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Appendix A - Evidence of statistical heterogeneity for aggregated model/dataset


Figure 1. Plot of residuals vs fitted for aggregate model, $N=785$


Figure 2. Electoral District 1 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity


Figure 3. Electoral District 2 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity


Figure 4. Electoral District 3 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity


Figure 5. Electoral District 4 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity


Figure 6. Electoral District 5 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity


Figure 7. Electoral District 6 multilevel model (MLM) homoscedasticity

Appendix B - Basic scatterplots for each ED and aggregated dataset


Figure 8. Scatterplot for Electoral District 1


Figure 9. Scatterplot for Electoral District 2


Figure 10. Scatterplot for Electoral District 3


Figure 11. Scatterplot for Electoral District 4


Figure 12. Scatterplot for Electoral District 5


Figure 13. Scatterplot for Electoral District 6

Basic scatterplots for aggregated dataset


Figure 14. Scatterplot for aggregate dataset, with pooled line of best fit


Figure 15. Scatterplot for aggregate dataset, with group-level lines of best fit

## Appendix C - Exploratory grouping-level analyses

## Categorical linear regression tables

The associative regression analyses below are for broad approximation only and not to be interpreted unless using a great deal of caution. These analyses are "flat", that is, they do not account for the non-independence of the polls nor the heteroscedasticity demonstrated by some of the variables.

Table 1
Regression results using vote share as the criterion and electoral district as a predictor

| Predictor | $b$ | $\begin{gathered} b \\ \text { 95\% CI } \\ \text { [LL, UL] } \end{gathered}$ | beta | $\begin{gathered} \text { beta } \\ 95 \% \mathrm{CI} \\ \text { [LL, } \\ \text { UL] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $s r^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} s r^{2} \\ 95 \% \mathrm{CI} \\ {[\mathrm{LL},} \\ \mathrm{UL}] \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $r$ | Fit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 16.24** | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { [14.43, } \\ 18.05] \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electoral district | 1.01** | [0.58, 1.44] | 0.16 | $\begin{array}{r} {[0.09} \\ 0.23] \end{array}$ | . 03 | $\begin{gathered} {[.01,} \\ .05] \end{gathered}$ | .16** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & R^{2}= \\ & .027 * * \\ & 95 \% \\ & \text { CI[.01,.05] } \end{aligned}$ |

Note. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. beta indicates the standardized regression weights. $s r^{2}$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared. $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. $L L$ and $U L$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. * indicates $p<.05$. ** indicates $p<.01$.

## Table 2

Regression results using vote share as the criterion and year as a predictor

| Predictor | $b$ | $\begin{gathered} b \\ \text { 95\% CI } \\ \text { [LL, UL] } \end{gathered}$ | beta | $\begin{gathered} \text { beta } \\ 95 \% \mathrm{CI} \\ {[\mathrm{LL},} \\ \mathrm{UL}] \end{gathered}$ | $s r^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} s r^{2} \\ 95 \% \mathrm{CI} \\ \text { [LL, } \\ \text { UL] } \end{gathered}$ | $r$ | Fit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $2913.22 * *$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[-3882.93,-} \\ & 1943.51] \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 1.45** | [0.97, 1.93] | 0.21 | $\begin{gathered} {[0.14,} \\ 0.28] \end{gathered}$ | . 04 | $\begin{gathered} {[.02,} \\ .07] \end{gathered}$ | . 21 ** |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R^{2}= \\
& .043 * * \\
& 95 \% \\
& \text { CI[.02,.07] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Note. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. beta indicates the standardized regression weights. $s r^{2}$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared. $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. $L L$ and $U L$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. * indicates $p<.05 .{ }^{* *}$ indicates $p<.01$.

## Table 3

Regression results using vote share as the criterion and electoral level as a predictor

| Predictor | $b$ | $b$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> [LL, UL] | $s r^{2}$ | $s r^{2}$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> [LL, UL] | Fit |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $15.84^{* *}$ | $[15.18,16.50]$ |  |  |  |
| Electoral <br> level | $24.55^{* *}$ | $[22.95,26.15]$ | .54 | $[.49, .57]$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $R^{2}=.536^{* *}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note. A significant $b$-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. $s r^{2}$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared. $L L$ and $U L$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. * indicates $\mathrm{p}<.05$. ${ }^{* *}$ indicates $\mathrm{p}<.01$.

