

# 2008 Survey of the Performance of American Elections

November 2007

Final Report

## 1. Introduction and background

This report describes the results of a November 2007 study that is the first major step leading to a nationwide survey in November 2008 to examine the experience of voters with the performance of the U.S. electoral system.<sup>1</sup> The present study surveyed 1,500 respondents in Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi about their voting experiences in those states' recent gubernatorial elections. The purpose was two-fold — first, to gain general experience with asking a battery of questions concerning the electoral system across a set of states and, second, to pre-test questions that will ultimately appear on the November 2008 nationwide survey.

The main substantive results from the November 2007 study may be summarized as follows:

1. Voters overall were satisfied with all aspects of the voting experience.
2. While there were performance differences across the three states on some of the performance measures, they tended to be small. There was no systematic evidence that any one state's elections were run substantially better than another's.
3. Non-whites reported less satisfaction with their voting experience than whites on many performance measures — it was more difficult finding the polling place, there were more problems with voter registration, lines were longer, the polling place was run less well, and poll workers were less helpful. Non-whites received more help voting than whites. Non-whites were less confident their votes were counted as cast than were whites. Some of these racial differences were state-specific, while others were not.
4. Many more voters report being required to show picture identification in Mississippi and Kentucky than is required by law. Whites and non-whites were asked for picture identification at equal rates.

---

<sup>1</sup> The investigators associated with this study were Michael Alvarez (Caltech), Stephen Ansolabehere (MIT), Adam Berinsky (MIT), Thad Hall (Utah), Gabriel Lenz (MIT), and Charles Stewart III (MIT). Please direct all correspondence to Charles Stewart III, Department of Political Science, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139 (cstewart@mit.edu).

The main results related to sampling and the questionnaire may be summarized as follows:

1. Based on a scan of previous studies about the election system, we identified previously asked questions to administer in November 2007. The only exception was the lack of a previous question that probed the general performance of voting technologies, which had to be constructed for this study.
2. Respondents to the November 2007 survey were more likely (by a factor of two) to turn out and vote than registered voters in the states surveyed. We will explore this over-reporting of turnout with the survey firm.
3. Respondents were slightly more likely to vote Republican, compared to the actual election returns.
4. Survey respondents report a significantly higher turnout rate than actually obtained in the three states studied; respondents were somewhat more likely to support Republican candidates for governor than the population state electorates.
5. Mode of survey (Internet vs. telephone) did not affect the over-reporting of turnout; the Internet mode yielded a closer estimate of the actual gubernatorial results in the three states than the telephone mode.
6. The questions asked on the survey appeared to perform well, though they did not reveal many differences between states or consistent differences across demographic groups. The one question we are concerned about is the last one, which was about the confidence the voter has that his/her vote will be counted as cast. We will add an open-ended follow-up probe to the February 2008 survey to explore this question further.
7. The disparity between state/federal laws concerning the showing of photo identification and the actual experience of voters prompts us to consider adding questions to the February 2008 survey to further explore answers to this question.
8. It remains to be seen whether the generally positive results and few inter-state differences will continue as we move to administer questions in higher-turnout elections, such as the Super Tuesday primaries and the presidential election.

## 2. Sampling

The current study focused on the three states that held gubernatorial elections in fall 2007, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi.<sup>2</sup> Because one of the major goals of the two pilots

---

<sup>2</sup> Kentucky and Mississippi held their elections on November 7. Under Louisiana's unique electoral regime, it held a gubernatorial primary on October 20. In that election, Bobby Jindal received a majority of votes cast, and therefore was declared the winner of the gubernatorial election. Had no one received a majority, a runoff would have been held on November 17. In the spring of 2007, when we were planning this study, we had assumed that no one would receive a majority of votes cast in the primary, and that therefore we would have polled immediately after the November 17 gubernatorial election. Instead, Jindal surged in the days leading up to the primary, requiring us to put the survey in the field earlier than we had originally planned.

(November 2007 and February 2008) is to understand what difference survey mode makes in the administration of this sort of survey, we conducted surveys using both a Web-based interface and a telephone mode.

Sample sizes for each state were 500 each. For each state, this was divided evenly, 250 by Internet and 250 by phone. This produced a final data set that consisted of 750 respondents in the Web survey and 750 respondents in the telephone survey.

We contracted with YouGov/Polimetrix to manage the survey implementation. They interviewed 1,338 respondents in the Web portion, who were then matched down to a sample of 750 to produce the final dataset. The respondents were matched on gender, age, race, education and party ID. For the telephone component of this survey, YouGov/Polimetrix interviewed 750 respondents who were selected at random from the Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi registered voter lists. Respondents were asked for by name in the telephone survey.

For each state and each survey mode, YouGov/Polimetrix then weighted the matched set of survey respondents to known marginals for the registered voter population in these states, as determined by the 2006 Current Population Survey Voter Supplement. We show those marginals in Table 1.

[Table 1]

YouGov/Polimetrix will deliver a data set with the validated vote, once those data become available. We anticipate receiving the validated vote data in May 2008.

### **3. Questionnaire**

Prior to preparing the questionnaire, we reviewed the existing set of public opinion surveys that have already been conducted about the election system and voting technology. (Members of the

research team were involved in most of these prior studies.) We have compiled those prior questions, reporting them in Appendix 1.

As we discussed in the original proposal for this study, one can think of the act of voting as a “chain” of actions, with each individual action constituting a link in the chain. These links run from intending to vote to the actual counting of ballots. Breaking the chain at any point will result in the negation of a voter’s intended vote. Because we seek to create a battery of questions that can probe the quality of the entire chain efficiently, our goal is to settle on a single question that can be associated with each link in the chain.

We have organized the catalogue of previously asked questions in Appendix 1 by the steps in the voting chain. Most links in the chain already had solid questions associated with them, and we chose to use those questions in the current study. A general question concerning the performance of voting technology had not been asked before, so we constructed a new question to address voting technology generally. (This new question also had an open-ended probe in the present study, to harvest details about the problems, when voters encountered them.)

At the same time, a great number of different questions have been asked in past studies to assess how well the polling place was managed. In the end, we decided to ask about polling place operations in two ways, randomly alternating between the two.

The first way of asking the question was the following:

How well were things run at the polling station on Election Day where you voted?  
<Very Well - there were no problems and any lines moved quickly>  
<Pretty Well - there were minor problems or short lines>  
<Okay - there were some problems or average lines>  
<Not well - Lines were slow and the pollworkers were having difficulties>  
<Terrible - There were serious problems with voting machines, registration or very long and slow lines>

The second question wording was the following:

Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted.

<excellent>

<good>

<fair>

<poor>

We discuss the performance of these two questions toward the end of this report

The following table summarizes the questions related to the voting process that ended up on the questionnaire. In addition, we included a standard battery of questions to ascertain income, education, party identification, length of time living in the current residence, gender, age, and county of residence. We also asked respondents how they voted in the gubernatorial contests.

