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• limits on contributions, not expenditures (Buckley vs. Valeo)

• hard money limits
  – individuals: $2,000 per election to a candidate (baseline value for 2004, indexed to increase with CPI)
  – higher limits if running against a “millionaire” (complicated)
  – PACs: $5,000 per election to a candidate
  – individuals: $37,500 aggregate to candidates per two years
  – individuals: $5,000 to a PAC per year
  – individuals: $25,000 per year to a party committee
  – individuals: $57,500 aggregate to PACs and parties per two years
• soft money
  – banned by BCRA
  – exempt: voter registration and GOTV ($10,000 per source)

• “the new soft money” (my phrase): non-PAC 527s
- non-party electioneering
  - corporations and unions prohibited
  - limited disclosure and reporting requirements
  - unlimited spending and contributions
  - 501(c)(4)s (but not 501(c)(3)s)
  - 527s
• itemized individual contributions FEC data (1982–2006)
  – in terms of the number of contributions, there is roughly parity between parties as long as Democrats are in the majority
  – REVOLUTION in 1994, especially in the last three months
  – individuals abandon Democrats after they lose the majority
  – counterrevolution in 2006?
  – (see the fecdiffs06.pdf plots linked to the course webpage)

• most individuals who contribute are investors

• contributors are strategic, and contributions are solicited (e.g., no candidate means no contributions)
• service
  – votes
  – changing priorities for a legislator’s actions, e.g., raising salience
  – bill proposals
  – legislative committee actions
  – regulation
  – bureaucratic intervention (oversight)
  – pork (local federal expenditure)
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  – bill proposals
  – legislative committee actions
  – regulation
  – bureaucratic intervention (oversight)
  – pork (local federal expenditure)

• timing
  – quid pro quo
  – long-term relationships (access)
• extent: pay different people for different things
  – paying supporters or buying off opponents
  – buying majorities (or supermajorities)
  – buying agenda control
• extent: pay different people for different things
  – paying supporters or buying off opponents
  – buying majorities (or supermajorities)
  – buying agenda control

• Groseclose-Snyder theory: buy (super)majority with
  – enough money to outspend the opposition
  – money allocated to give all the weakest supporters the same final payoff, taking into account their initial evaluations

• assumes legislators act independently
buying a majority
buying a majority
buying a majority
buying a majority

voters

value

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4
buying a majority

voters

value
• Groseclose-Snyder theory: buy (super)majority with
  – enough money to outspend the opposition
  – money allocated to give all the weakest supporters the
    same final payoff, taking into account their initial evaluations

• the Groseclose-Snyder theory is nominally about votes, but
  it’s not hard to see that the same idea should generalize to
  all kinds of service
• Groseclose-Snyder theory: buy (super)majority with
  – enough money to outspend the opposition
  – money allocated to give all the weakest supporters the
    same final payoff, taking into account their initial
    evaluations

• the Groseclose-Snyder theory is nominally about votes, but
  it’s not hard to see that the same idea should generalize to
  all kinds of service

• as stated, the theory assumes
  – Members act independently
  – Members’ actions are interchangeable: every member
    can do what any other member can do
• what if some Members’ actions are more useful or effective than others?
  – e.g., House leadership positions
  – e.g., party cartel leadership positions
• think about Members as being of varying quality
• use a basic principle for investing: equate marginal costs across possible investments
Price–service curves
Figure 1: Price–service curves with maximum service limits
Figure 2: Service–price curves
Figure 8: Service–price relationships with budget = 10
Figure 3: Service–price relationships with budget = 10
Figure 4: Service–price relationships with budget = 5
Figure 5: Service–price relationships with budget = 2
Figure 6: Service–price relationships with budget = 1
Figure 3: Service–price relationships with budget = 10
Figure 8: Service-price relationships with budget = 10 and maximum contribution = 4.
Figure 8: Service–price relationships with budget = 10 and maximum contribution = 3
• to buy the most high-quality service, equate marginal costs across legislators
  – give the most to the highest quality source, but not everything
  – with a limited contributor budget, some legislators receive zero
• to buy the most high-quality service, equate marginal costs across legislators
  – give the most to the highest quality source, but not everything
  – with a limited contributor budget, some legislators receive zero

• upper limits on contributions
  – imposing an upper limit may cause contributions to lower quality legislators to increase
  – increasing an existing upper limit may cause contributions to lower quality legislators to decrease
• distributing contributions across open seats
• partisan contributors and investor contributors
• distributing contributions across open seats

• partisan contributors and investor contributors
  – almost all labor PACs are Democratic partisans
  – very few labor PACs (some maritime unions) are Republican investors
  – most corporate PACs are Republican partisans
  – but many corporate PACs are also Democratic investors, at least when Democrats hold the majority
• Partisan Contributions Theory (Snyder)
• Investor Contributions Theory (Baron, Snyder)
• Unified Contributions Theory (Baron, Snyder, Wand)
simple partisan theory

money
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money vs. probability Democrat wins
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Contributions Theory Equilibrium (Baron, Snyder, Wand)

\( p \) is the probability that the Democrat defeats the Republican: 
\[ 0 < p < 1. \]

total of investor contributions, by party:
\[
X_D = \gamma_D p \\
X_R = \gamma_R (1 - p)
\]

total of partisan contributions, by party:
\[
Y_D = \phi_D p(1 - p) - X_D \\
Y_R = \phi_R p(1 - p) - X_R
\]

(see also Wand 2003, 35; 2006, 10)
• before and after 1994, separately, Wand classifies PACs as one of:
  – Republican partisan
  – Democratic partisan
  – Republican investor
  – Democratic investor
  – classification rules (pages 62–65)

• Wand (2003) then estimates the preceding model for each set of years 1984–92 and 1996–2000
how well does the theoretical model describe contributions in open seats?

Wand (2003) uses nonparametric estimates to assess this:

- party committees (Figure 3.1, page 46)
- corporate and labor PACs, presumptively partisan (Figure 3.2, page 48)
- corporate and labor PACs, presumptively investor (Figure 3.3, page 50)
- investors and partisans
  - classification rules (pages 62–65)
  - partisan estimates (Figure 3.8, page 66)
  - investor estimates (Figure 3.9, page 67)

parametric model estimates (2003, pages 73–74)
• Wand (2006) classifies PACs as one of:
  – business, labor, ideological and single interest, healthcare, lawyers/lobbyists
• Wand (2006) uses CQ classifications to assess whether contributions have the predicted curavatures with respect to probability of election victory
• see Wand (2006, 22, 24, 28)
• examples from the current election

• Cook Report categories for open seats with primaries before September
  – solid Republican: CA-22, CO-05, MI-07, NE-03, OH-04, OK-05, TN-01
  – likely Republican: ID-01, NV-02
  – lean Republican: none
  – toss Republican: CO-07, IL-06, IA-01
  – lean Democrat: none
  – likely Democrat: IL-17, OH-06, OH-13
  – solid Democrat: GA-04, TN-09

• look up PAC information for these races at the FECinfo site
to Republicans: Finance, Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>solid Rep</th>
<th>toss Rep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-22</td>
<td>CO-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. $64,000</td>
<td>2. $49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-05</td>
<td>IL-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-07</td>
<td>IA-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. $23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $58,500</td>
<td>likely Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK-05</td>
<td>IL-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. $13,500</td>
<td>8. $1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN-01</td>
<td>OH-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $61,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. $3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>likely Rep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solid Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to Democrats: Finance, Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Rep</th>
<th>Toss Rep</th>
<th>Likely Dem</th>
<th>Likely Rep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-22</td>
<td>CO-07</td>
<td>IL-06</td>
<td>ID-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL-06</td>
<td>IA-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NE-03              |          |            | OH-04      |
| OH-04              |          | OH-06      |            |
| $1,750             |          |            |            |
|                   |          | OH-13      |            |
|                   |          |            |            |

| OK-05              | IL-17    | OH-06      | NV-02      |
|                   |          |            |            |
| $2,500             |          |            |            |
|                   |          |            |            |

| TN-01              |          |            |            |
|                   |          |            |            |
| $2,500             |          |            |            |
|                   |          |            |            |
to Republicans: Organized Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>solid Rep</th>
<th>toss Rep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-22</td>
<td>CO-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-05</td>
<td>IL-06 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-07</td>
<td>IA-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-04</td>
<td>likely Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK-05</td>
<td>IL-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN-01 1. $5,000</td>
<td>OH-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH-13 11. $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-01</td>
<td>solid Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV-02</td>
<td>GA-04 1. $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TN-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to Democrats: Organized Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>solid Rep</th>
<th>toss Rep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-22</td>
<td>CO-07 1. $121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-05 1. $11,000</td>
<td>IL-06 1. $196,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-07</td>
<td>IA-01 1. $136,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-03 1. $80,000</td>
<td>OH-04 1. $5,250 likely Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-04 1. $5,250</td>
<td>IL-17 1. $140,500 likely Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK-05</td>
<td>OH-06 1. $178,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN-01</td>
<td>OH-13 1. $196,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>likely Rep</th>
<th>solid Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-01 1. $29,500</td>
<td>NV-02 1. $106,500 GA-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TN-09 1. $10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• where we are today, with a solution worse than the disease

  – see report and watch video demonstrations
• where we began, with a disease that was really awful
• Florida 2000
  – Palm Beach County’s butterfly ballot
Studentized Residual from Expected Vote for Buchanan