## Table 4

Regression results using vote share as the criterion and province as the predictor

| Predictor | $b$ | $b$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> [LL, UL] | $s r^{2}$ | $s r^{2}$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> [LL, UL] | Fit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $35.95^{* *}$ | $[33.49,38.41]$ |  |  |  |
| Province | $-17.81^{* *}$ | $[-20.41,-15.21]$ | .19 | $[.14, .23]$ | $R^{2}=.188^{* *}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $95 \% \mathrm{CI}[.14, .23]$ |

Note. A significant $b$-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. $b$ represents
unstandardized regression weights. $s r^{2}$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared. $L L$ and $U L$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.

* indicates $\mathrm{p}<.05$. $^{* *}$ indicates $\mathrm{p}<.01$.

Table 5
Regression results using vote share as the criterion and riding as the predictor

| Predictor | $b$ | $b$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> $[\mathrm{LL}, \mathrm{UL}]$ | $s r^{2}$ | $s r^{2}$ <br> $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ <br> [LL, UL] | Fit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | $21.04^{* *}$ | $[20.07,22.00]$ |  |  |  |
| Riding A | $-8.66^{* *}$ | $[-10.34,-6.99]$ | .09 | $[.06, .13]$ |  |
| Riding B | $14.92^{* *}$ | $[12.41,17.43]$ | .12 | $[.09, .16]$ | $R^{2}=.282^{* *}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note. A significant $b$-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. $s r^{2}$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared. $L L$ and $U L$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. * indicates $\mathrm{p}<.05 .{ }^{* *}$ indicates $\mathrm{p}<.01$.

Table 6
Model comparison of the above as potential explanatory models

| Predictor/model | df | AIC | R2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Electoral district | 7 | 5112.417 | 0.7536 |
| Year | 5 | 5580.449 | 0.5516 |
| Electoral level | 3 | 5606.539 | 0.5353 |
| Province | 3 | 6046.070 | 0.1865 |
| Riding | 4 | 5950.966 | 0.2803 |

## Exploratory grouping-level intraclass coeffecient (ICC) analyses

Neighbourhood as the sole group-level predictor for the multilevel model
$\mathrm{AIC}=5942.357$
$\mathrm{BIC}=5956.354$
$\mathrm{ICC}=0.4977237$
Riding as the sole group-level predictor for the multilevel model
AIC $=5961.949$
BIC $=5975.946$
$\mathrm{ICC}=0.5527897$
Year as the sole group-level predictor for the multilevel model

$$
\mathrm{AIC}=5598.055
$$

$\mathrm{BIC}=5612.052$
$\mathrm{ICC}=0.7933872$
Province as the sole group-level predictor for the multilevel model
AIC $=6052.238$
BIC $=6066.235$
$\mathrm{ICC}=0.5503762$
Electoral Level as the sole group-level predictor for the multilevel model
AIC $=5614.877$
$\mathrm{BIC}=5628.874$
$\mathrm{ICC}=0.8034488$

## Appendix D - Multilevel Regression Tables

Multilevel regression tables were produced using sjPlot (Lüdecke, 2021).

## Table 7

Electoral District 1 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear-only model, cubic model, and presence/absence model

|  | Vote share (linear) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (cubic) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (treatment) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | 11.23 *** | 9.50 to 12.96 | 12.74 | 4.81 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .001 \end{aligned}$ | 10.13 *** | 7.43 to 12.83 | 7.36 | 21.65 | $.001$ | $11.22^{* * *}$ | 9.10 to 13.33 | 10.39 | 5.49 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .001 \end{aligned}$ |
| Signs per 100 EOL | 3.00 *** | 2.40 to 3.60 | 9.79 | 231.27 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .001 \end{aligned}$ | 8.56* | 1.80 to 15.31 | 2.48 | 161.08 | . 014 |  |  |  |  |  |
| signsper^2 |  |  |  |  |  | -6.44 * | $\begin{aligned} & -12.01 \text { to }- \\ & 0.88 \end{aligned}$ | -2.27 | 160.97 | . 025 |  |  |  |  |  |
| signsper^3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.80 ** | 0.50 to 3.09 | 2.72 | 160.85 | . 007 |  |  |  |  |  |
| signs present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.97 *** | 1.89 to 4.04 | 5.40 | 230.21 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .001 \end{aligned}$ |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 11.38 |  |  |  |  | 10.41 |  |  |  |  | 14.25 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 3.29 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 3.57 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 4.64 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.22 |  |  |  |  | 0.26 |  |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 5 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 5 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 5 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| Obs. | 235 |  |  |  |  | 168 |  |  |  |  | 235 |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { Margin. } \mathrm{R}^{2} /$ <br> Condit.R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.25 / 0.42 |  |  |  |  | $0.26 / 0.45$ |  |  |  |  | 0.087 / 0.31 |  |  |  |  |


| AIC | 1255.66 | 886.80 | 1307.58 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BIC | 1269.50 | 905.55 | 1321.42 |