Step	Question
Intention to vote	Q1a. [Asked in Kentucky and Mississippi] Did you vote in the election held on November 6, 2007?<yes><no><don't know>  Q1b. [Asked in Louisiana] Did you vote in the Louisiana gubernatorial general election, held on October 20, 2007?<yes><no><don't know>
Method of voting	Q2. Did you vote in person on Election Day at a precinct, in person before Election Day, or by mail (that is, absentee)?<in person on Election Day (at polling booth or precinct)><in person before Election Day><voted absentee><don't know> <did not vote>
Difficulties finding precinct/getting mail ballot	Q3. [If Q2 = "in person, on Election Day"] How difficult was it to find your polling place on Election Day?<very difficult> <somewhat difficult> <easy>  Q4a. [If Q2 = "On Election Day, in a polling place" or "in person before Election Day"] Was there a problem with your voter registration when you tried to vote? <no> <yes (please specify what problem, or problems, you had)> <don't know>  Q4b. [If Q2 = "voted absentee"] Were there any problems getting your absentee ballot? <no> <yes (Please specify what problem, or problems, you had)> <don't know>
Registration difficulties	Q4a. [If Q2 = "On Election Day, in a polling place" or "in person before Election Day"] Was there a problem with your voter registration when you tried to vote? <no> <yes (please specify what problem, or problems, you had)> <don't know>

Step	Question
Waiting in line	Q5. [If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] Approximately, how long did you have to wait in line to vote? <not at all> <less than 10 minutes> <10-30 minutes> <31minutes – 1 hour> <more than 1 hour (please specify how long)> <don’t know>
Showing identification	Q6. [If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] Were you asked to show picture identification, such as a driver's license, at the polling place this November? <yes> <no> <don’t know>
Using voting equipment	Q7. Did you encounter any problems with the voting equipment or the ballot that may have interfered with your ability to cast your vote as intended? <no> <yes (please specify what problem, or problems, you had)> <don’t know> <did not vote>  Q8. Did you receive help in filling out your ballot? <yes> <no> <don’t know> <did not vote>
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Q9a. [RANDOMLY ALTERNATED WITH Q4b. If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] How well were things run at the polling place where you voted? <very well – there were no problems and any lines moved quickly> <pretty well – there were minor problems or short lines> <okay – there were some problems or average lines> <not well – lines were slow and the poll workers were having difficulties> <terrible – there were serious problems with voting machines, registration, or very long and slow lines> <don’t know>  Q9b. [RANDOMLY ALTERNATED WITH Q4a. If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted. <excellent> <good> <fair> <poor>
Summary judgment of voting integrity	Q11. How confident are you that your vote for governor in the November 2007 election was counted as you intended? <very confident> <somewhat confident> <not too confident> <not at all confident> <don’t know> <did not vote>

Samantha Luks, the YouGov/Polimetrix project manager, listened in on selected interviews for the telephone portion of the study. She reported that as a general matter, respondents tended not to need the questions repeated, and answered immediately. The one exception was the final summary judgment question, “How confident are you that your vote for governor in the November 2007 election was counted as you intended?” Because of this feedback, we intend to probe answers to this question in the February 2008 study.

#### 4. Comparison of sample with known quantities

The first task to undertake in examining the results from the survey is to compare the results of the survey with known quantities in the population. In this case, there are two questions that correspond with quantities that were known after the election was conducted — (1) the question that asked whether the respondent voted and (2) the question(s) asking about vote for governor.

All of the respondents who were initially contacted were known to be registered voters. Therefore, the percent of respondents who reported voting should correspond with actual turnout in the 2007 gubernatorial races. As we report in Table 2, turnout estimated in the survey was substantially greater than actual turnout, by roughly a factor of two. While respondents generally over-report whether they actually voted on public opinion surveys, this level of over-reporting seems to be on the high side. A good comparison is the 2006 Voting and Registration Supplement (VRS) to the Current Population Survey, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. In that study, 69% of registered respondents from Kentucky reported that they had voted in the 2006 general election, whereas state election statistics only indicated a turnout rate of 50% among registered voters.<sup>3</sup>

[Table 2]

This over-reporting of turnout is an issue we will explore further with YouGov/Polimetrix and monitor in the February 2008 study.

Whereas the turnout rate was significantly over-reported in our survey, the marginals for the gubernatorial races were much closer to the actual results. (See Table 3.) Still the gubernatorial results in the survey were significantly different from the known quantities. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Louisiana did not have a statewide election in 2006, so comparisons cannot be made with the 2006 VRS. Mississippi does not gather registration statistics centrally. So many Mississippi counties did not report their registration numbers in the Election Assistance Commission's 2006 Election Day Survey that we cannot even calculate registration figures for Mississippi by adding up the county reports.

discrepancies vary in magnitude. If we just confine ourselves to the winners, Steve Beshear's (D-KY) actual margin of 59% was 4% greater than the survey result; Bobby Jindal's (R-LA) actual margin of 64% was 10% less than the survey result; and Haley Barbour's (R-MS) 58% of the vote was 8% less than the survey result.

[Table 3]

Even with the small sample sizes, the results are beyond the traditional 95% "margin of error" that social scientists tend to use in surveys, particularly in Louisiana and Mississippi. In each of the three states, our respondents were more likely to support the Republican candidate than the official results would have predicted.

There is no obvious explanation for the Republican bias in the survey results, beyond bad luck, although this, too, is an issue we will explore with YouGov/Polimetrix. It is clear that the explanation does *not* rest with a "digital divide" answer, since the Internet responses tended to be less Republican than the phone responses. Indeed, the Internet-estimated gubernatorial results more closely matched the official election returns than the phone survey, which was based on random digit dialing from the voter lists.

These comparisons give us pause in interpreting the substantive results of the survey, at least until we receive the validated vote data back and can analyze what differences exist between the respondents who said they voted and did, versus those who said they voted but didn't. (And, of course, the validated vote will inform us about whether the sampling, in fact, yielded an over-abundance of actual voters.)



## 5. Report of results

We have reported all of the marginal frequencies from the survey in Appendix 3. We have reported the open-ended responses to a series of probes in Appendix 4. (The questions we asked for open-ended responses followed the questions about whether there were problems with voter registration, problems getting an absentee ballot, and problems with voting equipment.)

A more useful summary is contained in Table 4, where we report the state averages for all the election administration items. As a general matter, the voters in our survey reported a good experience on Election Day, with some variability across the states.

[Table 4]

### *Overall summary*

Overall, 97% of respondents found it “easy” to find their polling place on Election Day (or in early voting). Less than 1% had a problem with voter registration on Election Day, although 5% of those requesting an absentee ballot reported problems getting them. Only 1% of respondents waited more than 10 minutes to vote; 67% reported not waiting at all. Only 2% of respondents reported problems with their voting equipment. Almost 90% of respondents reported that their polling places were run “very well” and 72% rated the performance of poll workers as “excellent.” Over 76% of the respondents reported they were “very confident” that their votes were counted as intended, with another 18% reporting they were “confident.”

Although very few respondents from any state reported problems finding their polling place, a simple analysis-of-variance test reveals that the difference between Louisiana and the other two states is statistically significant.

It is quite possible that this difference is due to the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. For instance, if we confine ourselves to the counties that had 20 or more respondents in the survey,

respondents in Jefferson and Orleans Parishes reported the greatest difficulty finding their polling places. However, Katrina is not the entire story. For instance, Louisiana voters in Caddo Parish (Shreveport) also reported greater-than-average difficulty finding their polling places, even though Caddo Parish is in the northwest corner of the state. In addition, Gulf coast residents in Mississippi (Harrison and Jackson Counties) did not report especially great difficulties finding their polling places.

