On-line Appendix for "Personality Traits and Participation in Political Processes"

Appendix 1: Construction of Samples

The CCAP survey sample is constructed by first drawing a target population sample. This

sample is based on the 2005-2007 American Community Study, November 2008 Current

Population Survey Supplement, and the 2007 Pew Religious Life Survey. Thus, this target

sample is representative of the general population on a broad range of characteristics including a

variety of geographic (state, region, metropolitan statistical area), demographic (age, race,

income, education, gender), and other measures (born-again status, employment, interest in

news, party identification, ideology, turnout). Polimetrix invited a sample of their opt-in panel of

1.4 million survey respondents to participate in the study. Invitations were stratified based on

race, gender, and battleground status, with an oversample of nine battleground and early primary

states (Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania,

and Wisconsin). Those who completed the survey (approximately 2.5 times the target sample)

were then matched to the target sample using nearest neighbor matching based on the variables

listed in parentheses above. Finally, weights were calculated to adjust the final sample to reflect

the national public on these demographic and other characteristics (including correcting for the

oversampling of battleground states). For more detailed information on this type of survey and

sampling technique see Vavreck and Rivers (2008).[1] In concrete terms, the weighted CCAP

sample we use in our analysis appears similar in levels of political interest to that found in the

weighted 2008 ANES time-series survey. In the September wave of the CCAP we find that 56%

---

[1] Vavreck, Lynn, and Douglas Rivers. 2008. "The 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study."
Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties 18: 355-366.

of respondents in our sample are "very much" interested in politics (variable=scap813, "How interested are you in politics?"). In the ANES pre-election survey, the comparable figure is 58% (variable=V0830001b, "How interested are you in information about what's going on in government and politics?" = Extremely or Very interested, restricted to reported registered voters).

Discussion of CCAP and CT Samples and Registration Restrictions

The CCAP sample was restricted to reported registered voters. By contrast, in the CT Sample, which was not restricted to registered voters, we treat individuals who were not matched as unregistered and, hence, non-voters. We apply these different restrictions because all individuals in the CCAP should, if they were correctly reporting registration, have appeared in voter rolls.

In the CCAP, matching to voter records was based on full names, birthdates, gender, and address information. A recent voter file for Massachusetts residents was not available. We therefore excluded respondents from this state from our analysis. Because our models include state fixed effects, we also exclude cases from three states where records indicated no turnout among respondents in any general election from 2000 to 2006: North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. For the CCAP, unmatched cases may reflect the difficulty of matching, a problem that is amplified in cases without valid addresses in the CCAP dataset. Matching is also likely to be a much greater problem for voters who have recently moved or in states which purge voter history when individuals update their registration. To account for differences caused by state-by-state variation in voter file maintenance we include state fixed effects in our analysis of the CCAP. The CCAP data that is matched to state voter files does not permit an analysis of

overreporting of turnout because respondents were only asked to report their turnout behavior for 2008, while the validated turnout data only extends from 2000-2006.

CT survey respondents were merged to Connecticut's administrative voter file records by Catalist, Inc., using information provided on the survey sampling frame. These data included the selected individual's name, phone number, and address. To verify that the individual surveyed was the person listed on the sampling frame, the CT survey requested information about the respondent's age, first name, and the street number of their address. Catalist provided us with a list of records that matched on any of the data from the sampling frame. We then used the survey data to assess the quality of matches, delete improper matches (e.g., two individuals with the same name but dramatically different ages or names), and identify the correct individual when there were many potential matches. In certain rare cases where multiple individuals appeared as viable matches (e.g., a respondent who refused to provide his or her name, but did provide an age and address that matched two people in a household), we included both records as matches and weighted the records accordingly in our statistical analysis. (So, for example, in a case with 2 matches we assigned each a weight of .5, whereas respondents matched to only a single administrative record—or none at all—had a weight of 1.) Because the CT sample was not restricted to registered voters, unmatched cases may reflect non-registration or matching failures. Given that the CT sample was restricted to phone records with mailable addresses, we believe the former is more likely.

Appendix 2: Variable Coding and Question Wording

2007-2008 CCAP

TIPI (10 trait pairs)
Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other. I see myself as:

Extraversion: Extraverted, enthusiastic; Reserved, quiet (Reverse coded)
Agreeableness: Sympathetic, warm; Critical, quarrelsome (Reverse coded)
Conscientiousness: Dependable, self-disciplined; Disorganized, careless (Reverse coded)
Emotional Stability: Calm, emotionally stable; Anxious, easily upset (Reverse coded)
Openness: Open to new experiences, complex; Conventional, uncreative (Reverse coded)

(1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree moderately; 3 = Disagree a little; 4 = Neither agree nor disagree; 5 = Agree a little; 6 = Agree moderately; 7 = Agree strongly. Responses rescaled to range from 0 to 1.)

Political Participation
Validated Turnout (2000-2006): count of voting in four general elections from 2000-2006 (0=voted in none; 4=voted in all).

Campaign Participation Index: Thinking about the presidential candidates and their campaigns, did any of the following things happen to you YESTERDAY? (Choose as many as apply) <1> Donated money to a candidate or party; <2> Wore a button or sticker for a candidate; <3> Went to hear a candidate speak (Each form of participation respondents were assigned a 1 if they engaged in the act in *either* the September or October wave of the survey. We then created an additive scale of the number of forms of participation each respondent reported participating in, ranging from 0 to 3).

Other
Female: 0 = male; 1 = female

White: 0 = non-White; 1 = White

Black: 0 = non-Black; 1 = Black

Hispanic: 0 = non-Hispanic; 1 = Hispanic

Other race (Native American, Asian, Mixed, Other): 0 = not other race; 1 = Other race

Age: Years

Education: 1 = no high school diploma; 2 = high school graduate; 3 = some college; 4 = two year degree; 5 = college graduate; 6 = post-graduate

Family income: 1 < $10,000; 2 = $10,000-$14,999; 3 = $15,000-$19,999; 4 = $20,000-$24,999; 5 = $25,000-$29,999; 6 = $30,000-$39,999; 7 = $40,000-$49,999; 8 = $50,000-$59,999; 9 = $60,000-$69,999; 10 = $70,000-$79,999; 11 = $80,000-$99,999; 12 = $100,000-$119,999; 13 = $120,000-$149,999; 14 = $150,000 or more; 15 = prefer not to say or missing

2008 CT Survey

TIPI (10 trait pairs)
Same as CCAP.

Political Participation
Validated Turnout (2000-2006): count of voting in four general elections from 2000-2006 (0=voted in none; 4=voted in all).