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

## Table 8

Electoral District 2 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear model and presence/absence model

|  | Vote share (linear-only) |  | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | Vote share (treatment) |  |  | $d f$ | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | CI |  |  |  | $B$ | CI | $t$ |  |  |
| (Intercept) | $38.04{ }^{* * *}$ | 31.83 to 44.25 | 12.01 | 13.85 | $<.001$ | 36.46 *** | 29.96 to 42.97 | 10.99 | 19.01 | < . 001 |
| Signs per 100 EOL | -0.20 | -1.76 to 1.35 | -0.26 | 41.70 | . 800 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Signs present |  |  |  |  |  | 2.21 | -4.41 to 8.83 | 0.65 | 40.82 | . 517 |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 77.63 |  |  |  |  | 79.38 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 74.74 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 65.05 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.49 |  |  |  |  | 0.45 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 12 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 12 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| Obs. | 44 |  |  |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ / Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.001 / 0. |  |  |  |  | 0.008 / 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| AIC | 334.51 |  |  |  |  | 331.27 |  |  |  |  |
| BIC | 341.65 |  |  |  |  | 338.40 |  |  |  |  |
| *p<.05 ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 9

Electoral District 3 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear, log and quadratic models


## Table 10

Electoral District 4 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear, log and quadratic model

|  | Vote share (linear) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (log) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (quadratic) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | $39.57 \text { * }$ | 37.42 to 41.72 | 36.06 | 28.41 | $.001$ | $41.81^{* *}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.58 \text { to } 46 . \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | 19.36 | $\begin{aligned} & 47.9 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .001 \end{aligned}$ | $37.52^{* * *}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.77 \text { to } \\ & 41.27 \end{aligned}$ | 19.61 | 36.02 | $001$ |
| Signs per 100 EOL | 5.91 *** | 4.75 to 7.06 | 9.99 | 47.34 | $.001$ | 4.14* | 1.05 to 7.24 | 2.62 | $\begin{aligned} & 46.3 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | . 012 | 8.97 *** | $\begin{aligned} & 4.02 \text { to } 1 \\ & 3.92 \end{aligned}$ | 3.55 | 43.09 | . 001 |
| $\log$ (signsp <br> er) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.70 | -1.75 to 7.15 | 1.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 47.8 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | . 240 |  |  |  |  |  |
| signsper^2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.76 | $\begin{aligned} & -1.97 \text { to } \\ & 0.46 \end{aligned}$ | -1.22 | 46.08 | . 228 |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 12.29 |  |  |  |  | 12.05 |  |  |  |  | 12.78 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 4.79 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 5.00 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 3.77 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.28 |  |  |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |  | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 21 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 21 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 21 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| Obs. | 51 |  |  |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |
| Margin. $\mathrm{R}^{2} /$ <br> Condit. $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.67 / 0.76 |  |  |  |  | 0.68 / 0.77 |  |  |  |  | $0.691 / 0.76$ |  |  |  |  |
| AIC | 290.28 |  |  |  |  | 287.39 |  |  |  |  | 289.98 |  |  |  |  |
| BIC | 298.00 |  |  |  |  | 297.05 |  |  |  |  | 299.64 |  |  |  |  |

## Table 11

Electoral District 5 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear, linear ( $n=184$ ), log, and quadratic models

