** |  |
| public’s spending preferences in year*t-1* on issue*j* | .019+ |
|  | (.011) |
| president’s party*t*-1 owns issue*j* | .011\* |
|  | (.005) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x extent to which president’s party*t*-1 owns issue*j* | -.000 |
|  | (.001) |
| Congress*t*-1 is controlled by party owning issue*j* | .013\* |
|  | (.006) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x extent to which issue*j* owned by party controlling Congress*t*-1 | -.001+ |
|  | (.001) |
| ***additional coefficients estimated in model*** |  |
| neither party owns issue*j* | -.192\* |
|  | (.095) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x neither party owns issue*j* | -.005 |
|  | (.021) |
| intercept | .028 |
|  | (.101) |
| Standard deviations of: |  |
| Year intercepts | .442 |
| Issue opinion slopes | .021 |
|  |  |
| N | 397 |

Estimates significantly different from zero at +*p*<.10; \**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001 (two-tailed tests).

**Responsiveness calculations**

**(change in spending in standard deviations accompanying a 10-point increase in support for spending):**

Presidency, Congress controlled by party owning issue (by 10 percentage points):

.33 (.15)

Presidency, Congress controlled by party not owning issue (other party owns by 10 percentage points):

.04 (.15)

Difference:

.29 (.21), *p* < .16 (two-tailed test)

**K. Responsiveness of Federal Outlays to National Spending Preferences**

**(Robustness checks for Table 6.3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DV: change in % of all federal outlays spent on issue *j* in year *t***  **(standardized)** | | | |
|  | **I. mixed effects model (same as in text)** | **II. mixed effects model with lagged DV** | **III. panel-corrected standard errors model** | **IV. panel-corrected standard errors model w/AR(1) process** |
| public’s spending preferences in year*t-1* on issue*j* | .031\* | .026+ | .033 | .034+ |
|  | (.016) | (.015) | (.023) | (.018) |
| president’s party*t*-1 owns issue*j* | .164 | .137 | .226 | .225 |
|  | (.125) | (.124) | (.283) | (.156) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x president’s party*t*-1 owns issue*j* | -.003 | .001 | .003 | .006 |
|  | (.018) | (.018) | (.020) | (.020) |
| Congress*t*-1 is controlled by party owning issue*j* | .311\* | .315\* | .425 | .421\* |
|  | (.137) | (.135) | (.293) | (.174) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x | -.039\* | -.033+ | -.046\* | -.047\* |
| Congress*t*-1 is controlled by party owning issue*j* | (.018) | (.018) | (.019) | (.020) |
| neither party owns issue*j* | .011 | .050 | .074 | .070 |
|  | (.126) | (.126) | (.216) | (.153) |
| public’s spending preferences*j* x neither party owns issue*j* | -.016 | -.004 | -.026 | -.025 |
|  | (.024) | (.021) | (.023) | (.025) |
| lagged value of DV |  | .106\* |  |  |
|  |  | (.049) |  |  |
| intercept | -.171 | -.149 | -.236 | -.235 |
|  | (.129) | (.132) | (.239) | (.164) |
| Standard deviations of: |  |  |  |  |
| Year intercepts | .446 | .443 |  |  |
| Issue opinion slopes | .027 | .013 |  |  |
| estimated autocorrelation parameter (rho) |  |  |  | .055 |
| N | 397 | 386 | 397 | 397 |

See notes on next page for discussion. For additional details, see text.

Estimates significantly different from zero at +*p*<.10; \**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001 (two-tailed tests).

**Notes to Appendix Table K:**

This table shows that the findings in Table 6.3—that owning parties are less responsive to public opinion on the nation’s spending priorities than non-owning parties—are robust to other specifications and estimation strategies. Model I is the mixed-effects model shown in Table 6.3. Model II is the same mixed-effects model incorporating a lagged value of the dependent variable (change in spending) as predictor. Model III takes a different approach that more explicitly accounts for the time-series nature of the data. It is a panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) model that accounts for the fact that errors may be heteroskedastic across issues. Model IV is another PCSE model that also accounts for the fact that there may be first-order autocorrelation AR(1) that is common to all the issues. It estimates the autocorrelation parameter, rho.

Across all of the models, the findings are substantively similar. *Ceteris paribus*, the party controlling the presidency and Congress direct more federal dollars to their owned issues. When control of both branches of government is considered together, federal outlays are affected less by public opinion on issues the parties own than on issues they do not.