Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (CSDI)

Vanderbilt Poll Spring 2025
Methods Report

ssrs
redefining research

Table of Contents

Summary

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (CSDI) at Vanderbilt University regularly conducts public opinion polls of Tennessee registered voters to provide non-partisan, scientifically-based public opinion data. Each year, the Vanderbilt Poll conducts at least two statewide surveys, one prior to the start of the legislative season and one at its conclusion. These polls provide point-in-time data to find out what registered voters in Tennessee think about national, state, and local public policy issues.

The Tennessee Poll Spring 2025 implemented a hybrid design, splitting the sample into two mutually exclusive groups: [1] an all outbound phone design used in past waves and [2] a mixed mode mail-push-to-web design with multiple mode touchpoints (inbound and outbound phone, mail, email, and SMS).

A total of n=1,223 surveys were completed among a representative sample of registered voters, ages 18 or older, living in Tennessee. Table 1 below shows the breakdown of completed surveys by sample group and data collection mode. All surveys were conducted in English from April 17-April 27, 2025. Statistical results were weighted to correct known demographic discrepancies. The margin of sampling error for the complete set of weighted data is ± 3.5 percentage points.

Table 1: Completes by Sample and Mode

Sample	Mode	Total completes	Completes by Mode
Half Sample 1 (HS1)	Telephone (outbound only)	532	Landline: 145 Cell: 387
Half Sample 2 (HS2)	Telephone (inbound and outbound), web	691	Inbound: 0 Outbound: 54 SMS push to web: 154 Email: 64 Mail push to web: 419
Total		1,223	

This methods report details the sample design, data collection process, and weighting procedures for the Vanderbilt Poll.

Sample Design

The target population for this poll was Tennessee registered voters aged 18 or older. Registration-based sample (RBS) for the poll was generated from an updated state-level voter file purchased from L2[1] by SSRS. L2 is one of the major, non-partisan, national providers of voter list samples obtained from the states' election offices. The file contains voters' names and addresses, along with information on past voting, and demographics.

For HS1, the sampling frame was comprised of RBS records with a landline and/or cellular number attached. To improve population coverage for HS1, all cases without a phone number were sent to Dynata for a phone number append to increase the percentage of cases with a phone number, thereby increasing the likelihood of improved population coverage. For HS2, the sampling frame was comprised of RBS records with a landline, cell number, or address attached.

Sample Stratification

The sample was comprised of 219 strata, defined by the intersection of the variables listed in Table 2 from the L2 frame. Additionally, the design included a residual stratum to account for registered voters recently added to the L2 voter file who are not included in the primary sampling frame.

Table 2. Variables Used in Stratification

Region [Central, East, Memphis/West, Nashville Area]
Age [Under 30, 30+ or missing]
Party [Democratic, Republican, Non-partisan]
2020 Vote Mode [Voted early, Voted Election Day, Did not vote]
Phone [High Confidence (HC) landline, HC cell and no HC landline, no HC phone]

Newly Registered Voter Sample

A small additional sample of newly registered voters (NRV) was selected for fuller coverage. The NRV sample was defined as voters with a registration date after the latest registration date in the file from which the main sample was pulled. The NRV sample was treated as a separate stratum and was weighted to match its share of the current L2 universe.

---

[1] https://www.l2-data.com/

Marginal Stratification Frame Counts

The following table shows marginal frame distributions across the five stratification variables.

Table 3. Marginal Stratification Variable Frame Counts

Region	FRAME	
Central	861,136	19.1%
East	1,542,252	34.3%
Memphis/West	741,255	16.5%
Nashville Area	1,088,677	24.2%
NRV	267,331	5.9%
Total	4,500,651	100.0%

Age	FRAME	
Under 30	689,890	15.3%
30+ or missing	3,543,430	78.7%
NRV	267,331	5.9%
Total	4,500,651	100.0%

Party	FRAME	
Republican	1,488,822	33.1%
Democratic	799,915	17.8%
Non-Partisan	1,944,583	43.2%
NRV	267,331	5.9%
Total	4,500,651	100.0%

2020 Vote Mode	FRAME	
Voted early	2,041,312	45.4%
Voted Election Day	688,399	15.3%
Did not vote	1,503,609	33.4%
NRV	267,331	5.9%
Total	4,500,651	100.0%

Phone	FRAME	
High confidence landline	706,950	15.7%
High confidence cell (no LL)	940,211	20.9%
No high-confidence phone	2,586,159	57.5%
NRV	267,331	5.9%
Total	4,500,651	100.0%

Drawing the Sample

Separate samples were drawn for the two sample groups (HS1 and HS2), with 58,017 to the telephone treatment (HS1) and 36,088 pieces allocated to the mail treatment (HS2). Sampling was disproportionate across the age strata, with records marked as 18–29 being sampled at twice the rate of other records. No disproportionality was applied to the other stratification variables. For the NRV residual category, the sample was drawn using simple random sampling from among registered voters added to the frame after the main sample was created.