|  | Vote share (linear, $N=\mathbf{2 2 1}$ ) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (linear, $\boldsymbol{n}=184$ ) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (log) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (quadratic) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Interce pt) | $\begin{aligned} & 10.2 \\ & 6^{* * *} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.01 \text { to } \\ & 11.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 . \\ & 08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 . \\ & 66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.3 \\ & 8^{* * *} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.00 \text { to } \\ & 11.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 . \\ & 74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 . \\ & 73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ | $10.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.56 \text { to } \\ & 12.61 \end{aligned}$ | $7.8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148 \\ & .52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 4^{* * *} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.50 \text { to } \\ & 11.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 . \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 . \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ |
| Signs per 100 EOL | $2.97$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.26 \text { to } \\ & 3.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 216 \\ & .49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $2.83$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.03 \text { to } \\ & 3.63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.9 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178 \\ & .11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ | $3.06$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.23 \text { to } \\ & 4.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 167 \\ & .52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ | $3.69$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.83 \text { to } \\ & 5.56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 168 \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .0 \\ & 01 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\log (\operatorname{sig}$ nsper) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.21 | $\begin{gathered} -1.73 \text { to } \\ 1.31 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 . \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166 \\ & .02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .7 \\ & 87 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { signspe } \\ & \mathrm{r}^{\wedge} 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.32 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.93 \text { to } \\ & 0.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1 . \\ 00 \end{gathered}$ | $165$ | $\begin{gathered} .3 \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 7.71 |  |  |  |  | 7.87 |  |  |  |  | 7.92 |  |  |  |  | 7.86 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 6.78 |  |  |  |  | 7.66 nbh |  |  |  |  | 7.61 nb |  |  |  |  | 7.73 n |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.47 |  |  |  |  | 0.49 |  |  |  |  | 0.49 |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 23 nb |  |  |  |  | 23 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 23 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 23 nb |  |  |  |  |
| Obs. | 221 |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |  |  |  | 184 |  |  |  |  |
| Margin <br> . $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ / <br> Condit. <br> $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.19 | 0.57 |  |  |  | 0.16/0 |  |  |  |  | 0.16 / | . 57 |  |  |  | 0.16 / | 0.58 |  |  |  |
| AIC | 1131.50 |  |  |  |  | 952.73 |  |  |  |  | 953.33 |  |  |  |  | 954.20 |  |  |  |  |
| BIC | 1145.09 |  |  |  |  | 965.59 |  |  |  |  | 969.41 |  |  |  |  | 970.28 |  |  |  |  |

Table 12
Electoral District 5 multilevel regression results for presence/absence model

|  | Vote share (treatment) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $B$ | $C I$ | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | $10.60^{* * *}$ | 8.84 to 12.35 | 11.84 | 45.72 | $<.001$ |
| Signs present | $1.95^{* *}$ | 0.78 to 3.12 | 3.27 | 203.52 | $\mathbf{. 0 0 1}$ |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 9.38 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00 \text { nbhd }}$ | 10.89 |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.54 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~N}_{\text {nbhd }}$ | 23 |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 221 |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal $\mathrm{R}^{2} /$ Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $0.026 / 0.55$ |  |  |  |  |
| AIC | 1178.83 |  |  |  |  |
| BIC | 1192.43 |  |  |  |  |
| $* p<.05$ | $* * p<.01$ | $* * * p<.001$ |  |  |  |

## Table 13

Electoral District 6 multilevel regression results for effect of signs per 100 EOL on vote share for linear, linear $(n=191)$ and log models

|  | Vote share (linear) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (linear, $\boldsymbol{n}=191$ ) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (log) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | $21.14 \text { * }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.35 \text { to } 22 \text {. } \\ & 93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 33.38 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $21.44^{*}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.57 \text { to } 23 . \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.4 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 34.06 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $22.31 \text { * }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.27 \text { to } 24 \text {. } \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.4 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 42.35 | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Signs per 100 EOL | 1.91 *** | 1.49 to 2.32 | 9.01 | $\begin{aligned} & 194.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1.82 *** | 1.39 to 2.25 | 8.28 | $\begin{aligned} & 189.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 0.98* | 0.12 to 1.85 | 2.24 | $\begin{aligned} & 183.0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .02 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \log (\text { signspe } \\ & \text { r) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.92* | 0.17 to 3.67 | 2.15 | $175.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & .03 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 17.06 |  |  |  |  | 17.13 |  |  |  |  | 16.65 |  |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 10.37 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 11.14 nbhd |  |  |  |  | $12.04{ }_{\text {nbhd }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | 0.38 |  |  |  |  | 0.39 |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 23 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 23 nbhd |  |  |  |  | 23 nbhd |  |  |  |  |
| Obs. | 196 |  |  |  |  | 191 |  |  |  |  | 191 |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { Margin. } \mathrm{R}^{2}$ / Condit.R² | $0.28 / 0.55$ |  |  |  |  | $0.25 / 0.54$ |  |  |  |  | $0.25 / 0.57$ |  |  |  |  |
| AIC | 1156.82 |  |  |  |  | 1129.82 |  |  |  |  | $1125.69$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1169.93$ |  |  |  |  | $1142.83$ |  |  |  |  | $1141.96$ |  |  |  |  |

