

DATA REPORT

Prepared for

QIWEI SUN

Ph.D. Candidate in Electrical and Systems Engineering

University of Pennsylvania

By

EUNJI KIM

For the dissertation

UNDERSTANDING COALITION DYNAMICS IN MULTIPARTY CONFLICTS: AN AGENT-BASED
APPROACH WITH MULTI-OBJECTIVE SPATIAL MODEL

Data Summary

National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) 2008¹

In the field of political science, American National Election Studies (ANES hereinafter) data are the longest-standing public opinion survey and thus most frequently used. In the 2008, however, the Annenberg Public Policy Center collected an impressive large-N panel data to explore campaign dynamics and changing electoral contexts. Since the purpose of the dissertation is to have multiple groups of voters divided by sociodemographic characteristics such as income, the level of education, and the state of residence, having enough respondents in each cell was critical. NAES 2008—whose online panel (recruited by Knowledge Networks) consisted of interviews with a nationally representative random sample of 28,985 respondents—was better suited for the said purpose compared to ANES 2008 (its 2008 Times Series data had N= 2,322 pre-election and N= 2,102 post-election).

A total of 28,985 members of KnowledgePanel participated in NAES08-Online. NAES respondents participated in at least one of five NAES interviewing waves (Wave 1-4: pre-election, Wave 5: post-election).²

Wave 1 — pre-primary: Interviews conducted starting October 2, 2007, through January 1, 2008;

N =19,190 respondents participated in this wave

Wave 2 — primaries: Interviews conducted January 1, 2008, through March 31, 2008;

N = 17,747

Wave 3 — spring and summer 2008: Interviews conducted April 2, 2008, through August 29, 2008; N =

20,052

Wave 4 — general election: Interviews conducted August 29, 2008, through November 4, 2008;

¹ The Annenberg data are publicly available at <http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/naes-data-sets/>

² Please refer to the APPC website for the further information on sampling methodology.
<http://studies.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/naes08/online/method/index.html#NAES-description>

N = 19,241

Wave 5 — post-election: Interviews conducted November 5, 2008, through January 31, 2009;

N= 19,234

Since the part of the dissertation (to the best of my knowledge) will involve a comparison of the predicted vs actual election outcome, I focus on 16,242 participants who participated in both pre-election (Wave 4) and post-election wave (Wave 5). I used data from Wave 4 and Wave 5 for the following reasons:

- 1) Most of the voters do not pay attention to politics or do not know much about the candidates unless the election is immediate
- 2) Voters do not know who will be the presidential candidate nominees until the party conventions end. For your information, the Democratic Convention was held from August 25 to August 28, 2008; The Republican Convention was held from September 1 to September 4.

Voters by Sociodemographic Characteristics

1. Voters by Party ID (Republican, Independent, Democrat)

Republican	7,400	45.56%
Independents	361	2.22%
Democrats	8,481	52.22%
Total N	16,242	

2. Voters by Education Level (Low, Middle, High)

*Education would be a better category to use for predicting turnout/issue positions, more than income. Though low-income respondents, for instance, should be more favorable towards redistributive policies, it has not been the case. There has been no reliable association between income and support for redistribution policy (i.e., Gilens 2009; Kluegel and Smith 1986).

High school or below (Low)	4,216	25.96%
Some college (Middle)	5,490	33.80%
Bachelor's degree or higher (High)	6,536	40.24%
Total N	16,242	

3. Voters by Race (White, Non-White)

White	13,138	80.89%
Non-White	3,104	19.11%
Total N	16,242	

4. Voters by State of Residence (Northeast, West, South, Midwest)

* This particular geographic breakdown follows the Census grouping. The four census Regions are:

Northeast

- New England Division: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont
- Middle Atlantic Division: New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania

Midwest

- East North Central Division: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin
- West North Central Division: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota

South

- South Atlantic Division: Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia
- East South Central Division: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee
- West South Central Division: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas

West

- Mountain Division: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming
- Pacific Division: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington

Northeast	2,781	17.12%
Midwest	4,732	29.13%
South	4,788	28.48%
West	3,941	24.26%
Total N	16,242	

The four characteristics above (party ID, education, race, state of residence) give us $3 \times 3 \times 2 \times 4 = 72$ cells.

There are other variables that can be used, but to make sure that we have a meaningful number of respondents per cell, I would not recommend it.

