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- Ultimately, we want to measure campaign advertising effects in 2006 House races.

- A Midwest sample stratified on DMAs.

- First we want to know: Does our sample contain persuadable respondents in proper proportions? An obvious concern with an internet sample.

- Check this using a national sample.
CCES Sample

- Nationally Representative Respondents, N=2,000.
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• Nationally Representative Respondents, N=2,000.

• Compare to the American National Election Studies 2004 Cross-Section – Post-Election Completes Only, N=1,066.
  - Because the Census does not ask partisanship, ideology, etc.
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- Tried multiple methods.
- For this presentation: simplicity.
- Additive scale of correct responses to the same open-ended questions:
  - "What job or office does Dick Cheney hold?"
  - "What job or office does John Roberts hold?" (William Rehnquist in the NES 2004)
Weighted Proportions Correct

- NES 2004
  - Cheney: 85%

- CCES 2006
  - Cheney: 93%
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- NES 2004
  - Cheney: 85%
  - Rehnquist: 28%

- NES 1986
  - Rehnquist: 18% (no weights)

- CCES 2006
  - Cheney: 93%
  - Roberts: 27%
Weighted Proportions Correct

• NES 2004
  - Cheney: 85%
  - Rehnquist: 28%
  - Hastert: 9%

• CCES 2006
  • Cheney: 93%
  • Roberts: 27%
  • Hastert: 49%
Information in The CCES 2006
(Questions on Pre-Election Survey)
Measuring Partisanship & Ideology
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Measuring Partisanship & Ideology

• Partisanship
  - Polimetrix uses the same branching question as the NES '04 to get to a 7-point Party ID.

• Ideology
  - Polimetrix: 5-point Ideology, from "very liberal" to "very conservative."
  - NES '04: 7-point Ideology, from "extremely liberal" to "extremely conservative."
Note: NES prompted for "Haven't Thought Much About It"; 23% (weighted) of respondents selected this option.
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- We'd like some respondents who are not so politically constrained that they are immune to campaign advertising.
- Respondent persuadability should be related to how closely ideology maps to partisanship.
- Close ideology-partisanship relationship evidence of low persuadability.
- Noisy ideology-partisanship relationship evidence of persuadability.
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Respondents with 0 correct responses.

Respondents with 1 correct responses.

Respondents with 2 correct responses.
Quartiles of Party ID by Ideology by Information, CCES 2006

Respondents with 0 correct responses.

Respondents with 1 correct responses.

Respondents with 2 correct responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n=6</th>
<th>n=16</th>
<th>n=38</th>
<th>n=26</th>
<th>n=3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=79</td>
<td>n=192</td>
<td>n=515</td>
<td>n=335</td>
<td>n=117</td>
<td>n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=88</td>
<td>n=229</td>
<td>n=156</td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The interaction of information, party, and ideology (fitted data)

**NES**

- Strong Republican
- Independent
- Strong Democrat

**CCES**

- Strong Republican
- Independent
- Strong Democrat

Graph shows plot of fitted data from the model: 

\[ \text{PID} = b_0 + b_1 \cdot \text{ideo} + b_2 \cdot \text{info} + b_3 \cdot \text{ideo} \cdot \text{info} \]

(Variables coded to identical values in NES and CCES; ideology is a 3-pt variable)
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• CCES appears to have good balance on ideology relative to the NES 2004.

• CCES appears a little too (partisan) polarized, a little too informed ... too little susceptibility to political advertising?

• Potential non-ignorable difference between low-info NES respondents and low-info CCES respondents in regards to constraint.