

THE CALCULUS OF EDITORIAL CHOICE: AN EXPLANTORY MODEL OF NEWSPAPER  
EDITORIAL BOARD ENDORSEMENTS  
IN THE 2008 PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION CAMPAIGNS

by

ELI JOSEPH ABAD

(Under the Direction of Audrey Haynes)

ABSTRACT

While much attention has been paid to newspaper endorsements and their effects on vote choice, little attention has been paid to the endorsement process and the factors that editorial boards use when assessing candidates. This study develops a very basic theory and tests hypotheses that suggest editorial boards consider a number of candidate level factors during the endorsement process. Editorial behavior in the 2008 Republican and Democratic presidential nomination campaigns was the focus of this examination. Logistic regression analysis of the 2008 data suggests that both Democratic and Republican candidates trailing in national polls are less likely to accrue editorial support. For both models, ideological congruence between candidate and newspaper is the best explanatory variable for editorial choice. The more a candidate and a newspaper board agree on salient issues, the more likely that candidate will receive the newspaper's endorsement. These findings suggest editorial choice is based on certain identifiable factors relating to the support levels and issue stances of the candidate. In other words, newspaper endorsements are generally quite predictable events.

INDEX WORDS: Presidential Nomination Campaigns, Newspaper Endorsements, Candidate Viability, Candidate Quality, Localism, Editorial Boards

THE CALCULUS OF EDITORIAL CHOICE: AN EXPLANTORY MODEL  
OF NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL BOARD ENDORSEMENTS  
IN THE 2008 PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION CAMPAIGNS

by

ELI JOSEPH ABAD

B.A., Louisiana State University, 2007

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Eli Joseph Abad

All Rights Reserved.

THE CALCULUS OF EDITORIAL CHOICE: AN EXPLANTORY MODEL OF NEWSPAPER  
EDITORIAL BOARD ENDORSEMENTS  
IN THE 2008 PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION CAMPAIGNS

by

ELI JOSEPH ABAD

Major Professor: Audrey Haynes

Committee: Paul-Henri Gurian  
Teena Wilhelm

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2009

DEDICATION

For my Grandmother

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The foundation of this study was laid in large part by a convergence of ideas from my Campaign Politics and Research in Media and Politics classes. First, I would like to thank my major professor at the University of Georgia, Dr. Audrey Haynes. Dr. Haynes helped me refine and craft a wildly inchoate set of thoughts into a testable and worthwhile endeavor. Her guidance and patience throughout this project's entirety cannot be overstated.

I would also like to thank the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Paul-Henri Gurian and Dr. Teena Wilhelm, as well as the faculty and staff of the School of Public and International Affairs.

Much of the data collected for this study would have been inaccessible without the help of Dr. Rich Clark of the Carl Vinson Institute of Government. His expertise in public opinion and survey research allowed me to streamline what would have otherwise been a more arduous and expensive process.

I'd also like to thank Nan McMurry, Elizabeth White and Kristin Nielsen of the University of Georgia Library for helping me navigate through many extensive newspaper databases. I must also acknowledge Sabrina Riles and Jared Allman, whose friendship and kindness will not be forgotten. Finally, I must thank my family – Mom, Dad, Ellison and Lisa – for their endless encouragement and trust in me while I completed this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1    INTRODUCTION.....	1
2    THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	6
Endorsements and Candidate Competitive Status.....	9
Endorsements and Home State and Regional Advantage.....	11
Endorsements and Candidate-Newspaper Congruency.....	13
Endorsements and Candidate Quality.....	14
General Theory of Presidential Nomination Endorsements and Hypotheses.....	15
3    VARIABLE OPERATIONALIZATIONS, DATA AND METHODS .....	17
Dependent Variable.....	17
Independent Variables.....	17
Data.....	25
4    FINDINGS.....	27
5    CONCLUSIONS.....	31
REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDICES.....	36
A.1    DEMOCRATIC CORRELATION MATRIX.....	36
A.2    REPUBLICAN CORRELATION MATRIX.....	36

B.1	CANDIDATE ISSUE BELIEFS OF SALIENT ISSUES.....	37
B.2	NEWSPAPER ISSUE BELIEFS OF SALIENT ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE <i>ATLANTA JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION</i> .....	38
B.3	CONGRUENCY SCORES RELATIVE TO THE <i>ATLANTA JOURNAL- CONSTITUTION</i> .....	38
C	NEWSPAPERS SEARCHED.....	39



## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Candidate National and State Viability Scores .....	19
Table 2: Issue Buzzwords.....	23
Table 3: Predictors of Editorial Board Choice, 2008 Republicans .....	27
Table 4: Odds Ratios for 2008 Republican Data .....	28
Table 5: Predictors of Editorial Board Choice, 2008 Democrats .....	29
Table 6: Odds Ratios for 2008 Democratic Data .....	30

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In 2008, the *Los Angeles Times* chose to end its 36-year tradition of silence, endorsing both John McCain and Barack Obama as the Republican and Democratic presidential nominees, respectively. In support of Senator McCain, the *Los Angeles Times*' board wrote:

*At a different moment in American history, we would hesitate to support a candidate for president whose social views so substantially departed from those we hold. But in this election, nothing less than America's standing in the world turns on the outcome ("Times Endorses McCain, Obama," 2008).*

While the *Los Angeles Times*' editorial board members were reserved in their estimation of Sen. McCain, their endorsement of Sen. Obama effused unbridled optimism at the prospects of an Obama nomination:

*In the language of metaphor, Clinton is an essay, solid and reasoned; Obama is a poem, lyric and filled with possibility. Clinton would be a valuable and competent executive, but Obama matches her in substance and adds something that the nation has been missing far too long – a sense of aspiration ("Times Endorses McCain, Obama," 2008).*

On the surface, these endorsements may not be surprising; McCain's maverick persona and Obama's rock star appeal garnered much support from the news media throughout the invisible primary and the early contests. The *L.A. Times*' board chose to back McCain despite concerns regarding his ideological beliefs and the viable candidacy of his Republican competitor Mitt Romney, who they also applauded in their article. Support for Obama is even more surprising since they chose a neophyte candidate over the more experienced front-runner Senator Hillary Clinton. Why would the *Los Angeles Times* back a candidate who did not share their core

political convictions and a candidate who was not even favored to win his party's nomination? More importantly, *what factors in general influence the decisions of newspaper editorial boards to endorse a certain candidate over another particularly in the nomination context where uncertainty is more abundant than in the general election?* Given the limited nature of research on the subject, we have little to inform our answers to this question. Scholars have not ignored endorsements; however, most of the work that has been done examines them in terms of their potential impact on individual vote choice rather than the factors that influence the making of the endorsement.

In certain contexts, endorsements can truly impact a primary outcome and the subsequent fortunes of the candidate involved. This occurred in the 1980 Republican nomination campaign. Having suffered a surprising defeat to George Bush in the Iowa caucuses, Gov. Ronald Reagan had lost nearly all momentum heading into the New Hampshire primary. The endorsement from the *Manchester Union Leader* allowed Reagan to regain his footing. Moore (1987) found that the readers of this conservative newspaper were more likely to support Reagan over Bush by a margin of 35 to 40 points compared to nonreaders.