- Palm Beach, FL
- Jasper, SC
- Orleans, LA
Votes for Reform Candidates by Proportions Voting for U.S. Senate Candidates, for Palm Beach County Precincts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Senate: Nelson (D)</th>
<th>Senate: Deckard (Ref)</th>
<th>( \hat{\sigma} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All precincts</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>-6.17 (0.15)</td>
<td>2.06 (0.21)</td>
<td>-12.74 (14.79)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 35</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>-7.48 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.71)</td>
<td>13.13 (23.89)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 35</td>
<td>Lowe</td>
<td>-1.98 (0.34)</td>
<td>-1.86 (0.51)</td>
<td>18.06 (14.46)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 16</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>-7.00 (0.29)</td>
<td>3.32 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.95 (15.09)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 16</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td>-3.37 (0.30)</td>
<td>-1.00 (0.50)</td>
<td>25.96 (9.10)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are \( \tanh \) estimates of coefficient parameters of the overdispersed binomial regression model using precinct-level data from the 2000 election (standard errors are in parentheses). The last column reports the LQD dispersion estimate \( \hat{\sigma} \). Number of precincts: all precincts, 515; District 35, 105; District 16, 149.
Vote for Buchanan by U.S. Senate Vote in Palm Beach County, for Individual Ballots by Ballot Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Nelson (D)</th>
<th>Deckard (Ref)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election-Day</td>
<td>-5.18 (0.034)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.040)</td>
<td>2.41 (0.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>-6.11 (0.156)</td>
<td>-0.21 (0.236)</td>
<td>3.68 (0.400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are maximum likelihood estimates of coefficient parameters of the binary logistic regression model using ballot data from the 2000 election (standard errors are in parentheses). Ballots with spoiled presidential votes (undervotes or overvotes) are omitted. Including them does not materially change the results. Number of unspoiled ballots for each type: election-day, 381,449; absentee, 36,412.
### Proportion Voting for Buchanan by U.S. Senate Vote Choice and Ballot Type in Palm Beach County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Candidate</th>
<th>Election-Day Ballots</th>
<th>Absentee Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Nelson (D)</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>228,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Deckard (Ref)</td>
<td>0.0590</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are the proportion of ballots with a vote for Buchanan out of the $N$ ballots of each type voted for each Senate candidate, using ballot data from the 2000 election. Ballots with spoiled presidential votes (undervotes or overvotes) are omitted.
• Florida 2000
  – Palm Beach County’s butterfly ballot
• Florida 2000
  – Palm Beach County’s butterfly ballot
  – at least 2,000 people voted by mistake for Buchanan instead of Gore
Florida 2000
- Palm Beach County’s butterfly ballot
- at least 2,000 people voted by mistake for Buchanan instead of Gore
- most likely the number is about 2,800 people
Florida 2000
- Palm Beach County’s butterfly ballot
- at least 2,000 people voted by mistake for Buchanan instead of Gore
- most likely the number is about 2,800 people
- were other ballots used in Florida better?
• Florida 2000: other ballots better than the butterfly?
  – most counties with Votomatic machines had the candidates for president on one page
  – consider examples from Broward, Lee and Pinellas counties
### Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE W. BUSH for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REP)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CHENEY for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REP)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL GORE for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(DEM)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE LIEBERMAN for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(DEM)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BROWNE for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(LIB)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART OLIVER for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(GRE)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALPH NADER for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(SWP)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINONA LAUDE for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(LAW)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES HARRIS for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET TROWE for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HAGELIN for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(LAW)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAT GOLDBERGER for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(LAW)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT BUCHANAN for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZOLA FOSTER for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID McREYNOLDS for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(RFP)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY CAL HOLLIE for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(RFP)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD PHILLIPS for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. CURTIS FRAZIER for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONICA MOOREHEAD for PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(RFP)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA LARIVIA for VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>(RFP)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electors for President and Vice President**

Vote for One Group

---

### Congressional

**United States Senator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL McCOLLUM</td>
<td>(REP)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL NELSON</td>
<td>(DEM)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE SIMONETTA</td>
<td>(LAW)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL DECKARD</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE LOGAN</td>
<td>(NPA)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDY MARTIN</td>
<td>(NPA)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARRELL L. McCORMICK</td>
<td>(NPA)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To vote for a write-in candidate, follow the directions on the long stub of your ballot card.

**Representative in Congress, 14th Congressional District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PORTER GOSS</td>
<td>(REF)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM FARLING</td>
<td>(LAW)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To vote for a write-in candidate, follow the directions on the long stub of your ballot card.
VOTING INSTRUCTIONS

STEP 1. Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

STEP 2. Be sure the two slots in the end of your card fit down over the 2 red pins.

STEP 3. To vote, hold the punching stylus straight up. Punch straight down through the ballot card for the candidates, or issues of your choice.  
DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

STEP 4. You may vote all pages.

STEP 5. After voting, remove the ballot card from the Votomatic. Turn ballot card over and remove any small "clips" that may be attached to back of card. Fold top of ballot card down over voted portion and place in ballot box. 
NOTE: If you make a mistake, return your ballot card and obtain another.
• Florida 2000
  - Duval County’s two-page ballot
    * the cover of the voting book had the instruction (as in Pinellas County) “Vote all pages”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Law</td>
<td>John Haggard</td>
<td>For President</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Law</td>
<td>Nat Goldhaber</td>
<td>For Vice President</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
<td>For President</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Hazel Foster</td>
<td>For Vice President</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>David McReynolds</td>
<td>For President</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Betty Hollis</td>
<td>For Vice President</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Howard Phillips</td>
<td>For President</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>J. Curtis Fraizer</td>
<td>For Vice President</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers World</td>
<td>Monica Moorehead</td>
<td>For President</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers World</td>
<td>Gloria La Rua</td>
<td>For Vice President</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued from previous page)
• Florida 2000
  – Duval County’s two-page ballot
    * the cover of the voting book had the instruction (as in Pinellas County) “Vote all pages”
  – what happened?
Florida 2000
- Duval County’s two-page ballot
  * the cover of the voting book had the instruction (as in Pinellas County) “Vote all pages”
  - what happened?
  - the result was more than 26,000 overvotes
  - 291,581 ballots were cast in Duval County
  - about 9 percent of all ballots cast in Duval had an overvote for president
• Florida 2000: better ballots
  – optical scan ballots
    * precinct-tabulated in Hernando County
• Florida 2000: better ballots
  – optical scan ballots
    * not so good in Lake County
    * choices too compressed (see the Orlando Sentinel clip)
• Florida 2000: better ballots
  – optical scan ballots
    * not so good in Lake County
    * choices too compressed
Florida 2000: better ballots
  optical scan ballots
  * not so good in Lake County
  * choices too compressed
  * county-tabulated
  * irresponsible Election Board illegally did not count unambiguous write-ins
• Florida 2000: undervotes, other votes and overvotes
  - undervotes
    * primary focus of the recount efforts
    * Toobin tells the story well
    * divining the undervotes, the outcome depends on the rules used
    * with some rules Bush wins by a few hundred votes
    * with other rules Gore wins by a few hundred votes
- Florida 2000: undervotes, other votes and overvotes
  - undervotes
    * primary focus of the recount efforts
    * Toobin tells the story well
    * divining the undervotes, the outcome depends on the rules used
    * with some rules Bush wins by a few hundred votes
    * with other rules Gore wins by a few hundred votes
  - overseas absentee votes
    * 680 that were counted were illegal (New York Times)
    * without those ballots, Bush’s winning margin shrinks to (best guess) 251
• Florida 2000: overvotes
  – there were approximately 110,000 overvotes
  – the frequency of overvotes depended on administrative procedures, especially on:
    ∗ the type of machine
    ∗ the type of ballot
    ∗ the tabulation method
    ∗ whether a warn-and-correct system was in operation
  – many overvotes were Bush+ or Gore+
• many overvotes were Bush+ or Gore+
  – adjacent holes (e.g., on the butterfly ballot)
• many overvotes were Bush+ or Gore+
  – adjacent holes (e.g., on the butterfly ballot)
  – adjacent bubbles (e.g., Lieberman-Libertarian in Lake County)
• many overvotes were Bush+ or Gore+
  – adjacent holes (e.g., on the butterfly ballot)
  – adjacent bubbles (e.g., Lieberman-Libertarian in Lake County)
  – corrected mistakes (e.g., Leon County, see leonovervote.pdf)
  – redundant write-ins (e.g., Leon County, see leonovervote.pdf)
• many overvotes were Bush+ or Gore+
  – adjacent holes (e.g., on the butterfly ballot)
  – adjacent bubbles (e.g., Lieberman-Libertarian in Lake County)
  – corrected mistakes (e.g., Leon County, see leonovervote.pdf)
  – redundant write-ins (e.g., Leon County, see leonovervote.pdf)

• WHAT IF BETTER ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES HAD BEEN USED?
Votes and Allocated Overvotes in Florida, 2000 Presidential Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vote Counts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Results:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Total</td>
<td>2,911,215</td>
<td>2,911,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Absentee</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Total</td>
<td>2,912,790</td>
<td>2,912,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncounted Election-day Ballots:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unambiguous Write-ins</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous Write-ins</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-mark Overvotes</td>
<td>15,236</td>
<td>39,148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-mark Overvotes</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>29,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Allocated Overvotes</td>
<td>24,288</td>
<td>70,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: a “November 7, 2000 General Election Official Results,” Florida Department of State. b “Florida Ballots Project Data Files,” NORC.
Write-in Overvotes in Florida Counties with Optical Scan Machines, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabulation</th>
<th>Unambiguous</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ratio: Write-in to Certified</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Write-in Overvotes in Florida Counties with Optical Scan Machines, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Unambigious</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Ratio: Write-in to Certified</th>
<th>Tabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwannee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Unambiguous Bush</td>
<td>Unambiguous Gore</td>
<td>Ambiguous Bush</td>
<td>Ambiguous Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Allocated Overvotes in Florida Counties, 2000 Presidential Election, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabulation</th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Duval</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Miami-Dade</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Palm Beach</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>10,687</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Other</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>8,472</td>
<td>1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—One Page</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—Two Pages</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—One Column</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—Two Columns</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Precinct</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. Prec.—Columbia, Escambia</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand (Union)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allocated Overvotes in Florida Counties, 2000 Presidential Election, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabulation</th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Duval</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Miami-Dade</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Palm Beach</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Other</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—One Page</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—Two Pages</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—One Column</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—Two Columns</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Precinct</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. Prec.—Columbia, Escambia</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand (Union)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Are Many Marks a Vote?

• a simple model with “true voters” and “random voters”
  – true voters always vote to convey a specific voting intention, even though they sometimes make mistakes
  – random voters simply make marks at random

• Assume
  – all voters who mark only one candidate for president are true voters
  – but only a fraction of the voters who make multiple marks for president are true voters
• Assume
  – all voters who mark only one candidate for president are true voters
  – but only a fraction of the voters who make multiple marks for president are true voters

• the conditional Senate voting behavior of the one-mark voters, given their presidential choices, is the standard for the behavior of the true voters in each county

• discrepancies between that standard and the conditional Senate voting behavior of the two-mark or multiple-mark voters are due to the presence of random voters in those groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>One Mark</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>One Mark Bush</td>
<td>One Mark Gore</td>
<td>Two Marks Bush</td>
<td>Two Marks Gore</td>
<td>Multiple Bush</td>
<td>Multiple Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- a simple model with “true voters” and “random voters”
  - let $P_1$ denote the observed proportion of one-mark voters who cast a Senate vote for one of the major party candidates
  - let $P_2$ denote the observed proportion of two-mark voters who do so
• Assume:
  – $P_1$ is the rate at which all true voters vote for a major party candidate
  – $H$ denotes the unknown rate at which random voters vote for a major party candidate
  – $P_2$ is an average of the rates $P_1$ and $H$, weighted by the unknown proportion of true voters among the two-mark voters
  – let $\beta$ denote that proportion

\[ P_2 = \beta P_1 + (1 - \beta)H \]
• for the additional information needed to find $\beta$...
  - let $S_1$ denote the observed proportion of one-mark Bush voters who vote for McCollum instead of Nelson
  - let $S_2$ denote the observed proportion of two-mark Bush voters who do so
• Assume:
  - $S_1$ is the rate at which all true Bush voters choose McCollum over Nelson
  - $R$ denotes the unknown rate at which random voters who happen to have voted for either McCollum or Nelson end up voting for McCollum
  - $S_2$ is an average of the rates $S_1$ and $R$, weighted by the unknown proportion of true voters among the two-mark Bush voters who also voted for either McCollum or Nelson
    - let $\alpha$ denote that proportion
      \[ S_2 = \alpha S_1 + (1 - \alpha) R \]
given

\[ P_2 = \beta P_1 + (1 - \beta)H \] \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ S_2 = \alpha S_1 + (1 - \alpha)R \] \hspace{1cm} (2)

solve for \( \beta \)
• given

\[ P_2 = \beta P_1 + (1 - \beta)H \]  
\[ S_2 = \alpha S_1 + (1 - \alpha)R \]  

• solve for \( \beta \)
  
  – \( \alpha \) is the proportion of true voters among the two-mark Bush voters who also voted for either McCollum or Nelson
• given

\[ P_2 = \beta P_1 + (1 - \beta)H \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)
\[ S_2 = \alpha S_1 + (1 - \alpha)R \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

• solve for \( \beta \)

- \( \alpha \) is the proportion of true voters among the two-mark Bush voters who also voted for either McCollum or Nelson

- equation (1) implies \( \alpha = \beta P_1 / P_2 \)
• given

\[ P_2 = \beta P_1 + (1 - \beta)H \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ S_2 = \alpha S_1 + (1 - \alpha)R \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

• solve for \( \beta \)

  - \( \alpha \) is the proportion of true voters among the two-mark Bush voters who also voted for either McCollum or Nelson
  
  - equation (1) implies \( \alpha = \beta P_1 / P_2 \)
  
  - substituting for \( \alpha \), equation (2) can be solved for \( \beta \)

\[
\beta = \frac{P_2(S_2 - R)}{P_1(S_1 - R)}
\]
• computing $\beta$

$$\beta = \frac{P_2(S_2 - R)}{P_1(S_1 - R)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)
• computing $\beta$

$$\beta = \frac{P_2(S_2 - R)}{P_1(S_1 - R)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

• Assume:
  - random voters who happen to have picked Bush are truly choosing at random between McCollum and Nelson

• then it is reasonable to set $R = 1/2$
• computing $\beta$

$$\beta = \frac{P_2(S_2 - R)}{P_1(S_1 - R)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

• Assume:
  – random voters who happen to have picked Bush are truly choosing at random between McCollum and Nelson
  
  • then it is reasonable to set $R = 1/2$
  • $P_1, P_2, S_1$ and $S_2$ are all observed
  • so the stated model with equation (3) gives a practical procedure for computing the proportion of true votes among the two-mark overvotes allocated to Bush
• computing $\beta$

\[
\beta = \frac{P_2(S_2 - R)}{P_1(S_1 - R)}
\]  

(3)

• Assume:
  – random voters who happen to have picked Bush are truly choosing at random between McCollum and Nelson
• then it is reasonable to set $R = 1/2$
• $P_1$, $P_2$, $S_1$ and $S_2$ are all observed
• so the stated model with equation (3) gives a practical procedure for computing the proportion of true votes among the two-mark overvotes allocated to Bush
• it is straightforward to apply the procedure both to the overvotes allocated to Gore and to the allocated multiple-mark overvotes.
## Estimated True Votes Among the Presidential Overvotes, Ballot Image Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated True Votes Among the Presidential Overvotes, Ballot Image Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>9,522</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>19,185</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | Bush | Gore |
|               | 4,610| 26,922|
## Estimated True Votes Among the Presidential Overvotes, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabulation</th>
<th>Proportion True Votes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two Marks</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Duval</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—One Page</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—Two Pages</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—One Column</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—Two Columns</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Precinct</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. Prec.—Columbia, Escambia</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated True Votes Among the Presidential Overvotes, NORC Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabulation</th>
<th>Two Marks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>16,944</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>6,421</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>23,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votomatic—Duval</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>7,168</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>11,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—One Page</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datavote—Two Pages</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—One Column</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Central—Two Columns</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>4,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Precinct</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. Prec.—Columbia, Escambia</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>29,238</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>17,226</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>46,465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Florida 2000: overvotes

• WHAT IF BETTER ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES HAD BEEN USED?
  – if none of the administrative problems had occurred, then just based on the allocated overvotes that would not have occurred, Gore would have gained a net of more than 35,000 votes
  – if the best type of vote tabulation system used in the state in 2000—precinct-tabulated optical scan ballots with the warn-and-correct systems operational—had been used everywhere in Florida, Gore would have won by more than 30,000 votes
• Bush v. Gore
  – certiorari granted due to “unconstitutional” legislative action by the Florida Supreme Court
  – 7–2 on “equal protection” threats in the recount
  – 5–4 on decision to award the election to Bush
• Bush v. Gore
  – certiorari granted due to “unconstitutional” legislative action by the Florida Supreme Court
  – 7–2 on “equal protection” threats in the recount
  – 5–4 on decision to award the election to Bush

• evaluation (by me and most—not all—legal scholars)
  – thoroughly bogus actions by the court
  – nothing but a partisan power grab
  – see Hasen’s article for a somewhat more balanced review
“The Court’s decision in Bush v Gore has been regarded in many quarters as a travesty of constitutional law incapable of rational defense. Recently, for example, 585 law professors have signed a public letter attacking a conservative and mean-spirited Court for its devious and hypocritical judicial activism.” (Epstein 2001, 13)
• “The Court’s decision in Bush v Gore has been regarded in many quarters as a travesty of constitutional law incapable of rational defense. Recently, for example, 585 law professors have signed a public letter attacking a conservative and mean-spirited Court for its devious and hypocritical judicial activism.” (Epstein 2001, 13)

• the equal protection argument is “a confused nonstarter at best, which deserves much of the scorn that has been heaped upon it” (Epstein 2001, 14)

• Article II, Section I, Clause 2: “Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature Thereof May Direct,” the electors... (Rehnquist, Scalia, Thomas)
• election reform (the “cure”)
• Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA)
  – money for new machines
  – Election Administration Commission
- election reform (the “cure”)
- Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA)
  - money for new machines
  - Election Administration Commission
- late and inadequate
  - standards “are not intended to define appropriate election administration practices” (FEC 2002)
  - underfunded
  - goals set for 2006 not 2004
- see the Election Reform Information Project.
  http://electionline.org/ for updated information
• is new technology better?

• electronic touch screen systems
  – Diebold’s incompetent software
  – needed: voter verifiable paper audit trails (VVPAT) to allow audits and manual recounts
  – but it is a question whether VVPAT solves the security problems
  – see http://www.verifiedvoting.org/ for up to date information
• 2004 Election

• major controversies fueled by discrepancies between exit polls and election outcome

• judgment: the exit polls had a widespread Democratic bias
2004 Election: Florida

- in Florida, “the disturbing fact is that a repetition of the problems of 2000 now seems likely” (Jimmy Carter op-ed)
- actually, no: Florida comprehensively overhauled their election system after 2000
- all votes are precinct tabulated
- some counties use optical scan machines and the rest use direct record electronic (DRE) touchscreen machine

- after 2004, there were assertions that BOTH kinds of machines were hacked
• 2004 Election: Florida

• after 2004, assertions that optical scan machines were hacked

• evidence was disparity between registration and voting

• the answer is that the discrepancies reflect historical voting patterns (see http://macht.arts.cornell.edu/wrm1/commondreams/commondreams.html)
• 2004 Election: Florida

• after 2004, assertions that DRE machines were hacked

• current evidence from ballot and machine-level data shows only minor problems

• an interesting test involves checking whether the second digits in precinct vote counts satisfy Benford’s Law (the 2BL test)

• look at votes for candidates and for ballot initiatives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>digit</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2004 Election: Florida candidates

Bush  Republican presidential candidate
Kerry  Democratic presidential candidate
Martinez  Republican U.S. Senate candidate
Castor  Democratic U.S. Senate candidate
- 2004 Election: Florida amendments
  1. Parental Notification of a Minor’s Termination of Pregnancy
  2. Constitutional Amendments Proposed by Initiative
  3. The Medical Liability Claimant’s Compensation Amendment
  4. Authorizes Miami-Dade and Broward County Voters to Approve Slot Machines in Parimutuel Facilities
  5. Florida Minimum Wage Amendment
  6. Repeal of High Speed Rail Amendment
  7. Patients’ Right to Know About Adverse Medical Incidents
  8. Public Protection from Repeated Medical Malpractice
2004 Election: statewide votes for Florida amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. 1</td>
<td>4,639,635</td>
<td>2,534,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 2</td>
<td>4,574,361</td>
<td>2,109,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 3</td>
<td>4,583,164</td>
<td>2,622,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 4</td>
<td>3,631,261</td>
<td>3,512,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 5</td>
<td>5,198,514</td>
<td>2,097,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 6</td>
<td>4,519,423</td>
<td>2,573,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 7</td>
<td>5,849,125</td>
<td>1,358,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 8</td>
<td>5,121,841</td>
<td>2,083,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 2BL test results for three counties: Miami-Dade, Broward and Pasco
• election day voting and early voting
• the statistic is

\[ X^2_{B_2} = \sum_{i=0}^{9} \frac{(d_{2i} - d_2 q_{B2i})^2}{d_2 q_{B2i}} \]

where

– \( q_{B2i} \) is the expected relative frequency with which the second significant digit is \( i \) (the values shown in the second line of table of Benford’s Law frequencies)
– \( d_{2i} \) is the number of times the second digit is \( i \) among the precincts being considered
– \( d_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{9} d_{2i} \)

• with one set of counts (for one office in one county using one modality), a statistic larger than 16.9 would be worrying
• looking at 120 sets of counts, a statistic larger than 30.1 would be worrying
## Second-digit Benford’s Law (2BL) Tests of 2004 Precinct Vote Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Miami-Dade</th>
<th>Broward</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 757)</td>
<td>(n = 775)</td>
<td>(n = 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 5,186)</td>
<td>(n = 150)</td>
<td>(n = 372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-day</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>e-day</td>
<td>early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 1 Yes</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 1 No</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 2 Yes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 2 No</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 3 Yes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 3 No</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Second-digit Benford's Law (2BL) Tests of 2004 Precinct Vote Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Miami-Dade</th>
<th></th>
<th>Broward</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pasco</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-day</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>e-day</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>e-day</td>
<td>early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 4 Yes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 4 No</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 5 Yes</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 5 No</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 6 Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 6 No</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 7 Yes</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 7 No</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 8 Yes</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 8 No</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 2004 Election: Florida

• after 2004, assertions that DRE machines were hacked

• current evidence from ballot and machine-level data shows only minor problems

• check whether the second digits in precinct vote counts for candidates and for ballot initiatives satisfy Benford’s Law (the 2BL test)

• no statistics are worrisome given that 120 different sets of vote counts are being tested

