Comparing Face-to-face and Web Modes in the ANES 2016 Time Series Study

Lauren Guggenheim

Colleen McClain

Yioryos Nardis

Ted Brader

May 28, 2019

Contents

Statement of Purpose

This document contains statistical tests of differences in means and distributions across mode of interview for variables in the ANES 2016 Time Series study. The current effort analyzes differences between two parallel studies (i.e., the face-to-face mode and the Internet mode)—recruited from similar, but not identical, samples, and with similar, but not identical, interview designs. It is intended to be a reference document, allowing researchers to review how the web study compares to the face-to-face study. As such, substantive interpretations and conclusions are left largely to individual researchers to determine for the purposes of their own work. Summaries of results, outlined in each of the memos that follow, should be considered as a starting place for readers to investigate more fully on their own.

Summary

The American National Election Studies (ANES) 2016 Time Series is a continuation of the series of election studies conducted by the ANES since 1948 to support analysis of public opinion and voting behavior in U.S. elections. The 2016 study features a dual-mode design with both traditional face-to-face interviewing (n=1,181) and surveys conducted on the Internet (n=3,090), and a total sample size of 4,271. Comparisons between modes were organized into memos based on substantive domain.

Overall, mode differences were not widespread. Domains where differences between the two modes were evident included political knowledge (Engagement: Knowledge), assessments of personal financial situations (Personal: Financial), performance on Wordsum vocabulary test questions (Personal: Other), opinions on the 2010 health care law (Issues: Health Care), and spending on social welfare issues (Issues: Welfare, Government Spending), among others.

One common type of mode difference appearing in this document is the propensity of online respondents to select the middle category (e.g., 'neither favor nor oppose,' 'neither agree nor disagree,' 'moderately,' 'about the same.'). Online respondents were also more likely to be correct on knowledge items and Wordsum vocabulary test questions. To a lesser extent, there was some suggestive evidence of acquiescence bias and socially desirable responding in the face-to-face mode.

The use of Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing (CASI) on some questions in the face-to-face mode may have eliminated or reduced potential mode differences that could be attributable to measurement, since face-to-face respondents could enter their response on a computer and did not have to disclose to the interviewer directly. In particular, CASI was employed for variables where the potential for socially desirable responding was a concern. Finally, because this investigation was limited to mean and distribution comparisons of existing variables, some potential concerns, such as response order effects or satisficing, were not tested.

Methodology

Variable Groupings

Variables were grouped into memorandums based on substantive domain. Preliminary summaries of results appear for variable groupings in each memorandum. For the purposes of forming preliminary conclusions, mode differences are considered significant if they reach the standard .05 cutoff for alpha. For the reader interested in more substantial analysis or conclusions, however, corrections due to multiple comparisons can be estimated for the number of tests run (for example, by dividing the cutoff for significance by the number of tests; see the limitations section below for further discussion).

Overview of Sampling Design

The 2016 ANES Time Series study is a dual-mode two-wave panel design, with respondents interviewed prior to election day and then re-interviewed after the election. 4,271 pre-election interviews were completed, consisting of 1,181 face-to-face and 3,090 online responses. Of the 4,271 pre-election interviews, 3,649 re-interviews were completed for the post-election wave, with 1,059 face-to-face and 2,590 online responses.

The study used address-based sampling (ABS) to recruit respondents using the US Postal Service Delivery Sequence File. In the Internet mode, respondents were recruited by mail using ABS from the 50 states and DC. Questionnaires were then administered online. For the face-to-face mode, a stratified, clustered ABS design was used. There were 60 primary sampling areas in the 48 contiguous states and DC. Respondents were recruited and interviewed in-person. More information is available in the *Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study.*

Response Rate

The response rate was 50 percent for the face-to-face mode and 44 percent for the online mode, calculated using AAPOR RR1. Despite the high response rate, results are still susceptible to non-response and other bias. Details on response rate calculations can be found in the *Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study* (see especially Section 8. Dispositions and Outcome Rates). Additionally, the study had a 90 percent re-interview rate for the face-to-face mode and 84 percent rate for the Internet mode.

Recoding

Variables were recoded to exclude missing values (see the *User's Guide and Codebook for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study*, p.7 for a description of missing values). However, analysts conducting their own tests should be mindful of using suitable techniques for handling missing data. Where appropriate, the categories of some nominal variables were recoded in an ordinal fashion so that means could be run.

For example, V161205 PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security was originally coded '1. Increased', '2. Decreased', '3. Kept the Same', '-8. Don't know', '-9. Refused'. This variable was recoded '1. Decreased', '2. Kept the Same', '3. Increased', and 'Don't know' and 'Refused' as missing values.

Estimation and Statistical Tests

Stata 15 was used for analyses. Taylor Series Linearization was used to calculate standard errors based on the complex survey design. Subpopulation analyses were conducted to appropriately test differences across survey mode. Differences in means across mode were tested using Adjusted Wald F-tests. These test the null hypothesis of equality between means using complex survey data, which is similar to a t-test.

Differences in distributions across mode were tested using Rao-Scott Design-Adjusted F-tests, which correct for design effects on the sampling variances of proportions from complex samples. The test entails scaling the standard chi-squared test statistic by dividing it by an estimate of a generalized design effect factor.

More information about the estimation procedures can be found in Heeringa, West, and Berglund (2010) and StataCorp (2017).

Adjustment for Complex Sampling Design

To run statistical tests between modes the survey design information for the dual mode sample was used, with variables from the pre-election wave weighted by the pre-election weight (pweight = V160101) and with variables from the post-election wave weighted for the combined pre- and post-waves or post-wave only (pweight = V160102).

Analyses presented for pre-election wave variables used the following Stata code:

```
svyset V160202 [pweight = V160101], strata(V160201)
```

Analyses presented for the post-election wave variables used the following Stata code:

```
svyset V160202 [pweight = V160102], strata(V160201)
```

V160202 = Variance PSU - full sample
V160201 = Stratum - Full sample

V160101 = full sample weight using pre-election survey data only
V160102 = full sample weight using post-election survey only or both pre and post

Replicating the Estimates

Below is an annotated example of Stata code for creating the estimates. In this report, the version of the dataset used was *20171219*, and all relevant errata were applied. To begin the analysis, first load the ANES 2016 Time Series Study data:

```
use "C:\ANES2016\Data\anes_timeseries_2016.dta", clear
```

This example will focus on V161212 PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment. To take a closer look at this variable, including the value labels and number of observations, run a tabulation:

```
tab V161212
```

The tabulation shows that some respondents refused to answer the question or answered 'don't know.' The variable should be recoded to exclude the missing values and should also be put into order running from Decreased (1) to Increased (3):

```
gen V161212_R = .
replace V161212_R = 1 if V161212 == 2
replace V161212_R = 2 if V161212 == 3
replace V161212_R = 3 if V161212 == 1
```

Next, set up design-consistent estimation. Because V161212 is from the pre-election survey wave, V160101 is selected as the pweight which correctly weights for the pre-election. Note, that the full sample is also being used here rather than running estimates for the face-to-face and Internet sample separately with their respective weights.

```
svyset V160202 [pweight = V160101], strata(V160201)
```

Estimates appearing in Table 3: Proportions by Mode can be found by running a cross-tabulation on the data. Note that the svy: prefix is used to incorporate the survey design information described in the previous step into the estimation. The command also tells Stata to use only the non-missing data and to look at the

column proportions. The design-based F-statistic and p-value produced with this command comprise a test of independence for the table. The test is akin to a test of homogeneity of column proportions, and it provides information on whether there is a significant difference among environmental spending attitudes between the face-to-face and Internet sample. However, it does not provide tests of significance for comparisons between modes for specific answer categories.

svy: tab V161212_R V160501 if !missing(V161212_R), col

The estimates appearing in Table 2: Means by Mode can be produced by running a command for means on the data. Again, the svy prefix is used and the analysis is limited to non-missing data. The over command allows the mean for the environmental spending variable to be estimated by group.

svy, subpop(if !missing(V161212_R)): mean V161212_R, over(V160501)

To perform the Adjusted Wald test that there is no difference between means, the following command can be run:

test [V161212_R]_subpop_1 = [V161212_R]_subpop_2

Results from the tab and mean tests show that there are significant differences between face-to-face and Internet respondents' attitudes about federal budget spending to protect the environment.

