

Appendix to Chapter 8,
entitled
“Period Three: The Campaigns Confront the Economic Collapse
(September 10—October 14)”
from
*The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message
Shaped the 2008 Election*

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

**Appendix 8.1 (see page 180 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Perceptions of Economy as Most Important Problem**

**Appendix 8.2 (see page 190 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Vote Preference from Blaming Republicans in Congress for
Financial Crisis**

**Appendix 8.3 (see page 194 of *The Obama Victory*)
The Effect of Obama Two-Minute Advertisement on Perceptions of
Candidates’ Trustworthiness**

**Appendix 8.4 (see page 197 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Perceptions that Obama Would Do a Better Job at Handling
Economy than McCain from First Presidential Debate Viewing**

**Appendix 8.5 (see page 197 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Perceptions of McSame from First Presidential Debate
Viewing**

**Appendix 8.6 (see page 198 of *The Obama Victory*)
Second Presidential Debate Viewing**

Appendix 8.7 (see page 198 of *The Obama Victory*)

Predicting Candidate Favorability from Debate Viewing

Appendix 8.8 (see page 199 of *The Obama Victory*)

Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote through Economic Concerns

Appendix 8.9 (see page 201 of *The Obama Victory*)

**Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote through Economic Concerns
for College-educated, Non-Hispanic, White Males**

Appendix 8.1 (see page 180 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Perceptions of Economy as Most Important Problem

*Unsurprisingly, heavy news consumers were more likely than those who paid less attention to see the economy as the country's most important problem. Those closely following the election increasingly saw the economy as the more important problem facing the nation, with habitual TV and print news consumers the most likely to harbor that conclusion. * (p. 180)*

Table A8.1. Logistic Regression Predicting the Economy Being Identified as the Most Important Problem

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-.931 ***		.238	.394
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.137 *		.054	1.147
Age (in years)	.000		.002	1.000
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.038		.100	.962
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.128		.114	1.137
Education (in years)	.051 ***		.013	1.052
Household income (in thousands)	.001		.001	1.001
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-.158 *		.068	.854
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.201 **		.066	1.223
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.160 ***		.026	.853
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.132 ***		.039	1.141
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.037 **		.012	1.037
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.013		.010	.987
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.025 **		.009	1.025
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.014		.010	1.014
N			6,152	
Cox & Snell R-square			.037	
Nagelkerke R-square			.050	
Percent Correct			59.0	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/5/08 to 10/4/08.				

Economy as the Most Important Problem was measured with the question: “In your opinion, what is the most important problem facing the country today?” Respondents who said that the *economy* was the most important problem were coded as 1. Those who named *some other issue* or said that they *did not know* were coded as 0.

Appendix 8.2 (see page 190 of *The Obama Victory*)

Predicting Vote Preference from Blaming Republicans in Congress for Financial Crisis

Although the percentage of voters blaming the Democrats for the economic mess rose from the end of September to Election Day (see figure 8.5), in the contest over which party should shoulder responsibility, more of our respondents affixed the blame to the Republicans. Pointing fingers at the Republicans predicted an Obama vote; indicting the Democrats did the same for support for the Republican ticket. Presumably aware of this dynamic, the Republicans tried to associate Obama with Democrats in Congress. (p. 190)*

Table A8.2.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Vote Preference from Blaming Republicans in Congress for Financial Crisis

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-2.831	***	.576	.059
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.233	#	.123	.793
Age (in years)	-.003		.004	.997
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	.486	#	.259	1.626
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.591	*	.237	1.806
Education (in years)	.070	*	.029	1.072
Household income (in thousands)	.000		.001	1.000
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-.703	***	.175	.495
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.980	***	.139	2.664
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.379	***	.069	.685
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.013		.027	.987
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.029		.025	.971
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.030		.021	1.030
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.015		.022	1.015
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	.772	***	.035	2.163
McCain favorability (0 to 10)	-.427	***	.031	.653
Blame Republicans in Congress for financial crisis (1=yes, 0=no)	.766	***	.127	2.150
N			4,056	
Cox & Snell R-square			.604	
Nagelkerke R-square			.806	
Percent Correct			91.1	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/23/08 to 10/14/08.				

Obama Vote Preference was measured with two questions. 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 *another candidate* or saying they *did not know* were assigned a value of 0.