While the results of this study clearly suggest editorial influence on vote choice, the collective literature has been largely mixed. Linda Honold, head of Wisconsin's Democratic Party, best characterizes the state of newspaper endorsements and its effects of vote choice: "They have some value to people some of the time in some circumstances, but no one can say how much to whom and when – for sure" (Porter, 2004, para. 5). Yet, if an endorsement can have an influence on vote choice, we should understand its antecedents. Why did the *Manchester Union Leader* endorse Reagan over Bush? *Is endorsement-making an arbitrary process or are there certain factors that systematically influence the decisions of a newspaper editorial*

*board?* Are these similar to the factors that influence vote choice in general or are they more structural or organizationally related? This study attempts to shed light on these questions.

The value of this examination does more than just build upon editorial endorsement literature. By focusing on editorial choice and the possible considerations boards use, researchers could extrapolate key insights vital to the development of other research areas such as campaign strategy and candidate behavior. Candidates may view endorsements as an opportunity to parlay positive media coverage into other highly coveted resources. Studies conducted by Aldrich (1980) suggest the significance of campaign resources on candidate success. It is his belief that reciprocity exists between a candidate's electoral success and his or her ability to fundraise. Candidates who can best solicit and sustain finite campaign resources, such as money and media coverage, may better position themselves to win electoral contests, which in turn, may increase a candidate's resource gathering capabilities. Newspaper endorsements may be a means to those ends, since they not only solidify a candidate's viability, but also they may stimulate increased positive media coverage and other finite campaign resources such as money. Furthermore, if a candidate is aware of the criteria newspapers use when endorsing, he or she can tailor their campaign to make themselves more palatable in the eyes of editorial boards. While no existing literature has addressed these considerations, this study may function as a good starting point for such examinations.

Editorial endorsements may provide other advantages for the candidates who secure them. For instance, Kahn and Kenny (2002) found that editorial preferences bleed over onto a paper's news sections. Their analysis suggests that candidates supported in a newspaper's editorial section received more favorable news coverage compared to their unendorsed competitors. Thus, candidates who secure endorsements may experience additional positive press

with the backing of a newspaper's editorial board. Apart from influencing what is written in other newspaper sections, endorsements themselves can be quite valuable for a candidate. As campaigns become more and more reliant upon finite resources, endorsements in a way market a candidate for free. Candidates typically embrace free media coverage, especially if it is positive exposure. At the very least, endorsements may reinforce candidate name recognition and interest in a given electoral contest among newspaper readers. Overall, there is evidence to suggest that endorsements, while potentially limited on their direct effects on voters, do have substantial indirect effects through these avenues. And thus, it is important to focus attention on their antecedents.

Through greater understanding of the factors that influence the endorsing process, particularly during presidential nomination campaigns where endorsements are likely to have a greater influence than in a general election campaign, we can better ascertain their nature. Are endorsements primarily driven by competitive circumstances? How do candidates' stances on the issues relative to the newspaper influence whether or not they receive an endorsement? What of candidate status? These are all very simple questions, and they may seem undeserving of attention, but their impact has not been estimated in a systematic manner.

Thus, the primary purpose of this study is to better understand the factors that influence the endorsing behavior of newspaper editorial boards in the context of presidential nominations. It will explore how the ideological congruence between editors and candidates impacts editorial board decision-making, the role that a candidate's local and national level of support may have on the endorsement process, and other factors suggested by the literature. Undoubtedly every newspaper editorial board implements a somewhat varied endorsement process yet there is potential room for a general theory of endorsing behavior to emerge. The criteria used to

evaluate each candidate, the actors involved in making the endorsement, and the resources available to these opinion-makers may vary from newspaper to newspaper. However, certain commonalities are likely to be a part of the process. This study attempts to test a general theory of newspaper endorsing behaviors in presidential primaries based on the relatively limited theory and analyses that have emerged over the last few decades.

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Considered one of the first scholars in the field of communication studies, Harold Laswell underscored the three main functions of mass media. First, journalists are called to undertake a constant surveillance of individuals, organizations and events. It is through this vigilance that journalists may directly influence political discourse and even the actions of political actors themselves. Mass media is also tasked with framing events. This power of interpretation may be a useful tool in influencing the attitudes of audience members. Finally, mass media has a role in political socialization; “mass media information provides the ingredients that people use to adjust their existing attitudes and opinions to keep pace with a changing world” (Graber, 2006, p. 11). These functions are most evident during the endorsement process. Through their reporting, editors and writers may influence the way audience members think about candidates, campaign events, and other political happenings. Although editorial endorsements are not traditional news stories, they belong in a special category of news-like information that can have an influence on those who receive this information. Support for candidates can manifest itself in many ways on newspaper opinion pages. The format for lower municipal elections oftentimes involves a simple laundry list of preferred candidates and legislative measures. In higher profile races, such as presidential nomination campaigns, they go beyond simply cataloging their choices. This is especially true in open races where no incumbent has a sizable advantage (Clarke & Evans, 1983). Generally, these editorials are reasoned and well-articulated extended arguments used to delineate differences among candidates. They

broadcast their “collective wisdom” not only to edify readers, but also to drive civic discourse among possible voters. These expositions allow newspapers to set the agenda and frame campaign events. If these editorials can shape the way readers look at candidates, an understanding of the factors that contribute to an editorial board’s perception of a candidate is worthwhile.

Again, relatively few studies have examined editorial boards and the criteria they use when choosing to support a candidate in any electoral context. Instead, much of the focus has been geared towards assessing the relationship between newspaper endorsements and vote choice (Hooper, 1969; Mason, 1973; McCleghan, 1973). These studies have looked at municipal, state, and federal campaigns (Fleischmann & Stein, 1986; Banfield & Wilson 1963; Hain, 1975; Scarrow & Borman, 1979; Gregg, 1965; Mason, 1975; Erikson, 1976; Fedler, Counts & Stephens, 1982; Hurd & Singletary, 1984; Counts, 1985; Jamieson, 2000). Finding research that specifically examines editorial board behavior during the endorsement process is difficult. Moreover, most of the relevant literature almost exclusively considers newspaper endorsements in the context of general election campaigns. However, it is here that one must start. There are likely to be some comparisons that may be drawn from general elections to the presidential nomination context.

The structural differences between the general and nomination contexts should be mentioned. Research that looks at endorsements in the general election context often focuses heavily on the partisan orientation of endorsements and the incumbency effect. For instance, Ansolabehere et al. (2004) found that newspapers today are 10 percent more likely to support Democratic candidates over their Republican counterparts. Furthermore, they found a heavy bias towards incumbents. For the most part however, these testable elements do not apply to the



nomination campaign process. While nomination campaign competitors within their own party can be placed along an ideological spectrum, they still share the same party identification. Furthermore, the incumbency advantage in federal elections has been well documented. Although no existing endorsement research looks at a possible incumbency advantage in the context of the presidential nomination process, conventional wisdom tells us that sitting presidents do entertain some advantages. Lewis-Beck and Tien (2004) believe “the greatest incumbency advantage accrues to an elected president running for reelection. Such a candidate stands at the head of his nation and party, and has had the experience, exposure, and opportunities of years in office” (Lewis-Beck & Tien, 2004, p. 755). Perhaps due to these overwhelming advantages, when a party has an incumbent president, oftentimes there are no challengers for the nomination. In fact, the last viable challenger to a sitting president was Senator Ted Kennedy and his failed attempt to unseat President Carter in 1980. Thus, an examination of nomination campaigns presents an opportunity to look at the endorsement process in a context where incumbency advantages are absent and partisanship plays a far more limited role. It should be noted that newspapers tend to endorse candidates for each of the two major party nominations. Very rarely does a newspaper choose to endorse only one party. The circumstances surrounding a campaign may dictate this decision. In states where primaries took place towards the end of the campaign calendar, newspapers may eschew issuing an endorsement in a race if it is clear as to who will be the party’s nominee. Such endorsements may be seen as superfluous. Newspapers may avoid issuing an endorsement for a particular party altogether. For instance, the unabashedly conservative *Manchester Union Leader* oftentimes elects not to endorse a candidate seeking the Democratic nomination. As Moore (1987) puts it, the “*Union Leader* has chosen a neutral role [on the Democratic side] in the past few elections because of its

antipathy for all Democrats who have trooped across the state” (p. 124). For the most part, however, newspapers tend to endorse both parties during the nomination campaign process.

