

Online Appendix

CEO Activism and Political Mobilization

Young Hou and Christopher Poliquin

A METHODOLOGY AND STUDY DESIGN

A.1 Study Design and Randomization

Table A.1 presents participant counts across study conditions for several covariates and shows political party affiliation, views on abortion, the political affiliation of participants' senators, and gender are balanced across the four conditions.

Table A.1 Balance across study conditions

Characteristic	Overall	Study Conditions				<i>p</i> -value
		Control	CEOs	Democratic Leaders	Many People	
Total	4,578	1,303	1,304	1,311	660	
Political Party						0.99
Strong Democrat	1,291 (28%)	369 (28%)	371 (28%)	366 (28%)	185 (28%)	
Democrat	802 (18%)	228 (17%)	224 (17%)	231 (18%)	119 (18%)	
Lean Democrat	440 (9.6%)	126 (9.7%)	125 (9.6%)	127 (9.7%)	62 (9.4%)	
Independent	357 (7.8%)	100 (7.7%)	101 (7.7%)	105 (8.0%)	51 (7.7%)	
Lean Republican	338 (7.4%)	96 (7.4%)	97 (7.4%)	96 (7.3%)	49 (7.4%)	
Republican	714 (16%)	201 (15%)	205 (16%)	203 (15%)	105 (16%)	
Strong Republican	636 (14%)	183 (14%)	181 (14%)	183 (14%)	89 (13%)	
Views on Abortion						0.99
Illegal	366 (8.0%)	101 (7.8%)	110 (8.4%)	99 (7.6%)	56 (8.5%)	
Mostly illegal	1,122 (25%)	326 (25%)	311 (24%)	327 (25%)	158 (24%)	
Mostly legal	766 (17%)	213 (16%)	220 (17%)	223 (17%)	110 (17%)	
Legal	2,324 (51%)	663 (51%)	663 (51%)	662 (50%)	336 (51%)	
Has Dem. Senator	2,112 (46%)	608 (47%)	590 (45%)	611 (47%)	303 (46%)	0.88
Female	2,451 (54%)	705 (54%)	687 (53%)	711 (54%)	348 (53%)	0.81

Notes: Percentages refer to share of column for each variable. *Has Dem. Senator* is an indicator for having at least one Democratic Senator. Column of *p*-value refers to results of a Chi-squared test for an association between study conditions and the row variable.

A.2 Contacting Senators

Here, we explain how we contacted participants' U.S. Senators and handled replies from Senate offices while preserving participant privacy. Upon the conclusion of the data collection phase, we gather respondents' responses and mail letters to the respective senators. For privacy reasons, we mask respondents' contact information in the letter. When senators respond to the letter via the anonymized email address, we forward the

message to the corresponding respondent. A sample of the letter sent to senators is shown below (Figure A.1) along with a sample response (Figure A.2).



CHRISTOPHER W. POLIQUIN
Assistant Professor
Strategy
Tel (310) 206-6553
chris.poliquin@anderson.ucla.edu

October 27, 2022

The Honorable Brian Schatz
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator:

We recently conducted a study of voters' views on abortion and their willingness to participate in the political process by contacting their elected representatives. As part of the study, we offered participants the opportunity to send a message to their senators either supporting abortion rights or opposing abortion. We provided suggested language for both messages but gave participants the opportunity to modify the message.

The messages we collected from residents of Hawaii are enclosed. At the top of the document, you will see the count of letters that participants chose to send either supporting or opposing abortion. This summary is followed by the individual letters. Each letter shows an email address associated with the person who sent the message. For privacy reasons, we offered participants the ability to mask their real emails; these masked email addresses appear as 1234@uva-ucla-study.info in the list of letters. If you would like to respond to these (or any other constituent), you can simply email the address provided above the letter and it will be delivered to the individual constituent who sent the message.

If you have any questions, please contact us by email at chris.poliquin@anderson.ucla.edu and houy@arden.virginia.edu.

Sincerely,

Christopher W. Poliquin
Assistant Professor
UCLA Anderson School of Management

Young Hou
Assistant Professor
UVA Darden School of Business

Figure A.1. Letter to Senators

United States Senate

Dear Friend,

Thank you for contacting me about abortion rights.

Despite decades of long-standing precedent, the U.S. Supreme Court has overturned the constitutional right to abortion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. This decision sets a dangerous legal precedent and is a huge step backward. While the ruling will not impact Hawaii, which legalized abortion in 1970, it will impact people in nearly half the states across the country that have enacted or will soon enact laws to ban or severely restrict abortion. Low-income people and communities of color will be disproportionately impacted by this decision.

I believe a woman's fundamental right to make decisions about her own body are hers alone—not the government's. I will continue to do everything I can at the federal level to fight for abortion rights. I am an original cosponsor of the *Women's Health Protection Act*, which affirms abortion as a right and protects health care providers' ability to deliver abortion services free from medically unnecessary restrictions. I voted in February to advance the bill in the Senate, and I voted again in favor of this bill in May. Unfortunately, the bill did not receive the votes needed to pass.

The fight for reproductive freedom continues, and I will do everything in my power to support reproductive rights. Mahalo again for contacting me about this important issue.

Sincerely,



BRIAN SCHATZ
U.S. Senator

To respond to this message or comment on other issues, please visit my website and use the correspondence form at <http://www.schatz.senate.gov/contact>.

Figure A.2. Senator Response

B ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES AND ANALYSES

B.1 Additional Treatment Effect Estimates

Here we report several additional estimates of potential interest. Table B.1 reports treatment effect estimates for pro-choice study participants, extending Table 3 from the main text to include additional comparisons for the “many people” condition and for the subgroup of participants that identify politically as Independents. Unexpectedly, the message supporting abortion rights is *less effective* than showing no message among pro-choice Independents, but these tests were not pre-registered and no hypotheses specifically address the effects of CEO activism for this subgroup.

