Appendix:

The Influence of Partisanship on Assessments of Promise Fulfillment and Accountability*

Tabitha Bonilla[†] Associate Professor Northwestern University

^{*}This file contains demographic data, tables associated with figures presented in the article, and some additional analyses. Please see the DataVerse (doi:10.7910/DVN/FW87Y1) for results of each dependent variable individually and results including independents. This document is referred to in the manuscript as Appendix 1.

[†]Tabitha Bonilla (tabitha.bonilla@northwestern.edu, 2040 Sheridan Rd, Evanston, IL 60202) is Associate Professor of Human Development and Social Policy at Northwestern University and Faculty Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research. Funding for this project came from an APSA Small Grant.

Contents

A	Statement on Ethics in Research	ii
В	Study 1: Demographics and Moderators	iii
\mathbf{C}	Study 1: Dependent VariablesC.1 Dependent Variable Dimensions	iv iv iv
D	Study 1: Interaction Results	\mathbf{v}
${f E}$	Study 2: Demographics and Moderators	viii
\mathbf{F}	Study 2: Opinion on Human Trafficking and Immigration	x
\mathbf{G}	Study 2: Immigration Dependent Variables	xii
н	Study 2: Immigration Interaction Results	xiv
Ι	Study 2: Human Trafficking Dependent Variable Results	viii
J	Study 2: Human Trafficking Interactions	xx

A Statement on Ethics in Research

This research involved human subjects research. While it was submitted to the IRB, it was exempted from review. It did not pose any unique ethical challenges and should not have adversely affected participants. Participants were told that they could leave the study at any point with no consequences. The survey data was collected through two survey firms: Mechanical Turk and Lucid. These two survey firms do not give identifying information to the researcher, thus the privacy of the participants was protected and all data is analyzed in aggregate. Participants were paid the rate negotiated by Lucid and they were paid \$1.50 for the Mechanical Turk sample, an amount that would equal approximately \$9 per hour of the subject's time, and an amount that exceeded federal minimum wage standards at the time the survey was administered. The participant pool was census matched on Lucid, but was a convenience sample on Mechanical Turk. The participant pool was not composed of members of groups who we do not consider vulnerable or marginalized. The research should not be differentially harmful or beneficial to any particular group.

B Study 1: Demographics and Moderators

Table B.1: Study 1 Survey Demographics

			(1)		
	count	mean	sd	min	max
Age	377	.342961	.2090863	0	1
Female	377	.4111406	.4926945	0	1
College Educated	388	.6185567	.4863682	0	1
Family Income	375	.4499394	.2598668	0	1
Party Id	368	.3903985	.4264615	0	1
Ideology	377	.3753316	.3149943	0	1

Table B.2: Study 1 Survey Groups

-	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Out-Party	Out-party	Out-party	In-party	In-party	In-Party
	Broken	Partial	Kept	Broken	Partial	Kept
Age	0.348	0.345	0.344	0.334	0.335	0.356
	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.033)	(0.031)
Female	0.446	0.325	0.389	0.471	0.341	0.509
	(0.062)	(0.053)	(0.067)	(0.060)	(0.072)	(0.068)
College Educated	0.600	0.700	0.630	0.557	0.523	0.564
	(0.061)	(0.052)	(0.066)	(0.060)	(0.076)	(0.067)
Family Income	0.481	0.438	0.431	0.478	0.448	0.426
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.046)	(0.031)
Party Id	0.462	0.396	0.358	0.329	0.451	0.361
	(0.056)	(0.049)	(0.056)	(0.048)	(0.067)	(0.055)
Ideology	0.374	0.371	0.380	0.345	0.428	0.379
	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.043)	(0.036)	(0.049)	(0.040)
\overline{N}	65	80	54	70	44	55

C Study 1: Dependent Variables

C.1 Dependent Variable Dimensions

Table C.3: Study 1 Dimension 1 Dependent Variables

Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
Out-party	Broken	0.27	83	0.34	0.04
Out-party	Partial	0.29	58	0.35	0.05
Out-party	Kept	0.27	65	0.34	0.04
In-party	Broken	0.48	79	0.35	0.04
In-party	Partial	0.67	92	0.26	0.03
In-party	Kept	0.70	70	0.29	0.03