• not much sign of tampering
• 2004 Election: Ohio
• the Electoral Votes reported from Ohio were challenged in Congress
• Conyers report
• DNC report
  – voting experience survey
  – provisional ballot survey
  – precinct study: machine allocation, turnout, Issue 1, vote misallocation?
• 2004 Election: Ohio

• shortages and misallocations of voting machines caused the worst problems in the form of long waits that deprived many voters of their chances to vote

• there was not widespread misallocation of votes from Kerry to Bush

• support for Issue 1 (anti-gay marriage amendment) was correlated with increases on the order of one percent in voter turnout, which favored Bush
• 2004 Election: Ohio, provisional ballots
• principal reason for casting a provisional ballot is residential mobility
• see the DNC study provisional ballot survey results
2004 Election: Ohio, long lines

- many African American voters left the polls (six percent) but came back later (three percent)
- hence the net equivalence with white voters in turnout effects

- see the DNC study voting experience survey results
• 2004 Election: Ohio, Franklin County
• shortages and misallocations of voting machines caused long waits that deprived many voters of their chances to vote
• see my response to the DoJ letter.
  – the DoJ letter (Tanner to Soulas, June 29, 2005) claiming no VRA problems due to inadequate number of machines
  – my findings: inadequate machines reduced turnout disproportionately in precincts with high proportions of African Americans
  – conservative estimates: turnout was down more than four percent in heavily African American areas but by less than 1.5 percent in areas with few African American
• in my paper (Mebane 2005), see Figures 1 and 7, Tables 1, 5 and 6.
• 2004 Election: Ohio, misallocated votes?
• there was not widespread misallocation of votes from Kerry to Bush
• key results here are two kinds of correlations across precincts:
  1. relationship between Kerry 2004 and Hagan 2002 votes,
  2. relationship between Kerry 2004 votes and 2004 votes for Fungerhut, Issue 1 and voting by African Americans
• for an explanation of the Kerry-Hagan results, see my paper (Mebane 2006)
• the other results, see Mebane and Herron (2005)
• results from applying the 2BL test are mixed (see Mebane 2006)
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  – are preferences single peaked?
  – example: YES
  – preferences:
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    * person F: $y > z > x$
  – each person has an IDEAL POINT
• the spatial model
  – are preferences single peaked?
  – example: NO (when alternatives are not ordered appropriately)
• the spatial model
  – are preferences single peaked?
  – example: NO (when alternatives are not ordered appropriately)
  – preferences (same as before):
    * person D: \(x > y > z\)
    * person E: \(z > y > x\)
    * person F: \(y > z > x\)
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  – there is a one-dimensional spatial model when preferences are single peaked
• which alternative wins in a series of pairwise votes with single-peaked preferences?
  – with single-peaked preferences, the alternative that coincides with the median voter’s ideal point beats every other alternative
  – this is the MEDIAN VOTER THEOREM
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• single-peaked preferences and measures of distance
  – euclidean metrics: \[ d = -b(x_k - x_i)^2 \]
  – symmetry
  – example with same distances for different people
• which alternative wins in a series of pairwise votes?
• the spatial model
• with symmetric single-peaked preferences
• which is to say, in a pure one-dimensional spatial model...
• the spatial model
• with symmetric single-peaked preferences
• which is to say, in a pure one-dimensional spatial model...
• all information about the chooser’s preferences that is relevant for choice behavior is summarized by the chooser’s ideal point
- the spatial model
- representing a continuum of voters with symmetric, single-peaked preferences
- in other words, a one-dimensional spatial electorate
• the spatial model
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• adding party “policy” locations
• the spatial model

• a one-dimensional spatial electorate

• adding party “policy” locations

• counting votes
  – assume: everyone votes in accord with his or her preferences, which means everyone votes for the closest alternative
  – if two alternatives are equally close, the voter chooses each alternative with probability $\frac{1}{2}$
    * i.e., the voter flips a (fair) coin
• a one-dimensional spatial electorate
• where will two parties locate?
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• where will two parties locate?
• assume:
  – parties care only about winning the election
  – the voters act purely in accord with one-dimensional spatial preferences
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examples of inferior choices
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• median convergence is a Nash equilibrium
  – given that both are at the median, neither party can do better by choosing a different location

• sequential moves: the first party anticipates the second party’s response
• with a one-dimensional electorate, where will two parties locate?

• assume:
  – parties care only about winning the election
  – the voters act purely in accord with one-dimensional spatial preferences

• unique equilibrium result: median convergence

• median convergence is a Nash equilibrium
  – given that both are at the median, neither party can do better by choosing a different location

• sequential moves: the first party anticipates the second party’s response

• simultaneous moves: each party anticipates the other’s best response to every possible choice of location
• why do parties diverge?
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• a one-dimensional spatial model with different party motivations
• why do parties diverge?
• a one-dimensional spatial model with different party motivations
• assume parties care about winning and about policy
• result is equilibria with divergence (Roemer)
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• why do parties diverge?
• primary elections
• assume:
  – candidates have to win party primaries first
  – primary voters act purely in accord with one-dimensional spatial preferences
• if primary voters look ahead and vote strategically in the primaries in order to win the general election, general electorate median convergence again occurs
• why do parties diverge?
• why do parties diverge?
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• third parties

• assume:
  – the major parties choose positions first
  – then a third party may enter (i.e., choose a position)
  – this is a Stackelberg entry model
  – all parties care only about winning the election (plurality rule)
  – the voters act purely in accord with one-dimensional spatial preferences
• third parties and major party divergence
• suppose the major parties enter stacked up at the median
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• suppose the major parties diverge slightly from the median, asymmetrically
  – entering in the middle the third party loses, but may be able to determine the winner
  – a third party entering slightly more extreme than the major party that remains closest to the median may win in some cases
  – hence any equilibrium should feature a symmetric major party arrangement, away from the median
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• suppose the major parties enter stacked up at the median
  – a third party entering slightly to either side wins

• suppose the major parties diverge slightly from the median, asymmetrically
  – entering in the middle the third party loses, but may be able to determine the winner
  – a third party entering slightly more extreme than the major party that remains closest to the median may win in some cases
  – hence any equilibrium should feature a symmetric major party arrangement, away from the median

• are there positions where the major parties can avoid being outflanked?
- third parties and major party divergence
- suppose the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles
• third parties and major party divergence

• suppose the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles
  – a third party entering slightly more extreme than either major party loses but also causes the one it is near to lose
  – entering between the major parties the third party loses but again can determine the winner
  – but each major party is sure of finishing no worse than second
  – the third party maximizes the number of votes it receives (25 percent) by locating somewhere (anywhere) in the middle
• third parties and major party divergence

• suppose the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles
  – a third party entering slightly more extreme than either major party loses but also causes the one it is near to lose
  – entering between the major parties the third party loses but again can determine the winner
  – but each major party is sure of finishing no worse than second
  – the third party maximizes the number of votes it receives (25 percent) by locating somewhere (anywhere) in the middle

• since the third party cannot win, perhaps it does not enter after the major parties choose the polarized locations
• third parties and major party divergence

• unique equilibrium result with the Stackelberg entry rules: the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles
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  - if the third party is acting to maximize the number of votes it receives, it locates somewhere (anywhere) between the two major parties
  - if the third party is acting to win the election, it may be deterred from entering at all
  - a third party may be deterred from entering if it must get votes sufficient to overcome a sufficiently large cost
• third parties and major party divergence

• unique equilibrium result with the Stackelberg entry rules: the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles

• by finishing no worse than second, this position dominates all others given trembles
  – if the third party is acting to maximize the number of votes it receives, it locates somewhere (anywhere) between the two major parties
  – if the third party is acting to win the election, it may be deterred from entering at all
  – a third party may be deterred from entering if it must get votes sufficient to overcome a sufficiently large cost
  – if the third party is acting to get above a small threshold number of votes, it may enter anywhere
• third parties and major party divergence

• unique equilibrium result with the Stackelberg entry rules: the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles

• examples (?):
  – if the third party is acting to maximize the number of votes it receives, it locates somewhere (anywhere) between the two major parties: Perot in 1992
Perot in 1992?
• third parties and major party divergence

• unique equilibrium result with the Stackelberg entry rules:
  the major parties locate at the first and third quartiles

• examples (?):
  – if the third party is acting to get above a small threshold
    number of votes, it may enter anywhere: Green Party
    (and St. Ralph) in 2000
St. Ralph in 2000?
• with plurality rule elections, strategic voters may cause the number of parties to be reduced
• that is, with strategic voters, only a limited number of parties may get votes
• example: consider again St. Ralph in 2000
St. Ralph in 2000?
• with plurality rule elections, strategic voters may also cause the number of parties to be reduced

• wasted vote logic:
  – voters whose first choice is clearly losing vote instead for a second choice, in order to defeat a much worse alternative
• with plurality rule elections, strategic voters may also cause the number of parties to be reduced

• wasted vote logic:
  – voters whose first choice is clearly losing vote instead for a second choice, in order to defeat a much worse alternative

• with a plurality rule election, this generally leads to only two parties getting a positive number of votes

• this is another path to Duverger’s Law, driven by voters, not elites
how many parties? start with 4
• with plurality rule elections, strategic voters may also cause the number of parties to be reduced

• wasted vote logic

• with a plurality rule election, this generally leads to only two parties getting a positive number of votes
• with plurality rule elections, strategic voters may also cause the number of parties to be reduced

• wasted vote logic

• with a plurality rule election, this generally leads to only two parties getting a positive number of votes

• exceptions:
  – a third party gets votes from those who have the two leading parties tied as the worst alternatives
  – if there are many ties in preferences, more than two parties may get a positive number of votes
  – if the distribution of initial preferences is nearly even, more than two parties may get a positive number of votes
• Duverger’s Law with plurality rule elections
  – strategic elites may reduce the number of coalitions to two
  – strategic voters, using wasted vote logic, may give only two parties a positive number of votes
• Duverger’s Law with plurality rule elections
  – strategic elites may reduce the number of coalitions to two
  – strategic voters, using wasted vote logic, may give only two parties a positive number of votes
• special thresholds may give some voters a reason to vote for a third party
  – example: the Green Party in 2000
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• spatial models with multiple dimensions
  – there is nothing like a median voter result
  – in general, any position can be defeated

• define: winset of a point $x$
  – the set of positions that defeat $x$ in a pairwise contest

• e.g., in one dimension, the winset of the median is empty (i.e., is the empty set), while every other point has a nonempty winset

• in two dimensions...
• a two-dimensional spatial model

• two-dimensional separable euclidean preferences:
\[d = \left[ (x_k - x_i)^2 + (y_k - y_i)^2 \right]^{1/2}\]

• an example with three voters
Three Voters with Separable Euclidean Preferences
• a two-dimensional spatial model

• two-dimensional separable euclidean preferences:

\[ d = \left[ (x_k - x_i)^2 + (y_k - y_i)^2 \right]^{1/2} \]

• with two-dimensional spatial preferences, in general the winset of any point \( x \) is not empty