Validated Turnout (2004 & 2006): count of voting in two general elections (0=voted in neither; 2=voted in both).

Reported Turnout (2004 & 2006): count of reported voting in two general elections (0=voted in neither; 2=voted in both).

> 2006 Voting: Do you remember whether or not you voted in the 2006 gubernatorial election between Republican Jodi Rell and Democrat John DeStefano? (0 = no; 1 = yes, voted)

> 2004 Voting: Putting aside how you currently feel about President Bush and Senator John Kerry, do you remember whether or not you voted in the 2004 presidential election between Republican George Bush, Democrat John Kerry, and Green candidate Ralph Nader? (0 = no; 1 = yes, voted)

Overreport Turnout (2004 & 2006): number of elections the respondent reported voting in that the voter rolls indicate she did not (0=overreported in neither; 2=overreported in both).

Campaign Participation Index: additive index of the number of acts the respondent reported participating in (0 to 3).

> Volunteer: In the last 2 years, have you worked as a volunteer - that is, for no pay at all or for only a token amount for a candidate running for national, state, or local office? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

> Campaign meetings/rallies: In the last 2 years, did you go to any political meetings, rallies, speeches, fund raising dinners, or things like that in support of a particular candidate? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

Contribute: In the last 2 years, did you contribute MONEY to an individual candidate, party group, a political action committee, or any other organization that supported a candidate or a ballot proposition? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

Local Participation Index: additive index of the number of acts the respondent reported participating in (0 to 3).

Contacted Local Official: During the past two years, have you contacted a local elected official about an issue facing your local community or schools? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

Community meeting: During the past two years, did you attend a meeting about an issue facing your local community or schools? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

Spoke at Community Meeting: Did you speak publicly at any of the meetings you attended? (0 = no; 1 = yes)

Other
Non-White: 0 = White; 1 = non-White

Age: Years

Education: What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? 1. Did not graduate from high school, 2. High school graduate, 3. Some college, but no degree (yet), 4. 2-year college degree, 5. 4-year college degree, 6. Postgraduate degree (MA, MBA, MD, JD, PhD, etc.).

Family Income: I am going to read you a list of income categories. Please tell me which category best describes the total income of all members of your family living in your house in 2006 before taxes. This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all other income. Please stop me when I get to your family's income. 1. $30,000 or less, 2. More than $30,000 and less than $60,000, 3. More than $60,000 and less than $90,000, 4. More than $90,000 and less than $120,000, 5. More than $120,000 and less than $150,000, 6. More than $150,000, 7=Refused/Don't Know.

*Supplementary analysis, available upon request, shows that the linear scale for income is an appropriate substitute for entering each of the categories separately. However, similar analysis suggested that a linear scale for education was inappropriate.

Appendix 3: Reliability and Robustness of the TIPI

Reliability: We note that the TIPI was designed to measure the broad Big Five traits and the aim of the battery is to 1) be brief; 2) achieve high test-retest reliability (as well as reliability between self- and peer-administered ratings); and 3) yield measures that are highly correlated with those obtained using much longer batteries (the correlations between TIPI measures and the 44-item Big Five Inventory [BFI] range from .65 to .87; correlations with measures from the much longer, 240-item NEO PI-R range from .56 to .68). As a result, inter-item correlations between the two items used to measure each trait are less informative of the items' reliability (Gosling 2009).[2] This document includes correlations between the Big Five measures in Table A2.

For a partial list of research that has used the TIPI see Sam Gosling's website: http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/faculty/gosling/scales_we.htm.

Robustness: One concern with the TIPI measurement of the trait Openness to Experience is that it includes the (reversed pair) item in which the word pair is "conventional"/"uncreative". Because being conventional, in the sense of following community norms, might measure elements of the trait Conscientiousness, we reran all of our analysis measuring Openness excluding this item. We find highly similar results. Selected tables appear in this document (Tables A3-A5).

---

[2] Gosling, Samuel D. 2009. "A Note on Alpha Reliability and Factor Structure in the TIPI." December 20. http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/faculty/gosling/tipi_alpha_note.htm (January 5, 2010).

Appendix 4: Supplemental Analysis

    1: <u>Other model specifications:</u>

    A.   Our results are robust to using count specifications (negative binomial regression) for non-binary outcomes. Tables for this specification appear in Table A6.

    B.   Results without education and income as controls are reported in Tables A7-A9.

    C.   Election-by-election analysis of turnout, including marginal effects, appears in Table A10 with corresponding marginal effects in Table A11.

    2: <u>Effect of personality on different forms of participation:</u> In the article, we briefly discuss analysis of the relationship between personality and participation as measured using the individual participation items from the CT Survey. We discuss the results of this analysis (presented in Table A12 below) at greater length here. (We also show results from the individual items of the CCAP campaign participation index in Table A13.)

In our theory section, we discussed how the relationship between personality and participation may depend on the level of interpersonal interaction and conflict associated with various forms of participation. Specifically, we expected the negative association between Agreeableness and participation to be particularly strong in cases where the participation was likely to involve relatively high levels of conflict. By contrast, we expected the positive relationships between Extraversion and participation to be largest when that participation involved interpersonal interaction. We consider this possibility in greater depth in Table A12a by presenting a series of models using the individual participation items from the CT Survey as

dependent variables. Marginal effects associated with these models are presented in Table A12b. Examining these participatory acts individually reveals several interesting patterns.

First, we find that Extraversion is consistently associated with higher levels of participation across all of the outcomes. However, as predicted, this relationship is particularly pronounced for forms of participation that involve interacting with others, such as attending a rally or speaking at a local meeting, relative to those that do not, such as donating to a political candidate (also see Mondak et al. 2010).[3] (In making comparisons we focus on percent changes in the likelihood of each mode of participation to account for baseline differences in the probability of engaging in each activity; see Table A12b.) The effect of a 2 SD increase in Extraversion on the probability of engaging in each of these three forms of participation is 54.8, 35.1, and 22.2% (relative to baseline probabilities), respectively.