At the other end of the performance spectrum, Kentucky came out ahead of the other two states on the measures of how long voters had to wait in line and how well things were run at the polling place.

These questions — about registration problems, voting machine problems, etc. — are items in which there is a clear performance valance. That is, we can easily assume that it should be easy to find a polling place, that problems with voter registration should be few, that line should be short, etc. Two of the items reflected in Table 4 do not have a clear valance attached to them. One of those items is the question about receiving help filling out a ballot. Louisiana voters were less like to receive help than voters in the other states, but whether this is a positive, negative, or neutral difference awaits further research.

There are clear differences among demographic groups that help paint a picture of voters who receive help in casting their ballot. (See Table 5.) Some of these patterns are consistent with conventional wisdom about voter assistance, but other patterns are not. Non-white voters received help at twice the rate of white voters (6.3% vs. 11.3%);<sup>4</sup> absentee voters received help at a very low rate (1.2%), compared to those who voted in person, either on Election Day (7.6%) or at an early voting center (9.7%). Not surprisingly, respondents who reported problems with the

---

<sup>4</sup> The number of Hispanic and other racial groups in these three states was insufficiently large to allow us to distinguish among non-white group. The racial diversity in the Super Tuesday states will allow us to make finer distinctions in the next study.

voting equipment asked for help at a much higher rate (16.5%) than those who did not (7.4%). Low-income residents received help at a higher rate than high-income residents (10.3% for those with incomes below \$60,000, compared to 4.9% for those with incomes over \$60,000), and women received more help than men (9.7% vs. 5.1%). Respondents with either *no* college (8.5%) or post-graduate study (8.1%) received help at higher rates than those who went to college (6.3%). Finally, the youngest voters (9.5%, ages 18-44) and the oldest voters (9.4%, 65 and older) received more assistance than middle-aged voters (5.1% for those between 45 and 64).

[Table 5]

The second item that does not have a clear valence associated with it concerns needing to show picture identification. That is because different states have different identification requirements, so the most important answer, from the perspective of election administration, is whether election workers followed the particular law of the state. “Good” and “bad” answers will vary along with state laws.

Fortunately, each of the three states in this survey had different laws concerning the need to show identification at the polls. The extremes were anchored by Mississippi, which had the minimum HAVA requirement for some form of ID for first-time voters who registered by mail, and Louisiana, which required all voters to show a photo ID. Kentucky was in the middle by requiring identification, but not necessarily *photo* ID, of all voters.<sup>5</sup>

First, responses to the survey line up according to the stringency of the state identification requirement. Only 10% of Mississippi respondents reported needing to show a photo ID, compared to 67% of Kentucky respondents and 97% of Louisiana respondents.

Second, the estimates for Mississippi and Kentucky surely exceed what the relevant state laws require, since residents in neither state are required to show *photo* identification in order to

---

<sup>5</sup> These laws were taken from the election.org web site, last accessed January 11, 2008.

vote. It is possible, of course, that the respondents misunderstood the question, conflating all identification into the category of “picture ID.” Or, respondents may have, in fact, shown a picture ID when it was not required, since a drivers license would have been a convenient form of identification for most respondents, and they may have been unaware of the fine points of state and federal law.

Given the great public policy and legal interest in the question of voter identification, these sorts of questions are important to sort out in the future. Unfortunately, the limited scope of our study makes it impossible to probe the wide variety of issues associated with voter identification, either in the next pilot or in the November 2008 full study. We do plan to add some questions to the February 2008 administration that will help to hone our understanding of answers to this question.<sup>6</sup> These questions will include a follow-up, to see if the respondent was allowed to vote even if s/he did not show a photo ID, a question about whether the respondent was a first-time voter (since first-time voters are usually required to show some form of ID, because of HAVA), a question that probes whether a photo ID was shown because the precinct official *required* a photo ID or because it was simply convenient, and a question that asks whether the respondent has a drivers license. Asking questions such as these will help us to understand better whether the photo ID requirements are affecting the ability to vote and whether precinct officials are following the laws of their states.

#### *Comparison of results with 2006 CCES*

Three of the questions asked in this study were also asked in the 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES). Because the state-by-state sample sizes in the CCES

---

<sup>6</sup> We did some preliminary statistical analysis, trying to predict which types of voters were more likely to be asked for picture ID in these states. Being required to show a picture ID was not related to any demographics we measured. The one exception was that only in Mississippi, younger voters were more likely to be asked for a picture ID than older voters.

were comparable to the sample sizes in this study, it is useful to compare with study's results with those of the CCES.

Table 6 reports the comparison. Responses to the question about having to show picture ID were within sampling error across the two studies. Kentucky respondents reported significantly shorter lines in the November 2007 election than in 2006; respondents from the other states gave substantively similar responses across the two studies. Finally, respondents in all three states reported dramatically fewer registration problems in November 2007 than in November 2006. It is likely that this significant reduction in registration problems reflects the fact that the gubernatorial elections were lower-salience elections than the 2006 midterm in these states. In Kentucky, the one state in the current study that reports statewide registration figures and had a statewide election in 2006, turnout was certainly lower in 2007 (37.1%) than in 2006 (49.6%). This may also explain why voting lines were significantly shorter in Louisiana in 2007 than in 2006.

[Table 6]

#### *Differences across survey modes*

One goal of this and the February 2008 pilots is to understand what effect the survey mode has on the answers given in the survey. Table 7 helps to begin exploring these answers.

[Table 7]

Table 7 reports response differences in the answers to the core election-administration questions, by study mode. As a general matter, the response differences were either non-existent, or miniscule, between the Internet and the phone administrations. Web respondents waited slightly longer in line and phone respondents were slightly more likely to receive help in filling out ballots. While Web respondents showed a statistically significant tendency to have

registration problems, the statistical test can be thought of as an artifact of the miniscule variability in the item to begin with — *none* of the phone respondents had registration problems, so the 10 (weighted) Web respondents (out of 590 respondents total) who had problems look large by comparison.

#### *Non-response to items*

One of the purposes of this survey and the one in February 2008 is to examine the performance of a battery of questions in preparation for the November 2008 study. One indicator of the clarity of the questions is the non-response rate to each item.

Table 8 reports the non-response rate of the core election administration questions used in this study. Most of the items yielded precisely zero non-responses. There are four exceptions — the question about the method of voting, which two respondents skipped, the question about whether it was difficult to find the polling place, which five respondents skipped, the question about problems with the voting equipment, which two respondents skipped, and the final question about confidence in the vote being counted, which nine respondents skipped. Because these are very small numbers to begin with, we can discern no patterns in these non-responses.

[Table 8]

As we mentioned above, the last question was the only one that appeared to give the telephone respondents a difficult time, and it is the one that had the most missing values in the survey. This has led to us further discuss the purpose of this question, with the possibility we may ask a different question in the future. For the moment, we are planning to probe answers to this question in the February 2008 survey.

*Assessment of different ways of asking about poll worker performance*

We chose to ask respondents about how well their pollworkers performed their jobs in two ways. The first wording asked, “how well were things run at the polling station on Election Day where you voted?” The second asked, “please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted.” On the face of it, the questions orient the respondent in slightly different directions — the first question to a general assessment of competence, the second question to the more concrete behavior of individuals working the polls. The answer responses were also constructed differently. The first question gave five response categories that were associated with brief phrases — “very well – there were no problems and any lines moved quickly; pretty well – there were minor problems or short lines;” etc. The second question gave four response categories that were associated with a one-word answer — from “excellent” to “poor.”