Weighting Factors

The ANES uses a number of socio-demographic variables in nonresponse and poststratification weighting. Variables from the dataset that were used in weighting are omitted from this report, but interested readers should see the *User's Guide and Codebook for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study* for unweighted and weighted comparisons. For both modes, the variables include: age, gender, educational attainment, home tenure, whether there were children in the household, race/ethnicity, marital status, census region, nation of birth, and metropolitan status. More information about the variables used in weighting can be found in the *Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study.*

Limitations and Assumptions

Design. There is a long history of mode research in survey methodology. Because respondents were not randomized to mode of data collection after recruitment, but recruited into separate studies (i.e., the face-to-face mode and the Internet mode), we cannot disentangle the impacts of nonresponse error, coverage error, and measurement error on the differences presented. While the similar sample design helps to minimize the differences between the web and face-to-face studies, comparisons are still impacted by a number of potential error sources. For example, differential nonresponse due to factors not observed and addressed in weighting, differences in the sample design, interviewer presence, visual versus auditory delivery, and the impact of technology could all explain a particular mode difference. Interested readers who would like to draw suggestive explanations for the differences presented should refer to chapter 5 of Groves et al. (2009) for an introduction to the ways in which coverage, nonresponse, and measurement errors could be the underlying cause of any observed differences between parallel face-to-face and web studies. Readers should also refer to the ANES Methodology Report for more details of the differences between modes, including sample design and weight construction.

Multiple comparisons. In this document, preliminary conclusions were formed on the basis of setting alpha equal to .05. However, a large number of tests were implemented to create each memo and this resulting document. As a consequence, some of the variables appearing to have mode differences may, in fact, be false positives. We have chosen not to implement a correction for multiple comparisons for two reasons. First, this document largely deals with patterns appearing across the data and not with specific tests of variables. Second, the conclusions about individual variables or variable groupings are preliminary and serve as a starting point for researchers rather than a definitive guide to differences. However, for researchers concerned about mode differences for specific variables or domains, an attempt to adjust for the number of tests may

be warranted. In such a case, it is worth considering whether the correction is most appropriate at the document, memo/domain, or multiple-item (within-scale) level. A simple, though conservative, adjustment is the Bonferroni correction. To use this adjustment, divide the p-value cutoff for significance of .05 by the number of tests performed. For example, to make an adjustment at the memo level for a memo with ten tests, the level of significance for the same Type I error rate is .005 using this correction.

Non-normality. Accurate comparisons of means (or any moment-based analysis) depend on some assumption of normality. Larger sample sizes can relax this assumption, but the amount of non-normality that can be tolerated in a given setting is difficult to assess. In this document, variables have not been transformed, including those that are highly skewed. Thus, for any very skewed measurements (such as income), the reader may want to consider transforming variables and performing a mean comparison as a check on the presented results. It is important to note that the normality of the data is not an issue for the distributions (i.e., cross-tabulations), which are based on chi-square calculations.

Substantive Significance. No discussion of substantive significance is provided in the memos. Rather, statistical significance (p-values) are reported, and interested readers should make the determination as to whether these differences are important or substantively significant. Readers should also note that items rely on different response scales and should take these differences into account when making comparisons across variables in a memo.

Descriptive Mode Differences by Variable Grouping

Each memorandum below describes the outcomes for variable groupings based on substantive domain. For more information on variable groupings or statistical tests, see the Methodology section.

Candidate: Affect

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'candidate: affect' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twenty-three variables, nine of nineteen tested displayed significant differences in mean and all four tests of differences in distribution were significant.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to answer 'yes' to the four questions regarding whether there is anything they like or dislike about the two major party presidential candidates.
- Regarding the feeling thermometer items, nine out of the nineteen items exhibit significant differences across mode. Feelings towards candidates were more favorable in the face-to-face mode, in all but one question, irrespective of statistical significance.
- Feelings towards Senate candidates did not exhibit statistically significant differences across mode. Likewise, feelings towards Democratic and Republican presidential candidates did not exhibit statistically significant differences across mode. However, feelings towards third-party presidential candidates were more favorable and statistically significant in the face-to-face mode.

It is worth noting that the House candidate comparisons are confounded by sample differences that caused questionnaire differences, as the two modes typically ask about different candidates for different districts. Therefore, apparent mode differences for House candidates may not be due to mode at all.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161068	PRE: Is there anything R likes about Democratic Pres cand
V161071	PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic Pres cand
V161074	PRE: Is there anything R likes about Republican Pres cand
V161077	PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Republican Pres cand
V161086	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Presidential cand
V161087	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Presidential cand
V161088	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Presidential cand
V161089	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Green Party Presidential cand
V161090	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Vice-Pres cand
V161091	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Vice-Pres cand
V161094	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Vice-Pres cand
V162078	POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Presidential candidate
V162079	POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Presidential candidate
V162080	POST: Feeling thermometer: Libertarian Presidential candidate
V162081	POST: Feeling thermometer: Green Party Presidential candidate
V162082	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
V162083	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
V162084	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE
V162085	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
V162086	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
V162087	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE
V162091	POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Vice Presidential cand
V162092	POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Vice Presidential cand

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Presidential cand	43.49	41.69	0.902	0.344
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Presidential cand	38.58	35.91	1.667	0.199
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Presidential cand	47.61	42.33	25.825	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Green Party Presidential cand	47.74	41.31	26.677	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Vice-Pres cand	49.66	45.04	15.109	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Vice-Pres cand	52.01	47.04	10.769	0.001
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Vice-Pres cand	51.66	41.57	38.441	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Presidential candidate	45.84	43.17	2.036	0.156
POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Presidential candidate	45.12	41.20	3.300	0.072
POST: Feeling thermometer: Libertarian Presidential candidate	47.28	43.48	15.731	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: Green Party Presidential candidate	46.10	43.38	6.778	0.010
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	59.29	52.80	19.689	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	55.76	53.28	7.238	0.008
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE	49.68	51.77	0.383	0.539
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	54.92	54.03	0.286	0.594
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	53.11	51.18	2.101	0.150
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE	56.62	48.67	1.545	0.217
POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Vice Presidential cand	49.12	46.92	3.649	0.058
POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Vice Presidential cand	52.45	50.00	1.614	0.206