Second, we also find support for our expectation that the negative association between Agreeableness and participation would be strongest for forms of participation that are likely to involve conflict. The models predicting participation in local politics highlight this dynamic. Agreeableness is essentially unrelated to attending a local meeting (marginal effect -1.9%). However, we find a strong negative and statistically significant relationship between this trait and more conflictual forms of participation such as speaking at a local meeting (-29.5%). An increase in Agreeableness is also associated with a decreased probability of contacting a local official (-20.6%). We interpret this as evidence that Agreeable individuals are disinclined to complain to elected officials, although Ulbig and Funk (1999) argue that contacting a local

---

[3] Mondak, Jeffery J., Matthew V. Hibbing, Damarys Canache, Mitchell A. Seligson, and Mary R. Anderson. 2010. "Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior." *American Political Science Review* 104: 85-110.

official does not involve conflict.[4] We note, however, that even in situations where contact is not initiated to register a complaint – such as requests for service or assistance – the act of contacting an official still involves taking from, rather than contributing to, communal resources.

We also posited that Emotional Stability would be associated with greater tolerance of activities that are likely to involve conflict. While we find a statistically significant and fairly large relationship between this trait and speaking at a local meeting (an activity likely to involve conflict), we find a similar relationship between this trait and donating to a candidate (an activity unlikely to involve conflict). Similarly, we expected those high on Openness to be attracted to political activities where they were most likely to be exposed to an exchange of novel ideas. We find positive relationships between this trait and five of the six forms of participation. However, the magnitudes of the effects do not clearly follow the pattern we expected. Openness is strongly and positively associated with volunteering (an activity likely to reflect a commitment to a particular candidate), but only weakly associated with attending a local meeting (the activity that seems most likely to involve an exchange of ideas).

To focus more concretely on willingness to be exposed to conflict, we also take advantage of the fact that respondents in the CT Survey were asked two questions about their participation in local meetings—whether they attended such a meeting and, if so, whether they spoke. In column (7) of Table A12a we present a model predicting speaking at a local meeting restricting the sample to those who reported attending a meeting. This model therefore helps identify which personality traits are associated with a willingness to engage in a particularly "risky" active form of political engagement conditional on having made the decision to participate in a more passive manner by simply attending the meeting. These results support the

---

[4] Ulbig, Stacy G., and Carolyn L. Funk. 1999. "Conflict Avoidance and Political Participation." Political Behavior 21: 265-282.

above evidence that Extraversion is associated with a willingness to experience conflict and that Agreeableness is associated with reluctance to engage in this type of participation.

Finally, although we did not have clear expectations regarding variation in the relationship between Conscientiousness and various forms of participation, we noted that the intensity of social norms and instrumental benefits may vary across forms of participation. For example, people may feel particularly obliged to participate in local political affairs or may think that local politics is more likely to affect policy outcomes than participation in a national campaign. The evidence with regard to these distinctions is mixed, however. Conscientious individuals are more likely to donate money to a candidate and attend local meetings while less likely to volunteer or contact local officials, but none of these coefficients is statistically significant.

3: <u>Personality and policy views:</u> In the discussion section of the article, we briefly discuss the possibility that the associations we find between Big Five traits and political participation may also have significant consequences for the process of representation. We discuss this possibility at greater length here.

Previous work has identified a number of important relationships between Big Five traits and political attitudes. For example, Conscientiousness is consistently found to be associated with conservatism. We find that individuals high on this trait are also less likely to turn out to vote. Other work finds that Extraversion and Emotional Stability—traits we find are associated with higher levels of political participation—are associated with holding conservative economic attitudes (Gerber et al. 2010).[5] This suggests that political participation may attract individuals

---

[5] Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, Conor M. Dowling, and Shang E. Ha. 2010. "Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships Across Issue Domains and Political Contexts." *American Political Science Review* 104: 111-133.

with distinctive political attitudes, creating a politically engaged citizenry whose views are not representative of the broader public.

More specifically, focusing just on two forms of participation measured using the CT Survey, voting and speaking at a local meeting, we can compare the effects of personality on participation with their corresponding effects on attitudes as reported in prior research (Gerber et al. 2010). These comparisons are shown in Table A14. The first column is the effect of a 2 SD change in each trait on the likelihood (relative to baseline) of being an above-average turnout voter and the second column is the same marginal effect for speaking at a local meeting. Columns (3)-(5) replicate the comparable effects of Big Five traits on ideological self-placement (column [3]), economic policy attitudes (column [4]), and social policy attitudes (column [5]). The standard deviation of the ideology measure reported in Gerber et al. (2010) is 1.18. The economic and social policy attitude measures are indexes of policy preference items standardized to have means of 0 and standard deviations of 1 (see Gerber et al. 2010 for further coding details). As discussed above, we find a strong positive relationship between Emotional Stability and a variety of forms of political participation (including voting and speaking at meetings). The marginal effects reported in columns (3)-(5) suggest that this may result in conservative preferences (particularly those regarding economic policies) being over-represented on Election Day, as well as in local meetings. Similarly, other personality traits, such as Openness may shape the distribution of preferences that are represented in different participatory contexts.

Table A1. Summary Statistics

Variable	CCAP		CT
	Validated Turnout Sample	Common Content Sample	Survey
Extraversion (0-1)	0.515	0.517	0.607
	[.242]	[.2424]	[.29]
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.728	0.713	0.791
	[.1866]	[.1938]	[.2088]
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.773	0.768	0.856
	[.1906]	[.1998]	[.1932]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.691	0.679	0.756
	[.2236]	[.2261]	[.2382]
Openness (0-1)	0.706	0.696	0.720
	[.1955]	[.1963]	[.2452]
Female = 1	0.524	0.509	
	[.4996]	[.4999]	
Black = 1	0.097	0.098	
	[.296]	[.2979]	
Hispanic = 1	0.062	0.059	
	[.2408]	[.2359]	
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.038	0.045	
	[.1912]	[.2073]	
Non-White = 1			0.113
			[.3162]
Age (Years)	52.355	51.151	59.767
	[13.8179]	[13.8997]	[15.8327]
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.582	0.553	0.469
	[.2686]	[.2743]	[.3386]
Income Refused	0.099	0.088	0.179
	[.2982]	[.2829]	[.3831]
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	3.568	3.433	3.899
	[1.5809]	[1.5599]	[1.6156]
Observations	2147	11362	1924

Note: Cell entries are weighted means. Standard deviations in brackets.

Table A2. Correlations between Big Five Measures

CCAP Validated Turnout	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
Extraversion	1.000				
Agreeableness	0.019	1.000			
Conscientiousness	0.039	0.260	1.000		
Emotional Stability	0.068	0.344	0.349	1.000	
Openness	0.320	0.172	0.198	0.270	1.000

CCAP Common Content	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
Extraversion	1.000				
Agreeableness	0.044	1.000			
Conscientiousness	0.089	0.280	1.000		
Emotional Stability	0.072	0.390	0.364	1.000	
Openness	0.298	0.209	0.197	0.250	1.000

CT Survey	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
Extraversion	1.000				
Agreeableness	0.039	1.000			
Conscientiousness	0.106	0.123	1.000		
Emotional Stability	0.098	0.243	0.226	1.000	
Openness	0.234	0.125	0.139	0.176	1.000

Note: Cell entries are weighted correlations.

