The Bannock Street Project and Midterm Voting

Sean Murphy

Bemidji State University

Political Science Senior Thesis
Bemidji State University
Dr. Patrick Donnay, Advisor
April 2016

Abstract: *The Bannock Street Project was an effort by the Democratic Party during the 2014 congressional elections, to offset the Midterm Dilemma. The Midterm Dilemma is the focus of many theories trying to assess why the president's party tends to do poorly during the midterms. The Bannock Street project failed and as a result the Democrats lost control of the Senate in 2014. I attempt to discover why the Democrat's project failed, and if its failure can be attributed to either The Surge and Decline Theory or The Negative Voting Theory. I use 2014 Pew Center election data to analyze the question. I expect to find that the Negative Voting theory was the major factor in the 2014 midterm shift in power, and furthermore that the Bannock Street Project was not designed to combat this theory. This research can help us better understand American voting habits, especially in midterm elections.*

Introduction:

Elections are one of the most fascinating pieces of the American political system. As participants in this democratic process we often like to think that elections are unpredictable events in which the general population turns out to vote for the best possible candidate. However the reality of our election process is a little less romantic. Elections are not as unpredictable as we once believed them to be, many patterns have formed in the way that we vote. The midterm dilemma is one of these patterns and has been considered almost a certainty in American politics for the past 150 years. It refers to the nearly continuous cycle of presidents whose party loses congressional seats during the midterm elections. Many political minds have inquired as to why a party platform that was popular enough to win the White House, seems to become unpopular a mere two years later. There have been have been multiple theories to try and describe what causes this phenomenon to occur.

Two major theories on the subject are Angus Campbell's "Theory of Surge and Decline"(1960) and Samuel Kernell's "Negative Voting Theory"(1977). The two theories differ greatly in addressing who shows up to midterm elections and what drives them to do so. These theories, and others that have branched off of them have been debated for years, however very little had been done on a national level to address these theories. However, in 2014 the Democratic Party launched the first nationally coordinated effort to combat the midterm dilemma by instituting the Bannock Street Project. The project was intended to help senators in states that the Democrats believed they could win, even in a midterm election. The project was designed to boost voter turnout and mobilize reluctant Democrats. The project ultimately failed to prevent the midterm dilemma from occurring, as the Democrats lost 9 of the 10 seats that they had

targeted. The question that I will try to answer is why this project failed, and which if either of these midterm theories were major factors in 2014?

Surge and Decline:

Angus Campbell (1960) published his answer to the midterm question. Campbell suggested that there were two types of elections. The first is high-stimulus elections which mostly refers to presidential elections which have a great deal of voter contact. This voter contact can come in the form of television ads, news stories or grassroots efforts such as phone banking and door knocking. All of these forms of voter contact increase substantially during presidential elections. The second type of election is a low-stimulus election which often represents midterm elections. These low-stimulus elections often lack national media coverage as well as the massive volunteer base that candidates enjoy during presidential elections.

Campbell also divides voters into two categories, core voters and peripheral voters. Campbell classifies core voters as dedicated voters who show up to most elections and have a built in allegiance to a political party. Peripheral voters are voters who do not vote often and may have only a loose party affiliation if any at all. According to Campbell, peripheral voters need the frenzy of a high-stimulus election in order to turn out to vote. He believes that there is usually one candidate who will draw these peripheral voters to their side. Since these voters have only a loose affiliation with their party they are more likely to temporarily defect to vote for the leading presidential candidate. In addition, Campbell claims that congressional representatives will benefit from riding the presidential candidates coattails.

This surge of irregular voters and party defectors creates an artificial boost for a particular party. However two years later when the low-stimulus election arrives, these voter either do not show up to the polls or they do not defect the way that they did in the presidential

election. Campbell argues that since low-stimulus elections turn out mostly core voters, these are the most partisan elections and therefore they reduce the chance of people defecting to vote for a different party. This causes a disproportionate decline in voters for the previously victorious party which allows their opposition a chance to retake the congressional seats.