Group = 1 if Rep, White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 2 if Rep, White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 3 if Rep, White, Low Educ, South

Group = 4 if Rep, White, Low Educ, West

Group = 5 if Rep, White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 6 if Rep, White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 7 if Rep, White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 8 if Rep, White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 9 if Rep, White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 10 if Rep, White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 11 if Rep, White, High Educ, South

Group = 12 if Rep, White, High Educ, West

Group = 13 if Rep, Non-White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 14 if Rep, Non-White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 15 if Rep, Non-White, Low Educ, South

Group = 16 if Rep, Non-White, Low Educ, West

Group = 17 if Rep, Non-White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 18 if Rep, Non-White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 19 if Rep, Non-White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 20 if Rep, Non-White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 21 if Rep, Non-White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 22 if Rep, Non-White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 23 if Rep, Non-White, High Educ, South

Group = 24 if Rep, Non-White, High Educ, West

Group = 25 if Ind, White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 26 if Ind, White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 27 if Ind, White, Low Educ, South

Group = 28 if Ind, White, Low Educ, West

Group = 29 if Ind, White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 30 if Ind, White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 31 if Ind, White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 32 if Ind, White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 33 if Ind, White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 34 if Ind, White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 35 if Ind, White, High Educ, South

Group = 36 if Ind, White, High Educ, West

Group = 37 if Ind, Non-White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 38 if Ind, Non-White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 39 if Ind, Non-White, Low Educ, South

Group = 40 if Ind, Non-White, Low Educ, West

Group = 41 if Ind, Non-White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 42 if Ind, Non-White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 43 if Ind, Non-White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 44 if Ind, Non-White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 45 if Ind, Non-White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 46 if Ind, Non-White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 47 if Ind, Non-White, High Educ, South

Group = 48 if Ind, Non-White, High Educ, West

Group = 49 if Dem, White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 50 if Dem, White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 51 if Dem, White, Low Educ, South

Group = 52 if Dem, White, Low Educ, West

Group = 53 if Dem, White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 54 if Dem, White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 55 if Dem, White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 56 if Dem, White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 57 if Dem, White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 58 if Dem, White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 59 if Dem, White, High Educ, South

Group = 60 if Dem, White, High Educ, West

Group = 61 if Dem, Non-White, Low Educ, Northeast

Group = 62 if Dem, Non-White, Low Educ, Midwest

Group = 63 if Dem, Non-White, Low Educ, South

Group = 64 if Dem, Non-White, Low Educ, West

Group = 65 if Dem, Non-White, Mid Educ, Northeast

Group = 66 if Dem, Non-White, Mid Educ, Midwest

Group = 67 if Dem, Non-White, Mid Educ, South

Group = 68 if Dem, Non-White, Mid Educ, West

Group = 69 if Dem, Non-White, High Educ, Northeast

Group = 70 if Dem, Non-White, High Educ, Midwest

Group = 71 if Dem, Non-White, High Educ, South

Group = 72 if Dem, Non-White, High Educ, West

Group	N	Percent	Cum.
1	321	1.98	1.98
2	594	3.66	5.63
3	552	3.40	9.03
4	321	1.98	11.01
5	336	2.07	13.08
6	726	4.47	17.55
7	660	4.06	21.61
8	627	3.86	25.47
9	385	2.37	27.84
10	753	4.64	32.48
11	856	5.27	37.75
12	559	3.44	41.19
13	13	0.08	41.27
14	25	0.15	41.42
15	41	0.25	41.68
16	50	0.31	41.98
17	27	0.17	42.15
18	51	0.31	42.46
19	100	0.62	43.08
20	112	0.69	43.77
21	32	0.20	43.97
22	54	0.33	44.30
23	105	0.65	44.95
24	100	0.62	45.56

25	24	0.15	45.71
26	44	0.27	45.98
27	33	0.20	46.18
28	26	0.16	46.34
29	15	0.09	46.44
30	24	0.15	46.58
31	21	0.13	46.71
32	21	0.13	46.84
33	13	0.08	46.92
34	16	0.10	47.02
35	18	0.11	47.13
36	11	0.07	47.20
37	1	0.01	47.20
38	12	0.07	47.28
39	11	0.07	47.35
40	10	0.06	47.41
41	7	0.04	47.45
42	7	0.04	47.49
43	15	0.09	47.59
44	15	0.09	47.68
45	3	0.02	47.70
46	2	0.01	47.71
47	6	0.04	47.75
48	6	0.04	47.78
49	377	2.32	50.10
50	627	3.86	53.97
51	391	2.41	56.37

