

# Online Appendix for "Voter Turnout and Preference Aggregation"

Kei Kawai, Yuta Toyama, Yasutora Watanabe

## A Online Appendix A: Additional Tables

We report the estimates of state-specific effects on preference and efficacy in Tables A.1 and A.2, which we use to plot Figures 4 and 5.

	Estimate	SE		Estimate	SE
Alabama	0 (Normalized)		Nevada	-0.009	(0.059)
Arizona	-0.132	(0.050)	New Jersey	-0.247	(0.041)
Arkansas	-0.363	(0.034)	New Mexico	-0.055	(0.069)
California	-0.236	(0.060)	New York	-0.239	(0.036)
Colorado	-0.057	(0.055)	North Carolina	-0.088	(0.033)
Florida	-0.101	(0.039)	North Dakota	-0.006	(0.040)
Georgia	0.107	(0.028)	Ohio	-0.166	(0.035)
Idaho	0.129	(0.044)	Oklahoma	-0.057	(0.041)
Illinois	-0.243	(0.030)	Oregon	-0.130	(0.054)
Indiana	-0.099	(0.031)	Pennsylvania	-0.190	(0.037)
Iowa	-0.300	(0.032)	South Carolina	0.030	(0.031)
Kansas	0.194	(0.038)	South Dakota	0.000	(0.039)
Kentucky	-0.251	(0.032)	Tennessee	-0.345	(0.034)
Louisiana	0.163	(0.030)	Texas	0.127	(0.034)
Maryland	-0.107	(0.053)	Utah	0.079	(0.062)
Michigan	-0.246	(0.031)	Virginia	-0.114	(0.035)
Minnesota	-0.297	(0.032)	Washington	-0.223	(0.055)
Mississippi	0.128	(0.033)	West Virginia	-0.216	(0.037)
Missouri	-0.217	(0.029)	Wisconsin	-0.335	(0.033)
Montana	0.098	(0.044)	Wyoming	0.230	(0.057)

Table A.1: Estimates of State Preference Fixed Effects Relative to  $\lambda_{Alabama}$ . Standard errors are reported in parentheses. Higher values imply a stronger preference for Democrats.

	Estimate	SE		Estimate	SE
Alabama	1 (Normalized)		Nevada	0.854	(0.075)
Arizona	0.660	(0.109)	New Jersey	0.725	(0.054)
Arkansas	0.739	(0.043)	New Mexico	0.976	(0.083)
California	0.751	(0.053)	New York	0.795	(0.052)
Colorado	1.165	(0.073)	North Carolina	0.787	(0.040)
Florida	0.975	(0.054)	North Dakota	1.062	(0.056)
Georgia	0.842	(0.039)	Ohio	1.323	(0.057)
Idaho	1.274	(0.081)	Oklahoma	0.919	(0.041)
Illinois	1.067	(0.041)	Oregon	1.441	(0.086)
Indiana	0.814	(0.042)	Pennsylvania	0.838	(0.046)
Iowa	1.319	(0.055)	South Carolina	0.751	(0.045)
Kansas	0.877	(0.043)	South Dakota	1.680	(0.105)
Kentucky	1.052	(0.037)	Tennessee	0.867	(0.041)
Louisiana	1.316	(0.079)	Texas	0.769	(0.041)
Maryland	0.767	(0.050)	Utah	1.229	(0.087)
Michigan	1.180	(0.048)	Virginia	0.754	(0.043)
Minnesota	1.765	(0.103)	Washington	1.080	(0.051)
Mississippi	1.193	(0.067)	West Virginia	0.814	(0.043)
Missouri	1.159	(0.040)	Wisconsin	1.762	(0.108)
Montana	1.066	(0.054)	Wyoming	1.151	(0.060)

Table A.2: Estimates of State-level Fixed Effects of Voting Efficacy. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. Alabama is set to 1 for normalization.

## B Online Appendix B: Fit

In this Appendix, we report further on the fit of the model. Figure B.1 plots the actual and predicted distributions of the Democratic vote share, Republican vote share, and turnout rate. The figure shows that the model fits the data well. The corresponding  $\chi^2$  test statistics are 11.64 and 20.81, and 38.27 where the critical value for 95% is 12.59. Although we cannot reject the null that the predicted and the actual distributions are the same for the Democrats at the 5% level, we reject the null that the distributions are the same for the Republicans and for turnout.



Figure B.1: Model Fit. The top panel plots the actual and the predicted distributions of the Democratic vote share. The middle panel corresponds to the distributions for the Republican vote share and the bottom panel corresponds to the distributions for turnout.