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**Survey Sampling Information**

**National Survey**

A sample of 1,777 subjects was recruited by Survey Sampling International (SSI) to participate in a national political study from September 10-15, 2019. Participants were invited via email to participate in the survey. This was a nationally representative survey. SSI has more than 17 million qualified market research participants in over 90+ countries. They build and maintain their online panel by recruiting via verified, certified sources and methods to create a vast pool of potential research respondents for clients. Respondents are incented in many ways, depending on the amount of effort required, the population, and appropriate regional customs resulting in higher panel respondent satisfaction. SSI online panel members pass through multiple levels of authentication to recruit genuinely interested panelists who will provide valuable data. The measures include digital fingerprinting, source verification, two-factor authentication, third-party verification, geo-IP control, time stamps, questionnaire quality controls, and reward claim authentication. Participants were invited via email to participate in the survey. For this survey, SSI sent 61,549 invitations, 1,777 began the survey (2.8% response rate) and 1,549 (87.2%) completed the entire survey.

The demographic characteristics of this panel closely resemble that of the United States population on several important traits. Table A.1 displays the demographics of this sample compared to the American Community Survey 2019 Census estimates and two large-scale more nationally representative survey samples: the 2016 American National Election Study and the Cooperative Election Study (Ansolabehere and Shaffner 2018). Table A.1 shows that the general population sample is very similar to the demographic profile of the American National Election Study, the CES, and ACS 2019 estimates.

**Table A.1: General Population Survey Characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographics** | **SSI 2019 Survey** | **ACS 2019 Estimates** | **ANES 2016** | **CES 2019** |
| Female | 55.2% | 50.8% | 52.2% | 56.4% |
| Age (mean years) | 46.5 | 38.5 (median) | 48 | 50 |
| Education (% completing some college) | 75% | - | 61.7% | 58% |
| White | 68.1% | 72% | 71.1% | 69.5% |
| Black | 14.9% | 12.8% | 9.3% | 10.8% |
| Asian | 3.9% | 5.7% | 3.5% | 2.6% |
| Latino (a) | 9.3% | 18.4% | 10.5% | 12.4% |
| Multi-Racial | 2.4% | 3.4% | 4.1% | 2.4% |
| Party Identification |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | 37.7% | - | 33.9% | 36.3% |
| Independent | 34.7% | - | 32.1% | 36.2% |
| Republican | 27.5% | - | 28.1% | 27.4% |
| *N* | 1,543 | - | 4,271 | 52,900 |

**Law Student Survey**

The sample of law students was recruited during the spring semester of 2022 (between February and June of that year). We identified a diverse set of public and private law schools where we had personal connections to current students, former students, faculty, or administrators. We used those connections to connect with administrators and faculty who had the ability to send an email to all students or to a significant number of law students and asked them if they would be willing to send invitations to participate directly or over a listserv. While not representative, the set of universities are diverse ideologically. Overall, faculty and administrators at eight different schools were generous enough to send the survey to students at their law school. To get students to participate in the brief 10 minute survey, administrators and faculty members at the eight different law schools (Brigham Young University J. Reuben Clark Law School, Capital University Law School, Florida State University Law School, Regent University School of Law, University of Maine School of Law, University of Oregon School of Law, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, and Washburn University School of Law) agreed to distribute a link to the survey via email along with a brief explanation about the study and its intent in understanding law students interest in public service.

Although not representative, our sample is diverse along a number of dimensions including religious affiliation/secular affiliation of the law school, whether the law school was public or private, the ideology of the students at the law school, the race of students (compared to data from the American Bar Association, we have a slight over representation of white students (82% compared to 69%, and a slight under representation of African-American (4.2% compared to 7.8%) and Asian (3.4% compared to 6.3%) students and roughly the same representation of Hispanic/Latinx students (11.1% compared to 12.7%). However, those numbers are more comparable if you exclude Tier 5 and Tier 6 law schools (Li et al. 2020). Only one of our schools would likely be classified as a Tier 5 or Tier 6 law school (Capital University Law) based on its ranking outside of the top 150 Law Schools by U.S. News and World Report.

While we provided administrators and students who would send the emails recruiting law student responses a generic explanation to provide to students, we allowed those sending the email to customize the invitation based on their preferences. Below we show two examples of the text of invitations that were sent out:

**Example 1:** [Outside University] [Professor] is conducting a survey of law students about the relationship between individual characteristics and personality traits and their interest, or lack thereof, in public service in the judiciary, elected office, and in government agencies. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. [Embedded link]

**Example 2:** A month or so ago I spoke with [Outside University Professor with hyperlink to academic website], a political scientist with roots in [local area]. [Dr. Professor Name] is interested in the factors that influence people who plan to pursue careers in public service -- and so he's hoping to survey people in law school to learn about your goals and influences. You can do a good deed by participating here [embedded link].

Because the emails were sent to listservs and email lists internal to the university where they were sent, we do not know the exact number of individuals who had the opportunity to participate. One university administrator indicated that he had sent the survey to 120 students in the law school. From that law school we received 34 respondents for a response rate of 28%. Another faculty member at a law school where we received 185 response indicated he sent the survey to all of the enrolled students (roughly 600 students) indicating a response rate of 31%. Overall the survey from received 522 responses and the total enrollment at all of these law schools is approximately 2,600 students suggesting a response rate of *at least* 20% across all schools and likely higher given we do not know whether the survey was distributed to all students in all cases. Respondents took the survey voluntarily and were not compensated for their response.

Three quarters of the sample (75.1%) were respondents from the five public law schools we contacted (Florida State University Law School, University of Maine School of Law, University of Oregon School of Law, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, and Washburn University School of Law), while the other 24.9% came from the three private law schools (Brigham Young University J. Reuben Clark Law School, Capital University Law School, and Regent University School of Law).