James E. Campbell (1987) offered a revised version of the Surge and Decline Theory. This revised version puts less of an emphasis on the difference between peripheral and core voters. It claims that the surge and decline does not come from fringe voters but instead comes from partisan voters who are inspired by presidential candidates. He claimed, as well, that Independent voters were not likely to be swayed by the difference in exposure. "There is a surge of turnout in presidential elections. It is a surge that benefits the winning presidential party, but it is not a turnout surge of impressionable peripheral independents. The turnout surge is among partisans of the winning presidential party. Reinforced in their partisan pre-disposition by the campaign favoring their party, they turn out in greater numbers than usual."(J.E. Campbell 1987 p.977)

Negative Voting Theory:

Samuel Kernell (1977) proposed a different theory to explain the midterm dilemma. Kernell purposed that voters use the midterm elections as a referendum on the president. There are basically two main reasons why this referendum is almost always negative. The first reason is based in psychology, Kernell references a quote from Negativity in Evaluations:

> "It seems that negativity biases occur against the backdrop of perceived bliss - indeed perhaps because of it. Given that most people perceive the world as a predominantly positive place, there are a number of reasons why one might expect them to weigh positive information rather more lightly than negative. First there is the well-known judgmental anchoring, or contrast, effect. In a world of ointment the fly seems bad indeed. Second, if most choices and behavior-relevant

> evaluations are made from a range of general positive alternatives, it is simpler and less effortful to sort the alternatives on the basis of their few negative aspects rather than the many positive ones." (Kanouse/Hanson 1972 p.10)

This quote makes the argument that when people process information, negative information leaves a greater impression in their mind. This means that people are more motivated to oppose things that they view as negative, than they are to support things that they view in a positive way. The other major reason that Kernell gives as to why the midterm elections are a negative referendum on the president, involves campaign promises. While on the campaign trail the president makes numerous promises to voters, however after two years most voters usually find themselves disappointed by the lack of progress that has been made. Given this information Kernell theorizes that people who disapprove of the president are more likely to be motivated to turn out in a midterm election than those who approve of the president.
Also Kernell disagrees with Campbell's assertion that party defectors are not a major factor during midterm elections. Instead, Kernell argues that members of the president's party are more likely to defect to the opposition if they are dissatisfied with the president, more so than members of the opposition party are to defect to the president's party because they approve of the president. Kernell also believed that Independents would be strongly influenced by their perception of the president.

Building off of Kernell's theory, Atkeson and Partin (1995) decided to compare senatorial and gubernatorial races with the national referendum hypothesis (Kernell's hypothesis) as well as an economic retrospective hypothesis. Their research concluded, "We find a strong national referendum effect in Senate races whereby candidates of the president's party (challengers as well as incumbents) benefit or suffer from the popularity of the sitting president. Furthermore, in senatorial elections, we do not find any significant effect of economic

evaluations on vote choice. In marked contrast, we find that governors, as chief executives of their respective states, are held responsible for the health of their state economies and are not generally shown to be liable for fluctuations in presidential approval." (p.105) Their findings support Kernell's claim that Senate races are influenced by presidential approval.

Bannock Street Project:

The Bannock Street project was named after the location of Michael Bennet's campaign headquarters in Denver Colorado during the 2010 midterm election. Bennet was in a desperately close race against a Tea Party challenger. When TV ads and traditional campaigning did nothing to help him pull away from his opponent he changed his focus. He embarked on a mission to get out the vote through phone banks as well as sending out a large number of door knockers. In the end Bennet managed to scrape out a win, crediting his last minute success to his get out the vote (GOTV) efforts. However other Democrats were not as fortunate, according to the FEC, after turning out only 37.8% of voters, the Democrats lost 69 congressional seats, 63 in the House and 6 in the Senate.

Realizing just how dire their situation was in the 2014 elections, the Democratic Party chose 10 senate races that they thought they could win. The 10 battle ground states they chose were Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Michigan, Montana and West Virginia. They invested 60 million dollars into these 10 states hoping to create turnout similar to Obama's turnout in 2008. The idea was to implement the grassroots organizing strategy that had both Bennett and Obama had managed to use so effectively. Essentially this project was designed to attempt to combat the Theory of Surge and Decline by creating an artificial "surge" in voter awareness and stimulation during a midterm election.

In 2008 Obama managed to turn out an unprecedented 56.8% of eligible voters. Also youth voter turnout increased by 1.8% from 2004 and Obama garnered 66% of the youth vote (Keeter, Horowitz & Tyson 2008). On top of this, relative to the presidential election of 2004, the voting rates for blacks, Asians and Hispanics each increased by about 4 percentage points according to the Census Bureau's "Current Population Survey" of 2012 and 2014 . Obama took full advantage of this increase in minority turnout taking 96% of the African American vote as well as 62% of the Hispanic vote. (Keeter, Horowitz & Tyson 2008) One thing that had been crucial to Obama's success was his grassroots campaigning. Through local field offices as well as social media he was able to get voters registered and get them out to the polls on voting day. The Obama campaign established more than 700 field offices across the country, compared to fewer than 400 maintained by the McCain campaign" (Masket 2009 p.1026). Most of these field offices were scattered throughout key battleground states. His ground game produced an increase in voter turnout for both him and other Democratic Party candidates. When compared to John Kerry's campaign in 2004, Obama saw no less than a 3 point increase in counties where he established a field office (Masket 2009 p.1026).

