

Appendix to Chapter 10,  
entitled  
“Period Five: Be Very, Very Afraid/Be Reassured (October 29—  
November 4)”  
from  
*The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message  
Shaped the 2008 Election*

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

**Appendix 10.1 (see page 242 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Palin Not “Ready to Be President” from Watching Obama’s  
Half-Hour Program**

**Appendix 10.2 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Viewing of Obama’s Half-Hour Program**

**Appendix 10.3 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Candidate Favorability from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour  
Program**

**Appendix 10.4 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Vote Preference from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour  
Program**

**Appendix 10.5 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Obama Traits from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour Program**

**Appendix 10.1 (see page 242 of *The Obama Victory*)  
Predicting Palin Not “Ready to Be President” from Watching Obama’s  
Half-Hour Program**

*Before examining that infomercial in detail, we pause here to note an interesting effect it may have produced. Specifically, watching the Obama half-hour decreased perceptions of Governor Palin’s readiness to be president.\* (p. 242)*

Table A10.1. OLS Regression Predicting Palin Not “Ready to Be President” from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour Program

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	5.434	***	.720	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.088		.161	.014
Age (in years)	-.007		.006	-.035
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.083	***	.307	.094
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	-.103		.356	-.007
Education (in years)	.154	***	.038	.120
Household income (in thousands)	.002		.002	.035
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.792	***	.209	-.262
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.188	***	.195	.185
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.569	***	.080	-.218
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.030		.042	.019
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.046	#	.027	-.044
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.064	*	.027	.066
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.055	*	.027	.058
Watched Obama’s half-hour program (1=yes, 0=no)	.438	**	.165	.070
N			962	
R-Square			.388	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/30/08 to 11/03/08.				

*Palin Not Ready to Be President* was measured with the question: “Now I am going to ask you about the candidates for vice-president. On a scale of 0 to 10, where ‘zero’ means it does not apply at all and 10 means it applies extremely well, please tell me how well the phrase ‘ready to be president’ applies to Sarah Palin.” For the analysis, the scale was reverse-coded, so that 0 meant *applies extremely well* and 10 meant *not at all*.

*Watching Obama’s Half-hour Program* was measured with the question: “Did you happen to watch any of the 30 minute ad that Barack Obama put on television (last night/this past Wednesday night)? (IF YES:) Did you watch all of it, some of it or just a little?.” Responses were coded so that *yes* responses were assigned a value of 1 and *no* responses were assigned a value of 0.

## Appendix 10.2 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Viewing of Obama's Half-Hour Program

*Black Americans were significantly more likely to view the show, as were those who said they were closely following the election and respondents who got their campaign information from television.\* (p. 246)*

Table A10.2. Logistic Regression Predicting Viewing of Obama's Half-hour Program

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
<b>Intercept</b>	-3.317	***	.735	.036
<b>Female (1=yes, 0=no)</b>	.151		.143	1.164
<b>Age (in years)</b>	.003		.005	1.003
<b>Black (1=yes, 0=no)</b>	.747	**	.269	2.110
<b>Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)</b>	-.061		.312	.941
<b>Education (in years)</b>	-.014		.034	.986
<b>Household income (in thousands)</b>	.000		.001	1.000
<b>Republican (1=yes, 0=no)</b>	-.383	*	.190	.682
<b>Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)</b>	.204		.170	1.226
<b>Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)</b>	-.222	**	.071	.801
<b>Closely following the 2008 presidential campaign (1=not closely at all to 4=very closely)</b>	.720	***	.129	2.054
<b>Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week</b>	.131	**	.042	1.140
<b>Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week</b>	.037		.024	1.037
<b>Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week</b>	.026		.024	1.027
<b>Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week</b>	.015		.024	1.015
<b>N</b>			978	
<b>Cox &amp; Snell R-square</b>			.121	
<b>Nagelkerke R-square</b>			.163	
<b>Percent Correct</b>			66.1	
<b># p &lt; .10 * p &lt; .05 ** p &lt; .01 *** p &lt; .001</b>				
<b>Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/30/08 to 11/03/08.</b>				

**Appendix 10.3 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*)**  
**Predicting Candidate Favorability from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour Program**

*In the presence of controls, those who tuned in for the half-hour program were significantly more favorable toward Obama than those who didn’t and marginally less disposed toward McCain.\* (p. 246)*

Table A10.3. OLS Regression Predicting Candidate Favorability from Watching Obama’s Half-Hour Program

