

Quality Candidates – predicting victory in SMD contests

It appears that the data I merged with the Reed cruns, etc. was not messed up (the results are staying the same once I don't do the merge). But I'd like to hold off on the merge if possible until we know we can merge everything perfectly. There were some discrepancies in the merge (although they didn't affect my results in any analysis).

The short story here is that:

- Quality candidates (and former local office holders) are important in 2000 & 2003, but not at all in 2005. **And according to the analysis below, probably not in 2009.**
- LDP as a party is not important in 2000 and 2003, but it's really important in 2005 & 2009.
- No surprise: Always less likely to win if running against an SMD incumbent.

Unit of analysis: New candidates for LDP and DPJ.

Dependent variable: smdwin - win an SMD=1, don't win=0

By the way, a "new candidate" is one who's never won a seat before.

Independent variables:

kkid: Koizumi kid – ran and elected for first time (LDP) in 2005

local: former kengi, city mayor, or prefectural governor – 0-1

hc: former HC seat holder – 0-1

tv: former TV newscaster – 0-1

inherit: inherited seat from parent or sibling – 0-1

quality: local, hc, or tv – 0-1

quality2: local, hc, tv, or INHERIT – 0-1

ldp: coded 1 for LDP, 0 for DPJ

coord_fail: # of candidates in your camp minus # in the other camp (in the district)

DPJ camp is JCP, SDPJ & DPJ independents

LDP camp is Komei, LDP independents, Kokumin Shinto, & Daichi Shinto

candidate_spend: amount spent by the candidate/limit on what they can spend

Yes, there are probably much better ways to create this measure.

samecand: 1 if ran for the party last time, 0 if not

opp_inherits: 1 if there is an opponent who inherited the SMD from a family member, 0 if not

opp_major_sinc: 1 if there is in the district an SMD incumbent from the LDP or DPJ, 0 otherwise

did: DID – urban-rural measure

postal_there: 1 if a postal rebel is running in the district, 0 otherwise

I also run a model with all of the above for all candidates from the LDP and DPJ. There is include the following. (The aggregated quality variables are significant for 2000, but non-significant in 2003. However, local is significant for both 2000 & 2003. I only show the models with local, etc. below.)

sinc: SMD incumbent (for models with more than just new candidates only) – 0-1

pinc: PR incumbents (again, not for models that only have new candidates) – 0-1

returnee: former HR seat holder – 0-1

New Candidates only – Quality measure is “quality”

Quality becomes less important over time. Party becomes important in 2005. Facing a major party SMD incumbent was not a problem in 2009.

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| quality | 0.975^{***} (3.62) | 0.719^{**} (2.83) | 0.571 (1.63) | 0.396 (1.52) |
| ldp | -0.344 (-0.65) | -0.245 (-0.46) | 3.619^{***} (3.68) | -1.996^{***} (-4.37) |
| coord_fail | 0.0337 (0.13) | 0.0404 (0.15) | 0.499 (1.23) | -0.0319 (-0.11) |
| cand_spend | 0.625 (0.99) | 0.991 (1.33) | 0.742 (0.77) | |
| samecand | 0.427 (1.36) | 0.360 (1.23) | 0.962 [*] (2.55) | 0.562 [*] (2.07) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.775^{**} (-3.20) | -0.662[*] (-2.54) | -1.486^{**} (-2.82) | -0.0607 (-0.18) |
| did | 0.667 (1.58) | 1.228 ^{**} (2.76) | 2.640 ^{***} (3.38) | 1.485 ^{**} (3.15) |
| inherit | | 1.262 [*] (2.55) | -0.0283 (-0.05) | 1.046 (1.08) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.0129 (-0.02) | 2.155 (1.76) | -0.537 (-0.60) |
| postal_there | | | -0.718 (-1.40) | |
| _cons | -1.338 ^{**} (-2.81) | -2.063 ^{***} (-3.88) | -4.752 ^{***} (-4.39) | -0.683 (-1.66) |
| <i>N</i> | 185 | 186 | 187 | 151 |

New Candidates only – quality measure is “quality2”

Same pattern as above, but quality is significant in 2009 at .061 level. However, if I run just the DPJ, quality is non-significant. If I run just LDP, non-quality perfectly predicts loss, so quality falls out of the model.