Respondents chose the most positive response category of both question wordings at a very high rate — 89% responded “very well” to the first question and 72% chose “excellent” to the second question wording. These responses are of a similar magnitude to previous studies that have used these question wordings. For instance, 77% of respondents nationwide gave the “very well” response to the first question in the 2006 CCES (MIT Content). Confining ourselves to the 21 respondents in the 2006 CCES (MIT Content) who were from our three states, 95% gave the top response to this question.

Although answers to the two questions tended to cluster in the top category, it is clear from an analysis of the answers that the two questions were tapping different types of evaluations. This is made clear in a simple regression analysis, where we use answers to the two

questions as the dependent variables and use the others answers in the survey as independent variables. We report the results of these two regressions in Table 9.

[Table 9]

These results strongly suggest that answers to these two questions are tapping into different experiences that voters had in the election. The first, more general question was related to length of lines and whether the voter voted in person, before Election Day. The second question, which focused more on poll workers, was related to experiencing registration problems, voting equipment problems, and being nonwhite. The first question is also significantly explained by the large number of dummy variables that are inserted, one for each county, as part of the fixed effects estimation, which is not true of answers to the second question.

These results are too preliminary to make too much of. For instance, the signs on two of the significant variables — the coefficient associated with voting center for the first question and the coefficient associated with registration problems in the second question — seem to be in the wrong direction. (For instance, it is hard to imagine that things are run much worse in county offices before Election Day than in the precincts on Election Day.) The one result that does appear to be robust is the finding that nonwhites rated the performance of pollworkers lower than did white respondents.

At the moment, we do not have enough information to choose between these two questions if, in fact, they are measuring the same thing. Therefore, we may attempt to ask both questions of all respondents in the Super Tuesday study, to see where the answers diverge.



*Response differences by race*

A critical policy question that has animated much debate about the conduct of elections in recent years has been whether non-whites face voting obstacles that are not faced by whites. This could be either due to overt discrimination or, just as consequential, to differences such as income and the quality of public services provided in the community. Each of the three states included in this survey have above-average numbers of African Americans living in them, compared to the nation as a whole; therefore, they provide a good setting to begin exploring the extent of these differences.

In Table 10 we report differences in the average response rates between white and non-white respondents in our survey. (Because of the small number of Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and other minority groups, it is not possible to disaggregate racial categories any further in this analysis.) Most of the questions show statistically significant differences between whites and non-whites; all these differences point to non-whites having a less satisfactory voting experience than whites. The only questions that did not show racial differences concerned problems getting absentee ballots, showing picture IDs, and having problems with the voting equipment. Non-whites reported that it was more difficult finding the polling place; there were more problems with voter registration; lines were longer; the polling place was run less well; and poll workers were less helpful. Non-whites received more help voting than whites. Non-whites were less confident their votes were counted as cast than were whites. Some of these racial differences were state-specific, while others were not.

[Table 10]

We have designed this project primarily to document the quality of experiences, rather than to explain them comprehensively; therefore, we must be very careful in drawing

conclusions related to these differences. First, non-white respondents are, on average, lower-income and less well educated in these states than whites. Once we control for these factors using simple regression models, some of the differences persist,<sup>7</sup> while others are better explained by these demographic differences.<sup>8</sup>

Second, when inter-racial difference exist, closer examination reveals that in some cases, they exist in only one state, while in other states they are found in all. For instance, the difference between non-whites and whites in how hard it was to find the polling place on Election Day turns out to be entirely due to differences in Louisiana. In that state, 11% of non-whites said it was “somewhat difficult” or “very difficult” to find the polling place, compared to only 1.9% of whites who gave these responses. In Kentucky the percentages of non-whites and whites giving these responses were 2.5% and 2.6%, respectively; in Mississippi the percentages were 0.7% and 1.0%.

On the other hand, there were racial differences in how long non-whites waited to vote, compared to whites, in all three states. We estimate that non-whites waited in line to vote at least twice as long as whites in each state — 3.0 minutes *vs.* 1.4 in Kentucky, 6.8 minutes *vs.* 2.6 in Louisiana, and 5.8 minutes *vs.* 2.6 minutes in Mississippi.

It is beyond the scope of this project to examine in any depth what is behind the racial differences that we discovered in this survey, or are likely to discover in future administrations. That is because the differences are likely due to state and local administrative decisions that

---

<sup>7</sup> These are the questions where racial differences persist even after we control for education and income: encountering a registration problem; length of lines to vote; reporting that poll workers performed poorly; and having confidence that one’s ballot will be counted as cast.

<sup>8</sup> These are the questions where racial differences drop to statistical insignificance after controlling for education and income: difficulty finding the polling place; receiving help voting; and concluding that things were well-run at the polls.

result in better or worse voting experiences. This survey, however, can identify geographic areas in the various states where the greatest problems exist, allowing others to follow-up.

## **6. Conclusion**

Understanding how citizens encounter the election system, and how those experiences vary across states and localities, is an important topic to address in improving the electoral experience for voters. This study was the first attempt to ask a comprehensive set of questions to gauge the overall experience of voters, from the point of deciding to vote, to the point of casting a ballot. The questions were asked in the context of three medium-turnout races, and in this context, the survey did not encounter major problems. A more difficult test awaits Super Tuesday, when the states will be more varied, in terms of demographics and region, and when turnout will be higher and national attention will be greater.

We learned from this study that the questions pertaining to the voter ID issue need to be developed more, since responses to the current questions interact in complicated ways with national law, state law, local practice, and respondent recall.

The context of this study was also not especially conducive to discovering whether the differences between states are sufficiently large to be discerned through a study of this sort. Experiences were overwhelmingly positive in each of the three states, and so there was very little variance in performance to be explained in the first place. A better test will be the Super Tuesday primary, but even so, presidential primaries are so much unlike other elections, that we may not be able to discern great differences between states until the strains of the quadrennial general election are upon us.

Appendix 1. Election administration questions used in previous studies

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Intention to vote	Did you vote in the election held on [date]?	2006 CCES Common Content	These three questions were used in different modules in the 2006 CCES	Q1a/Q1b
Intention to vote	In any election, some people are not able to vote because they are sick or busy or have some other reason, and others do not want to vote. How about you? Did you vote in the election held on [date]	2006 CCES Common Content	These three questions were used in different modules in the 2006 CCES	
Intention to vote	In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have time. Which of the following statements best describes you? <1/> I did not vote (in the election this November) <2/> I thought about voting this time - but didn't <3/> I usually vote, but didn't this time <4/> I am sure I voted	2006 CCES Common Content	These three questions were used in different modules in the 2006 CCES	

