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Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:
   [ ] Post-Election Study
   [X ] 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:
   [X ] In person, face-to-face
   [ ] Telephone
   [ ] Mail or self-completion supplement
   [ ] Internet

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?
   [X ] 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
   [X ] 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
   [X ] 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
   [X ] No
   [ ] Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] 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?
   [X ] 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?
   [X ] Yes
   [ ] No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?
   [ ] Yes
   [X ] 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?
   [ X] 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?
   [ X] 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?
   [ X] 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
   [X ] 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?
   [X ] 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?
   [X ] 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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
<th>Stratification</th>
<th>Type of Selection</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Stage: Counties</strong></td>
<td>All Counties in the 48 coterminous states and DC</td>
<td>Eight Largest MSAs(^a) and remaining Counties</td>
<td>Eight largest MSAs: Counties selected with certainty Other Counties: Probabilities proportional to size measures</td>
<td>Eight Largest MSAs: All Counties Other Counties: Approximately 64 Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Stage: Census Tracts (CTs)</strong></td>
<td>All CTs in selected counties</td>
<td>Eight Largest MSAs and remainder of the country</td>
<td>Probabilities proportional to size measures</td>
<td>Eight Largest MSAs: Approximately 32 CTs (proportionally allocated to each MSA) Other Counties: Approximately 128 CTs (2 per County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Stage: Census Block Groups (CBGs)</strong></td>
<td>CBGs with locatable mailing addresses(^c) in selected CTs</td>
<td>Implicitly sorted by CBG number</td>
<td>Probabilities proportional to size measures</td>
<td>320 CBGs (2 per CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Stage: Locatable Mailing Addresses</strong></td>
<td>All locatable residential mailing addresses in selected CBGs</td>
<td>Implicitly sorted by delivery sequence number</td>
<td>Systematic sampling within each CBG</td>
<td>4,598 locatable mailing addresses(^d) (average of 14.4 per CBG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Screening Results</strong></td>
<td>Occupied HUs(^e) 4,230 HHs (92%) Screened(^e) 3,723 HHs (88%) Eligible(^f) 3,415 HHs (92%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Stage: Eligible Persons</strong></td>
<td>Roster of eligible persons in screened and eligible HHs</td>
<td>Latino, African American, and Other R/E</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Study of Electoral Systems
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>3,088 eligible persons (zero or one per HH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Pre-Election (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos:</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other R/E:</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Dallas, Miami, Houston, and Washington.
- The average Census Block Group contains about 550 households.
- The frame will exclude approximately two percent of HHs in CBGs with unlocatable addresses.
- Does not include addresses included with the CHUM procedure.
- Occupancy and screening rates based on prior survey experience.
- 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?
   [X ] 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
   [X] No

   If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?
   [ ] Yes
   [ X] 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.

[X] 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  
[X ] No

If yes, please describe:

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

[ ] Yes  
[X ] No

If yes, please describe:

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

[X] Non-residential sample point  
[X] All members of household are ineligible  
[X] Housing unit is vacant  
[ ] No answer at housing unit after _______ callbacks  
[X ] Other (Please explain): Non-spanish/non-english speakers

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

[ ] Yes  
[X ] 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?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

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

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?
[X] 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
[X] 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.)
[X] 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
   [X ] 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**?
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?
   [ X] 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?
   [ X] 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?
   [X ] 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?
   [X ] 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?
   [ X] 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
[X ] 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?
   [X ] 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of completed interviews:</th>
<th>2,322</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Number of partial interviews:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Number of refusals and break-offs:</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Number non-contact (never contacted):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Other non-response:</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent cannot speak English or Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Spanish-speaking interviewer available</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent physically/mentally incapable</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent never available</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonresponse without refusal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete secondary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational</td>
<td>% &amp;</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University incomplete</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 populated being studied?
   [ X] 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?
   [ X] 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

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?
   [ X] 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?
   [X ] 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?
   [X ] 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
   [ X] 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:
http://electionstudies.org/resources/papers/nes012493.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted (base weight)</th>
<th>Weighted (poststrat)</th>
<th>Percent difference from benchmark</th>
<th>Percent difference from benchmark</th>
<th>Percent difference from benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-29</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>-5.7 **</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.1 **</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 or older</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>-3.8 **</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>-3.5 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>3.8 **</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>3.3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>-29.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>-9.9 ***</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>-6.9 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school credential</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/eqvl.</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>-9.1 ***</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>-7.6 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>8.9 ***</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>7.3 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>14.7 ***</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>5.3 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>-5.0 ***</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-3.4 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>-5.5 ***</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>-3.0 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 people</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-2.3 ***</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 people</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.8 **</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>-12.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>-9.3 ***</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>-4.2 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3 **</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.9 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.4 ***</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.2 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8 ***</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income, annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,999 or less</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.9 ***</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.9 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$29,999</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.9 ***</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$49,999</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3.1 **</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-3.5 ***</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-2.6 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-10.8 ***</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-8.7 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential vote choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCain</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>15.7 ***</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>15.7 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout rate</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-10.7 ***</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-9.9 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 = 2,192.

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

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:

Turnout:
