

Errata for:

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick 1998. "The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62: 291-330.

Due to data entry errors in the Franklin County dataset, as well as typos and rounding errors, some of the numbers reported in Miller and Krosnick (1998) were incorrect. Included here are the corrected tables, which correspond to the tables in Miller and Krosnick (1998). As the summary tables (pages 2-5 of this document) indicate, the changes are minor. None of the numbers or directions of the statistically significant, marginally significant, or non-significant effects changed as a result of the corrections. Two of the average vote percentages changed slightly:

- 1) the average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed second for significant and marginally significant primacy effects in 2-candidate races in Franklin County changed from 3.61 to 3.62 (see Summary Table 1)
- 2) the average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed last for significant and marginally significant primacy effects in the races with more than 2 candidates in Franklin County changed from 2.76 to 2.78 (see Summary Table 2).

The differences between the regression coefficients reported in Table 4 in the original manuscript and the corrected coefficients are also minor, except that the original manuscript incorrectly reported the Hamilton County vs. Cuyahoga County coefficient as positive .27 (n.s.), whereas it should be negative: -.27 (n.s.; see Summary Table 4).

January 14, 2019

Summary Table 1: Errata for Table 1, Miller & Krosnick (1998)

	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)
Number of statistically significant effects in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	22	22	14	14	3	3
Number of marginally significant effects in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of non-significant effects in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	6	6	19	19	16	16
Total number of effects in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	28	28	33	33	19	19
Average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed second for significant and marginally significant <i>primacy</i> effects	3.61	3.62	1.86	1.86	3.22	3.22
Number of statistically significant effects in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	2	2	0	0
Number of marginally significant effects in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of non-significant effects in the direction of <i>recency</i>	3	3	8	8	3	3
Total number of effects in the direction of <i>recency</i>	3	3	10	10	3	3
Average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed second for significant or marginally significant <i>recency</i> effects	na	na	-1.45	-1.45	na	na

Summary Table 2: Errata for Table 2, Miller & Krosnick (1998)

	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)
Number of statistically significant ANOVAs	16	16	16	16	7	7
Number of marginally significant ANOVAs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of non-significant ANOVAs	7	7	25	25	16	16
Number of statistically significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	17	17	10	10	6	6
Number of marginally significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of non-significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	6	6	26	26	10	10
Average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed last for significant or marginally significant <i>primacy</i> effects	2.76	2.78	1.53	1.53	2.08	2.08
Number of statistically significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of marginally significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of non-significant differences between first and last position in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	5	5	7	7
Average vote percentage difference between being listed first and being listed last for significant or marginally significant <i>recency</i> effects	na	na	na	na	na	na

Summary Table 3: Errata for Table 3, Miller & Krosnick (1998)

	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)	Original POQ article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	After corrections (Jan 2019)
Number of statistically significant nonlinear effects in the direction of <i>primacy</i>	15	15	10	10	6	6
Number of statistically significant nonlinear effects in the direction of <i>recency</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of statistically significant nonlinear effects in the direction of <i>middle</i>	1	1	2	2	1	1
Number of statistically significant nonlinear effects in the direction of <i>primacy & recency</i>	0	0	4	4	0	0

Summary Table 4: Errata for Table 4, Miller & Krosnick (1998)

	Coefficients reported in original article (Miller & Krosnick 1998)	Coefficients after corrections (Jan 2019)
Partisan affiliation of candidates	-1.34**** (.34)	-1.35**** (.35)
Race position on the ballot	-1.79*** (.65)	-1.80*** (.66)
Amount of news media attention	-1.56*** (.62)	-1.57** (.63)
Incumbency	-.32* (.20)	-.35# (.20)
Franklin County vs. Cuyahoga County	1.64**** (.24)	1.65**** (.25)
Hamilton County vs. Cuyahoga County	.27 (.24)	-.27 (.24)
R-square	.53	.53
n	118	118

Note: Standard errors appear below the coefficients in parentheses.