Table B.1 Treatment effect estimates for pro-choice participants

Comparison	$\hat{\tau}$	$\sigma_{\hat{\tau}}$	95% Confidence Intervals		<i>p</i> -value
			Two-sided	One-sided	
<i>All Pro-Choice Subjects</i>					
CEO vs. Control	0.38	2.26	[-4.05, 4.80]	[-3.33, ∞]	0.87
Dem vs. Control	-3.53	2.23	[-7.91, 0.84]	[-7.21, ∞]	0.11
Many people vs. Control	-3.29	2.72	[-8.61, 2.04]	[-7.76, ∞]	0.23
CEO vs. Dem	3.79	2.25	[-0.62, 8.20]	[0.09, ∞]	0.09
<i>Republicans</i>					
CEO vs. Control	4.25	6.33	[-8.16, 16.67]	[-6.17, ∞]	0.50
Dem vs. Control	0.51	6.15	[-11.53, 12.56]	[-9.60, ∞]	0.93
Many people vs. Control	-2.04	7.22	[-16.18, 12.10]	[-13.91, ∞]	0.78
CEO vs. Dem	3.74	6.23	[-8.46, 15.95]	[-6.50, ∞]	0.55
<i>Democrats</i>					
CEO vs. Control	3.69	2.93	[-2.04, 9.43]	[-1.12, ∞]	0.21
Dem vs. Control	-1.57	2.92	[-7.30, 4.16]	[-6.37, ∞]	0.59
Many people vs. Control	1.42	3.52	[-5.47, 8.32]	[-4.36, ∞]	0.69
CEO vs. Dem	5.26	2.90	[-0.42, 10.94]	[0.50, ∞]	0.07
<i>Independents</i>					
CEO vs. Control	-9.54	4.25	[-17.86, -1.21]	[-16.52, ∞]	0.02
Dem vs. Control	-10.32	4.15	[-18.44, -2.19]	[-17.14, ∞]	0.01
Many people vs. Control	-15.29	5.30	[-25.67, -4.91]	[-24.00, ∞]	0.00
CEO vs. Dem	0.36	4.35	[-8.17, 8.90]	[-6.80, ∞]	0.93

Note: The outcome is sending a letter supporting abortion rights. Treatment effect estimates, standard errors, and confidence intervals reported in percentage points. *p*-values are for two-sided tests.

Table B.2 shows treatment effect estimates for pro-life study participants, extending Table 3 from the main text to include comparisons for subgroups of participants defined by political affiliation.

Table B.2 Treatment effect estimates for pro-life participants

Comparison	$\hat{\tau}$	$\sigma_{\hat{\tau}}$	95% Confidence Intervals		<i>p</i> -value
			Two-sided	One-sided	
<i>All Pro-Life Subjects</i>					
CEO vs. Control	-2.22	2.86	[-7.82, 3.38]	$[-\infty, 2.48]$	0.44
Dem vs. Control	-3.40	2.79	[-8.88, 2.07]	$[-\infty, 1.19]$	0.22
Many people vs. Control	-4.65	3.32	[-11.16, 1.87]	$[-\infty, 0.82]$	0.16
CEO vs. Dem	1.26	2.80	[-4.23, 6.75]	$[-\infty, 5.86]$	0.65
<i>Republicans</i>					
CEO vs. Control	0.13	3.84	[-7.40, 7.66]	$[-\infty, 6.45]$	0.97
Dem vs. Control	-1.29	3.78	[-8.70, 6.12]	$[-\infty, 4.93]$	0.73
Many people vs. Control	-6.01	4.34	[-14.52, 2.49]	$[-\infty, 1.12]$	0.17
CEO vs. Dem	1.25	3.88	[-6.35, 8.86]	$[-\infty, 7.64]$	0.75
<i>Democrats</i>					
CEO vs. Control	-6.38	5.98	[-18.11, 5.34]	$[-\infty, 3.46]$	0.29
Dem vs. Control	-9.92	5.22	[-20.16, 0.31]	$[-\infty, -1.33]$	0.06
Many people vs. Control	-13.49	4.63	[-22.57, -4.42]	$[-\infty, -5.88]$	0.00
CEO vs. Dem	3.91	4.73	[-5.36, 13.18]	$[-\infty, 11.69]$	0.41
<i>Independents</i>					
CEO vs. Control	-6.13	5.49	[-16.89, 4.62]	$[-\infty, 2.89]$	0.26
Dem vs. Control	-5.15	5.51	[-15.95, 5.64]	$[-\infty, 3.91]$	0.35
Many people vs. Control	4.56	7.80	[-10.73, 19.84]	$[-\infty, 17.38]$	0.56
CEO vs. Dem	-0.35	5.17	[-10.49, 9.79]	$[-\infty, 8.16]$	0.95

Note: The outcome is sending a letter opposing abortion. Treatment effect estimates, standard errors, and confidence intervals reported in percentage points. *p*-values are for two-sided tests.

B.2 Letters that Disagree with Reported Views on Abortion

All study participants had the opportunity to send a letter supporting abortion rights or opposing abortion (or no letter) regardless of their own views on abortion. This raises the possibility of pro-choice participants sending letters *opposing* abortion and pro-life participants sending letters *supporting* abortion rights. We ignore this outcome in our main analyses because (a) it was not the subject of any pre-registered analyses, and (b) it is a rare, counterintuitive outcome potentially explained by subjects either misreporting their views on abortion, accidentally selecting the “wrong” letter, or otherwise not paying attention during the study.