Obama Favorability and *McCain 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.

Blame Republicans in Congress for Financial Crisis was measured with the question: “Who is more responsible for the current financial crisis facing the United States, (ROTATE) the Democrats in Congress or the Republicans in Congress?” Responses were coded so that those who said *Republicans in Congress* were coded as 1, while *all other substantive responses* (e.g., Democrats in Congress, all equal, none are responsible, President Bush, Wall Street Bankers) and *don't know* responses were coded as 0.

Table A8.2.2. Logistic Regression Predicting McCain Vote Preference from Blaming Republicans in Congress for Financial Crisis

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-2.205 ***		.568	.110
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.193		.121	.824
Age (in years)	-.002		.004	.998
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	-.998 **		.368	.369
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.123		.251	.885
Education (in years)	-.037		.029	.963
Household income (in thousands)	.002 #		.001	1.002
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	1.353 ***		.142	3.869
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	-.279 #		.160	.756
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.357 ***		.067	1.429
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.050 #		.026	1.051
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	.027		.024	1.027
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	-.006		.021	.994
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	-.041 *		.021	.959
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	-.539 ***		.028	.584
McCain favorability (0 to 10)	.650 ***		.034	1.916
Blame Republicans in Congress for financial crisis (1=yes, 0=no)	-.638 ***		.145	.528
N			4,056	
Cox & Snell R-square			.586	
Nagelkerke R-square			.790	
Percent Correct			90.8	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/23/08 to 10/14/08.				

McCain Vote Preference was measured with two questions. 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 *McCain* were assigned a value of 1 and those who reported preferring *another candidate* or saying they *did not know* were assigned a value of 0.

Appendix 8.3 (see page 194 of *The Obama Victory*)
The Effect of Obama Two-Minute Advertisement on Perceptions of
Candidates' Trustworthiness

In a regression model predicting the difference in that scale (Obama minus McCain), the ad-buy data for the two-minute advertisement produced a significant and positive relationship in the presence of controls. (p. 194)*

Table A8.3. OLS Regression Predicting the Effect of Obama Two-Minute Advertisement on Candidates' Trustworthiness (Obama minus McCain)

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	4.028	***	.302	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.167	**	.070	.016
Age (in years)	-.024	***	.003	-.070
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	3.304	***	.133	.170
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.773	***	.148	.035
Education (in years)	.044	**	.017	.020
Household income (in thousands)	-.003	***	.001	-.037
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-2.680	***	.091	-.230
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	2.680	***	.086	.244
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-1.276	***	.035	-.280
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.026		.016	-.011
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.088	***	.013	-.046
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.095	***	.012	.056
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.031	*	.012	.018
Obama advertising spending for two-minute advertisement (per \$1,000)	.003	***	.001	.024
N			12,626	
R-square			.439	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/01/08 to 11/03/08.				

Difference in Rating Trustworthy 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 (INSERT). How well does the phrase ‘trustworthy’ apply to (INSERT)?” For the analysis, McCain’s ratings were subtracted from Obama’s ratings on the trustworthy trait.

Appendix 8.4 (see page 197 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Perceptions that Obama Would Do a Better Job at Handling Economy than McCain from First Presidential Debate Viewing

Viewing the first presidential debate predicted a significant increase in the perception that Obama would do a better job than McCain at handling the economy in the presence of controls. (p. 197)*

Table A8.4. Logistic Regression Predicting Perception that Obama Would Better Handle the Economy than McCain from First Presidential Debate Viewing

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	2.905 ***		.597	18.256
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.036		.134	1.037
Age (in years)	-.023 ***		.005	.977
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.831 ***		.349	6.239
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.088		.269	1.092
Education (in years)	-.007		.032	.993
Household income (in thousands)	-.004 **		.001	.996
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.052 ***		.167	.349
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.640 ***		.162	5.155
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.744 ***		.068	.475
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.149		.103	1.161
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.011		.032	.989
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.042 #		.025	.959
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.051 *		.024	1.052
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.030		.024	1.030
Watched first presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.205 ***		.060	1.227
N			1,595	
Cox & Snell R-square			.373	
Nagelkerke R-square			.498	
Percent Correct			78.8	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/27/08 to 10/4/08.				