Table A.2 shows the demographic characteristics of the sample. As noted, these are individuals who are in the process of acquiring law degrees which would provide them with the basic qualifications necessary in many cases to pursue careers in each of the areas of public service in which we were interested. Moreover, as noted below, the survey contains substantial diversity along gender, ideological, and partisan lines.

**Table A.2: Summary of Law Student Survey Demographics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Demographics** | **2022 Law Student Survey** |
| Female | 42.2% |
| White | 82.1% |
| Black | 4.2% |
| Asian | 3.4% |
| Hispanic/Latinx | 11.1% |
| Multi-Racial | 3.6% |
| **Party Identification** |  |
| Democrat | 39.3% |
| Independent | 35.7% |
| Republican | 25.0% |
| **Ideology** |  |
| Liberal | 48.0% |
| Moderate | 19.7% |
| Conservative | 32.4% |
| *N* | 522 |

**American Government Employees Survey (AGES)**

On January 28, 2019, we fielded the second wave of the American Government Employee Survey (AGES). One of our primary interests was to gauge the effect of the long government shutdown on those who had participated in the first wave a year before. As such, we re-contacted the original participants and invited them to answer another set of questions related to the four-week federal government shutdown that began on December 22, 2018 and ended on January 25, 2019. Many of the respondents had work that required more immediate attention than our survey, so we left the second wave in the field for about one month. Ultimately, 2,084 federal employees began the survey, for a response rate of 68%. Of the 2,084 who responded, 1,842 (88.4%) completed the entire survey. Respondents took the survey voluntarily and were not compensated for their response.

**Figure A.1 Example Email Invitation for the 2019 American Government Employees Survey**
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Table A.3 shows how sample participants in the AGES survey are not substantially different from the general population of the United States. Public employees who took our survey are more educated than the US population, but in terms of religion, political ideology, age, 2016 presidential vote choice, and salary; the sample seems similar.

**Table A.3: Summary of AGES Survey Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographics** | **AGES 2019** | **ACS 2014** | **MTurk** | **NAES 2008** | **CCES 2016** |
| Female | 52% | 50.8% | 60.1% | 56.62% | 51.7% |
| Age (mean years) | 50-54 (categorical) | 37.4 (median) | 20.3 | 50.05 | 48 |
| Education (% completing some college) | 96% | - | - | 62.86% | 58% |
| White | 66.6% | 73.8% | 83.5% | 79.12% | 72.4% |
| Black | 12.54% | 12.6% | 4.4% | 9.67% | 12.2% |
| Asian | 3.27% | 5.0% | - | 2.53% | 3.5% |
| Latinx | 6.25% | 16.9% | - | 6.3% | 7.3% |
| Multi-Racial | 4.5% | 2.9% | - | 2.37% | 2.3% |
| Native American | 1.05% |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Eastern | 0.25% |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 3.69% |  |  |  |  |
| **Party Identification** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | 31.2% | - | 40.8% | 36.67% | 36.2% |
| Independent | 28.8% | - | 34.1% | 20.82% | 31.7% |
| Republican | 25.2% | - | 16.9% | 30.61% | 28.4% |
| Other Party | 5.7% |  |  |  |  |
| Don’t Know | 7.5% |  |  |  |  |
| *N* | 2,385 | - | 484-551 | 19,234 | 52,900 |

# Ethical Practices Concerning Human Participants

This research fully conforms with APSA’s Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research. In particular, in each survey, respondents gave their voluntary informed consent to participate in the research in accordance with IRB guidance and with APSA’s Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research. In particular, respondents were provided with the following information about the project:

* researcher name and affiliation and contact information
* the general purpose of the research
* an explanation of what participation entails
* potential risks to participants
* clarification that no potential benefits to participants were expected
* assurances that responses were confidential and additional information about how identities and data will be protected
* and sources of financial support for the research (there was none)

In the general population survey, respondents were compensated by SSI through their standard payment procedure for participants in their panel. For the bureaucratic and law student samples, respondents participated voluntarily and were not compensated for participation. No deception was used. In all cases, IRB review identified the research as having minimal risk of harm.

# Overall Levels of Ambition by Sample

Consistent with previous surveys of the general public, nascent ambition for elected office among the general public is low. Only about 2% of respondents indicated that they are actively working towards elected office and 17% indicated they are open to the possibility. Overall, 81% of the general public has no interest in elected office. Figure A.2 shows that ambition for public service for other positions is low as well, with the percentage actively seeking and open to the possibility of public service in the judiciary and the bureaucracy (regardless of type) at levels similar to elected office.

In contrast, law students and federal bureaucrats have much higher levels of ambition. Among bureaucrats, relatively similar percentages of respondents indicated they are actively considering electoral public service, state bureaucratic public service, or judicial public service. However, compared to the general population, federal bureaucrats are significantly more likely to indicate that they are open to the possibility of seeking elected office (29%) or seeking opportunities for state bureaucratic service (40%). Unsurprisingly, almost 25% of our federal bureaucratic respondents stated that they are actively working toward moving up the ranks in federal agencies and another 49% indicated they are open to the opportunity.

Lastly, 8% of law students indicated that they are actively considering seeking elected office, four times the percentage of the general public and bureaucrats. Similarly, 8% and 7% indicated an active interest in public service in state and federal agencies, respectively, and 12% indicated active consideration of public service in the judiciary. The percentages of law students open to the possibility of public service in any one of these four areas of public service is also consistently more than three times higher than the percentages of the general population who indicate they are open to the possibility. As we expected, individuals who have already taken some steps toward seeking a career in public service are more interested in public service than those who have not.