Table A3. Replication of Table 3a Excluding "Conventional" Openness Item

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	CCAP	CT Survey	CT Survey		
	2006 (4 elections)		General Election Turnout 2004 and 2006 (2 elections)		
	Validated Turnout (0-4)		Validated Turnout (0-2)	Reported Turnout (0-2)	Overreport Turnout (0-2)
Extraversion (0-1)	0.405	0.302	0.313	0.635	-0.049
	[0.251]	[0.152]**	[0.160]*	[0.191]***	[0.161]
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.454	0.102	0.283	-0.174	-0.419
	[0.292]	[0.217]	[0.220]	[0.269]	[0.227]*
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.597	-0.413	-0.412	0.075	0.351
	[0.369]	[0.232]*	[0.238]*	[0.268]	[0.235]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.795	0.346	0.390	0.457	-0.190
	[0.267]***	[0.189]*	[0.196]**	[0.227]**	[0.199]
Openness (0-1) [no conventional item]	0.205	-0.163	-0.002	0.018	-0.067
	[0.260]	[0.163]	[0.168]	[0.199]	[0.166]
Female = 1	-0.073				
	[0.095]				
Black = 1	-0.210				
	[0.147]				
Hispanic = 1	0.234				
	[0.274]				
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.012				
	[0.364]				
Non-White = 1		-0.380	-0.335	-0.134	0.166
		[0.151]**	[0.151]**	[0.169]	[0.145]
Age (Years)	0.106	0.116	0.103	0.129	-0.019
	[0.026]***	[0.018]***	[0.020]***	[0.022]***	[0.019]
Age^2/100	-0.063	-0.074	-0.066	-0.077	0.015
	[0.025]**	[0.015]***	[0.017]***	[0.019]***	[0.016]
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.926	0.411	0.366	0.976	0.143
	[0.348]***	[0.203]**	[0.218]*	[0.271]***	[0.212]
Income Refused	-0.171	-0.166	-0.006	-0.710	-0.367
	[0.274]	[0.174]	[0.191]	[0.234]***	[0.192]*
Educ<HS	-0.466	-0.908	-0.821	-0.988	-0.073
	[0.343]	[0.263]***	[0.249]***	[0.255]***	[0.250]
Educ=some college	-0.050	0.096	0.111	0.282	0.101
	[0.177]	[0.144]	[0.144]	[0.170]*	[0.146]
Educ=2 year college	-0.003	0.080	0.232	0.485	0.117
	[0.197]	[0.139]	[0.146]	[0.173]***	[0.149]
Educ=College	0.226	0.176	0.263	0.697	0.262
	[0.192]	[0.131]	[0.138]*	[0.166]***	[0.138]*
Educ=Post Grad	0.049	0.373	0.453	0.951	0.071
	[0.201]	[0.132]***	[0.135]***	[0.166]***	[0.141]
Indicators for state?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Observations	2147	1924	1909	1909	1909
F-test: Big Five	0.023	0.063	0.024	0.002	0.187
Mean	2.429	1.591	1.009	1.611	0.666

Note: Ordered logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A4. Replication of Table 4a Excluding "Conventional" Openness Item

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CCAP	CT Survey	
	Campaign Participation Index (0-3)	Campaign Participation Index (0-3)	Local Participation Index (0-3)
Extraversion (0-1)	1.128	0.680	0.795
	[0.083]***	[0.187]***	[0.157]***
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.091	-0.304	-0.392
	[0.228]	[0.259]	[0.226]*
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.530	0.277	0.261
	[0.160]***	[0.284]	[0.243]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.292	0.126	0.230
	[0.144]**	[0.243]	[0.193]
Openness (0-1) [no conventional item]	0.505	0.514	0.447
	[0.197]**	[0.208]**	[0.165]***
Female = 1	0.059		
	[0.046]		
Black = 1	0.470		
	[0.092]***		
Hispanic = 1	0.234		
	[0.148]		
Other = 1	0.180		
	[0.125]		
Non-White = 1		0.444	0.125
		[0.160]***	[0.151]
Age (Years)	-0.014	0.060	0.092
	[0.013]	[0.025]**	[0.021]***
Age^2/100	0.029	-0.031	-0.075
	[0.011]**	[0.021]	[0.017]***
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.994	0.855	0.678
	[0.173]***	[0.248]***	[0.217]***
Income Refused	-0.556	-0.825	-0.508
	[0.123]***	[0.212]***	[0.190]***
Educ<HS	0.219	-0.384	0.045
	[0.237]	[0.357]	[0.267]
Educ=some college	0.468	0.498	0.376
	[0.073]***	[0.185]***	[0.151]**
Educ=2 year college	0.330	0.499	0.647
	[0.108]***	[0.189]***	[0.145]***
Educ=College	0.577	0.664	0.898
	[0.081]***	[0.170]***	[0.143]***
Educ=Post Grad	0.754	1.074	0.913
	[0.085]***	[0.162]***	[0.140]***
Indicators for state and day of week of surveys?	Yes	No	No
Observations	11362	1924	1924
F-test: Big Five	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean	0.254	0.402	0.852

Note: Ordered logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A5. Replication of Table A12a Excluding "Conventional" Openness Item

