Milestone #4: A Replication Exercise Test Run

Debora Gonzalez

2/28/2020

Contents

1 Introduction

Research Paper: Local demographic changes and US presidential voting, 2012 to 2016

Authors: Seth J. Hilla, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Gregory A. Huberc

This PDF shows a general understanding of the tools needed to complete my replication final project (Xie, Allaire, and Grolemund 2019) for GOV1006.

2 Overview

The topics of immigration and the increase of racial and ethnic minorities have been fairly prevalent in media, social media, and political rhetoric over the last few years, but do these phenomena actually influence voting behavior? This study analyzes voting patterns in areas that received an influx of immigrants prior to the 2016 general election. Notably, using precinct-level data, it finds that these influxes did not influence voting behavior in favor of Trump, but rather (in a slight way) benefited his opponent in those particular areas. In other words, local demographic changes are not, on their own, increasing support for anti-immigration candidates. The authors argue that this means the cities in question are not engaging in the often suggested "threatened response" associated with voting behavior in light of immigration influxes. The authors acknowledge that "despite its disparate local impacts, immigration may be a symbolic, nationalized issue whose effects, do not depend on local experiences." However, the actual connection has yet to be proven empirically and it is tough to do so given several factors influencing voting patterns. Some of these factors include, but are not limited to, greater exposure to international trade and declining economic prospects for the less educated. The authors explain that 'positive intergroup contact' could be responsible for the seemingly 'supportive' voting patterns at low levels of aggregation (locally). The authors study change in proportion of Hispanics and proportion change of Hispanic proportions concluding that in places with demographic shifts, Trump did not benefit, but, in fact, Clinton did. These findings are further validated by a similar model utilizing foreign-born, noncitizens proportions to discard the posibility of increased Clinton support due to changing electoral composition (given that noncitizens cannot vote and would not influence the electoral outcome in such way) (Hilla, Hopkins, and Huberc 2019). I am interested in exploring this topic further by analyzing the variables used and figuring out whether this conclusion stands across demographic groups. In addition, this paper evokes an interest in understanding how Trump's nationalist rhetoric and media's portrayal of immigration influxes may have attracted different demographic groups in cities that did not experience such influx (fearing that they might) i.e. the Deep South.

Dan Hopkins offers a link to the data for this research paper on his website. The full paper can be found here. Check out my project's Github repo[1].

[1] My project's Github repo.

3 A GT Table of my Data

Average Changes in Proportion of Population Groups by State
Proportion of foreign born and GOP voters respectively between 2011-2016

State	Avg. Change in Foreign Pop.	Avg. Change in Republican Voters
FL	-0.780	-0.162
GA	NA	NA
MI	-0.012	NA
NV	NA	NA
OH	NA	3.963
PA	0.213	2.809
WA	NA	NA

Source: HHH Demographic Threat Data Archive: Precinct

4 Regression Models

```
##
## ================================================================================
##                                          Dependent variable:
##                                 ---------------------------------------------
##                                 Change in Prop. Republicans Total Votes per Preccint
##                                             (1)                       (2)
## --------------------------------------------------------------------------------
## Change in Prop. Foreign Born             0.323**                -972,429.600***
##                                          (0.140)                 (165,985.300)
##
## Change in Prop. Hispanic                                         411,682.300***
##                                                                  (129,165.800)
##
## Constant                                 0.118***                37,036.540***
##                                          (0.002)                 (2,653.172)
##
## --------------------------------------------------------------------------------
## Observations                              2,901                     2,901
## Log Likelihood                           2,441.776                -38,003.730
## Akaike Inf. Crit.                        -4,879.551                76,013.470
## ================================================================================
## Note:                                                *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
```

References

Hilla, Seth J., Daniel J. Hopkins, and Gregory A. Huberc. 2019. "Local Demographic Changes and Us Presidential Voting, 2012 to 2016."

Xie, Yihui, J. J. Allaire, and Garrett Grolemund. 2019. *R Markdown: The Definitive Guide.*