#p<.09

*p<.11

**p<.05

***p<.01

Corrected Table 1. Difference Between the Percent of Votes Received in Different Name Orders in Two-Candidate Races

	Percentage Difference		
	Franklin County	Cuyahoga County	Hamilton County
U.S. Representative I	.24 (585)	.25 (772)	.02 (381)
U.S. Representative II		1.67 (393)	
State Senator I	3.47 (388)	.54 (119)	1.37 (356)
State Senator II	5.02*** (455)		
State Representative I	.56 (140)	-.78 (154)	-.57 (145)
State Representative II	-1.31 (118)	-.12 (155)	3.00 (112)
State Representative III	-1.28 (138)	.64 (159)	1.97 (125)
State Representative IV	-.55 (125)	-.72 (155)	1.88 (110)
State Representative V	2.13 (136)	1.18 (145)	1.32 (133)
State Representative VI	3.69 (159)	1.03 (156)	
State Representative VII	1.73 (125)		-2.11 (151)
State Representative VIII		1.23 (167)	.34 (144)
State Representative IX		.89 (159)	
State Representative X		1.39 (163)	
County Commissioner I	4.07*** (1263)	1.71*** (2031)	
County Commissioner II	3.19*** (1263)	.62 (2031)	1.28 (1041)
County Commissioner III			1.10 (1041)
County Auditor	3.09*** (1263)		
Prosecuting Attorney	4.03*** (1263)	.75 (2031)	1.24 (1041)
Common Pleas Clerk	3.30*** (1263)	1.19 (2031)	1.81 (1041)

Corrected Table 1. (Cont'd)

	Percentage Difference		
	Franklin County	Cuyahoga County	Hamilton County
Sheriff	2.70*** (1263)	.76 (2031)	1.31 (1041)
County Recorder	3.54*** (1263)		.21 (1041)
County Treasurer	2.76** (1263)	1.44** (2031)	-.21 (1041)
County Engineer			2.80* (1041)
Coroner	3.17*** (1263)		1.28 (1041)
Supreme Court Justice I	5.02*** (1263)	1.79*** (2031)	2.87*** (1041)
Supreme Court Justice II	4.99*** (1263)	.62 (2031)	4.00*** (1041)
Court of Appeals I		3.43*** (2031)	.53 (1041)
Court of Appeals II	4.56*** (1263)	2.39*** (2031)	
Court of Appeals III	4.25*** (1263)		
Court of Appeals IV	3.87*** (1263)	-.93** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge I		2.79*** (2031)	.06 (1041)
Common Pleas Judge II	3.75*** (1263)	.79* (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge III	3.63** (1263)	.50 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge IV	4.82*** (1263)	1.73*** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge V	2.14*** (1263)	.40 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge VI	2.00** (1263)	1.39 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge VII	3.93*** (1263)		
Common Pleas Judge VIII	1.75* (1263)	-.35 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge IX		1.11*** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge X		1.22*** (2031)	

Corrected Table 1. (Cont'd)

	Percentage Difference		
	Franklin County	Cuyahoga County	Hamilton County
Common Pleas Judge XII		3.36*** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XIII		2.38*** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XIV		-.18 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XVI		-.85 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XVII		-1.96*** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XVIII		-.40 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XIX		.42 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XX		.77* (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XXI		-.53 (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XXII		1.18** (2031)	
Common Pleas Judge XXIII		.15 (2031)	

Note: The difference in vote percentage across orders in this table is reported for the candidate whose last name appeared earliest in the alphabet. Significance levels are derived from t-tests. In parentheses under each percentage difference is the number of precincts that contributed data to each t-test.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Corrected Table 2. Tests of Differences Between the Percent of Votes Received in Different Name Orders in Races That Involved More Than Two Candidates

