

Pre-Analysis Plan for Summer 2018 Immigration Experiment

[BLINDED FOR PEER REVIEW]

August 14, 2018

Note: For any issues unaddressed in this pre-analysis plan, we will first consult the pre-analysis plan for a similar prior study on abortion attitudes available at <https://egap.org/content/abortion-stigma-experiment>. If further issues remain, we commit to the defaults described in Version 1.05 of the Lin, Green, and Coppock (2016) standard operating procedures available at http://alexandercoppock.com/Green-Lab-SOP/Green_Lab_SOP.pdf.

Background

The experiment has seven steps:

1. We recruited voters to join an online survey panel. The voters were recruited via mail sent to the address at which they were registered to vote. This mail directed them to an online survey.
2. Among voters who completed the baseline survey, we randomly assigned voters to receive a long treatment conversation on immigration, a short treatment conversation on immigration or a placebo conversation. This random assignment took place at the household level, within blocks defined by household size and the first factor from factor analysis on a number of pre-treatment covariates about immigration. We dropped voters who were above the 90th percentile within the voter's state on both of two indices formed by the policy and prejudice immigration items, respectively, as these voters should not see any persuasive effects due to a ceiling effect. This was approximately 5% of voters in pilot data.
3. The partner group implements the canvass, delivering either a persuasion conversation or a placebo conversation depending on the voter's random assignment. Voters do not realize the canvassing is connected to the survey in any way.
4. We invite voters who were successfully reached (compliers) to take a follow-up survey.
5. We analyze the results of this survey to assess the effects of the conversations. In particular, we compare the views of voters who received the immigration conversations to those who received the placebo conversations. How we plan to do so is described below.
6. We will assess how long-lasting the persuasive effects of the canvass are by continuing to send follow-up survey waves. Currently, surveys are planned at 3-5 days and one month after canvassing.

Timeline

This pre-analysis plan is being written as the partner organization is beginning implementation of Step 3 (which will take ~4 weeks). No compliers data has been provided to researchers. No post-treatment surveys have been launched. Thus, no post-treatment outcome data has been gathered yet.

Outcomes

- **Site-Specific Outcome** (this depends on the site)
 - **Fresno:** The government should provide legal aid to all undocumented immigrants who cannot afford their own attorney for legal or courtroom deportation proceedings.
 - **OC:** Local police should ask for documentation and automatically turn immigrants over to federal immigration officers when they are found to be in the country illegally.
 - **TN:** The federal government should work to identify and deport all illegal immigrants, including in the workplace.
- **Anti-Immigrant Prejudice Index**
 - I would have no problem living in areas where undocumented immigrants live.
 - Too many undocumented immigrants just don't want to fit into American society.
 - Undocumented immigrants are too much of a burden on our communities.
 - Undocumented immigrants have already broken the law coming here illegally, so they are more likely to commit other crimes.
 - Undocumented immigrants hold the same values as me and my family.
 - *Feeling thermometer:* Illegal immigrants.
 - *Undocumented immigrant closeness:* Look at each of them and say which is the closest relationship you would find acceptable for each group.
- **Anti-Immigrant Policy Index**
 - All three of the site-specific outcomes above, regardless of site. These are:
 - The government should provide legal aid to all undocumented immigrants who cannot afford their own attorney for legal or courtroom deportation proceedings.
 - Local police should ask for documentation and automatically turn immigrants over to federal immigration officers when they are found to be in the country illegally.
 - The federal government should work to identify and deport all illegal immigrants, including in the workplace.
 - Undocumented immigrants deserve compassion and should not live in daily fear of deportation.
 - The federal government should grant legal status to people who were brought to the US illegally as children and who have graduated from a U.S. high school.
 - The federal government should allow undocumented immigrants currently in the U.S. to become citizens after they have lived, worked, and paid taxes for at least 5 years.

