

Appendix

A: Robustness Checks Involving Volume of Donations

As noted in the main text, a potential concern about CFscores is that they are sensitive to the volume of receipts attracted by legislators. For example, while some important legislators may attract donations from both ideological and access-seeking givers, others may enjoy donations from only one of these types. If a legislator receives donations only from access-seekers while another receives donations from ideological and access-seeking interests, CFscores may erroneously measure the former legislator as more moderate than the latter legislator, for example. This concern is particularly salient when examining state legislatures, where the volume of donations is typically lower than in Congress.

To address this concern, I introduce a variable, *Total Receipts*, into the regression models from Test 2. This variable represents the total dollar amount of donations received by the winning candidate. Its inclusion controls for the possibility that the total number of campaign funds received by the winner explains the observed correlation between winner moderation and exposure to same-party general-election competition. Table A1 depicts the results of regression models including this variable.

As Table A1 depicts, the inclusion of *Total Receipts* does not alter the substantive results presented in the main text. That is, even after controlling for the volume of campaign funds received by the winning candidate, exposure to same-party general-election competition remains negatively associated with ideological extremism among the winning candidates. *Total Receipts* is itself moderately associated with the ideological extremism of candidates, displaying a positive, statistically significant association with *Winner Extremism*. This relationship is only significant, however, when state-level fixed effects are included. This is perhaps not surprising, given differences in fundraising between California and Washington.

Table A1: Same-Party Competition, Campaign Receipts, and Winner Extremism

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>			
	Winner Extremism			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Same-Party Competition</i>	-0.144*** (0.043)	-0.148*** (0.043)	-0.095** (0.043)	-0.097** (0.043)
<i>Total Receipts</i>	0.000 (0.00000)	0.000 (0.00000)	0.00000** (0.00000)	0.00000* (0.00000)
<i>Congressional Race</i>	-0.028 (0.071)	0.046 (0.082)	0.014 (0.069)	0.016 (0.079)
<i>Party</i>	-0.0003* (0.0002)	-0.0002 (0.0002)	-0.0003 (0.0002)	-0.0003 (0.0002)
<i>Incumbent Winner</i>	-0.067 (0.055)	-0.077 (0.056)	-0.103* (0.053)	-0.098* (0.053)
<i>Open Seat</i>	-0.020 (0.058)	-0.033 (0.059)	-0.034 (0.056)	-0.040 (0.056)
<i>Upper Chamber</i>	-0.062 (0.038)	-0.058 (0.037)	-0.071* (0.036)	-0.070* (0.036)
<i>District Extremism</i>	0.213*** (0.068)	0.236*** (0.071)	0.285*** (0.067)	0.270*** (0.068)
<i>Difference in Extremism</i>	-0.357*** (0.038)	-0.353*** (0.038)	-0.367*** (0.036)	-0.363*** (0.036)
Constant	1.115*** (0.063)	1.071*** (0.070)	1.143*** (0.061)	1.083*** (0.067)
State FEs?	N	N	Y	Y
Year FEs?	N	Y	N	Y
Observations	324	324	324	324
Log Likelihood	-24.028	-21.190	-11.248	-6.433
Akaike Inf. Crit.	68.056	68.379	44.495	40.867

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

B: Facsimile of Sam Reed Meeting Notes

In August 2016, the author visited the Washington State Archive in Olympia, WA to study the records and writings of the architects of the top-two system. The primary architect of the top-two primary system—and primary defender in front of the Supreme Court—was then-Secretary of State Sam Reed. Given transparency laws in place in Washington, most or all of Secretary Reed’s e-mails, meeting notes, and other office contents from his time in office have been preserved at the Archive and are available for public viewing. Thus, as part of the trip, the author photocopied many of these documents, along with columns, new stories, and ballots from the nearly decade-long battle over the top-two. These included the clip found in Figure 1 of the main text.

Below, I display the full photocopy of the document from which Figure 1 was created. It should be noted that the sentiments captured in the notes were independently reiterated in a later phone interview with Secretary Reed directly.

What is it your constituents want?

Compliment CAUCUS.

— Why? Broken?

BOP Intervenor

This bill is good for Republicans.

- Libertarian Issue (Slade, other examples)
- Ds are larger party--we get hurt when Ds pick party ballot in primary
- We need cross over votes in many districts
- We need to elect moderates in Urban areas

This bill is the only vehicle with a realistic chance of passing.

- We have the votes to move the bill in the House with R help
- We doubt that Montana has the support to move in the house.
- Top two is the only bill with a realistic chance.

The Modified Montana has many problems

(We got the support.)

- The bill has many technical concerns
- It would cost a lot to administer
- The Auditors and my staff are very concerned about administration
- The bill requires voters to choose a party ballot
- The bill controls ballot access for candidates — Statewide 350,000
- The bill gives Party Rules the Force and Effect of Law
- The bill gives the parties control over the election process
- The parties could change the rules, and election process, every year
- Parties could opt out of a primary and disenfranchise many voters
- Montana style bill puts us on slippery slope of party litigation

Please Don't believe everything you hear from the Parties.

- Top Two may result in litigation--but we will win.
- Parties may litigate right to use "name"--but we will win
- Parties may go to convention--but will not control ballot access
- Montana results in more "serious" litigation--and we might not win

Modified Blanket Primary has withstood the test of time and legislative process

- Public supports 2-1
- 34 editorials support

California

Bush

Norm Rice
Larry Phillips

Why 3/4 of GOP in Senate
Against it: Adam Klues,
Jane Kohl-Wells,
Jacobson
Rosa Franklin