

Online Appendix for “Do Voters Dislike Working-Class Candidates? Voter Biases and the Descriptive Underrepresentation of the Working Class”

Nicholas Carnes and Noam Lupu

Table A1: Regression Estimates for Figure 1

Sample	Britain	US	Argentina
Working-class	0.02 (0.02)	0.05 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)
Female	0.02 (0.02)	0.00 (0.03)	0.03 (0.02)
Less education	0.02 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.02)
Tory/Rep/Radical	0.00 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.02)
White	--	-0.06+ (0.03)	--
Experience	--	--	0.09** (0.02)
Intercept	0.41** (0.05)	0.52** (0.04)	0.49** (0.02)
<i>N</i>	7,558	1,356	2,000
<i>R</i> ²	0.0013	0.0059	0.0209
St. Err.	0.49984	0.49962	0.49549

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate’s occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. +*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A2: Regression Estimates for Figure 2

Dependent variable	Qualified			Understand			Left		
	Britain	US	Arg.	Britain	US	Arg.	Britain	US	Arg.
Working-class	-0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.08** (0.02)	0.12** (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.11** (0.02)	0.02 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)
Female	0.00 (0.02)	0.05 (0.04)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.10** (0.03)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)	-0.00 (0.03)
Less education	-0.03 ⁺ (0.02)	0.00 (0.03)	-0.07** (0.02)	0.03 ⁺ (0.02)	-0.07 ⁺ (0.03)	-0.00 (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)	0.05 ⁺ (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)
Tory/Rep/Radical	0.00 (0.02)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.07** (0.02)	-0.05** (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.02)	-0.43** (0.02)	-0.48** (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)
White	--	-0.05 (0.04)	--	--	-0.05 (0.04)	--	--	-0.04 (0.03)	--
Experience	--	--	0.11** (0.02)	--	--	0.08** (0.02)	--	--	0.01 (0.03)
Intercept	0.57** (0.05)	0.51** (0.04)	0.51** (0.03)	0.37** (0.05)	0.43** (0.04)	0.50** (0.03)	0.86** (0.05)	0.70** (0.04)	0.48** (0.03)
<i>N</i>	5,438	1,022	1,916	6,208	1,152	1,968	5,814	940	1,476
<i>R</i> ²	0.0012	0.0074	0.0217	0.0110	0.0314	0.0169	0.2047	0.2347	0.0004
St. Err.	0.49994	0.49963	0.49532	0.49745	0.49338	0.49651	0.44609	0.43881	0.50091

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, and (in the US sample) race. Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺ $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, two tailed.

Table A3: Regression Estimates for Figure 3

Sample	Britain	US	Argentina	Britain	US	Argentina
Respondents	Labour	Democrat	Peronist	Tory	Republican	Radical
Working-class	0.05* (0.03)	0.09* (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.13 (0.14)
Female	0.02 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.19 (0.13)
Less education	0.00 (0.03)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.14)
Tory/Rep/Radical	-0.37** (0.03)	-0.34** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	0.44** (0.02)	0.47** (0.06)	0.10 (0.13)
White	--	-0.14** (0.04)	--	--	-0.01 (0.06)	--
Experience	--	--	0.12** (0.04)	--	--	0.01 (0.12)
Intercept	0.94** (0.08)	0.68** (0.05)	0.52** (0.04)	0.13+ (0.07)	0.28** (0.07)	0.43** (0.13)
<i>N</i>	2390	578	694	2326	300	60
<i>R</i> ²	0.1391	0.1547	0.0425	0.1975	0.2223	0.0791
St. Err.	.46441	.46212	0.49139	.4484	.44542	0.50578

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A4: Candidate Characteristics and Perceived Corruption in Argentina

Working-class	-0.02 (0.03)
Female	-0.03 (0.03)
Less education	-0.02 (0.03)
Radical	0.06* (0.03)
Experience	-0.06+ (0.03)
Intercept	0.53* (0.03)
<i>N</i>	1,168
<i>R</i> ²	0.0084
St. Err.	0.499

Source: 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, and experience. Standard errors are clustered by unique election. + $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, two tailed.