We will also test whether the treatments increased respondents' ability to actively process and perspective take on immigration. We will ask the following questions:

- **Perspective Taking**
 - I can imagine how things look from undocumented immigrants' perspective. (Ku et al 2015)
 - I find it difficult to see things from an undocumented immigrants' point of view. (Davis 1983 Perspective Taking Scale, <https://ogg.osu.edu/media/documents/MB%20Stream/PT%20and%20EC.pdf>)
- **Active Processing**
 - I have thought a lot about how we should treat undocumented immigrants in our community.
 - I feel confident in my ability to distinguish good from bad immigration policies. (Hill and Huber Forthcoming, https://huber.research.yale.edu/materials/57_paper.pdf)

Treatment Effect Heterogeneity

- **Canvasser Heterogeneous Treatment Effects**
 - Primary: By canvasser immigration status: Answered “yes” to “Do you consider yourself to be an immigrant?”
 - Secondary
 - By site: Fresno vs. OC vs. TN
 - By canvasser race: Latino-only vs. White-only vs. Other
 - By canvasser age: 30 and under vs. over 30
- **Voter Heterogeneous Treatment Effects**
 - *Voters who have an ability to share a real-lived experience are expected to have larger treatment effects, regardless of treatment condition. The below two baseline surveys measures are likely to predict the ability to share a real-lived experience with immigration during the treatment. We will confirm whether these characteristics actually produce more cases of voters sharing real-lived experiences because during the canvass, the canvasser will record this data.*
 - By having a close friend, colleague, or family member who is undocumented in the baseline survey (yes vs. all other responses).
 - By being born outside of the US.
 - *We view the remainder of these as exploratory.*
 - By party: Democrat vs. Republican vs. Independent/Other
 - By race: Latino-only vs. White-only vs. Asian-only vs. African American-only vs. Other
 - By economic status: Excellent/good personal financial situation vs. Other
 - By education: College educated vs. Other
 - By baseline support: Three separate subgroups of bottom third, middle third, and top third of baseline support factor used to block

Estimation Procedures

- We will use the following variables from the baseline survey and administrative data as covariates to predict the outcome and increase power:
 - Baseline Survey Data
 - t0_imm_better_worse t0_imm_police t0_imm_driverslicense t0_imm_daca t0_imm_citizenship t0_imm_deportall t0_imm_attorney t0_imm_prej_living t0_imm_prej_neighbor t0_imm_prej_speaking t0_imm_prej_workethic t0_imm_prej_fit t0_imm_know t0_social_distance_immigrant t0_therm_illegal_immigrant t0_therm_legal_immigrant t0_college_educ t0_asian t0_latino t0_black t0_white t0_born_in_us t0_factor_undoc_immigrant t0_factor_lgbt t0_factor_trump
 - Administrative Data
 - vf_age vf_voted08 vf_voted10 vf_voted12 vf_voted14 vf_voted16 vf_female
- For outcomes with multiple measures, we will create the dependent variables using factor analysis. The factors will be rescaled to mean 0 and standard deviation 1 to allow for a natural interpretation of the size of the effects in standard deviations.
- Our analysis will be conducted using OLS with cluster-robust standard errors. Standard errors will be clustered at the household level because that is the level at which the random assignment occurred. Note that we do not include treatment-by-covariate interactions in the regression model because the design is approximately balanced (see Lin, “Agnostic Notes”).
- Our OLS model will be of the form: $\text{lm}(\text{DV} \sim \text{treat} + \text{X})$, where X is a matrix of the above pre-treatment covariates.

Missing Values

We will recode missing values to their means. These are rare.

CACE vs. ATE

Because we expect many conversations to end shortly after the topic of immigration is introduced, we wish to demarcate the CACE vs. the ATE. All conversations where the targeted voter came to the door becomes eligible for the post-treatment survey. This voter is identified prior to the placebo topic or immigration being introduced. We will look at the CACE by two different cutpoints coded during the canvass: (1) voter answered the first rating question, and (2) completed conversation as coded by the canvasser. We will divide the ATE by the percentage of conversations started that reach each of these stages as an estimate of the CACE.

Test for Proper Implementation

- We will test that contact rates in treatment and placebo are the same.
- We will also test that compliers in the placebo group have similar baseline values to compliers in the treatment group. For the covariates for this test, will use the baseline covariates mentioned above for covariate adjustment.
- We will also test for differential attrition by investigating treatment by baseline covariate interactions. We will compare the F-statistic on the restricted and unrestricted models that include and do not include these interactions.