• with separable preferences, the median on one dimension can be defeated by alternatives that shift along both dimensions

• with nonseparable preferences, a one-dimensional median is even more unstable
two-dimensional nonseparable euclidean preferences:

\[ d = \left[ (x_k - x_i)^2 + (y_k - y_i)^2 + b(x_k - x_i)(y_k - y_i) \right]^{1/2} \]
Three Voters with Nonseparable Euclidean Preferences
• two-dimensional nonseparable euclidean preferences:

\[ d = \left[ (x_k - x_i)^2 + (y_k - y_i)^2 + b(x_k - x_i)(y_k - y_i) \right]^{1/2} \]

• with two-dimensional spatial preferences, whether separable or nonseparable, in general the winset of any point \( x \) is not empty

• with nonseparable preferences, the median on one dimension can be defeated even by alternatives that shift along the same dimension
• the general implication for political strategy: almost every position in a multidimensional policy space can be defeated
• the general implication for political strategy: almost every position in a multidimensional policy space can be defeated

• the Legislator’s Dilemma
  – running for reelection based on one’s rollcall voting record almost surely means one will be defeated
  – hence, in theory at least, incumbents run on pork, reputation and similar nonspatial things
  – in practice the only thing that works is to suppress the challenger
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  – running for reelection based on one’s rollcall voting record almost surely means one will be defeated
  – hence, in theory at least, incumbents run on pork, reputation and similar nonspatial things
  – in practice the only thing that works is to suppress the challenger
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Strategy of Ambiguity
• the general implication for political strategy: almost every position in a multidimensional policy space can be defeated

• the strategy of matching

• response: the strategy of ambiguity
- the general implication for political strategy: almost every position in a multidimensional policy space can be defeated
- the strategy of matching
- response: the strategy of ambiguity
- the strategy of ambiguity fails, if voters are risk averse
• three types of negative campaigning
  1. highlighting nonspatial characteristics
• three types of negative campaigning
  1. highlighting nonspatial characteristics
  2. matching
• three types of negative campaigning
  1. highlighting nonspatial characteristics
  2. matching
  3. asserting the opponent is ambiguous ("flip-flop")
• instability with multidimensional spatial preferences
• the chaos theorems
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• the chaos theorems
  – there is a finite path of pairwise majority votes from any alternative to any other alternative, and back
  – power of the agenda setter given sincere voters
• an example with three voters
Three Voters
• Pareto set:
  - the set of all points that are not unanimously inferior to any other point
• Pareto set:
  – the set of all points that are not unanimously inferior to any other point

• each point in the Pareto set
  1. is not unanimously inferior to any other point
  2. is unanimously superior to at least one other point
Three Voters with Pareto Set
Three Voters Facing an Agenda
Indifference Curves At Status Quo
Indifference Curves At First Alternative
Indifference Curves At Second Alternative
Indifference Curves At Third Alternative
Indifference Curves at Each Point of the Agenda

At Status Quo

At First Alternative

At Second Alternative

At Final Alternative
• instability with multidimensional spatial preferences
• the chaos theorems
  – there is a finite path of pairwise majority votes from any alternative to any other alternative, and back
  – power of the agenda setter given sincere voters
• in an election campaign, what’s illustrated here with fixed dimensions might be accomplished instead using salience manipulations
• strategic voters can keep outcomes inside the Pareto set
Indifference Curves At Status Quo, with Pareto Set
Indifference Curves At First Alternative, with Pareto Set
- instability with multidimensional spatial preferences
- strategic voters can keep outcomes inside the Pareto set
  - technically, strategic voters can keep outcomes inside a smaller set, the “uncovered set”
• instability with multidimensional spatial preferences

• strategic voters can keep outcomes inside the Pareto set
  – technically, strategic voters can keep outcomes inside a smaller set, the “uncovered set”

• that’s with a prespecified, public agenda
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• strategic voters can keep outcomes inside the Pareto set
  – technically, strategic voters can keep outcomes inside a smaller set, the “uncovered set”

• that’s with a prespecified, public agenda

• one can get a similar result with an unknown agenda, if voters are risk averse
  – a voter does not support “extreme” alternatives that are very favorable to the voter if they are outside the Pareto set, due to the risk of getting outcomes that swing wildly far away
• is turnout down?
  – yes, from 1960 until 2000 (with a bump up in 1992), if voting age population (VAP) is used
  – not so much, if voting eligible population (VEP) is used (see turnou2.gif from McDonald’s webpage)
  – hence, the correct answer is mostly not, considering the VEP older than 21 years (as per McDonald and Popkin)
is turnout down?
- yes, from 1960 until 2000 (with a bump up in 1992), if voting age population (VAP) is used
- not so much, if voting eligible population (VEP) is used (see turnou2.gif from McDonald’s webpage)
- hence, the correct answer is mostly not, considering the VEP older than 21 years (as per McDonald and Popkin)

turnout was up substantially in 2004

aggressive mobilization was one key there, although policy separation between the parties was also at an all-time high

Bush (Rove’s “72 hour campaign”) seems to have outmobilized Kerry (MoveOn and ACT); clearly so in Ohio
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• vote only if the difference between the candidates is sufficiently large
  – $V_A$: value of candidate $A$
  – $V_Z$: value of candidate $Z$
  – $C$: net cost of voting
  – vote if
    \[ |V_A - V_Z| - C > 0 \]

• but this does not explicitly incorporate the elector’s own behavior or its consequences
• rational choice turnout models
  – \( P \): probability that one’s vote decides the election
  – \( B \): net benefit from having one’s preferred alternative win
  – \( C \): net cost of voting
  – vote if
    \[
    PB - C > 0
    \]

• how big are \( P, B \) and \( C \)?
• rational choice turnout models
  – $P$: probability that one’s vote decides the election
  – $B$: net benefit from having one’s preferred alternative win
  – $C$: net cost of voting
  – vote if
    \[ PB - C > 0 \]
• how big are $P$, $B$ and $C$?
• size of $P$: see “Am I Decisive?”
• size of $B$: think about taxes and about public goods
• rational choice turnout models
  – $P$: probability that one’s vote decides the election
  – $B$: net benefit from having one’s preferred alternative win
  – $C$: net cost of voting
  – $D$: “duty”
  – vote if

  $$PB - C + D > 0$$

• if $PB$ is small, everything depends on $D$
• rational choice turnout models
  – $P$: probability that one’s vote decides the election
  – $B$: net benefit from having one’s prefered alternative win
  – $C$: net cost of voting
  – $D$: “duty”
  – vote if
    \[ PB - C + D > 0 \]
  – if $PB$ is small, everything depends on $D$
  – groups: $D = I + G$, combining individually felt and group-supplied benefits
• turnout
• turnout
  – closeness and turnout in 2004 (Henry Brady’s graphs [turnout.pdf and turndet.pdf])
• turnout
  – closeness and turnout in 2004 (Henry Brady’s graphs [turnout.pdf and turndet.pdf])
  – strategic abstention and strategic ignorance (Downs)
• demographic factors and turnout:
  – age
  – education
  – income and socioeconomic status (SES)
  – race

• demographics and rational choice turnout models
  – vote if
    \[ PB - C + D > 0 \]
  – demographic factors variously affect \( B \) (as perceived), \( C \) (efficacy) and \( D \) (through both \( I \) and \( G \))
• turnout
  – “roll-off” (also a measure of the “residual vote”)
• turnout
  – “roll-off” (also a measure of the “residual vote”)
  – racially related (motivated?) abstention (Herron-Sekhon 2004)
    * “the African-American residual vote rate will shrink in contests with black candidates”
    * supporting evidence from 1998 in Cook County, Illinois
    * some evidence also of “discretionary residual votes” among white voters facing a strong black incumbent; others have argued for such demobilizing effects more generally.
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• unified models: vote choice with abstention
  – vote only if the difference between the candidates is sufficiently large

• define for each potential voter
  – $V_A$: value of candidate $A$
  – $V_Z$: value of candidate $Z$
  – $C$: net cost of voting

• the values $V_A$, $V_Z$ and $C$ do not necessarily indicate a rational choice.

• for example, they may summarize predispositions from unconsidered habits; in that case this formulation is a bit misleading
• define for each potential voter
  – $V_A$: value of candidate $A$
  – $V_Z$: value of candidate $Z$
  – $C$: net cost of voting

• general rules:
  – vote only if $|V_A - V_Z| > C$
  – choose $A$ if $V_A > V_Z$
  – choose $Z$ if $V_Z > V_A$
• vote choice models
  - choose A if $V_A > V_Z$
  - choose Z if $V_Z > V_A$
• vote choice models
  – choose $A$ if $V_A > V_Z$
  – choose $Z$ if $V_Z > V_A$
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  – KM say that an explanation is better if it “(a) shows a stronger, nonspurious statistical association with voters’ choices, (b) involves a more believable (and nontrivial) account of the way voters arrive at their decisions, and (c) permits one to predict voters’ choices more accurately”
  – “Any decision may be thought of as involving both a set of considerations (conscious or unconscious) and a rule (conscious or unconscious) in accordance with which these considerations are weighed” (KM)
• “the simple act of voting” (Kelley-Mirer, APSR 1974)
  – presented as a response to the weighted-sum kind of method associated with the Michigan school (to be examined momentarily)
  – KM say that an explanation is better if it “(a) shows a stronger, nonspurious statistical association with voters’ choices, (b) involves a more believable (and nontrivial) account of the way voters arrive at their decisions, and (c) permits one to predict voters’ choices more accurately”
  – “Any decision may be thought of as involving both a set of considerations (conscious or unconscious) and a rule (conscious or unconscious) in accordance with which these considerations are weighed” (KM)
  – use the NES likes-dislikes items and party identification
• NES likes-dislikes items: parties
  – Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?
  – Is there anything in particular that you don’t like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don’t like about the Democratic Party]?
  – Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?
  – Is there anything in particular that you don’t like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don’t like about the Republican Party]?
• NES likes-dislikes items: candidates
  – Is there anything in particular about (Democratic presidential candidate) that might make you want to vote for him? What is that? Anything else?
  – Is there anything in particular about (Democratic presidential candidate) that might make you want to vote against him? What is that? Anything else?
  – Is there anything in particular about (Republican presidential candidate) that might make you want to vote for him? What is that? Anything else?
  – Is there anything in particular about (Republican presidential candidate) that might make you want to vote against him? What is that? Anything else?
• “the simple act of voting” (Kelley-Mirer)

• consider the NES likes-dislikes items
  – record up to five “mentions” from each respondent

• compute
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  – \(R_{cD} = \text{number of Rep candidate dislikes}\)
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  \[ S = D_{pL} + D_{cL} - D_{pD} - D_{cD} + R_{pD} + R_{cD} - R_{pL} - R_{cL} \]
• decision rule:
  – vote Dem if \( S > 0 \)
  – vote Rep if \( S < 0 \)
  – if \( S = 0 \), use party identification to break the tie
• “the simple act of voting” (Kelley-Mirer)

