

PS 688  
The 2008 Election and the American National Election Studies  
Winter Semester 2009, Tuesdays 12-2.

Professor Arthur Lupia  
Office Hours: Thursday 10:10-11:45, 6757 Haven Hall.

This course is designed to provide you with instruction, mentoring, and feedback on your efforts to conduct creative, innovative, and technically sound research on the historic election of 2008. Part of the course will involve formal lectures and part will feature rigorous classroom discussions. The class will end with a public mini-conference at which you will present new research on the election of 2008.

A focal part of the course will be surveys run by the American National Election Studies. For 2008, the ANES not only continued its well-known Time Series study, it also added many new innovations. Some of these innovations come in the form of new and improved questions on a variety of topics, most notably race, media, and psychological underpinnings of electoral attitudes and voting behavior. Other innovations come in the form of an entirely new study -- a Panel Study that tracked a large and random sample of Americans from the date of the first primary elections through the year following the general election. The timing of key events in the course is coordinated with relevant events in the ANES data release calendar.

The 2008 ANES was managed by scholars and staff at the University of Michigan and Stanford University. One consequence of that fact is that participants in this class can obtain first hand information and advice about the 2008 ANES. As a result, this course presents you with an opportunity to obtain a "first-mover" advantage in many of scholarly debates about the 2008 election that are likely to follow.

My expectation of students in this class is that you will emerge from it with advanced knowledge of appropriate (and inappropriate) uses of survey data and a deeper understanding of the relationship between the existing literature on elections and the circumstances of the 2008 election. My belief is also that if you apply yourself and take full advantage of this course's opportunities, you can emerge from it with a research paper on the 2008 election that is suitable for presentation at major conferences and well on the way to being publishable in influential scholarly outlets.

#### Course Objectives

- Provide detailed mentoring on how to use the ANES to explore important hypotheses about the most important presidential election in a generation.

#### Technical Objectives

- Provide students with a detailed background on the content of the 2008 ANES.
- Provide details about survey production processes that will help them draw valid and reliable inferences from the data.

- Challenge students to identify commonalities and contrasts between voting and elections as seen in the existing literature and these topics as revealed by the election of 2008.
- Create a venue for faculty and students to exchange ideas on research designs that are best suited for explaining important aspects of the 2008 election.

### Office Hours

- On Thursdays from 10-11:45, I will hold office hours. I encourage you to come. If enough of you attend regularly, we can use these sessions to focus on development of students' class-related research agendas.

### Key Dates

- January 15: Release of all post-election 2008 questionnaires.
- January 31: Release of 2008 Waves of the Panel Study.
- February 28: Initial Release of the 2008 Time Series Study

### SCHEDULE of CLASSES

#### January 13. Introduction to the ANES and My Approach to the Class

1. What is the social value of a national election study?
2. What does the American National Election Studies do?
3. What are your obligations as a scientist when using survey data?

#### Readings

- Arthur Lupia. 2000. "Evaluating Political Science Research: Information for Buyers and Sellers." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33: 7-13.
- Nancy Burns. 2006. "The Michigan, then National, then American National Election Studies." Manuscript, University of Michigan.
- Arthur Lupia. 2008. "Procedural Transparency and the Credibility of Election Surveys." *Electoral Studies* 27: 732-739.
- Become familiar with the ANES website sufficiently well that you know the meanings of the following terms.
  - The Time Series
  - The Core
  - The 2008-9 Panel Study
  - The 2006 Pilot Study
  - The ANES-NLS Partnership
  - The Online Commons

#### January 20. Survey Design Issues

1. Are internet surveys as valuable as those administered by telephone or face-to-face?
2. What is optimal question design and would I know it if I saw it?
3. What statistical methods are most appropriate for evaluating various hypotheses?

## Readings

- Duane F. Alwin and Jon A. Krosnick. 1991. "The Reliability of Survey Attitude Measurement: The Influence of Question and Respondent Attributes." *Sociological Methods and Research* 20: 139-181.
- Jon A. Krosnick. 1999. "Survey Research." *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 537-567.
- Allyson L. Holbrook, Melanie C. Green, and Jon A. Krosnick. 2003. "Telephone versus Face-to-Face Interviewing of National Probability Samples with Long Questionnaires: Comparisons of Respondent Satisficing and Social Desirability Bias." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67: 79-125.
- Jon A. Krosnick. 2004. "Suggestions on Think-Aloud Interviewing to Pre-test Questionnaires." Manuscript, Stanford University.
- Stephen J. Blumberg and Julian V. Luke. 2007. "Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, January – June 2007 "
- Allyson L. Holbrook, Jon A. Krosnick, and Alison Pfent. 2008. "The Causes and Consequences of Response Rates in Surveys by the News Media and Government Contractor Survey Research Firms" In James M. Lepkowski et. al. (eds.) *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology*, p. 499-528.
- Neil Malhotra and Jon A. Krosnick. 2008. "The Effect of Survey Mode and Sampling on Inferences about Political Attitudes and Behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to Internet Surveys with Nonprobability Samples." *Political Analysis* 15: 286-323.