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Is there anything R likes about Democratic Pres cand				
0. No (n=2,317)	0.50	0.58		
1. Yes (n=1,942)	0.50	0.42		
			6.950	0.009
PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic Pres cand				
0. No (n=1,644)	0.33	0.43		
1. Yes (n=2,609)	0.67	0.57		
			16.202	0.000
PRE: Is there anything R likes about Republican Pres cand				
0. No (n=2,402)	0.51	0.61		
1. Yes (n=1,854)	0.49	0.39		
			13.853	0.000
PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Republican Pres cand				
0. No (n=1,331)	0.26	0.35		
1. Yes (n=2,922)	0.74	0.65		
			11.973	0.001

Candidate: Emotion

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'candidate: emotion' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of ten variables, three displayed significant differences in mean and five displayed significant differences in distribution.
- For the items that exhibited significant differences across modes, web respondents indicated that they experienced the particular emotions more frequently than face-to-face respondents did.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161116	PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: angry
V161117	PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: hopeful
V161118	PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: afraid
V161119	PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: proud
V161120	PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: disgusted
V161121	PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: angry
V161122	PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: hopeful
V161123	PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: afraid
V161124	PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: proud
V161125	PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: disgusted

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: angry	2.56	2.66	1.841	0.177
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: hopeful	2.21	2.23	0.139	0.709
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: afraid	2.37	2.52	4.647	0.033
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: proud	2.15	2.14	0.034	0.854
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: disgusted	2.60	2.71	1.696	0.195
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: angry	2.83	3.02	6.520	0.012
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: hopeful	2.10	2.11	0.025	0.875
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: afraid	2.63	2.94	13.281	0.000
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: proud	1.87	1.90	0.272	0.603
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: disgusted	3.04	3.19	3.448	0.066

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: angry				
1. Never (n=1,234)	0.30	0.29		
2. Some of the time (n=1,166)	0.28	0.27		
3. About half the time (n=427)	0.11	0.10		
4. Most of the time (n=727)	0.19	0.17		
5. Always (n=703)	0.13	0.17		
			1.842	0.127
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: hopeful				
1. Never (n=1,840)	0.41	0.44		
2. Some of the time (n=900)	0.26	0.20		

3. About half the time (n=484)	0.10	0.12		
4. Most of the time (n=741)	0.16	0.16		
5. Always (n=291)	0.07	0.07		
			3.316	0.015
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: afraid				
1. Never (n=1,611)	0.40	0.37		
2. Some of the time (n=920)	0.22	0.21		
3. About half the time (n=423)	0.11	0.10		
4. Most of the time (n=657)	0.14	0.16		
5. Always (n=650)	0.12	0.16		
			1.505	0.204
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: proud				
1. Never (n=1,973)	0.44	0.47		
2. Some of the time (n=918)	0.25	0.21		
3. About half the time (n=429)	0.10	0.10		
4. Most of the time (n=686)	0.15	0.16		
5. Always (n=253)	0.06	0.07		
			1.821	0.131
PRE: Affect for Democratic Pres cand: disgusted				
1. Never (n=1,349)	0.33	0.31		
2. Some of the time (n=994)	0.23	0.24		
3. About half the time (n=361)	0.11	0.08		
4. Most of the time (n=735)	0.18	0.17		
5. Always (n=817)	0.16	0.20		
			1.951	0.110
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: angry				
1. Never (n=917)	0.21	0.21		
2. Some of the time (n=1,113)	0.31	0.24		
3. About half the time (n=448)	0.11	0.11		
4. Most of the time (n=842)	0.20	0.19		
5. Always (n=937)	0.18	0.25		
			5.009	0.001
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: hopeful				
1. Never (n=2,100)	0.49	0.51		
2. Some of the time (n=756)	0.20	0.15		
3. About half the time (n=467)	0.10	0.11		
4. Most of the time (n=664)	0.14	0.16		
5. Always (n=273)	0.06	0.06		
			2.420	0.054
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: afraid				
1. Never (n=1,155)	0.31	0.26		
2. Some of the time (n=952)	0.25	0.20		
3. About half the time (n=444)	0.11	0.11		
4. Most of the time (n=781)	0.16	0.18		
5. Always (n=922)	0.17	0.25		
			5.317	0.001
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: proud				
1. Never (n=2,380)	0.55	0.57		
2. Some of the time (n=768)	0.22	0.16		
3. About half the time (n=444)	0.09	0.11		
4. Most of the time (n=476)	0.10	0.11		
5. Always (n=192)	0.04	0.05		
			2.990	0.028
PRE: Affect for Republican Pres cand: disgusted				

1. Never (n=750)	0.18	0.18		
2. Some of the time (n=1,104)	0.28	0.24		
3. About half the time (n=393)	0.10	0.09		
4. Most of the time (n=863)	0.22	0.19		
5. Always (n=1,149)	0.23	0.30		
			3.400	0.013

Candidate: Other

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'candidate: other' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of sixteen variables, two displayed significant differences in mean and five displayed significant differences in distributon.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to believe that Clinton was going to become president than web respondents.
- Web respondents were more likely to report extreme opinions about how both Trump and Clinton treated women: either extremely poorly or extremely well. Web respondents were also significantly less likely to think that Clinton treated women well.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161134a	PRE: PLACEMENT1: Percent for Democratic Pres candidate
V161134b	PRE: PLACEMENT1: Percent for Republican Pres candidate
V161135a	PRE: PLACEMENT1: State percent for Democratic Pres candidate
V161135b	PRE: PLACEMENT1: State percent for Republican Pres candidate
V161146	PRE: Who does R think will be elected President
V161147	PRE: Will Pres race be a close or will (winner) win by a lot
V161148	PRE: Which Pres cand will carry state
V161149	PRE: Will Pres race be close in state
V162126	POST: Heard about Rep Presidential cand Trump 2005 video about women
V162127	POST: Does Rep Presidential cand Trump 2005 video about women matter
V162188	POST: How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women
V162188a	POST: How well/poorly does Rep Presidential candidate treat women
V162188x	POST: SUMMARY- How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women
V162189	POST: How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women
V162189a	POST: How well/poorly does Dem Presidential candidate treat women
V162189x	POST: SUMMARY- How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: PLACEMENT1: Percent for Democratic Pres candidate	53.74	52.87	0.545	0.462
PRE: PLACEMENT1: Percent for Republican Pres candidate	44.78	44.70	0.004	0.947
PRE: PLACEMENT1: State percent for Democratic Pres candidate	51.40	51.99	0.076	0.783
PRE: PLACEMENT1: State percent for Republican Pres candidate	46.86	45.35	0.549	0.460
POST: Does Rep Presidential cand Trump 2005 video about women matter	2.82	2.81	0.011	0.918
POST: How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women	1.64	1.69	1.039	0.310
POST: How well/poorly does Rep Presidential candidate treat women	1.58	1.45	12.334	0.001
POST: SUMMARY- How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women	3.00	3.09	0.490	0.485
POST: How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women	2.52	2.46	3.562	0.061
POST: How well/poorly does Dem Presidential candidate treat women	1.56	1.51	2.895	0.091
POST: SUMMARY- How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women	5.29	5.13	3.940	0.049