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Campaign Participation Items			Local Participation Items			
	Donate to Political Candidate	Volunteer	Attended Rally	Contact Local Official	Attend Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting (if Attend Local Meeting=1)
Extraversion (0-1)	0.387	0.653	0.964	0.624	0.785	0.992	0.629
	[0.239]	[0.287]**	[0.246]***	[0.182]***	[0.177]***	[0.242]***	[0.295]**
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.427	0.035	-0.285	-0.619	-0.036	-0.706	-1.032
	[0.324]	[0.405]	[0.322]	[0.249]**	[0.248]	[0.319]**	[0.399]***
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.475	0.007	0.285	0.021	0.429	0.480	0.401
	[0.375]	[0.426]	[0.374]	[0.276]	[0.269]	[0.397]	[0.475]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.578	-0.166	0.016	0.164	0.218	0.531	0.555
	[0.320]*	[0.355]	[0.301]	[0.230]	[0.225]	[0.308]*	[0.374]
Openness (0-1) [no conventional item]	0.147	0.638	0.907	0.416	0.388	0.461	0.208
	[0.252]	[0.343]*	[0.321]***	[0.198]**	[0.191]**	[0.278]*	[0.331]
Non-White = 1	0.026	0.339	0.721	0.026	0.184	0.172	0.015
	[0.222]	[0.256]	[0.197]***	[0.162]	[0.160]	[0.221]	[0.260]
Age (Years)	0.131	0.026	0.023	0.086	0.085	0.072	0.011
	[0.035]***	[0.039]	[0.032]	[0.023]***	[0.023]***	[0.033]**	[0.043]
Age^2/100	-0.078	-0.010	-0.010	-0.067	-0.074	-0.064	-0.012
	[0.028]***	[0.032]	[0.027]	[0.020]***	[0.019]***	[0.028]**	[0.036]
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.986	0.240	0.938	0.111	1.008	0.505	-0.093
	[0.300]***	[0.384]	[0.326]***	[0.234]	[0.233]***	[0.314]	[0.394]
Income Refused	-0.977	-0.342	-0.692	-0.204	-0.616	-0.252	0.144
	[0.259]***	[0.331]	[0.269]**	[0.203]	[0.201]***	[0.260]	[0.316]
Educ<HS	0.259	-0.559	-2.005	-0.087	0.133	0.243	0.151
	[0.387]	[0.750]	[1.029]*	[0.324]	[0.298]	[0.507]	[0.582]
Educ=Some college	0.505	0.734	0.380	0.411	0.286	0.518	0.399
	[0.230]**	[0.307]**	[0.241]	[0.178]**	[0.170]*	[0.276]*	[0.319]
Educ=2 year college	0.268	0.830	0.339	0.675	0.435	0.642	0.373
	[0.247]	[0.310]***	[0.248]	[0.175]***	[0.170]**	[0.267]**	[0.305]
Educ=College	0.564	0.815	0.585	0.857	0.670	1.238	1.013
	[0.212]***	[0.283]***	[0.218]***	[0.160]***	[0.155]***	[0.239]***	[0.274]***
Educ=Post Grad	1.021	1.071	0.778	0.942	0.643	1.207	0.951
	[0.200]***	[0.277]***	[0.214]***	[0.157]***	[0.151]***	[0.234]***	[0.271]***
Constant	-8.243	-5.062	-4.933	-4.219	-4.901	-5.925	-1.800
	[1.156]***	[1.272]***	[1.027]***	[0.753]***	[0.735]***	[1.086]***	[1.350]
Observations	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	721
F-test: Big Five	0.043	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019
Mean	0.163	0.090	0.149	0.333	0.372	0.147	0.394

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A6. Count Model Specifications for Turnout and Participation Index Outcomes

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	CCAP	CT Survey		CCAP	CT Survey	
	General Election Turnout 2000-2006 (4 elections)		Overreport Voting Total (0-2)	Campaign Participation Index (0-3)	Local Participation Index (0-3)	
Extraversion (0-1)	0.122	0.171	-0.017	0.876	0.592	0.502
	[0.066]*	[0.078]**	[0.099]	[0.072]***	[0.146]***	[0.097]***
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.126	0.059	-0.289	0.065	-0.255	-0.308
	[0.083]	[0.113]	[0.131]**	[0.177]	[0.193]	[0.132]**
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.185	-0.204	0.234	-0.414	0.220	0.173
	[0.095]*	[0.118]*	[0.151]	[0.115]***	[0.235]	[0.155]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.238	0.188	-0.133	0.227	0.216	0.190
	[0.073]***	[0.100]*	[0.119]	[0.118]*	[0.186]	[0.120]
Openness (0-1)	0.052	-0.181	0.132	0.583	0.205	0.302
	[0.070]	[0.096]*	[0.126]	[0.165]***	[0.189]	[0.126]**
Female = 1	-0.021			0.045		
	[0.024]			[0.039]		
Black = 1	-0.060			0.414		
	[0.039]			[0.068]***		
Hispanic = 1	0.062			0.260		
	[0.085]			[0.139]*		
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.012			0.190		
	[0.099]			[0.098]*		
Non-White = 1		-0.225	0.113		0.308	0.075
		[0.084]***	[0.084]		[0.121]**	[0.089]
Age (Years)	0.039	0.084	-0.010	-0.009	0.045	0.054
	[0.008]***	[0.011]***	[0.011]	[0.009]	[0.020]**	[0.014]***
Age^2/100	-0.026	-0.056	0.009	0.021	-0.023	-0.045
	[0.007]***	[0.009]***	[0.010]	[0.008]***	[0.017]	[0.012]***
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.268	0.237	0.080	0.829	0.671	0.379
	[0.095]***	[0.104]**	[0.128]	[0.144]***	[0.181]***	[0.127]***
Income Refused	-0.055	-0.092	-0.206	-0.417	-0.629	-0.254
	[0.070]	[0.086]	[0.118]*	[0.098]***	[0.157]***	[0.106]**
Educ<HS	-0.123	-0.538	-0.029	0.204	-0.360	0.039
	[0.095]	[0.175]***	[0.159]	[0.198]	[0.348]	[0.201]
Educ=some college	-0.025	0.062	0.049	0.406	0.460	0.280
	[0.049]	[0.074]	[0.093]	[0.061]***	[0.154]***	[0.107]***
Educ=2 year college	-0.008	0.035	0.070	0.316	0.395	0.400
	[0.057]	[0.074]	[0.093]	[0.089]***	[0.155]**	[0.099]***
Educ=College	0.053	0.103	0.154	0.474	0.557	0.581
	[0.052]	[0.068]	[0.084]*	[0.070]***	[0.139]***	[0.092]***
Educ=Post Grad	0.014	0.206	0.052	0.600	0.809	0.583
	[0.056]	[0.065]***	[0.088]	[0.073]***	[0.130]***	[0.091]***
Constant	-0.468	-2.576	-0.182	-3.285	-4.148	-2.788
	[0.235]**	[0.355]***	[0.353]	[0.283]***	[0.656]***	[0.433]***
Observations	2147	1924	1909	11362	1924	1924
F-test: Big Five	0.010	0.018	0.067	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean	2.429	1.591	0.666	0.254	0.402	0.852

Note: Coefficients from negative binomial models with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) presented in brackets.
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

