

Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 3: Sample Design and Data Collection Report

June 05, 2006

Country:	United States of America
Date of Election:	November 4, 2008
Prepared by:	Darrell Donakowski
Date of Preparation:	February 2, 2013

NOTES TO COLLABORATORS:

- Where brackets [] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket or brackets.
- If more space is needed to answer any question, please lengthen the document as necessary.

Collaborator(s):

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in the CSES dataset - they are not necessarily the parties who collected the data. These collaborators and their contact information will be listed on the CSES website.

Name: Darrell Donakowski Title: Director of Studies Organization: American National Election Studies Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States Telephone: 734-764-5494 Fax: 734-764-3341 E-Mail: ANES@electionstudies.org Website: http://www.electionstudies.org/	Name: Title: Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:
---	---

<p>Name: Arthur Lupia Title: Research Professor Organization: University of Michigan</p> <p>Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States</p> <p>Telephone: 734-647-7549 Fax: 734-764-3341 E-Mail: lupia@umich.edu Website:</p>	<p>Name: Jon Krosnick Title: Organization: Stanford University</p> <p>Address: 432 McClatchy Hall 450 Serra Mall, Stanford, California, 94305 United States</p> <p>Telephone: 650-725-3031 Fax: 650-725-2472 E-Mail: Krosnick@Stanford.edu Website:</p>
--	--

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: RTI International
Address: 3040 East Cornwallis Road Post Office Box 12194 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 United States
Telephone: 919-541-6000
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: http://www.rti.org/

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: National Science Foundation
Address: 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230 United States
Telephone: 703- 292-5111
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: http://nsf.gov/
Organization: University of Michigan
Address: The Regents of The University of Michigan 3003 South State St. Room 1062 Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1271 Telephone: 734-764-1817 Fax:
E-Mail: info@umich.edu
Website: http://www.umich.edu/

Organization: Stanford University

Address:

Stanford University
340 Panama Street
Stanford, CA 94305-6203

Telephone: (650) 723-2300

Fax:

E-Mail:

Website: <http://www.stanford.edu/>

Archiving Organization7

If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will be archived:

Organization:

American National Election Studies

Address:

Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321
United States

Telephone: 734-764-5494

Fax: 734-764-3341

E-Mail: ANES@electionstudies.org

Website: <http://www.electionstudies.org/>

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:

Currently Available

Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:

Post-Election Study

Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

November 5, 2008

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

December 21, 2008

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:
- In person, face-to-face
 - Telephone
 - Mail or self-completion supplement
 - Internet

- 4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?
- Yes
 - No

4b. If the survey was part of a panel study, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

Pre-Election Interviewing began on September 7, 2008 and ended on November 3, 2008.

Translation

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English. Note: Questions are based on those developed for the ISSP.

5. Was the questionnaire translated?

- Yes, translated by member(s) of research team
- Yes, by translation bureau
- Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
- No, not translated

6. Please list all languages used for the fielded module:

Spanish

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

- Yes, by group discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: _____
- No
- Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7d. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

U.S. citizens age 18 or older as of October 31, 2008.

Eligibility Requirements

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18 or older as of October 31, 2008

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9d. Please list any other interviewing requirements or filters used:

Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

The states of Alaska and Hawaii were excluded from the sample frame.

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? ___unknown___ %

If yes, please explain:

Institutional quarters, which were excluded, were defined as “those occupied or intended for occupancy by the persons for whom the facility is operated.” By this definition, institutional quarters were: patient quarters in hospitals; rest homes; nursing homes or mental institutions; quarters for the religious in cloistered convents or monasteries; student dormitories in schools or colleges, fraternities or sororities; and inmates' quarters in penal institutions.

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? ___unknown___ %

If yes, please explain:

Military personnel in on-base housing were excluded. Military personnel residing in households that were not located within restricted boundaries of a military base or reservation were included.