Candidate	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position
<u>U.S. President</u>						
Bush	n.s.	.38	n.s.	.46	n.s.	-.37
Clinton	n.s.	.46	n.s.	.38	n.s.	.38
Fulani	p<.001	.32***	n.s.	.15	n.s.	.02
Gritz	n.s.	.10***	p<.01	.13***	n.s.	-.04
Hagelin	p<.001	.07**	n.s.	.09***	n.s.	.04
Larouche	n.s.	.06*	p<.001	.06***	n.s.	-.09
Marrou	p<.001	.26***	p<.01	.11	n.s.	.65
Perot	n.s.	.55	n.s.	.46	n.s.	-.03
N	1263		2031		1041	
<u>U.S. Senate</u>						
Dewine	p<.01	3.31***	n.s.	1.05	n.s.	-.12
Glenn	p<.05	2.31*	n.s.	.31	n.s.	-.52
Grevatt	p<.001	3.83***	p<.001	-.07	p<.05	.05
N	1263		2031		1041	
<u>U.S. Representative II</u>						
Cordray	p<.01	2.85***				
Pryce	p<.001	2.52*				
Reidelbach	p<.001	4.06***				
N	724					
<u>U.S. Representative II</u>						
Berns					p<.01	.55*
Grote					n.s.	3.08
Mann					n.s.	1.19
N					659	
<u>U.S. Representative III</u>						
Gudenas			n.s.	-.07		
Henley			p<.001	.92***		
Rothschild			n.s.	2.40		
Stokes			n.s.	1.22		
N			845			
<u>State Senate II</u>						
Dunning			n.s.	.64		
Stakes			n.s.	.27		
Suhadolnik			n.s.	1.63		
N			486			

Corrected Table 2. (Cont'd)

Candidate	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position
<u>State Representative VIII</u>						
Briggs	n.s.	3.88				
Ryman	p<.05	.78				
Thomas	n.s.	3.91				
N	173					
<u>State Representative XI</u>						
Barna			n.s.	1.89		
Mottl			n.s.	1.69		
Obuch			n.s.	.71		
N			160			
<u>State Representative XII</u>						
Cain			n.s.	.70		
Misenik			n.s.	.76		
Popovich			n.s.	-.63		
N			139			
<u>State Representative XIII</u>						
Cline			n.s.	.40		
Johanek			n.s.	.16		
Nagin			n.s.	1.45		
Pringle			n.s.	.54		
N			139			
<u>County Commissioner I</u>						
Chabot					n.s.	-.09
Mirlisena					n.s.	.19
Sykes					n.s.	.38
N					1041	
<u>Board of Education I</u>						
Norton	p<.001	2.75***				
Pfeifer	p<.001	5.14***				
Smith	p<.001	5.23***				
N	1263					
<u>Board of Education I</u>						
Costanzo			p<.05	2.65**		
Francioli			p<.001	1.98***		
Hawk			n.s.	2.63*		
N			1389			
<u>Board of Education I</u>						
Hahn					p<.001	2.91***
Hubbell					p<.001	2.26***
Price					p<.001	4.22***
N					1041	

Corrected Table 2. (Cont'd)

Candidate	Franklin County		Cuyahoga County		Hamilton County	
	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position	Significance of ANOVA comparing all positions	Difference Between First and Last Position
<u>Board of Education II</u>						
Brickner			p<.001	1.39		
Case			n.s.	.58		
Fabek			p<.001	-.19		
Hamilton			p<.001	-.55		
Smith			p<.001	.42		
Tighe			p<.001	.40		
Tryon			p<.001	.18		
N			641			
<u>Chief Justice of Supreme Court</u>						
Gorman	p<.001	6.11***	p<.001	2.30***	n.s.	.44
Haffey	p<.001	2.03***	p<.001	1.82***	p<.001	.52**
Moyer	p<.001	6.27***	p<.001	2.67***	p<.01	2.04***
N	1263		2031		1041	

Note: Ns indicate the total number of precincts contributing data to each one-way ANOVA.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Corrected Table 3. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients Characterizing Significant Name Order Effects in Races Involving 3, 4, 7, and 8 Candidates