Table C.4: Study 1 Dimension 2 Dependent Variables

Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
Out-party	Broken	0.28	83	0.34	0.04
Out-party	Partial	0.44	58	0.27	0.04
Out-party	Kept	0.52	65	0.29	0.04
In-party	Broken	0.38	79	0.32	0.04
In-party	Partial	0.57	92	0.23	0.02
In-party	Kept	0.74	70	0.22	0.03

C.2 Individual Dependent Variables

Table C.5: Study 1 Dependent Variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Favor	0.523	0.658	0.673	0.295	0.288	0.297
	(0.046)	(0.032)	(0.046)	(0.044)	(0.056)	(0.050)
Vote	0.558	0.697	0.727	0.275	0.335	0.273
	(0.042)	(0.029)	(0.038)	(0.041)	(0.059)	(0.047)
Act	0.487	0.646	0.790	0.319	0.508	0.564
	(0.045)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.041)
Success	0.369	0.508	0.722	0.248	0.386	0.436
	(0.041)	(0.031)	(0.037)	(0.044)	(0.054)	(0.045)
N	65	80	54	70	44	55

D Study 1: Interaction Results

Table D.6: Study 1: Interaction Results For Full Index

	$Dependent\ variable:$							
		Bscale						
	R Consistent	D Consistent	R Inconsistent	D Inconsistent				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
Promise	0.720**	0.026	0.326	-0.045				
	(0.294)	(0.054)	(0.350)	(0.070)				
PID Strength	0.247***	-0.159^{***}	0.176***	-0.111**				
	(0.057)	(0.037)	(0.064)	(0.049)				
Promise X Strength	-0.085^{*}	0.057**	-0.042	0.060				
J	(0.047)	(0.029)	(0.055)	(0.040)				
Constant	-1.188***	0.752***	-0.717^{*}	0.404***				
	(0.366)	(0.068)	(0.405)	(0.084)				
Observations	93	148	76	129				
R^2	0.356	0.266	0.155	0.071				
Adjusted R ²	0.335	0.251	0.120	0.049				

Table D.7: Study 1: Interaction Results for Dimension 1

	Dependent variable:							
		B _rate						
	R Consistent	D Consistent	R Inconsistent	D Inconsistent				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
Retro	0.654*	-0.048	0.040	-0.123				
	(0.346)	(0.063)	(0.410)	(0.083)				
pid7	0.245***	-0.212***	0.196**	-0.119**				
1	(0.067)	(0.044)	(0.076)	(0.058)				
Retro:pid7	-0.078	0.077**	0.0003	0.059				
1	(0.055)	(0.034)	(0.065)	(0.048)				
Constant	-1.130**	0.915***	-0.910^*	0.438***				
	(0.431)	(0.081)	(0.475)	(0.100)				
Observations	93	148	76	129				
$ m R^2$	0.259	0.213	0.174	0.041				
Adjusted R ²	0.234	0.197	0.140	0.018				

Table D.8: Study 1: Interaction Results for Dimension 2

		Depend	ent variable:					
	B_account							
	R Consistent	D Consistent	R Inconsistent	D Inconsistent				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
Promise	0.786**	0.100*	0.587^{*}	0.032				
	(0.306)	(0.057)	(0.336)	(0.078)				
PID Strength	0.249***	-0.107***	0.153**	-0.103^*				
G	(0.059)	(0.039)	(0.062)	(0.054)				
Promise X Strength	-0.092^*	0.037	-0.079	0.062				
<u> </u>	(0.048)	(0.031)	(0.053)	(0.045)				
Constant	-1.247^{***}	0.588***	-0.516	0.370***				
	(0.381)	(0.072)	(0.391)	(0.094)				
Observations	93	148	77	129				
\mathbb{R}^2	0.370	0.277	0.135	0.173				
Adjusted \mathbb{R}^2	0.349	0.262	0.099	0.153				

