

Appendix to Chapter 1,
entitled
“The Economy and the Unpopular Incumbent”
from
*The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message
Shaped the 2008 Election*

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

**Appendix 1.1 (see page 14 of *The Obama Victory*)
Vote Preference**

**Appendix 1.2 (see page 17 of *The Obama Victory*)
Most Important Problem**

**Appendix 1.3 (see page 20 of *The Obama Victory*)
Ideology and Party**

**Appendix 1.4 (see page 21 of *The Obama Victory*)
Cross-Ideological Draw**

**Appendix 1.5 (see page 21 of *The Obama Victory*)
Conservatives for Obama vs. Conservatives against Obama**

**Appendix 1.6 (see page 24 of *The Obama Victory*)
Economy on Voting Behavior across Time**

Appendix 1.1 (see page 14 of *The Obama Victory*) Vote Preference

...we set the stage for our argument that message, media, and money nonetheless contributed to Obama's ballot total by isolating the percentage of the 2008 presidential vote intention that can be predicted by party preference, ideological placement, economic conditions, and disapproval of the presidency of George W. Bush alone. (p. 14)*

Table A1.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Two-Party Vote

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	5.682	***	.391	293.551
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.114	***	.180	.328
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.826	***	.164	2.285
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.791	***	.075	.453
Voted for Bush in 2004 (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.450	***	.152	.235
Approval of Bush as president (1=strongly disapprove to 4=strongly approve)	-1.248	***	.083	.287
National economic conditions worse than one year ago (1=much worse one year ago to 5=much better one year ago)	.029		.064	1.030
Personal economic conditions worse than one year ago (1=much worse one year ago to 5=much better one year ago)	-.010		.072	.990
N			2,982	
Cox & Snell R-square			.582	
Nagelkerke R-square			.780	
Percent Correct			90.4	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey and postelection panel telephone survey.				

NOTE: A similar table can be found in the book on page 23. That table presents the results of a probit model with variables coded in a slightly different manner. Substantively, the results are the same as those found above.

Obama Two-Party Vote was measured with the question: “In the 2008 presidential election who did you vote for: John McCain and Sarah Palin, the Republicans, Barack Obama and Joe Biden, the Democrats, Ralph Nader and Matt Gonzalez, the Independent candidates, and Bob Barr and Wayne Allyn Root, the Libertarians and Cynthia McKinney and Rosa Clemente, the Green Party candidates?” These responses were recoded so that those voting for *Obama* were coded as 1 and those voting for *McCain* were coded as 0. All other responses were treated as missing so that the focus was on those respondents selecting one of the major party candidates as their presidential preference.

Party Identification was measured with the question: “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?” Two dummy variables were created from this item. *Republican* was coded so that those identifying as a *Republican* were assigned a value of 1 and all *other* responses were assigned a value of 0. *Democrat* was coded so that those identifying as a *Democrat* were assigned a value of 1 and all *other* responses were coded as 0.

Ideology was measured with the question: “Generally speaking, would you describe your political views as very conservative, somewhat conservative, moderate, somewhat liberal, or very liberal?” Ideology was coded so that the continuum ranged from *very liberal* (1) to *very conservative* (5).

Voted for Bush in 2004 was measured with the question: “Did you vote in the 2004 presidential election when George W. Bush ran against John Kerry? (IF YES:) Did you vote for George W. Bush, the Republican, John Kerry, the Democrat, Ralph Nader of the Green Party or someone else?” Those who said *Bush* were assigned a value of 1 and those who said *Kerry*, *Nader*, or *someone else* were assigned a value of 0. Those who *did not vote* were also assigned a value of 0.

Approval of Bush as President was measured with the question: “Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? (IF APPROVE:) Do you approve strongly or only somewhat? (IF DISAPPROVE:) Do you disapprove strongly or only somewhat?” The response options were assigned values from 1 to 4 (1=*disapprove strongly*, 2=*disapprove somewhat*, 3=*approve somewhat*, 4=*approve strongly*).

National Economic Conditions Worse Than One Year Ago was measured with the question: “Now, thinking about one year ago, in your opinion, were the economic conditions in this country much better than they are right now, somewhat better, the same, somewhat worse, or much worse?” Responses were assigned values from 1 to 5 (5=*much better than they are right now*, 4=*somewhat better*, 3=*the same*, 2=*somewhat worse*, 1=*much worse*).

Personal Economic Conditions Worse than One Year Ago was measured with the question: “Still thinking about one year ago, was your personal economic situation much better than it is right now, somewhat better, the same, somewhat worse, or much worse?” Responses were assigned values from 1 to 5 (5=*much better than they are right now*, 4=*somewhat better*, 3=*the same*, 2=*somewhat worse*, 1=*much worse*).