Obama Would Better Handle the Economy was measured with the question: “Now I’m going to mention a few items and for each one, please tell me if you think (ROTATE) Barack Obama or John McCain would better handle that issue if they were elected president in 2008. Here’s the

first. Who would better handle the economy (ISSUES ROTATED) if they were elected president in 2008, Barack Obama or John McCain?” For the analysis, those who said that *Obama* would better handle the economy were coded as 1, while those who said *McCain* or *neither* were coded as 0. *Don't know* responses were also assigned a value of 0.

Watched First Presidential Debate was measured with the question: “Did you happen to watch the presidential debate on Friday, September 26 between (ROTATE) John McCain and Barack Obama? (IF YES:) Did you watch all, most or just some of it?” Those who *did not watch* the debate were assigned a value of 0, those who watched *just some* if it were assigned a value of 1, those who watched *most* of it were assigned a value of 2, and those who watched *all* of it were assigned a value of 3.

Appendix 8.5 (see page 197 of *The Obama Victory*)
Predicting Perceptions of McCain from First Presidential Debate Viewing

As worrisome for the McCain campaign was the finding that viewing the debate also predicted a significant increase in the perception that electing McCain would in effect produce a third Bush term. (p. 197)*

Table A8.5. Logistic Regression Predicting Perception that Electing McCain Would Be Like A Bush Third Term from First Presidential Debate Viewing

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	1.468 *		.571	4.339
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.003		.127	1.003
Age (in years)	-.011 *		.005	.989
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	.938 ***		.241	2.554
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.005		.255	1.005
Education (in years)	-.032		.030	.968
Household income (in thousands)	-.004 **		.001	.996
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.385 ***		.191	.250
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.233 ***		.138	3.431
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.519 ***		.062	.595
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.147		.099	1.159
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.044		.030	1.045
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.041 #		.024	.960
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.006		.022	1.006
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.019		.022	1.019
Watched first presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.123 *		.057	1.131
N			1,590	
Cox & Snell R-square			.300	
Nagelkerke R-square			.403	
Percent Correct			75.4	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/27/08 to 10/4/08.				

McCain Equals Bush Third Term was measured with the question: “Which of the following two statements come closer to your view: electing Sen. John McCain for President would be like

electing George W. Bush for a third term, or Sen. McCain will have major differences with George W. Bush in a number of areas.” Responses that said both or neither were also recorded. For the analysis, those who said that “*electing Sen. John McCain for President would be like electing George W. Bush for a third term*” were assigned a value of 1, and those who said that “*Sen. McCain will have major differences with George W. Bush in a number of areas,*” *both, neither,* or *don’t know* were assigned a value of 0.

Appendix 8.6 (see page 198 of *The Obama Victory*) Second Presidential Debate Viewing

Obama may have gained marginally from the second presidential debate as well. We find that watching it was positively related both to the view that he would handle the economy better and the perception that a McCain election would equal a Bush third, but these relationships do not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. (p. 198)*

Table A8.6.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Perception that Obama Would Better Handle the Economy than McCain from Second Presidential Debate Viewing

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	2.427 ***		.640	11.324
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.285 *		.144	.752
Age (in years)	-.015 **		.005	.985
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	2.141 ***		.400	8.510
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.198		.302	1.219
Education (in years)	-.026		.034	.974
Household income (in thousands)	-.002		.001	.998
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.567 ***		.188	.209
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.573 ***		.172	4.820
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.766 ***		.072	.465
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.335 **		.111	1.397
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.005		.033	1.005
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.060 *		.027	.942
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.076 **		.024	1.079
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.030		.025	1.031
Watched second presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.038		.063	1.039
N			1,521	
Cox & Snell R-square			.408	
Nagelkerke R-square			.544	
Percent Correct			79.9	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/8/08 to 10/15/08.				

Watched Second Presidential Debate was measured with the question: “Did you happen to watch the presidential debate on Tuesday, October 7th between (ROTATE) John McCain and Barack Obama where voters got to ask questions of the candidates? (IF YES:) Did you watch all, most or just some of it?” Those who *did not watch* the debate were assigned a value of 0, those who watched *just some* if it were assigned a value of 1, those who watched *most* of it were assigned a value of 2, and those who watched *all* of it were assigned a value of 3.

