

Exploiting Friends-and-Neighbors to Estimate Coattail Effects

MARC MEREDITH *University of Pennsylvania*

*F*ederalist democracies often hold concurrent elections for multiple offices. A potential consequence of simultaneously voting for multiple offices that vary with respect to scope and scale is that the personal appeal of candidates in a high-profile race may affect electoral outcomes in less salient races. In this article I estimate the magnitude of such coattail effects from governors onto other concurrently elected statewide executive officers using a unique dataset of county election returns for all statewide executive office elections in the United States from 1987 to 2010. I exploit the disproportionate support that candidates receive from geographically proximate voters, which is often referred to as the friends-and-neighbors vote, to isolate variation in the personal appeal of candidates. I find that a one-percentage-point increase in the personal vote received by a gubernatorial candidate increases the vote share of their party's secretary of state and attorney general candidates by 0.1 to 0.2 percentage points. In contrast, personal votes for a secretary of state or attorney general candidate have no effect on the performance of their party's gubernatorial candidate or other down-ballot candidates.

INTRODUCTION

Voters in most federalist countries elect representatives to serve in political institutions that vary in scope and scale. Representatives in such multilevel governments are selected in a mix of concurrent and separate elections, often referred to as the electoral cycle. Previous research has identified a number of channels through which the electoral cycle can cause contamination effects such that electoral outcomes at one level of government are affected by a feature of another level of government.¹ One contamination effect that has long interested academics, journalists, and political pundits is the coattail effect. Miller (1955) defines a coattail effect as the effect that the personal identity of a party's candidate in one election has on the performance of the party's candidates in concurrent elections.² Coattails affect the chances

that personally popular executives such as Ronald Reagan or Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva will come into office with a supportive legislature, which in turn has consequences for whether such leaders can enact their agendas. Coattails also have important implications for the structure of political parties, campaign finance, and the electoral incentives of representatives (Samuels 2002, 2004).

Since the 1940s, scholars have tried to empirically test for the existence of coattails and to estimate the magnitude of their influence in a variety of contexts. Estimating these effects might seem like a straightforward exercise, but this is not the case because a number of factors, for instance, voters' preferences and the state of macroeconomy, affect how a party's candidates perform at both the top and bottom of the ballot. Regressions are typically used to control for variables that are thought to affect both a party's top- and down-ballot performance, and any remaining association between a party's top- and down-ballot vote share is interpreted as the coattail effect (Samuels 2003, 83). Unfortunately, it is difficult to observe, measure, and specify the proper functional relationship between all these variables. These unmeasured or mismeasured determinants of a party's down-ballot vote share are also likely to affect the party's vote shares in other races. When this happens, the association between a party's top- and down-ballot vote shares is expected to be larger than the true coattail effect due to these omitted variables. Even if all of the other joint determinants of top- and down-ballot vote shares are properly included in a regression, additional problems arise when down-ballot candidates' coattails also affect the top-ballot race. In such cases, endogeneity will cause the expected association between top- and down-ballot vote shares to overstate the coattail effect. Consequently, previous research that interprets this association as a

Marc Meredith is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, 208 S. 37th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19604 (marcmere@sas.upenn.edu).

I thank Luke Reilly, Aakash Abbi, and Emily Thorson for providing excellent research assistance. I also thank Olle Folke, Alex Gelber, Jason Grissom, Jens Haimueller, Shigeo Hirano, Dan Hopkins, Greg Huber, Luke Keele, Jon Kolstad, John Lapinski, Matt Levensky, Gabe Lenz, Todd Makse, Neil Malhotra, Erik Snowberg, Gaurav Sood, and Jim Snyder, as well as seminar audiences at Caltech, NYU, Emory, the 2009 Yale Center for the Study of American Politics Conference, the 2010 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, and the 2010 State Politics and Policy Conference for useful discussions and assistance with data gathering.

¹ A high profile election can either provide or crowd out vote-relevant information in less salient concurrent elections (Freedman, Franz, and Goldstein 2004; Wolak 2009). The mix of races on a ballot may affect the distribution of preferences of individuals who turn out to vote (Berry and Gersen 2010), in part by changing parties and elites incentives to engage in mobilization (Cox 1999). How voter preferences are translated into votes also differ when elections are held concurrently (Mondak and McCurley 1994; Zudenkova 2011). Thus, the electoral cycle may affect the entry decisions of candidates and parties (Golder 2006; Shugart and Carey 1992) and the incentives for candidates and parties to share resources and engage in other forms of coordination (Hicken and Stoll 2011; Samuels 2003).

² Although this definition is generally accepted in the American politics literature, sometimes the term "coattail effect" is used in the comparative politics literature to refer to any feature of one level of government that affects election outcomes at another level of government. For example, Ames (1994) refers to the relationship

between local political control and national election outcomes as a coattail effect. Others refer to such cross-level spillovers as contamination or interaction effects (Cox and Schoppa 2002; Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa 2005; Haimueller and Kern 2008; Herron and Nishikawa 2001).