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Method of voting	Did you vote in person on Election Day at a precinct, in person before Election Day, or by mail (that is, absentee or vote by mail)?	2006 CCES Common Content		Q2
Method of voting	Did you vote early, by absentee or on Election Day?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Method of voting	Thinking back to when you voted in the November 2004 election for president, did you physically go to your local precinct to vote, or did you cast your vote by mail using an absentee ballot, or did you use an "early voting" option, which is available in some states?	Alvarez-Hall omnibus surveys (Carnegie)		
Difficulties finding precinct/getting mail ballot	How difficult was it to find your polling place on Election Day?	None	New question for this study	Q3
Difficulties finding precinct/getting mail ballot	Were there any problems getting your absentee ballot?	None	New question for this study	Q4b
Difficulties finding precinct/getting mail ballot	Was your polling station or vote center easy to find?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Registration difficulties	Was there a problem with your voter registration when you tried to vote?	2006 CCES Common Content	Follow-up: Were you allowed to vote?	Q4a (asked without follow-up)
Waiting in line	Approximately how long did you wait in line to vote on Election Day? <1> Not at all <2> Less than 10 minutes <3> 10 to 30 minutes <4> 31 minutes to an hour <5> More than an hour (please specify how long)	2006 CCES Common Content		Q5
Waiting in line	Please rate the conditions of the polling place where you voted in the 2004 Election: Amount of time waiting in line	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Showing identification	Were you asked to show picture identification, such as a driver's license, at the polling place this November?	2006 CCES Common Content	Follow-up: Were you then allowed to vote?	Q6 (Asked without the follow-up)
Showing identification	What type of voter identification did you have to show?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Using voting equipment	Did you encounter any problems with the voting equipment or the ballot that may have interfered with your ability to cast your vote as intended?	None	New question for this study	Q7
Using voting equipment	Did you receive help in filling out your ballot?	None	New question for this study	Q8
Using voting equipment	Did you vote using a bubble paper ballot or a voter-assisted terminal?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Using voting equipment	Again, thinking back to when you voted in the November 2004 election for president; do you remember the type of voting machine you used to cast your ballot? Was it a [ROTATE]:	Alvarez-Hall omnibus surveys (Carnegie)		
Using voting equipment	How confusing did you find your ballot?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Using voting equipment	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. It took too long to vote with the ballot method I used.	2006 post election survey NM and CO		

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Using voting equipment	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. The voting equipment was easy to use.	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Using voting equipment	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. I felt comfortable using the equipment:	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Using voting equipment	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. Characters on the ballot were easy to read	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Using voting equipment	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. The wording on the ballot was easy to understand	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Using voting equipment	I enjoyed voting with the method I used.	2006 post election survey NM and CO		



Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Using voting equipment	How confident are you that the bubble paper ballot used to record votes will provide an accurate reflection of ALL THE VOTES?	2006 post election survey NM and Colorado		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How well were things run at the polling station on Election Day where you voted? <1/"Very well"> Very Well - there were no problems and any lines moved quickly <2/"Pretty well"> Pretty Well - there were minor problems or short lines <3/"Okay"> Okay - there were some problems or average lines <4/"Not well"> Not well - Lines were slow and the pollworkers were having difficulties <5/"Terrible"> Terrible - There were serious problems with voting machines, registration or very long and slow lines	2006 CCES MIT content		Q9a (rotated with question below)
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted.	None	New question for this study	Q9b (rotated with question above)

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please rate the conditions of the polling place where you voted in the 2004 Election: Ease of finding polling place	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please rate the conditions of the polling place where you voted in the 2004 Election: Convenience in parking	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please rate the conditions of the polling place where you voted in the 2004 Election: Helpfulness of posted information	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How helpful were the poll workers at your voting location?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Have you ever had any problems while voting?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please rate the conditions of the polling place where you voted in the 2004 Election: Job precinct poll-workers performed	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How would you rate your voting experience in this election compared to prior voting experiences?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Overall, how confusing did you find your voting experience?	2006 post election survey NM and CO		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How would you rate your overall voting experience?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How confident are you that your ballot in the November of 2004 presidential contest between George Bush and John Kerry was counted as you intended?	Alvarez-Hall omnibus surveys (Carnegie)		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How confident are you that YOUR VOTE in the November 2006 election will be counted as you intended?	Alvarez-Hall omnibus surveys (Carnegie)		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How confident are you that the current election process in your state produces election outcomes that reflect the will of the people?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How confident are you that the current election process in the United States produces election outcomes that reflect the will of the people?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		

Question category	Question wording	Previous use	Notes	Question no. in Nov. 2007 survey
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How satisfied were you with your voting experience in the 2006 fall election?	2006 post election survey NM and Colorado		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How confident are you that your ballot for president in the 2004 election was counted as you intended?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	Please indicate how much you DISAGREE or AGREE with the following statements about voting in the 2004 election. I am confident that my vote was accurately recorded:	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Overall quality of experience at the polling place	How would you rate your overall voting experience?	BYU Exit Poll and Voter Poll		
Demographics related to election process	Was this your first time voting, or have you voted in elections before?	2006 CCES MIT content		

## Appendix 2. Questionnaire

[Note: In addition to the following questions, respondents were given a standard battery of questions to ascertain income, education, party identification, length of time living in the current residence, gender, age, and county of residence.]

Q1a. [Asked in Kentucky and Mississippi] Did you vote in the election held on November 6, 2007?

<yes>  
<no>  
<don't know>

Q1b. [Asked in Louisiana] Did you vote in the Louisiana gubernatorial primary, held on October 20, 2007?

<yes>  
<no>  
<don't know>

Q2. Did you vote in person on Election Day at a precinct, in person before Election Day, or by mail (that is, absentee)?

<in person on Election Day (at polling booth or precinct)>  
<in person before Election Day>  
<voted absentee>  
<don't know>  
<did not vote>

Q3. [If Q2 = "in person, on Election Day"] How difficult was it to find your polling place on Election Day?

<very difficult>  
<somewhat difficult>  
<easy>

Q4a. [If Q2 = "On Election Day, in a polling place" or "in person before Election Day"] Was there a problem with your voter registration when you tried to vote?

<no>  
<yes (please specify what problem, or problems, you had)>

<don't know>

Q4b. [If Q2 = "voted absentee"] Were there any problems getting your absentee ballot?

<no>

<yes (Please specify what problem, or problems, you had)>

<don't know>

Q5. [If Q2 = "On Election Day, in a polling place" or "in person before Election Day"]  
Approximately, how long did you have to wait in line to vote?

<not at all>

<less than 10 minutes>

<10-30 minutes>

<31minutes – 1 hour>

<more than 1 hour (please specify how long)>

<don't know>

Q6. [If Q2 = "On Election Day, in a polling place" or "in person before Election Day"] Were you asked to show picture identification, such as a driver's license, at the polling place this November?

<yes>

<no>

<don't know>

Q7. Did you encounter any problems with the voting equipment or the ballot that may have interfered with your ability to cast your vote as intended?

<no>

<yes (please specify what problem, or problems, you had)>

<don't know>

<did not vote>

Q8. Did you receive help in filling out your ballot?

<yes>

<no>

<don't know>

<did not vote>

Q9a. [RANDOMLY ALTERNATED WITH Q4b. If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] How well were things run at the polling place where you voted?

- <very well – there were no problems and any lines moved quickly>
- <pretty well – there were minor problems or short lines>
- <okay – there were some problems or average lines>
- <not well – lines were slow and the poll workers were having difficulties>
- <terrible – there were serious problems with voting machines, registration, or very long and slow lines>
- <don't know>

Q9b. [RANDOMLY ALTERNATED WITH Q4a. If Q2 = “On Election Day, in a polling place” or “in person before Election Day”] Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted.