Throughout the 10 Bannock Street States Democrats set up field offices and recruited volunteers to help promote this impressive grassroots strategy. In Arkansas for example they were able to establish as many 40 field offices with over 1,200 volunteers by the end of August according to Molly Ball. At the same time she reported, "Republicans now have 11 offices open across Arkansas, party officials told me, all of them staffed by field organizers. They have recruited "hundreds" of volunteers, and the RNC has had staff here for almost a year." (Ball 2014). However even with this enormous gap in field offices, which represented a fundamental piece of the project, Republicans still walked away with a landslide victory in that state. In the

Senate the Republicans scored 56.5% of the vote while the Democrats scraped up just 39.5%. West Virginia was another state where despite the added attention from the Democratic Party, the Republicans in the Senate still walked away with an overwhelming victory with 62.1% of the vote compared to the Democrats 34.5%. A few of the Senate races involved in the project were close however, such as in Alaska with Republicans getting 48.8% to the Democrats 45.6%. It was a similar story in North Carolina; Republicans 49.0% and Democrats 47.3%. In other states the Republicans won solid victories in their Senate races: Georgia: R 53.0% D 45.1%, Iowa: R 52.2% D 43.7%, Kentucky R 56.2% D 40.7% and Montana: R 57.9% D 40.0%. In Louisiana the Democratic candidate initially had the most votes, however in the Louisiana system a candidate must receive more than 50% of the vote. Since no candidate receive the required votes there was a runoff between the top two candidates. In this runoff the Republican candidate came out on top with 55.9% over the Democrat with 44.1% Of all the states that the Democratic party attempted the Bannock Street Project, only in Michigan did they have electoral success. Here they won a sizable victory accumulating 54.6% of the vote over the Republicans 41.4% to hold that Senate seat. It is worth noting that the Democrats held on by a thread in a few states that were not a part of the project. In Virginia for example Democrat Mark Warner held onto his Senate seat by .8% of the vote.

However there was some evidence that the project achieved its goal of increasing turnout of Democratic voters. On average those Democratic candidates in states that implemented the Bannock Street Project saw an increase of about 81,000 votes in comparison to the Democrats who ran in states that did not implement the project (Bleiberg & West 2014). Showing that the Democrats GOTV campaign had some effect on getting people to the voting booths. Yet somehow this increase in voter turnout was ineffective at clinching a victory in all but one state.

Initial Evidence:

Since 1862 the midterm dilemma has been a constant for all but three elections. The first was with Franklin D Roosevelt in 1934, the second was under Bill Clinton in 1998 and the third and final exception came with George W. Bush in 2002. All three of the cases are unique, FDR was the first one to break the cycle, Clinton was the only one to gain congressional seats in his second midterm election, and Bush is the only Republican to break the cycle. While I could not find reliable statistics on the 1934 election, I decided to compare the midterm elections for Clinton, Bush and Obama. I used FEC data to compare national voter turnout for each of the midterm elections to see if there was an obvious relationship between voter turnout and a president's party winning in a midterm election. I found that in 1994 when Clinton lost congressional seats there was 38.8% national voter turnout, in 1998 when Clinton gained seats, the turnout was at 36.4%. When Bush gained seats in 2002 there was 37% voter turnout, and when Bush lost seats in 2006 there was 37.1% voter turnout. When Obama lost 69 congressional seats in 2010 national voter turnout was at 37.8% while 2014 saw 36.3% turnout. There does not appear to be any obvious relationship between national voter turnout and the outcome of midterm elections.

I then used Gallup Poll data to test whether there was an obvious relationship between presidential approval and the president's party wining a midterm election. I used the approval ratings from the week before the election so that I had an idea of what the mood of the country was heading into the polls. When Clinton lost congressional seats in 1994 he had an approval rating of 48%, whereas, when Clinton gained seats in 1998 his approval rating was up to 65%. When Bush gained seats in 2002 his approval rating was at 63%, when he lost seats in 2006 his

approval had dropped to 37%. In the 2010 election Obama had an approval rating of 45%, in 2014 his approval was at 43%. Initially there appears to be some correlation between a president's approval rating and the ability of their party to win in a midterm election.