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

Please explain:

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

Yes

No

If no, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: _____ %

Sample Selection Procedures

11. Please describe, in your own words, how the sample for the study was selected. If the survey is part of a panel study, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

Please see the table below.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Counties: All Counties in the 48 conterminous states and DC

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

Yes

No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

13. Were there further stages of selection?

Yes

No

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

A summary of the Sampling Design for the 2008 ANES follows:

First Stage: Counties	
Sampling Frame	All Counties in the 48 coterminous states and DC
Stratification	Eight Largest MSAs ^a and remaining Counties
Type of Selection	Eight largest MSAs: Counties selected with certainty Other Counties: Probabilities proportional to size measures
Sample Size	Eight Largest MSAs: All Counties Other Counties: Approximately 64 Counties
Second Stage: Census Tracts (CTs)	
Sampling Frame	All CTs in selected counties
Stratification	Eight Largest MSAs and remainder of the country
Type of Selection	Probabilities proportional to size measures
Sample Size	Eight Largest MSAs: Approximately 32 CTs (proportionally allocated to each MSA) Other Counties: Approximately 128 CTs (2 per County)
Third Stage: Census Block Groups (CBGs) ^b	
Sampling Frame	CBGs with locatable mailing addresses ^c in selected CTs
Stratification	Implicitly sorted by CBG number
Type of Selection	Probabilities proportional to size measures
Sample Size	320 CBGs (2 per CT)
Fourth Stage: Locatable Mailing Addresses	
Sampling Frame	All locatable residential mailing addresses in selected CBGs
Stratification	Implicitly sorted by delivery sequence number
Type of Selection	Systematic sampling within each CBG
Sample Size	4,598 locatable mailing addresses ^d (average of 14.4 per CBG)
Expected	Occupied HUs ^e 4,230 HHs (92%)
Screening	Screened ^e 3,723 HHs (88%)
Results	Eligible ^f 3,415 HHs (92%)
Fifth Stage: Eligible Persons	
Sampling Frame	Roster of eligible persons in screened and eligible HHs
Stratification	Latino, African American, and Other R/E
Type of Selection	Stratified random sampling

Sample Size	3,088 eligible persons (zero or one per HH)		
		<u>Pre-Election (80%)</u>	<u>Post-Election (90%)</u>
Expected	Latinos:	507	456
Interview	African Americans:	527	474
Results	Other R/E:	<u>1,436</u>	<u>1,293</u>
		2,470	2,223

^a New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Dallas, Miami, Houston, and Washington.

^b The average Census Block Group contains about 550 households.

^c The frame will exclude approximately two percent of HHs in CBGs with unlocatable addresses.

^d Does not include addresses included with the CHUM procedure.

^e Occupancy and screening rates based on prior survey experience.

^f Percentage of U.S. population 18 and older who are U.S. citizens (2006 American Community Survey).

13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages?

Please see the chart under 13a.

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?

Yes

No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

Please see the chart under 13a.

14a. How were individual respondents identified and selected in the final stage?

At the fifth and final stage of sampling, field interviewers randomly selected either zero or one eligible person from each household that was successfully screened and eligible for the survey.

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

16. Did the sample design include stratification?

Definition: Stratification involves the division of the population of interest according to certain characteristics (for instance: geographic, political, or demographic). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result.

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):
Please see the chart under 13a.

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

Non-residential sample point

All members of household are ineligible

Housing unit is vacant

No answer at housing unit after _____ callbacks

Other (Please explain):

Non-spanish/non-english speakers

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

Yes

No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

Yes

No

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

Yes

No

21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what % list frame_____ and what % RDD_____

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?

Yes

No

Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

Yes

No

Please explain:

Incentives

24a. Prior to the study, was a letter sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

A \$2.00 bill was included with the advance letter as an incentive.

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

For the Pre-Election wave, households were sent advance mailings by first class mail in a stamped 9.5 by 13.5 inch padded manila envelope, with a signed letter and brochure enclosed. A respondent incentive of \$25 per interview was initially offered to all cases, payable in cash immediately upon completion of the survey interview. The case incentive was increased to \$50 beginning October 7, 2008. The incentive increase was announced in a letter sent to all respondents not yet interviewed or scheduled with an interview appointment.