- <excellent>
- <good>
- <fair>
- <poor>

Q10. [If “yes” to Q1a or Q1b] Who did you vote for in the governor's race?

[Kentucky]	[Louisiana]	[Mississippi]
<Ernie Fletcher, Republican>	<Walter J. Boasso, Democrat>	<John A. Eaves, Jr., Democrat>
<Steven L. Beshear, Democrat>	<John Georges, No Party>	<Haley Barbour, Republican>
<Other> <Write in other>	<"Bobby" Jindal, Republican>	<Other> <Write in other>
<Did not vote for governor>	<Other> <Write in other>	<Did not vote for governor>
<don't know>	<Did not vote for governor>	<don't know>
	<don't know>	

Q11. How confident are you that your vote for governor in the November 2007 election was counted as you intended?

- <very confident>
- <somewhat confident>
- <not too confident>

<not at all confident>

<don't know>

<did not vote>



### Appendix 3. Marginal frequencies of dataset

**Name: Q1a**

**Description: Vote in general election**

Count	Code	Label
786	1	Yes
214	2	No
0	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
500	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q1b**

**Description: Vote in Louisiana primary**

Count	Code	Label
399	1	Yes
100	2	No
1	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
1000	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q2**

**Description: Method of voting**

Count	Code	Label
1090	1	In person on Election Day (at polling booth or precinct)
52	2	In person before Election Day
41	3	Voted absentee
0	4	Don't know
2	8	Skipped
315	9	Not Asked

**Name: Q3**

**Description: Difficulty finding polling place**

Count	Code	Label
5	1	Very difficult
24	2	Somewhat difficult
1056	3	Easy
5	8	Skipped
410	9	Not Asked

**Name: Q4a**

**Description: Problem with voter registration**

Count	Code	Label
1132	1	No
10	2	Yes
0	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
358	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q4b**

**Description: Problem getting absentee ballot**

Count	Code	Label
-------	------	-------

39	1	No
1	2	Yes
1	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
1459	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q5****Description: Length of time in line**

Count	Code	Label
767	1	Not at all
301	2	Less than 10 minutes
61	3	10-30 minutes
10	4	31 minutes - 1 hour
3	5	More than 1 hour
1	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
358	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q6****Description: Need to show picture ID**

Count	Code	Label
693	1	Yes
445	2	No
4	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
358	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q7****Description: Problems with equipment**

Count	Code	Label
1160	1	No
20	2	Yes
2	8	Don't know
2	98	Skipped
315	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q8****Description: Help filling out ballot**

Count	Code	Label
89	1	Yes
1096	2	No
0	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped

**Name: Q9a****Description: How well were things run**

Count	Code	Label
517	1	Very well - There were no problems and any lines moved quick
42	2	Pretty well - There were minor problems or short lines
12	3	Okay - There were some problems or average lines
3	4	Not well - Lines were slow and the poll workers were having
1	5	Terrible - There were serious problems with voting machines,

3	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
922	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q9b****Description: Job performance of poll workers**

Count	Code	Label
402	1	Excellent
143	2	Good
9	3	Fair
5	4	Poor
4	8	Don't know
936	9	Not Asked

**Name: Q10ky****Description: Vote choice for governor - Kentucky**

Count	Code	Label
158	1	Ernie Fletcher, Republican
193	2	Steven L. Beshear, Democrat
1	5	Other
5	7	Did not vote for governor
2	8	Don't know
40	98	Skipped
1101	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q10la****Description: Vote choice for governor - Louisiana**

Count	Code	Label
40	1	Walter J. Boasso, Democrat
39	2	Foster Campbell, Democrat
46	3	John Georges, No Party
217	4	Bobby" Jindal, Republican
4	5	Other
1	7	Did not vote for governor
11	8	Don't know
42	98	Skipped
1101	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q10ms****Description: Vote choice for governor - Mississippi**

Count	Code	Label
124	1	John A. Eaves, Jr., Democrat
208	2	Haley Barbour, Republican
5	5	Other
3	7	Did not vote for governor
1	8	Don't know
47	98	Skipped
1113	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q11L****Description: Confidence that October Primary vote was counted**

Count	Code	Label
296	1	Very confident
71	2	Somewhat confident

13	3	Not too confident
7	4	Not at all confident
11	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
1101	99	Not Asked

**Name: Q11KM****Description: Confidence that November vote was counted**

Count	Code	Label
581	1	Very confident
140	2	Somewhat confident
27	3	Not too confident
13	4	Not at all confident
16	8	Don't know
0	98	Skipped
722	99	Not Asked

**Name: income****Description: Income**

Count	Code	Label
84	1	less than \$10,000
67	2	\$10,000 - \$14,999
84	3	\$15,000 - \$19,999
83	4	\$20,000 - \$24,999
96	5	\$25,000 - \$29,999
125	6	\$30,000 - \$39,999
116	7	\$40,000 - \$49,999
96	8	\$50,000 - \$59,999
122	9	\$60,000 - \$69,999
62	10	\$70,000 - \$79,999
100	11	\$80,000 - \$99,999
68	12	\$100,000 - \$119,999
38	13	\$120,000 - \$149,999
48	14	\$150,000 or more
290	15	Prefer not to say
22	98	Skipped
0	99	Not Asked

**Name: educ****Description: Education**

Count	Code	Label
117	1	No HS
582	2	High school graduate
275	3	Some college
137	4	2-year
215	5	4-year
129	6	Post-grad
0	8	Skipped
44	9	Refused

**Name: pid3****Description: Party ID - 3 pt**

Count	Code	Label
551	1	Democrat
530	2	Republican
268	3	Independent

61	4	Other
19	5	Not sure
0	8	Skipped
70	9	Refused

**Name: pid7****Description: Party ID - 7 pt**

Count	Code	Label
315	1	Strong Democrat
228	2	Not very strong Democrat
92	3	Lean Democrat
94	4	Independent
111	5	Lean Republican
191	6	Not very strong Republican
333	7	Strong Republican
33	8	Other
0	9	Not Asked
34	98	Not sure
70	99	Refused

**Name: time\_years****Description: Time in current residence (months)**

Count	Code	Label
0	-9	Not Asked
18	-8	Skipped

**Name: time\_months****Description: Time in current residence (years)**

Count	Code	Label
0	-9	Not Asked
242	-8	Skipped

**Name: race****Description: Race**

Count	Code	Label
1103	1	White
297	2	Black
9	3	Hispanic
9	4	Asian
6	5	Native American
7	6	Mixed
15	7	Other
1	8	Middle Eastern
0	98	Skipped
53	99	Not Asked

**Name: gender**  
**Description: Gender**

Count	Code	Label
657	1	Male
813	2	Female
2	8	Skipped
28	9	Refused

**Name: birthyr**  
**Description: Year of birth**

Count	Code	Label
0	9998	Skipped
77	9999	Refused

**Name: stcntyfips**  
**Description: State and county FIPS code**

**Name: starttime**  
**Description: Interview Start Time**

**Name: endtime**  
**Description: Interview End Time**

Appendix 4. Verbatim responses to open-ended probes.