Table 4. Sample Distribution by Strata: HS1

Stratum	Stratum Description	Total Sample Released	Distri-bution
111111	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	40	0.07%
111112	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	19	0.03%
111121	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	13	0.02%
111122	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	10	0.02%
111131	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	21	0.04%
111132	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	18	0.03%
111211	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	77	0.13%
111212	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	48	0.08%
111221	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	48	0.08%
111222	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	23	0.04%
111231	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	63	0.11%
111232	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	34	0.06%
111311	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	129	0.22%
111312	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	94	0.16%
111321	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	95	0.16%
111322	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	93	0.16%
111331	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	546	0.94%
111332	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	306	0.53%
112111	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	599	1.03%
112112	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	522	0.90%
112121	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	172	0.30%
112122	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	165	0.28%
112131	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	157	0.27%
112132	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	187	0.32%
112211	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	1455	2.51%
112212	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	1423	2.45%

112221	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	575	0.99%
112222	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	599	1.03%
112231	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	193	0.33%
112232	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	373	0.64%
112311	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	417	0.72%
112312	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	553	0.95%
112321	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	257	0.44%
112322	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	371	0.64%
112331	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	514	0.89%
112332	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	853	1.47%
121111	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	85	0.15%
121112	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	64	0.11%
121121	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	22	0.04%
121122	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	21	0.04%
121131	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	35	0.06%
121132	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	36	0.06%
121211	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	102	0.18%
121212	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	90	0.16%
121221	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	54	0.09%
121222	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	48	0.08%
121231	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	78	0.13%
121232	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	67	0.12%
121311	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	235	0.41%
121312	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	194	0.33%
121321	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	166	0.29%
121322	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	146	0.25%
121331	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	761	1.31%
121332	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	529	0.91%
122111	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	901	1.55%
122112	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	1122	1.93%
122121	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	198	0.34%
122122	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	272	0.47%
122131	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	167	0.29%
122132	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	318	0.55%
122211	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	2449	4.22%
122212	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	3034	5.23%
122221	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	865	1.49%
122222	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	1144	1.97%

122231	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	334	0.58%
122232	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	818	1.41%
122311	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	681	1.17%
122312	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	1156	1.99%
122321	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	390	0.67%
122322	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	730	1.26%
122331	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	814	1.40%
122332	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	1698	2.93%
131111	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	92	0.16%
131112	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	68	0.12%
131121	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	11	0.02%
131122	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	10	0.02%
131131	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	33	0.06%
131132	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	24	0.04%
131211	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	41	0.07%
131212	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	36	0.06%
131221	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	7	0.01%
131222	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	10	0.02%
131231	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	25	0.04%
131232	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	14	0.02%
131311	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	176	0.30%
131312	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	144	0.25%
131321	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	66	0.11%
131322	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	54	0.09%
131331	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	504	0.87%
131332	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	360	0.62%
132111	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	1132	1.95%
132112	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	1391	2.40%
132121	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	122	0.21%
132122	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	164	0.28%
132131	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	173	0.30%
132132	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	265	0.46%
132211	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	865	1.49%
132212	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	1108	1.91%
132221	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	162	0.28%

132222	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	220	0.38%
132231	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	86	0.15%
132232	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	173	0.30%
132311	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	411	0.71%
132312	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	681	1.17%
132321	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	138	0.24%
132322	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	251	0.43%
132331	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	559	0.96%
132332	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	1016	1.75%
141111	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	141	0.24%
141112	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	95	0.16%
141121	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	16	0.03%
141122	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	14	0.02%
141131	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	47	0.08%
141132	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	43	0.07%
141211	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	86	0.15%
141212	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	65	0.11%
141221	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	19	0.03%
141222	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	13	0.02%
141231	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	58	0.10%
141232	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	41	0.07%
141311	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	267	0.46%
141312	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	218	0.38%
141321	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	106	0.18%
141322	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	85	0.15%
141331	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	649	1.12%
141332	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	411	0.71%
142111	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	1227	2.11%
142112	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	1543	2.66%
142121	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	128	0.22%
142122	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	167	0.29%
142131	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	134	0.23%
142132	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	269	0.46%
142211	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	1726	2.97%