# The Components of Public Service

Between February and April 2019, a group of undergraduate students used snowball sampling and social media contacts to recruit people from the general public to participate in structured interviews. The interviews took 3 to 8 minutes to complete. Most of the 211 respondents (about 90%) were from Oregon, Washington, Utah, Idaho, and Nevada. Almost 50% of the participants were female. We asked broad questions about how elected officials should behave, whether the respondents were interested in running for elected office, and what aspects of public service were appealing or unappealing to them. The actual questionnaire is below.

An advantage of snowball sampling is the potential to get responses from individuals who otherwise would not participate in a political survey. A disadvantage is that the sample can be biased. The interviewers were students majoring in political science, which means that many of the interviewees might know more about politics than the average person. To the extent that this is true, the items generated from these open-ended survey questions will not reflect the universe of items that influence interest in public service. Although we have attempted to be very comprehensive in our approach, our conclusions about the factors contributing to the appeal or aversion to public service may be limited by our sample.

**2019 Political Interest Interview Questions**

1. Thinking about the people who represent us in government. We are interested in what kind of person makes a good representative. In an ideal world, what traits do you look for in a good government representative?
2. When people think about running for office themselves, they often think about two aspects. The first is the actual process of running for office, the second is the job they are running for. Of these two, which is more attractive, running for office or having the job of an elected official.
3. What about running for office is appealing to you?
4. What about running for office would be awful to you?
5. What about being in an elected office would be awful to you?
6. What about being in an elected office is appealing to you?
7. We are interested in knowing more about how people in elected office should or should not behave. Can you list some things that elected officials should ALWAYS do?
8. We are interested in knowing more about how people in elected office should or should not behave. Can you list some things that elected officials should NEVER do?

When we looked at the open-ended response to questions 3-6, we did not identify any consistent themes. That is, we found that respondents had very broad views about what was appealing or unappealing about public service. We identified a couple of general patterns in the interview responses. First, much of what people considered to be appealing about holding office are also in the things they listed as appealing about running for office. That is, people do not seem to distinguish between running for office and being in office. Second, some of what people found undesirable about holding office is similar to what they find unappealing about running for elected office. Each of these suggested to us the need for further exploration of public perceptions about running for, holding, and being in elected office.

As mentioned previously, the breadth of the responses made it difficult to identify a small number of components that might be included in a closed-ended question on a survey. As such, we decided to try to identify as many themes as possible. Once again, we found similar themes in the questions about running for office as we did in the questions about holding public office.

Here is the list of the themes we found.

What about *being in* an elected office would be awful to you?

* **Time commitment:** The image mentions that the time commitment required for the job is a major challenge.
* **Conflict:** Politicians often find themselves in conflict with others.
* **Public scrutiny:** Politicians are constantly in the public eye and their actions are often scrutinized.
* **Lying and choosing sides:** The text mentions that politicians often have to lie and choose sides, which can be difficult.
* **Desk job:** While campaigning involves a lot of travel and meeting people, being a politician also involves a lot of desk work.
* **Hindered and blamed:** Politicians often feel like they are hindered by bureaucracy and blamed for things out of their control.
* **National debt:** The text mentions that the national debt is a concern for some politicians.
* **Long hours and few breaks:** The job of a politician is often demanding, with long hours and few breaks.

What about *running for* elected office would be awful to you?

* **Scrutiny and negativity:** Constant public scrutiny, media attention, and potential for personal attacks and smears.
* **Time commitment and pressure:** Demanding schedule, long hours, and pressure to constantly perform and campaign.
* **Financial burden:** Fundraising, campaign costs, and potential for personal financial strain.
* **Privacy concerns:** Loss of privacy, personal life being exposed to public scrutiny.
* **Stress and mental health:** High stress levels, potential for burnout and mental health issues.
* **Negativity in politics:** Dealing with political mudslinging, dishonesty, and corruption.
* **Family impact:** Campaigning and office work taking away time and attention from family.
* **Public speaking and self-promotion:** Discomfort with public speaking and self-promotion required for campaigning.
* **Dealing with opposition:** Facing attacks, criticism, and unfair tactics from opponents.
* **Limited impact and power:** Feeling unable to make a real difference despite the effort involved.

What about *running for* elected office is appealing?

* **Making a difference:** Helping others, serving the public good, creating positive change.
* **Policymaking and influence:** Shaping policy, influencing decisions, getting ideas heard.
* **Representation and community focus:** Representing constituents, understanding needs, connecting with people.
* **Personal growth and learning:** Gaining experience, meeting new people, challenging oneself.
* **Inspiration and hope:** Sharing ideas, inspiring others, motivating change.
* **Personal satisfaction and accomplishment:** Feeling proud of work, contributing to society.

What about *being in* an elected office is appealing to you?

* **Helping others:** This was the most frequently mentioned theme, with many expressing a desire to use their position to improve the lives of others.
* **Making a difference:** Closely related to helping others, many emphasized the desire to enact positive change in the community, country, or world.
* **Public service:** A sense of duty and commitment to serving the public good was a common theme.
* **Policymaking:** Shaping policy and influencing decisions was a motivating factor for some.
* **Representation:** Representing the voices and interests of constituents was important to many.
* **Personal growth and experience:** The opportunity to learn, grow, and gain experience was mentioned by some.
* **Power:** The power associated with the position was acknowledged, with some expressing concerns about its responsible use.
* **Challenges and difficulties:** The demanding nature of the job, including time commitment, scrutiny, and challenges in enacting change, was recognized.
* **Financial considerations:** Salary and benefits were mentioned by some, but not as a primary motivator.
* **Personal motivations:** Some mentioned more personal motivations, such as wanting to stand for truth or make a difference in their local community.
* **Knowledge and information:** Access to knowledge and information about important issues was seen as a benefit.
* **Influence:** The ability to influence others and shape public discourse was mentioned by some.
* **Community focus:** A desire to serve and improve the local community was expressed by many.
* **Personal satisfaction:** The feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction from making a difference was mentioned.
* **Negative aspects:** Some mentioned negative aspects like time commitment, scrutiny, and limitations of power.
* **Ideological motivations:** Some expressed motivations based on specific ideologies or beliefs.
* **Career advancement:** For some, the position was seen as a stepping-stone for future opportunities.
* **Personal gain:** A few mentioned personal benefits like money or status.
* **Public perception:** Concerns about public perception and judgment were mentioned.
* **Specific policy areas:** Some mentioned specific policy areas they were passionate about.