Q4a. Problem with voter registration. (6 of 7 providing reason)

- Needed to file change of address
- the people were very rude
- The people working tried to watch me vote
- the polling staff said that we had to sign the registrar exactly as the registrar said
- had name listed twice on voter rolls
- Had to verify address

Q4b. Problem getting absentee ballot (2 of 2 providing reason)

- didn't rec it and had to call
- The problem that I had was getting someone to tell us what information they need from us to receive the absentee ballot

Q7. Problems with voting equipment (16 of 16 describing problem)

- Only one electronic voting booth, no paper ballots available
- My wife had a problem with the electronic machine. They need to have a demo machine set up at the polling place so that elderly people can get familiar with the machines. Currently, it is difficult for some seniors to vote intelligently with these machines
- when i selected a name it would jump back to another name and I would have to do it over again
- New touch screen design, was not familiar with it
- The procedure for changing your vote was a little difficult. ie, If you had voted or marked one space but then wanted to vote for some one else that was difficult It make voting stright party the only option.
- No receipt/confirmation that the vote computer accurately recorded my vote.
- New computers were not registering votes
- the ballots were confusing, demo/Rep/candidates were scrambled on the ballot
- My children wanted to vote and the childens polling machine was not set up.
- I went to vote straight republican and the light did not come on. I was very concerned that my vote did not count.
- I could not find any names on the ballot they were too small.
- They had inside an outside and it was confusing for me and they had tax propositions and I didnt know if i should vote for that and the luitenant governors race i didnt even see.
- They had a plastic film over it, and I had to hold it down to be able to see what it said.
- It was my fault because I should of checked what district i was in and i didnt so i put down the wrong district.
- electicity went out

- I had to get my card recoded. The machine said that my voting had been completed, but I had not done anything yet.



Table 1. Demographic marginals used for weighting.

<b>Kentucky</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>
Age	Age
18-34: 23.56%	18-34: 23.32%
35-54: 41.07%	35-54: 38.84%
55+: 35.37%	55+: 37.84%
Gender	Gender
Male: 46.88%	Male: 43.13%
Female: 53.12%	Female: 56.87%
Race	Race
White/Other: 93.75%	White/Other: 62.93%
Black: 5.61%	Black: 36.07%
Hispanic: 0.64%	Hispanic: 1.00%
Education	Education
HS or less: 49.36%	HS or less: 49.43%
Some College: 27.77%	Some College: 30.52%
College Graduate: 13.93%	College Graduate: 13.67%
Post-graduate: 8.95%	Post-graduate: 6.38%
<b>Louisiana</b>	
Age	
18-34: 22.44%	
35-54: 43.88%	
55+: 33.69%	
Gender	
Male: 45.05%	
Female: 54.95%	
Race	
White/Other: 71.30%	
Black: 27.16%	
Hispanic: 1.54%	
Education	
HS or less: 46.97%	
Some College: 29.24%	
College Graduate: 15.29%	
Post-graduate: 8.50%	

Table 2. Turnout as a percentage of registered voters.

State	Turnout reported in survey			Turnout reported by state (registered voters)
	Total (N)	Internet (N)	Phone (N)	
Kentucky	79.8% (500)	83.3% (250)	76.2% (250)	37.1% (1,055,325)
Louisiana	79.9% (500)	78.4% (250)	81.4% (250)	46.6% (1,317,870)
Mississippi	77.4% (500)	77.5% (250)	77.3% (250)	Not reported

## Sources of state data:

Kentucky: <http://elect.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/98D95280-38EE-45D7-837C-E1691D40A64A/134907/STATE1.txt>, accessed December 28, 2007

Louisiana:

[http://www400.sos.louisiana.gov/stats/Post\\_Election\\_Statistics/Statewide/2007\\_1020\\_sta.xls](http://www400.sos.louisiana.gov/stats/Post_Election_Statistics/Statewide/2007_1020_sta.xls), accessed December 28, 2007

Mississippi: State does not collect registration statistics

Table 3. Comparison of election results

## a. Kentucky

Candidate	Gubernatorial results in survey			Official results
	Total	Internet	Phone	
Steve Beshear (D)	54.9%	56.0%	53.4%	58.7%
Ernie Fletcher (R)	44.8%	43.6%	46.6%	41.3%
N	363	201	162	

State data source: <http://elect.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/98D95280-38EE-45D7-837C-E1691D40A64A/134907/STATE1.txt>, accessed December 28, 2007.

## b. Louisiana

Candidate	Gubernatorial results in survey			Official results
	Total	Internet	Phone	
Walter Boasso (D)	11.5%	14.2%	8.4%	17%
Foster Campbell (D)	11.2%	13.7%	8.4%	12%
John Georges (N)	12.4%	13.7%	10.8%	14%
Bobby Jindal (R)	63.8%	56.8%	71.7%	54%
N	356	190	166	

State data source:

<http://www400.sos.louisiana.gov:8090/cgi-bin/?rqstyp=elcms2&rqsda=102007>

## c. Mississippi

Candidate	Gubernatorial results in survey			Official results
	Total	Internet	Phone	
John A. Eaves (D)	32.3%	36.4%	27.3%	42.1%
Haley Barbour (R)	65.7%	60.6%	72.1%	57.9%
N	359	198	161	

State data source: <http://www.sos.state.ms.us/elections/2007/Statewide%20Results/Governor.pdf>

Table 4. Comparison of results across states. (Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations for non-binary variables.)

Questions	Overall mean	Means by state			<i>p</i> value of <i>F</i> -test of equality across states
		Kentucky	Louisiana	Mississippi	
Q3. Difficulty finding polling place (3 = easy; 1 = very difficult)	2.97 (0.20) (N=1,110)	2.97 (0.21) (N=382)	2.95 (0.25) (N=350)	2.99 (0.10) (N=378)	.01
Q4a. Problem with voter registration (pct. yes)	0.9% (N=1,175)	0.7% (N=401)	1.0% (N=386)	0.9% (N=388)	.94
Q4b. Problem getting absentee ballot (pct. yes)	2.6% (N=41)	0.0% (N=6)	5.7% (N=18)	0.0% (N=17)	.64
Q5. Length of time in line (1 = no time at all; 5 = more than 1 hour)	1.41 (0.66) (N=1,174)	1.26 (0.50) (N=401)	1.47 (0.73) (N=386)	1.51 (0.69) (N=387)	.00
Q6. Need to show picture ID (pct. yes)	60.9% (N=1,169)	67.6% (N=400)	98.8% (N=384)	14.3% (N=385)	.00
Q7. Problems with equipment (pct. yes)	1.7% (N=1,215)	1.2% (N=406)	2.6% (N=405)	1.4% (N=404)	.25
Q8. Help filling out ballot (pct. yes)	7.5% (N=1,220)	8.9% (N=408)	4.6% (N=406)	9.0% (N=406)	.02
Q9a. How well were things run (1 = very well; 5 = terrible)	1.14 (0.45) (N=572)	1.06 (0.29) (N=198)	1.22 (0.58) (N=188)	1.13 (0.43) (N=186)	.003
Q9b. Job performance of poll workers (1 = excellent; 4 = poor)	1.32 (0.55) (N=595)	1.26 (0.51) (N=201)	1.29 (0.50) (N=197)	1.39 (0.62) (N=197)	.03
Q11l/Q11km. Confidence that vote was counted (1 = very confident; 4 = not at all confident)*	1.31 (0.62) (1,185)	1.29 (0.58) (N=397)	1.31 (0.63) (N=393)	1.33 (0.67) (N=395)	.33

\*Combination of Q11l (Louisiana) and Q11km (Kentucky and Mississippi)

Table 5. Demographic variability in receiving assistance in casting ballot.