Table A5: Candidate Characteristics and Voting in Britain, by Respondent Class

Respondents	White-collar	Workers
Working-class	-0.01 (0.02)	0.08** (0.03)
Female	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.03)
Less education	0.01 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)
Conservative	-0.01 (0.02)	0.05 ⁺ (0.03)
Intercept	0.48** (0.06)	0.28** (0.08)
<i>N</i>	3,836	1,932
<i>R</i> ²	0.0006	0.0098
St. Err.	0.50017	0.49818

Source: 2015 British Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A6: Candidate Characteristics and Voting in the US, by Level of Office

Office	City Co.	State Leg.	Mayor	Governor
Working-class	0.04 (0.06)	0.08 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.07)	0.10 ⁺ (0.06)
Female	-0.06 (0.07)	0.08 (0.07)	0.02 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.06)
Less education	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.06)	0.00 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)
Republican	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.07)	0.03 (0.06)
White	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.12 ⁺ (0.06)	0.00 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.06)
Intercept	0.58** (0.07)	0.51** (0.07)	0.52** (0.08)	0.45** (0.06)
<i>N</i>	336	356	292	372
<i>R</i> ²	0.0158	0.0273	0.0015	0.0170
St. Err.	0.50052	0.49734	0.50484	0.49977

Source: 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, and race. Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A7: Candidate Characteristics, Vote Choice, and Vote Likelihood in the US

Dependent Variable	Vote Choice (indicator)	Vote Likelihood (1 to 5 scale)
Working-class	0.05 (0.03)	0.11 ⁺ (0.06)
Female	0.00 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.06)
Less education	-0.01 (0.03)	0.08 (0.06)
Republican	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.06 (0.07)
White	-0.06 ⁺ (0.03)	-0.15 ^{**} (0.06)
Intercept	0.52 ^{**} (0.04)	2.87 ^{**} (0.07)
<i>N</i>	1,356	2,000
<i>R</i> ²	0.0059	0.0084
St. Err.	0.49962	1.1562

Source: 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, and race. Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A8: Candidate Characteristics and Voting in Britain, the US, and Argentina – Additional Models

Modification	Including “not sure”	Including “not sure”	Including “not sure”	Focusing on “typical” cases	Focusing on “typical” cases	Focusing on “typical” cases	Opponent from other class	Opponent from other class	Opponent from other class
	Britain	US	Argentina	Britain	US	Argentina	Britain	US	Argentina
Working-class	0.03 (0.02)	0.06 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)	0.00 (0.08)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.09 (0.06)	0.03 (0.05)
Female	0.03 (0.02)	0.00 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.06)	0.03 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.03 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)
Less education	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	--	--	--	0.03 (0.02)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.03)
Tory/Rep/Radical	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.18** (0.04)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.03 (0.05)	-0.10** (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.09** (0.03)
White	--	-0.08* (0.04)	--	--	-0.06 (0.06)	--	--	-0.07 (0.04)	--
Experience	--	--	0.17** (0.04)	--	--	0.10** (0.03)	--	--	0.12** (0.03)
Intercept	-0.12+ (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	0.44** (0.08)	0.50** (0.05)	0.47** (0.03)	0.40** (0.07)	0.46** (0.05)	0.48** (0.04)
<i>N</i>	11,096	2,000	2,254	2,765	432	1,060	3,720	714	934
<i>R</i> ²	0.0009	0.0057	0.0186	0.0005	0.0045	0.0207	0.0030	0.0144	0.0262
St. Err.	0.82299	0.8223	0.93439	0.5001	0.5015	0.49586	0.49958	0.4985	0.49499

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate’s occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A9: Candidate Characteristics and Voting in Britain and the US
(Limited to Cases Where the Two Hypothetical Candidates Had Different Educational Levels)

Sample	Britain	US
Working-class	0.03 (0.02)	0.07 (0.06)
Female	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.03)
Less education	0.04 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.05)
Tory/Rep/Radical	0.01 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.14)
White	--	-0.04 (0.04)
Experience	--	--
Intercept	0.34** (0.07)	0.49** (0.10)
<i>N</i>	3,682	730
<i>R</i> ²	0.0031	0.0070
St. Err.	0.49957	0.5003

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study.
Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A10: Candidate Characteristics and Voting in Britain, the US, and Argentina
(Using Logit Rather than OLS)

Sample	Britain	US	Argentina
Working-class	0.08 (0.06)	0.20 (0.13)	0.03 (0.09)
Female	0.09 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.13)	0.13 (0.09)
Less education	0.07 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.06 (0.09)
Tory/Rep/Radical	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.06 (0.13)	-0.41** (0.09)
White	--	-0.22 ⁺ (0.12)	--
Experience	--	--	0.36** (0.09)
Intercept	-0.34 (0.18)	0.07 (0.14)	-0.03** (0.10)
<i>N</i>	7,558	1,356	1,912
Pseudo <i>R</i> ²	0.0009	0.0043	0.0141
Log pseudolikelihood	-6264.962	-914.828	-1305.301

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from logistic regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.