Hypothesis:

If I test variables related to both Negative Voting Theory and Surge and Decline Theory, I will find that the Negative Voting Theory was the main contributor to the midterm dilemma in 2014.

Analysis:

The data that I used for my analysis was obtained from the Pew Research Center. It contains exit poll data collected after the 2014 election. (For more information on the data collection methodology see Appendix)

Negative Voting Analysis:

The first data analysis that I decided to test was to help determine if Presidential approval had a connection with voter turnout. According to Kernell's theory, those who disapprove of President Obama are more likely to turn out to vote during midterm elections. My dependent variable was whether or not the respondent voted[i]. My independent variable was party identification in which the response options were, Republican, Democrat or Independent. I used party identification to test Kernell's idea that members of the president's own party are more likely to show up when they disapprove of him, than members of the opposite party are when they approve of him. These two variables were then layered with the variable of whether the respondent approved or disapproved of President Barack Obama.

(Table 1 and Figure1 1 here)

The evidence from this table appears to follow Kernell's theory as it pertains to voter turnout. We see that Republicans are twice as likely to turnout if they disapprove of Obama as they are if they approve of him. Democrat voters are equally likely to turnout whether they approve or disapprove. Also we see a sizeable increase in Independent voters when they disapprove of the president.

The statistical significance of this analysis is strong, because it does prove the null hypothesis to be incorrect. The null hypothesis is the theoretical claim that there is no relationship between the variables tested. By proving the null hypothesis incorrect I have established that there is a relationship between these variables. The high Chi-square numbers tell us that it is very unlikely that these numbers were caused by random sampling error. The Phi and Cramer's V numbers measure the association between the variables. In this table the Phi and Cramer's V values are less than .29 which means that the association between the variables, while it does exist, is weak.

To test Kernell's theory of partisan defectors. I tested a dependent variable which asked the respondent if they had voted for a Republican or a Democrat in their congressional elections. This question was only available to those who had responded "yes" to voting in the election. I further eliminated any respondent who answered "Did Not Vote for Congress", "Don't Know/Don't Remember" and "Refused". My independent variable remained the same as before as did the variable that I used as a layer.

(Table 2 and Figure 2 here)

This table supports Kernell's idea that presidential disapproval can cause partisan defectors. Kernell believed that disapproval of a president in one's own party would lead to higher defection rates than approval of a president in the opposing party. According to the data, Democrats who disapprove of the president are twice as likely to vote for a Republican candidate, as Republicans who approve of the president are to vote for a Democrat. Also remember in Figure 1, a higher percentage of disapproving Democrats are voting as compared to approving Republicans. However, it is surprising that Independents are more likely to vote for Democrats when they approve of the president, than they are likely to vote for a Republican when they disapprove of the president. This piece of the data does not support Kernell's claim that Independent voters are the most susceptible to Negative Voting.

The statistical significance of this analysis is quite strong. Once again the statistical significance proves the null hypothesis to be incorrect. The Chi-square value on this table is higher than the previous table, making it more unlikely that these numbers were caused by random sampling data. Also with this table our Phi values are all above a .6 which means that the level of association is very strong.

Surge and Decline Analysis:

Lastly I decided to test Angus Campbell's theory that higher political stimulation caused higher voter turnout. My dependent variable was whether or not the respondent's voted. For my dependent variable I combined the party identification variable with the "political leanings" variable. The "political leanings" question was asked to those who responded with, "Independent" or "Other" when asked their political identification. When I recoded the

combined variables, respondents who answered “Republican” or “Democrat” in the initial question were labeled as “Strong Republican’s” or “Strong Democrat’s” respectively. Those who responded “Republican” or “Democrat” after further prodding were labeled “Lean Republican” or “Lean Democrat” respectively. Those who responded “Independent” to both questions were labeled as “Independent”. The voting variable and the party affiliation variable were then layered with an additional variable. This variable asked the respondents if they felt like they had learned enough about the candidates and issues to make an informed decision. This variable was chosen to represent the amount of exposure and stimulation that voters had received during the election.