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Who does R think will be elected President				
1. Hillary Clinton (n=2,578)	0.64	0.60		
2. Donald Trump (n=1,425)	0.35	0.35		
3. Other Specify, specified as: Hillary Clinton (n=3)	0.00	0.00		
4. Other Specify, specified as: Donald Trump (n=1)	0.00	0.00		
5. Other SPECIFY (n=53)	0.01	0.02		
6. Other specify as statement against both major party candidates (n=22)	0.00	0.01		
7. Other specify given as: DK (n=37)	0.00	0.01		
8. Other specify- no specification given/specif is REF (n=26)	0.00	0.01		
9. Other Specify- don't care, doesn't matter, won't vote (n=5)	0.00	0.00		
			2.757	0.018
PRE: Will Pres race be a close or will (winner) win by a lot				
0. Win by quite a bit (n=1,167)	0.28	0.28		
1. Will be close (n=3,077)	0.72	0.72		
			0.167	0.683
PRE: Which Pres cand will carry state				
1. Hillary Clinton (n=2,230)	0.52	0.54		
2. Donald Trump (n=1,900)	0.48	0.44		
3. Other Specify, specified as: Hillary Clinton (n=1)	0.00	0.00		
5. Other SPECIFY (n=28)	0.01	0.01		
6. Other specify as statement against both major party candidates (n=3)	0.00	0.00		
7. Other specify given as: DK (n=20)	0.00	0.00		
8. Other specify- no specification given/specif is REF (n=18)	0.00	0.01		
9. Other Specify- don't care, doesn't matter, won't vote (n=2)	0.00	0.00		
			1.093	0.360
PRE: Will Pres race be close in state				
0. Win by quite a bit (n=2,108)	0.53	0.49		
1. Will be close (n=2,126)	0.47	0.51		
			3.134	0.079
POST: Heard about Rep Presidential cand Trump 2005 video about women				
0. No, have not heard about it (n=237)	0.08	0.08		
1. Yes, heard about the video (n=3,410)	0.92	0.92		
			0.007	0.930
POST: Does Rep Presidential cand Trump 2005 video about women matter				
1. A great deal (n=1,021)	0.30	0.31		
2. A lot (n=473)	0.14	0.13		
3. A moderate amount (n=634)	0.19	0.18		
4. A little (n=620)	0.21	0.17		
5. Not at all (n=654)	0.17	0.20		
			1.168	0.321
POST: How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women				
1. Treats women poorly (n=1,951)	0.56	0.53		
2. Treats women neither poorly nor well (n=918)	0.25	0.25		
3. Treats women well (n=755)	0.20	0.22		
			0.620	0.527
POST: How well/poorly does Rep Presidential candidate treat women				
1. Extremely (n=1,572)	0.49	0.61		
2. Moderately (n=974)	0.44	0.34		
3. Slightly (n=158)	0.07	0.06		
			9.016	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- How does Rep Presidential candidate treat women				

1. Treats women extremely poorly (n=1,332)	0.33	0.38		
2. Treats women moderately poorly (n=507)	0.19	0.12		
3. Treats women slightly poorly (n=111)	0.04	0.03		
4. Treats women neigher poorly nor well (n=918)	0.25	0.25		
5. Treats women slightly well (n=47)	0.02	0.01		
6. Treats women moderately well (n=467)	0.14	0.13		
7. Treats women extremely well (n=240)	0.04	0.08		
			4.522	0.000
POST: How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women				
1. Treats women poorly (n=446)	0.08	0.14		
2. Treats women neither poorly nor well (n=1,027)	0.32	0.27		
3. Treats women well (n=2,152)	0.60	0.59		
			6.718	0.002
POST: How well/poorly does Dem Presidential candidate treat women				
1. Extremely (n=1,397)	0.51	0.55		
2. Moderately (n=1,030)	0.42	0.39		
3. Slightly (n=166)	0.07	0.06		
			1.347	0.262
POST: SUMMARY- How does Dem Presidential candidate treat women				
1. Treats women extremely poorly (n=223)	0.03	0.08		
2. Treats women moderately poorly (n=180)	0.04	0.05		
3. Treats women slightly poorly (n=42)	0.01	0.01		
4. Treats women neigher poorly nor well (n=1,027)	0.32	0.27		
5. Treats women slightly well (n=124)	0.03	0.04		
6. Treats women moderately well (n=850)	0.25	0.23		
7. Treats women extremely well (n=1,174)	0.32	0.32		
			3.795	0.001

Candidate: Placement

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'candidate: placement' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of eighteen variables, seven displayed significant differences in mean and thirteen displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents were signifcantly more likely to view as conservative Trump's position on guaranteed income (i.e. favoring a smaller government), environment-jobs tradeoff, and abortion (i.e. pro-life). Moreover, they were more likely to view Clinton's position on spending and services, government medical insurance, as well as the tradeoff between protecting the environment and creating jobs while regulating business as liberal (i.e. favoring a larger government).

It is worth noting that the House candidate comparisons are confounded by sample differences that caused questionnaire differences, as the two modes typically ask about different candidates for different districts. Therefore, apparent mode differences for House candidates may not be due to mode at all.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161128	PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Dem Pres cand
V161129	PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Rep Pres cand
V161179	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand
V161180	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand
V161182	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand
V161183	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand
V161185	PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Dem Pres cand
V161186	PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Rep Pres cand
V161190	PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Dem Pres cand
V161191	PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Rep Pres cand
V161199	PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Dem Pres cand
V161200	PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Rep Pres cand
V161202	PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Dem Pres cand
V161203	PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Rep Pres cand
V162172	POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Democratic House cand
V162173	POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Republican House cand
V162181	POST: STD Abortion: Democratic Presidential cand placemt
V162182	POST: STD Abortion: Republican Presidential cand placemt

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Dem Pres cand	2.80	2.81	0.040	0.841
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Rep Pres cand	4.74	4.84	1.249	0.266
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand	5.32	5.14	7.497	0.007
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand	3.05	2.93	1.465	0.228
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand	3.74	3.66	1.184	0.279
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand	5.33	5.29	0.347	0.557
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Dem Pres cand	2.73	2.91	4.727	0.031
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Rep Pres cand	5.55	5.41	3.446	0.066
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Dem Pres cand	3.05	3.14	0.786	0.377
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Rep Pres cand	5.65	5.44	5.122	0.025

PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Dem Pres cand	2.96	2.94	0.065	0.800
PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Rep Pres cand	5.59	5.55	0.285	0.594
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Dem Pres cand	2.71	2.92	10.152	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Rep Pres cand	5.24	5.07	5.365	0.022
POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Democratic House cand	2.32	2.96	47.393	0.000
POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Republican House cand	4.93	4.75	3.303	0.071
POST: STD Abortion: Democratic Presidential cand placemt	3.52	3.50	0.421	0.518
POST: STD Abortion: Republican Presidential cand placemt	1.96	2.06	4.542	0.035

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Dem Pres cand				
1. Extremely liberal (n=1,025)	0.24	0.25		
2. Liberal (n=1,274)	0.31	0.28		
3. Slightly liberal (n=619)	0.14	0.15		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=695)	0.16	0.19		
5. Slightly conservative (n=237)	0.06	0.05		
6. Conservative (n=212)	0.06	0.06		
7. Extremely conservative (n=95)	0.03	0.03		
			1.043	0.392
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative - Rep Pres cand				
1. Extremely liberal (n=331)	0.10	0.08		
2. Liberal (n=262)	0.07	0.07		
3. Slightly liberal (n=212)	0.04	0.05		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=614)	0.16	0.16		
5. Slightly conservative (n=833)	0.20	0.18		
6. Conservative (n=1,072)	0.24	0.25		
7. Extremely conservative (n=780)	0.18	0.20		
			0.722	0.611
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=149)	0.03	0.04		
2. (n=109)	0.03	0.03		
3. (n=204)	0.05	0.05		
4. (n=714)	0.14	0.20		
5. (n=946)	0.24	0.22		
6. (n=974)	0.26	0.21		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=1,094)	0.26	0.25		
			3.785	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=1,012)	0.22	0.26		
2. (n=979)	0.23	0.21		
3. (n=804)	0.20	0.18		
4. (n=722)	0.16	0.19		
5. (n=269)	0.08	0.06		
6. (n=176)	0.05	0.04		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=200)	0.06	0.06		
			1.588	0.163
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=498)	0.10	0.13		
2. (n=556)	0.12	0.12		
3. (n=674)	0.18	0.15		
4. (n=1,272)	0.28	0.33		