142212	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	1918	3.31%
142221	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	302	0.52%
142222	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	379	0.65%
142231	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	137	0.24%
142232	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	405	0.70%
142311	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	614	1.06%
142312	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	1154	1.99%
142321	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	188	0.32%
142322	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	428	0.74%
142331	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	522	0.90%
142332	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	1190	2.05%
153441	NRV, NRV, NRV, NRV, LL	657	1.13%
153442	NRV, NRV, NRV, NRV, Cell	1077	1.86%

Table 5. Sample Distribution by Strata: HS2

Stratum	Stratum Description	Total Sample Released	Distri-bution
211111	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	9	0.02%
211112	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	4	0.01%
211119	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	36	0.10%
211121	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	3	0.01%
211122	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	2	0.01%
211129	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	15	0.04%
211131	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	5	0.01%
211132	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	4	0.01%
211139	Central, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	28	0.08%
211211	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	19	0.05%
211212	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	9	0.02%
211219	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	86	0.24%
211221	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	11	0.03%
211222	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	5	0.01%
211229	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	44	0.12%
211231	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	12	0.03%
211232	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	7	0.02%
211239	Central, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	77	0.21%
211311	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	24	0.07%
211312	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	18	0.05%
211319	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	176	0.49%
211321	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	25	0.07%
211322	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	16	0.04%
211329	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	150	0.42%
211331	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	120	0.33%
211332	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	66	0.18%
211339	Central, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	992	2.75%
212111	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	131	0.36%
212112	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	115	0.32%
212119	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	243	0.67%
212121	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	38	0.11%
212122	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	36	0.10%
212129	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	83	0.23%

212131	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	33	0.09%
212132	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	41	0.11%
212139	Central, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	109	0.30%
212211	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	318	0.88%
212212	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	312	0.86%
212219	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	714	1.98%
212221	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	126	0.35%
212222	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	131	0.36%
212229	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	306	0.85%
212231	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	42	0.12%
212232	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	82	0.23%
212239	Central, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	209	0.58%
212311	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	89	0.25%
212312	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	121	0.34%
212319	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	318	0.88%
212321	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	51	0.14%
212322	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	81	0.22%
212329	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	223	0.62%
212331	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	107	0.30%
212332	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	187	0.52%
212339	Central, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	722	2.00%
221111	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	15	0.04%
221112	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	14	0.04%
221119	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	106	0.29%
221121	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	5	0.01%
221122	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	5	0.01%
221129	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	32	0.09%
221131	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	8	0.02%
221132	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	8	0.02%
221139	East, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	60	0.17%
221211	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	24	0.07%
221212	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	17	0.05%
221219	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	135	0.37%
221221	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	11	0.03%

221222	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	9	0.02%
221229	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	70	0.19%
221231	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	18	0.05%
221232	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	12	0.03%
221239	East, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	127	0.35%
221311	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	55	0.15%
221312	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	39	0.11%
221319	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	337	0.93%
221321	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	31	0.09%
221322	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	31	0.09%
221329	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	266	0.74%
221331	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	164	0.45%
221332	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	114	0.32%
221339	East, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	1536	4.26%
222111	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	198	0.55%
222112	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	246	0.68%
222119	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	465	1.29%
222121	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	43	0.12%
222122	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	60	0.17%
222129	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	121	0.34%
222131	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	37	0.10%
222132	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	70	0.19%
222139	East, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	158	0.44%
222211	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	537	1.49%
222212	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	666	1.85%
222219	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	1360	3.77%
222221	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	184	0.51%
222222	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	251	0.70%
222229	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	510	1.41%
222231	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	73	0.20%
222232	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	179	0.50%
222239	East, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	429	1.19%
222311	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	149	0.41%
222312	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	254	0.70%
222319	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	597	1.65%
222321	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	86	0.24%

222322	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	160	0.44%
222329	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	399	1.11%
222331	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	179	0.50%
222332	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	373	1.03%
222339	East, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	1274	3.53%
231111	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	22	0.06%
231112	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	13	0.04%
231119	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	77	0.21%
231121	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	2	0.01%
231122	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	2	0.01%
231129	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	11	0.03%
231131	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	7	0.02%
231132	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	5	0.01%
231139	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	33	0.09%
231211	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	11	0.03%
231212	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	6	0.02%
231219	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	46	0.13%
231221	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	2	0.01%
231222	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	2	0.01%
231229	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	11	0.03%
231231	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	5	0.01%
231232	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	3	0.01%
231239	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	27	0.07%
231311	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	40	0.11%
231312	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	29	0.08%
231319	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	208	0.58%
231321	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	13	0.04%
231322	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	11	0.03%
231329	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	85	0.24%
231331	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	108	0.30%
231332	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	77	0.21%
231339	Memphis/West, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	820	2.27%
232111	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	248	0.69%