Candidate	Equation 1	Equation 2		Primacy, Recency or Middle Effect
	Order (b ₁)	Order (b ₂)	Order ² (b ₃)	
<u>Franklin County</u>				
Fulani	-.01***	-.01***	.01***	Primacy
Hagelin	-.01***	-.01***	.01***	Primacy
Marrou	-.01***	-.01***	-.01	Primacy
Dewine	-.02**	-.02***	-.01	Primacy
Glenn	-.01*	-.01*	-.02	Primacy
Grevatt	-.02*	-.02***	-.02***	Primacy
Cordray	-.01**	-.01***	-.01	Primacy
Pryce	-.01**	-.01**	-.02**	Primacy
Reidelbach	-.02***	-.02***	-.02***	Primacy
Ryman	-.01	-.01	-.01*	Middle
Norton	-.01***	-.01***	.01*	Primacy
Pfeifer	-.03***	-.03***	-.01	Primacy
Smith	-.03***	-.03***	.02***	Primacy
Gorman	-.03***	-.03***	.01*	Primacy
Haffey	-.01***	-.01***	-.01***	Primacy
Moyer	-.03***	-.03**	-.03***	Primacy
<u>Cuyahoga County</u>				
Gritz	-.01*	-.01**	.01**	Primacy
Larouche	-.01***	-.01***	.01**	Primacy
Marrou	-.01*	-.01*	.01*	Primacy
Grevatt	.00	.00	-.01***	Middle
Henley	-.01***	-.01***	.00	Primacy
Costanzo	-.01**	-.01**	.00	Primacy
Francioli	-.01***	-.01***	.00	Primacy

Corrected Table 3. (Cont'd)

Candidate	Equation 1	Equation 2		Primacy, Recency or Middle Effect
	Order (b ₁)	Order (b ₂)	Order ² (b ₃)	
Brickner	-.01*	-.01*	.01***	Primacy
Fabek	.00	.00	.01***	Primacy & Recency
Hamilton	-.01	-.01	.01***	Primacy & Recency
Smith	-.01	-.01	.01***	Primacy & Recency
Tighe	-.01	-.01	.01***	Primacy & Recency
Tryon ^a	.00	.00	.00	Middle
Gorman	-.01***	-.01***	-.01	Primacy
Haffey	-.01***	-.01***	-.01***	Primacy
Moyer	-.01***	-.01***	-.01***	Primacy
<u>Hamilton County</u>				
Grevatt	.00	.00	-.01*	Middle
Berns	-.01*	-.01*	-.01**	Primacy
Hahn	-.02***	-.02*	-.01	Primacy
Hubbell	-.01***	-.01***	-.02***	Primacy
Price	-.02***	-.02***	-.01**	Primacy
Haffey	-.01*	-.01*	-.01***	Primacy
Moyer	-.01***	-.01***	-.01	Primacy

^aFor Tryon, order raised to the fourth power is significant, meaning that he did best in the middle, though there is also some evidence of primacy and recency.

Note: Order was coded 1=first position, 2=second position, and so on, and then centered at zero.

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Corrected Table 4. Unstandardized Ordinary Least Squares Regression Coefficients Predicting the Magnitude of Name Order Effects

Predictor	Coefficient
Partisan Affiliation of Candidates	-1.35*** (.35)
Race Position on the Ballot	-1.80** (.66)
Amount of News Media Attention	-1.57* (.63)
Incumbency	-.35+ (.20)
Franklin County vs. Cuyahoga County	1.65*** (.25)
Hamilton County vs. Cuyahoga County	-.27 (.24)
R ²	.53
N	118

Note: Standard errors appear below the coefficients in parentheses.

+p<.10

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

NOTE: This table is not included in the POQ manuscript, but the coefficients effect from this analysis is described in the text, on page 313. The original text is included here:

“Rolloff had a significant positive effect ($b = 1.63$; $p < .05$)... And as in table 4, partisanship had a significant negative effect ($b = -.92$; $p < .05$); incumbency had a marginally significant negative effect ($b = -.33$; $p < .11$); and position had a significant negative effect ($b = -2.14$; $p < .01$).”

Table 4a. Unstandardized Ordinary Least Squares Regression Coefficients Predicting the Magnitude of Name Order Effects

Predictor	Coefficient
Partisan Affiliation of Candidates	-.93* (.42)
Race Position on the Ballot	-2.14** (.71)
Rolloff	1.63* (.82)
Incumbency	-.36+ (.20)
Franklin County vs. Cuyahoga County	1.34*** (.30)
Hamilton County vs. Cuyahoga County	-.49+ (.26)
R ²	.52
N	118

Note: Standard errors appear below the coefficients in parentheses.

+ $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$