TABLE A.1. Selected Previous Estimates of Coattail Effects

| Study | Type | County | From | To | Years | Point Estimate |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|----------------------|--|------------|----------------------|
| Kramer (1971) | T | U.S. | President | House | 1896–1994 | 0.30 |
| Jacobson (1976) | I | U.S. | President | House: Independents Republicans Democrats | 1972 | 0.49 0.39 0.18 |
| Calvert and Ferejohn (1983) | I | U.S. | President | House | 1956–1980 | 0.49 |
| Born (1984) | C | U.S. | President | House | 1952–1980 | 0.33 |
| Ferejohn and Calvert (1984) | T | U.S. | President | House | 1896–1980 | 0.24 to 0.51 |
| Campbell and Sumners (1990) | C | U.S. | President | Senate | 1972–1998 | 0.18 |
| Campbell (1991) | T | U.S. | President | House | 1868–1988 | 0.30 to 0.35 |
| Mondak (1993) | C | | President | House: Open-Seat Non-Open-Seat | 1976–1988 | 0.79 0.41 |
| Flemming (1995) | C | U.S. | President | Open-Seat House | 1972–1992 | 0.29 |
| Samuels (2000) | C | Brazil | President | National Congress | 1994, 1998 | 0.42 0.18 |
| Hogan (2005) | C | U.S. | Governor | State Legislature | 1994, 1998 | 0.43 |
| Mattei and Glasgow (2005) | C | U.S. | President | House: Open-Seat Non-Open-Seat | 1976–2000 | 0.82 0.30 |
| Broockman (2009) | C | U.S. | House | President | | 0.05 |
| Fair (2009) | T | U.S. | President | House | 1916–2006 | –0.70 to 0.80 |
| Magar (2012) | C | Mexico | Chamber of Deputies: | | 1979–2009 | |
| | | | Governor | President Concurrent | | 0.37 |
| | | | | President Not Concurrent | | 0.49 |
| | | | President | Governor Concurrent | | 0.03 |
| | | | | Governor Not Concurrent | | 0.44 |

Notes: Type “I” is an individual-level study, type “C” is an aggregated cross-sectional study, and type “T” is a time-series study. In studies where multiple point estimates are reported for different years or different parties, I average the point estimates across all years or all parties.

