# The Effect of Political Competition on Democratic Accountability
## Online Appendix

Philip Edward Jones
pejones@udel.edu

Department of Political Science and International Relations
University of Delaware
347 Smith Hall
Newark, DE 19716

**Abstract** Representing uncompetitive, homogeneous constituencies is increasingly the norm for American legislators. Extensive research has investigated how competition affects the way representatives respond to their constituents' policy preferences. This paper explores competition's effect on the *other* side of representation, how constituents respond to their legislators' policy record. Combining multiple measures of state competitiveness with large-N survey data, I demonstrate that competition enhances democratic accountability. Voters in competitive states are more interested in politics, more aware of the policy positions their U.S. senators have taken, and more likely to hold them accountable for those positions at election time. Robustness checks show that these effects are not due to the intensity of campaigning in a state: general competition, not particular campaign activities, drives citizens' response. The recent increase in uncompetitive constituencies has likely lessened the degree to which legislators are held accountable for their actions in office.

Table A1: Levels of perceived policy congruence in states and rankings on measures of political competition.

| | % of constituents perceiving | | Rank (and value) of political competition | | |
| | 25% congruence | 75% congruence | Electoral | Ideological | Demographic |
| State | or less | or more | competition | disagreement | diversity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WI | 31.33 | 44.29 | 1 (94.62) | 7 (1.97) | 22 (0.34) |
| FL | 33.20 | 40.19 | 2 (93.57) | 8 (1.91) | 7 (0.45) |
| WA | 30.91 | 44.16 | 3 (93.39) | 1 (2.51) | 13 (0.38) |
| PA | 39.95 | 38.39 | 4 (92.41) | 23 (1.35) | 19 (0.36) |
| MO | 43.05 | 37.37 | 5 (92.10) | 5 (2.14) | 18 (0.37) |
| NJ | 33.04 | 41.46 | 6 (90.80) | 3 (2.35) | 9 (0.44) |
| DE | 49.21 | 39.13 | 7 (89.83) | 18 (1.52) | 11 (0.41) |
| MI | 24.77 | 55.19 | 8 (89.82) | 6 (1.98) | 14 (0.38) |
| ME | 20.91 | 44.98 | 9 (89.13) | 13 (1.73) | 27 (0.30) |
| CA | 27.92 | 44.13 | 10 (87.57) | 2 (2.47) | 1 (0.52) |
| NM | 23.19 | 52.01 | 11 (83.83) | 9 (1.89) | 5 (0.47) |
| OH | 44.22 | 33.19 | 12 (83.26) | 19 (1.5) | 15 (0.37) |
| TX | 35.49 | 39.12 | 13 (82.23) | 11 (1.75) | 2 (0.48) |
| CT | 35.56 | 21.27 | 14 (80.83) | 22 (1.37) | 16 (0.37) |
| MT | 34.56 | 48.44 | 15 (80.55) | 20 (1.47) | 24 (0.34) |
| WV | 29.52 | 45.60 | 16 (76.82) | 25 (0.70) | 23 (0.34) |
| AZ | 39.43 | 37.31 | 17 (76.58) | 17 (1.64) | 8 (0.45) |
| NV | 38.55 | 39.06 | 18 (73.06) | 14 (1.70) | 6 (0.46) |
| VA | 41.04 | 35.27 | 19 (72.67) | 4 (2.33) | 10 (0.41) |
| NY | 20.01 | 50.98 | 20 (71.65) | 16 (1.67) | 3 (0.48) |
| RI | 33.09 | 33.57 | 21 (70.91) | 24 (1.07) | 12 (0.40) |
| WY | 24.88 | 47.63 | 22 (70.47) | 26 (0.57) | 26 (0.32) |
| MA | 21.83 | 53.52 | 23 (68.94) | 10 (1.82) | 17 (0.37) |
| MS | 23.09 | 51.70 | 24 (68.23) | 21 (1.42) | 4 (0.48) |
| UT | 26.70 | 41.98 | 25 (65.08) | 14 (1.70) | 20 (0.35) |
| ND | 18.19 | 62.16 | 26 (63.72) | 27 (0.23) | 25 (0.33) |
| NE | 17.92 | 33.41 | 27 (51.04) | 12 (1.74) | 21 (0.34) |
| | | | | | |
| Mean | 31.17 | 42.79 | 79.75 | 1.65 | .40 |

Note: State's rank on each measure of political competition shown, with the actual value of competition in parentheses. States are ordered by their level of electoral competition, shown in the third column.

Table A2: Correlations between state-level variables.

|  |  | 2006 campaign variables | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Quality challenger | Incumbent spending | Challenger spending |
| General competition variables | Electoral competition | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
|  | Ideological disagreement | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.14 |
|  | Demographic diversity | 0.19 | 0.15 | −0.12 |

Note: Cell entries are Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients between state-level variables. None of the correlations are significant at the .1 level.

Table A3: Multi-level Poisson regression models predicting number of senator's policy positions constituents correctly identified, excluding one policy from scale in turn.

| | Abortion | | Stem cells | | Iraq | | Immigration | | Min. wage | | CAFTA | | Capital gains | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Number of policy positions correct, excluding position on…** | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | 1.26 (0.05) | *** | 1.23 (0.06) | *** | 1.23 (0.06) | *** | 1.24 (0.06) | *** | 1.18 (0.06) | *** | 1.32 (0.05) | *** | 1.24 (0.05) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | −0.02 (0.01) | | −0.02 (0.02) | | −0.02 (0.02) | | −0.02 (0.02) | | −0.02 (0.02) | | −0.03 (0.01) | * | −0.02 (0.01) | |
| High school grads | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.04 (0.02) | * | 0.02 (0.02) | |
| GOP senator | 0.01 (0.07) | | 0.08 (0.08) | | 0.03 (0.08) | | 0.08 (0.08) | | 0.16 (0.08) | * | 0.00 (0.07) | | 0.03 (0.07) | |
| Years in office | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | |
| Committee chair | −0.34 (0.14) | * | −0.29 (0.16) | ^ | −0.32 (0.15) | * | −0.34 (0.15) | * | −0.28 (0.16) | ^ | −0.14 (0.12) | | −0.29 (0.13) | * |
| Electoral competition | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.01 (0.00) | * | 0.01 (0.00) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | 1.23 (0.05) | *** | 1.20 (0.05) | *** | 1.19 (0.05) | *** | 1.21 (0.05) | *** | 1.15 (0.05) | *** | 1.29 (0.05) | *** | 1.21 (0.05) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | 0.00 (0.01) | | −0.01 (0.01) | | −0.01 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | −0.01 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | |
| High school grads | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.02) | | 0.02 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | |
| GOP senator | 0.05 (0.07) | | 0.13 (0.07) | ^ | 0.08 (0.07) | | 0.12 (0.07) | ^ | 0.21 (0.07) | ** | 0.03 (0.07) | | 0.07 (0.06) | |
| Years in office | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | |
| Committee chair | −0.40 (0.13) | ** | −0.34 (0.13) | * | −0.39 (0.13) | ** | −0.42 (0.13) | ** | −0.36 (0.14) | ** | −0.17 (0.11) | | −0.35 (0.11) | ** |
| Ideological disagreement | 0.16 (0.06) | ** | 0.19 (0.07) | ** | 0.20 (0.06) | *** | 0.18 (0.06) | ** | 0.20 (0.07) | ** | 0.18 (0.07) | ** | 0.18 (0.06) | ** |
| Prop. same party | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.01 (0.01) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | 1.22 (0.05) | *** | 1.19 (0.06) | *** | 1.18 (0.05) | *** | 1.2 (0.06) | *** | 1.14 (0.06) | *** | 1.28 (0.05) | *** | 1.20 (0.05) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | 0.01 (0.01) | | −0.01 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | |
| High school grads | 0.02 (0.02) | | 0.03 (0.02) | ^ | 0.03 (0.02) | * | 0.03 (0.02) | | 0.03 (0.02) | ^ | 0.04 (0.02) | * | 0.03 (0.01) | ^ |
| GOP senator | 0.09 (0.07) | | 0.17 (0.08) | * | 0.14 (0.07) | ^ | 0.16 (0.08) | * | 0.26 (0.08) | ** | 0.08 (0.08) | | 0.12 (0.07) | ^ |
| Years in office | 0.01 (0.00) | ^ | 0.01 (0.00) | * | 0.01 (0.00) | * | 0.01 (0.00) | * | 0.01 (0.00) | ^ | 0.01 (0.00) | ^ | 0.01 (0.00) | * |
| Committee chair | −0.40 (0.13) | ** | −0.33 (0.14) | * | −0.38 (0.13) | ** | −0.40 (0.14) | ** | −0.35 (0.14) | * | −0.17 (0.11) | | −0.35 (0.12) | ** |
| Demographic diversity | 2.29 (1.00) | * | 2.63 (1.09) | * | 3.11 (0.98) | ** | 2.34 (1.07) | * | 2.67 (1.10) | * | 2.69 (1.10) | * | 2.45 (0.90) | ** |

^p<.1  *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001

Note: Individual-level variables measuring perceived party congruence, gender, age, income, race, and education are included as in Table 2 but not shown here.

Table A4: Multi-level probit models predicting vote choice for or against incumbent senator, allowing all individual-level coefficients to vary by state.

| | | Model 1: Electoral competition | | Model 2: Ideological disagreement | | Model 3: Demographic diversity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept ($\beta_{0j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{00}$) | 0.97 (0.41) | * | 0.88 (0.41) | * | 1.00 (0.44) | * |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{01}$) | 0.00 (0.11) | | 0.05 (0.09) | | −0.05 (0.08) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{02}$) | −0.02 (0.14) | | −0.06 (0.12) | | 0.11 (0.15) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{03}$) | −3.36 (0.56) | *** | −3.25 (0.56) | *** | −3.23 (0.63) | *** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{04}$) | −0.02 (0.04) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{05}$) | | | −0.22 (0.60) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{06}$) | | | 0.15 (0.07) | * | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{07}$) | | | | | 5.91 (7.99) | |
| Policy congruence ($\beta_{1j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{10}$) | 4.71 (0.32) | *** | 4.47 (0.28) | *** | 4.67 (0.33) | *** |
| Perceived party congruence[a] | | | | | | | |
| Co−partisan ($\beta_{2j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{20}$) | 2.16 (0.37) | *** | 2.17 (0.38) | *** | 2.11 (0.36) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{21}$) | 0.06 (0.10) | | −0.04 (0.09) | | −0.01 (0.07) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{22}$) | −0.02 (0.13) | | 0.08 (0.11) | | 0.09 (0.13) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{23}$) | 0.48 (0.51) | | 0.44 (0.52) | | 0.53 (0.53) | |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{24}$) | −0.03 (0.03) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{25}$) | | | 0.09 (0.56) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{26}$) | | | −0.03 (0.07) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{27}$) | | | | | 3.63 (6.44) | |
| Independent ($\beta_{3j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{30}$) | 0.86 (0.18) | *** | 0.94 (0.20) | *** | 0.97 (0.20) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{31}$) | 0.02 (0.05) | | −0.01 (0.04) | | 0.00 (0.04) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{32}$) | −0.02 (0.06) | | 0.01 (0.06) | | −0.04 (0.07) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{33}$) | 0.42 (0.25) | ^ | 0.36 (0.28) | | 0.24 (0.29) | |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{34}$) | −0.01 (0.02) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{35}$) | | | −0.13 (0.31) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{36}$) | | | −0.02 (0.04) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{37}$) | | | | | −3.22 (3.58) | |
| Don't know ($\beta_{4j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{40}$) | 1.20 (0.31) | *** | 1.05 (0.30) | *** | 1.19 (0.32) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{41}$) | 0.00 (0.09) | | −0.04 (0.07) | | −0.06 (0.07) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{42}$) | −0.12 (0.11) | | −0.08 (0.10) | | −0.06 (0.13) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{43}$) | −0.20 (0.44) | | −0.04 (0.44) | | −0.21 (0.48) | |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{44}$) | −0.03 (0.03) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{45}$) | | | 0.28 (0.47) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{46}$) | | | 0.06 (0.06) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{47}$) | | | | | −0.53 (6.11) | |