For the Post-Election wave, respondents received an advance signed letter by first class mail in a stamped 9.5 by 13.5 inch padded manila envelope. As an incentive for their post-election interview, respondents were offered the same dollar amount that they received for the pre-election survey. Beginning December 4, 2008, all respondents who were not already offered a \$50 Post-election incentive and who were still refusing to complete the survey were offered an increased incentive of \$50. A letter was sent to these respondents, announced the increase.

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

87% of interviews were conducted by female interviewers. 85% of interviewers had a college level education. 83% of interviews were conducted by a white interviewer, 95% of those were non-hispanic. Interviewer years of experience ranged from just months to over 11 years experience.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Interviewers were all trained and competent in General Interviewing Techniques (GIT) and received additional study-specific training.

Prior to the pre-election study, all interviewers completed a 2-day training session. New hires received training as a group on General Interviewing Techniques (GIT). All interviewers had to pass a certification test using the pre-election survey before they were allowed to begin interviewing.

Prior to the post-election study, all interviewers received a CD with post-election specific training. All interviewers had to pass a certification test

Contacts

27a. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample?

13

27b. For households where contact was made, what was the average number of contact attempts prior to first contact?

3

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample**?

Unlimited

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview**?

Unlimited

28e. During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

Respondents could be contacted throughout

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers were instructed to vary the re-contact attempts from late morning to early evening.

Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

Please describe:

Interviewers were trained in refusal conversion techniques.

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter or letters.)

If yes, please describe:

Eligible respondents were sent a customized letter (hand-signed, on RTI letterhead) that was intended to address their specific concern.

29c. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, how much?

As described previously, toward the end of the pre-election field period, sample lines eligible to be interviewed were offered an increased incentive of \$50 for their interview. This group includes respondents who were reluctant to take part. Respondents that received \$50 for their pre-election interview were then subsequently offered \$50 again for their post-election interview.

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

Yes

No

29e. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondents to be interviewed?

There was no rule in place concerning a maximum number of re-contacts.

29f. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interview/Survey Verification

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

30. Was interview/survey verification used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe the method(s) used:

A field supervisor would contact respondents and ask if 4 or 5 questions from the survey to see if those questions were familiar to the respondent. Audio transcripts were also used for verification purposes.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 10 %

Response Rate

31. What was the response rate of the survey that the CSES Module appeared in? Please show your calculations. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the response rate of the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

59.5% is what AAPOR calls Response Rate 1 (RR1) for the survey, which is the minimum response rate. It is referred to as the "minimum" because it assumes that in all households at which the eligibility of residents was not determined, at least one eligible adult lived there. AAPOR Response Rate 3 (RR3) assumes that in households at which eligibility was not determined, the proportion of households containing an eligible adult was the same as that proportion among households at which eligibility was determined. That response rate is 63.7%. The maximum response rate, AAPOR's RR5, is 78.2% and is computed by assuming that no eligible adult lived in any of the households in which eligibility was not determined.

For the post-election survey, the minimum rate (AAPOR RR1) is 53.9 percent; the estimated rate (AAPOR RR3) is 57.7 percent; the maximum rate (AAPOR RR5) is 70.8 percent. The re-interview rate is 90.5.

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. Note: If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the statistics for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

A. Total number of households in sample: 5,032

B. Number of valid households: 2,970

C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	1,130
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	932
E. Number of completed interviews:	2,322
F. Number of partial interviews:	0
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	446
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	0
I. Other non-response:	202

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why:

If statistic D (number of households of unknown validity) has a value greater than zero (0), please estimate the proportion of households of unknown validity that are valid:

The sum of E+F+G+H+I should equal the value of B. If not, please describe why:

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:

Selected respondent cannot speak English or Spanish	5
No Spanish-speaking interviewer available	8
Selected respondent physically/mentally incapable	52
Selected respondent never available	127
Other nonresponse without refusal	10

33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

Only one wave (pre-election) was conducted prior to the wave (post-election) that included the CSES Module.

34. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, what was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

Of the 2,323 respondents to the pre-election interview, 2,102 completed the post-election interview, for a reinterview rate of 90.5 percent. 221 respondents complete the second wave. The data collection firm did not deliver disposition records for the post-election interview, so we are unable to compute post-election contact, cooperation, or refusal rates.

35. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module:
2,322 pre-election; 2,102 post-election

36. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the following statistics for panel attrition by age and education. In each cell, indicate the percent of all completed interviews in each category for the indicated wave.

Age	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	%	%
26-40	%	%
41-64	%	%
65 and over	%	%

Education	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	%	%
Incomplete primary	%	%
Primary completed	%	%
Incomplete secondary	%	%
Secondary completed	%	%
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	%	%
University incomplete	%	%
University degree	%	%

This analysis was not done. We expected little difference between pre and post.

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

37. Are weights necessary to make the sample representative of the population being studied?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Weights account for the sampling design and match population benchmark for selected variables. ANES data are based on complex sample designs and must be weighted to adjust for the sample design in order to generalize to the population. Weights for such analysis must adjust for unequal probability of household selection and for respondent selection within households. Additionally, the weights take into account nonresponse adjustment and post-stratification raking when needed to match known population benchmarks.

38. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were constructed:

The construction of the weights was a very detailed process. The entire report on the process can be found at <http://electionstudies.org/resources/papers/nes012427.pdf>
DeBell, Matthew and Jon A. Krosnick. 2009. *Computing Weights for American National Election Study Survey Data*, ANES Technical Report Series, No. nes012427.

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Please see the report mentioned above

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Please see the report mentioned above

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Please see the report mentioned above

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):

The following table is from the report :

DeBell, Matthew, and Jonathan Cowden. 2010. *Benchmark Report for the 2008 American National Election Studies Time Series and Panel Study*, ANES Technical Report Series, No. nes012493.

<http://electionstudies.org/resources/papers/nes012493.pdf>

Table 1. Percentage distribution of selected characteristics in 2008 ANES Time Series survey compared to population benchmarks: 2008 post-election survey