5. (n=682)	0.18	0.15		
6. (n=298)	0.09	0.06		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=191)	0.04	0.05		
			3.843	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=170)	0.04	0.05		
2. (n=152)	0.04	0.03		
3. (n=228)	0.07	0.05		
4. (n=572)	0.10	0.16		
5. (n=719)	0.19	0.16		
6. (n=1,137)	0.27	0.25		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=1,191)	0.29	0.29		
			3.508	0.003
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Dem Pres cand				
1. Govt insurance plan (n=1,326)	0.30	0.31		
2. (n=761)	0.22	0.17		
3. (n=679)	0.19	0.15		
4. (n=763)	0.15	0.21		
5. (n=272)	0.06	0.07		
6. (n=191)	0.05	0.05		
7. Private insurance plan (n=175)	0.03	0.05		
			3.990	0.001
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: Rep Pres cand				
1. Govt insurance plan (n=162)	0.03	0.05		
2. (n=135)	0.03	0.04		
3. (n=165)	0.04	0.04		
4. (n=611)	0.12	0.16		
5. (n=569)	0.16	0.13		
6. (n=935)	0.27	0.20		
7. Private insurance plan (n=1,564)	0.35	0.38		
			4.298	0.001
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Dem Pres cand				
1. Govt should see to jobs and standard of living (n=872)	0.19	0.21		
2. (n=823)	0.22	0.18		
3. (n=920)	0.23	0.21		
4. (n=881)	0.18	0.23		
5. (n=342)	0.10	0.08		
6. (n=170)	0.05	0.04		
7. Govt should let each person get ahead on own (n=171)	0.03	0.05		
			2.428	0.036
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: Rep Pres cand				
1. Govt should see to jobs and standard of living (n=167)	0.03	0.05		
2. (n=132)	0.03	0.03		
3. (n=180)	0.04	0.05		
4. (n=576)	0.10	0.16		
5. (n=491)	0.12	0.12		
6. (n=958)	0.29	0.20		
7. Govt should let each person get ahead on own (n=1,669)	0.38	0.39		
			6.283	0.000
PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Dem Pres cand				
1. Govt should help Blacks (n=1,056)	0.21	0.26		
2. (n=795)	0.21	0.18		
3. (n=825)	0.23	0.19		
4. (n=934)	0.21	0.24		

5. (n=247)	0.07	0.05		
6. (n=131)	0.04	0.03		
7. Blacks should help themselves (n=174)	0.03	0.05		
			2.799	0.017
PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: Rep Pres cand				
1. Govt should help Blacks (n=132)	0.03	0.04		
2. (n=91)	0.02	0.02		
3. (n=164)	0.05	0.04		
4. (n=680)	0.13	0.18		
5. (n=554)	0.13	0.13		
6. (n=826)	0.24	0.18		
7. Blacks should help themselves (n=1,720)	0.39	0.42		
			3.796	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Dem Pres cand				
1. Regulate business to protect the environment and create jobs (n=1,076)	0.25	0.25		
2. (n=929)	0.26	0.20		
3. (n=760)	0.22	0.17		
4. (n=853)	0.16	0.24		
5. (n=250)	0.06	0.06		
6. (n=138)	0.03	0.03		
7. No regulation because it will not work and will cost jobs (n=127)	0.02	0.04		
			5.384	0.000
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff Rep Pres cand				
1. Regulate business to protect the environment and create jobs (n=213)	0.05	0.06		
2. (n=183)	0.05	0.05		
3. (n=268)	0.07	0.07		
4. (n=751)	0.14	0.21		
5. (n=570)	0.15	0.13		
6. (n=814)	0.23	0.18		
7. No regulation because it will not work and will cost jobs (n=1,324)	0.32	0.31		
			4.152	0.001
POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Democratic House cand				
1. Extremely liberal (n=959)	0.47	0.20		
2. Liberal (n=715)	0.14	0.21		
3. Slightly liberal (n=597)	0.15	0.17		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=904)	0.14	0.31		
5. Slightly conservative (n=202)	0.05	0.06		
6. Conservative (n=119)	0.04	0.03		
7. Extremely conservative (n=22)	0.00	0.01		
			25.881	0.000
POST: 7pt scale liberal-conservative: Republican House cand				
1. Extremely liberal (n=21)	0.01	0.01		
2. Liberal (n=128)	0.04	0.05		
3. Slightly liberal (n=204)	0.08	0.08		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=807)	0.26	0.32		
5. Slightly conservative (n=498)	0.20	0.16		
6. Conservative (n=928)	0.35	0.31		
7. Extremely conservative (n=163)	0.07	0.06		
			1.612	0.166
POST: STD Abortion: Democratic Presidential cand placemt				
1. By law, abortion should never be permitted (n=175)	0.06	0.05		
2. The law should permit abortion only in case of... (n=363)	0.09	0.12		
3. The law should permit abortion for reasons other... (n=407)	0.11	0.12		
4. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain... (n=2,627)	0.74	0.72		

			2.467	0.062
POST: STD Abortion: Republican Presidential cand placemt				
1. By law, abortion should never be permitted (n=1,242)	0.35	0.35		
2. The law should permit abortion only in case of... (n=1,429)	0.43	0.38		
3. The law should permit abortion for reasons other... (n=441)	0.12	0.13		
4. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain... (n=433)	0.10	0.14		
			3.260	0.024

Candidate: Traits

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'candidate: traits' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twelve variables, four displayed significant differences in mean and eight displayed significant differences in distribution.
- For the items that exhibited significant differences across modes (Pres Dem cand trait knowledgeable; Pres Dem cand trait speaks mind; Pres Rep cand trait knowledgeable; Pres Rep cand trait speaks mind), face-to-face respondents are more likely to state that the trait described the candidate well.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161159	PRE: Pres Dem cand trait strong leadership
V161160	PRE: Pres Dem cand trait really cares
V161161	PRE: Pres Dem cand trait knowledgeable
V161162	PRE: Pres Dem cand trait honest
V161163	PRE: Pres Dem cand trait speaks mind
V161164	PRE: Pres Rep cand trait strong leadership
V161165	PRE: Pres Rep cand trait really cares
V161166	PRE: Pres Rep cand trait knowledgeable
V161167	PRE: Pres Rep cand trait honest
V161168	PRE: Pres Rep cand trait speaks mind
V161169	PRE: Pres Dem cand even-tempered
V161170	PRE: Pres Rep cand even-tempered

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait strong leadership	3.24	3.28	0.437	0.510
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait really cares	3.47	3.54	0.901	0.344
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait knowledgeable	2.45	2.63	7.308	0.008
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait honest	3.94	3.93	0.028	0.868
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait speaks mind	2.96	3.14	8.640	0.004
PRE: Pres Dem cand even-tempered	3.02	3.06	0.399	0.529
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait strong leadership	3.39	3.48	1.097	0.297
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait really cares	3.86	3.88	0.044	0.834
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait knowledgeable	3.56	3.72	4.230	0.042
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait honest	3.67	3.74	1.052	0.307
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait speaks mind	1.72	1.86	7.875	0.006
PRE: Pres Rep cand even-tempered	4.17	4.16	0.042	0.839

