

Appendix to Chapter 4,
entitled
“Obama: Not Ready to Lead”
from
*The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message
Shaped the 2008 Election*

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

**Appendix 4.1 (see page 95 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Vote Preference from the Trait "Patriotism"**

**Appendix 4.2 (see page 100 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Beliefs in Allegations against Obama from E-mail**

Appendix 4.1 (see page 95 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Vote Preference from the Trait "Patriotism"

*An analysis of the last three weeks of the campaign suggests that perceptions of Obama's and McCain's "patriotism" were associated with vote preference. The NAES data reveal that such beliefs were significant predictors of a preference to vote for Obama even when sociodemographic and political characteristics, news media exposure, and the presidential and vice presidential candidates' favorability ratings were taken into consideration. As perception that Obama was unpatriotic increased, the likelihood of voting for him dropped.⁷³ * (p. 95)*

Table A4.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Two-Party Vote from the Trait "Patriotic"

	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	2.704 **	1.043	14.942
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.242	.193	.785
Age (in years)	.003	.007	1.003
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	5.384 ***	1.331	217.830
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.910 *	.388	2.484
Education (in years)	-.046	.046	.955
Household income (in thousands)	.001	.002	1.001
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.034 ***	.238	.356
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.028 ***	.247	2.796
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.578 ***	.112	.561
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.070	.048	1.073
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.034	.038	.966
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	-.040	.035	.961
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.038	.034	1.038
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	.617 ***	.062	1.853
McCain favorability (0 to 10)	-.478 ***	.061	.620
Biden favorability rating (0 to 10)	.117 *	.060	1.125
Palin favorability rating (0 to 10)	-.320 ***	.047	.726
Barack Obama is unpatriotic (0 to 10)	-.307 ***	.049	.736
John McCain is unpatriotic (0 to 10)	.344 ***	.066	1.410
N		3,330	
Cox & Snell R-square		.684	
Nagelkerke R-square		.914	
Percent Correct		96.1	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001			
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/15/08 to 11/03/08.			

Obama Two-Party Vote Preference was measured with two questions. Since its inception in 2000, one of the unique features of the NAES has been measurement of absentee and early voting.¹ About 14 percent of voters cast their ballots before Election Day in 2000, and this rose to 20 percent in 2004.² NAES data show that over 30 percent of ballots were cast before Election Day in 2008. Consequently, when assessing vote preference across a campaign, it is important to combine vote intentions for those respondents who have not cast their ballots yet at the time of the interview and vote behaviors for those respondents who have already voted. Survey participants who had not yet voted were asked, “Thinking about the general election for president in November, 2008, if that election were held today, and the candidates were: 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, for whom would you vote?” A similar question was asked of those who reported that they had already cast their ballots, but their question began with “In the 2008 presidential election who did you vote for?” followed by the same response options provided on the vote intention question. The names of the tickets were randomly rotated. For the analysis, those who reported preferring *Obama* were assigned a value of 1 and those who reported preferring *McCain* were assigned a value of 0.

Obama Favorability, *McCain Favorability*, *Biden Favorability*, and *Palin Favorability* were measured with the question: “Now for each of the following people, please tell me if your opinion is favorable or unfavorable using a scale from 0 to 10. Zero means very unfavorable, and 10 means very favorable. Five means you do not feel favorable or unfavorable toward that person. Of course you can use any number between zero and 10. The (first | next) person is (INSERT). (FIRST TIME, THEN AS NECESSARY) On a scale of 0 to 10, how would you rate (INSERT)?” To assess favorability toward Obama, “Barack Obama” was inserted in the question. To assess favorability toward McCain, “John McCain” was inserted in the question. To assess favorability toward Biden, “Joe Biden” was inserted in the question. To assess favorability toward Palin, “Sarah Palin” was inserted in the question.

Obama Unpatriotic was measured with the question: “I am going to read you some phrases. For each one, please tell me how well that phrase applies to the following candidates. Please use a scale from 0 to 10, where ‘zero’ means it does not apply at all and 10 means it applies extremely well. Of course you can use any number in between. The first candidate is Barack Obama. How well does the phrase ‘patriotic’ apply to Barack Obama?” For the analysis, the scale was reverse-coded, so that 0 meant *applies extremely well* and 10 meant *not at all*.