Table A8.6.2. Logistic Regression Predicting Perception that Electing McCain Would Be Like a Bush Third Term from Second Presidential Debate Viewing

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	2.914 ***		.591	18.434
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	-.028		.129	.972
Age (in years)	-.010 *		.005	.990
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.473 ***		.283	4.362
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.331		.261	1.393
Education (in years)	-.099 **		.030	.906
Household income (in thousands)	-.004 **		.001	.996
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.340 ***		.185	.262
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.846 ***		.143	2.331
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.574 ***		.064	.563
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.115		.101	1.122
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.034		.031	1.035
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.025		.024	.976
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.039 #		.022	1.040
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.028		.023	1.028
Watched second presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.031		.058	1.031
N			1,523	
Cox & Snell R-square			.293	
Nagelkerke R-square			.393	
Percent Correct			74.7	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/8/08 to 10/15/08.				

Appendix 8.7 (see page 198 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Candidate Favorability from Debate Viewing

More important is our finding that overall debate viewing was significantly associated with the favorability ratings for Obama but not McCain. (p. 198)*

Table A8.7.1. OLS Regression Predicting Candidate Favorability from First Presidential Debate Viewing

	Obama Favorability			McCain Favorability		
	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	6.604 ***	.690		3.455 ***	.662	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.040	.152	.006	-.065	.144	-.011
Age (in years)	-.014 **	.005	-.068	.007	.005	.038
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	2.120 ***	.282	.178	-1.175 ***	.268	-.111
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.587 #	.330	.041	.516	.314	.040
Education (in years)	.043	.037	.031	.013	.035	.011
Household income (in thousands)	-.002	.002	-.035	.004 *	.002	.071
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.369 ***	.196	-.187	1.437 ***	.186	.220
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.665 ***	.182	.246	-1.518 ***	.173	-.251
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.753 ***	.072	-.266	.468 ***	.069	.185
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.307 *	.122	.068	.038	.117	.009
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.023	.036	.015	-.018	.034	-.014
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.075 **	.028	-.064	.007	.026	.007
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.029	.027	.027	-.004	.025	-.004
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.024	.027	.022	-.053 *	.026	-.057
Watched first presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.183 **	.069	.071	-.083	.065	-.036
N		1,211			1,210	
R-Square		.391			.309	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/27/08 to 10/2/08.						

Table A8.7.2. OLS Regression Predicting Candidate Favorability from Second Presidential Debate Viewing

	Obama Favorability			McCain Favorability		
	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	7.698 ***	.588		3.116 ***	.554	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.021	.129	.003	-.073	.121	-.013
Age (in years)	-.009 #	.005	-.040	-.004	.004	-.020
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.902 ***	.253	.153	-1.154 ***	.238	-.108
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.924 ***	.269	.067	.308	.253	.026
Education (in years)	.022	.030	.016	.054 #	.029	.046
Household income (in thousands)	.000	.001	-.002	.000	.001	.003
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.592 ***	.165	-.218	1.451 ***	.155	.232
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.511 ***	.158	.219	-1.309 ***	.149	-.222
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.913 ***	.063	-.322	.606 ***	.060	.250
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	.269 **	.102	.060	.063	.096	.016
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.027	.031	-.017	-.055 #	.029	-.042
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.096 ***	.024	-.081	-.006	.022	-.006
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.068 **	.022	.063	-.027	.021	-.030
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	-.005	.023	-.005	-.038 #	.021	-.042
Watched second presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.103 #	.057	.040	.050	.054	.023
N		1,512			1,517	
R-Square		.454			.338	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/8/08 to 10/15/08.						