52	259	1.59	57.97
53	320	1.97	59.94
54	619	3.81	63.75
55	417	2.57	66.32
56	487	3.00	69.31
57	527	3.24	72.56
58	726	4.47	77.03
59	683	4.21	81.23
60	749	4.61	85.85
61	78	0.48	86.33
62	90	0.55	86.88
63	199	1.23	88.10
64	117	0.72	88.83
65	144	0.89	89.71
66	183	1.13	90.84
67	328	2.02	92.86
68	228	1.40	94.26
69	158	0.97	95.23
70	179	1.10	96.34
71	352	2.17	98.50
72	243	1.50	100.00

Total 16,242 100.00

Voters' Issue Preferences (on 6 issues)

The NAES 2008 have 5 political issues (gay marriage, Iraq war, immigration, free trade, and abortion), and it asked three different questions regarding each issue. First, they were asked how a respondent thinks of an issue. Second, they were asked which candidates' views are most like their own views. Third, they were asked which candidates' views are unacceptable to them. I also added one more issue here, which is the state of the economy, given the vast array of political science literature that shows a robust connection between voters' retrospective assessment of the economy and electoral support for the incumbent party/politician.

ISSUE 1: GAY MARRIAGE

Variable name: **gaymarriage** (coded so that higher score means pro-gay marriage)

Q. There has been much talk recently about whether gays and lesbians should have the legal right to marry someone of the same sex. Which of the following options comes closest to your position on this issue?

1. I do not support any form of legal recognition of the relationships of gay and lesbian couples.
2. I support civil unions or domestic partnerships, but not gay marriage.
3. I support full marriage rights for gay and lesbian couples.

Variable name: **gm_likeobama/ gm_likemccain**

Q. Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to gay marriage? (coded as 1 if like your own, 0 if not)

Variable name: **gm_dislikeobama/ gm_dislikemccain**

Q. Are there any presidential candidates whose views on gay marriage are unacceptable to you? (coded as 1 if unacceptable, 0 if not)

ISSUE 2: IRAQ WAR

Variable name: **iraq** (coded so that higher score means pro-Iraq war)

Q. Which of the following plans for United States policy in Iraq comes closest to your own position?

1. The US should withdraw all troops from Iraq as soon as possible, regardless of conditions in Iraq.
2. The US should set a deadline for withdrawing its troops if the Iraqi government doesn't show definite progress in training Iraqi forces and controlling violence on its own.
3. The US should keep its troops in Iraq as long as is needed until a stable democratic government is established there.

Variable name: **iq_likeobama/ iq_likemccain**

Q. Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to Iraq War? (coded as 1 if like your own, 0 if not)

Variable name: **iq_dislikeobama/ iq_dislikemccain**

Q. Are there any presidential candidates whose views on Iraq War are unacceptable to you? (coded as 1 if unacceptable, 0 if not)

ISSUE 3: IMMIGRATION

Variable name: **immigration** (coded so that higher score means pro-immigration)

Q. Please indicate whether you favor or oppose the following proposal addressing immigration.

“Provide a path to citizenship for some illegal aliens who agree to return to their home country for a period of time and pay substantial fines.”

4 Strongly favor

3 Somewhat favor

2 Somewhat oppose

1 Strongly oppose

Variable name: **im_likeobama/ im_likemccain**

Q. Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to immigration? (coded as

1 if like your own, 0 if not)

Variable name: **im_dislikeobama/ im_dislikemccain**

Q. Are there any presidential candidates whose views on immigration are unacceptable to you? (coded as 1 if unacceptable, 0 if not)

ISSUE 4: FREE TRADE

Variable name: **freetrade** (coded so that higher score means pro-trade)

Do you favor or oppose the federal government in Washington negotiating more free trade agreements like NAFTA?

- 4 Strongly favor
- 3 Somewhat favor
- 2 Somewhat oppose
- 1 Strongly oppose

Variable name: **ft_likeobama/ ft_likemccain**

Q. Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to free trade? (coded as 1 if like your own, 0 if not)

Variable name: **ft_dislikeobama/ ft_dislikemccain**

Q. Are there any presidential candidates whose views on free trade are unacceptable to you? (coded as 1 if unacceptable, 0 if not)

ISSUE 5: ABORTION

Variable name: **abortion** (coded so that higher score means pro-abortion)

Q. Which of the following options comes closest to your view on abortion?

4 Abortion should be available to anyone who wants it.

3 Abortion should be available, but with stricter limits than it is now.

2 Abortion should not be permitted except in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the woman is at risk.

1 Abortion should not be permitted under any circumstances.

Variable name: **ab_likeobama/ ab_likemccain**

Q. Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to free trade? (coded as 1 if like your own, 0 if not)