Table A11: Diagnostic Check for Profile Order Effects

Sample	Britain	US	Argentina
First profile	-0.063 (0.097)	0.138 ⁺ (0.076)	0.044 (0.061)
Working-class	0.002 (0.022)	0.048 (0.043)	-0.027 (0.047)
Working-class * First profile	0.039 (0.031)	-0.008 (0.058)	0.027 (0.047)
Female	0.024 (0.022)	-0.003 (0.043)	0.030 (0.032)
Female * First profile	-0.000 (0.032)	0.014 (0.057)	0.005 (0.045)
Less education	0.031 (0.022)	0.003 (0.043)	-0.030 (0.032)
Less education * First profile	-0.027 (0.032)	-0.012 (0.060)	0.039 (0.045)
Tory/Rep/Radical	-0.010 (0.022)	-0.017 (0.043)	-0.068 ^{**} (0.032)
Tory/Rep/Radical * First profile	0.011 (0.030)	0.007 (0.056)	-0.064 (0.032)
White	--	-0.069 (0.043)	--
White * First profile	--	0.035 (0.060)	--
Experience	--	--	0.183 ^{**} (0.032)
Experience * First profile	--	--	-0.191 ^{**} (0.046)
Intercept	0.444 ^{**} (0.066)	0.442 ^{**} (0.053)	0.467 ^{**} (0.040)
<i>N</i>	7,558	1,356	1,912
<i>R</i> ²	0.003	0.031	0.033
St. Err.	0.500	0.495	0.493

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2015 Argentina Panel Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating the dependent variable to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺ $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, two tailed.

Table A12: Randomization Checks

Sample Respondent characteristic	Britain			US			Argentina		
	Gender	Age	Education	Gender	Age	Education	Gender	Age	Education
Working-class	0.011 (0.013)	-0.002 (0.013)	-0.020 (0.013)	-0.037 (0.025)	0.048 ⁺ (0.025)	0.010 (0.023)	0.006 (0.022)	0.027 (0.022)	-0.013 (0.017)
Female	-0.021 ⁺ (0.013)	-0.014 (0.013)	0.008 (0.013)	-0.016 (0.024)	0.024 (0.024)	-0.036 (0.023)	-0.013 (0.021)	0.014 (0.021)	0.002 (0.017)
Less education	-0.011 (0.013)	-0.017 (0.013)	-0.010 (0.013)	-0.020 (0.026)	-0.035 (0.026)	-0.019 (0.024)	-0.020 (0.021)	-0.014 (0.021)	0.030 ⁺ (0.016)
Tory/Rep/Radical	0.013 (0.013)	-0.001 (0.013)	0.008 (0.013)	-0.009 (0.025)	-0.009 (0.025)	-0.011 (0.024)	0.017 (0.021)	-0.001 (0.022)	0.024 (0.017)
White	--	--	--	-0.014 (0.025)	0.023 (0.025)	-0.015 (0.024)	--	--	--
Experience	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.006 (0.021)	-0.023 (0.021)	-0.024 (0.016)
Intercept	1.533** (0.040)	0.533** (0.040)	0.440** (0.040)	0.566** (0.032)	0.490** (0.032)	0.392** (0.031)	0.530** (0.028)	0.495** (0.028)	0.167** (0.022)
<i>N</i>	11,096	11,096	10,776	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,298	2,298	2,298
<i>R</i> ²	0.0009	0.0005	0.0006	0.0023	0.0050	0.0022	0.0009	0.0016	0.0037
St. Err.	0.49946	0.49962	0.49375	0.49986	0.49927	0.47922	0.49992	0.50023	0.39078

Sources: 2015 British Election Study, 2015 Cooperative Congressional Election Study.

Notes: Cells report estimates from ordinary least squares regression models relating dichotomous variables for gender, age (young versus old), and education (college versus no college) to indicators for the hypothetical candidate's occupation, gender, education, party, race (US only), and experience (Argentina only). Standard errors are clustered by unique election. ⁺*p* < 0.10; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01, two tailed.