

Errata

On Kirkland and Coppock (2018), *Political Behavior* 40(3)

This note lists six errors in “Candidate Choice Without Party Labels: New Insights from Conjoint Survey Experiments,” published in *Political Behavior* 40(3), doi [10.1007/s11109-017-9414-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9414-8). **None of them changes a conclusion of the article.** Four are misstated numbers and two are descriptions of the figures that the estimates behind those figures do not support. Each is recorded because a reader who quoted the sentence would be quoting something the article’s own data do not bear out.

Every corrected value below is computed from the data at the time this document is rendered: the conjoint estimates from the deposited replication archive ([10.7910/DVN/WSUHI3](https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/WSUHI3)), and the mayoral election data from the file the authors supplied, which the deposit omits. The code supporting each correction is at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/kirkland_coppock_2018.

1. The two ballot types are transposed in the experience-advantage comparison

Subsetting our dataset to only those elections in which candidates have different levels of political experience (779 elections), we see that the candidate with more experience wins about **62%** of the time in **partisan** elections and **61%** of the time in **nonpartisan** elections.

Corrected:

Subsetting our dataset to only those elections in which candidates have different levels of political experience (779 elections), we see that the candidate with more experience wins about **62%** of the time in **nonpartisan** elections and **61%** of the time in **partisan** elections.

Both percentages are right and the labels attached to them are the wrong way round. The data give 62.1 per cent in nonpartisan elections and 61.3 per cent in partisan elections, across the 779 elections the sentence identifies. The direction matters here, because the article’s own argument is that nonpartisan ballots favour the more experienced candidate: the published sentence reports the gap running the other way.

2. The racial preference pattern holds in one sample and not the other

Republican respondents marginally prefer white candidates while Democrats marginally prefer nonwhite candidates.

Corrected:

Republican respondents marginally prefer white candidates **in the YouGov sample**, while Democrats marginally prefer nonwhite candidates **in both**.

The Democratic half of the sentence holds everywhere: all six estimates are positive, Asian +4.0, Black +6.1, Hispanic +1.5 percentage points on Mechanical Turk and Asian +3.0, Black +9.1, Hispanic +0.0 on YouGov, the last of those being +0.018 rather than a true zero. The Republican half holds only on YouGov, where the three estimates are Asian -5.9, Black -6.7, Hispanic -9.3. On Mechanical Turk, Republican respondents prefer **Asian** candidates to white candidates by 6.1 percentage points, while preferring white candidates to Black ones by 9.8 and to Hispanic ones by 4.3. A reader taking the sentence as a general finding about Republican respondents would be taking a pattern that reverses on one of the paper's two samples.

3. Republican respondents do show a competence gap by election type

As shown in the difference column, Democratic respondents (**but not Republican respondents**) rate such candidates as even more competent in the absence of party labels.

Corrected:

As shown in the difference column, Democratic respondents (**and, for candidates who have been mayor, Republican respondents**) rate such candidates as even more competent in the absence of party labels.

The parenthetical reads the Republican half of Figure 7's difference column as null, and one of its four estimates is not. 2 of the 4 Democratic intervals exclude zero and so does 1 of the 4 Republican ones: Republican respondents rate a candidate who has been mayor 4.74 points more competent in nonpartisan than in partisan elections, with a 95 per cent interval of 0.23 to 9.25. The contrast the sentence draws is one of degree rather than of presence.

4. The p-value on the experience-advantage comparison reproduces under no test

This difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.791$).

Corrected:

This difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.852$).

The corrected figure is a regression of the more-experienced-candidate-wins indicator on ballot type with HC2 standard errors. A chi-squared test of the same two-by-two table gives 0.919, and no standard test of this comparison returns 0.791. The conclusion the sentence draws is unaffected: the difference of 0.8 percentage points is not distinguishable from zero on any of them.

5. The number of municipalities in the mayoral election dataset

This dataset covers **225** unique municipalities and records background characteristics of winners and runners-up, contextual information such as electoral rules, and electoral outcomes.

Corrected:

This dataset covers **237** unique municipalities and records background characteristics of winners and runners-up, contextual information such as electoral rules, and electoral outcomes.

The file carries 237 distinct FIPS place codes across its 1010 elections, and it is the file the sentence describes: the election count and the 1945 to 2007 span both reproduce exactly. No other reading of it returns 225 either, since municipalities holding more than one election number 171, the subset used later in the paragraph covers 216, and truncating the place code to five digits gives 213.

6. The range of political experience effects is stated more tightly than the estimates support

Relative to a candidate with no political experience, respondents prefer candidates who are City Council Members, State Legislators, Mayors, or Representatives in Congress by a margin of **25–30** percentage points.

Corrected:

Relative to a candidate with no political experience, respondents prefer candidates who are City Council Members, State Legislators, Mayors, or Representatives in Congress by a margin of **23–32** percentage points.

The published range is wrong at both ends rather than at one. The four estimates in the nonpartisan column of Figure 3 are Representative in Congress 25.2, Mayor 32.0, State Legislator 25.3, City Council Member 22.7 percentage points. The claim the sentence makes is unaffected: political experience remains by a wide margin the most consequential attribute in the figure, and the next largest effect of any kind is 5.5 percentage points.