¹ The absentee and early voting battery was designed by Kate Kenski.

² Kate Kenski, “Early Voting Reaches Record Levels in 2004, National Annenberg Election Survey Shows,” Annenberg Public Policy Center press release, March 24, 2005, <http://annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/NewsDetails.aspx?myId=67>

McCain Unpatriotic was measured with the question: “I am going to read you some phrases. For each one, please tell me how well that phrase applies to the following candidates. Please use a scale from 0 to 10, where ‘zero’ means it does not apply at all and 10 means it applies extremely well. Of course you can use any number in between. The first candidate is John McCain. How well does the phrase ‘patriotic’ apply to John McCain?” For the analysis, the scale was reverse-coded, so that 0 meant *applies extremely well* and 10 meant *not at all*.

NOTE: Candidate names were randomly rotated. When Obama or McCain were not the first candidate about whom the respondent was asked, the question was modified to reflect the order.

Appendix 4.2 (see page 100 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Beliefs in Allegations against Obama from E-mail

Analyses of the Annenberg Claims survey highlight the role of viral e-mail in predicting belief in the allegations that we have discussed in this chapter.^{85} (p. 100)*

Table A4.2.1. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama is a Muslim

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	.130		.502	1.139
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.028		.122	1.028
Age (in years)	-.003		.004	.997
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.282	***	.358	.278
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.407		.264	1.502
Education (in years)	-.123	***	.029	.884
Household income (in thousands)	-.001		.001	.999
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.579	***	.143	1.785
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.012		.162	1.012
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.185	**	.063	1.203
Number of days watched national network news on TV in the past week	-.016		.025	.984
Number of days watched 24 hour cable news channel in the past week	-.064	**	.022	.938
Number of days read a daily newspaper in past week	-.080	***	.022	.923
Number of days listened to NPR	-.089	**	.034	.915
Number of days listened to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics in past week (not including NPR)	.049	#	.028	1.050
Frequency of accessing Internet for information about presidential campaign (0=never/no access, 5=several times a day)	-.106	**	.039	.899
Received negative e-mail about candidates	.032	**	.010	1.033
N			2259	
Cox & Snell R-square			.079	
Nagelkerke R-square			.134	
Percent Correct			83.5	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 postelection telephone survey.				

Obama Muslim was measured with the question: “Could you tell me what you think Barack Obama’s religion is?” Those who volunteered *Muslim* were coded as 1, while *all other answers* were coded as 0.

Received Negative E-mail about Candidate was measured by a single item that asked respondents: “Thinking about the final weeks of the campaign, *how many emails* did you receive that told you negative things about one of the presidential candidates?” The responses were coded into the categories none, 1-5, 6-9, 10-14, and 15 or more. The mid-point for each category was selected as the recoded value for the continuous variable with 17 chosen as the maximum value.

Table A4.2.2. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama is Half-Arab

	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-.397	.674	.673
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.005	.161	1.005
Age (in years)	.000	.006	1.000
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.717 *	.360	.488
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.476	.330	1.609
Education (in years)	-.101 **	.038	.904
Household income (in thousands)	.000	.001	1.000
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.316 #	.191	1.371
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	-.090	.201	.914
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.229 **	.081	1.257
Number of days watched national network news on TV in the past week	.025	.031	1.026
Number of days watched 24 hour cable news channel in the past week	-.070 *	.028	.932
Number of days read a daily newspaper in past week	-.032	.028	.969
Number of days listened to NPR	-.029	.040	.971
Number of days listened to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics in past week	.043	.036	1.044
Frequency of accessing Internet for information about presidential campaign (0=never/no access, 5=several times a day)	-.102 *	.051	.903
Received negative e-mail about candidates	.029 *	.014	1.029
N		1,102	
Cox & Snell R-square		.060	
Nagelkerke R-square		.094	
Percent Correct		79.4	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001			
Data: NAES08 postelection telephone survey.			

Obama Half-Arab was measured with the question: “Senator Barack Obama is nearly half Arab. (READ IF NECESSARY:) How truthful do you think that statement is? Would you say it is very truthful, somewhat truthful, not too truthful, or not truthful at all?” Those who said *very* or *somewhat truthful* were coded as 1, while *all other responses* were coded as 0.