Table A8.7.3. OLS Regression Predicting Candidate Favorability from Third Presidential Debate Viewing

	Obama Favorability			McCain Favorability		
	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	8.316 ***	.642		3.284 ***	.621	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.053	.141	.008	-.246 #	.137	-.043
Age (in years)	-.005	.005	-.023	.009 #	.005	.046
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.386 ***	.295	.102	-.459	.286	-.039
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	1.631 ***	.272	.129	-.435 #	.264	-.040
Education (in years)	.001	.033	.001	.034	.032	.028
Household income (in thousands)	.002	.001	.035	.001	.001	.010
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-2.151 ***	.183	-.293	1.921 ***	.177	.301
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.577 ***	.173	.229	-1.456 ***	.168	-.243
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.751 ***	.072	-.252	.379 ***	.070	.147
Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)	-.046	.117	-.010	-.004	.113	-.001
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.032	.035	-.020	.024	.034	.017
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.087 ***	.026	-.072	.022	.025	.022
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.069 **	.025	.063	-.016	.024	-.016
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.014	.025	.013	-.051 *	.024	-.056
Watched third presidential debate (0=none to 3=all)	.116 #	.063	.045	.012	.061	.005
N		1,248			1,250	
R-Square		.466			.338	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/16/08 to 10/21/08.						

Watched Third Presidential Debate was measured with the question: “Did you happen to watch the presidential debate on Wednesday, October 15 between (ROTATE) John McCain and Barack Obama focusing on domestic issues? (IF YES:) Did you watch all, most or just some of it?” Those who *did not watch* the debate were assigned a value of 0, those who watched *just some* if it were assigned a value of 1, those who watched *most* of it were assigned a value of 2, and those who watched *all* of it were assigned a value of 3.

Appendix 8.8 (see page 199 of *The Obama Victory*) Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote through Economic Concerns

In our model, the beliefs that the country is on the wrong track, the economy is the most important issue, and Republicans should be blamed for the crisis predict the notion that electing McCain equals a Bush third term and also increase the likelihood of a favorable rating of Obama. A series of regression analyses indicate the interrelations among these variables. (p. 199)*

Table A8.8. Regression Models Supporting Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote through Economic Concerns

	Economy “Most Important Problem”	Blame GOP	McCain equals Bush third term	Obama better handle economy than McCain	Obama Favorability	Obama Vote Preference
	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Std. Betas)	(Odds Ratios)
Constant	.515**	.813	2.158***	.212***	--	.004***
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	1.180**	.963	.975	1.324***	-.006	.767**
Age (in years)	.999	.995**	.992***	1.010***	-.021*	1.000
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.115	1.944***	2.633***	3.196***	.084***	2.187***
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	1.210#	.870	1.177	2.063***	.049***	1.698**
Education (in years)	1.027*	.984	.960**	1.044**	.040***	1.050*
Household income (in thousands)	1.003***	.999	.997***	1.000	.006	1.002
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	1.047	.410***	.333***	.280***	-.106***	.489***
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.274***	2.754***	2.116***	2.000***	.085***	2.428***
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.865***	.714***	.688***	.565***	-.149***	.731***
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	1.055***	1.013	1.022	.961**	.009	1.007
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	.978*	.994	.971***	.996	-.046***	.960*
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	1.032***	1.040***	1.012	1.020	.029***	1.022
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	1.016#	1.017#	1.019#	1.035**	-.015#	1.030#
Country on Wrong Track (1=yes, 0=no)	2.030***	1.955***	2.162***	2.002***	.029***	1.185
Economy “Most Important Problem”(1=yes, 0=no)	--	1.207***	1.065	1.042***	.063***	1.210#
Blame GOP (1=yes, 0=no)	--	--	3.577***	2.479***	.087***	2.017***
McCain equals Bush third term (1=yes, 0=no)	--	--	--	7.983***	.149***	3.275***
Obama better handle economy than McCain	--	--	--	--	.339***	5.881***

(1=yes, 0=no)						
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	--	--	--	--	--	1.794***
N	8,279	8,279	8,279	7,823	7,757	7,630
R-square	--	--	--	--	.584	--
Cox & Snell R-square	.056	.208	.327	.487	--	.624
Nagelkerke R-square	.077	.286	.438	.650	--	.833
Percent Correct	65.8	72.6	77.1	85.4	--	92.3
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/22/08 to 11/3/08.						
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Note: Odds ratios are presented in the table. Estimates that are below 1.0 indicate a negative relationship while estimates above 1.0 indicate a positive relationship.						

Country on Wrong Track was measured by a single question that asked: “Do you feel things in this country are generally going in the right direction, or do you think things are seriously off on the wrong track?” Those who said *wrong track* were coded as 1, while those who said *right direction* and *don’t know* were coded as 0.