### **Endorsements and Candidate Competitive Status**

According to *The New York Times* editor Howell Raines, “a candidate endorsement is not an attempt to dictate to the reader what he ought to do. It’s more a reflection of our feelings that we have an obligation to be part of the civic dialogue. We have a specific obligation to our readers to let them know what our collective wisdom is” (Barringer, 2000, para. 5). This quote suggests that editorial boards participate in the process of election. They actively take in information, weight it, and share their “collective wisdom” with their readers. Thus, certain types of information may be valuable to the members of the board, and it is here that we may find influential factors. It also suggests that editorial boards act much in the same way as individuals when determining their preferences – the factors that influence vote choice to some extent are likely to influence their endorsement choice – however, they also have an institutional constraint that individual voters do not: they are employees of a newspaper and they also have concerns regarding the business of the newspaper and they have an obligation to their readers. We might expect that certain factors influence them during the campaign, but that they are also constrained to some extent by the nature of their newspaper’s specific characteristics.

#### *Viability: National Support for a Presidential Candidate*

Newspaper staff may weigh a candidate’s chances at the nomination when determining which candidate to support. For example, Meltzer’s work (1987) that evaluates endorsements in gubernatorial elections suggests that editorial board members fear choosing a losing candidate

because it may lead to a backlash affect against their paper's credibility. This is likely to be a consideration that is consistent among most profit-based newspaper organizations – is the candidate electable? In the presidential nomination context, rather than focus on electability, newspaper boards are likely first to examine the nature of a candidate's viability. According to Abramowitz (1989), viability is defined as “the voter's perception of the candidates' chances of receiving their party's nomination” (Reed, 2006, pp. 10-11). Previous researchers have generally used some form of delegate count/accrual relative to an ideal point such as a majority to measure candidate viability.

It is likely that editors see their newspaper's endorsement process as an obligation. And while editorial boards may fulfill this responsibility for contests at all levels of government, they may feel a heightened responsibility in presidential races. In addition, endorsements made in presidential elections can be thought of as the ultimate manifestation of a newspaper's identity. *Miami Herald* editorial page editor Tom Fielder agrees with this sentiment, stating that presidential endorsements are “a litmus test of all other positions we take. If we can be credible on this position, then the other positions we take on elections and other issues will also be credible” (Barringer, 2000, para. 10). Not wanting to waste this opportunity that comes along every four years, editorial board members may choose to consider only candidates who have an actual chance of winning not only their state contests, but also the party's nomination. Choosing fringe candidates may hurt their credibility as a reliable news source and jeopardize their ability to influence.

### *Proximate Popularity: Local Support for a Presidential Candidate*

Newspapers editors may consider prevailing community sentiment when making an endorsement. The growth of public opinion polling allows the general voting public, those involved in campaign activities, and the media outlets covering these events to better assess the support for each candidate. According to Atkin and Gaudino (1984), for a variety of reasons newspaper editors may take into account levels of candidate support as indicated by polls. Editorial boards may feel that favorable polling numbers indicate a candidate's worthiness. The relationship between candidate and voter can be thought of as an extensive vetting process. If a candidate holds up under the scrutiny of the mass public and enjoys widespread support, a newspaper board may feel this candidate has earned their endorsement. Newspaper editors may also feel pressured to choose a winner. According to Meltzer (2007), "a paper that endorses a losing candidate may lose credibility with readers post-election who may interpret editorials about the winning candidate as negatively biased and the board as having a predisposition toward the officeholder" (Meltzer, 2007, p. 3). If this backlash affect occurs, it may undermine a paper's legitimacy and more importantly, lead to a decrease in circulation numbers. However, there is no study that examines directly the potential linkage between state support for a presidential candidate and the endorsement of a newspaper for that candidate.

#### **Endorsements and Home State and Regional Advantage**

A candidate's home state and home region may also affect the endorsement process. Although existing research does not specifically address whether editorial boards evaluate home state candidates differently than other nomination participants, it does examine whether localism provides an electoral advantage for a state's "native son." The reasons voters support local

candidates may vary. Voters may feel a familial responsibility to embrace homegrown politicians. Moreover, they may anticipate certain benefits if their home state candidate wins the presidency (Lewis-Beck and Rice, 1983; Garand, 1988; Powell, 2004). Lewis-Beck & Rice (1983) find these explanations plausible:

*It gives us a chance to show “pride in our own” by voting for a native son. Such local loyalty is not wholly unreasonable. We are offered the psychological satisfaction of identification with a president who is more like our “friends and neighbors.” Further, we might hope that as president he would remember “the folks back home” when distributing federal largess (Lewis-Beck & Rice, 1983, p. 552).*

State-level broadcast media may perpetuate this home state bias. Native candidates may enjoy extensive and favorable coverage in local media markets at least during their presidential race (Garand, 1988). This could go a long way in reassuring voters of their candidate’s competency while also suggesting an insider-outsider dynamic among the entire field of candidates.

Similar to voters, those involved in newspaper organizations may feel the same pull towards local candidates. Given the frequency that editors and writers report on local politicians compared to other outsider candidates, one may assume that these opinion-makers enjoy a unique familiarity with indigenous candidates. It is entirely possible for editorial boards to tailor their endorsements around this home state bias. Moreover, journalistic routines suggest that greater coverage will emerge if there is a local tie-in. A candidate from an area is more relevant to that area than a candidate from outside the area in general (Graber, 2007). Furthermore, if voters prefer local candidates, editors may fear alienating them if they instead choose to back an outsider. This may take place in both the presidential nomination campaign and the general election. For instance, editorial readers of the *Hartford Courant* voiced their displeasure regarding the paper’s decision not to endorse Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore and his

vice presidential running mate Joseph Liebermann, a native of Connecticut (Shields, 2000). For these reasons, one must consider the possibility that voters and opinion-makers are affected by this home state bias. One codicil, however, must be considered. If one's home state candidate has absolutely no national viability, then it is highly unlikely that a newspaper will endorse him or her.

### **Endorsements and Candidate-Newspaper Congruence**

While it is important to include factors such as candidate viability, as well as local and regional candidate associations in this study, other linkages between candidates and editorial boards must also be addressed. Conventional wisdom points to a simple explanatory model of newspaper endorsements: editorial boards choose a candidate who best espouses their collective values and adheres to their political ideologies. Editorial support may reflect an allegiance to a candidate who ideologically mirrors an editorial board's policy preferences. During the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the new business model in newspapers led the newspaper's political preferences to migrate to a separate section – the editorial section. Here the newspaper's editorial board could espouse their thoughts and convictions as to what should be done in a host of policy arenas. While coverage of the news was considered separate and unbiased, on the editorial page, the admonitions for particular policy were fair game. In this light, the newspaper felt it did its duty to its public, discussing the issues of the day and weighing in. They acted then, and continue to do so today, as opinion leaders and agenda setters. In doing so, they oftentimes weigh in on controversial issues that concern their readers. Issues at the center of public debate determine much of what is written by opinion makers and spoken by candidates throughout the course of the campaign. Moreover, candidates stand to benefit from making such statements particularly in

a crowded field where it is critical that they distinguish themselves from their opponents. According to Aldrich (1980), candidates “must make a series of comparisons: what their ideal platform is, how that compares with what they can reasonably enunciate in public, and how these compare with the policies their opponents are likely to espouse” (p. 44). The very nature of campaign discourse provides ample opportunities for candidates to stake out positions on a wide variety of issues, which allows them to distance themselves from their intraparty competitors (Gopioian, 1982). With each candidate’s policy beliefs clearly defined across a range of salient issues, newspaper editorial boards then could make a reasoned choice based on the candidate who best aligns with their political ideology.