Variable name: **ab_dislikeobama/ ab_dislikemccain**

Q. Are there any presidential candidates whose views on free trade are unacceptable to you? (coded as 1 if unacceptable, 0 if not)

ISSUE 6: ECONOMY

Variable name: **economy** (coded so that higher score means good economy)

Q. Thinking about the economy in the country as a whole, would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse?

5 Gotten a lot better

4 Gotten a little better

3 Stayed about the same

2 Gotten a little worse

1 Gotten a lot worse

Variable name: **econ_goodobama / econ_goodmccain**

Q. Are there any candidates who you think would do a particularly good job of handling the nation's economy?

Variable name: **econ_badobama/ econ_badmccain**

Q. Are there any candidates who you think would do a particularly bad job of handling the nation's economy?

POSITION STRENGTH

Note: Ideally, you probably want to have to what extent voters care about each issue. Such data unfortunately do not exist, and the truth of the matter is that most people will always pick economy as

the most important issue. Therefore, I created a dichotomous variable, **econ_mostimportant**, to indicate those who said economy as the most important issue facing the U.S. today (coded as 1) vs. those who did not (meaning that they said education is the most important, etc) (coded as 0)

VOTER PARTICIPATION

Registered (from Wave 4, pre-election)

- Coded as 1 if registered, 0 if not.

Voted (from Wave 5, post-election)

- Coded as 1 if voted, 0 if not.

VotedObama (From Wave 5, post-election)

- Coded as 1 if voted for Obama/Biden, 0 if not.

REFERNECES

WHY THESE ISSUES?

Institutions that collect national opinion data during election years have their own board members (consisted of selected, prominent scholars of the field) who review the survey questions and decide which questions should (not) be included. Issues such as abortion and economy are typically asked in any survey. Issues such as gay marriage, Iraq war, immigration, free trade are quite new, but were included in NAES based on the possible party alignments around these evolving political issues and on the level of salience in national conversations.

Here is a list of previous studies that suggest the electoral importance of these issues.

Gay Marriage:

Campbell, David E., and J. Quin Monson. "The Religion Card Gay Marriage and the 2004 Presidential Election." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (2008): 399-419.

Wald, Kenneth D., and Allison Calhoun-Brown. *Religion and politics in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

Baunach, Dawn Michelle. "Changing same-sex marriage attitudes in America from 1988 through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76, no. 2 (2012): 364-378.

Free Trade:

Mansfield, Edward D., and Diana C. Mutz. "Support for free trade: Self-interest, sociotropic politics, and out-group anxiety." *International Organization* 63, no. 03 (2009): 425-457.

Milner, Helen V., and Dustin H. Tingley. "Who supports global economic engagement? The sources of preferences in American foreign economic policy." *International Organization* 65, no. 01 (2011): 37-68.

Iraq War:

Karol, David, and Edward Miguel. "The electoral cost of war: Iraq casualties and the 2004 US presidential election." *Journal of Politics* 69, no. 3 (2007): 633-648.

Berinsky, Adam J., and James N. Druckman. "The polls—Review public opinion research and support for the Iraq War." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (2007): 126-141.

Voeten, Erik, and Paul R. Brewer. "Public opinion, the war in Iraq, and presidential accountability." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50, no. 6 (2006): 809-830.

Abortion:

Abramowitz, Alan I. "It's abortion, stupid: Policy voting in the 1992 presidential election." *The Journal of Politics* 57, no. 01 (1995): 176-186.

Craig, Barbara Hinkson, and David M. OBrien. "Abortion and American politics." (1993).

Cook, Elizabeth Adell, Ted G. Jelen, and Clyde Wilcox. "Between two absolutes: public opinion and the politics of abortion." (1992).

Immigration:

Citrin, Jack, Donald P. Green, Christopher Muste, and Cara Wong. "Public opinion toward immigration reform: The role of economic motivations." *The Journal of Politics* 59, no. 03 (1997): 858-881.

Burns, Peter, and James G. Gimpel. "Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 115, no. 2 (2000): 201-225.

Saggar, Shamit. "Immigration and the politics of public opinion." *The political quarterly* 74, no. s1 (2003): 178-194.

Economy:

Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Mary Stegmaier. "Economic determinants of electoral outcomes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3, no. 1 (2000): 183-219.

Dorussen, Han, and Michael Taylor, eds. *Economic voting*. Routledge, 2003.

Nadeau, Richard, and Michael S. Lewis-Beck. "National economic voting in US presidential elections." *Journal of Politics* 63, no. 1 (2001): 159-181.