E Study 2: Demographics and Moderators

Table E.9: Study 2 Survey Demographics: Human Trafficking

	Count	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	829	44.95175	16.28016	17	89
Female	832	.5252404	.4996629	0	1
College Educated	834	.4616307	.4988248	0	1
Family Income	834	.4918066	.3120178	0	1
Party Id	834	.4642286	.3087461	0	1
Ideology	834	.4642286	.3087461	0	1

Table E.10: Study 2 Survey Demographics: Human Trafficking

	Count	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	1337	43.6552	16.57518	4	99
Female	1271	.5255704	.4995423	0	1
College Educated	1409	.5003549	.5001774	0	1
Family Income	1297	.4861218	.3132452	0	1
Party Id	1257	.4770618	.3202443	0	1
Ideology	1257	.4770618	.3202443	0	1

Table E.11: Study 2 Balance Table: Immigration


	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
	\mathbf{I}_{1}	nconsister	nt	Consistent			
	Broke	Partial	Kept	Kept	Partial	Kept	
Age	47.444	45.299	46.359	44.130	45.158	45.829	
	(1.430)	(1.534)	(1.402)	(1.407)	(1.475)	(1.578)	
Female	0.460	0.579	0.519	0.421	0.541	0.504	
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.046)	
College Educated	0.520	0.467	0.444	0.557	0.474	0.462	
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.043)	(0.046)	
Family Income	0.533	0.473	0.520	0.488	0.490	0.488	
	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.029)	
Party Id	0.505	0.436	0.441	0.428	0.476	0.462	
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.028)	
Ideology	0.505	0.436	0.441	0.428	0.476	0.462	
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.028)	
N	127	107	133	115	133	119	

Table E.12: Study 2 Balance Table: Human Trafficking

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	I	nconsister	nt		No Party		(Consisten	t
	Broke	Partial	Kept	Broke	Partial	Kept	Broke	Partial	Kept
Age	44.145	43.714	44.927	44.683	43.197	45.428	44.631	43.874	42.750
	(1.487)	(1.615)	(1.628)	(1.286)	(1.609)	(1.295)	(1.587)	(1.409)	(1.440)
Female	0.393	0.554	0.492	0.507	0.508	0.500	0.514	0.555	0.457
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.048)	(0.046)	(0.046)
College Educated	0.556	0.455	0.540	0.534	0.424	0.478	0.405	0.496	0.500
	(0.046)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.046)	(0.047)
Family Income	0.511	0.506	0.468	0.506	0.516	0.518	0.501	0.487	0.513
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)
Party Id	0.486	0.438	0.480	0.476	0.494	0.492	0.468	0.447	0.477
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.032)
Ideology	0.486	0.438	0.480	0.476	0.494	0.492	0.468	0.447	0.477
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.032)
N	117	112	124	146	118	138	111	119	116

F Study 2: Opinion on Human Trafficking and Immigration


In order to demonstrate that partisan attitudes are less polarized on human trafficking than immigration, I examine opinion toward both human trafficking and immigration. For immigration, I examine the question asking if respondents support or oppose building a wall along the border. For human trafficking, I do not have the same access to opinion if they support or oppose human trafficking following Bonilla and Mo (2018). However, because the prospective portion of the treatment features a candidate who has no partisan information and who makes a statement on human trafficking, support for this candidate proxies support and opposition for human trafficking.



- (a) Immigration by Partisan Identification
- (b) Human Trafficking by Partisan Identification

Figure F.1a shows the results for opinions on immigration across the whole sample; higher values indicate stronger support for a border wall, and lower values indicate less support for a border wall. As public discourse reflects, Democrats are more opposed to a border wall, while Republicans are more approving of a border wall. Independents sit in the middle of both parties. The data suggests that strength of partisanship among Democrats does not suggest higher opposition to the wall–in fact, Democrat Leaners are significantly more opposed to the wall than are Strong Democrats ($\mu_{SD} = 0.36, \mu_{LD} = 0.26 \ p = 0.002$). However, for Republicans, Strong Democrats are more supportive of the wall than either Weak Republicans ($\mu_{SR} = 0.84, \mu_{WR} = 0.65 \ p < 0.001$) or Republican Leaners ($\mu_{SR} = 0.84, \mu_{LD} = 0.71 \ p < 0.001$). Figure F.2a shows the linear regression for the relationship between partisan identity and opinions on the border wall. There is a clear significant and positive relationship between Republican identification and support for a border wall ($\beta = 0.51, p < 0.001$), supporting an argument that opinions in this sample correspond to findings from other literature which suggest immigration is an issue on which attitudes are divided and sorted according to partisan beliefs.