### **Endorsements and Candidate Quality**

Voters and editorial boards have at their disposal much information that can be put towards candidate evaluation. Editorial board members and voters might ask themselves, “Is this candidate fit to be Commander-in-Chief?” Sullivan, Aldrich, Borgida and Rahn (1990) suggest that in a presidential nomination campaign context candidate appraisal involves much more consideration: “the question is not simply whether a given candidate is competent or not, but whether s/he is more competent than the other contender” (Sullivan et al., 1990, p. 462). One way to assess a candidate’s credibility and competence relative to the other candidates is to look at his or her previous job experiences. Newspaper editorial boards may view a candidate’s accrued experience over the course of his or her political career as a possible indicator of future success. Some have even argued that particular political jobs provide better training for the Executive Office of the President:

*America is usually better off with a president who has had executive experience before reaching the White House. Presidents have to lead, set a course, and come to conclusions. Senators can, with furrowed brow, be very concerned, vote this way and that*

*to show their concern, and hope to gain the votes of the citizens expressing the concerns. But once in the White House, men of concern, consensus and compromise are much less likely to provide the leadership the country needs than men of principle, resolve, and the executive experience to make decisions* (Du Pont, 2004, para. 3).

Although no empirical studies have tested this assertion, others have looked at how ambition may play a role in shaping the careers and behavior of officeholders. More specifically, they have evaluated the ambition theory; “the central assumption of ambition theory is that a politician’s behavior is a response to his office goals...the politician as office seeker engages in political acts and makes decisions appropriate to gaining office” (Hibbing, 1986, p. 651). As politicians climb the political ladder, potential voters and even editorial boards take notice. It is possible editorial boards ascribe worth to a politician’s past political jobs in their candidate evaluations.

### **General Theory of Presidential Nomination Endorsements and Hypotheses**

Although the research area of editorial board endorsements remains largely untitled, the extant theoretical and empirical literature provide a limited but solid foundation on which to base this analysis. After examining both the empirical research and the informed speculation surrounding the endorsement process in presidential nomination campaigns, it seems that a general model of endorsements might look something like this. Candidate endorsement by a specific newspaper is a function of candidate level variables such as 1. a candidate’s national and state support level, 2. A candidate’s quality/status, 3. a candidate’s home state and/or home region status relative to the newspaper, as well as a function of the 4. interaction between the editorial board and the candidate in terms of ideological congruence. More formally presented as hypotheses:



H1: If a presidential nomination candidate is leading in the national polls, thus evincing viability, a newspaper is more likely to endorse that candidate.

H1a: If a presidential nomination candidate is leading in the state polls, thus evincing state popularity and thus likely to be supported by the state's readership, then a newspaper is more likely to endorse that candidate.

H2: If a newspaper shares similar ideological leanings with a candidate, then that newspaper would be more likely to endorse that candidate rather than a candidate who shares disparate political beliefs.

H3: If a candidate and a newspaper share the same home state, then that newspaper would be more likely to endorse the local candidate.

H4: If a candidate and a newspaper belong to the same geographic region, then that newspaper would be more likely to endorse the regional candidate.

H5: If a candidate possess more executive experience relative to his or her nomination competitors, then that candidate would be more likely to garner a newspaper's endorsement.

## CHAPTER 3

### VARIABLE OPERATIONALIZATIONS, DATA AND METHODS

In this chapter, I will discuss the variable operationalizations, data and methods. An understanding of these elements is essential to test the aforementioned hypotheses.

#### **Dependent Variable**

For the purposes of this paper, the dependent variable is operationalized simply as whether or not a candidate received a newspaper's endorsement. It is a dummy variable that captures whether or not a candidate competing in a primary or caucus was endorsed by the newspaper in that locale.

#### **Independent Variables**

##### *National Viability and Local Support*

While other studies use some variation of delegate count or fundraising levels as measures of viability (Bartels, 1987; Haynes et al., 1997), the study utilizes polling numbers to indicate levels of national and state support. The impetus for using polling numbers as indicators of national and state support are in large part due to Atkin and Gaudino's work (1984). Since their suggestions have not been empirically tested, inclusion into this project was fitting. Additionally, it is unlikely that newspapers determine a candidate's viability through an intricate formulas involving campaign fundraising and delegate count. Instead, it is more likely that editorial boards consult more readily available and less convoluted data such as poll numbers

when determining a candidate's viability. This study implements a measure of competitive status of candidates during the invisible primary utilized by Haynes, Gurian, Crespin and Zorn (2004). However, using poll numbers to determine viability does have its limitations. During the course of a campaign, the field is winnowed, thus changing the dynamics of the race as well as the number of participants competing. Iowa and New Hampshire eliminates candidates who need wins to keep going but do not get them. The "inter-sessional" period eliminates candidates who cannot develop some sort of base support. Super Tuesday eliminates candidates who either do not have the money or support to continue a long campaign, while the final period generally winnows out the remaining candidates until there is a winner. Each level should be expected to have fewer candidates than the previous one. Thus, a candidate polling at 20% amongst a crowded field in the invisible primary does not compare with a candidate polling at 20% in a two-candidate struggle towards the end of the nomination campaign. Using national polling numbers collected prior to the publication of each endorsement, this study measures candidate viability using the difference between the poll standing of the frontrunner and each of his or her nomination competitors (see Table 1 for an example of candidate viability by endorsement), thus making it a measure that is always relative to the frontrunner. I am not so concerned with a perfect measure of actual viability, but rather an indicator of who the front-runner is, both nationally and at the state level, and how far the other candidates are to that frontrunner. Since the frontrunner has no ground to gain, the leading candidate's measure is always equal to zero. This is a simple measure, but one that captures what is needed here. Polling numbers were collected using Polling Report.<sup>1</sup> Theoretically, state support – the most proximate support for the candidate relative to the newspaper – is a factor in the editorial board's decision making.

---

<sup>1</sup> Polling Report is an independent, nonpartisan resource on trends in American public opinion. Polling Report can be found using the following URL: <http://www.pollingreport.com/>.

However, given this sample derived in relation to the 2008 nomination campaigns, the correlations between national poll data and state poll data are too high and thus create problems for analysis. The appendix (Table A) includes the correlation matrices for both the 2008 and Republican and Democratic data. As indicated by these matrices, state and national polls are highly correlated for the Democrats. This can be attributed to lack of variation among the Democrats; Senators Clinton and Obama dominated the majority of Democratic nomination race. Correlation between the state and national poll variables is lower for Republicans; this is not surprising, since there was much variation in national and state poll numbers among the Republican candidates. Potentially, if this model were expanded to other campaigns, the problem might be lessened. Or perhaps a surrogate for local support might be found. Thus, while theoretically relevant, the relationship between endorsements and local support for a candidate cannot be tested with this data.