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait strong leadership				
1. Extremely well (n=581)	0.12	0.14		
2. Very well (n=858)	0.19	0.20		
3. Moderately well (n=940)	0.26	0.21		
4. Slightly well (n=642)	0.17	0.14		

5. Not well at all (n=1,232)	0.25	0.31		
			3.910	0.005
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait really cares				
1. Extremely well (n=447)	0.10	0.11		
2. Very well (n=704)	0.17	0.16		
3. Moderately well (n=859)	0.22	0.20		
4. Slightly well (n=662)	0.18	0.15		
5. Not well at all (n=1,581)	0.34	0.38		
			1.864	0.123
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait knowledgeable				
1. Extremely well (n=1,139)	0.26	0.25		
2. Very well (n=1,154)	0.32	0.25		
3. Moderately well (n=973)	0.22	0.25		
4. Slightly well (n=522)	0.12	0.13		
5. Not well at all (n=463)	0.08	0.12		
			4.290	0.004
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait honest				
1. Extremely well (n=182)	0.04	0.05		
2. Very well (n=449)	0.10	0.11		
3. Moderately well (n=875)	0.21	0.21		
4. Slightly well (n=647)	0.19	0.14		
5. Not well at all (n=2,098)	0.46	0.50		
			3.259	0.016
PRE: Pres Dem cand trait speaks mind				
1. Extremely well (n=509)	0.15	0.11		
2. Very well (n=992)	0.24	0.23		
3. Moderately well (n=1,192)	0.29	0.27		
4. Slightly well (n=730)	0.14	0.18		
5. Not well at all (n=826)	0.18	0.20		
			3.918	0.005
PRE: Pres Dem cand even-tempered				
1. Extremely well (n=601)	0.15	0.13		
2. Very well (n=937)	0.22	0.22		
3. Moderately well (n=1,194)	0.28	0.29		
4. Slightly well (n=715)	0.17	0.17		
5. Not well at all (n=797)	0.18	0.19		
			0.420	0.766
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait strong leadership				
1. Extremely well (n=539)	0.12	0.13		
2. Very well (n=771)	0.18	0.18		
3. Moderately well (n=782)	0.20	0.17		
4. Slightly well (n=571)	0.16	0.12		
5. Not well at all (n=1,587)	0.33	0.39		
			2.913	0.029
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait really cares				
1. Extremely well (n=296)	0.07	0.07		
2. Very well (n=531)	0.12	0.12		
3. Moderately well (n=755)	0.18	0.18		
4. Slightly well (n=521)	0.15	0.11		
5. Not well at all (n=2,144)	0.48	0.52		
			1.285	0.279
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait knowledgeable				
1. Extremely well (n=271)	0.07	0.06		
2. Very well (n=610)	0.15	0.14		

3. Moderately well (n=946)	0.24	0.22		
4. Slightly well (n=739)	0.22	0.15		
5. Not well at all (n=1,678)	0.32	0.42		
			5.389	0.001
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait honest				
1. Extremely well (n=298)	0.07	0.08		
2. Very well (n=655)	0.15	0.15		
3. Moderately well (n=823)	0.22	0.19		
4. Slightly well (n=616)	0.17	0.13		
5. Not well at all (n=1,853)	0.39	0.45		
			2.972	0.021
PRE: Pres Rep cand trait speaks mind				
1. Extremely well (n=2,381)	0.57	0.55		
2. Very well (n=1,085)	0.27	0.24		
3. Moderately well (n=348)	0.07	0.08		
4. Slightly well (n=153)	0.03	0.04		
5. Not well at all (n=284)	0.05	0.08		
			2.796	0.034
PRE: Pres Rep cand even-tempered				
1. Extremely well (n=113)	0.03	0.03		
2. Very well (n=205)	0.04	0.05		
3. Moderately well (n=796)	0.19	0.19		
4. Slightly well (n=740)	0.20	0.17		
5. Not well at all (n=2,395)	0.54	0.55		
			0.829	0.484

Demographics: Attributes

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'demographics: attributes' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of three variables, the one variable that was tested for differences in mean displayed significant differences. Two variables tested for differences in distribution did not display significant differences.
- Ratings of participants' own skintone was higher, i.e. darker skin tone, among face-to-face participants.
- Sexual orientation and sexual orientation of family and friends did not differ across modes.

V161342 (PRE FTF CASI / WEB: R self-identified gender) is not shown here because this variable was similar to one used to construct weights. Those who are interested in mode differences for gender should run an unweighted comparison of this variable.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161511	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Sexual orientation of R
V161512	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Sexual orientation of family and friends
V162368	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: R rate own skintone

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: R rate own skintone	2.97	2.37	50.275	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Sexual orientation of R				
1. Heterosexual or straight (n=3,909)	0.94	0.94		
2. Homosexual or gay (or lesbian) (n=109)	0.03	0.03		
3. Bisexual (n=117)	0.03	0.03		
			0.591	0.554
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Sexual orientation of family and friends				
0. No (n=1,865)	0.44	0.47		
1. Yes (n=2,273)	0.56	0.53		
			1.289	0.258

Demographics: Ethnicity

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'demographics: ethnicity' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of four variables, one out of one tested displayed significant differences in mean and one out of four tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to have all of their grandparents born outside of the country.

V161310x (PRE: SUMMARY - R self-identified race) is not shown here. Because this variable was used to construct weights, those who are interested should run an unweighted comparison.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161309	PRE: R: Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino
V161315	PRE: Native status of parents
V161317	PRE: How many grandparents born outside the U.S.
V161323	PRE: LATINO Rs: language at home

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How many grandparents born outside the U.S.	1.00	1.16	4.650	0.033

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: R: Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino				
0. No (n=3,807)	0.88	0.88		
1. Yes (n=450)	0.12	0.12		
			0.006	0.934
PRE: Native status of parents				
1. Both parents born in the U.S. (n=3,449)	0.82	0.82		
2. One parent born in the U.S. (n=243)	0.05	0.06		
3. Both parents born in another country (n=547)	0.13	0.12		
			0.130	0.852
PRE: How many grandparents born outside the U.S.				
0. None (n=2,531)	0.62	0.61		
1. One (n=302)	0.10	0.06		
2. Two (n=460)	0.10	0.11		
3. Three (n=82)	0.02	0.02		
4. All (n=847)	0.16	0.21		
			5.147	0.001
PRE: LATINO Rs: language at home				
1. Only or mostly English (n=213)	0.48	0.49		
2. Both languages equally (n=149)	0.32	0.35		
3. Only or mostly Spanish (n=87)	0.20	0.16		
			0.404	0.667

Demographics: Family

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'demographics: family' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of four variables, none of the two tested displayed significant differences in mean and none of the two tested displayed significant differences in distribution.