(Table 3 and Figure 3 here)

This table is inconclusive regarding Angus Campbell's theory on stimulation's relation to voter turnout. The two "Lean" categories represent what Angus Campbell referred to as "peripheral voters". According to Angus Campbell there should have been a large drop in the amount of peripheral voters that were not stimulated, or engaged in the election however the data shows that Republican peripheral voters were as likely to show up as the "Strong" or "Core" voters. Democratic peripheral voters were the least likely group to turn out if they were stimulated by the campaign, however they were the most likely to turn out if they had not been stimulated by the campaign. The campaign stimulation had the greatest impact of persuading Independents to turn out. This table does not support James Campbell’s variation either. There is a distinct difference in how peripherals voted compared to partisans and the Independents were the most effected by the amount of exposure to the campaign.

This analysis has a very weak significance, but it still proves the null hypothesis to be incorrect. However the Chi-square value for this table is very low, allowing for the possibility that these numbers were caused by random sampling error. Also the Phi and Cramer's V values are extremely low, showing that there is not a lot of measurable association between these variables.

Conclusion:

After examining my data and my literature I find that my research is inconclusive. There is evidence that suggests that Negative Voting Theory played a role in the 2014 election, the data followed Kernell's theory in regards to both voter turnout as well as partisan defections. The statistical significance for both tables regarding Kernell's theory had strong statistical significance and levels association. While these are strong indications it is also true that exit poll data is sometimes unreliable because people are not always truthful about their political beliefs or their voting history. The exit poll data used is limited, both in the questions available, and in the small sample size provided. The variable "Did you learn enough to make an informed decision?" is workable, however a better question for the purpose of this paper would inquire as to whether or not the respondent was directly contacted by members of the campaign as well as whether they voted in the previous general election and if so for whom did they vote. This would help us get a better perspective on the Theory of Surge and Decline. Another setback to my research is that the theories used are dated. Even the more modern interpretations predate the use of cellphones and social media, both of which have become factors in political campaigning. These new platforms could have an impact on both of the proposed theories. Also the growing disenfranchisement that voters say they are feeling with both parties could change the landscape of midterm elections. These theories were both designed with only two parties in mind and a

back and forth between the two. However for the moment more research is necessary for a better understanding on which members of the electorate show up to vote in midterm elections and what drives them to the polls.

Table 1: Cross tabulation at Party ID by Voting and Presidential Approval

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Barack Obama is handling his job as President?			With which party do you affiliate			
			Republican	Democrat	Independent	Total
Approve	Did you vote?	Yes, Voted	30	684	221	935
			34.5%	62.0%	35.1%	51.4%
		No, Did not vote	57	419	408	884
			65.5%	38.0%	64.9%	48.6%
	Total		87	1103	629	1819
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Disapprove	Did you vote?	Yes, Voted	746	144	438	1328
			70.4%	61.8%	46.6%	59.5%
		No, Did not vote	313	89	501	903
			29.6%	38.2%	53.4%	40.5%
	Total		1059	233	939	2231
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 1:

Approve: Chi-Square= 126.311, Phi= .264, Cramer's V= .264

Disapprove: Chi-Square= 117.558, Phi= .230, Cramer's V= .230

Total: Chi-Square= 207.261, Phi= .226, Cramer's V= .226

Table 2: Cross tabulation at Vote for Congress by Party ID and Presidential Approval

Do you Approve or Disapprove of President Obama?				With which party do you affiliate? Republican	Democrat	Independent	Total
Approve	In the race for Congress did you vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate?	Republican	Count	26	17	35	78
				86.7%	2.5%	15.8%	8.3%
		Democrat	Count	2	649	149	800
				6.7%	94.9%	67.4%	85.6%
		Other candidate	Count	2	18	37	57
				6.7%	2.6%	16.7%	6.1%
	Total		Count	30	684	221	935
				100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Disapprove	In the race for Congress did you vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate?	Republican	Count	705	21	243	969
				94.5%	14.5%	55.5%	72.9%
		Democrat	Count	19	104	78	201
				2.5%	71.7%	17.8%	15.1%
		Other candidate	Count	22	20	117	159
				2.9%	13.8%	26.7%	12.0%
	Total		Count	746	145	438	1329
				100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	In the race for Congress did you vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate?	Republican	Count	731	38	278	1047
				94.2%	4.6%	42.2%	46.2%
		Democrat	Count	21	753	227	1001
				2.7%	90.8%	34.4%	44.2%
		Other candidate	Count	24	38	154	216
				3.1%	4.6%	23.4%	9.5%
	Total		Count	776	829	659	2264
				100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 2:

Approve: Chi- Square= 355.461, Phi= .617, Cramer's V= .436

Disapprove: Chi-Square= 651.810, Phi= .700, Cramer's V= .495

Total: Chi-Square= 1610.721, Phi= .843, Cramer's V= .596

Did you learn enough about the candidates to make an informed choice?			Political Affiliation					
			Strong Republican	Lean Republican	Independent	Lean Democrat	Strong Democrat	Total
Learned enough to make an informed choice	Did you vote?	Yes, voted	627	217	66	134	562	1606
			86.7%	86.8%	88.0%	74.9%	89.5%	86.6%
		No, did not vote	96	33	9	45	66	249
			13.3%	13.2%	12.0%	25.1%	10.5%	13.4%
	Total		723	250	75	179	628	1855
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Did not learn enough from the campaign	Did you vote?	Yes, voted	136	94	71	119	285	705
			63.0%	63.1%	55.0%	68.8%	62.5%	62.8%
		No, did not vote	80	55	58	54	171	418
			37.0%	36.9%	45.0%	31.2%	37.5%	37.2%
	Total		216	149	129	173	456	1123
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Did you vote?	Yes, voted	763	311	137	253	847	2311
			81.3%	77.9%	67.2%	71.9%	78.1%	77.6%
		No, did not vote	176	88	67	99	237	667
			18.7%	22.1%	32.8%	28.1%	21.9%	22.4%
	Total		939	399	204	352	1084	2978
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix:

Data Collection Procedure:

"The analysis in this report is based on telephone interviews conducted November 6-9 among a national sample of 1,353 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia (541 respondents were interviewed on a landline telephone, and 812 were interviewed on a cell phone, including 449 who had no landline telephone). The survey was conducted by interviewers at Princeton Data Source under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates International. A combination of landline and cell phone random digit dial samples were used; both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. Respondents in the landline sample were selected by randomly asking for the youngest adult male or female who is now at home. Interviews in the cell sample were conducted with the person who answered the phone, if that person was an adult 18 years of age or older.

The combined landline and cell phone sample are weighted using an iterative technique that matches gender, age, education, race, Hispanic origin and nativity and region to parameters from the 2012 Census Bureau's American Community Survey and population density to parameters from the Decennial Census. The sample also is weighted to match current patterns of telephone status (landline only, cell phone only, or both landline and cell phone), based on extrapolations from the 2013 National Health Interview Survey. The weighting procedure also accounts for the fact that respondents with both landline and cell phones have a greater probability of being included in the combined sample and adjusts for household size among respondents with a landline phone. Sampling errors and statistical tests of significance take into account the effect of weighting."

Bibliography

Atkeson, L. R., & Partin, R. W. (1995). Economic and Referendum Voting: A Comparison of Gubernatorial and Senatorial Elections. *The American Political Science Review*, 99-107.

Ball, M. (2014, August 24). *Inside the Democrats Plan to Save Arkansas*. Retrieved from The Atlantic: http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/08/inside-the-democrats-plan-to-save-arkansasand-the-senate/379028/

Bleiberg, J., & West, D. (2014, November 17). *Did the Democrats Digital Voter Outreach Plan Fail? Examining the Bannock Street Project*. Retrieved from The Brookings Institution: http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/techtank/posts/2014/11/17-digital-voter-outreach-bannock-street

Campbell, A. (1960). Surge and Decline: A Study of Electoral Change. *Public Opinon Quarterly*, 397-418.

Campbell, J. E. (1987). The Revised Theory of Surge and Decline . *The American Journal of Political Science*, 965-979.

Keeter, S., Horowitz, J., & Tyson, A. (2008, November 13). *"Young Voters in the 2008 Election"*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center: http://www.pewresearch.org/2008/11/13/young-voters-in-the-2008-election/

Kernell, S. (1977). Presidential Popularity and Negative Voting: An Alternative Explanation of the Midterm Congressional Decline of the President's Party. *The American Political Science Review*, 44-66.

Masket, S. (2009). "Did Obama's Ground Game Matter?". *Public Opinon Quarterly*, 1023-1039. Retrieved from Public Opinon Quarterly.

Endnotes

[i] For this variable I had to recode those who responded "I don't know" together with those who responded that they had not voted. I did this because it is unlikely for people to not know if they voted, especially only days after the election, and it is more likely that they did not want to admit to not voting. This also created turnout percentages similar to actual turnout.