Table A7. Replication of Table 3a (Excluding Controls for Education and Income)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	CCAP	CT Survey	CT Survey		
	2006 (4 elections)		General Election Turnout 2004 and 2006 (2 elections)		
	Validated Turnout (0-4)		Validated Turnout (0-2)	Reported Turnout (0-2)	Overreport Turnout (0-2)
Extraversion (0-1)	0.468	0.378	0.389	0.722	-0.073
	[0.226]**	[0.151]**	[0.158]**	[0.179]***	[0.161]
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.604	0.085	0.254	-0.306	-0.437
	[0.301]**	[0.214]	[0.216]	[0.261]	[0.225]*
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.473	-0.325	-0.327	0.163	0.305
	[0.364]	[0.230]	[0.235]	[0.262]	[0.235]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	1.035	0.435	0.480	0.647	-0.175
	[0.251]***	[0.186]**	[0.193]**	[0.216]***	[0.196]
Openness (0-1)	0.306	-0.161	0.038	0.446	0.252
	[0.271]	[0.188]	[0.192]	[0.227]**	[0.200]
Female = 1	-0.110				
	[0.094]				
Black = 1	-0.267				
	[0.160]*				
Hispanic = 1	0.162				
	[0.242]				
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.025				
	[0.347]				
Non-White = 1		-0.496	-0.435	-0.328	0.127
		[0.148]***	[0.148]***	[0.161]**	[0.144]
Age (Years)	0.116	0.123	0.111	0.136	-0.021
	[0.024]***	[0.018]***	[0.019]***	[0.021]***	[0.018]
Age^2/100	-0.076	-0.083	-0.075	-0.091	0.015
	[0.023]***	[0.015]***	[0.016]***	[0.018]***	[0.016]
Indicators for state?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Observations	2147	1924	1909	1909	1909
F-test: Big Five	0.000	0.014	0.003	0.000	0.143
Mean	2.429	1.591	1.009	1.611	0.666

Note: Ordered logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A8. Replication of Table 4a (Excluding Controls for Education and Income)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CCAP	CT Survey	
	Campaign Participation Index (0-3)	Campaign Participation Index (0-3)	Local Participation Index (0-3)
Extraversion (0-1)	1.187	0.810	0.876
	[0.092]***	[0.186]***	[0.154]***
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.075	-0.458	-0.510
	[0.231]	[0.252]*	[0.224]**
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.478	0.245	0.226
	[0.147]***	[0.280]	[0.240]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.502	0.409	0.387
	[0.148]***	[0.238]*	[0.193]**
Openness (0-1)	1.059	0.538	0.624
	[0.174]***	[0.226]**	[0.188]***
Female = 1	-0.056		
	[0.044]		
Black = 1	0.428		
	[0.098]***		
Hispanic = 1	0.233		
	[0.156]		
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.200		
	[0.116]*		
Non-White = 1		0.267	-0.049
		[0.156]*	[0.145]
Age (Years)	-0.005	0.068	0.089
	[0.011]	[0.024]***	[0.021]***
Age^2/100	0.018	-0.044	-0.078
	[0.010]*	[0.020]**	[0.017]***
Observations	11362	1924	1924
F-test: Big Five	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean	0.254	0.402	0.852

Note: Ordered logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A9. Replication of Table A12a (Excluding Controls for Education and Income)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Campaign Participation Items			Local Participation Items			
	Donate to Political Candidate	Volunteer	Attended Rally	Contact Local Official	Attend Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting (if Attend Local Meeting=1)
Extraversion (0-1)	0.528	0.741	1.177	0.679	0.886	1.055	0.605
	[0.239]**	[0.293]**	[0.245]***	[0.179]***	[0.175]***	[0.243]***	[0.292]**
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.554	-0.143	-0.413	-0.726	-0.166	-0.818	-1.110
	[0.312]*	[0.401]	[0.316]	[0.245]***	[0.243]	[0.311]***	[0.388]***
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.479	-0.052	0.303	-0.040	0.445	0.395	0.159
	[0.375]	[0.424]	[0.372]	[0.270]	[0.268]*	[0.387]	[0.454]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.805	0.012	0.285	0.328	0.373	0.679	0.618
	[0.320]**	[0.352]	[0.300]	[0.227]	[0.223]*	[0.309]**	[0.364]*
Openness (0-1)	0.104	1.071	0.606	0.670	0.511	0.876	0.778
	[0.283]	[0.378]***	[0.301]**	[0.228]***	[0.218]**	[0.307]***	[0.354]**
Non-White = 1	-0.113	0.222	0.551	-0.090	0.066	0.015	-0.104
	[0.218]	[0.252]	[0.188]***	[0.160]	[0.154]	[0.215]	[0.259]
Age (Years)	0.135	0.026	0.034	0.083	0.092	0.070	-0.004
	[0.034]***	[0.038]	[0.031]	[0.023]***	[0.022]***	[0.032]**	[0.040]
Age^2/100	-0.090	-0.014	-0.025	-0.068	-0.084	-0.065	0.000
	[0.027]***	[0.031]	[0.026]	[0.019]***	[0.019]***	[0.027]**	[0.034]
Constant	-7.352	-4.500	-4.250	-3.596	-4.311	-5.007	-0.923
	[1.114]***	[1.246]***	[0.997]***	[0.722]***	[0.711]***	[1.002]***	[1.215]
Observations	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	721
F-test: Big Five	0.002	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
Mean	0.163	0.090	0.149	0.333	0.372	0.147	0.394

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A10. General Election Turnout by Election

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey
	2000		2002		2004		2006	
Extraversion (0-1)	0.196	0.372	0.265	0.238	0.692	0.290	0.708	0.286
	[0.280]	[0.190]*	[0.297]	[0.187]	[0.292]**	[0.169]*	[0.337]**	[0.172]*
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.742	-0.215	-0.382	-0.010	-0.226	0.301	-0.195	0.209
	[0.370]**	[0.264]	[0.377]	[0.260]	[0.437]	[0.237]	[0.466]	[0.241]
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.877	-0.392	-0.887	-0.141	-0.248	-0.367	-0.236	-0.449
	[0.405]**	[0.277]	[0.459]*	[0.282]	[0.389]	[0.261]	[0.470]	[0.266]*
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.536	0.446	0.703	0.154	0.645	0.457	1.249	0.372
	[0.312]*	[0.242]*	[0.305]**	[0.237]	[0.391]*	[0.215]**	[0.302]***	[0.218]*
Openness (0-1)	0.149	-0.664	0.362	-0.473	-0.040	-0.082	0.253	-0.172
	[0.265]	[0.232]***	[0.355]	[0.225]**	[0.373]	[0.208]	[0.418]	[0.212]
Female = 1	0.133		0.063		-0.211		-0.417	
	[0.101]		[0.145]		[0.150]		[0.201]**	
Black = 1	0.121		0.030		-0.301		-0.776	
	[0.193]		[0.229]		[0.230]		[0.186]***	
Hispanic = 1	-0.066		0.613		-0.132		0.364	
	[0.205]		[0.445]		[0.378]		[0.377]	
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.232		0.184		-0.035		-0.085	
	[0.401]		[0.371]		[0.421]		[0.313]	
Non-White = 1		-0.417		-0.308		-0.348		-0.283
		[0.184]**		[0.181]*		[0.152]**		[0.157]*
Age (Years)	0.165	0.158	0.095	0.175	0.097	0.075	0.024	0.133
	[0.032]***	[0.025]***	[0.029]***	[0.027]***	[0.029]***	[0.022]***	[0.038]	[0.023]***
Age^2/100	-0.118	-0.107	-0.051	-0.117	-0.066	-0.045	0.010	-0.088
	[0.028]***	[0.020]***	[0.026]*	[0.021]***	[0.028]**	[0.018]**	[0.038]	[0.019]***
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.755	0.453	1.240	0.496	0.718	0.409	0.674	0.361
	[0.378]**	[0.243]*	[0.371]***	[0.243]**	[0.605]	[0.227]*	[0.345]*	[0.232]
Income Refused	-0.400	-0.306	-0.334	-0.312	0.155	-0.070	0.280	0.001
	[0.227]*	[0.211]	[0.340]	[0.213]	[0.345]	[0.197]	[0.383]	[0.201]
Educ<HS	-0.389	-0.696	-0.438	-0.933	0.029	-0.791	-0.654	-0.859
	[0.385]	[0.324]**	[0.382]	[0.339]***	[0.424]	[0.272]***	[0.466]	[0.288]***
Educ=some college	0.042	0.139	-0.061	0.012	-0.169	0.056	-0.098	0.202
	[0.214]	[0.174]	[0.178]	[0.175]	[0.158]	[0.157]	[0.303]	[0.159]
Educ=2 year college	0.156	-0.207	-0.392	-0.116	0.242	0.139	0.069	0.296
	[0.237]	[0.182]	[0.223]*	[0.178]	[0.220]	[0.159]	[0.331]	[0.159]*
Educ=College	0.201	-0.015	0.228	0.106	0.180	0.100	0.266	0.412
	[0.228]	[0.165]	[0.192]	[0.163]	[0.230]	[0.147]	[0.299]	[0.149]***
Educ=Post Grad	0.203	0.239	-0.130	0.298	0.086	0.250	0.217	0.646
	[0.199]	[0.159]	[0.244]	[0.157]*	[0.247]	[0.144]*	[0.402]	[0.146]***
Constant	-4.748	-6.024	-4.161	-6.972	-2.326	-3.305	-1.196	-5.101
	[0.944]***	[0.816]***	[0.862]***	[0.878]***	[1.039]**	[0.680]***	[1.081]	[0.717]***
Observations	2098	1924	2034	1924	2082	1924	2036	1924
F-test: Big Five	0.133	0.012	0.069	0.342	0.057	0.042	0.000	0.106
Mean	0.537	0.289	0.434	0.294	0.772	0.514	0.686	0.494

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A11. Marginal Effects, General Election Turnout by Election

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey	CCAP	CT Survey
	2000		2002		2004		2006	
Baseline Probability	62.1%	36.3%	49.6%	36.5%	81.2%	55.1%	78.2%	50.4%
Extraversion	3.6%	13.8%	6.4%	8.8%	6.3%	7.5%	7.4%	8.2%
Agreeableness	-10.5%	-5.7%	-7.2%	-0.3%	-1.6%	5.6%	-1.6%	4.3%
Conscientiousness	-12.6%	-9.6%	-17.0%	-3.4%	-1.8%	-6.4%	-2.0%	-8.6%
Emotional Stability	9.1%	13.5%	15.8%	4.7%	5.4%	9.8%	12.1%	8.8%
Openness	2.2%	-20.7%	7.2%	-14.7%	-0.3%	-1.8%	2.2%	-4.2%
Income	13.9%	14.7%	30.2%	16.0%	6.5%	9.3%	7.1%	9.1%
Education	7.4%	-0.9%	11.4%	6.8%	3.2%	4.4%	5.4%	20.1%

Note: See text for details of marginal effects specifications. Table entries are proportional changes relative to baseline probability for two standard deviation increase in each item. For income this corresponds to a change from approximately $25,000/year to $100,000/year. For education this is a change from high school graduate to college graduate.

Table A12a. Non-Voting Political Participation: Specific Activities CT Survey

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Campaign Participation Items			Local Participation Items			
	Donate to Political Candidate	Volunteer	Attended Rally	Contact Local Official	Attend Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting (if Attend Local Meeting=1)
Extraversion (0-1)	0.444	0.634	1.049	0.627	0.800	0.978	0.591
	[0.237]*	[0.289]**	[0.243]***	[0.181]***	[0.176]***	[0.243]***	[0.297]**
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.411	-0.056	-0.325	-0.662	-0.068	-0.763	-1.107
	[0.324]	[0.401]	[0.320]	[0.249]***	[0.247]	[0.319]**	[0.404]***
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.494	-0.069	0.262	-0.024	0.395	0.426	0.346
	[0.379]	[0.425]	[0.374]	[0.277]	[0.269]	[0.396]	[0.476]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.624	-0.162	0.113	0.176	0.239	0.529	0.544
	[0.321]*	[0.349]	[0.298]	[0.229]	[0.224]	[0.307]*	[0.370]
Openness (0-1)	-0.184	0.853	0.368	0.477	0.357	0.626	0.535
	[0.295]	[0.391]**	[0.317]	[0.235]**	[0.225]	[0.317]**	[0.367]
Non-White = 1	0.031	0.349	0.734	0.033	0.190	0.180	0.013
	[0.222]	[0.259]	[0.197]***	[0.163]	[0.160]	[0.221]	[0.259]
Age (Years)	0.133	0.023	0.023	0.085	0.084	0.069	0.007
	[0.036]***	[0.039]	[0.032]	[0.023]***	[0.023]***	[0.033]**	[0.042]
Age^2/100	-0.081	-0.007	-0.010	-0.066	-0.073	-0.061	-0.008
	[0.028]***	[0.032]	[0.027]	[0.020]***	[0.019]***	[0.028]**	[0.036]
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	0.983	0.278	0.959	0.130	1.022	0.534	-0.049
	[0.301]***	[0.384]	[0.327]***	[0.234]	[0.234]***	[0.316]*	[0.398]
Income Refused	-0.976	-0.374	-0.722	-0.222	-0.630	-0.272	0.118
	[0.260]***	[0.332]	[0.269]***	[0.202]	[0.201]***	[0.262]	[0.317]
Educ<HS	0.248	-0.524	-1.992	-0.071	0.144	0.259	0.153
	[0.386]	[0.748]	[1.031]*	[0.323]	[0.295]	[0.505]	[0.594]
Educ=Some college	0.523	0.729	0.403	0.407	0.285	0.508	0.391
	[0.230]**	[0.307]**	[0.242]*	[0.179]**	[0.171]*	[0.276]*	[0.320]
Educ=2 year college	0.272	0.822	0.341	0.669	0.430	0.634	0.380
	[0.246]	[0.311]***	[0.246]	[0.175]***	[0.170]**	[0.267]**	[0.305]
Educ=College	0.587	0.793	0.605	0.845	0.664	1.217	0.984
	[0.213]***	[0.284]***	[0.220]***	[0.160]***	[0.155]***	[0.239]***	[0.275]***
Educ=Post Grad	1.052	1.046	0.804	0.930	0.638	1.185	0.926
	[0.201]***	[0.280]***	[0.217]***	[0.158]***	[0.152]***	[0.235]***	[0.271]***
Constant	-8.158	-5.012	-4.590	-4.166	-4.820	-5.865	-1.825
	[1.156]***	[1.242]***	[1.016]***	[0.745]***	[0.729]***	[1.062]***	[1.317]
Observations	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	1924	721
F-test: Big Five	0.041	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009
Mean	0.163	0.090	0.149	0.333	0.372	0.147	0.394