REFERENCES

- Ade, Florian, and Ronny Freier. 2011. "Divided government versus incumbency externality effect: Quasi-experimental evidence on multiple voting decisions." German Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper 1121.
- Ames, Barry. 1994. "The Reverse Coattails Effect: Local Party Organization in the 1989 Brazilian Presidential Election." *American Political Science Review* 88 (1): 95–111.
- Ansolahehere, Stephen, and James M. Snyder. 2002. "The Incumbency Advantage in U.S. Elections: An Analysis of State and Federal Offices, 1942–2000." *Election Law Journal* 1 (3): 315–38.
- Bean, Louis H. 1948. *How to Predict Elections*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Berry, Christopher R., and Jacob E. Gersen. 2010. "The Timing of Elections." *University of Chicago Law Review* 77 (1): 37–64.
- Born, Richard. 1984. "Reassessing the Decline of Presidential Coattails: U. S. House Elections from 1952–80." *Journal of Politics* 46 (1): 60–79.
- Broockman, David E. 2009. "Do congressional Candidates have Reverse Coattails? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design." *Political Analysis* 17 (4): 418–34.
- Brown, Adam R. 2011. "Wikipedia as a Data Source for Political Scientists: Accuracy and Completeness of Coverage." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44 (2): 339–43.
- Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. 1990. *The Personal Vote*. Harvard University Press.
- Calvert, Randall L., and John A. Ferejohn. 1983. "Coattail Voting in Recent Presidential Elections." *American Political Science Review* 77 (2): 407–19.
- Cameron, A. Colin, Jonah B. Gelbach, and Douglas L. Miller. 2011. "Robust Inference with Multiway Clustering." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 29 (2): 238–49.
- Campbell, Angus. 1960. "Surge and Decline: A Study of Electoral Change." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24 (3): 397–418.
- Campbell, James E. 1991. "The Presidential Surge and its Midterm Decline in Congressional Elections, 1868–1988." *Journal of Politics* 53 (2): 477–87.
- Campbell, James E., and Joe A. Sumners. 1990. "Presidential Coattails in Senate Elections." *American Political Science Review* 84 (2): 513–24.
- Campbell, Angus, and Warren E. Miller. 1957. "The Motivational Basis of Straight and Split Ticket Voting." *American Political Science Review* 51 (2): 293–312.
- Conley, Timothy G., Christian B. Hansen, and Peter E. Rossi. 2012. "Plausibly Exogenous." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94 (1): 260–72.
- Converse, Philip E. 1966. "The Concept of the Normal Vote." In *Elections and the Political Order*, eds. Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Cox, Gary W. 1999. "Electoral Rules and the Calculus of Mobilization." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24 (3): 387–419.
- Cox, Karen E., and Leonard J. Schoppa. 2002. "Interaction Effects in Mixed-Member Electoral Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (9): 1027–53.
- Fair, Ray C. 2009. "Presidential and Congressional Vote-Share Equations." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1): 55–72.
- Ferejohn, John A., and Randall L. Calvert. 1984. "Presidential Coattails in Historical Perspective." *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (1): 127–46.
- Ferrara, Federico, Erik S. Herron, and Misa Nishikawa. 2005. *Mixed Electoral Systems: Contamination and its Consequences*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flemming, Gregory N. 1995. "Presidential Coattails in Open-Seat Elections." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20 (2): 197–211.
- Folke, Olle, and James M. Snyder. 2012. "Gubernatorial Midterm Slumps." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (4): 931–48.
- Freedman, Paul, Michael Franz, and Kenneth Goldstein. 2004. "Campaign Advertising and Democratic Citizenship." *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4): 723–41.
- Gerber, Alan S., Daniel P. Kessler, and Marc Meredith. 2011. "The Persuasive Effects of Direct Mail: A Regression Discontinuity Based Approach." *Journal of Politics* 73 (1): 140–55.
- Gimpel, James G., Kimberly A. Karnes, John McTague, and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2008. "Distance-Decay in the Political Geography of Friends-and-Neighbors Voting." *Political Geography* 27 (2): 231–52.
- Golder, Matt. 2006. "Presidential Coattails and Legislative Fragmentation." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (1): 34–48.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Holger Lutz Kern. 2008. "Incumbency as a Source of Spillover Effects in Mixed Electoral Systems: Evidence from a Regression-Discontinuity Design." *Electoral Studies* 27 (2): 213–27.
- Herron, Erik S., and Misa Nishikawa. 2001. "Contamination Effects and the Number of Parties in Mixed-Superposition Electoral Systems." *Electoral Studies* 20 (1): 63–86.
- Hicken, Allen, and Heather Stoll. 2011. "Presidents and Parties: How Presidential Elections Shape Coordination in Legislative Elections." *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (7): 854–83.
- Hogan, Robert E. 2005. "Gubernatorial Coattail Effects in State Legislative Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 58 (4): 587–97.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Joshua D. Angrist. 1994. "Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects." *Econometrica* 62 (2): 467–75.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 1976. "Presidential Coattails in 1972." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 40 (2): 194–200.
- Key, V. O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: A. A. Knopf.
- Kramer, Gerald H. 1971. "Short-Term Fluctuations in US Voting Behavior, 1896–1964." *American Political Science Review* 65 (1): 131–43.
- Levitt, Steven D., and Catherine D. Wolfram. 1997. "Decomposing the Sources of Incumbency Advantage in the U.S. House." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22 (1): 45–60.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Tom W. Rice. 1983. "Localism in Presidential Elections: The Home State Advantage." *American Journal of Political Science* 27 (3): 548–56.
- Magar, Eric. 2012. "Gubernatorial Coattails in Mexican Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* 74 (2): 383–99.
- Mattei, Franco, and Joshua Glasgow. 2005. "Presidential Coattails, Incumbency Advantage, and Open Seats: A District-Level Analysis of the 1976–2000 U.S. House Elections." *Electoral Studies* 24 (4): 619–41.
- Meredith, Marc. 2013. "Heterogenous Friends-and-Neighbors Voting." University of Pennsylvania mimeo.
- Miller, Warren E. 1955. "Presidential Coattails: A Study in Political Myth and Methodology." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 19 (4): 353–68.
- Miller, Rupert G. 1974. "The Jackknife—A Review." *Biometrika* 61 (1): 1–15.
- Miller, Arthur H. 1979. "Normal Vote Analysis: Sensitivity to Change Over Time." *American Journal of Political Science* 23 (2): 406–25.
- Mondak, Jeffery J. 1993. "Presidential Coattails and Open Seats: The District-Level Impact of Heuristic Processing." *American Politics Research* 21 (3): 307–19.
- Mondak, Jeffery J., and Carl McCurley. 1994. "Cognitive Efficiency and the Congressional Vote: The Psychology of Coattail Voting." *Political Research Quarterly* 47 (1): 151–75.
- Moos, Malcolm. 1952. *Politics, Presidents, and Coattails*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Rahn, Wendy M., Jon A. Krosnick, and Marijke Breuning. 1994. "Rationalization and Derivation Processes in Survey Studies of Political Candidate Evaluation." *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (3): 582–600.
- Rice, Tom W., and Alisa A. Macht. 1987a. "Friends and Neighbors Voting in Statewide General Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 31 (2): 448–52.
- Rice, Tom W., and Alisa A. Macht. 1987b. "The Hometown Advantage: Mobilization or Conversion?" *Political Behavior* 9 (3): 257–62.
- Rusk, Jerrold G. 1970. "The Effect of the Australian Ballot Reform on Split Ticket Voting: 1876–1908." *American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1220–38.
- Samuels, David J. 2000. "The Gubernatorial Coattails Effect: Federalism and Congressional Elections in Brazil." *Journal of Politics* 62 (1): 240–53.