Online Appendix: Modeling Party Preferences With Clustered Errors

	Traditional Wording	Position Cue Wording	Competence Cue Wording	All Wordings
PID: Democrat	-1.92^{***} (0.38)	-2.29^{***} (0.43)	-1.99^{***} (0.39)	-1.92^{***} (0.38)
PID: Democrat \times Position Cue				-0.37 (0.57)
PID: Democrat \times Competence Cue				-0.07 (0.55)
PID: Republican	2.14^{***} (0.50)	1.63^{***} (0.46)	1.56^{***} (0.43)	$2.14^{***} \\ (0.50)$
PID: Republican \times Position Cue				-0.52 (0.68)
PID: Republican \times Competence Cue				-0.58 (0.66)
Ideology	$1.45^{***} \\ (0.23)$	1.96^{***} (0.33)	1.53^{***} (0.26)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.45^{***} \\ (0.23) \end{array}$
Ideology \times Position Cue				0.52 (0.40)
Ideology \times Competence Cue				0.08 (0.34)
Issue Fixed Effects (<i>Wald statistic, 8 d.f.</i>) Issue Fixed Effects (<i>Wald statistic, 8 d.f.</i>) Issue Fixed Effects \times Position Cue (16 d.f.) Issue Fixed Effects \times Competence Cue (16 d.f.)	81.19***	69.56***	108.10***	81.39*** 151.17*** 189.75***
Position Cue				-1.83 (1.33)
Competence Cue				-0.11 (1.11)
Constant	-3.62^{***} (0.72)	-5.45^{***} (1.12)	-3.73^{***} (0.84)	-3.62^{***} (0.72)
n	1984	1643	1866	5493

DV: Preference for Republicans on an issue (binary logit model)

This table replicates the results in Table 3 using clustered standard errors rather than traditional SEs, which are presented in order to suggest an upper bound to the degree of error potentially present in these analyses. In reading an earlier version of this paper, one reviewer pointed out that the responses from a single individual are likely to be correlated, and that as such the standard SE estimates may be too small. While the author is unconvinced that observations of different survey questions from a given individual are equivalent to repeated observations of the same question asked of groups of individuals or of the same individuals in waves of a panel survey (the two most common applications of clustered errors to survey data), this is less a methodological disagreement than a philosophical one, and there is ultimatly no perfect solution to this question. By presenting both the traditional SEs in the paper and the clustered SEs in this appendix, we aim to give a sense of the potential bounds of the errors involved in these models, and readers can choose their own weighting of the two extremes based upon their own interepretation of this methodological challenge.