• consider the NES likes-dislikes items
  – record up to five “mentions” from each respondent

• compute net score:
  \[ S = D_{pL} + D_{cL} - D_{pD} - D_{cD} + R_{pD} + R_{cD} - R_{pL} - R_{cL} \]

• decision rule:
  – vote Dem if \( S > 0 \)
  – vote Rep if \( S < 0 \)
  – if \( S = 0 \), use party identification to break the tie

• performance: in NES data from 1952, 1956, 1960 and 1964 they correctly predicted about 88 percent of respondents’ self-reports of their vote choices
• “the simple act of voting” (Kelley-Mirer, APSR 1974)
  - KM say that an explanation is better if it “(a) shows a stronger, nonspurious statistical association with voters’ choices, (b) involves a more believable (and nontrivial) account of the way voters arrive at their decisions, and (c) permits one to predict voters’ choices more accurately”

• concerns
• “the simple act of voting” (Kelley-Mirer, APSR 1974)
  – KM say that an explanation is better if it “(a) shows a
    stronger, nonspurious statistical association with voters’
    choices, (b) involves a more believable (and nontrivial)
    account of the way voters arrive at their decisions, and
    (c) permits one to predict voters’ choices more
    accurately”

• concerns
  – spuriousness: mentioned considerations may not faithfully
    represent the factors that changed voters’ opinions
  – endogeneity due to rationalization: voters may decide
    who they will vote for then look for reasons to tell others
  – likes-dislikes are strongly correlated with partisanship, so
    maybe the model is basically party ID
• vote choice models
  – choose $A$ if $V_A > V_Z$
  – choose $Z$ if $V_Z > V_A$
• vote choice models
  – choose $A$ if $V_A > V_Z$
  – choose $Z$ if $V_Z > V_A$
• the Michigan model
• the Michigan model
• has party identification (party ID, PID) at its core
• claims voting decisions depend on party ID and other attitudes
• NES standard question format:
  – “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?”
  – (IF REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT) “Would you call yourself a strong (REPUBLICAN/Democrat) or a not very strong (REPUBLICAN/Democrat)?”
  – (IF INDEPENDENT, OTHER [1966 and later: OR NO PREFERENCE]):) “Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?”

• result: seven-point index of party ID
  – Strong Democrat, Weak Democrat, Independent Democrat, Independent, Independent Republican, Weak Republican, Strong Republican
  – a scattering of people are Apolitical, identify with a third party (very rare), don’t know or refuse to answer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PID</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Democrat</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Democrat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Democrat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Republican</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Republican</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Republican</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolitical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NES Party ID item in 2004:

V043116 J1x. Summary: R party ID

PRE-ELECTION SURVEY:

QUESTION:

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a REPUBLICAN, a DEMOCRAT, an INDEPENDENT, or what? Would you call yourself a STRONG [Democrat/Republican] or a NOT VERY STRONG [Democrat/Republican]? Do you think of yourself as CLOSER to the Republican Party or to the Democratic party?
VALID CODES:
----------------
0. Strong Democrat (2/1/.)
1. Weak Democrat (2/5-8-9/.)
2. Independent-Democrat (3-4-5/./.5)
3. Independent-Independent
   (3/.3-8-9 ; 5/./3-8-9 if not apolitical)
4. Independent-Republican (3-4-5/./.1)
5. Weak Republican (1/5-8-9/.)
6. Strong Republican (1/1/.)
7. Other; minor party; refuses to say (9/./. ; 4/.3-8-9)

MISSING CODES:
----------------
8. Apolitical (5/.3-8-9 if apolitical)
9. DK (8/./.)
NOTES:

Code combinations in parentheses represent corresponding values in J1/J1a/J1b.
Code 8 (apolitical) was used if R was coded No preference in J1 and also showed little or no interest in politics in response to the following survey questions:
A1 (Pre) Interest in campaigns
A12 (Pre) Care about Congressional race outcome
C1a/C1b (Post) Voted
E4 (Post) Follow public affairs
Respondents coded 'no preference' in J1 who showed interest in politics were coded 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>Dec 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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  – a “standing decision” (Campbell), but not the same as the current vote choice, or even many recent vote choices
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    * leaners are at least as partisan in their current vote choices as partisans are
• what is party ID?
  – a “standing decision” (Campbell), but not the same as the current vote choice, or even many recent vote choices
    * pure independents versus leaners
    * leaners are at least as partisan in their current vote choices as partisans are
  – a “socialized” attribute: early adult or even childhood acquisition that subsequently changes only rarely
    * childish habit? (“I’m a Democrat because my daddy was a Democrat” [American Voter])
• what is party ID?
  – a “standing decision” (Campbell), but not the same as
    the current vote choice, or even many recent vote
    choices
    ∗ pure independents versus leaners
    ∗ leaners are at least as partisan in their current vote
      choices as partisans are
  – a “socialized” attribute: early adult or even childhood
    acquisition that subsequently changes only rarely
    ∗ childish habit? (“I’m a Democrat because my daddy
      was a Democrat” [American Voter])
  – retrospective treatment: a “running tally”; fully rational,
    even Bayesian update of the parties’ records in office?
    ∗ “contextual partisanship”: responding to the current
      campaign, in particular to the candidates’ positions
    ∗ e.g., 1984 (Mondale versus Hart)
• party ID and voting behavior in presidential elections
• the normal vote: regular frequencies of turning out and choosing candidates
• party ID and voting behavior in presidential elections

• the normal vote: regular frequencies of turning out and choosing candidates
  – strong partisans are most likely to vote and highly loyal (about 98%)
  – weak partisans are slightly less likely to vote and somewhat less loyal (about 95% for Republicans, about 93% for Democrats)
  – leaners are somewhat less likely to vote than weak partisans, but no less loyal (Republicans) or more loyal (Democrats)
  – pure independents are much less likely to vote
• a normal vote analysis takes the party ID long-run frequencies as a baseline and then evaluations deviations from those as due to the effects of “short-term forces”

• short-term forces include a short list of other attitudes: domestic and foreign policy issues; characteristics of the candidates; economic evaluations
party ID and voting behavior in presidential elections

the weighted-sum kind method: specify attitudes as a vector field, i.e., each person is a regression equation

all attitudes, including party ID, are treated symmetrically
• each person is a (probit) regression equation

• define:

\[
y_i = \begin{dcases} 
 REP & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\
 DEM & \text{if } y_i^* < 0
\end{dcases}
\]

\[
y_i^* = b_0 + b_1 PID_i + b_2 POLD_i + b_3 POLR_i + b_4 CAND_i + b_5 CANR_i + b_6 ECON_i + e_i
\]
• each person is a (probit) regression equation

• define:

\[ y_i = \begin{cases} 
    REP & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\
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\end{cases} \]

\[ y_i^* = b_0 + b_1 PID_i + b_2 POLD_i + b_3 POLR_i + b_4 CAND_i + b_5 CANR_i + b_6 ECON_i + e_i \]

• measure the attitudes with survey data, estimate the coefficients
• each person is a (probit) regression equation

• define:

\[ y_i = \begin{cases} 
REP & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\
DEM & \text{if } y_i^* < 0 
\end{cases} \]

\[ y_i^* = b_0 + b_1 PID_i + b_2 POLD_i + b_3 POLR_i + b_4 CAND_i + b_5 CANR_i + b_6 ECON_i + e_i \]

• measure the attitudes with survey data, estimate the coefficients

• referring to
  - choose A if \( V_A > V_Z \)
  - choose Z if \( V_Z > V_A \)

\[ y_i^* = V_A - V_Z \]
• each person is a (probit) regression equation
• an example: the Bush-Gore vote choice in 2000 (NES data)
questions to measure the variables:

\( y_i \), vote choice (CF0704a) “(IF R VOTED:) How about the election for President? Did you vote for a candidate for President? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?”

PID (CF0301) “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?” (IF REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT) “Would you call yourself a strong (REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRAT) or a not very strong (REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRAT)?” (IF INDEPENDENT, OTHER [1966 and later: OR NO PREFERENCE]):) “Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?”
• questions to measure the variables:

Intelligent Dem (CF0350) “I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures... Think about Al Gore. The first phrase is ‘intelligent.’ In your opinion, does the phrase ‘intelligent’ describe Al Gore extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all?”

Intelligent Rep (CF0362) “I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures... Think about George W. Bush. The first phrase is ‘intelligent.’ In your opinion, does the phrase ‘intelligent’ describe George W. Bush extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all?”
• questions to measure the variables:

National Economy (CF0872) “What about the next 12 months? ALL YEARS EXC. 2000: VERSION 1: Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get better, stay about the same, or get worse? VERSION 2: Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get worse, stay about the same, or get better?”
questions to measure the variables:

Libcon Self (CF0803) “(ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE:) We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R) (2000 TELEPHONE) When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven’t you thought much about this?”
• questions to measure the variables:

Libcon Dem (CF9088) “We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place Al Gore on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)”

Libcon Rep (CF9096) “Where would you place George Bush on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)”
• response codes used to measure the variables:
  vote choice Democrat, 1; Republican, 2
  PID create a set of “dummy variables”
    PID: strong Dem (1 if Strong Democrat, 0 otherwise)
    PID: weak Dem (1 if Weak Democrat, 0 otherwise)
    PID: lean Dem (1 if Democrat leaner, 0 otherwise)
    PID: Independent (1 if Pure Independent, 0 otherwise)
    PID: lean Rep (1 if Republican leaner, 0 otherwise)
    PID: weak Rep (1 if Weak Republican, 0 otherwise)
    PID: strong Rep (1 if Strong Republican, 0 otherwise)
• response codes used to measure the variables:
  Intelligent Dem, Intelligent Rep Not well at all, 0; Not too well, 1; Quite well, 2; Extremely well, 4
  National Economy Better, 1; Same, 0; Worse, −1
  Libcon Self, Libcon Dem, Libcon Rep Extremely liberal, 1; Liberal, 2; Slightly liberal, 3; Moderate, middle of the road, 4; Slightly conservative, 5; Conservative, 6; Extremely conservative, 7
  Dem Distance |(Libcon Self) – (Libcon Dem)|
  Rep Distance |(Libcon Self) – (Libcon Rep)|
• each person is a (probit) regression equation

• an example: the Bush-Gore vote choice in 2000 (NES data)