232112	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	305	0.85%
232119	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	474	1.31%
232121	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	27	0.07%
232122	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	36	0.10%
232129	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	64	0.18%
232131	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	38	0.11%
232132	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	58	0.16%
232139	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	115	0.32%
232211	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	190	0.53%
232212	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	243	0.67%
232219	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	448	1.24%
232221	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	32	0.09%
232222	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	48	0.13%
232229	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	93	0.26%
232231	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	17	0.05%
232232	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	38	0.11%
232239	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	77	0.21%
232311	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	89	0.25%
232312	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	149	0.41%
232319	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	313	0.87%
232321	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	30	0.08%
232322	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	55	0.15%
232329	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	126	0.35%
232331	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	123	0.34%
232332	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	223	0.62%
232339	Memphis/West, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	631	1.75%

241111	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, LL	33	0.09%
241112	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, Cell	19	0.05%
241119	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	137	0.38%
241121	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	4	0.01%
241122	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	3	0.01%
241129	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	20	0.06%
241131	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, LL	11	0.03%
241132	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	9	0.02%
241139	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	68	0.19%
241211	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, LL	23	0.06%
241212	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, Cell	11	0.03%
241219	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	83	0.23%
241221	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	4	0.01%
241222	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	3	0.01%
241229	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	21	0.06%
241231	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, LL	13	0.04%
241232	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	8	0.02%
241239	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	76	0.21%
241311	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	60	0.17%
241312	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	38	0.11%
241319	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	350	0.97%
241321	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	23	0.06%
241322	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	18	0.05%
241329	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	157	0.44%
241331	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	148	0.41%
241332	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	85	0.24%
241339	Nashville Area, Age 18-29, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	1212	3.36%
242111	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, LL	267	0.74%
242112	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, Cell	339	0.94%
242119	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted early, No Phone match	578	1.60%
242121	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, LL	28	0.08%
242122	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, Cell	37	0.10%
242129	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	70	0.19%

242131	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, LL	29	0.08%
242132	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, Cell	59	0.16%
242139	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, DEM, Did not vote, No Phone match	127	0.35%
242211	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, LL	379	1.05%
242212	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, Cell	421	1.17%
242219	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted early, No Phone match	758	2.10%
242221	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, LL	66	0.18%
242222	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, Cell	83	0.23%
242229	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	154	0.43%
242231	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, LL	30	0.08%
242232	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, Cell	89	0.25%
242239	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, GOP, Did not vote, No Phone match	186	0.52%
242311	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, LL	133	0.37%
242312	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, Cell	253	0.70%
242319	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted early, No Phone match	552	1.53%
242321	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, LL	41	0.11%
242322	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, Cell	94	0.26%
242329	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Voted on Election Day, No Phone match	218	0.60%
242331	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, LL	114	0.32%
242332	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, Cell	261	0.72%
242339	Nashville Area, Age 30+ or missing, Non-partisan, Did not vote, No Phone match	854	2.37%
253441	NRV, LL	143	0.40%
253442	NRV, Cell	222	0.62%
253449	NRV, No Phone match	1662	4.61%
TOTAL	TOTAL	36088	100.00%

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was developed by the Principal Investigators at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (CSDI) at Vanderbilt in consultation with the SSRS project team. The survey was designed as multi-mode, meaning data could be collected by (1) respondents completing the questionnaire online; or by (2) respondents completing the questionnaire with a live interviewer by calling into a dedicated toll-free number; or by (3) respondents completing the questionnaire with a live interviewer who called the number attached to the sample record for the voter.

SSRS reviewed the questionnaire primarily to identify potential problems in the instrument that might increase respondent burden, cause respondents to refuse or terminate the interview, create problems with respondent comprehension, or pose practical challenges for mode-specific administration, such as complex skip patterns for the PAPI instrument.

Mailing Material Design

The text and design for the postcard invitation for HS2 was developed by the SSRS project team in consultation with CSDI. A sample of the postcard artwork can be found in Appendix A of this report.

Contact Procedure and Schedule

All sampled voters were asked to take a survey for CSDI. Invitation to the survey was done through the following multi-step procedure.

Half Sample 1

For HS1, outbound dialing began on April 17. Respondent selection for landline sample was based on a random rotation, with interviews conducted with the youngest adult male/female, ages 18 or older, who was at home. For the cellular sample, interviews were conducted with the person who answered the phone. Interviewers verified that the person was an adult and in a safe place before administering the survey.

Eligibility was determined based on age, geographic location, and current voter registration status prior to accepting the respondent into the survey.