Appendix 1.2 (see page 17 of *The Obama Victory*) Most Important Problem

NAES data tell us that the economy was the most important issue for respondents regardless of their race, gender, age, education, political identification, and so on. (p. 17)*

Table A1.2. The Most Important Problem by Demographic and Political Characteristics

	Economy	Iraq	Other Responses Combined	Don't Know	Refused	N
Men	41.9%	12.6%	45.1%	0.4%	0.1%	24,231
Women	43.0%	13.4%	43.0%	0.6%	0.0%	32,128
High school or less	38.2%	14.0%	47.1%	0.7%	0.0%	16,788
Some college	42.2%	12.0%	45.3%	0.4%	0.0%	15,411
College degree or more	46.0%	13.1%	40.5%	0.3%	0.1%	22,875
18-29 years old	35.3%	14.7%	48.9%	0.9%	0.1%	4,139
30-44 years old	42.9%	12.1%	44.6%	0.4%	0.1%	12,282
45-64 years old	44.1%	12.2%	43.3%	0.3%	0.0%	24,948
65 and older	41.7%	14.8%	42.7%	0.7%	0.0%	13,778
Household income below \$35,000	38.8%	14.1%	46.3%	0.8%	0.0%	12,762
\$35,000 to less than \$75,000	42.8%	12.0%	44.7%	0.4%	0.1%	16,616
\$75,000 and over	45.8%	12.8%	41.0%	0.2%	0.1%	19,564
Whites	42.4%	13.2%	43.9%	0.5%	0.0%	46,798
Blacks	44.4%	12.4%	42.6%	0.6%		4,397
Hispanics/Latinos	44.2%	13.8%	41.3%	0.7%	0.1%	3,510
Republican	37.7%	12.9%	48.8%	0.5%	0.1%	16,059
Democrat	46.7%	14.5%	38.4%	0.4%	0.0%	19,752
Independent	44.0%	11.5%	44.0%	0.5%	0.1%	16,638
Conservative	37.6%	12.3%	49.5%	0.4%	0.1%	21,907
Moderate	47.7%	12.4%	39.3%	0.5%	0.0%	17,969
Liberal	44.7%	15.0%	40.0%	0.3%	0.0%	14,621
Data: NAES08 telephone survey.						

Most Important Problem was measured with the question: “In your opinion, what is the most important problem facing the country today?”

NOTE: The percentages presented in this appendix are based on unweighted data because they are focused on bivariate relationships. Readers should assume that the data analyses were based

on unweighted data unless specified. In several cases, we ran the data weighted and unweighted, but the substantive interpretations remained the same.

Appendix 1.3 (see page 20 of *The Obama Victory*) Ideology and Party

According to the NAES data, Democrats and independents are less ideologically predictable than their Republican counterparts. (p. 20)*

Table A1.3. Ideology by Party Identification

	Republican	Independent	Democrat
Conservative	69.5%	33.9%	18.2%
Moderate	22.4%	39.7%	33.4%
Liberal	6.4%	23.2%	45.0%
Don't know/refused	1.6%	3.2%	3.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N	16,526	17,035	20,258
Data: NAES08 telephone survey.			

Appendix 1.4 (see page 21 of *The Obama Victory*) Cross-Ideological Draw

The cross-ideological draw of the senator from Illinois was stronger than that of the Republican Party nominee. (p. 21)*

Table A1.4.1. Vote Preference by Ideology

	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
McCain	80.2%	32.9%	7.6%
Obama	18.3%	65.0%	91.1%
Other/did not vote	1.5%	2.1%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0	100.0%
N	1,260	1,033	895
Data: NAES08 postelection panel telephone survey.			

Table A1.4.2. Vote Preference by Party Identification

	Republican	Independent	Democrat
McCain	90.1%	41.3%	9.8%
Obama	8.8%	55.5%	89.5%
Other/did not vote	1.1%	3.3%	0.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0	100.0%
N	952	943	1,216
Data: NAES08 postelection panel telephone survey.			

Appendix 1.5 (see page 21 of *The Obama Victory*) Conservatives for Obama vs. Conservatives against Obama

Using the 2008 NAES phone postelection panel data to compare the 17.4 percent of conservatives voting for Obama against other conservatives, we find that those for the Democratic ticket were significantly more likely to be black, Hispanic, lower income, and inclined to believe that their personal economic situation had worsened in the past year. (p. 21)*

Table A1.5. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Two-Party Vote Among Conservatives

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-1.407	#	.791	.245
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.218		.173	1.243
Age (in years)	.004		.006	1.004
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	4.707	***	.733	110.708
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.957	**	.323	2.603
Education (in years)	-.063		.042	.939
Household income (in thousands)	-.006	**	.002	.995
National economic conditions worse than one year ago (1=much worse one year ago to 5=much better one year ago)	-.014		.083	.986
Personal economic conditions worse than one year ago (1=much worse one year ago to 5=much better 1 year ago)	.207	*	.092	1.229
N			1,139	
Cox & Snell R-square			.145	
Nagelkerke R-square			.233	
Percent Correct			84.8	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 postelection panel telephone survey.				

Appendix 1.6 (see page 24 of *The Obama Victory*) Economy on Voting Behavior across Time

However, our economic indicator did not produce a lagged effect on voting behavior, suggesting that although these two variables may move together, shifts in economic conditions do not appear to precede and influence votes for Obama.^{42} (p. 24)*

Table A1.6. ARIMA (4,1,4) Model Predicting Aggregate Percentage of Obama Two-Party Vote by ABC's Weekly Consumer Confidence Index

		Estimate	Standard Error
Autoregressive Model	Lag 1	-.275	.704
	Lag 2	-.172	.691
	Lag 3	-.489	.716
	Lag 4	-.084	.432
Difference		1	
Moving Average Model	Lag 1	.966	300.732
	Lag 2	-.243	22.954
	Lag 3	-.584	85.840
	Lag 4	.861	255.405
N		31	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001			
Data: ABC's Consumer Confidence Index; NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 3/28/08 to 11/3/08 (31 weeks).			