• define:

\[ y_i^* = b_0 + b_1(\text{PID: weak Dem})_i + b_2(\text{PID: lean Dem})_i \\
+ b_3(\text{PID: Independent})_i + b_4(\text{PID: lean Rep})_i \\
+ b_5(\text{PID: weak Rep})_i + b_6(\text{PID: strong Rep})_i \\
+ b_7(\text{Intelligent Dem})_i + b_8(\text{Intelligent Rep})_i \\
+ b_9(\text{Dem Distance})_i + b_{10}(\text{Rep Distance})_i \\
+ b_{11}(\text{National Economy})_i + e_i \]

\[ y_i = \begin{cases} 
REP & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\
DEM & \text{if } y_i^* < 0 
\end{cases} \]
Probit Regression Scores and Corresponding Probability
### 2000 Presidential Vote Choices (NES, Probit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-stat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>−2.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>−3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: weak Dem</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: lean Dem</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: Independent</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: lean Rep</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: weak Rep</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID: strong Rep</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Dem</td>
<td>−0.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>−2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Rep</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem Distance</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Distance</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>−4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Economy</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probit Regression Probabilities, 2000 Presidential Votes
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Probit Regression Probabilities, 2004 Presidential Votes
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• the Michigan model

• concerns
  – predictive ability: not bad, but not terrific; circa 70%–85% correctly classified
  – complexity
    * for voters: do people really think like that? are decisions vectors?
    * for analysts: models! statistics! ick!
• the Michigan model
• concerns
  – meaningfulness: do the attitudes exist?
    * nonresponse
• the Michigan model

• concerns
  – meaningfulness: do the attitudes exist?
    * nonresponse
    * nonattitudes: symptom, choosing the middle of the scale
## NES Libcon Self Placements, Percentage within Study Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-placement</th>
<th>’84</th>
<th>’86</th>
<th>’88</th>
<th>’90</th>
<th>’92</th>
<th>’94</th>
<th>’96</th>
<th>’98</th>
<th>’00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Liberal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate, Middle of Road</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Conservative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Conservative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• the Michigan model

• concerns
  – meaningfulness: do the attitudes exist?
    * nonresponse
    * nonattitudes: symptom, choosing the middle of the scale
    * nonattitudes: symptom, response instability over time
    * nonattitudes: symptom, inability to explain one’s position
• the Michigan model

• concerns
  – meaningfulness: do the attitudes exist?
    * nonresponse
    * nonattitudes
  – spuriousness: voters’ opinions are for the most part strongly correlated with party ID
• the Michigan model

• concerns
  – meaningfulness: do the attitudes exist?
    * nonresponse
    * nonattitudes
  – spuriousness: voters’ opinions are for the most part strongly correlated with party ID
  – endogeneity: are the opinions causes or consequences of the vote choice?
• vote choice models
  – choose $A$ if $V_A > V_Z$
  – choose $Z$ if $V_Z > V_A$

• the spatial model (i.e., it’s almost all spatial)
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• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates
  – spatial characteristics are defined by distances from each voter’s ideal point, in however many dimensions
  – nonspatial characteristics are defined by simple positive responsiveness: more is always better (or less is always better)
  – nonspatial characteristics are also known as valence issues
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• the spatial model (i.e., it’s almost all spatial)

• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates
  – spatial characteristics are defined by distances from each voter’s ideal point, in however many dimensions
  – nonspatial characteristics are defined by simple positive responsiveness: more is always better (or less is always better)
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• the spatial model (i.e., it’s almost all spatial)
• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates
  – spatial characteristics are defined by distances from each voter’s ideal point, in however many dimensions
  – nonspatial characteristics are defined by simple positive responsiveness: more is always better (or less is always better)
  – nonspatial characteristics are also known as valence issues
    * examples:
    * candidate traits (intelligent, strong leader, etc.)
    * economic performance (complicated: growth, unemployment, inflation, income)
• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates

• one spatial dimension:
  – voter $i$’s ideal point: $x_i$
  – candidates’ positions: $x_A, x_Z$
  – candidates’ nonspatial attributes: $w_A, w_Z$
  – unobserved random components: $e_{Ai}, e_{Zi}$
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• one spatial dimension:
  – voter $i$’s ideal point: $x_i$
  – candidates’ positions: $x_A, x_Z$
  – candidates’ nonspatial attributes: $w_A, w_Z$
  – unobserved random components: $e_{Ai}, e_{Zi}$

$$V_{Ai} = -|x_i - x_A| + w_A + e_{Ai}$$
$$V_{Zi} = -|x_i - x_Z| + w_Z + e_{Zi}$$
• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates

• several \((m)\) spatial dimensions:
  - voter \(i\)’s ideal point: \((x_{1i}, \ldots, x_{mi})\)
  - candidates’ positions: \((x_{1A}, \ldots, x_{mA}), (x_{1Z}, \ldots, x_{mZ})\)
  - candidates’ nonspatial attributes: \(w_A, w_Z\)
  - unobserved random components: \(e_{Ai}, e_{Zi}\)
• distinguish spatial from nonspatial characteristics of candidates

• several \((m)\) spatial dimensions:
  – voter \(i\)’s ideal point: \((x_{1i}, \ldots, x_{mi})\)
  – candidates’ positions: \((x_{1A}, \ldots, x_{mA}), (x_{1Z}, \ldots, x_{mZ})\)
  – candidates’ nonspatial attributes: \(w_A, w_Z\)
  – unobserved random components: \(e_{Ai}, e_{Zi}\)

\[
V_{Ai} = - \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{m} (x_{ki} - x_{kA})^2 \right]^{1/2} + w_A + e_{Ai}
\]

\[
V_{Zi} = - \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{m} (x_{ki} - x_{kZ})^2 \right]^{1/2} + w_Z + e_{Zi}
\]
• if there is only one spatial dimension, it is conventional to interpret it as corresponding to a liberal-conservative dimension

• if there are several spatial dimensions, it is conventional to interpret them as corresponding to distinct issue positions
  – in NES data, the issue positions are measured using self-placement and candidate or party placement items
• in NES data, the issue positions are measured using self-placement and candidate or party placement items
• the selection of issues varies from year to year
• in NES data, the selection of issues varies from year to year (examples)

• Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his/their own.

Where would you place the Democratic party on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R) [used in 1972–1984, 1988, 1992, 1994, 2000]
• in NES data, the selection of issues varies from year to year (examples)

• Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending.

Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R) [used in 1982–2000]
• in NES data, the selection of issues varies from year to year (examples)

• Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.

• several \( m \) spatial dimensions:

• most of the issues used in NES surveys are strongly correlated with libcon, for people who respond to both issues and libcon
  – not everyone cares about (or knows about) all issues: the idea of “issue publics”
• several \((m)\) spatial dimensions:

• most of the issues used in NES surveys are strongly correlated with libcon, for people who respond to both issues and libcon
  – not everyone cares about (or knows about) all issues: the idea of “issue publics”

• how many dimensions are there?
  – the idea of the “basic space”
• several \((m)\) spatial dimensions:
• most of the issues used in NES surveys are strongly correlated with libcon, for people who respond to both issues and libcon
  – not everyone cares about (or knows about) all issues: the idea of “issue publics”
• how many dimensions are there?
  – the idea of the “basic space”
• is partisanship in the basic space?
• suppose we treat everything as spatial, using statistical procedures to map everything onto a conjectured basic space
• especially this has been done by Poole and Rosenthal
• following are results using NES data
Our unfolding results are basically similar to those of Rabinowitz (1978). First, most of the variation of the thermometers is accounted for by three dimensions. Second, the candidates appear near the periphery of the space, although voters are unimodally distributed about the center. (See Figures 1–4. Figures 1 and 3 are the plots obtained for voters, Figures 2 and 4 the plots obtained for nonvoters. Similar plots for 1972 and 1980 are available from the authors on request. Major candidate positions are similar across years. In 1980, Anderson is close to Carter. The contour lines are explained below.)

This second result is at variance with some simple spatial theories which would hold that the candidates should converge to a point in the center of the distribution. One might be inclined to ascribe the extreme placement of the candidates to either lack of graduated discrimination by respondents or to methodological artifact.² Two corroborative pieces of evidence, however, buttress the

²One possibility for methodological artifact can be ruled out. Suppose the thermometers measured not distance but utility and that reported utilities were some nonlinear function of distance, say distance squared. Suppose further that the candidates had converged to a common position. Using
Our second set of evidence on polarization comes from studies of Congress. Fiorina (1974), replicating an earlier study by Strain, found dramatic changes in the roll call positions of a constituency when its representative was replaced by a representative from the opposite party. Similarly, using the same metric unfolding technique used here, but this time on interest group ratings of Congress, Poole (1981) and Poole and Daniels (1982) found a polarized, bimodal Congress. Using their one-dimensional unfolding values, we have confirmed the Strain- Fiorina results for the Senate (see Poole and Rosenthal, 1983; also Bullock and Brady, 1983). Senators from the same state but from different parties are far apart on the dimension, but senators from the same party and the same state tend to be spatial clones.

Even though congressional data and survey data on issue placement of presidential candidates both point to spatial polarization, we remain struck by the extent to which the candidates are at the periphery of the space. Indeed Burnham

---

3 In distinction to the thermometer data, the interest group ratings contain a full range of numerical values and no piling up of implicit "don't knows" on a score of 30. Hence, the polarized positions of the candidates are surely not simply a consequence of these quirks of survey thermometer data.
vented convergence in all runs except one. In that case, on the second wave, a one-dimensional model gave the highest geometric mean. The estimated choice probabilities along the dimension are graphed in Figure 5.

We conjecture that spatial models are as successful as raw thermometers in explaining electoral choice because the thermometers are noisy measurements. In positioning a respondent relative to a given candidate on the basis of the respondent’s set of thermometer rankings and not just the ranking for the candidate, one smooths the error. The basic, commonly shared ideological space is, we further conjecture, of very small dimension. Thus, when one unfolds the thermometer data into higher dimensional spaces, one is basically reintroducing the noise in the original measurements. These conjectures are consistent with the observation that the three-dimensional model typically does not predict as well as a two-dimensional model. The fact that the spatial models do not do even better than thermometers probably reflects the ability of the thermometers to measure, as Pierce (1981) and Fiorina (1981, p. 154) suggest, nonspatial aspects of preference as well as noise.