The sample size for HS1 was n=532 interviews. Overall, 27% of respondents were reached via landline and 73% of respondents were reached via cellular telephone.

Half Sample 2

For HS2, sampled voters were contacted via multiple channels, including mail, outbound dialing, email, and SMS.

- On April 15, two days before the start of fieldwork, all sampled registered voters were sent a fold-over invitation postcard which included the Vanderbilt/CSDI logo. The postcard included the survey web link, the respondent's unique survey password, and a toll-free phone number respondents could call to complete the survey if preferred.
- Fieldwork began on April 17 with a soft launch of SMS outreach to 10% of sampled respondents with cell phone numbers. These messages included a brief invitation asking whether they would be interested in participating in a poll. Email invitations were also sent that day, containing similar information as the postcard, along with details about the study's goals and a $10 contingent incentive.
- On April 18, SMS messages were sent to the remaining sampled voters with cell phone numbers, and email reminders were sent to those who received the email invitation.
- On April 19, the second email reminder was sent.
- The target number of web completes for HS2 was reached on April 20, at which point the remaining scheduled email and SMS reminders were canceled. Outbound dialing to targeted HS2 respondents began on April 25, after initial contact efforts had yielded sufficient preliminary results. The table below outlines the schedule of the contact points for HS2.

Table 6: HS2 Contact Procedure Schedule

Date	Task
April 15, 2025	Postcard mailed
April 17, 2025	SMS soft launch and email invitation full launch
April 18, 2025	SMS full launch and first email reminder
April 19, 2025	Second email reminder
April 20, 2025	Web data collection cut-off
April 25, 2025	Outbound dialing start

Like HS1, eligibility was determined based on age, geographic location, and current voter registration status prior to accepting the respondent into the survey.

The sample size for HS2 was n=691 surveys.

Data Collection Procedures

The field period for this study was April 17–27, 2025. HS1 respondents completed the survey by speaking with a live interviewer over the phone. HS2 respondents had the option to complete the survey either online or by phone.

Online Data Collection

The web program was available on April 17, the date of soft launch. On the survey's landing page, respondents were welcomed to the survey and provided with information about the survey, as well as a prompt to enter the unique password provided to them in their mailed invitation. They could also directly scan a QR code on the postcard that they received to access the survey. Respondents could suspend the survey at any point and resume later from the point where they suspended.

At the end of the survey, online respondents were given the choice of an electronic Amazon gift code or Virtual Visa gift card as a token of appreciation for their survey participation.

SMS Contact Procedures

SMS outreach was conducted in collaboration with Survey160[2] to increase completion rates among respondents who had a cell phone number on file. Survey160 interviewers sent a short introduction through text message. Messages were sent individually to each respondent by a Survey160 interviewer. The first screen asked respondents whether they would be interested in participating in the survey, and if they responded that they were interested, a follow-up message provided the link to the survey.

Email Contact Procedures

All sampled voters with an email address were emailed an invitation to complete the survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique password-embedded link.

---

[2] https://www.survey160.com/

Telephone Data Collection

All telephone interviews were completed in English using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system. The CATI system ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns and that complete dispositions of all call attempts were recorded.

CATI interviewers received written materials about the survey instrument and received formal training for this particular project. The written materials were provided prior to commencement of data collection and included an annotated questionnaire that contained information about the goals of the study, detailed explanations about why questions were being asked, the meaning and pronunciation of key terms or names, potential obstacles to overcome in getting good answers to questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time, as well as strategies for addressing the potential problems.

Interviewer training was conducted before the study was launched. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection.

To maximize survey response, SSRS enacted the following procedures during the field period:

- A maximum of five (5) contact attempts were made for each sampled telephone number for HS1 and up to three (3) attempts for HS2.
- Calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chance of making contact with potential respondents.
- At least one daytime call was conducted if necessary.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and its importance.
- Respondents were offered the option of scheduling a call-back at their convenience.
- Specially trained interviewers contacted numbers where the initial call resulted in respondents hanging up the phone.

At the end of the survey, HS2 respondents were asked to provide a mailing address to receive a $10 mailed check as a token of appreciation for their survey participation. HS1 respondents were not offered a monetary reward.

Device-Responsive Design

As a growing share of Americans now use mobile devices as their main form of online access, many are taking surveys on smartphones and tablets, rather than on desktop or laptop computers.

This requires that surveys be programmed in what is known as a responsive platform, meaning the survey program identifies the likely type of device on which the survey is being taken (desktop/laptop, tablet, smartphone) and then renders the online survey accordingly. Specifically, laptop and desktop screen monitors are laid out horizontally, while smartphones and tablets have a vertical orientation. In addition, screens for mobile devices tend to be smaller and would be unreadable if they included excess verbiage or grid layouts.