Characteristic	Benchmark	Time Series Post-election					
		Unweighted		Weighted (base weight)		Weighted (poststratified)	
		Percent	Difference from benchmark	Percent	Difference from benchmark	Percent	Difference from benchmark
Age							
18-29	21.3	17.6	-3.7	15.6	-5.7 ***	20.9	-0.4
30-39	16.4	18.9	2.5	18.5	2.1 *	16.6	0.2
40-49	19.3	18.7	-0.6	18.1	-1.2	19.4	0.1
50-59	18.3	20.1	1.8	20.5	2.2	18.6	0.3
60-69	12.6	13.6	1.0	14.5	1.9	12.1	-0.5
70 or older	12.2	11.0	-1.2	12.8	0.6	12.4	0.2
Sex							
Male	48.0	43.0	-5.0	44.2	-3.8 **	44.9	-3.1 *
Female	52.0	57.0	5.0	55.8	3.8 **	55.1	3.1 *
Race/ethnicity							
White	83.4	53.6	-29.8	73.5	-9.9 ***	76.5	-6.9 **
Black	12.5	25.4	12.9	16.1	3.6	12.4	-0.1
Asian	3.7	2.1	-1.6	2.7	-1.0	3.0	-0.7
Native American	1.8	1.7	-0.1	2.0	0.2	1.8	0.0
Hispanic	9.5	20.6	11.1	8.7	-0.8	9.5	0.0
Other	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.3
Educational attainment							
Less than high school credential	11.2	14.2	3.0	11.1	-0.1	11.8	0.6
High school diploma/equiv.	31.7	32.7	1.0	32.5	0.8	31.4	-0.3
Some college	29.6	31.4	1.8	31.7	2.1	28.8	-0.8
Bachelor's degree	18.5	15.2	-3.3	16.5	-2.0	19.0	0.5
Graduate degree	9.0	6.5	-2.5	8.1	-0.9	9.0	0.0
Home tenure							
Own	74.4	62.4	-12.0	65.3	-9.1 ***	66.8	-7.6 **
Rent	24.3	36.0	11.7	33.2	8.9 ***	31.6	7.3 **
Other	1.2	1.6	0.4	1.5	0.3	1.6	0.4
Household size							
1 person	15.2	27.7	12.5	29.9	14.7 ***	20.5	5.3 ***
2 people	35.0	32.4	-2.6	34.5	-0.5	37.7	2.7
3 people	19.1	15.3	-3.8	14.1	-5.0 ***	15.7	-3.4 ***
4 people	17.1	12.7	-4.4	11.6	-5.5 ***	14.1	-3.0 **
5 people	8.2	6.8	-1.4	5.9	-2.3 **	7.0	-1.2
6 people	3.1	3.1	0.0	2.6	-0.5	3.3	0.2
7 or more	2.2	2.1	-0.1	1.4	-0.8 **	1.7	-0.5
Marital status							
Married	55.1	43.0	-12.1	45.2	-9.9 ***	50.8	-4.3 *
Separated	2.0	4.4	2.4	3.3	1.3 **	2.9	0.9 *
Divorced	10.7	16.2	5.5	16.1	5.4 ***	12.9	2.2 *
Widowed	6.6	9.4	2.8	10.4	3.8 ***	7.8	1.2
Never married	25.6	26.9	1.3	25.0	-0.6	25.6	0.0
Household income, annual							
\$14,999 or less	8.9	19.5	10.6	16.8	7.9 ***	14.8	5.9 ***
\$15,000-\$29,999	13.6	19.0	5.4	17.5	3.9 **	16.3	2.7
\$30,000-\$49,999	18.0	22.1	4.1	21.1	3.1 **	20.3	2.3
\$50,000-\$74,999	19.2	17.1	-2.1	18.5	-0.7	19.3	0.1
\$75,000-\$99,999	14.4	9.7	-4.7	10.8	-3.6 ***	11.8	-2.6 *
\$100,000 or more	26.1	12.6	-13.5	15.3	-10.8 ***	17.4	-8.7 ***
Presidential vote choice							
Obama	52.9	65.5	12.6	55.9	3.0	53.8	0.9
McCain	45.7	32.9	-12.8	42.0	-3.7	44.2	-1.5
Other	1.4	1.6	0.2	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.6
Turnout							
Voted	62.3	76.3	14.0	78.0	15.7 ***	77.4	15.1 ***
Did not vote	37.7	23.7	-14.0	22.0	-15.7 ***	22.6	-15.1 ***

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Notes: Turnout is the total ballots counted divided by the voting eligible population. This differs from turnout rates based on the voting age population or the total ballots cast for president. Race/ethnicity categories are indicator variables. Respondents may identify with more than one race/ethnicity, so race/ethnicity percentages do not sum to 100 percent. n = 2,102.

Sources: Vote choice data compiled by Federal Election Commission, available at <http://www.fec.gov/pubrec/fe2008/2008presgeresults.pdf>. Turnout: United States Elections Project estimates at http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2008G.html. Income and home tenure benchmarks: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2008. Other benchmarks: CPS, November 2008. ANES estimates: 2008 Time Series, post-election data.

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Completed Interviews</u>	
		<u>Unweighted Distribution</u>	<u>Weighted Distribution</u>
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	%	%	%
26-40	%	%	%
41-64	%	%	%
65 and over	%	%	%
<u>Education</u>			
None	%	%	%
Incomplete Primary	%	%	%
Primary Completed	%	%	%
Incomplete Secondary	%	%	%
Secondary Completed	%	%	%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	%	%	%
University Incomplete	%	%	%
University Degree	%	%	%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	%	%	%
Female	%	%	%

42. Please indicate the source of the population estimates in the prior question. English language sources are especially helpful. Include website links or contact information if applicable.

Sources:

Vote choice data compiled by Federal Election Commission, available at <http://www.fec.gov/pubrec/fe2008/2008presgeresults.pdf>.

Turnout:

United States Elections Project estimates at http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2008G.html

Income and home tenure benchmarks: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2008.

Other benchmarks: CPS, November 2008. ANES estimates: 2008 Time Series, post-election data.