

The Unsettled Effect of Physical Height on Political Preferences

Appendix

Table	Page
Table A1. Measured Height and Party Identification without Fixed Effects	2
Table A2. Replication of Table 2 without Fixed Effects but with Gender	3
Table A3. Measured Height and Ideology without Fixed Effects	4
Table A4. “First Stage” Relationships between Height and Income/Wealth	5
Table A5: Descriptive Statistics in Full WLS Sample	6

Table A1. Measured Height and Party Identification without Fixed Effects

Year	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2011	2011
Sample	All	All	All	All	Male	Female	Male	Female	All	All
Height	.041** (.005)	.047** (.008)	.026** (.008)	.032** (.012)	.039** (.011)	.014 (.011)	.064** (.017)	.003 (.016)	.034** (.005)	.018* (.008)
Gender (Female)	--	--	-.166** (.061)	-.162 (.091)	--	--	--	--	--	-.175** (.062)
Same- Gender Only	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Log Likelihood	-10,762	-5,055	-10,758	-5,054	-5,129	-5,606	-2,381	-2,659	-10,687	-10,683
N	7,291	3,420	7,291	3,420	3,440	3,851	1,595	1,825	7,116	7,116

Models are ordered logit regressions including age.
 Estimates for age, constants, and cut points are not reported.
 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed tests

Table A2. Replication of Table 2 without Fixed Effects but with Gender

Potential Mechanism	Health	Weight	Environ. Mastery	Birthweight	Education	Big 5 Personality
Height	.026* (.012)	.036** (.012)	.028* (.012)	.025 (.015)	.032** (.012)	.033** (.012)
Health (HUI)	.61** (.18)		--	--	--	--
Weight		-.0005 (.0009)				
Environmental Mastery	--		.033** (.008)	--	--	--
Birthweight	--		--	.002 (.002)	--	--
Education (College Graduate)	--		--	--	-.095 (.068)	--
Extraversion	--		--	--	--	.017** (.006)
Agreeableness	--		--	--	--	-.018* (.008)
Conscientiousness	--		--	--	--	.017* (.008)
Neuroticism	--		--	--	--	-.029** (.008)
Openness	--		--	--	--	-.047** (.093)
Log Likelihood	-4,608	-4,986	-4,994	-3,277	-2,230	-4,966
N	3,120	3,376	3,381	2,239	3,300	3,379

Models are ordered logit regressions including controls for age and gender.

Estimates for age, gender, constants, and cut points are not reported.

Data analysis limited to same-gender siblings.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed tests

Table A3. Measured Height and Ideology without Fixed Effects

Year	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2005	2011	2011
Sample	All	All	All	All	Male	Female	All	All
Height	.047** (.005)	.046** (.008)	-.0001 (.008)	-.007 (.012)	.012 (.011)	-.013 (.011)	.036** (.005)	-.003 (.008)
Gender	--	--	-.506** (.061)	-.552** (.090)	--	--	--	-.423 (.062)
Same-Gender Only	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Log Likelihood	-11,924	-5,602	-11,890	-5,584	-5,619	-6,248	-12,057	-12,034
N	7,423	3,487	7,423	3,487	3,508	3,915	7,222	7,222

Models are ordered logit regressions including age.

Estimates for age, constants, and cut points are not reported.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed tests

Table A4. “First Stage” Relationships between Height and Income/Wealth

Outcome	Income	Net Worth	Income	Net Worth	Income	Income	Net Worth	Net Worth
Sample	All	All	All	All	Male	Female	Male	Female
Height	3.47** (.23)	39.92** (3.34)	2.09** (.33)	24.90** (4.85)	2.97** (.53)	1.19** (.40)	34.53** (7.98)	15.10** (5.65)
Gender (Female)	--	--	-14.9** (2.6)	-162.1** (38.0)	--	--	--	--
N	8,365	8,245	8,365	8,245	3,933	4,432	3,887	4,358

Models are linear regressions including age.

Estimates for age and constants not reported.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed tests

Table A5. Descriptive Statistics in Full WLS Sample

Variable	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Party Identification (2005)	3.16	1	5
Party Identification (2011)	3.13	1	5
Ideology (2005)	4.47	1	7
Ideology (2011)	4.52	1	7
Height (Inches)	65.9	41.5	81.5
Age (2005)	65.6	45	87
Age (2011)	71.6	51	93
Gender (Female)	.51	0	1
Health (HUI)	.84	-.23	1
Birthweight (Ounces)	118.9	19	284
Weight (Pounds)	185.3	120	280
Environmental Mastery	24.2	1	30
Education (College Graduate)	.29	0	1
Extraversion	22.3	1	36
Agreeableness	28.3	1	36
Conscientiousness	28.3	1	36
Neuroticism	15.1	1	30
Openness	21.0	1	36
Income (Thousands of Dollars)	64.1	0	710
Net Worth (Thousands of Dollars)	631.2	0	12,000

Note that effective sample sizes differ across variables and among analyses in the article.