The questionnaire was programmed with this responsive approach, and respondents' type of device was stored as paradata. Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the study into Forsta Plus (formerly known as Confirmit) Web-CATI software. Extensive checking of the program was conducted, using multiple devices and browsers, ensuring questions appeared correctly on each type of device and platform.

Quality Control and Data Cleaning

Data Processing and Integration

Prior to running cross-tabulations, data were cleaned and checked using standard procedures. This program establishes editing parameters to locate any errors. No coding was done for open-end responses.

Quality Control Checks

For web surveys, quality checks were incorporated into the survey. Respondents who failed the quality checks were not included in the final data set. This included:

1. Flagged as speeder if finished in 20% or less of the median web length (set after soft launch) (n=1).
2. Completion rate failures (web/phone: answered less than 70% of the questions they were asked) (n=3).
3. DQFail (trap question failures) who are allowed to complete the survey but should not count towards completes (n=0).

A total of n=4 completed surveys were removed after applying these cleaning standards (0.3%).

For telephone surveys, interviews were closely monitored by interviewing staff for quality control. In addition, select recordings were reviewed by supervisors to monitor quality and interviewer procedures.

Weighting

The weighted data represent registered voters in Tennessee. The dataset was divided into two half samples to test different modes of contact—phone and mail push-to-web. Each half sample was weighted separately before being combined and reweighted together. The weighting procedure began with the application of a design weight for each half sample, followed by calibration to target population benchmarks. A nonresponse adjustment was applied to the design weight for the mail-push-to-web sample.

Design Weights

The sampling frame for this study is the L2 voter file. Separate samples were drawn for two half samples using the same stratification. Strata were defined by region (Central, East, Memphis/West, Nashville Area), age (Under 30, 30 and older/no age), party affiliation (Democratic, Republican, non-partisan), 2020 voting mode (voted early, voted on election day, did not vote), and phone append status (high-confidence landline, high-confidence cell with no landline, no high-confidence phone). Additionally, a residual stratum was included to account for registered voters recently added to the L2 voter file who were not part of the primary sampling frame.

Design Weight Phone Sample (HS1)

The design weight for the phone half-sample sample is $DWP_i = P_i/p_i$ where P_i is the proportion of the sampling frame in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of interviews conducted in stratum i. When computing the design weight for the phone sample, the 219 detailed strata were collapsed into 9 strata, defined as the cross of the four regions with the two age strata, plus the residual stratum. The final base weight for the phone sample is the design weight.

Design Weight Mail Push to Web Sample (HS2)

The design weight for the mail push to web sample is $DWM_i = P_i/p_i$ where P_i is the proportion of the sampling frame in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of sample released in stratum i.

A non-response propensity adjustment was applied to account for differential non-response across sample strata. This adjustment was calculated by running a logistic regression on the mail push to web sample file. The outcome variable was interview completion, and the predictors were the variables used to define the sample strata. The reciprocal of the predicted probabilities (pre) was used to compute the propensity adjustment (PA) such that:

$$PA = 1/pre.$$

The final base weight for the mail push to web sample is the product of the design weight and the non-response propensity adjustment. Final base weights for each half-sample were standardized to sum to the number of completed interviews.

Calibration

With the base weight applied, the data were weighted to align the sample's demographic profile with the target population benchmarks. Weighting was performed using iterative proportional fitting (raking), which adjusts sample distributions to match target population distributions. This procedure balances each calibration variable individually and iteratively, cycling through the full set of calibration variables until the weights converge across all dimensions.

Data were weighted to distributions of sex (male, female), age (18-29, 30-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+), education (HS grad or less, some college/2-year degree, 4-year degree or more), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, other), and region (Central, East, Memphis/West, Nashville). Missing data in the raking variables were imputed using hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. Hot decking was done using an SPSS macro detailed in *Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handing Missing Data* (Myers, 2011).

Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates. Each half-sample was calibrated separately, and the combined sample was also calibrated.

The following table presents the data sources used for calibration totals.

Table 7. Calibration Variable Sources

DIMENSIONS	SOURCE
Sex	L2 Tennessee Voter File Frame
Age	
Education	November 2022 Current Population Survey Voting and Registration Supplement [3]
Race	
Region	L2 Tennessee Voter File Frame

---

[3] Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 11.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2023. https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V11.0

The following tables compare unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmarks.

Table 8. Sample Demographics (HS1)

CATEGORY	VALUES	BENCHMARK	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
SEX	Male	45.8%	49.1%	46.7%
	Female	54.2%	50.9%	53.3%
AGE	18-29	18.5%	4.9%	15.5%
	30-34	8.8%	3.9%	8.9%
	35-44	16.0%	13.0%	15.9%
	45-54	15.3%	15.4%	16.1%
	55-64	16.4%	15.2%	17.3%
	65+	25.0%	47.6%	26.4%
EDUCATION	HS grad or less	33.7%	18.8%	31.3%
	Some college	29.6%	28.0%	30.6%
	College+	36.7%	53.2%	38.1%
RACE/ETHNICITY	White non-Hispanic	79.9%	82.3%	81.6%
	Other	20.1%	17.7%	18.4%
REGION	East	36.5%	35.3%	34.8%
	Nashville Area	25.9%	24.8%	25.9%
	Central	20.3%	20.5%	21.2%
	Memphis/West	17.3%	19.4%	18.1%

Table 9. Sample Demographics (HS2)

CATEGORY	VALUES	BENCHMARK	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
SEX	Male	45.8%	52.2%	45.8%
	Female	54.2%	47.8%	54.2%
AGE	18-29	18.5%	15.5%	18.3%
	30-34	8.8%	5.8%	8.5%
	35-44	16.0%	13.9%	15.6%
	45-54	15.3%	16.8%	15.5%
	55-64	16.4%	17.7%	16.3%
	65+	25.0%	30.4%	25.7%
EDUCATION	HS grad or less	33.7%	14.0%	31.9%
	Some college	29.6%	34.0%	30.5%

	College+	36.7%	52.0%	37.6%
RACE/ETHNICITY	White non-Hispanic	79.9%	88.9%	80.9%
	Other	20.1%	11.1%	19.1%
REGION	East	36.5%	35.3%	36.9%
	Nashville Area	25.9%	31.1%	26.4%
	Central	20.3%	23.3%	20.3%
	Memphis/West	17.3%	10.3%	16.3%

Table 10. Sample Demographics (combined sample)

CATEGORY	VALUES	BENCHMARK	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
SEX	Male	45.8%	50.9%	46.0%
	Female	54.2%	49.1%	54.0%
AGE	18-29	18.5%	10.9%	17.5%
	30-34	8.8%	5.0%	8.5%
	35-44	16.0%	13.5%	15.6%
	45-54	15.3%	16.2%	15.7%
	55-64	16.4%	16.6%	16.6%
	65+	25.0%	37.9%	26.0%
EDUCATION	HS grad or less	33.7%	16.1%	31.3%
	Some college	29.6%	31.4%	30.7%
	College+	36.7%	52.5%	38.0%
RACE/ETHNICITY	White non-Hispanic	79.9%	86.0%	81.0%
	Other	20.1%	14.0%	19.0%
REGION	East	36.5%	35.3%	36.4%
	Nashville Area	25.9%	28.4%	26.2%
	Central	20.3%	22.1%	20.7%
	Memphis/West	17.3%	14.2%	16.6%

Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. SSRS calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results

from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w, as:[4]

$$deff = \frac{n \sum w^2}{(\sum w)^2}$$

The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — the one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the entire sample is ± 3.5 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of every 100 samples drawn using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3.5 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for subgroups will be larger. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording, and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude. The following table shows sample sizes, design effects and maximum margins of sampling error for the different weights.

Table 11. Design Effects and Maximum Margins of Sampling Error

GROUP	N	DESIGN EFFECT	MARGIN OF SAMPLING ERROR
Total sample	1,223	1.60	+- 3.5 percentage points
HS1	532	1.72	+- 5.6 percentage points
HS2	691	1.76	+- 4.9 percentage points

---

[4] Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. Journal of Official Statistics, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

Response Rates

The tables below report the disposition of all sampled records that were contacted. The response rate estimates the fraction of all eligible sample that was ultimately surveyed. Response rates are computed according to American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standards.[5] Sample disposition and response rate 3 (RR3) for HS1 and HS2 are detailed in the tables below.

Table 12. HS1 Sample Disposition and Response Rates

Eligible, Interview (Category 1)	LANDLINE	CELL
Complete	145	387
Eligible, Non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	62	116
Refusal	0	0
Respondent never available	0	0
Telephone answering device (confirming HH)	9	111
Answering machine household-no message left	0	0
Answering machine household-message left	0	0
Other, non-refusals	0	0
Deceased respondent	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0
Language problem	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Not attempted or worked	10	656
No answer/Busy	2,522	12,543
Answering machine-don't know if household	4,060	12,959
Call blocking	21	167
Technical phone problems	363	1
Residential, unknown if eligible respondent	0	0
No screener completed, residential and live contact made	1,031	4,811
No screener completed, residential and no live contact	0	0
Other	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	181	63
Non-working number	14,542	2,678
Nonresidence	251	158

---

[5] American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 10th edition. Revised 2023.

