

Appendix to Chapter 12,
entitled
“Spending Differences and the Role of Microtargeting”
from
*The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message
Shaped the 2008 Election*

By Kate Kenski, Bruce W. Hardy, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson

**Appendix 12.1 (see page 267 of *The Obama Victory*)
Vote Preference and National Advertising**

**Appendix 12.2 (see page 282 of *The Obama Victory*)
Knowledge about the Candidates' Pro-Stem Cell Research Positions**

**Appendix 12.3 (see page 282-283 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting the Belief that Obama Supports Federal Funding for
Embryonic Stem Cell Research**

Appendix 12.1 (see page 267 of *The Obama Victory*) Vote Preference and National Advertising

Overall, when we concentrate on respondents in the nonbattleground and control for demographics, political orientation, and media use, we find that weeks in which Obama outspent McCain on national ads are significantly related to an Obama vote “if the election were held today.” (p. 267)*

Table A12.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Vote Preference (Respondents in the Nonbattleground Only)

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	1.397	***	.375	4.04
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.082		.087	.922
Age (in years)	-.004		.003	.996
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	2.859	***	.255	17.445
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	1.043	***	.154	2.838
Education (in years)	.102	***	.021	1.107
Household income (in thousands)	-.001		.001	.999
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.988	***	.117	.137
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.728	***	.101	5.632
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.896	***	.045	.408
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.009		.019	.991
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.045	**	.016	.956
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.050	***	.015	1.052
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.007		.015	1.007
Difference in national 30-second television advertising spending by campaigns (Obama – McCain and RNC) (Per \$100,000 by week - 9/02/08 to Election Day)	.004	**	.001	1.004
N			5,049	
Cox & Snell R-square			.492	
Nagelkerke R-square			.656	
Percent Correct			84.4	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/02/08 to 11/03/08.				

Appendix 12.2 (see page 282 of *The Obama Victory*) Knowledge about the Candidates' Pro-Stem Cell Research Positions

The effects of suppositions about Republicans in general and the power of Obama's spending on ads presumably combine to explain why, even though McCain and Obama held the same position, most NAES respondents attributed a pro-stem cell stance to Obama only (figure 12.8) when asked "which candidate or candidates running for president supports federal funding for embryonic stem cell research?" And this attribution occurred regardless of the position on the issue held by the person surveyed. (p. 282)*

Table A12.2. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama Supports Federal Funding for Embryonic Stem Cell Research

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-2.313		92.359	.100
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.037		.056	1.038
Age (in years)	.005	**	.002	1.005
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.686	***	.098	.504
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.353	***	.094	.702
Education (in years)	.120	***	.013	1.127
Household income (in thousands)	.003	***	.001	1.003
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.207	**	.073	1.230
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.197	**	.068	1.218
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.080	**	.029	.923
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.048	***	.014	1.049
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	.021	*	.010	1.021
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.011		.010	1.011
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.050	***	.010	1.051
Position on stem cell research (1=favor, 0 =oppose)	-.003		.062	.997
N			5,793	
Cox & Snell R-square			.078	
Nagelkerke R-square			.103	
Percent Correct			62.3	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/03/08 to 11/03/08.				

As shown in table Table A12.2 the position of the respondent is not significantly related to believing Obama is the only candidate that supports embryonic stem cell research.

Belief that Obama Not McCain Supported Stem Cell Research was measured with the question: “Which candidate or candidates running for president supports federal funding for embryonic stem cell research? (ROTATE CHOICES) Barack Obama, John McCain, both, or neither?” Responses were coded so that respondents saying *Obama* were coded as 1, while respondents saying *McCain*, *both*, or *neither* were coded as 0.

Respondent’s Position on Stem Cell Research was measured with the question: “Do you (ROTATE: favor/oppose) federal funding of embryonic stem cell research? (IF FAVOR, READ:) Would you strongly favor or somewhat favor this? (IF OPPOSE, READ:) Would you strongly oppose or somewhat oppose this?” Responses were coded so that those respondents who reported *favoring* the position were coded as 1, and those who reported *opposing* the position were coded as 0.

Appendix 12.3 (see page 282-283 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting the Belief that Obama Supports Federal Funding for Embryonic Stem Cell Research

To do so we rely on our campaign ad-buy data and a logistic regression predicting the belief that Obama (not McCain or both candidates) supports federal funding for embryonic stem cell research.²⁹ Our question gave respondents the option of picking “Obama,” “McCain,” “Both,” or “Neither”—with the correct answer being “Both.” Although the differential spending in Obama’s favor produced relationships in the direction that could be interpreted as a pro-Obama effect, the relationship was not statistically significant. (p. 282-283)*

Table A12.3. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama Supports Federal Funding for Embryonic Stem Cell Research

	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	2.372 ***	.213	.093
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.056	.053	1.058
Age (in years)	.002	.002	1.002
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.757 ***	.093	.469
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.423 ***	.088	.655
Education (in years)	.130 ***	.012	1.139
Household income (in thousands)	.003 ***	.001	1.003
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.235 ***	.069	1.265
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.196 **	.064	1.216
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.067 **	.026	.935
Average of number of days saw or hear presidential campaign information in past week across television, newspaper, talk radio, and internet	.125 ***	.017	1.134
2004 presidential vote margin by county (FIPS – Kerry percent of total vote minus Bush Percent of total vote)	.280 **	.101	1.324
2004 presidential vote margin by county (FIPS – Kerry percent of total vote minus Bush Percent of total vote).	-.079	.261	.924
Difference in total GRP by campaigns (Obama – McCain and RNC) (Per 100 GRPs) (Broadcast, Radio, & Cable)	.024	.019	1.025
N		6,407	
Cox & Snell R-square		.089	
Nagelkerke R-square		.119	
Percent Correct		63.3	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001			
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/03/08 to 11/03/08. Data for the county level election results were compiled by Leip, David. Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections. http://www.uselectionatlas.org			