The data for human trafficking diverges from the immigration results. Figure F.1b demonstrates that opinion for human trafficking, is only significantly higher for Strong Republicans compared to Weak Republicans, Independents, and all Democratic identifiers. Democrats, regardless of partisan strength, Independents, Republican Leaners, and Weak Republicans are all not significantly different than each other. Corresponding to this result, we do see a significant regression result for the relationship between Republican identification and support for anti-trafficking ($\beta = 0.17, p < 0.001$) as demonstrated in Figure F.2b. Importantly, it is Strong Republicans who drive this trend; dropping them yields no statistical significance in this metric ($\beta = 0.17, p < 0.001$). On one hand, this is evidence that human trafficking is less polarizing than immigration. On the other hand, this evidence suggests that human trafficking may be becoming more polarizing. Nonetheless, there are clear differences between how sharply partisan human trafficking and immigration are.



xi

G Study 2: Immigration Dependent Variables

Table G.13: Study 2 Dimension 1 Dependent Variable Index, Immigration

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-party	Broken	0.40	134	0.38	0.03
2	Out-party	Partial	0.43	110	0.39	0.04
3	Out-party	Full	0.40	136	0.39	0.03
4	In-party	Broken	0.51	115	0.36	0.03
5	In-party	Partial	0.71	135	0.27	0.02
6	In-party	Full	0.76	120	0.29	0.03

Table G.14: Study 2 Dimension 2 Dependent Variable Index, Immigration

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-party	Broken	0.37	134	0.38	0.03
2	Out-party	Partial	0.48	110	0.34	0.03
3	Out-party	Full	0.54	136	0.30	0.03
4	In-party	Broken	0.46	115	0.38	0.04
5	In-party	Partial	0.61	135	0.28	0.02
6	In-party	Full	0.72	120	0.28	0.03

Table G.15: Study 2 Full Dependent Variable Index, Immigration

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-partisan	Broken	0.39	134	0.37	0.03
2	Out-partisan	Partial	0.46	110	0.35	0.03
3	Out-partisan	Full	0.47	136	0.31	0.03
4	In-partisan	Broken	0.49	115	0.36	0.03
5	In-partisan	Partial	0.66	135	0.26	0.02
6	In-partisan	Full	0.74	120	0.27	0.02

H Study 2: Immigration Interaction Results

Table H.16: Study 2: Interaction Results with Parties Combined, Immigration

			Deper	ndent variable:			
	Dime	nsion 1	Dime	nsion 2	Full Index		
	Consistent	Consistent Inconsistent Co		Inconsistent	Consistent	Inconsistent	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Promise-	0.183***	-0.088**	0.154***	0.021	0.169***	-0.037	
keeping	(0.044)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.036)	(0.040)	(0.035)	
Partisan	0.004	0.049***	0.011	0.039***	0.008	0.044***	
Strength	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	
Promise X	-0.020**	0.027***	-0.005	0.014^{*}	-0.012	0.021***	
Strength	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	
Constant	0.397***	0.332***	0.318***	0.323***	0.357***	0.329***	
	(0.057)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.048)	(0.052)	(0.046)	
Observations	366	376	363	375	363	375	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.075	0.283	0.109	0.193	0.090	0.258	
Adjusted \mathbb{R}^2	0.068	0.277	0.102	0.186	0.082	0.252	