Table 1 Candidate National and State Viability Scores				
Newspaper: Tampa Tribune (Florida)				
Date of Endorsement: Jan. 11 2008				
Candidate	Nat. Poll %	Nat. Viability	State Poll %	State Viability
McCain	24	0	15	-10
Huckabee	21	-3	21	-4
Romney	11	-13	13	-12
Giuliani	16	-8	25	0
Paul	0	-24	4	-21
Thompson	9	-15	10	-15

### *Candidate Home State*

This analysis includes a control for the home state of a candidate in order to measure the home state effects on the newspaper endorsement process. While it is easy to discern the home state of a candidate running in municipal and state races, determining the home states of candidates involved in federal elections may be more challenging. Oftentimes career politicians, especially those aspiring to national offices, lead nomadic lifestyles. For instance, Hillary Clinton was born in Illinois, practiced law in Massachusetts and Arkansas, acted as First Lady in Washington, D.C., and finally represented New York in the U.S. Senate. In this study, a dummy variable (1,0) is used to control for a “home state” advantage. A candidate’s home state is identified as **the last state in which the candidate held public office.**

### *Candidate Home Region*

Identifying a candidate’s home region may be more problematic. Some researchers have tried to place states into regions using economic, political and geographic characteristics (Campbell, 1992; Garand, 1988; Reed, 2006). However, many states cannot be placed neatly into a certain region. For the purposes of this study, a candidate’s home region includes each state adjacent to the candidate’s home state. Holbrook (1991) uses a similar “home region” measure in order to capture regional effects on presidential election outcomes. For every endorsing newspaper, this variable assigns a value of 1 to any candidate whose home state borders the state where the newspaper is published and 0 to any candidate whose home state is not contiguous with the publishing paper’s state.

### *Newspaper-Candidate Congruency*

A continuous variable was included to indicate whether a newspaper editorial board and a candidate share certain beliefs across a range of issues. Newspaper editorial boards may choose to support a candidate who best represents their ideological leanings. In order to measure whether a candidate and an endorsing newspaper possess similar issue beliefs, candidate stances as well as each editorial board's published opinions on key issues are compared. Since no previous research has endeavored to create such a comprehensive measure for newspaper-candidate congruency, a rigorous content analysis was implemented in order to identify both a newspaper's collective view and each candidate's beliefs regarding certain salient issues. Most of the editorial articles were collected using the Lexis-Nexis Academic and Newspaper Source databases, which archives most publications of major U.S. newspapers. However, these databases do not include all newspapers used in this project; in fact, many of the newspapers with lower circulation numbers are not included in this archive. Editorial stances of newspapers not directly archived by Lexis-Nexis or Newspaper Source were identified by consulting each newspaper's website. While candidates and editorial board members hold positions on a host of issues, this study focuses on salient topics that illuminate the differences among both Republican and Democratic candidates. This study includes editorial positions taken on health care, foreign policy and immigration. Only articles written in 2007 are included.

Naturally, Republicans showed a deep interest in foreign policy issues. This issue's importance only gained throughout the campaign, as tensions between Russia and the Republic of Georgia escalated. However, there was little variation among Republican candidates in the area of foreign policy. Most volatility within the Republican ranks centered on the issues of immigration reform, gun control and health care. In 2007, the congressional agenda was ripe

with legislation addressing these policy areas. These issues dominated the invisible primary, allowing editorial board members and candidates to voice their opposition or support for proposed bills such as the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and the Assault Weapons Ban and Law Enforcement Protection Act. While these efforts did not necessarily lead to in-party divisions, it did delineate subtle differences among the candidates' issue beliefs.

Unlike the Republicans, there was much more uniformity among the Democratic candidates. The major issue throughout the invisible primary and in the early states was the Iraq War. While all the candidates opposed it, there was some variation among candidates. For instance, early front-runner Sen. Hillary Clinton voted for the resolution authorizing President George W. Bush to take military action in Iraq, while Sen. Barack Obama voted against the measure. Furthermore, the candidates had differing opinions on which strategy to best implement in Iraq. Health care was an important secondary issue during the entire campaign; in fact, there were clear distinctions in each democratic candidate's health care plans. Although economic conditions worsened as the presidential nomination campaigns progressed, the accompanying news stories dominated news cycles only after the nomination process was well underway. Table 2 includes a list of keywords and phrases used to search the Lexis-Nexis and Newspaper Source databases.

Table 2 Issue Buzzwords	
Date Range: January 1 <sup>st</sup> 2007- December 31 <sup>st</sup> 2007	
Issue	Keyword or Phrase
Immigration	“Immigration,” “Opinion,” “Editorial,” “Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act”
Health Care	“Health Care,” “Opinion,” “Editorial,” “SCHIP”
Gun Control	“Guns,” “Gun Control,” “Opinion,” “Editorial,” “Assault Weapons Ban,” “Virginia Tech Shooting”
Iraq	“Iraq War,” “Opinion,” “Editorial,” “Surge”

The positions of each presidential candidate are determined by consulting their presidential websites, as well as analyzing statements they have made regarding these four salient issues prior to the campaign season. For the most part, these Internet sites document their candidate’s policy stances on key issues important to potential voters. Additionally, On the Issues catalogues candidate statements on any given issue. These resources clearly indicate each candidate’s issue beliefs<sup>2</sup>.

Editorial board positions and candidate issue beliefs are then compared. An additive scale is created to determine congruence. For instance, a score of 1 is attributed if a candidate and editorial board agree, -1 if they disagree, and 0 if an editorial board’s issue belief is not clearly stated or mixed. Across three separate issues, congruency measures between each Republican candidate and newspaper range from -3 to 3. Democratic scores range from -2 to 2. The appendix

---

<sup>2</sup> On the Issues is a non-partisan resource that aggregates candidate’s statements regarding issues from a variety of sources – newspapers, speeches, press releases, and the Internet. On the Issues can be found using the following URL: <http://www.ontheissues.org/>.



(Table B) displays an example of the content analysis and congruence measure between a candidate and a newspaper. For brevity, only the Republican congruency scores are listed.

### *Candidate Quality*

Finally, a simple measure of candidate quality is included. Candidates who have won gubernatorial elections and other executive offices are coded as 4. A candidate who has won a statewide race such as a U.S. Senate campaign is coded as 3, while House members are coded as 2. Although infrequent, a candidate with no statewide or national electoral experience may seek his or her party's nomination. Rudy Giuliani, the former moderate mayor of New York City, made such a leap. Such candidates were coded as 1. Although the inclusion of this variable is theoretically justified, there are certain shortcomings with this measure. Certainly the issue of candidate quality was more central to the Democratic nomination process, especially for Obama and Clinton. While both nomination candidates were U.S. Senators, concern was raised over Obama's relative lack of experience. Compared to Clinton whose laurels include an active role as First Lady of the United States and eight years as Senator of New York, Obama enjoyed a meteoric rise onto the nation stage. This limited measure does not account for differences in terms of years served. Despite these limitations, this candidate quality measure is included since there is some variation among the candidates concerning the political positions they have held.

These measures are candidate specific, which allows for the testing of the likelihood of a newspaper endorsement considering factors specific to each candidate. Since the dependent variable of this study is dichotomous, the models in this study were run using logistic regression.

## Data

This study focuses on editorial endorsements made during the 2008 Republican and Democratic presidential nomination campaigns. These races provide a good starting point for the study of editorial endorsements. Both nomination campaigns were extremely competitive. The Republican contest entertained a diverse group of candidates with as many as ten politicians seeking the party's nomination. Throughout the invisible primary and early nomination contests, none of the party's main contenders were able to gain frontrunner status. It was only in early February that Sen. John McCain emerged as the presumptive nominee.