V161268 (PRE: R marital status) is not shown here. Because this variable was used to construct weights, those who are interested should run an unweighted comparison.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161109	PRE: R living with how many family members
V161324	PRE: How many children in HH age 0-17
V161269	PRE: Domestic partnership status
V162296a	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: WEB ONLY: R has any living sons or daughters

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: R living with how many family members	1.89	2.05	3.894	0.051
PRE: How many children in HH age 0-17	0.67	0.67	0.000	0.984

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Domestic partnership status				
0. No, not living with a partner (n=1,697)	0.75	0.75		
1. Yes, living with a partner (n=404)	0.25	0.25		
			0.033	0.855
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: WEB ONLY: R has any living sons or daughters				
1. One or more sons (birth, adoped, or stepson) (n=1,822)	0.49	0.51		
2. One or more daughters (birth adopted or step daughter (n=756)	0.24	0.20		
3. No sons and no daughters (n=1,015)	0.27	0.29		
			1.552	0.215

Demographics: Religion

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'demographics: religion' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of nine variables, neither of the two tested displayed significant differences in mean and five of the nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to report that religion was an important part of their life and the Bible is the actual word of God, while web respondents were more likely to report that religion provided guidance in their everyday life.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to attend religious services as well as to consider themselves as part of a church or denomination.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161241	PRE: Is religion important part of R life
V161242	PRE: Religion provides guidance in day-to-day living
V161243	PRE: Is Bible word of God or men
V161244	PRE: Ever attend church or religious services
V161245	PRE: Attend religious services how often
V161245a	PRE: Attend church more often than once a week
V161246	PRE: Ever think of self as part of church or denomination
V161247a	PRE: (Attends church) R subjective description own major religious group
V161247b	PRE: (Nonattendance) R subjective description of own major religious group

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Religion provides guidance in day-to-day living	1.22	1.07	2.501	0.116
PRE: Attend religious services how often	2.54	2.50	0.210	0.647

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Is religion important part of R life				
0. Not important (n=1,462)	0.26	0.38		
1. Important (n=2,782)	0.74	0.62		
			23.053	0.000
PRE: Religion provides guidance in day-to-day living				
1. Some (n=549)	0.24	0.18		
2. Quite a bit (n=779)	0.30	0.26		
3. A great deal (n=1,442)	0.47	0.55		
			6.441	0.002
PRE: Is Bible word of God or men				
1. The Bible is the actual word of God... (n=1,214)	0.36	0.29		
2. The Bible is the word of God but not everything in it... (n=1,942)	0.44	0.46		
3. The Bible is a book written by men and is not... (n=1,042)	0.19	0.25		
5. Other SPECIFY (n=9)	0.01	0.00		
			9.921	0.000

PRE: Ever attend church or religious services				
0. No (n=1,700)	0.36	0.42		
1. Yes (n=2,552)	0.64	0.58		
			13.353	0.000
PRE: Attend religious services how often				
1. Every week (n=789)	0.30	0.31		
2. Almost every week (n=536)	0.19	0.21		
3. Once or twice a month (n=471)	0.19	0.18		
4. A few times a year (n=704)	0.31	0.27		
5. Never (n=49)	0.01	0.03		
			1.987	0.102
PRE: Attend church more often than once a week				
0. More often than once a week (n=362)	0.49	0.45		
1. Once a week (n=426)	0.51	0.55		
			0.515	0.474
PRE: Ever think of self as part of church or denomination				
0. No (n=877)	0.42	0.53		
1. Yes (n=875)	0.57	0.47		
			9.396	0.003
PRE: (Attends church) R subjective description own major religious group				
1. Protestant (n=919)	0.39	0.33		
2. Catholic (n=643)	0.23	0.26		
3. Jewish (n=46)	0.02	0.02		
4. Other (n=886)	0.36	0.39		
			1.529	0.207
PRE: (Nonattendance) R subjective description of own major religious group				
1. Protestant (n=242)	0.26	0.26		
2. Catholic (n=291)	0.34	0.34		
3. Jewish (n=39)	0.05	0.03		
4. Other (n=299)	0.36	0.37		
			0.181	0.875

Demographics: SES

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'demographics: SES' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of twenty variables, none of the four tested displayed significant differences in mean and three out of eighteed tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Currently working or temporarily laid off respondents that were interviewed face-to-face were more likely to be self-employed and to report working about the right number of hours they wanted to.
- Two questions about residence are also included in this memo, and neither question shows differences between web and face-to-face in the length of time respondents reside in their current community or at their current address.

V161270 (PRE: Highest Level of Education) is not shown here. Because this variable was used to construct weights, those who are interested should run an unweighted comparison.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161271	PRE: R high school completion- diploma or GED
V161272	PRE: Spouse partner: Highest Level of Education
V161273	PRE: Spouse high school completion- diploma or GED
V161277	PRE: Initial R employment status, start of occupation module
V161278	PRE: Initial status Homemaker student: working now
V161279	PRE: Initial status Homemaker student: job in last 6 mon
V161281	PRE: Initial status unemployed disabled: R ever work for pay
V161284	PRE: Past self-empl status (R ret dis unemp hmkr stud)
V161286	PRE: Initial status unempl ret disabled: job in last 6 mo
V161288	PRE: Initial status retired disabled: working now
V161289	PRE: Init status nonworkg ret dis unemp hmkr st: look for work
V161293	PRE: Working TLO now - work for self
V161294	PRE: Working TLO now - work for govt
V161296	PRE: Working TLO now - hours works OK
V161298	PRE: Working now: out of work or laid off in last 6 mos
V161299	PRE: Working now: had reduction in work hrs or pay cut
V161300a	PRE: Working now - spouse/partner employment status
V161302	PRE: Anyone in HH belong to labor union
V161331x	PRE: SUMMARY - Length in current community
V161337	PRE: Years R lived at address

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Spouse partner: Highest Level of Education	11.02	11.01	0.007	0.932
PRE: Working TLO now - hours works OK	2.18	2.14	2.400	0.124
PRE: SUMMARY - Length in current community	17.08	17.78	0.840	0.361
PRE: Years R lived at address	4.47	4.56	0.319	0.573

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: R high school completion- diploma or GED				
0. Ged or other equivalent (n=141)	0.20	0.16		
1. Graduation from high school (n=668)	0.80	0.84		
			1.109	0.294
PRE: Spouse partner: Highest Level of Education				
2. 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th grade (n=3)	0.00	0.00		
3. 5th or 6th grade (n=8)	0.00	0.00		
4. 7th or 8th grade (n=11)	0.01	0.00		
5. 9th grade (n=16)	0.01	0.01		
6. 10th grade (n=25)	0.02	0.01		
7. 11th grade (n=33)	0.02	0.02		
8. 12th grade no diploma (n=77)	0.03	0.04		
9. High school grad- h.s. diploma or equivalent(e.g., GED) (n=479)	0.27	0.22		
10. Some college but no degree (n=487)	0.12	0.22		
11. Associate degree-occupational/vocational program (n=151)	0.06	0.06		
12. Associate degree-academic program (n=149)	0.07	0.06		
13. Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, AB, BS) (n=641)	0.23	0.23		
14. Master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, MENG, MED, MSW, MBA) (n=316)	0.12	0.11		
15. Professional school degree (e.g., MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) (n=65)	0.01	0.02		
16. Doctorate degree (e.g., PHD, EDD) (n=55)	0.03	0.02		
			2.650	0.004
PRE: Spouse high school completion- diploma or GED				
0. Ged or other equivalent (n=83)	0.18	0.16		
1. Graduation from high school (n=396)	0.82	0.84		
			0.097	0.755
PRE: Initial R employment status, start of occupation module				
1. Initial employment status: working now (n=2,547)	0.61	0.60		
2. Initial employment status: temporarily laid off (n=49)	0.01	0.01		
4. Initial employment status: unemployed (n=220)	0.04	0.07		
5. Initial employment status: retired (n=922)	0.17	0.18		
6. Initial employment status: permanently disabled (n=182)	0.06	0.04		
7. Initial employment status: homemaker (n=222)	0.06	0.06		
8. Initial employment status: student (n=113)	0.04	0.04		
			0.838	0.522
PRE: Initial status Homemaker student: working now				
0. No (n=284)	0.77	0.84		
1. Yes (n=51)	0.23	0.16		
			1.229	0.270
PRE: Initial status Homemaker student: job in last 6 mon				
0. No (n=220)	0.70	0.78		
1. Yes (n=64)	0.30	0.22		
			1.744	0.189
PRE: Initial status unemployed disabled: R ever work for pay				
0. No (n=17)	0.07	0.04		
1. Yes (n=384)	0.93	0.96		
			0.768	0.382
PRE: Past self-empl status (R ret dis unemp hmkr stud)				
1. Someone else (n=1,123)	0.86	0.84		
2. Both self and someone else (n=107)	0.04	0.08		
3. Self-employed (n=131)	0.10	0.08		
			1.818	0.165

