



Errata: A Theory of Nonseparable Preferences in Survey Responses

American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 45, No. 3. (Jul., 2001), p. 745.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0092-5853%28200107%2945%3A3%3C745%3AEATONP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

American Journal of Political Science is currently published by Midwest Political Science Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/mpsa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A Theory of Nonseparable Preferences in Survey Responses

Dean Lacy

“A Theory of Nonseparable Preferences in Survey Responses” (*American Journal of Political Science* 45(2):239–258) contains several printing errors, including the omission of all “not equal to” and “greater than or equal to” symbols that were to appear in the text. The following are corrections:

On page 240, the sentence in the last two lines of the first column should read:

“To define nonseparable preferences formally, let $J = \{1, \dots, J\}$, $J \geq 2$, be a set of issues.”

On page 246, in the second line after the heading “A Model of the Survey Response,” the text should read:

“... $J = \{1, \dots, J\}$, $J \geq 2$ is a set of issues ...”

Also on page 246, in the sixth line after the heading “A Model of the Survey Response,” the text should read:

“... $\{o_j^1, \dots, o_j^L\}$ is a set of possible outcomes on issue j , $L \geq 2$...”

Also on page 246, in the second line of the second paragraph after the heading “A Model of the Survey Response,” the text should read:

“... about M issues, $M \geq 2$...”

Also on page 246, in the fourth line of the second paragraph after the heading “A Model of the Survey Response,” the text should read:

“... of responses $R_j = (r_j^1, \dots, r_j^N)$, $N \geq 2$.”

Also on page 246, in the second column, first paragraph after *Assumption 2*, footnote 78 should be numbered footnote 7.

On page 247, first column, the result should read:

Result: $r_i^*(q_j > q_k | r_{ik}^*) \neq r_i^*(q_j < q_k | s_{ik})$ if and only if i has nonseparable preferences for issues j and k , and $r_{ik}^* \neq s_{ik}$.

On page 250, in footnote 15 “(Lacey 2001)” should be “(Lacy 2001).”

On page 257, Appendix B should read:

Proof: Drop i . For sufficiency, if i 's preference for issue j is nonseparable from issue or set of issues k , then there exists an \mathbf{o}_k and \mathbf{o}'_k such that $(o_j, \mathbf{o}_k) \succeq_i (o'_j, \mathbf{o}_k)$ and $(o'_j, \mathbf{o}'_k) \succ_i (o_j, \mathbf{o}'_k)$, which, by Assumption 3, implies $(r_j, \mathbf{r}_k) \succeq_i (r'_j, \mathbf{r}_k)$ and $(r'_j, \mathbf{r}'_k) \succ_i (r_j, \mathbf{r}'_k)$. If $q_j > q_k$, then $r_j^* = r^*(q_j | \mathbf{r}_k^*)$. If $q_j < q_k$, then $r_j^* = r(q_j | s_k)$. If $\mathbf{r}_k^* \neq \mathbf{s}_k$, then $r^*(q_j > q_k | \mathbf{r}_k^*) \neq r^*(q_j < q_k | \mathbf{s}_k)$. For necessity, if $\mathbf{r}_k^* = \mathbf{s}_k$, then $r_i^*(q_j > q_k | \mathbf{r}_k^*) = r_i^*(q_j < q_k | \mathbf{s}_k)$. For the second necessary condition, if i 's preference for j is separable from k , then $(r_j, \mathbf{r}_k) \succeq_i (r'_j, \mathbf{r}'_k)$ and $(r_j, \mathbf{r}'_k) \succeq_i (r'_j, \mathbf{r}'_k)$, which implies $r_j^*(\cdot) = r_j^*(\cdot)$. ■

In the context of the spatial model, the same result can be proved as follows:

Proof: Individual i 's preferences are representable by the quadratic utility function:

$$U_i(o_j | o_k) = -[a_{ikk}(o_k - \theta_{ik})^2 + 2a_{ijk}(o_k - \theta_{ik})(o_j - \theta_{ij}) + a_{ijj}(o_j - \theta_{ij})^2]$$

Maximizing this function with respect to o_j , dropping i , and rearranging terms:

$$o_j | o_k = \theta_j - \left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{kk}} \right) (o_k - \theta_k)$$

which is i 's constrained ideal point on issue j . Person i 's response on j , conditional on her beliefs about the status quo on k , substituting s_k for o_k , is:

$$r(q_j | s_k) = \theta_j - \left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{jj}} \right) (s_k - \theta_k)$$

But i 's response on j conditional on a previous response of r_k^* to k , substituting r_k^* for o_k , is:

$$r(q_j | r_k^*) = \theta_j - \left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{jj}} \right) (r_k^* - \theta_k)$$

If preferences for j and k are nonseparable, then $\left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{jj}} \right)$ is nonzero. If $(s_k - \theta_k) \neq (r_k^* - \theta_k)$ and if $\left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{jj}} \right) \neq 0$, then $r(q_j | s_k) \neq r(q_j | r_k^*)$. For necessity, if the respondent's preferences are separable, then $\left(\frac{a_{jk}}{a_{jj}} \right) = 0$ and $r(q_j | s_k) = r(q_j | r_k^*)$. ■

Department of Political Science
Ohio State University
(dlacy+@osu.edu)