While Republican candidates sprinted towards their Super Tuesday finish line, the Democratic candidates engaged in a contentious marathon spanning nearly the entire nomination calendar. From the beginning, Senators Clinton, Obama, and Edwards garnered most of the media's attention. Prior to the Iowa Caucus, Clinton enjoyed comfortable leads in most nationwide polls. However, early victories by Obama in Iowa and South Carolina quickly erased any chance of a Clinton coronation. This two-candidate competitive race between Obama and Clinton lasted until early June, when Obama secured enough delegates for the Democratic nomination.

The analysis includes 71 U.S. daily newspapers that made endorsements in one or both of the 2008 Republican and Democratic presidential nomination campaigns. The appendix (Table C) catalogues each newspaper and whether they endorsed a Republican, Democrat or both. Lists of newspaper endorsements were gathered using the Lexis-Nexis and Newspaper Source databases, candidate websites and George Washington University's Democracy in Action project<sup>3</sup>. The search for endorsement articles involved the keyword phrases "election,"

---

<sup>3</sup> The George Washington's Democracy in Action project organizes important information specific to each presidential election year. This resources archives press releases, reports and other useful articles. For the purposes

“editorial,” “opinion,” and “endorsement” published between November 1<sup>st</sup> 2007 and July 1<sup>st</sup> 2008. This was done in order to ensure account for changes in editorial board issue beliefs during the campaign.

---

of this study, its contents were used to identify and verify newspaper endorsements. This extensive endorsement catalogue can be found at the following URL: <http://www.gwu.edu/%7Eaction/2008/papersp/endorse08newsp.html>

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

Utilizing logistic regression, the model of candidate endorsements was applied to the data after splitting the sample by political party. Table 4 displays the results of the model using 2008 data from the Republican nomination campaign.

Table 3 Predictors of Editorial Board Choice, 2008 Republicans				
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	Coef.	Std. Error	P>Z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Can. Quality	.0358905	.3157839	0.910	-.5830345, .6548154
Can. Region	.0205393	.7902465	0.979	-1.528315, 1.569394
<i>Paper-Can. Cong.</i>	1.137819	.2316151	0.000	.6838615, 1.591776
<i>Can. Nat. Support</i>	.2424891	.0421384	0.000	.1598994, .3250788
Constant	.3630025	1.003303	0.717	-1.603435, 2.32944
Number of Obs. = 262 LR chi2(4) = 165.04 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.6191				

Using the standard 95% confidence interval, the “Candidate Region” and “Candidate Quality” variables are statistically insignificant. The “Candidate National Support” variable is statistically significant and in the expected direction. This suggests that the further behind a candidate is in the national polls, the less likely he or she will receive a newspaper’s support. The “Paper-Candidate Congruency” measure is in the expected direction and statistically significant. Thus, the likelihood of an endorsement increases as the congruence between candidate and newspaper ideology strengthens. It should be noted that the “Candidate Home State” variable

was dropped from this model, since every home state newspaper did not endorse their homegrown candidate. A total of eight observations were dropped. The null hypothesis – all independent variables combined do not have an effect on editorial choice – can be rejected since the chi(2) value is larger than at least two times the degrees of freedom.

Table 4 Odds Ratios for 2008 Republican Data				
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	Odds Ratio	Std. Error	P>Z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Can. Quality	1.036542	.3273233	0.910	.5582019, 1.924787
Can. Region	1.020752	.8066454	0.979	.2169008, 4.803736
Paper-Can. Cong.	3.119956	.7226288	0.000	1.981515, 4.912466
Can. Nat. Support	1.274417	.0537019	0.000	1.173393, 1.38414
Number of Obs. = 262 LR chi2(4) = 165.04 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.6191				

In logit, the coefficients on the original equation are often difficult to interpret. Odds ratios provide a context to the explanatory variables. These coefficients suggest how much each variable is impacting the change in the dependent variable or we might say, it tells us the likelihood that such the event – endorsement – will occur given the presence of the factor. It is a relative measure of likelihood, giving us an idea of how much more likely it is that, when, for example, a newspaper and a candidate agree on issues, that an endorsement will occur. Odds ratios are not probability estimates, nor are they coefficients. The larger the coefficient, the more impact that variable has on the dependent variable than the others. If it is less than one, then the independent variable has a negative impact on the dependent variable. Table 5 displays the odds ratios for the 2008 Republican data. The issue congruence between a newspaper editorial board and candidate has the largest effect on editorial choice. A one-unit increase in the “Paper-

Candidate Congruency” measure increases the odds of a newspaper endorsing a candidate by 212 percent. A candidate’s national standing also has an effect on the endorsement process. A one-unit increase in the “Candidate National Support” measure increases the odds of a newspaper endorsing a candidate by 27 percent.

Table 6 displays the results of the logistic regression model using the data collected for the 2008 Democratic nomination race.

Table 5 Predictors of Editorial Board Choice, 2008 Democrats				
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	Coef.	Std. Error	P>Z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Can. Quality	2.07191	1.231592	0.093	-.3419656, 4.485785
Can. Homestate	1.168701	1.130441	0.301	-1.046922, 3.384324
Can. Region	-.8129534	.5487268	0.138	-1.888438, .2625313
Paper-Can. Cong.	1.1476	.2555945	0.000	.6466441, 1.648556
Can. Nat. Support	.0613521	.0166364	0.000	.0287455, .0939588
Constant	-7.363809	3.767966	0.051	-14.74889, .0212696
Number of Obs. = 239 LR chi2(6) = 91.34 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.3313				

Like the 2008 Republicans, the “candidate’s quality”, “home state” or “home region” variables failed to reach statistical significance. As expected, national poll position prior to the publication of an endorsement was in the expected direction and found to be a significant predictor of editorial choice. The null hypothesis can be rejected since the chi(2) value is larger than at least two times the degrees of freedom.

Table 7 presents that the varying effects that each independent variable has on the odds of a candidate receiving an editorial endorsement. Like the 2008 Republicans, issue congruence and

national standing significantly affect editorial choice. A one-unit increase in the “Paper-Candidate Congruency” measure increases the odds of a newspaper to endorse that candidate by 215 percent. Compared to Republicans, the poll standing of a candidate is less influential but nonetheless significant. A one-unit increase in the “National Support” variable increases the odds of a newspaper to endorse that candidate by 6.3 percent. This may be explained by the lack of variation among the Democratic candidates.

Table 6 Odds Ratios for 2008 Democratic Data				
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	Odds Ratio	Std. Error	P>Z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Can. Quality	7.939973	9.778805	0.093	.7103726, 88.74661
Can. State	3.21781	3.637544	0.301	.3510165, 29.49805
Can. Region	.4435462	.2433857	0.138	.151308, 1.300217
Paper-Can. Cong.	3.150622	.8052816	0.000	1.909123, 5.199466
Can. Nat. Support	1.063273	.017689	0.000	1.029163, 1.098514
Number of Obs. = 239 LR chi2(5) = 91.34 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.3313				

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS

The results presented here suggest editorial board members value certain criteria when assessing which candidates are worthy of their support. Both a candidate's national standing and ideological congruence with an editorial board have significant influence on the endorsement process.

It should be emphasized that this study is limited to only the 2008 Democratic and Republican presidential nomination campaigns. An analysis of these two contests presents a simple yet unique snapshot into the world of newspaper editorial endorsements. However, the inclusion of additional data across election cycles should be a point of emphasis for future research.

