

final_results

Chris Kardish, Marie Agosta

December 8, 2016

Results

The results are presented both as they appear in logistic regression output (Figure 1) for basic interpretation of the coefficients, but owing to the challenge of interpreting substantive significance from log odds, a table of the same coefficients in exponential form is provided (Figure 3) to show the same results as odds ratios. Confidence intervals are supplied for both the log-odd coefficients (Figure 2) and for odds ratios (Figure 4).

% Table created by stargazer v.5.2 by Marek Hlavac, Harvard University. E-mail: hlavac at fas.harvard.edu
% Date and time: Fri, Dec 09, 2016 - 6:22:32 PM

Table 1: Figure 1: Log Odds Across Four Generations

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>			
	Probability of voting in 2012			
	Gen Y	Gen X	Boomers	Silent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
education	0.276** (0.014, 0.538)	0.124 (-0.107, 0.356)	0.320*** (0.085, 0.555)	0.340* (-0.037, 0.716)
female	0.106 (-0.355, 0.566)	0.307 (-0.177, 0.792)	0.187 (-0.309, 0.684)	-0.726 (-1.668, 0.216)
vote_2008	1.084*** (0.597, 1.571)	1.906*** (1.376, 2.436)	2.672*** (2.175, 3.170)	3.175*** (1.951, 4.399)
black	0.971** (0.201, 1.741)	0.449 (-0.385, 1.284)	-0.730** (-1.429, -0.031)	1.837** (0.134, 3.540)
hispanic	0.630* (-0.061, 1.321)	-0.386 (-0.969, 0.197)	-0.125 (-0.890, 0.640)	-1.339 (-2.970, 0.293)
income	0.196** (0.042, 0.351)	0.149* (-0.021, 0.319)	0.179*** (0.044, 0.315)	0.510** (0.088, 0.932)
Constant	-1.427*** (-2.237, -0.617)	-0.972* (-1.943, -0.001)	-1.494*** (-2.364, -0.624)	-1.935** (-3.526, -0.345)
Observations	750	988	1,745	698

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Coefficients	Gen Y	Gen X	Boomer	Silent
Intercept	-2.237,-0.617	-1.943,-0.001	-2.364,-0.624	-3.526,-0.345
education	0.014,0.538	-0.107,0.356	0.085,0.555	-0.037,0.716
female	-0.355,0.566	-0.177,0.792	-0.309,0.684	-1.668,0.216

Coefficients	Gen Y	Gen X	Boomer	Silent
vote_2008	0.597,1.571	1.376,2.436	2.175,3.17	1.951,4.399
black	0.201,1.741	-0.385,1.284	-1.429,-0.031	0.134,3.54
hispanic	-0.061,1.321	-0.969,0.197	-0.89,0.64	-2.97,0.293
income	0.042,0.351	-0.021,0.319	0.044,0.315	0.088,0.932

The results in figures 1 and 2 show a considerable degree of consistency across generations. The effect of an additional level of education or income has a similar positive, statistically significant, and substantively significant relationship with voter turnout across generations. The lone exception is education among Generation X, but as seen in Figure 2, the confidence interval does not quite include zero within its range. Still, it is considered statistically insignificant for Generation X. The effect of being a woman is also generally consistent across generations, though not statistically significant, while the effect of past voting behavior (vote_2008) is positive across all generations but varies in terms of the strength of the effect, as will be made clearer below when viewing the exponentiated coefficients.

The greatest variation between generations can be found in the effects of race, and those effects are not uniformly statistically significant across generations. The effect of being black or hispanic is positive and significant for Millennials, while the effect of being hispanic is not statistically significant or positive for any other generation. The effect of being black is also statistically significant for Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation, but the substantive significance is markedly different: the effect is negative for Baby Boomers but strongly positive among the Silent Generation, even more substantively significant than for Millennials.

% Table created by stargazer v.5.2 by Marek Hlavac, Harvard University. E-mail: hlavac at fas.harvard.edu
 % Date and time: Fri, Dec 09, 2016 - 6:22:34 PM

Coefficients	Gen Y	Gen X	Boomers	Silent
Intercept	0.107,0.54	0.143,0.999	0.094,0.536	0.029,0.709
education	1.014,1.712	0.899,1.427	1.089,1.743	0.963,2.047
female	0.701,1.761	0.838,2.207	0.734,1.982	0.189,1.241
vote_2008	1.816,4.81	3.959,11.432	8.803,23.799	7.038,81.402
black	1.223,5.701	0.68,3.611	0.24,0.969	1.144,34.452
hispanic	0.941,3.747	0.379,1.218	0.411,1.896	0.051,1.34
income	1.043,1.42	0.979,1.375	1.044,1.37	1.092,2.54

The above findings are simply reinforced when observing the exponentiated coefficients (Figure 3), but their substantive impact is easier to interpret.

<https://www.quora.com/How-does-one-interpret-an-odds-ratio> <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/faq/oratio.htm> odds are _____ times larger if blah blah

Table 3: Figure 3: Odds Ratios Across Four Generations

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>			
	Probability of voting in 2012			
	Gen Y (1)	Gen X (2)	Boomers (3)	Silent (4)
education	1.317 t = 2.064**	1.133 t = 1.055	1.377 t = 2.668***	1.404 t = 1.765*
female	1.112 t = 0.450	1.360 t = 1.244	1.206 t = 0.739	0.484 t = -1.511
vote_2008	2.956 t = 4.361***	6.727 t = 7.046***	14.474 t = 10.532***	23.935 t = 5.084***
black	2.640 t = 2.472**	1.567 t = 1.055	0.482 t = -2.047**	6.277 t = 2.114**
hispanic	1.878 t = 1.788*	0.680 t = -1.297	0.883 t = -0.320	0.262 t = -1.608
income	1.217 t = 2.491**	1.161 t = 1.720*	1.196 t = 2.589***	1.665 t = 2.368**
Constant	0.240 t = -3.452***	0.378 t = -1.962*	0.224 t = -3.366***	0.144 t = -2.384**
Observations	750	988	1,745	698
<i>Note:</i>			*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	