## January 27. The Measurement and Explanation of Turnout

1. Why do people turnout?
2. How does social desirability affect responses to turnout questions?
3. Can advertisements affect turnout?

## Readings

- Jennifer K. Smith, Alan S. Gerber, and Anton Orlich. 2003. "Self-Prophecy Effects and Voter Turnout." *Political Psychology*. 24: 593-604.
- Santiago Suarez. 2006. "Social Utility and the Calculus of Voting: An Experimental Analysis of Over-Reporting." Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences.
- Kelly Zidar. 2007. "American National Election Studies 2004 Vote Validation: A Demonstration Exercise."  
[http://www.electionstudies.org/announce/newsltr/ANES\\_VoteValidationMemo\\_20071031.pdf](http://www.electionstudies.org/announce/newsltr/ANES_VoteValidationMemo_20071031.pdf)
- Andre Blais. 2008. "The Study of Turnout: Measurement Issues." Presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Allyson Holbrook and Jon A. Krosnick. 2009. "Social Desirability Bias in Voter Turnout Reports: Tests Using the Item Count Technique." In press, *Public Opinion Quarterly*.
- Yanna Krupnikov. 2009. Selected Dissertation Chapters

- Chapter 1: Do Negative Advertisements Affect Voter Turnout: Introduction and Overview
- Chapter 2: Eight Theoretical Premises on Negativity and Turnout
- Chapter 3: Negativity and Turnout 1976 to 2000

JANUARY 31. RELEASE OF PANEL STUDY DATA

February 3. Review of the 2008 Time Series Questionnaires

Readings:

- Arthur Lupia and Gisela Sin. 2003. "Which Public Goods are Endangered? How Evolving Communication Technologies Affect The Logic of Collective Action." *Public Choice* 117: 315-331.
- Kenyatha V. Loftis and Arthur Lupia. 2008. "Using the Internet to Create Research Opportunities: The New Virtual Communities of TESS and the American National Election studies." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41: 547-550.
- The Questionnaires
- All Relevant Online Commons Proposals

February 10. Review of the 2008 Panel Study Questionnaires

Readings:

- The Questionnaires
- All Relevant Online Commons Proposals

FEBRUARY 17. CLASS DEVOTED TO STUDENT PRESENTATIONS OF RESEARCH IDEAS.

SPRING BREAK

FEBRUARY 28. RELEASE OF TIME SERIES DATA

March 3. What Voters Know

1. What do voters know?
2. What is the value of our current measurements of political knowledge?
3. Can the precision, relevance, and value of these measures be improved?

Readings

- Tom W. Smith, Sara P. Crovitz, and Christopher Walsh. 1988. "Measuring Occupation: A Comparison of 1970 and 1980 Occupation Classification Systems of the Bureau of the Census." *GSS Methodological Report No. 59*.
- Arthur Lupia. 1994. "Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88: 63-76.
- Patrick Sturgis. 2004. "The Effect of Coding Error on Time Use Surveys Estimates" *Journal of Official Statistics* 20: 467-480.

- Arthur Lupia. 2006. "How Elitism Undermines the Study of Voter Competence." *Critical Review* 18: 217-232.
- Markus Prior and Arthur Lupia. 2008. "Money, Time, and Political Knowledge: Distinguishing Quick Recall from Political Learning Skills." *American Journal of Political Science* 52: 168-182.
- Jon A. Krosnick, Arthur Lupia, Matthew DeBell and Darrell Donakowski. 2008. "Problems with ANES Questions Measuring Political Knowledge." Available at <http://www.electionstudies.org/announce/newsltr/20080324PoliticalKnowledgeMemo.pdf>
- James L. Gibson and Gregory A. Caldiera. 2009. "Knowing the Supreme Court? A Reconsideration of Public Ignorance of the High Court. Forthcoming, *Journal of Politics*.

### March 10. The Changing Role of Media

1. How has technology affected media coverage of campaigns?
2. How do economies of scale affect what media outlets cover?
3. Can estimates of media effects be improved?