We emphasize, though, that regardless of nonspatial aspects, thermometer data are consistent with the basic assumptions of spatial theory. For 1980, for example, we do as well by replacing three thermometer ratings for the candidates by a single coordinate, based on the theoretical restrictions of the Euclidean metric and a common perception of candidate locations for all individuals. Sim-

FIGURE 5
One Dimension, 1980

3 See Weisberg (1980) for a discussion of literature demonstrating that when error is present a variety of multivariate techniques will find excessive dimensionality.
• economic performance voting
• pocketbook or sociotropic?
  – cross-sectional NES data says sociotropic
  – but it’s fallacious to use variation over people instead of variation over time (tracing to Kramer 1983)
  – unfortunately time-series relationships are ambiguous to interpret
- a digression on making inferences about economic performance voting: a fallacy of using variation over people instead of variation over time (tracing to Kramer 1983)
  - define personal economic experience and economically related political evaluations:

\[
\begin{align*}
  x_{ti} &= a_0 + q_{ti} + r_{ti} + s_t \\
  y_{ti}^* &= b_0 + r_{ti} + s_t \\
  y_{ti} &= \Phi(y_{ti}^*)
\end{align*}
\]

- \( q_{ti} \): idiosyncratic experience
- \( r_{ti} \): governmentally relevant personal experience
- \( s_t \): governmentally induced collective experience
- \( a_0, b_0 \): constants
- \( \Phi(z) \): normal distribution function (maps argument into (0,1))
• methodological digression

\[ x_{ti} = a_0 + q_{ti} + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti}^* = b_0 + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti} = \Phi(y_{ti}^*) \]

• cross-sectional data: consider relationship between \( x_{ti} \) and \( y_{ti} \) across \( i \) (people) for each \( t \) (time)
Cross-sectional relations for a simulated population
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methodological digression

\[ x_{ti} = a_0 + q_{ti} + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti}^* = b_0 + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti} = \Phi(y_{ti}^*) \]

cross-sectional data: consider relationship between 
\[ x_{ti} - x_{t-1,i} \] (personal changes) and \[ y_{ti} \] across \( i \) (people) for each \( t \) (time)
Cross-sectional changes in $x$ for a simulated population

![Graphs for years 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 showing changes in finances and approval over time.]
• methodological digression

\[ x_{ti} = a_0 + q_{ti} + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti}^* = b_0 + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti} = \Phi(y_{ti}^*) \]

• panel data: consider relationship between \( x_{ti} \) and \( y_{ti} \) across \( t \) (time) for each \( i \) (people)
Individual-level time series relations for a simulated population
• methodological digression

\[ x_{ti} = a_0 + q_{ti} + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti}^* = b_0 + r_{ti} + s_t \]
\[ y_{ti} = \Phi(y_{ti}^*) \]

• aggregate time series data: consider relationship between 
  \((1/n) \sum_{i} x_{ti}\) and \((1/n) \sum_{i} y_{ti}\) (i.e., the averages) across \(t\) (time)
Aggregate time series relations for a simulated population
• economic performance voting

• economics and presidential voting in 2004: unemployment and employment matter
  – state economic changes and state-level pre-election polls (Will Hausberg’s thesis)
  – state-level unemployment increases hurt Bush
  – state-level employment increases helped Bush
  – state-level changes mattered, not national level changes
• congressional elections
• House and Senate
  – biggest difference from presidential races...
• congressional elections
• House and Senate
  – biggest difference from presidential races...
  – incumbent advantage
• congressional elections

• House and Senate
  – biggest difference from presidential races...
  – incumbent advantage
  – noncompetitive races
  – 98 percent reelection rate in the House
  – 90 percent reelection rate in the Senate in recent years (since the mid 1980s)
  – unopposed races
Probit Regression Probabilities, 2004 Presidential Votes
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Probit Regression, 2004 House Votes, Democratic Incumbent
• House and Senate elections
  – importance of constituency service: complicated
    * many know about service (nearly 70 percent of constituents in some cases)
    * but efforts to find strong connections to votes have not borne out
• House and Senate elections
  - relationship between pork and votes is complicated: more pork does not mean more votes
• House and Senate elections
  – relationship between pork and votes is complicated: more pork does not mean more votes
  – reasons
    * general: only discretionary pork that can be attributed to the representative should be considered by voters
    * but a lot of pork is directed at local elites and not at voters
    * besides, not all voters like pork
House and Senate elections

- relationship between pork and votes is complicated: more pork does not mean more votes

- four kinds of House campaigns (Mebane 2000):
  * good service, unopposed incumbent, high contributions (.08)
  * good service, incumbent drops out (.07)
  * bad service, unopposed incumbent, high contributions (.38)
  * bad service, competitive race but incumbent advantage (.47)
• districting in House elections
  – incumbent advantage and gerrymandering
    * incumbent protection
    * partisan districts
• districting in House elections
  – Voting Rights Act
    * majority minority districts: changes over time
    * contiguity and other aesthetics
    * substantive representation and symbolic representation
    * “bleaching” districts
• midterm elections and midterm loss
  – midterm loss: president’s party loses vote share at midterm
  – midterm loss was a reliable pattern through most of the 20th century, except for 1998 and 2002
  – it’s back in 2006
  – why did it happen, why did it go away, why is it back?
- midterm elections and midterm loss
  - midterm loss: president’s party loses vote share at midterm
  - midterm loss was a reliable pattern through most of the 20th century, except for 1998 and 2002
  - it’s back in 2006
  - why did it happen, why did it go away, why is it back?

- alternative possible theories
  - surge and decline (false)
  - economic performance voting (mostly false)
  - “presidential penalty” (Erikson’s term: mostly true)
• midterm loss: two reliable mechanisms seem to exist, one always, the other mostly
  – institutional balancing (based on institutional awareness and strategic voting)
  – ideological shifting
• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
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• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
  – four possible policies: $\theta_{DD}, \theta_{DR}, \theta_{RD}, \theta_{RR}$
  – Fiorina’s model: voters choose the closest policy (sincere voting)
voting model example
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Fiorina model example (sincere voting)
• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
  – four possible policies: $\theta_{DD}$, $\theta_{DR}$, $\theta_{RD}$, $\theta_{RR}$
  – Fiorina’s model with strategic voting: voters choose the closest policy, taking into account how others will vote
strategic voting model example
• models of institutional balancing

• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
  – four possible policies: $\theta_{DD}, \theta_{DR}, \theta_{RD}, \theta_{RR}$
  – Fiorina’s model with strategic voting: voters choose the closest policy, taking into account how others will vote
  – in (coalition-proof Nash) equilibrium, only one group of voters split their tickets
  – hence the observed split tickets all go only one way: they are either all DR or all RD, not some of each
• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
• a more elaborate representation of the institutions and of strategic behavior (Alesina and Rosenthal)
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• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)

• a more elaborate representation of the institutions and of strategic behavior (Alesina and Rosenthal)
  – $\bar{H}$: expected proportion Republican in the legislature
  – $\bar{P}$: probability that Republican wins the presidency
  – $\alpha_D, \alpha_R$: power of president, Democrat or Republican
• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
• a more elaborate representation of the institutions and of strategic behavior (Alesina and Rosenthal)
  – $\bar{H}$: expected proportion Republican in the legislature
  – $\bar{P}$: probability that Republican wins the presidency
  – $\alpha_D$, $\alpha_R$: power of president, Democrat or Republican

$$\tilde{\theta}_D^i = \alpha_D \theta_D^i + (1 - \alpha_D)[\bar{H}\theta_R^i + (1 - \bar{H})\theta_D^i], \quad 0 \leq \alpha_D \leq 1,$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_R^i = \alpha_R \theta_R^i + (1 - \alpha_R)[\bar{H}\theta_R^i + (1 - \bar{H})\theta_D^i], \quad 0 \leq \alpha_R \leq 1$$

expected policy

$$= \bar{P}\tilde{\theta}_R^i + (1 - \bar{P})\tilde{\theta}_D^i$$
• models of institutional balancing
• a president and a legislature (treated as unicameral)
• a more elaborate representation of the institutions and of strategic behavior (Alesina and Rosenthal)
  – $\bar{H}$: expected proportion Republican in the legislature
  – $\bar{P}$: probability that Republican wins the presidency
  – $\alpha_D$, $\alpha_R$: power of president, Democrat or Republican

$$\tilde{\theta}_D^i = \alpha_D \theta_D^i + (1 - \alpha_D)[\bar{H}\theta_R^i + (1 - \bar{H})\theta_D^i], \quad 0 \leq \alpha_D \leq 1,$$
$$\tilde{\theta}_R^i = \alpha_R \theta_R^i + (1 - \alpha_R)[\bar{H}\theta_R^i + (1 - \bar{H})\theta_D^i], \quad 0 \leq \alpha_R \leq 1$$

expected policy $= \bar{P}\tilde{\theta}_R^i + (1 - \bar{P})\tilde{\theta}_D^i$

• with cutpoint equilibria, ticket splits go only one way
Alesina-Rosenthal model: presidential year, uncertain
A-R model: pres. year with post-election policies
A-R model: pres. year with Republican victory certain
A-R model: pres. year with Democratic victory certain
A-R model: pres. year, post-election policies
A-R model: midterm with Republican president
A-R model: midterm with Democratic president
• models of institutional balancing

• in addition to the structural midterm shifts of Alesina and Rosenthal which relate to uncertainty ...

• there is a pattern of midterm shifts in voters’ and nonvoters’ ideal points away from the party of the president
• models of institutional balancing

• in addition to the structural midterm shifts of Alesina and Rosenthal which relate to uncertainty ...

• there is a pattern of midterm shifts in voters’ and nonvoters’ ideal points away from the party of the president
  – Stimson’s averaged opinion poll data going back to 1952
Jim Stimson’s Policy Mood, 1952-2004
• models of institutional balancing

• in addition to the structural midterm shifts of Alesina and Rosenthal which relate to uncertainty ... 

• there is a pattern of midterm shifts in voters’ and nonvoters’ ideal points away from the party of the president
  – NES data going back to 1976
Median Absolute Difference, Self versus Winner’s Party

(a) All Voters and Nonvoters

(b) Independent Independents

(c) Strong Democrats

(d) Democrats

(e) Independent Democrats

(f) Independent Republicans

(g) Republicans

(h) Strong Republicans
## Median Signed Difference, Self versus Both Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>(a) All Voters</th>
<th>(b) Independent Independents</th>
<th>(c) Strong Democrats</th>
<th>(d) Democrats</th>
<th>(e) Independent Democrats</th>
<th>(f) Independent Republicans</th>
<th>(g) Republicans</th>
<th>(h) Strong Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• economics and politics: inequality
• polarized voting in Congress is strongly correlated, over the past 100 years, with measures of income inequality (McCarty, Poole and Rosenthal)
• immigration catalyzes this (M, P, R)
McCarty, Poole, Rosenthal: party polarization and income
McCarty, Poole, Rosenthal: party polarization and income

Top 1% Income Share and House Polarization
1913 - 1998

$r = .73$
McCarty, Poole, Rosenthal: party polarization and immigration

House Polarization vs. Percent Foreign Born
1880 - 2003

$r = .90$
• economics and politics: inequality

• is the elite division that Fiorina diagnoses in Culture War primarily driven by preferences for economic distribution?
• economics and politics: inequality
• is the elite division that Fiorina diagnoses in Culture War primarily driven by preferences for economic distribution?
• party ID is strongly driven by economic position (M, P, R)
  – changes correlated with income since the 1970s are especially pronounced in the South
  – evangelicals are highly sensitive to income
  – this enhances the “accidental” (my term) correlation with “moral issues”: many evangelicals are relatively wealthy
• economics and politics: inequality

• the red-blue state distinction is a distracting illusion
  – within each state, partisan voting intentions are strongly correlated with income (Gelman et al.)
  – similar findings with NES data (Bartels)

• 2006 was importantly about the war in Iraq

• but more profoundly it was about economic inequality

• this will be the dominant agenda item for the near future of American politics