Table H.17: Study 2: Interaction Results on Full Index, Immigration

			Dependent varia	able:	
	Consi	stent	Inconsistent		
	Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Promise	0.037	0.151***	0.161	-0.009	
keeping	(0.188)	(0.033)	(0.218)	(0.035)	
Partisanship	0.863***	-0.541**	1.148***	-0.804**	
Strength	(0.263)	(0.241)	(0.300)	(0.361)	
Promise X	0.074	-0.063	-0.084	0.248	
Strength	(0.201)	(0.199)	(0.235)	(0.248)	
Constant	-0.183	0.439***	-0.647**	0.437***	
	(0.246)	(0.043)	(0.277)	(0.045)	
Observations	190	171	192	185	
R^2	0.224	0.220	0.175	0.040	
Adjusted R ²	0.212	0.206	0.162	0.024	

Table H.18: Study 2: Interaction Results for Dimension 1 (Approval), Immigration

		Depende	ent variable:	
	Consi	stent	Incon	sistent
	Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Promise	0.010	0.156***	0.019	-0.044
Keeping	(0.198)	(0.035)	(0.247)	(0.039)
Partisan	0.854***	-0.481*	1.052***	-0.558
Strength	(0.278)	(0.253)	(0.340)	(0.410)
Promise X	0.095	-0.047	0.026	0.120
Strength	(0.212)	(0.206)	(0.267)	(0.282)
Constant	-0.140	0.467***	-0.543^{*}	0.433***
	(0.260)	(0.045)	(0.314)	(0.052)
Observations	190	173	193	186
R ²	0.201	0.201	0.121	0.029
Adjusted R^2	0.189	0.187	0.108	0.013

Table H.19: Study 2: Interaction Results for Dimension 2 (Accountability), Immigration

		$Dependent\ variable:$						
	Consi	stent	Inconsistent					
	Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
Promise	0.065	0.145***	0.302	0.034				
Keeping	(0.196)	(0.035)	(0.211)	(0.035)				
Partisan	0.873***	-0.598**	1.245***	-1.039***				
Strength	(0.275)	(0.256)	(0.290)	(0.362)				
Promise X	0.052	-0.078	-0.195	0.346				
Strength	(0.210)	(0.212)	(0.228)	(0.250)				
Constant	-0.227	0.412***	-0.753***	0.438***				
	(0.257)	(0.045)	(0.267)	(0.046)				
Observations	190	171	192	185				
R^2	0.214	0.202	0.224	0.074				
Adjusted R^2	0.202	0.188	0.212	0.059				

I Study 2: Human Trafficking Dependent Variable Results

Table I.20: Study 2 Dimension 1 Dependent Variable Index, Human Trafficking

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-party	Broken	0.40	118	0.40	0.04
2	Out-party	Partial	0.52	112	0.34	0.03
3	Out-party	Full	0.66	127	0.26	0.02
4	No party	Broken	0.41	148	0.38	0.03
5	No party	Partial	0.63	122	0.30	0.03
6	No party	Full	0.76	140	0.24	0.02
7	In-party	Broken	0.51	112	0.38	0.04
8	In-party	Partial	0.70	122	0.27	0.02
9	In-party	Full	0.80	118	0.20	0.02

Table I.21: Study 2 Dimension 2 Dependent Variable Index, Human Trafficking

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-party	Broken	0.39	118	0.41	0.04
2	Out-party	Partial	0.47	112	0.34	0.03
3	Out-party	Full	0.63	127	0.30	0.03
4	No party	Broken	0.37	148	0.39	0.03
5	No party	Partial	0.54	122	0.32	0.03
6	No party	Full	0.70	140	0.25	0.02
7	In-party	Broken	0.48	112	0.40	0.04
8	In-party	Partial	0.60	122	0.32	0.03
9	In-party	Full	0.73	118	0.24	0.02

Table I.22: Study 2 Full Dependent Variable Index, Human Trafficking

Treatment	Party	Promise	Mean	N	SD	SE
1	Out-party	Broken	0.39	118	0.40	0.04
2	Out-party	Partial	0.50	112	0.32	0.03
3	Out-party	Full	0.64	127	0.26	0.02
4	No party	Broken	0.39	148	0.37	0.03
5	No party	Partial	0.58	122	0.30	0.03
6	No party	Full	0.73	140	0.23	0.02
7	In-party	Broken	0.50	112	0.38	0.04
8	In-party	Partial	0.65	122	0.28	0.03
9	In-party	Full	0.77	118	0.20	0.02