	Obama Favorability			McCain Favorability		
	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta	B Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta
Intercept	5.630 ***	.738		3.248 ***	.680	
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.135	.166	.019	-.024	.153	-.004
Age (in years)	-.005	.006	-.023	.001	.005	.007
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.635 ***	.314	.126	-1.244 ***	.292	-.114
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.904 *	.354	.060	.121	.326	.010
Education (in years)	.159 ***	.039	.110	.050	.036	.041
Household income (in thousands)	.000	.002	-.002	.003 *	.002	.067
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-2.240 ***	.217	-.287	1.722 ***	.200	.266
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	1.654 ***	.200	.228	-1.385 ***	.185	-.229
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.753 ***	.082	-.252	.491 ***	.076	.197
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.014	.043	-.008	.025	.040	.016
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.041	.028	-.034	-.002	.026	-.002
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.021	.028	.019	-.042 #	.025	-.045
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.027	.027	.025	-.055 *	.025	-.061
Watched Obama’s half-hour program (1=yes, 0=no)	.798 ***	.170	.113	-.301 #	.157	-.051
N		980			977	
R-Square		.491			.373	
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001						
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/30/08 to 11/03/08.						

*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.

## Appendix 10.4 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Vote Preference from Watching Obama's Half-hour Program

*Our analysis reveals that even after including the candidate favorability measures as controls, a move that takes the effects of selective exposure out of the equation, those who watched the Obama infomercial were significantly more likely to report a vote preference for Obama than those who did not watch it.\* (p. 246)*

Table A10.4. Logistic Regression Predicting Obama Vote Preference from Watching Obama's Half-hour Program

	B Coefficient		Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Intercept	.057		1.067	1.058
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.196		.254	1.216
Age (in years)	-.003		.009	.997
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	1.819 **		.670	6.166
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.696		.471	2.005
Education (in years)	-.052		.059	.949
Household income (in thousands)	.004		.003	1.004
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-1.430 ***		.431	.239
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.832 **		.284	2.297
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.393 **		.134	.675
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	-.002		.060	.998
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.074 #		.045	.929
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.057		.044	1.059
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.028		.043	1.029
Watched Obama's half-hour program (1=yes, 0=no)	.493 #		.255	1.638
Obama favorability (0 to 10)	.597 ***		.058	1.816
McCain favorability (0 to 10)	-.445 ***		.062	.641
N				952
Cox & Snell R-square				.604
Nagelkerke R-square				.805
Percent Correct				91.7
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001				
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/30/08 to 11/03/08.				

*Obama 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.<sup>1</sup> About 14 percent of voters cast their ballots before Election Day in 2000, and this rose to 20 percent in 2004.<sup>2</sup> 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 *another candidate* or saying they *did not know* were assigned a value of 0.

---

<sup>1</sup> The absentee and early voting battery was designed by Kate Kenski.

<sup>2</sup> 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>

## Appendix 10.5 (see page 246 of *The Obama Victory*) Predicting Obama Traits from Watching Obama's Half-hour Program

*During the last few days of the election, those who saw the program also rated Obama significantly higher on traits such as experience, judgment, and "shares my values" than those who did not watch. \* (p. 246)*

Table A10.5. OLS Regression Predicting Obama Traits from Watching Obama's Half-hour Program

	Experience	Judgment	Shares My Values	Trustworthy	Strong Leader
Female (1=yes, 0=no)	.046#	.018	.020	.006	.008
Age (in years)	-.006	-.021	-.043#	-.029	-.058*
Black (1=yes, 0=no)	.161***	.126***	.107***	.121***	.116***
Hispanic (1=yes, 0=no)	.059*	.048*	.053*	.060*	.043#
Education (in years)	.088**	.101***	.064*	.121***	.129***
Household income (in thousands)	-.036	.000	-.025	-.017	-.030
Republican (1=yes, 0=no)	-.257***	-.283***	-.266***	-.275***	-.267***
Democrat (1=yes, 0=no)	.269***	.221***	.273***	.234***	.221***
Ideology (1=very liberal to 5=very conservative)	-.197***	-.252***	-.274***	-.244***	-.208***
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on TV news in past week	.000	-.008	-.008	.015	.014
Number of days heard about presidential campaign on talk radio in past week	-.038	-.037	-.049*	-.051*	-.049#
Number of days saw presidential campaign information in newspapers in past week	.022	.052*	.056*	.039	.027
Number of days saw presidential campaign information on Internet in past week	.022	.003	.004	.004	.050#
Watched Obama's half-hour program (1=yes, 0=no)	.097***	.107***	.106***	.109***	.120***
N	975	970	973	967	969
R-Square	.459	.479	.525	.480	.438
# p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001					
Data: NAES08 telephone survey. Dates: 10/30/08 to 11/03/08.					
Note: Beta coefficients are presented in the table.					

*Obama Experience* 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 ‘has the experience needed to be president’ apply to Barack Obama?”

*Obama Judgment* 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 ‘has the judgment needed to be president’ apply to Barack Obama?”

*Obama Shares My Values* 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 ‘shares my values’ apply to Barack Obama?”

*Obama 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 Barack Obama. How well does the phrase ‘trustworthy’ apply to Barack Obama?”

*Obama Strong Leader* 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 ‘strong leader’ apply to Barack Obama?”

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