4

Table A4 continued

| | | Model 1: Electoral competition | | Model 2: Ideological disagreement | | Model 3: Demographic diversity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluation of economy[b] | | | | | | | |
| Worse ($\beta_{5j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{50}$) | 0.12 (0.21) | | 0.24 (0.24) | | 0.00 (0.25) | |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{51}$) | 0.07 (0.06) | | 0.01 (0.05) | | 0.05 (0.04) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{52}$) | −0.04 (0.07) | | 0.02 (0.06) | | 0.02 (0.08) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{53}$) | 0.08 (0.28) | | −0.03 (0.32) | | 0.28 (0.35) | |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{54}$) | −0.01 (0.02) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{55}$) | | | −0.06 (0.38) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{56}$) | | | −0.07 (0.04) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{57}$) | | | | | 3.12 (4.55) | |
| Stayed same ($\beta_{6j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{60}$) | −0.47 (0.23) | * | −0.30 (0.24) | | −0.55 (0.27) | * |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{61}$) | 0.11 (0.07) | ^ | 0.00 (0.05) | | 0.07 (0.05) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{62}$) | −0.11 (0.08) | | −0.01 (0.06) | | −0.07 (0.09) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{63}$) | 1.00 (0.32) | ** | 0.86 (0.33) | ** | 1.06 (0.39) | ** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{64}$) | −0.02 (0.02) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{65}$) | | | −0.37 (0.38) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{66}$) | | | −0.13 (0.04) | ** | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{67}$) | | | | | −0.80 (5.08) | |
| Better ($\beta_{7j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{70}$) | −1.22 (0.31) | *** | −1.09 (0.31) | *** | −1.36 (0.35) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{71}$) | 0.06 (0.09) | | 0.02 (0.07) | | 0.09 (0.07) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{72}$) | −0.08 (0.11) | | −0.05 (0.09) | | −0.14 (0.12) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{73}$) | 2.69 (0.44) | *** | 2.54 (0.44) | *** | 2.75 (0.51) | *** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{74}$) | 0.01 (0.03) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{75}$) | | | −0.22 (0.48) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{76}$) | | | −0.13 (0.06) | * | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{77}$) | | | | | −2.44 (6.60) | |
| Much better ($\beta_{8j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{80}$) | −1.90 (0.41) | *** | −1.85 (0.41) | *** | −2.18 (0.47) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{81}$) | 0.19 (0.12) | | 0.07 (0.09) | | 0.17 (0.09) | ^ |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{82}$) | −0.21 (0.15) | | −0.08 (0.12) | | −0.15 (0.16) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{83}$) | 4.48 (0.62) | *** | 4.38 (0.62) | *** | 4.68 (0.72) | *** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{84}$) | −0.02 (0.04) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{85}$) | | | 0.21 (0.65) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{86}$) | | | −0.14 (0.08) | ^ | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{87}$) | | | | | 1.98 (8.96) | |
| Don't know ($\beta_{9j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{90}$) | −0.57 (0.52) | | −0.12 (0.63) | | −0.32 (0.74) | |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{91}$) | 0.23 (0.18) | | 0.04 (0.15) | | 0.09 (0.13) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{92}$) | −0.15 (0.19) | | 0.02 (0.17) | | −0.11 (0.22) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{93}$) | 1.01 (0.69) | | 0.63 (0.80) | | 0.71 (1.02) | |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{94}$) | −0.07 (0.06) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{95}$) | | | −1.00 (0.97) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{96}$) | | | −0.16 (0.10) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{97}$) | | | | | −7.55 (14.39) | |

|  |  | Model 1: Electoral competition | | Model 2: Ideological disagreement | | Model 3: Demographic diversity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluation of Iraq war$^c$ | | | | | | | |
| Not a mistake ($\beta_{10j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{100}$) | −1.70 (0.40) | *** | −1.57 (0.40) | *** | −1.39 (0.40) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{101}$) | 0.20 (0.12) | ^ | 0.13 (0.10) | | 0.11 (0.08) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{102}$) | −0.25 (0.15) | ^ | −0.16 (0.13) | | −0.31 (0.15) | * |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{103}$) | 3.87 (0.58) | *** | 3.78 (0.58) | *** | 3.47 (0.59) | *** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{104}$) | −0.04 (0.04) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{105}$) | | | −0.96 (0.58) | ^ | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{106}$) | | | −0.05 (0.07) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{107}$) | | | | | −13.47 (7.46) | ^ |
| Don't know ($\beta_{11j}$) | Intercept ($\gamma_{110}$) | −1.51 (0.30) | *** | −1.59 (0.32) | *** | −1.54 (0.32) | *** |
| | Turnout 2004 ($\gamma_{111}$) | 0.12 (0.09) | | 0.10 (0.07) | | 0.10 (0.06) | |
| | High school grads ($\gamma_{112}$) | −0.17 (0.11) | | −0.12 (0.10) | | −0.14 (0.11) | |
| | GOP senator ($\gamma_{113}$) | 2.83 (0.42) | *** | 2.98 (0.45) | *** | 2.97 (0.47) | *** |
| | Electoral competition ($\gamma_{114}$) | 0.00 (0.03) | | | | | |
| | Ideol. disagreement ($\gamma_{115}$) | | | −0.03 (0.49) | | | |
| | Prop. same party ($\gamma_{116}$) | | | 0.00 (0.06) | | | |
| | Demographic diversity ($\gamma_{117}$) | | | | | 0.01 (5.94) | |
| Log-likelihood | | −3074 (df=100) | | −3067 (df=112) | | −3076 (df=100) | |
| N voters | | 17,887 | | 17,887 | | 17,887 | |
| N states | | 27 | | 27 | | 27 | |

$^a$Reference category: Other party     $^b$Reference category: Much worse     $^c$Reference category: A mistake
^p<.1   *p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

Note: Coefficient for perceived policy congruence also allowed to vary by state, with same group-level coefficients as shown in Table 4