**State**

Kentucky, 8.9%  
Louisiana, 4.6%  
Mississippi, 9.0%

**Race**

White, 6.3%  
Non-white, 11.3%

**Where R voted**

In person, on Election Day, 7.6%  
In person, before Election Day, 9.7%  
Absentee, 1.2%

**Did R have problems with equipment?**

Yes, 16.5%  
No, 7.4%

**Income**

Less than \$60,000, 10.3%  
Greater than \$50,000, 4.9%

**Education**

No college, 8.5%  
College, 6.3%  
Post-graduate, 8.1%

**Sex**

Male, 5.1%  
Female, 9.7%

**Age**

18-44, 9.5%  
45-65, 5.1%  
66 and over, 9.4%

Table 6. Comparison of items with CCES

CCES question	Nov. '07 question #	Kentucky		Louisiana		Mississippi	
		CCES average	Nov. 2007 average	CCES average	Nov. 2007 average	CCES average	Nov. 2007 average
Asked to show picture identification (pct. yes)	Q6	72% (327)	68% (400)	96% (231)	99% (384)	18% (125)	14% (385)
Length of wait to vote (1-5 scale)	Q5	2.03 (315)	1.26 (401)	1.45 (220)	1.48 (386)	1.59 (116)	1.48 (388)
Problem with voter registration (pct. yes)	Q4a	3.0% (339)	0.7% (401)	5.2% (235)	1.0% (386)	5.1% (130)	0.9% (388)

\*Average is pct. of respondents answering "yes" to the item.

Table 7. Comparison of election administration items, by survey mode.

Question	Web average	Phone average	<i>p</i> value on difference in <i>t</i> -test
Q2. Method of voting			
In person, on election day	92.8%	91.5%	.91 ( <i>F</i> -test)
In person, before election day	3.1%	5.7%	
Absentee	4.0%	2.9%	
Q3. Difficulty finding polling place (3-point scale)	2.97	2.97	.93
Q4a. Problem with voter registration (pct. yes)	1.7%	0.0%	.001
Q4b. Problem getting absentee ballot (pct. yes)	3.0%	2.0%	.85
Q5. Length of time in line (5-point scale)	1.44	1.37	.097
Q6. Need to show picture ID (pct. yes)	61.8%	59.9%	.51
Q7. Problems with equipment (pct. yes)	1.9%	1.5%	.56
Q8. Help filling out ballot (pct. yes)	5.4%	9.6%	.005
Q9a. How well were things run (5-point scale)	1.18	1.10	.036
Q9b. Job performance of poll workers (4-point scale)	1.32	1.31	.83
Q11/Q11km. Confidence that vote (4-point scale)*	1.34	1.27	.06

\*Combination of Q111 (Louisiana) and Q11km (Kentucky and Mississippi)

Table 8. Non-response rates to election administration questions

Question	Non-responses (weighted)		Number of respondents asked question
	N	Pct.	
Q2. Method of voting	2	0.2%	1,220
Q3. Difficulty finding polling place	5	0.5%	1,116
Q4a. Problem with voter registration	0	0.0%	1,175
Q4b. Problem getting absentee ballot	0	0.0%	42
Q5. Length of time in line	0	0.0%	1,175
Q6. Need to show picture ID	0	0.0%	1,175
Q7. Problems with equipment	2	0.2%	1,217
Q8. Help filling out ballot	0	0.0%	1,217
Q9a. How well were things run	0	0.0%	575
Q9b. Job performance of poll workers	0	0.0%	575
Q11/km. Confidence that vote was counted	9	0.8%	1,083



Table 9. Regressions predicting answers to two questions concerning the performance of poll workers. (Standard errors in parentheses; fixed effects regression, clustering on county; **bold** coefficients significant at  $p < .05$ )

Variable	Question wording	
	How well were things run at the polling place where you voted? (5-point response)	Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at the polling place where you voted. (4-point response)
Did R experience a registration problem? (yes/no)	-0.059 (0.209)	<b>-0.69</b> <b>(0.33)</b>
How long did R wait in line to vote?	<b>0.040</b> <b>(0.004)</b>	-0.0046 (0.0048)
Did R experience a voting equipment problem? (yes/no)	0.10 (0.06)	<b>1.41</b> <b>(0.24)</b>
Did R vote in person before Election Day? (yes/no)	<b>-0.28</b> <b>(0.13)</b>	0.047 (0.13)
Got help voting? (yes/no)	0.044 (0.084)	-0.06 (0.12)
Party identification (7 = strong dem.; 1 = strong rep.)	-0.012 (0.009)	0.010 (0.013)
Nonwhite (yes/no)	-0.010 (0.058)	<b>0.23</b> <b>(0.09)</b>
Income (14-point scale)	-0.0065 (0.0052)	0.002 (0.007)
Education (6-point scale)	0.002 (0.014)	-0.031 (0.019)
Female (yes/no)	0.010 (0.039)	-0.01 (0.06)
Age (years)	0.0015 (0.0013)	-0.0006 (0.0020)
Intercept	1.13 (0.23)	2.03 (0.35)
County fixed effects	F(163,336) = 4.330	F(168,360) = 1.146
N	551	540
R <sup>2</sup>	.73	.45
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	.58	.18
Root MSE	.34	.51

Table 10. Comparisons by race.

Questions	Overall mean (N)	Mean by race		<i>p</i> value of <i>t</i> -test of equality between races
		White (N)	Non-white (N)	
Q3. Difficulty finding polling place (3 = easy; 1 = very difficult)	2.97 (0.20) (N=1,110)	2.94 (0.25) (N=904)	2.98 (0.18) (N=206)	.015
Q4a. Problem with voter registration (pct. yes)	0.9% (N=1,175)	0.5% (N=961)	2.0% (N=214)	.019
Q4b. Problem getting absentee ballot (pct. yes)	2.6% (N=41)	4.7% (N=24)	0.0% (N=17)	.36
Q5. Length of time in line (1 = no time at all; 5 = more than 1 hour)	1.41 (0.66) (N=1,174)	1.33 (0.56)	1.64 (0.87)	<.0001
Q6. Need to show picture ID (pct. yes)	60.9% (N=1,169)	61.1% (N=956)	60.3% (N=213)	.80
Q7. Problems with equipment (pct. yes)	1.7% (N=1,215)	1.9% (N=983)	1.1% (N=232)	.33
Q8. Help filling out ballot (pct. yes)	7.5% (N=1,220)	6.3% (N=987)	11.3% (N=233)	.01
Q9a. How well were things run (1 = very well; 5 = terrible)	1.14 (0.45) (N=572)	1.11 (0.44) (N=470)	1.21 (0.49) (N=102)	.03
Q9b. Job performance of poll workers (1 = excellent; 4 = poor)	1.32 (0.55) (N=595)	1.26 (0.53) (N=484)	1.48 (0.56) (N=111)	<.0001
Q11/Q11km. Confidence that vote was counted (1 = very confident; 4 = not at all confident)*	1.31 (0.62) (1,185)	1.23 (0.55) (N=970)	1.56 (0.77) (N=215)	<.0001