Because of data limitations, this analysis did not allow for the testing of candidate's state popularity on editorial choice. Since presidential nomination contests have increasingly become nationalized due to heightened press coverage, one would expect a candidate's national popularity to be highly correlated with a candidate's proximate support. In other previous campaign years, there might be more variation between national and state polls, allowing for the inclusion of a variable measuring a candidate's state support. In addition, broadening the scope beyond the 2008 nomination campaigns would not only increase the sample size, but also would allow for the observation of changes over time. Campaigns by their very nature are dynamic. From the minutiae of a candidate's resource allocation strategy to the implications of the frontloading phenomenon, the elements of nomination campaigns are constantly changing. Party-centered elections have long been cast away for candidate-oriented politics. Media outlets, more



specifically newspaper organizations, have taken notice of these changes. What is for certain is that campaign context matters. There are an infinite number of unique elements in a given nomination campaign, from the different sets of aspiring candidates to the combination of salient issues worthy of their attention. While one may assume that there are certain general and predictable factors considered by editorial boards for each campaign, it is worth asking whether campaign context affects the relative importance of these considerations. For instance, the 2008 data suggest ideological similarities between a newspaper and a candidate, as well a candidate's national standing, are strong explanatory variables of editorial choice. Does this hold true across election cycles? Is it possible that home region and home state bias are strong predictors of newspaper support in other elections? Incorporating nomination campaign data across election years may help to answer these questions

This examination also does not account for any possible effects brought about by a newspaper's institutional structure. Endorsement literature is fertile with studies interested in assessing the role ownership plays in the endorsement process (St. Dizier, 1983; Wackman, Gillmore, Gaziano, & Dennis, 1975). Can the political leanings of both editors and publishers influence editorial behavior? Does the nature of the relationship between the two determine which candidate is endorsed? These questions have been asked, but almost exclusively in the context of a general election campaign. Future research should incorporate measures that capture ownership effects on editorial endorsements during the nomination process.

## REFERENCES

- Abramowitz, Alan. (1989). Viability, Electability and Candidate Choice in a Presidential Primary Election: a Test of Competing Models. *Journal of Politics*, 51(4), 977-992.
- Aldrich, John H. (1980). *Before the Convention*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Lessem, Rebecca & Snyder, J. (2004). The Political Orientation of Newspaper Endorsements in U.S. Elections, 1940-2002. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 1 (4), 393-404.
- Atkin, Charles K. & Gaudino, James. (1984). The Impact of Polling on the Mass Media. *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, 427, 119-128.
- Banfield, E.C., & Wilson, J.Q. (1963). *City Politics*. New York: Vintage.
- Barringer, Felicity (2000, November 5). Ideas and trends: taking a stand; why newspapers endorse candidates. *The New York Times*, p. D4.
- Bartels, L. (1987). Candidate Choice and the Dynamics of the Presidential Nomination Process. *American Journal of Politics*, 31 (1), 1-30.
- Campbell, James E. (1992). Forecasting the Presidential Vote in the States. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36 (2), 537-540
- Clarke, P., & Evans, S. (1983). *Covering Campaigns*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Counts, Tim (1985). Effects of Endorsements on Presidential Vote. *Journalism Quarterly*, 62, 644-647.
- Du Pont, Pete. (2004, August 12 ). Can Kerry Execute? Why governors make better presidents than senators do. *The Wall Street Journal*. Website:  
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/columnists/pdupont/?id=110005433>
- Erikson, Robert (1976). The Influence of Newspaper Endorsements in Presidential Elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 20, 207-234.
- Fedler, F., Counts, T. & Stephens, L. (1982). Newspaper Endorsements and Voter Behavior in the 1980 Presidential Election. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 4, 3-11.

Fleischmann, Arnold & Stein, Lara. (1986). Newspaper and Business Endorsements in Municipal Elections: A Test in Conventional Wisdom. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 9 (4), 325-336.

Garand, James C. (1988). Localism and Regionalism in Presidential Elections: Is there a Home State or Regional Advantage? *Western Political Quarterly*, 41(1), 85-103.

Gopoian, J.D. (1982). Issue Preference and Candidate Choice in Presidential Primaries. *American Journal of Political Science*, 26 (3), 523-546.

Graber, Doris (2006). *Mass Media & American Politics*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Gregg, James E. (1965). Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-62. *Journalism Quarterly*, 42, 532-538.

Haynes, Audrey, Paul-Henri Gurian, and Nichols (1997). The Impact of Candidate Spending on Vote Outcomes in Presidential Prenomination Campaigns. *Journal of Politics*, 59 (1), 213-225.

Haynes, Audrey, Gurian, P.H., Crespin, M., Zorn, C. (2004). The Calculus of Concession: Media Coverage and the Dynamics of Winnowing in Presidential Nominations. *American Politics Research*, 32, 310-337.

Hain, Paul L. (1975). How an Endorsement Affected a Non-Partisan Mayoral Vote. *Journalism Quarterly*, 52, 337-340.

Hibbing, John R. (1986). Ambition in the House: Behavioral Consequences of Higher Office Goals Among U.S. Representatives. *American Journal of Political Science*, 30 (3), 651-665.

Holbrook, Thomas M. (1991). Presidential Elections in Space and Time. *American Journal of Political Science*, 35 (1), 91-109.

Hooper, Michael (1969). Party and Newspaper Endorsement as Predictor of Vote Choice. *Journalism Quarterly*, 46, 301-305.

Hurd, Robert E. and Singletary, M.W. (1984). Newspaper Endorsement Influence on the 1980 Presidential Election Vote. *Journalism Quarterly*, 61, 332-338.

Kahn, Kim F. and Patrick Kenney (2002). The Slant of the News: How Editorial Endorsements Influence Campaign Coverage and Citizens' Views of Candidates. *American Political Science Review*. 96 (2) 381-394.

Jamieson, Kathleen H. (2000). *Everything You Think You Know About Politics... And Why You're Wrong*. New York: Basic Books.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S. & Rice, T.W. (1983). Localism in Presidential Elections: The Home State Advantage. *American Journal of Political Science*, 27 (3), 548-556.

- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. & Tien, C. (2004). Jobs and the Job of the President: A Forecast for 2004. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 37 (4), 753-758.
- Mason, William M. (1975). The Impact of Endorsements on Voting. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 1 (4), 463-495
- McClenghan, Jack S. (1973). Effect of Endorsements in Texas Local Elections. *Journalism Quarterly*, 50, 363-366
- Meltzer, Kim (2007). Newspaper editorial boards and the practice of endorsing candidates for political office in the Unites States. *Journalism*, 8 (1), 83-103.
- Moore, D. W. (1987). The Manchester Union Leader in the New Hampshire Primary. In G. Orren and N. Polsby (Ed.), *Media and Momentum: The New Hampshire Primary and Nomination Politics* (pp. 104-126). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.
- Porter, Tim (2004, October/November). What's the point? Few voters are swayed by newspaper endorsements of presidential candidates. So why do editorial pages keep publishing them? *American Journalism Review*, 26 (5), 58.
- Powell, Richard J. (2004). The Strategic Importance of State-Level Factors in Presidential Elections. *Publius*, 34 (3), 115-130.
- Reed, D. (2006, May). Do Local Ties Really Matter? The Regional Advantage in Democratic Presidential Primaries. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Scarrow, Howard A. & Borman, S. (1979). The Effects of Newspaper Endorsements on Election Outcomes: A Case Study. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 43 (3), 388-393.
- Shields, T. (2000). Campaign Confidential. *Editor and Publisher*, 6, 16.
- St. Dizier, Byron. (1983). Editorial page editors and endorsements: chain-owned vs. independent newspapers. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 8 (1), 63-69.
- Sullivan, J., Aldrich, J.H., Borgida, E., & Rahn, W. (1990) Candidate Appraisal and Human Nature: Man and Superman in 1984 Election. *Political Psychology*. 11 (3), pp. 459-484.
- Wackman, D., Gillmore, D.M., Gaziano, C. & Dennis, E.E. (1975). Chain newspapers autonomy as reflected in presidential campaign endorsements. *Journalism Quarterly*, 52 (3), 411-420.
- Times endorses McCain, Obama. (2008, February 1). *Los Angeles Times*, p. A33.

APPENDICES

Table A.1. Democratic Correlation Matrix						
	Nat. Poll	State Poll	Home Reg.	Home State	Congruency	Can. Qual.
Nat. Poll	1.000					
State Poll	0.881	1.000				
Home Reg.	0.249	0.309	1.000			
Home State	0.142	0.168	0.401	1.000		
Congruency	0.668	0.638	0.195	0.102	1.000	
Can. Qual	0.060	0.067	0.022	0.001	0.115	1.000

Table A.2. Republican Correlation Matrix						
	Nat. Poll	State Poll	Home Reg.	Home State	Congruency	Can. Qual.
Nat. Poll	1.000					
State Poll	0.632	1.000				
Home Reg.	0.078	0.124	1.000			
Home State	-0.119	0.056	0.446	1.000		
Congruency	0.481	0.528	0.104	-0.009	1.000	
Can. Qual	0.239	0.344	0.060	0.003	0.330	1.000

Appendix Table B.1  
Candidate Issue Beliefs of Salient Issues

	Immigration	Gun Control	Health Care
McCain	-Allow guest workers -Support for Comprehensive Immigration reform -Social Justice when dealing with Illegal Immigrants	-Don't hold gun manufacturers liable for crimes -Opposes restrictions on assault weapons and ammunition types	-Supports the extension of SCHIP -Place health care records online to streamline the process
Thompson	-Against Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act -Against amnesty, welfare programs for Illegals	-Colleges can decide whether they want to allow guns on campus -Strong supporter of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> amendment	-Against the expansion of SCHIP -Competition, free-market solutions
Huckabee	-Social Justice towards Illegals -Don't punish the children of Illegals -Some problems with Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act	-2 <sup>nd</sup> amendment is an essential freedom -Gun use in self defense is okay	-Supports the expansion of SCHIP -Focus on Health and Prevention
Romney	-Illegals should not get tuition breaks in schools -Deport Illegals in 90 days -Comprehensive Immigration Reform is a form of amnesty	- Okay to ban lethal weapons that threaten police -Supports the assault weapons ban	-Mandating citizens to buy Health Care is Conservative -Against SCHIP
Giuliani	-Declared NYC a sanctuary city -Tamperproof ids -Mildly supportive of Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act.	-Government can impose reasonable regulation on guns	-Against SCHIP -For the creation of a Health Savings account
Paul	-Against Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act - No amnesty	-Opposes the D.C. gun ban	-Against SCHIP -Private medical accounts; no government meddling

Appendix Table B.2 Newspaper Issue Beliefs of Salient Issues Relevant to the <i>Atlanta Journal-Constitution</i>		
Immigration	Gun Control	Health Care
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (2007) is a bipartisan solution to growing immigration problem</li> <li>- Illegal Immigrants deserve to be treated with Social Justice</li> <li>- Supports the Dream Act, which allows immigrant children an opportunity to progress through higher education.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Virginia Tech Massacre was preventable.</li> <li>- Close loopholes in gun law.</li> <li>- Restrict access to guns</li> <li>- Highly in favor of the Assault Weapons Ban</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Renewing SCHIP is a must</li> <li>-Children should be given the same coverage as Congressman and Senators</li> </ul>

Appendix Table B.3 Congruency Scores Relative to the <i>Atlanta Journal-Constitution</i>				
Candidate	Immigration Score	Gun Control Score	Health Care Score	Total Congruence
McCain	1	0	1	2
Thompson	-1	-1	-1	-3
Romney	-1	1	0	0
Giuliani	0	1	-1	0
Paul	-1	-1	-1	-3
Huckabee	0	-1	1	0

Appendix Table C  
Newspapers Searched

Newspaper	Endorsed Party Candidate
Akron Beacon	Democrats, Republicans
Albuquerque Journal	Democrats
Atlanta Journal-Constitution	Democrats, Republicans
Austin American-Statesman	Democrats
Baltimore Sun	Democrats, Republicans
Birmingham News	Democrats, Republicans
Boston Globe	Democrats, Republicans
Boston Herald	Democrats, Republicans
Cape Cod Times	Democrats
Charleston Post	Republicans
Chicago Sun-Times	Democrats, Republicans
Claremont Eagle-Times	Democrats, Republicans
Cleveland Plain Dealer	Democrats, Republicans
Columbus Dispatch	Democrats, Republicans
Connecticut Post	Democrats
Contra Costa Times	Democrats, Republicans
Dayton Daily News	Democrats, Republicans
Denver Post	Democrats, Republicans
Fort Worth Star	Democrats, Republicans
Fredricksburg Free Lance-Star	Democrats, Republicans
Fresno Bee	Democrats, Republicans
Houston Chronicle	Democrats, Republicans
Jackson Citizen-Patriot	Republicans
Joplin Globe	Democrats, Republicans
Kalamazoo Gazette	Republicans
Kansas City Star	Democrats, Republicans
Knoxville News -Sentinel	Democrats, Republicans
Las Vegas Review Journal	Democrats, Republicans
Los Angeles Daily News	Republicans
Marin Independent Journal	Democrats
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel	Democrats, Republicans
New Jersey Star Ledger	Democrats, Republicans
New York Daily Star	Democrats
New York Post	Democrats, Republicans
Orlando Sentinel	Democrats, Republicans
Palm Beach Post	Democrats, Republicans
Pasadena Star News	Democrats, Republicans
Patriot News	Democrats
Peoria Journal	Democrats, Republicans
Philadelphia Inquirer	Democrats, Republicans
Pittsburg Post Gazette	Democrats
Pittsburg Tribune	Democrats
Portland Press-Herald	Democrats, Republicans
Quad City Times	Democrats, Republicans
Riverside Press-Enterprise	Democrats
Rock Hill Herald	Democrats, Republicans
Sacramento Bee	Democrats, Republicans
San Antonio Express-News	Democrats, Republicans
San Francisco Chronicle	Democrats, Republicans
San Jose Mercury News	Democrats, Republicans
Santa Fe New Mexican	Democrats
Savannah Morning News	Republicans
Seattle Post-Intelligencer	Democrats, Republicans
Seattle Times	Democrats, Republicans
St. Louis Post Dispatch	Democrats, Republicans
St. Petersburg Times	Democrats, Republicans
Tacoma News Tribune	Democrats, Republicans
Tampa Tribune	Democrats, Republicans
The Burlington Hawkeye	Democrats
The Hartford Courant	Democrats, Republicans
The Indianapolis Star	Democrats
The Nashua Telegraph	Democrats, Republicans
The New York Times	Democrats, Republicans
The Oregonian	Democrats, Republicans
The Springfield Republican	Democrats, Republicans
The Worcester Telegram	Democrats, Republicans
Toledo Blade	Democrats
Trenton Times	Democrats, Republicans
Union Leader	Republicans