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| quality2 | 1.137*** (4.34) | 0.707** (2.74) | 0.566 (1.63) | 0.491 (1.87) |
| ldp | -0.218 (-0.42) | -0.105 (-0.20) | 3.451*** (3.69) | -1.982*** (-4.39) |
| coord_fail | 0.0590 (0.24) | 0.0540 (0.20) | 0.469 (1.18) | -0.0876 (-0.33) |
| cand_spend | 0.638 (1.04) | 1.230 (1.72) | 0.749 (0.77) | |
| samecand | 0.364 (1.15) | 0.313 (1.07) | 0.927* (2.49) | 0.564* (2.07) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.919*** (-3.90) | -0.729** (-2.85) | -1.352** (-2.71) | -0.0809 (-0.24) |
| did | 0.482 (1.20) | 1.107* (2.53) | 2.801*** (3.60) | 1.566*** (3.39) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.0882 (-0.13) | 2.275 (1.86) | -0.562 (-0.62) |
| postal_there | | | -0.514 (-1.09) | |
| _cons | -1.183* (-2.56) | -2.022*** (-3.86) | -4.902*** (-4.46) | -0.712 (-1.73) |
| N | 192 | 186 | 187 | 151 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

New Candidates only – Many quality independent variables

Same pattern – quality non-significant after 03. LDP significant after 03.

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| local | 0.623 (1.95) | 0.992*** (3.36) | 0.539 (1.31) | 0.461 (1.42) |
| hc | 1.499* (2.14) | | | 0.936 (0.94) |
| bur | 1.466** (3.09) | 0.122 (0.27) | 0.299 (0.66) | 0.468 (1.12) |
| tv | 1.755* (2.18) | 0.672 (1.00) | | -0.911 (-1.02) |
| ldp | -0.387 (-0.71) | -0.110 (-0.20) | 3.874*** (3.74) | -2.098*** (-4.48) |
| coord_fail | 0.0167 (0.07) | 0.106 (0.37) | 0.691 (1.59) | -0.0438 (-0.16) |
| cand_spend | 0.695 (1.08) | 1.014 (1.32) | 0.934 (0.95) | |
| samecand | 0.390 (1.20) | 0.303 (1.01) | 0.929* (2.48) | 0.625* (2.24) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.771** (-3.11) | -0.715** (-2.65) | -1.456** (-2.75) | -0.105 (-0.31) |
| did | 0.759 (1.75) | 1.129* (2.51) | 2.637*** (3.37) | 1.609*** (3.32) |
| inherit | | 1.223* (2.42) | -0.0953 (-0.16) | 1.022 (1.05) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.0569 (-0.08) | 2.153 (1.72) | -0.603 (-0.67) |
| postal_there | | | -0.558 (-1.06) | |
| _cons | -1.402** (-2.89) | -2.022*** (-3.76) | -4.890*** (-4.32) | -0.718 (-1.72) |
| <i>N</i> | 185 | 184 | 182 | 151 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

All Candidates – “Quality” independent variable

Party still the biggest thing now (2005 & 2009). Incumbency still important in 2009. Quality is significant at .108 level in 2009.

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| sinc | 1.225*** (6.14) | 1.016*** (4.56) | 1.608*** (4.80) | 1.094*** (3.33) |
| pinc | 0.735*** (3.31) | 0.288 (1.52) | 0.385 (1.50) | 0.709* (2.47) |
| returnee | 0.245 (0.89) | 0.137 (0.57) | -0.121 (-0.34) | 1.264*** (3.46) |
| quality | 0.723** (3.16) | 0.196 (0.94) | 0.177 (0.60) | 0.403 (1.61) |
| ldp | -0.233 (-0.76) | -0.343 (-1.12) | 2.807*** (6.08) | -2.340*** (-8.78) |
| coord_fail | -0.0464 (-0.31) | -0.223 (-1.42) | 0.128 (0.56) | 0.513*** (3.92) |
| cand_spend | 0.584 (1.73) | 0.883* (2.46) | 0.324 (0.70) | |
| samecand | 0.346* (2.15) | 0.0260 (0.15) | 0.603** (2.62) | 0.296 (1.47) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.803*** (-4.56) | -0.948*** (-5.80) | -0.628* (-2.47) | -0.711** (-2.85) |
| did | -0.138 (-0.59) | -0.00993 (-0.05) | 0.344 (1.09) | -0.284 (-1.24) |
| inherit | | 0.378 (0.89) | -0.430 (-0.86) | 2.110* (2.32) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.387 (-0.93) | 0.890 (1.59) | -0.828 (-1.22) |
| postal_there | | | -0.380 (-1.38) | |
| kkid | | | | -0.327 (-0.79) |
| _cons | -0.705* (-2.41) | -0.373 (-1.35) | -2.817*** (-5.65) | 0.810** (2.91) |
| <i>N</i> | 501 | 544 | 579 | 561 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Quality2 independent variable

Party very important 05 & 09, but not before. Quality is significant in 09, but probably for the reason laid out in the analysis above (which didn't include incumbents).