Based on these general themes, we generated a list of 12 items that were frequently mentioned as being appealing or unappealing about public service. Some of these aspects are directly related to elections, while others are related to other aspects of public service.

Many of the interviewees had negative responses about public service that might create subject demand if it were included as an item in the survey. For example, one theme we noticed is that interviewees stated that politicians are expected to lie, cheat, be negative in their campaigns, or be unkind to others. This is a function of electoral competition. Candidates who do not have to compete with other candidates for office do not encounter the same pressure to be negative, mudsling, or lie about their opponents as candidates in a competitive race.

Another common theme about holding public office is that the process of getting things done involves conflict and blame. Some respondents really did not like the idea of being blamed for something they did not do and this was tied with the difficulty of getting things done. To avoid subject demand and for simplicity, we label this concept conflict.

Helping others was the most frequently mentioned positive aspect of being in public office, but the other dominant theme was fear that the decisions they made in office would be scrutinized. Again, we expected that subject demand would lead many to select helping others as a positive component of public service, so we decided to break this into several aspects: We decided that making important decisions and talking about solutions is the best way to capture \*helping others\* while avoiding subject demand, and that the item *public scrutiny* would measure the extent to which people are dissuaded from public service because they don’t like people criticizing their decisions.

We split the items into two survey questions that tap into the ideas commonly mentioned in the open-ended interview responses. The survey items are below.

Q1 What about running for elected office is appealing to you? Please indicate if each of the following would make you more likely to run for office.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less likely to run | Neither/Neutral | More likely to run |
| Talking about solutions |  |  |  |
| Meeting new people |  |  |  |
| Fundraising |  |  |  |
| The publicity |  |  |  |
| Trying to persuade people to vote for you |  |  |  |
| The competition |  |  |  |

Q2 Many people are not interested in running for elected office. We would like to know what you might find unappealing about running for elected office. Please indicate if each of the following would make you LESS likely to run for office.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less likely to run | Neither/Neutral | More likely to run |
| Lack of privacy |  |  |  |
| Having to make important decisions in office |  |  |  |
| Public scrutiny |  |  |  |
| The schedule/travelling |  |  |  |
| Difficult on family/friends |  |  |  |
| The conflict |  |  |  |

Some of the items that were mentioned in the open-ended responses to the questions seemed idiosyncratic or not directly related to the concept of political ambition. For example some people who were worried about having a desk job, or were interested in advancing a specific policy proposal. It did not seem necessary to have a specific question on the survey to measure those attitudes. In addition, some of the ideas expressed are more consistent with progressive (rather than nascent) political ambition. For example, some people mentioned that they were interested in the personal gain that they could get from holding public office or career advancement, or using public office as a stepping stone to something else. Those ideas seem more consistent with progressive ambition than ambition generally, so we decided to exclude it from our survey questions.

We included these 12 items in the 2019 SSI survey and asked respondents to identify whether each aspect of public service would influence their interest in seeking public office. Figure A.2 displays the propriety of respondents in each category in the general population and law student surveys.

Figure A2: Attractiveness of Public Service
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Law students differ from the general population in their interest in public service *and* in the aspects of public service that are (un)appealing. Among the sample of national adults, the most attractive components of public service are meeting new people and making important decisions. Although only around 25% of them are interested in these. Among the law students sample. The most attractive components of public service are talking about solutions and making important decisions. Law students are much more interested in making important decisions than are respondents in the general population sample. Law students also seem to be much more concerned about the difficulty on their family, fundraising, the lack of privacy, and the publicity compared to the sample of national adults.

To group these items into larger components of public service, we conducted exploratory factor analysis with Promax rotation because the factors are likely correlated. The items with their loadings are in Table A3.

**Table A3: Attractiveness of Public Office Loadings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Personal Life Components | Electoral Components | Job Responsibility Components |
| Lack of privacy | 0.81 | 0.10 | 0.15 |
| Public scrutiny | 0.77 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| The conflict | 0.77 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
| Difficult on family/friends | 0.75 | 0.11 | 0.13 |
| The schedule/travelling | 0.61 | 0.03 | 0.22 |
| The publicity | 0.12 | 0.81 | 0.11 |
| Fundraising | 0.06 | 0.80 | 0.09 |
| Trying to persuade people to vote for you | 0.05 | 0.71 | 0.16 |
| The competition | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.27 |
| Talking about solutions | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.86 |
| Having to make important decisions | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.76 |
| Meeting new people | 0.12 | 0.35 | 0.63 |

The data in Table 4 suggests that three factors influence people's interest in seeking public office: (1) personal factors, such as lack of privacy, public scrutiny, and the demands on their family and time; (2) electoral concerns, such as competition, fundraising, and winning votes; and (3) job responsibilities, such as talking about solutions and making important decisions.

In both the general population and law student surveys, we asked respondents to rate how likely each of the 12 items would make them run for public office (1 = less likely, 2 = neither, 3 = more likely). To create a dependent variable that measures how much an individual finds a particular factor to be positive or negative, we created an additive index for each component. We added up the ratings for each component and divided them by the number of items in that component. Each of these variables is scaled from 1 to 3, with higher scores indicating that a person is more likely to seek public office.