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors in brackets. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A12b. Marginal Effects for Table 7 and 9 Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Data Source:	CT Survey	CT Survey	CT Survey	CT Survey	CT Survey	CT Survey	CT Survey
Measure:	Donate to Political Candidate	Volunteer	Attended Rally	Contact Local Official	Attend Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting	Speak at Local Meeting (if Attend Local Meeting=1)
Marginal Effect for Outcome:	1=Yes	1=Yes	1=Yes	1=Yes	1=Yes	1=Yes	1=Yes
Results appear in:	T9, C(1)	T9, C(2)	T9, C(3)	T9, C(4)	T9, C(5)	T9, C(6)	T9, C(7)
Baseline Probability	14.0%	5.0%	10.6%	25.6%	34.2%	7.8%	23.8%
Extraversion	22.2%	35.1%	54.8%	27.0%	30.4%	52.7%	24.9%
Agreeableness	-14.8%	-2.2%	-12.1%	-20.6%	-1.9%	-29.5%	-35.3%
Conscientiousness	16.4%	-2.5%	9.0%	-0.7%	10.0%	15.2%	9.5%
Emotional Stability	25.6%	-7.4%	4.8%	6.2%	7.5%	23.3%	19.1%
Openness	-7.8%	40.0%	16.1%	17.4%	11.5%	28.4%	19.0%
Income	43.3%	13.5%	43.9%	4.9%	34.2%	25.1%	-1.8%
Education	61.8%	108.4%	68.3%	73.6%	46.9%	184.8%	91.2%

Note: See text for details of marginal effects specifications. Table entries are proportional changes relative to baseline probability for two standard deviation increase in each

Table A13. CCAP Participation Items Analysis

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CCAP		
	Active: Donated	Active: Wore Button	Active: Attended Rally
Extraversion (0-1)	0.866	1.126	1.301
	[0.120]***	[0.114]***	[0.310]***
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.375	-0.072	-0.110
	[0.309]	[0.228]	[0.417]
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.595	-0.508	-0.153
	[0.207]***	[0.179]***	[0.451]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.482	0.086	0.373
	[0.237]**	[0.153]	[0.359]
Openness (0-1)	0.407	1.100	-0.467
	[0.322]	[0.184]***	[0.538]
Female = 1	-0.173	0.238	0.144
	[0.053]***	[0.064]***	[0.198]
Black = 1	0.470	0.426	0.912
	[0.126]***	[0.101]***	[0.240]***
Hispanic = 1	0.178	0.221	1.113
	[0.143]	[0.172]	[0.405]***
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.122	0.157	0.777
	[0.130]	[0.167]	[0.254]***
Age (Years)	-0.017	0.021	-0.045
	[0.020]	[0.018]	[0.042]
Age^2/100	0.047	-0.016	0.047
	[0.018]***	[0.017]	[0.041]
Income (0-1, 1=Refused)	1.683	0.571	0.275
	[0.189]***	[0.206]***	[0.486]
Income Refused	-0.817	-0.288	-0.262
	[0.172]***	[0.137]**	[0.311]
Educ<HS	0.153	0.146	0.718
	[0.295]	[0.231]	[0.535]
Educ=some college	0.436	0.460	0.490
	[0.101]***	[0.089]***	[0.254]*
Educ=2 year college	0.405	0.365	-0.127
	[0.142]***	[0.112]***	[0.442]
Educ=College	0.542	0.528	0.492
	[0.140]***	[0.129]***	[0.256]*
Educ=Post Grad	0.673	0.722	0.621
	[0.119]***	[0.115]***	[0.242]**
Constant	-4.790	-4.568	-4.993
	[0.613]***	[0.531]***	[1.220]***
Indicators for state and day of week of surveys?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11362	11362	11281
F-test: Big Five	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean	0.103	0.131	0.020

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered by state in CCAP models) in brackets. Eighty-one cases are lost in column 3 because no residents from Maine reported attending a rally. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Two-tailed tests.

Table A14. Effects of Big Five Traits on Participation and Political Attitudes

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Vote (MFX: T6, c[2])	Speak (MFX: T8, c[9])	Ideology (-2 Cons +2 V Lib)	Economic Liberalism (M=0; SD=1)	Social Liberalism (M=0; SD=1)
Extraversion	9.8%	52.7%	-0.08	-0.14	-0.05
Agreeableness	2.9%	-29.5%	0.02	0.20	-0.12
Conscientiousness	-7.9%	15.2%	-0.34	-0.22	-0.26
Emotional Stability	8.9%	23.3%	-0.26	-0.43	-0.13
Openness to Experience	-7.9%	28.4%	0.70	0.48	0.53

Note: Cell entries are the estimated marginal effect of the independent variable on the outcome. Estimates presented in columns (3)-(5) are from Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling, and Ha (2010).