J Study 2: Human Trafficking Interactions

Table J.23: Study 2 Interaction on the Full Index, Human Trafficking

			Dependen	nt variable:			
			Full	Index			
	In nantre	Republican Democrat					
	In-party	Out-party	No party	In-party	Out-party	No Party	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Promise	0.194	0.533**	0.799***	0.161***	0.130***	0.181***	
keeping	(0.191)	(0.219)	(0.227)	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.034)	
Partisan	0.928***	1.249***	1.657***	-0.257	-0.421	-0.544*	
Strength	(0.298)	(0.295)	(0.352)	(0.283)	(0.331)	(0.301)	
Promise X	-0.100	-0.464^{*}	-0.664***	0.037	0.314	0.150	
Strength	(0.207)	(0.236)	(0.241)	(0.249)	(0.246)	(0.220)	
Constant	-0.255	-0.691**	-1.114***	0.438***	0.327***	0.390***	
	(0.278)	(0.274)	(0.335)	(0.044)	(0.050)	(0.042)	
Observations	178	186	194	171	167	164	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.171	0.165	0.254	0.180	0.145	0.240	
Adjusted \mathbb{R}^2	0.157	0.151	0.243	0.165	0.129	0.226	

Table J.24: Study 2 Interaction on Dimension 1, Human Trafficking

	Dependent variable:									
	Dimension 1: Approval									
		Republican			Democrat					
	In-party	Out-party	No party	In-party	Out-party	No Party				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)				
Promise	0.307	0.495**	0.793***	0.173***	0.133***	0.196***				
keeping	(0.188)	(0.223)	(0.227)	(0.034)	(0.038)	(0.035)				
Partisan	0.962***	1.129***	1.571***	-0.296	-0.342	-0.379				
Strength	(0.292)	(0.300)	(0.353)	(0.281)	(0.341)	(0.314)				
Promise X	-0.222	-0.414^*	-0.664^{***}	0.075	0.346	0.073				
Strength	(0.203)	(0.240)	(0.241)	(0.247)	(0.253)	(0.230)				
Constant	-0.252	-0.570**	-0.997***	0.458***	0.327***	0.399***				
	(0.273)	(0.279)	(0.336)	(0.044)	(0.052)	(0.044)				
Observations	178	186	194	171	169	164				
\mathbb{R}^2	0.160	0.155	0.237	0.209	0.146	0.235				
Adjusted \mathbb{R}^2	0.145	0.141	0.225	0.195	0.131	0.221				

Table J.25

	Dependent variable: Dimension 2: Accountability Republican Democrat								
	In-party	Out-party	No party	In-party	Out-party	No Party			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)			
Promise	0.081	0.571**	0.805***	0.148***	0.131***	0.158***			
keeping	(0.210)	(0.229)	(0.239)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.036)			
Partisan	0.894***	1.369***	1.743***	-0.218	-0.508	-0.756**			
Strength	(0.328)	(0.308)	(0.372)	(0.311)	(0.348)	(0.317)			
Promise X	0.023	-0.514**	-0.664^{***}	-0.00001	0.292	0.255			
Strength	(0.228)	(0.246)	(0.254)	(0.273)	(0.258)	(0.233)			
Constant	-0.258	-0.812***	-1.231***	0.419***	0.327***	0.393***			
	(0.306)	(0.286)	(0.354)	(0.048)	(0.053)	(0.044)			
Observations	178	186	194	171	167	165			
\mathbb{R}^2	0.164	0.161	0.251	0.130	0.134	0.207			
Adjusted \mathbb{R}^2	0.149	0.147	0.239	0.115	0.118	0.192			

References

Bonilla, T., and C. H. Mo. 2018. "Bridging the partisan divide on immigration policy attitudes through a bipartisan issue area: The case of human trafficking." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 5 (2): 107–120.

Grossmann, M., and D. A. Hopkins. 2016. Asymmetric politics: Ideological Republicans and group interest Democrats. New York: Oxford University Press.