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| sinc | 1.182*** (5.96) | 0.989*** (4.44) | 1.651*** (4.94) | 1.018** (3.19) |
| pinc | 0.740*** (3.32) | 0.267 (1.40) | 0.409 (1.59) | 0.715* (2.51) |
| returnee | 0.242 (0.87) | 0.113 (0.47) | -0.102 (-0.29) | 1.286*** (3.53) |
| quality2 | 0.878*** (4.01) | 0.158 (0.79) | 0.101 (0.36) | 0.540* (2.15) |
| ldp | -0.188 (-0.62) | -0.330 (-1.08) | 2.772*** (6.06) | -2.297*** (-8.82) |
| coord_fail | -0.0337 (-0.23) | -0.221 (-1.41) | 0.117 (0.51) | 0.490*** (3.78) |
| cand_spend | 0.585 (1.75) | 0.913* (2.55) | 0.315 (0.67) | |
| samecand | 0.327* (2.02) | 0.0223 (0.13) | 0.589* (2.57) | 0.287 (1.43) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.877*** (-5.05) | -0.954*** (-5.87) | -0.595* (-2.36) | -0.764** (-3.08) |
| did | -0.168 (-0.72) | -0.00956 (-0.04) | 0.389 (1.23) | -0.249 (-1.10) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.403 (-0.97) | 0.918 (1.64) | -0.863 (-1.26) |
| postal_there | | | -0.330 (-1.22) | |
| kkid | | | | -0.348 (-0.84) |
| _cons | -0.663* (-2.28) | -0.366 (-1.32) | -2.868*** (-5.72) | 0.825** (2.97) |
| N | 508 | 544 | 579 | 561 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

All Candidates – Many quality independent variables

And same pattern disaggregating the quality candidate variable.

| | (1) smdwin00 | (2) smdwin03 | (3) smdwin05 | (4) smdwin09 |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| sinc | 1.244*** (6.20) | 1.018*** (4.55) | 1.563*** (4.68) | 1.083** (3.28) |
| pinc | 0.743*** (3.35) | 0.291 (1.52) | 0.351 (1.38) | 0.700* (2.43) |
| returnee | 0.252 (0.91) | 0.148 (0.61) | -0.151 (-0.43) | 1.258*** (3.42) |
| local | 0.570 (1.96) | 0.528* (2.07) | 0.109 (0.31) | 0.466 (1.52) |
| hc | 1.292 (1.93) | | | 0.534 (0.57) |
| bur | 0.567 (1.46) | -0.568 (-1.34) | 0.141 (0.34) | 0.457 (1.09) |
| tv | 1.695* (2.32) | 0.366 (0.59) | | -0.634 (-0.71) |
| ldp | -0.249 (-0.81) | -0.305 (-0.99) | 2.880*** (6.05) | -2.359*** (-8.76) |
| coord_fail | -0.0590 (-0.40) | -0.203 (-1.28) | 0.172 (0.72) | 0.519*** (3.95) |
| cand_spend | 0.597 (1.77) | 0.886* (2.44) | 0.342 (0.73) | |
| samecand | 0.331* (2.03) | 0.00979 (0.06) | 0.604** (2.62) | 0.316 (1.56) |
| opp_major_sinc | -0.784*** (-4.42) | -0.974*** (-5.86) | -0.640* (-2.51) | -0.734** (-2.91) |
| did | -0.137 (-0.58) | -0.0426 (-0.20) | 0.343 (1.08) | -0.266 (-1.16) |
| inherit | | 0.379 (0.86) | -0.469 (-0.93) | 2.083* (2.29) |
| opp_inherits | | -0.397 (-0.96) | 0.875 (1.56) | -0.863 (-1.26) |
| postal_there | | | -0.349 (-1.26) | |
| kkid | | | | -0.327 (-0.79) |
| _cons | -0.711* (-2.42) | -0.360 (-1.29) | -2.823*** (-5.56) | 0.814** (2.91) |
| <i>N</i> | 501 | 542 | 574 | 561 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$