# Region, The Economy, and The Government Do economy-based evaluations of the government depend on region?

### Overview

### Introduction

Different ethnoreligious and cultural groups settled in different regions of the country. These deep-rooted cultural differences-coupled with an American tendency towards local government- have created legitimate regional differences. If find that these differences translate into political differences through perception and outlook on the economy. In an increasingly divided political climate, any understanding of the issues that divide us- and the root of these issues- is useful.

### Model

Dependent Variable: Congress, President, Federal Government Feeling Thermometers Independent Variable: Interaction between region and economic conern Controls: Year, Race, Gender, Party Identification

OLS regression using NES data from 1980-2012

### economic perception:

"think about the past year. would you say the economy has gotten worse or better?"

### economic outlook:

"how about next year? do you think the economy will get worse or better?"

### Regions

Northeast: CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT, NJ, NY, PA, DE, DC, MD Midwest: IL, ID, MI, OH, WI, IA, KS, MN, MS, NE, ND, SD Southeast: FL, FA, NC, SC, VA, WV, AL, KY, MS, TN Southwest: AR, LA, OK, TX AZ, NM, NV West: ID, WY, AK, CA, HI, OR, WA, CO

## Interaction between Region and Economy

Economic concerns have an undeniable affect on evaluations of the government: the more positive people are about the economy, the more positively they rate the government. I tested whether this relationship varies across region.

### The Economy Over Time





### Overall Effects

	Economic Paragetion			Economic Outlook		
Variable	Coefficient (Std. Error)					
	Federal Government	Congress	President	Foderal Government	Congress	President
Economic Perception	(.417)	1,345***	(.547)			
Economic Outlook				(200)	(.230)	(340)
1990	(.527)	(866)	(3.217)	(487)	12.853*** C6490	3.404*** (.945)
1988	11.366***	14.808*** 4.760	(1.045)	16.247***	(.579)	(843)
1992	5.955***	5,513***	3.737****	6.836***	(.519)	(2389**
1996	5.908***	(811)	-3.158**	11.997***	(390)	4.699*** (.860)
2000	7.316***	(.791)	(1.60%)	(.629)	(.997)	.833 (.870)
2004	(1.645***	12.071***	-1.613 (- 1.613)	15.615***	(17,175***	.748
2006	9.019*** (.715)	(400)	-8.06)*** (.838)	6.597***	(.679)	-18.39  FH (.989)
Gender	4.022***	6,164***	3.246***	3.400*** (.340)	6.005***	2.010***
Party Meet/Soption	-3.643****	(23)  ***	-2.968*** (.308)	-3.797*** 6.187)	-1.806*** 6.1790	4.302**** (.259)
Race	2.062*** (.151)	(147)	(199)	2.303*** 6.12-0	£119)	1.324*** (.172)
Intercept	(3.239)	(1.159)	(1.625)	(.975)	27.315***	(1.350)

### Economic Perception

Just one interaction term was significant in any model. Economic Perception alone is always a significant predictor of government popularity, but there is little evidence that the relationship between economic perception and ratings of the government is affected in a significant way by region.

### Economic Outlook

There were significant differences between regions for the relationship between economic outlook and ratings of the federal government. This indicates that the way people think of the government based on the way they think about the future economy may be significantly impacted by the region in which they reside.

Results

My paper offers new insights into the role of region and the economy within political behavior, and prompts new questions.

What are the psychological differences
between economic outlook and economic

Implications

- Why is the relationship between the economy and government popularity different across region?
- Could this help explain the surprising-to-some election of Donald Trump?

Direct		Interactive			
Variable	(fed, Error)	Variable	Coefficier (No. Error		
		Southeast * Tuonomic	2.041**		
		Outlook	6.7450		
		Midwest * Economic Outlook	1,291*		
			6,741)		
		Southwest * Economic	1.008		
		Outlook	(.836)		
		West * Economic Chalcols	1.565**		
			£770		
Economia Outlook	6.000***	Economic Outlook	4,777000		
	(200)		C.5560		
Southeast	1,640**	Southeast	-2.803		
	(.526)				
Muleural	. 9791	Malwest	-3.48975		
	(.508)		(1.670)		
Southwart	1,670**	Southwest	-497		
	(ARX)		(1.929)		
West	1.004777	West	15.540**		
	(.555)		(1.747)		
1490	11.904***	1980	23.966***		
	(.482)		(482)		
1968	16.41.3***	1988	14.413***		
	(ARR)		CARRY		
1992	6.990 ***	1992	6.900***		
	(.565)		(.543)		
1996	11.965***	1996	11.951***		
	(.626)		£420)		
2000	14.009***	2000	14.003***		
	(A29)		EA290		
2004	15.66(948)	3994	15.621.444		
	(.725)		(.705)		
2008	8.450***	2008			
	(715)		(717)		
Gender	3,330***	Gender	3,346***		
	(340)		£340)		
Party Identification	3.748***	Purp Mentification	3.753***		
	(.187)		(.187)		
Race	2.168***	Race	2.161***		
	(.129)		(129)		
Intercept	27.153***	Intervept.	29.813***		
	(1.626)		(1.457)		
N-14848, R2+156		N=14848, R2=156	N-14848, R2-156		
*ac.10 **ac.05 ***					

Isabel Strobing | Advisor: Dino Christenson | Boston University Department of Political Science
Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Boston University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences degree of Political Science Master of Arts