Business, government office, other organizations	0	0
No eligible respondent	26	144
Quota filled	0	0
Other	0	0
Summary Dispositions		
I=Complete Interviews (1.1)	145	387
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)	0	0
R=Refusal and break off with eligible case (2.1)	62	116
NC=Non-contact with eligible case (2.2)	9	111
O=Other non-interview with eligible case (2.0, 2.3)	0	0
UH=Unknown if residential (3.0, 3.1)	6,976	26,326
UO=Unknown other (3.2, 3.9) (residential, unknown if eligible)	1,031	4,811
INNR = Ineligible: Not residential (4.0,4.1,4.2,4.3,4.4,4.5,4.8,4.9)	14,974	2,899
INR=Ineligible: Residential but ineligible for survey (4.7)	26	144
Total	23,223	34,794
ADDRESSING CASES WITH UNDETERMINED ELIGIBILITY		
e1 = the % of known-residential cases estimated to have eligible R	89.3%	81.0%
e2 = the % of unknown-if-residential cases that are estimated to be residential	7.8%	65.8%
Total sample used	**23,223**	**34,794**
Response Rate 3 (I / (I+P+R+NC+O+[e1*e2*UH]+[e1*UO]))	**8.9%**	**2.1%**
Cooperation Rate 3 ((I+INR)/(I+INR+R+(e2*UO)))	**13.5%**	**9.7%**
Refusal Rate 3 (R/(I+P+R+NC+O))	**87.7%**	**90.8%**
Contact Rate 3 ((I+P+R+O) / (I+P+R+O+NC))	**16.6%**	**9.3%**

Table 13. HS2 Sample Disposition and Response Rates

Region	I-Complete	R-Refusal and break-off	UH-Unknown house-hold, non-interview	UO-Unknown Respon-dent eligibility, non-interview	NS-Ineligible	NS-Non-house-hold	RR3
East	148	28	6588	0	14	153	4.2%
Nashville Area	245	47	11747	0	18	250	3.8%
Central	69	14	5741	0	5	137	3.1%
Memphis/West	207	40	8412	0	14	184	4.2%
NRV	22	5	1957	0	3	40	2.8%
Total	691	134	34445	0	54	764	3.8%

Deliverables

SSRS delivered to Vanderbilt University:

- Final questionnaire instrument.
- Weighted dataset in SPSS.
- Weighted banners in PDF.
- Topline.
- A detailed methods report.

About SSRS

SSRS is a full-service survey and market research firm managed by a core of dedicated professionals with advanced degrees in the social sciences. Service offerings include the SSRS Opinion Panel and other Online Solutions, SSRS Business Insights, SSRS Virtual Insights, and SSRS Text Message Panel, as well as custom research programs – all driven by a central commitment to methodological rigor. The SSRS team is renowned for its multimodal approach, as well as its sophisticated and proprietary sample designs. Typical projects for the company include complex strategic, tactical, and public opinion initiatives in the U.S. and in more than 40 countries worldwide. Visit www.ssrs.com for more information.

Appendix A

Postcard

Face 1 (outer front)

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions

c/o SSRS
PO Box 5003
Concordville, PA 19331-5003

[INSERT QR RETURN CODE HERE]

<<bVoters_FirstName>> <<bVoters_LastName>>
<<Address>>
<<Address2>>
<<City>>, <<bState>> <<bZIPCode>>-<<bZIP4>>

Face 2 (inner top)

Dear <<bVoters_FirstName>> <<bVoters_LastName>>,

We are writing to invite you to answer a few questions for the **Vanderbilt Poll**.

What is the Vanderbilt Poll? It is a short, non-partisan survey on important issues facing Tennesseans like you.

Why should I participate? Your voice matters. Our goal is to understand what citizens think about public policy issues and provide information to residents, policymakers, and others. If you qualify for and complete the survey, we will send you **$10** to thank you for your time.

If you have questions, contact us at info@vanderbiltpoll.com.

Your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Face 3 (inner bottom)

Take a short survey and get $10!

Visit **www.VanderbiltPoll.com**
and enter your unique passcode:

<INSERT PASSCODE>

<u>Or,</u> use your phone or tablet to scan the
QR code to the right.

What if I don't have internet access?

Call us toll-free at **1-888-408-5755** to <u>take</u> the survey by phone. We will
ask you for your passcode and the best phone number to reach you.

Face 4 (outer back)