Table A5: Replicating interest, knowledge, and congruence models with campaign variables but excluding competition variables.

|  | Interest in politics [as in Table 1] | | Knowledge of positions [as in Table 2] | | Perceptions of congruence [as in Table 3] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | −2.79 (0.10) | *** | 1.38 (0.06) | *** | 0.40 (0.01) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | 0.03 (0.01) | * | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.00) | |
| High school grads | −0.05 (0.02) | ** | 0.00 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.00) | |
| GOP senator | | | 0.06 (0.07) | | 0.02 (0.02) | |
| Years in office | | | 0.00 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | ** |
| Committee chair | | | −0.24 (0.11) | * | 0.04 (0.03) | ^ |
| Quality challenger | −0.02 (0.08) | | 0.00 (0.07) | | −0.02 (0.02) | |
| Challenger fundraising | 0.01 (0.01) | | 0.00 (0.01) | | −0.01 (0.00) | *** |
| Incumbent fundraising | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.01 (0.00) | | 0.00 (0.00) | |
|  | | | | | | |
| Actual policy congruence | | | | | 0.75 (0.01) | *** |
| Party congruence[a] | | | | | | |
| Co-partisan | | | −0.16 (0.01) | *** | 0.29 (0.01) | *** |
| Independent | | | −0.10 (0.01) | *** | 0.13 (0.00) | *** |
| Don't know | | | −1.29 (0.02) | *** | 0.18 (0.01) | *** |
| Female | −0.83 (0.04) | *** | −0.17 (0.01) | *** | | |
| Age | 0.03 (0.00) | *** | 0.00 (0.00) | *** | | |
| Income | 0.17 (0.01) | *** | 0.02 (0.00) | *** | | |
| Race[b] | | | | | | |
| Black | −0.66 (0.06) | *** | −0.08 (0.01) | *** | | |
| Hispanic | −0.55 (0.06) | *** | −0.03 (0.01) | ** | | |
| Other race | 0.10 (0.08) | | 0.00 (0.02) | | | |
| Education [c] | | | | | | |
| High school | −0.06 (0.09) | | 0.02 (0.02) | | | |
| Some college | 0.88 (0.09) | *** | 0.11 (0.02) | *** | | |
| College | 1.04 (0.09) | *** | 0.14 (0.02) | *** | | |
| Post-college | 1.48 (0.11) | *** | 0.17 (0.02) | *** | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| Threshold 2 | −0.55 (0.10) | *** | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| Log-likelihood | −12251 (df=18) | | −16421 (df=24) | | −1629 (df=15) | |
| N voters | 16,790 | | 24,118 | | 21,020 | |
| N states | 27 | | 27 | | 27 | |

[a]Reference category: Other party    [b]Reference category: White
[c]Reference category: No high school degree
^p<.1   *p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

Table A6: Replicating vote choice models with campaign variables but excluding competition variables.

| | Vote choice [as in Table 4] | |
|---|---:|---|
| Intercept | −0.66 (0.17) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | 0.05 (0.03) | ^ |
| High school grads | −0.08 (0.04) | * |
| GOP senator | −0.13 (0.18) | |
| Quality challenger | −0.40 (0.20) | * |
| Challenger fundraising | −0.03 (0.02) | * |
| Incumbent fundraising | 0.00 (0.01) | |
| | | |
| Policy congruence | 5.46 (0.56) | *** |
| Turnout 2004 | −0.06 (0.10) | |
| High school grads | 0.06 (0.15) | |
| GOP senator | 0.89 (0.72) | |
| Quality challenger | 0.00 (0.79) | |
| Challenger fundraising | −0.07 (0.07) | |
| Incumbent fundraising | 0.08 (0.04) | ^ |
| | | |
| Perceived party congruence[a] | | |
|   Co-partisan | 3.13 (0.09) | *** |
|   Independent | 1.55 (0.07) | *** |
|   Don't know | 1.27 (0.14) | *** |
| | | |
| Evaluation of economy[b] | | |
|   Worse | 0.00 (0.11) | |
|   Stayed same | −0.10 (0.11) | |
|   Better | −0.09 (0.12) | |
|   Much better | −0.16 (0.14) | |
|   Don't know | −0.35 (0.29) | |
| Evaluation of Iraq war[c] | | |
|   Not a mistake | −0.21 (0.09) | * |
|   Don't know | −0.27 (0.12) | * |
| | | |
| Log-likelihood | −4061 (df=27) | |
| N voters | 17,887 | |
| N states | 27 | |

[a] Reference category: Other party
[b] Reference category: Much worse
[c] Reference category: A mistake
^p<.1   *p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001