Table A4.2.3. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama Pals Around with Terrorists

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-2.660	***	.720	.070
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.120		.171	.887
Age (in years)	.024	***	.006	1.024
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.576	*	.618	.207
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.577		.566	.561
Education (in years)	-.087	*	.041	.917
Household income (in thousands)	-.001		.001	.999
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.234		.185	1.264
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	-.916	***	.264	.400
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.396	***	.093	1.486
Number of days watched national network news on TV in the past week	-.156	***	.035	.856
Number of days watched 24 hour cable news channel in the past week	.044		.029	1.045
Number of days read a daily newspaper in past week	-.050		.030	.951
Number of days listened to NPR	-.094	*	.045	.910
Number of days listened to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics in past week	.172	***	.036	1.188
Frequency of accessing Internet for information about presidential campaign (0=never/no access, 5=several times a day)	.078		.053	1.081
Received negative e-mail about candidates	.045	**	.014	1.046
N			1,157	
Cox & Snell R-square			.192	
Nagelkerke R-square			.301	
Percent Correct			82.0	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 postelection telephone survey.				

Obama Pals Around With Terrorists was measured with the question: “Barack Obama pals around with terrorists. (READ IF NECESSARY:) How truthful do you think that statement is? Would you say it is very truthful, somewhat truthful, not too truthful, or not truthful at all?” Those who said *very* or *somewhat truthful* were coded as 1, while *all other responses* were coded as 0.

Table A4.2.4. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama and Ayers Are Close

	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-.132	.520	.876
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.157	.117	1.170
Age (in years)	-.003	.005	.997
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.008 ***	.249	.365
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.401	.324	1.494
Education (in years)	-.058 *	.028	.944
Household income (in thousands)	-.001	.001	.999
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.679 ***	.153	1.972
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	-.711 ***	.137	.491
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.488 ***	.062	1.629
Number of days watched national network news on TV in the past week	-.106 ***	.023	.900
Number of days watched 24 hour cable news channel in the past week	.018	.020	1.018
Number of days read a daily newspaper in past week	-.011	.021	.989
Number of days listened to NPR	-.108 ***	.027	.898
Number of days listened to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics in past week	.161 ***	.028	1.175
Frequency of accessing Internet for information about presidential campaign (0=never/no access, 5=several times a day)	-.036	.037	.965
Received negative e-mail about candidates	.029 **	.010	1.030
N		1,714	
Cox & Snell R-square		.263	
Nagelkerke R-square		.353	
Percent Correct		74.4	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001			
Data: NAES08 postelection telephone survey.			

Obama and Ayers Close was measured with the question: “How close do you think the relationship between Senator Obama and William Ayers was? Do you think they were very close, somewhat close, or not close at all?” Those who said *very* or *somewhat close* were coded as 1, while *all other responses* were coded as 0.

Table A4.2.5. Logistic Regression Predicting the Belief that Obama Was Able To Buy House Because of Rezko

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-2.656	***	.577	.070
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.051		.134	1.053
Age (in years)	.016	**	.005	1.016
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.013		.243	.987
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.150		.316	.861
Education (in years)	.026		.032	1.027
Household income (in thousands)	.000		.001	1.000
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	.316	#	.167	1.372
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	-.351	*	.162	.704
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.154	*	.067	1.166
Number of days watched national network news on TV in the past week	-.016		.026	.984
Number of days watched 24 hour cable news channel in the past week	.085	***	.023	1.089
Number of days read a daily newspaper in past week	.027		.024	1.028
Number of days listened to NPR	.027		.031	1.028
Number of days listened to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics in past week	.109	***	.030	1.115
Frequency of accessing Internet for information about presidential campaign (0=never/no access, 5=several times a day)	.064		.041	1.066
Received negative e-mail about candidates	.008		.012	1.008
N			1,102	
Cox & Snell R-square			.089	
Nagelkerke R-square			.120	
Percent Correct			66.2	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 postelection telephone survey.				

Obama Housing Because of Rezko was measured with the question: “Senator Obama was able to buy his house because a man named Tony Rezko purchased the lot next door at full price. (READ IF NECESSARY:) How truthful do you think that statement is? Would you say it is very truthful, somewhat truthful, not too truthful, or not truthful at all?” Those who said *very* or *somewhat truthful* were coded as 1, while *all other responses* were coded as 0.