#### Readings

- Markus Prior. 2007. *Post Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- James N. Druckman and Arthur Lupia. 2000. "Preference Formation." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 1 - 24.
- Scott Althaus and David H. Tewksbury. 2007. "Toward a New Generation of Media Use Measures for the ANES." Available at: <http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011903.pdf>
- William P. Eveland, Jr., Myiah Hutchens Hively, and Fei Shen. 2007. "Exposure, Attention, or "Use" of News? Validating Measurement of a Central Concept in Political Communication and Public Opinion Research." Presented at the 2007 MAPOR Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- LinChiat Chang and Jon A. Krosnick. 2007. "Measuring the Frequency of Regular Behaviors: Comparing the "Typical Week" to the "Past Week" *Sociological Methodology* 33:55-80.

### March 17. Implications of the Bush Years

1. Is the country really more polarized today than it was a decade or two decades ago?
2. In what ways was the Bush electoral strategy innovative and effective?
3. Does Obama's election signal important changes in the electorate?

#### Readings

- Morris Fiorina, Samuel J. Abrams, and Jeremy Pope. 2005. *Culture War: The Myth of a Polarized America*. New York: Longman.

- Daron R. Shaw. 2006. *The Race to 270. The Electoral College and the Campaign Strategies of 2000 and 2004*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arthur Lupia. 2009. Did Bush Voters Cause Obama's Victory? Manuscript, University of Michigan

## March 24. CLASS DEVOTED TO STUDENT PRESENTATIONS OF PROGRESS REPORTS

### March 31. Faith in Elections

1. Is the role of faith in today's election really different than in prior years?
2. In what ways do candidates attempt to appeal to secular and religious organizations simultaneously?
3. How are evolving theological differences within the Christian faith pertinent to American electoral politics?

#### Readings

- David E. Campbell (ed.) *A Matter of Faith: Religion in the 2004 Presidential Election*. Washington: The Brookings Institution.
- Stephen T. Mockabee, Kenneth D. Wald, and David C. Leege. 2007. "Reexamining Religiosity A Report on the New Religion Items in the ANES 2006 Pilot Study." *ANES Pilot Study Report*  
<http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011907.pdf>

### April 7. Race and Gender in Elections

1. How do conservative and liberal views of the role of race in politics differ?
2. To what extent can members of various races form credible and lasting political coalitions?
3. To what extent did voters view Barack Obama through racial lenses?

#### Readings

- Patricia G. Devine. 1989. "Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56: 5-18.
- Zoltan Hajnal. 2001. "White Residents, Black Incumbents, and a Declining Racial Divide," *American Political Science Review*. 95(3):603-617.
- Brian Nosek. 2007. "Implicit-Explicit Relations." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 16:65-69.
- N. Sriram and Anthony G. Greenwald. 2007. "The Brief Implicit Association Test." Manuscript, University of Washington.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira and Kathleen Dolan. 2007. "Gender Stereotypes and Gender Preferences on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study." *ANES Pilot Study Report*  
<http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011883.pdf>
- Zigerell, L.J., Jr., David Barker and Heather Rice. 2007. "ANES Pilot Study Report: Abortion Items." *ANES Pilot Study Report*.  
<http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011891.pdf>

- Daniel J. Hopkins. 2008. "No More Wilder Effect, Never a Whitman Effect: When and Why Polls Mislead about Black and Female Candidates." <http://people.iq.harvard.edu/~dhopkins/wilder13.pdf>
- B. Keith Payne, Melissa A. Burkley, and Mark B. Stokes. 2008. "Why Do Implicit and Explicit Attitude Tests Diverge? The Role of Structural Fit." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94:16-31.

#### April 14 & 21. Public Mini-Conferences on the 2008 Elections

- Assuming that N students take the class, each mini-conference will feature N/2 presentations. Each mini-conference will be two hours in length.
- The public will be invited to this conference.
- We may also record it.
- I do not believe that we will employ discussants. However, Q&A will be an important part of the event.

#### Grading

- *Paper proposal. 5 percent.* Must include a clear statement of: motivation, theoretical rationale, null hypotheses, proposed statistical tests. Due in class on February 17.
- *First draft of paper. 10 percent.* Must include initial analyses. Due in class on March 24.
- *Final draft of paper: 30 percent.* A paper asking an original question, developing a novel theoretical approach, and using 2008 ANES data. Due at noon on April 24.
- *Presentation of paper. Conference style. 15 percent.* The final two class sessions will place students in a conference panel format complete with time limits and Q&A. The public will be invited to attend.
- *Class participation. 30 percent.* (Six opening statements @ 3 percent each plus up to 12 additional points). Each class will feature class discussions and debates about literature relevant to the development of the surveys. Doing all of the assigned reading well enough to answer questions about it is a necessary condition. In addition, for each of these classes, a few students will be chosen to make an opening statement arguing for or against a particular work's applicability to the 2008 election.