## Table 14

Aggregated multilevel regression results for 4-level model with random intercepts, random slopes in riding, and presence/absence models

|  | Vote share (random intercepts) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (random slope in ED) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (treatment) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | 24.80 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.66 \text { to } 42.9 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 2.68 | 1.70 | $\begin{aligned} & .13 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.29 \text { to } 47.7 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .30 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 24.60 | $\begin{aligned} & 3.35 \text { to } 45.8 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 1.46 | $\begin{aligned} & .19 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Signs per 100 EOL | 1.79** | 1.50 to 2.07 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.2 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $767.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1.72 | 0.10 to 3.34 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.0 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .17 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Signs present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2.46^{* *}$ | 1.53 to 3.39 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 735.4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & < \\ & .00 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |

## Random Effects

| $\sigma^{2}$ | 17.06 | 16.08 | 19.59 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\tau_{00}$ | 39.01 nbhd | 44.58 nbhd | 46.95 nbhd |
|  | 91.59 year | 46.68 year | 78.74 year |
|  | 30.15 electoral.district | 30.23 electoral.district | 44.16 electoral.district |
|  | 102.24 electoral.level | 221.86 electoral.level | 162.18 electoral.level |
| $\tau_{11}$ |  | 1.96 electoral.district.signsper |  |
| $\rho_{01}$ |  | -0.02 electoral. district |  |
| ICC | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.94 |
| N | 53 nbhd | 53 nbhd | 53 nbhd |
|  | 3 electoral.district | 3 electoral.district | 3 electoral.district |
|  | 4 year | 4 year | 4 year |
|  | 2 electoral.level | 2 electoral.level | 2 electoral.level |


| Obs. | 785 | 785 | 785 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Margin.R | $0.025 / 0.94$ | $0.018 / 0.96$ | $0.002 / 0.94$ |
| / Condit. |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| AIC | 4647.13 | 4619.18 | 4755.17 |
| BIC | 4679.79 | 4661.17 | 4787.83 |
| $* p<.05 * * p<.01 * * * p<.001$ |  |  |  |

## Table 15

Aggregated multilevel regression results for 4-level model for linear, log, and quadratic models

|  | Vote share (linear) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (log) |  |  |  |  | Vote share (quadratic) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | $B$ | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ | B | CI | $t$ | $d f$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | $\begin{aligned} & 24.6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.20 \text { to } \\ 43.12 \end{gathered}$ | 2.62 | 1.58 | . 152 | 25.70 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.33 \text { to } 4 \\ & 4.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 1.54 | . 147 | 23.89 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.71 \text { to } \\ & 42.06 \end{aligned}$ | 2.58 | 1.59 | . 155 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Signs per } 100 \\ & \text { EOL } \end{aligned}$ | 1.67 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.36 \text { to } \\ & 1.97 \end{aligned}$ | 10.77 | 636.23 | < . 001 | 1.00 *** | $\begin{aligned} & 0.51 \text { to } 1 \text {. } \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.9 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 621.46 | < . 001 | 2.68 *** | $\begin{aligned} & 2.01 \text { to } \\ & 3.34 \end{aligned}$ | 7.90 | $\begin{aligned} & 613.5 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | < 0001 |
| $\log$ (signsper) |  |  |  |  |  | 1.29 *** | $\begin{aligned} & 0.54 \text { to } 2 . \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 603.79 | . 001 |  |  |  |  |  |
| signsper^2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.16*** | $\begin{aligned} & -0.25 \text { to - } \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | -3.35 | $\begin{aligned} & 610.0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | . 001 |

## Random Effects

| $\sigma^{2}$ | 16.10 | 15.82 | 15.83 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\tau_{00}$ | $31.61_{\text {nbhd }}$ | $32.10_{\text {nbhd }}$ | $31.90_{\text {nbhd }}$ |
|  | 85.49 year | $81.39_{\text {year }}$ | $84.25_{\text {year }}$ |
|  | $31.79_{\text {electoral.district }}$ | $30.33_{\text {electoral.district }}$ | $29.93_{\text {electoral.district }}$ |
|  | $110.48_{\text {electoral.level }}$ | $111.53_{\text {electoral.level }}$ | $106.80_{\text {electoral.level }}$ |
| ICC | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| N | $51_{\text {nbhd }}$ | $51_{\text {nbhd }}$ | 51 nbhd |
|  | 3 electoral.district | 3 electoral.district | 3 electoral.district |
|  | 4 year | 4 year | 4 year |
|  | 2 electoral.level | 2 electoral.level | 2 electoral.level |
| Obs. | 657 | 657 | 657 |
| Marg. $\mathrm{R}^{2} /$ | $0.022 / 0.94$ | $0.025 / 0.94$ | $0.026 / 0.94$ |
| Condit. $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ |  |  |  |


| AIC | 3864.19 | 3855.10 | 3859.33 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BIC | 3895.60 | 3891.00 | 3895.23 |

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