**Independent Variables**

This section includes the survey questions used to measure the independent variables used as controls in the regression models.

**Age:** Is a numeric variable measured with responses to the question, “What is your age?”

**Income:** Is measured with responses to the following question. Last year, that is in 2018, what was your total family income from all sources, before taxes?

* Less than $20,000 (1)
* 20 to under $30,000 (2)
* 30 to under $40,000 (3)
* 40 to under $50,000 (4)
* 50 to under $75,000 (5)
* 75 to under $100,000 (6)
* 100 to under $125,000 (7)
* 125 to under $150,000 (8)
* $150,000 to under $175,000 (9)
* $175,000 to under $200,000 (10)
* $200,000 and above (11)

**Party Identification:** Is measured by a series of questions, beginning with the following question. After this question respondents were asked if they lean toward one party or the other, or if they are “strong” identifiers with their party. The result is a seven point scale that ranges from “Strong democrat” to “Strong republican”.

In politics TODAY, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or independent, or what?

* Republican (1)
* Democrat (2)
* Independent (3)
* Other (4)

**Political Knowledge:** Is measured by adding up the number of correct responses to the following five questions and dividing that by five. The result is the percent correct.

What job or political office does Mitch McConnell now hold?

* Senate Majority Leader (4)
* House Minority Leader (5)
* Treasury Secretary (6)
* Chairman of the Federal Reserve (7)
* Don’t know/Unsure (8)

What job or political office does Mike Pompeo now hold?

* National Security Advisor (4)
* President Pro Tempore of the Senate (5)
* Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (6)
* Secretary of State (7)
* Don’t know/Unsure (8)

In the U.S. Senate a presidential veto can be overridden by a….

* Majority vote (5)
* 2/3 Vote (6)
* 3/4 Vote (7)
* None of the above (8)

Which political party controls the U.S. House?

* Republican Party (1)
* Democratic Party (2)
* Don't know (3)

In the 2016 election, Donald Trump won the majority of votes for president in the Electoral College. Who do you think won the most popular votes?”

* Hillary Clinton (4)
* Donald Trump (5)
* Don’t Know (6)

**Political Interest:** Measured with the following question.

Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs ...

* Most of the time (1)
* Some of the time (2)
* Only now and then (3)
* Hardly at all (4)

**Political Ideology:** Measured with the following question.

How would you describe your political views

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely Liberal (1) | Liberal (2) | Somewhat Liberal (3) | Moderate (4) | Somewhat Conservative (5) | Conservative (6) | Extremely Conservative (7) |
| Where would you place yourself on this scale? (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Education:** What was the last grade in school you completed?

* 8th grade or less (1)
* High school incomplete [grades 9, 10, 11] (2)
* High school complete [grade 12] (3)
* Some college, but no degree (4)
* Associates degree (5)
* College graduate/bachelors degree (6)
* Postgraduate degree, such as Master's, Ph.D, MD,JD. (7)

For ease of interpretation, these categorical variables are treated as numeric when included as independent variables in the following regression models. The results concerning the independent variables of theoretical interest do not change when these independent variables are modeled as categorical independent variables. For readers interested in the statistical significance of categorical variables treated as numerical variables in the following models, we encourage them to use the replication data and code to examine the relationships.

**Full Model Results**

**Table A.5: Complete Regression Models Presented in the Paper (2019 American Government Employee Survey Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Bureaucracy | Electoral | Judicial | Federal Bureaucracy |
|  | Ambition | Ambition | Ambition | Ambition |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.181\*\*** | **-0.210\*\*** | **-0.157\*\*** | **-0.155\*\*** |
|  | **(0.035)** | **(0.033)** | **(0.029)** | **(0.048)** |
| Age | **-0.046\*\*** | **-0.036\*\*** | **-0.008** | **-0.086\*\*** |
|  | (0.008) | (0.007) | (0.006) | (0.012) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.133 | 0.014 | -0.016 | -0.028 |
|  | (0.079) | (0.096) | (0.063) | (0.124) |
| Race (Black) | 0.119\* | 0.044 | 0.105\* | 0.093 |
|  | (0.058) | (0.055) | (0.048) | (0.080) |
| Race (Hispanic) | 0.100 | -0.013 | 0.071 | 0.123 |
|  | (0.074) | (0.068) | (0.060) | (0.089) |
| Race (Middle Eastern) | 0.512\*\* | -0.415\*\* | -0.117\*\* | 0.814\*\* |
|  | (0.056) | (0.058) | (0.044) | (0.079) |
| Race (Mixed) | 0.248\*\* | 0.136\* | 0.145\* | 0.096 |
|  | (0.087) | (0.069) | (0.071) | (0.100) |
| Race (Native American) | 0.510\*\* | 0.252 | 0.356\* | 0.386\*\* |
|  | (0.172) | (0.170) | (0.162) | (0.121) |
| Race (Other) | 0.220\* | 0.180 | 0.208\* | 0.119 |
|  | (0.108) | (0.102) | (0.082) | (0.103) |
| Education (College graduate) | 0.092 | 0.058 | 0.066 | -0.052 |
|  | (0.050) | (0.049) | (0.039) | (0.073) |
| Education (Graduate degree) | 0.203\*\* | 0.122\*\* | 0.112\*\* | 0.023 |
|  | (0.046) | (0.044) | (0.036) | (0.068) |
| Education (High School) | 0.061 | -0.036 | 0.091 | -0.088 |
|  | (0.096) | (0.089) | (0.083) | (0.116) |
| Education (some post-grad) | 0.162\* | 0.164\*\* | 0.079 | -0.002 |
|  | (0.070) | (0.063) | (0.049) | (0.092) |
| Party Identification | 0.022\* | 0.008 | 0.015 | 0.017 |
|  | (0.011) | (0.011) | (0.009) | (0.016) |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.022\* | 0.032\*\* | 0.006 | 0.021 |
|  | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.007) | (0.011) |
| Constant | 0.518\*\* | 0.423\*\* | 0.137 | 1.567\*\* |
|  | (0.105) | (0.096) | (0.079) | (0.155) |
| Observations | 884 | 884 | 884 | 884 |
| R-squared | 0.117 | 0.096 | 0.073 | 0.093 |

*Source:* American Government Employees Survey (2019).

*Note*: Entries are estimates from Ordinary Least Squares Regression. Reference category for race is “white”, reference category for education is “some college”. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.6: Ordered Logit Regression Models (2019 American Government Employee Survey Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Bureaucracy | Electoral | Judicial | Federal Bureaucracy |
|  | Ambition | Ambition | Ambition | Ambition |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.793\*\*** | **-0.976\*\*** | **-1.042\*\*** | **-0.440\*\*** |
|  | **(0.149)** | **(0.157)** | **(0.194)** | **(0.133)** |
| Age | -0.190\*\* | -0.152\*\* | -0.043 | -0.248\*\* |
|  | (0.033) | (0.032) | (0.038) | (0.036) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.571 | -0.123 | -0.069 | -0.058 |
|  | (0.318) | (0.429) | (0.502) | (0.350) |
| Race (Black) | 0.556\* | 0.289 | 0.764\*\* | 0.256 |
|  | (0.244) | (0.258) | (0.293) | (0.216) |
| Race (Hispanic) | 0.398 | -0.039 | 0.543 | 0.312 |
|  | (0.300) | (0.330) | (0.354) | (0.238) |
| Race (Middle Eastern) | 2.068\*\* | -13.122\*\* | -10.076\*\* | 13.642\*\* |
|  | (0.253) | (1.032) | (1.049) | (1.025) |
| Race (Mixed) | 1.006\*\* | 0.655\* | 0.945\* | 0.266 |
|  | (0.338) | (0.274) | (0.369) | (0.259) |
| Race (Native American) | 1.951\*\* | 1.009 | 1.690\*\* | 0.948\*\* |
|  | (0.726) | (0.639) | (0.616) | (0.317) |
| Race (Other) | 0.775 | 0.784 | 1.285\*\* | 0.251 |
|  | (0.425) | (0.407) | (0.390) | (0.279) |
| Education (College graduate) | 0.459\* | 0.282 | 0.438 | -0.160 |
|  | (0.225) | (0.248) | (0.287) | (0.204) |
| Education (Graduate degree) | 0.889\*\* | 0.597\*\* | 0.720\*\* | 0.055 |
|  | (0.212) | (0.227) | (0.267) | (0.190) |
| Education (High School) | 0.351 | -0.074 | 0.622 | -0.233 |
|  | (0.414) | (0.482) | (0.502) | (0.302) |
| Education (some post-grad) | 0.697\* | 0.859\*\* | 0.593 | 0.019 |
|  | (0.297) | (0.294) | (0.360) | (0.250) |
| Party Identification | 0.105\* | 0.036 | 0.100 | 0.050 |
|  | (0.047) | (0.051) | (0.061) | (0.045) |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.091\* | 0.148\*\* | 0.046 | 0.048 |
|  | (0.036) | (0.040) | (0.045) | (0.032) |
| Cutpoint 1 | 0.090 | 0.582 | 2.122\*\* | -2.849\*\* |
|  | (0.431) | (0.426) | (0.518) | (0.460) |
| Cutpoint 2 | 3.954\*\* | 3.805\*\* | 5.414\*\* | -0.566 |
|  | (0.489) | (0.497) | (0.659) | (0.440) |
| Observations | 880 | 880 | 880 | 880 |
| R-Squared | 0.082 | 0.074 | 0.071 | 0.047 |

*Source:* American Government Employees Survey (2019).

*Note:* Entries are coefficients from an ordered logistic regression model. Reference category for race is “white”, reference category for education is “some college”. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.7: Political Ambition (2019 National Survey Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Bureaucracy  Ambition | Electoral  Ambition | Judicial  Ambition | Federal Bureaucracy  Ambition |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.103\*\*** | **-0.104\*\*** | **-0.076\*\*** | **-0.093\*\*** |
|  | **(0.028)** | **(0.027)** | **(0.029)** | **(0.027)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.010 | -0.003 | -0.003 | 0.021 |
|  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.016) | (0.014) |
| Party Identification | -0.000 | 0.009 | 0.029 | -0.019 |
|  | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.022) | (0.020) |
| Race (Black) | 0.142\*\* | 0.134\*\* | 0.165\*\* | 0.127\*\* |
|  | (0.047) | (0.046) | (0.048) | (0.046) |
| Race (Asian) | -0.028 | 0.054 | -0.063 | -0.004 |
|  | (0.060) | (0.061) | (0.050) | (0.061) |
| Race (Latino/Hispanic) | 0.125\* | 0.012 | 0.157\*\* | 0.021 |
|  | (0.055) | (0.047) | (0.055) | (0.041) |
| Race (Other) | -0.046 | -0.055 | -0.049 | 0.093 |
|  | (0.099) | (0.084) | (0.079) | (0.127) |
| Race (Mixed) | 0.318\*\* | 0.237\* | -0.009 | 0.297\*\* |
|  | (0.083) | (0.112) | (0.076) | (0.108) |
| Age | -0.007\*\* | -0.007\*\* | -0.007\*\* | -0.007\*\* |
|  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Education | 0.035\*\* | 0.030\*\* | 0.029\*\* | 0.038\*\* |
|  | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.008) |
| Income | 0.001 | -0.004 | 0.001 | -0.001 |
|  | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.005) |
| Political Knowledge | -0.078 | -0.120\*\* | -0.079 | -0.057 |
|  | (0.048) | (0.043) | (0.045) | (0.045) |
| Political Interest | -0.095\*\* | -0.073\*\* | -0.062\*\* | -0.057\*\* |
|  | (0.015) | (0.014) | (0.015) | (0.014) |
| Constant | 1.624\*\* | 1.655\*\* | 1.500\*\* | 1.474\*\* |
|  | (0.084) | (0.084) | (0.083) | (0.080) |
| Observations | 1,425 | 1,428 | 1,422 | 1,424 |
| R-squared | 0.144 | 0.138 | 0.113 | 0.124 |