Economy Most Important Problem, was measure by a single question that asked: “In your opinion, what is the most important problem facing the country today? (RECORD VERBATIM - IF MORE THAN ONE GIVEN, PROBE FOR ONE).” These verbatim responses were then coded by trained coders at Abt SRBI Inc. All mentions of the *economy* were coded as 1, while *all other* mentions were coded as 0.

Blame GOP was measured by with the question: “Who is more responsible for the current financial crisis facing the United States, (ROTATE) the Democrats in Congress or the Republicans in Congress?” Those who said *Republicans in Congress* were coded as 1 and *all other* responses were coded as 0.

McCain Equals Bush Third Term was measured with the question: “Which of the following two statements come closer to your view: electing Sen. John McCain for President would be like electing George W. Bush for a third term, or Sen. McCain will have major differences with George W. Bush in a number of areas.” Responses that said both or neither were also recorded. For the analysis, those who said that “*electing Sen. John McCain for President would be like electing George W. Bush for a third term*” were assigned a value of 1, and those who said that “*Sen. McCain will have major differences with George W. Bush in a number of areas,*” *both*, *neither*, or *don’t know* were assigned a value of 0.

Obama Can Better Handle the Economy was measured with the question: “Now I’m going to mention a few items and for each one, please tell me if you think (ROTATE) Barack Obama or John McCain would better handle that issue if they were elected president in 2008. Here’s the first. Who would better handle the economy (ISSUES ROTATED) if they were elected president in 2008, Barack Obama or John McCain?” For the analysis, those who said *Obama* were coded as 1, while those who said *McCain*, *neither*, or *don’t know* were coded as 0.

Appendix 8.9 (see page 201 of *The Obama Victory*)
Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote through Economic Concerns
for College-Educated, Non-Hispanic, White Males

For college-educated white males, the model we just sketched works in the same way that it does for the population as a whole. Perception that the country is on the wrong track, the belief that the Republicans are responsible for the economic crash, and that view that electing McCain will in effect produce a third Bush term all independently predict an increased likelihood that educated white men will say that they prefer Obama for president. (p. 201)*

Table A8.9. Regression Models Supporting Theoretical Progression to Obama Vote Through Economic Concerns (Non-Hispanic, White Males with at Least 16 Years of Formal Education Only)

	Economy “Most Important Problem”	Blame GOP	McCain equals Bush third term	Obama better handle economy than McCain	Obama Favorability	Obama Vote Preference
	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Odds Ratios)	(Std. Betas)	(Odds Ratios)
Constant	1.284	1.399	.974	.747	--	.001***
Age (in years)	.994	.993	.985*	1.012	-.035#	.986
Household income (in thousands)	1.002#	1.001	.999	1.001	.012	.999
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	1.138	.331***	.400***	.305***	-.043*	.265***
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.384#	1.980***	2.437***	1.098	.092***	2.321*
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	.857*	.535***	.614***	.357***	-.265***	.716#
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	1.038#	.976	1.013	.932	-.001	1.081
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	.967#	.998	.990	.965	-.049*	.938
Number of days read presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	1.046*	1.028	.993	1.062#	.021	1.119*
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	1.005	1.004	1.033	1.054	.004	1.111#
Country on Wrong Track (1=yes, 0=no)	1.721***	2.857***	3.830***	4.079***	.091***	3.422**
Economy “Most Important Problem”(1=yes, 0=no)	--	1.157	1.103	1.097	.068***	.950
Blame GOP (1=yes, 0=no)	--	--	3.969***	3.680***	.066***	2.391*
McCain equals Bush third term (1=yes, 0=no)	--	--	--	10.205***	.109***	6.383***

Obama better handle economy than McCain (1=yes, 0=no)	--	--	--	--	.307***	12.055***
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	--	--	--	--	--	2.363***
N	1,307	1,307	1,307	1,251	1,249	1,223
R-square	--	--	--	--	.622	--
Cox & Snell R-square	.051	.261	.363	.545	--	.676
Nagelkerke R-square	.070	.370	.499	.740	--	.907
Percent Correct	65.1	75.7	80.6	89.0	--	95.1
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 9/22/08 to 11/3/08.						
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Note: Odds ratios are presented in the table. Estimates that are below 1.0 indicate a negative relationship while estimates above 1.0 indicate a positive relationship.						