*Source:* National Survey of US Adults

*Note:* Estimated coefficients from an OLS regression model, with robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.8: Ordered Logit Regression Models (2019 National Survey Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Electoral Ambition | State Bureaucracy  Ambition | Judicial  Ambition | Federal Bureaucracy  Ambition |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.672\*\*** | **-0.582\*\*** | **-0.439\*\*** | **-0.636\*\*** |
|  | **(0.170)** | **(0.155)** | **(0.167)** | **(0.169)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.027 | 0.095 | 0.051 | 0.172\* |
|  | (0.083) | (0.074) | (0.082) | (0.080) |
| Party Identification | 0.007 | -0.019 | 0.097 | -0.130 |
|  | (0.120) | (0.110) | (0.118) | (0.120) |
| Race (Black) | 0.635\*\* | 0.660\*\* | 0.769\*\* | 0.652\*\* |
|  | (0.226) | (0.214) | (0.221) | (0.223) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.306 | -0.188 | -0.402 | -0.044 |
|  | (0.327) | (0.364) | (0.393) | (0.386) |
| Race (Latino/Hispanic) | 0.077 | 0.565\* | 0.713\*\* | 0.211 |
|  | (0.262) | (0.239) | (0.234) | (0.236) |
| Race (Other) | -0.228 | -0.076 | -0.218 | 0.525 |
|  | (0.668) | (0.639) | (0.606) | (0.618) |
| Race (Mixed) | 1.090\* | 1.463\*\* | 0.125 | 1.358\*\* |
|  | (0.440) | (0.295) | (0.427) | (0.394) |
| Age | -0.055\*\* | -0.046\*\* | -0.043\*\* | -0.051\*\* |
|  | (0.006) | (0.005) | (0.006) | (0.006) |
| Education | 0.251\*\* | 0.255\*\* | 0.231\*\* | 0.318\*\* |
|  | (0.061) | (0.058) | (0.061) | (0.061) |
| Income | -0.040 | 0.002 | -0.018 | -0.014 |
|  | (0.034) | (0.033) | (0.035) | (0.034) |
| Political Knowledge | -0.612\* | -0.278 | -0.295 | -0.133 |
|  | (0.279) | (0.277) | (0.275) | (0.294) |
| Political Interest | -0.483\*\* | -0.589\*\* | -0.380\*\* | -0.369\*\* |
|  | (0.091) | (0.094) | (0.094) | (0.094) |
| Cutpoint 1 | -1.111\* | -0.514 | 0.061 | 0.207 |
|  | (0.510) | (0.461) | (0.481) | (0.502) |
| Cutpoint 2 | 1.336\* | 1.999\*\* | 2.383\*\* | 2.862\*\* |
|  | (0.524) | (0.491) | (0.506) | (0.558) |
| Observations | 1,428 | 1,425 | 1,422 | 1,424 |
| R-squared | 0.138 | 0.129 | 0.099 | 0.126 |

*Source:* National Survey of US Adults

*Note:* Estimated coefficients from an Ordered Logistic regression model, with robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05 † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.9: Political Ambition (2022 Law Students Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Bureaucracy  Ambition | Electoral  Ambition | Judicial  Ambition | Federal Bureaucracy  Ambition |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Female** | **-0.058†** | **-0.263\*\*** | **-0.150\*** | **-0.001** |
|  | **(0.029)** | **(0.050)** | **(0.054)** | **(0.051)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.002 | 0.055 | 0.002 | 0.013 |
|  | (0.021) | (0.030) | (0.011) | (0.024) |
| Party Identification | -0.023 | -0.024 | -0.005 | -0.026 |
|  | (0.015) | (0.017) | (0.018) | (0.029) |
| Race (Black) | 0.068 | 0.031 | -0.157 | 0.061 |
|  | (0.290) | (0.220) | (0.080) | (0.212) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.158 | 0.068 | -0.037 | 0.138 |
|  | (0.188) | (0.193) | (0.125) | (0.058) |
| Race (Other) | 0.041 | -0.248\* | 0.498\* | -0.056 |
|  | (0.128) | (0.068) | (0.172) | (0.119) |
| Race (Mixed) | 0.091 | 0.093 | 0.058 | 0.152 |
|  | (0.112) | (0.083) | (0.066) | (0.091) |
| Political Knowledge | 0.275\*\* | 0.111 | 0.101 | 0.272\*\* |
|  | (0.072) | (0.062) | (0.165) | (0.071) |
| Private Law School | 0.076 | 0.022 | 0.152\* | 0.100\*\* |
|  | (0.049) | (0.028) | (0.049) | (0.025) |
| Constant | 1.710\*\* | 1.621\*\* | 1.864\*\* | 1.593\*\* |
|  | (0.073) | (0.087) | (0.159) | (0.105) |
| Observations | 384 | 384 | 384 | 384 |
| R-squared | 0.036 | 0.070 | 0.072 | 0.030 |

*Source:* Law Student Survey 2022.

*Note:* Estimated coefficients from OLS regression models, with standard errors clustered by law school in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.10 Ordered Logit Regression Models (2022 Law Students Data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Bureaucracy  Ambition | Electoral  Ambition | Judicial  Ambition | Federal Bureaucracy  Ambition |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Female** | **-0.231†** | **-0.850\*\*** | **-0.552\*\*** | **0.011** |
|  | **(0.120)** | **(0.177)** | **(0.199)** | **(0.200)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | -0.001 | 0.181 | 0.013 | 0.035 |
|  | (0.083) | (0.108) | (0.042) | (0.092) |
| Party Identification | -0.086 | -0.076 | -0.021 | -0.086 |
|  | (0.056) | (0.064) | (0.069) | (0.114) |
| Race (Black) | 0.193 | 0.028 | -0.567\* | 0.192 |
|  | (1.265) | (0.705) | (0.270) | (0.756) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.654 | 0.204 | -0.168 | 0.542\*\* |
|  | (0.802) | (0.608) | (0.465) | (0.192) |
| Race (Other) | 0.179 | -0.780\*\* | 1.748\*\* | -0.196 |
|  | (0.503) | (0.248) | (0.661) | (0.373) |
| Race (Mixed) | 0.384 | 0.309 | 0.197 | 0.560 |
|  | (0.445) | (0.266) | (0.263) | (0.314) |
| Political Knowledge | 1.053\*\* | 0.373 | 0.400 | 0.920\*\* |
|  | (0.251) | (0.229) | (0.579) | (0.229) |
| Private Law School | 0.308 | 0.101 | 0.550\*\* | 0.343\*\* |
|  | (0.184) | (0.084) | (0.192) | (0.092) |
| Cutpoint 1 | -0.735\* | -0.185 | -1.170\* | -0.250 |
|  | (0.308) | (0.285) | (0.558) | (0.382) |
| Cutpoint 2 | 3.010\*\* | 2.707\*\* | 2.250\*\* | 3.134\*\* |
|  | (0.234) | (0.334) | (0.629) | (0.326) |
| Observations | 384 | 384 | 384 | 384 |
| R-squared | 0.022 | 0.040 | 0.042 | 0.017 |

*Source:* Law Student Survey 2022.

*Note: :* Estimated coefficients from ordered logit models, with standard errors clustered by law school in parentheses.\*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.11: Attributes Influencing the Attractiveness of Public Office (2019 National Survey Data)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Electoral Factors | Personal Life Factors | Job Responsibility Factors |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.168\*\*** | **-0.161\*\*** | **-0.084\*** |
|  | **(0.027)** | **(0.030)** | **(0.035)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | -0.018 | 0.011 | -0.017 |
|  | (0.015) | (0.016) | (0.017) |
| Party Identification | 0.035 | 0.019 | 0.024 |
|  | (0.021) | (0.022) | (0.024) |
| Race (Black) | 0.164\*\* | 0.173\*\* | 0.000 |
|  | (0.043) | (0.047) | (0.050) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.025 | -0.009 | -0.232\*\* |
|  | (0.062) | (0.069) | (0.078) |
| Race (Latino/Hispanic) | 0.100\* | 0.146\*\* | 0.080 |
|  | (0.047) | (0.051) | (0.053) |
| Race (Other) | -0.058 | -0.158 | -0.109 |
|  | (0.089) | (0.097) | (0.113) |
| Race (Mixed) | 0.110 | 0.072 | 0.166 |
|  | (0.089) | (0.079) | (0.097) |
| Age | -0.006\*\* | -0.005\*\* | -0.002 |
|  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Education | 0.018 | 0.016 | 0.041\*\* |
|  | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.012) |
| Income | -0.002 | -0.012 | -0.010 |
|  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.007) |
| Political knowledge | -0.331\*\* | -0.313\*\* | 0.155\*\* |
|  | (0.047) | (0.051) | (0.059) |
| Political interest | -0.074\*\* | -0.073\*\* | -0.088\*\* |
|  | (0.015) | (0.017) | (0.019) |
| Constant | 2.069\*\* | 2.158\*\* | 2.109\*\* |
|  | (0.084) | (0.089) | (0.099) |
| Observations | 1,429 | 1,429 | 1,429 |
| R-squared | 0.155 | 0.122 | 0.073 |

*Source:* National Survey of US Adults

*Note:* Entries are estimates from Ordinary Least Squares regression. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.

**Table A.12: Attributes Influencing the Attractiveness of Public Office (2022 Law Students Data)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Electoral Factors | Personal Life Factors | Job Responsibility Factors |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Gender (Female)** | **-0.166\*\*** | **-0.201\*\*** | **-0.083\*** |
|  | **(0.026)** | **(0.045)** | **(0.029)** |
| Ideology (1=Very Liberal) | 0.027\* | 0.033 | 0.022 |
|  | (0.011) | (0.026) | (0.013) |
| Party Identification | -0.023 | 0.002 | -0.012 |
|  | (0.013) | (0.016) | (0.018) |
| Race (Black) | 0.242\* | 0.216 | -0.211 |
|  | (0.094) | (0.142) | (0.122) |
| Race (Asian) | 0.090 | -0.207\* | -0.004 |
|  | (0.093) | (0.068) | (0.079) |
| Race (Other) | -0.153\* | 0.169 | 0.105 |
|  | (0.051) | (0.081) | (0.173) |
| Race (Mixed) | -0.041 | 0.053 | -0.045 |
|  | (0.051) | (0.100) | (0.062) |
| Private School | -0.046 | -0.147\* | 0.038 |
|  | (0.029) | (0.048) | (0.041) |
| Constant | 1.567\*\* | 1.517\*\* | 2.507\*\* |
|  | (0.043) | (0.069) | (0.091) |
| Observations | 382 | 380 | 381 |
| R-squared | 0.077 | 0.101 | 0.027 |

*Source:* Law Student Survey 2022.

*Note:* Entries are estimates from Ordinary Least Squares regression. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1, two-tailed test.
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