PRE: Initial status unempl ret disabled: job in last 6 mo				
0. No (n=1,085)	0.82	0.84		
1. Yes (n=211)	0.18	0.16		
			0.625	0.430
PRE: Initial status retired disabled: working now				
0. No (n=966)	0.88	0.92		
1. Yes (n=111)	0.12	0.08		
			2.198	0.140
PRE: Init status nonworkg ret dis unemp hmkr st: look for work				
0. No (n=1,197)	0.80	0.78		
1. Yes (n=264)	0.20	0.22		
			0.985	0.323
PRE: Working TLO now - work for self				
1. Someone else (n=2,259)	0.83	0.83		
2. Both self and someone else (n=186)	0.03	0.08		
3. Self-employed (n=309)	0.14	0.09		
			10.538	0.000
PRE: Working TLO now - work for govt				
0. No (n=1,894)	0.76	0.79		
1. Yes (n=537)	0.24	0.21		
			0.913	0.341
PRE: Working TLO now - hours works OK				
1. Fewer (n=269)	0.07	0.12		
2. About right (n=1,757)	0.68	0.63		
3. More (n=715)	0.25	0.26		
			5.326	0.006
PRE: Working now: out of work or laid off in last 6 mos				
0. No (n=2,453)	0.91	0.89		
1. Yes (n=253)	0.09	0.11		
			1.505	0.222
PRE: Working now: had reduction in work hrs or pay cut				
0. No (n=2,370)	0.88	0.86		
1. Yes (n=334)	0.12	0.14		
			1.142	0.287
PRE: Anyone in HH belong to labor union				
1. Yes (n=579)	0.15	0.15		
2. No (n=3,665)	0.85	0.85		
			0.027	0.868
PRE: Working now - spouse/partner employment status				
0. Not selected (n=922)	0.34	0.36		
1. Selected (n=1,613)	0.66	0.64		
			0.332	0.565

Engagement: Contact

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'engagement: contact' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of fourteen variables, seven displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely than face-to-face respondents to report that they were contacted during the 2016 campaign. By contrast, forms of contact originating from respondents did not typically exhibit differences across mode.
- Web respondents were more likely to report that they were contacted by a party. Among those contacted, web and face-to-face respondents reported equal levels of contact from the Democratic Party. Face-to-face respondents reported higher contact levels from the Republican party and lower contact levels from both parties. Web respondents were also more likely to report that they were contacted to register/turn out to vote and to vote for or against a candidate or party.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162007	POST: Did party contact R about 2016 campaign
V162007a	POST: Which party contacted R about 2016 campaign
V162008	POST: Did anyone other than parties contact R about cands
V162009	POST: Anyone talk to R abt registering or getting out to vote
V162010	POST: R talk to anyone about voting for or against cand or pty
V162019	POST: Contact U.S. Representative or Senator
V162020a	POST: Who did R contact: was it U.S. Senator from R's state
V162020c	POST: Who did R contact: was it R's district U.S. Representative
V162020b	POST: Who did R contact: was it U.S. Senator from another state
V162020d	POST: Who did R contact: was it other U.S. Representative
V162198	POST: Has R contacted elected federal official in past 12 months
V162200	POST: Has R contacted non-elected federal official in past 12 months
V162202	POST: Has R contacted elected local official in past 12 months
V162204	POST: Has R contacted non-elected local official in past 12 months

Table 2: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Did party contact R about 2016 campaign				
0. No (n=2,468)	0.72	0.67		
1. Yes (n=1,178)	0.28	0.33		
			5.538	0.020
POST: Which party contacted R about 2016 campaign				
1. Democrats (n=455)	0.39	0.39		
2. Republicans (n=270)	0.33	0.21		
3. Both (n=413)	0.24	0.38		
5. Other (n=31)	0.04	0.02		
			5.366	0.002
POST: Did anyone other than parties contact R about cands				
0. No (n=3,181)	0.89	0.86		
1. Yes (n=467)	0.11	0.14		
			2.640	0.107
POST: Anyone talk to R abt registering or getting out to vote				

0. No, no one did (n=1,981)	0.59	0.49		
1. Yes, someone did (n=1,668)	0.41	0.51		
			14.806	0.000
POST: R talk to anyone about voting for or against cand or pty				
0. No (n=1,819)	0.56	0.49		
1. Yes (n=1,829)	0.44	0.51		
			6.191	0.014
POST: Contact U.S. Representative or Senator				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=3,235)	0.90	0.90		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=410)	0.10	0.10		
			0.064	0.800
POST: Who did R contact: was it U.S. Senator from R's state				
0. No (n=114)	0.37	0.24		
1. Yes (n=294)	0.63	0.76		
			4.700	0.032
POST: Who did R contact: was it R's district U.S. Representative				
0. No (n=147)	0.48	0.34		
1. Yes (n=262)	0.52	0.66		
			4.147	0.044
POST: Who did R contact: was it U.S. Senator from another state				
0. No (n=342)	0.82	0.84		
1. Yes (n=67)	0.18	0.16		
			0.174	0.677
POST: Who did R contact: was it other U.S. Representative				
0. No (n=358)	0.88	0.84		
1. Yes (n=51)	0.12	0.16		
			0.552	0.459
POST: Has R contacted elected federal official in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=3,189)	0.90	0.88		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=449)	0.10	0.12		
			2.108	0.149
POST: Has R contacted non-elected federal official in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=3,396)	0.96	0.93		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=243)	0.04	0.07		
			7.524	0.007
POST: Has R contacted elected local official in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=3,154)	0.86	0.89		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=485)	0.14	0.11		
			3.110	0.080
POST: Has R contacted non-elected local official in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=3,295)	0.90	0.92		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=345)	0.10	0.08		
			2.467	0.119

Engagement: Interest

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'engagement: interest' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of four variables, none displayed significant differences in mean and one displayed a significant difference in distribution.
- Attention to politics and elections displayed a significant difference in distribution. Face-to-face respondents were more likely to report 'Always' paying attention to politics and elections.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161003	PRE: How often does R pay attn to politics and elections
V161004	PRE: How interested in following campaigns
V161145	PRE: Care who wins Presidential Election revised version
V161004	PRE: How interested in following campaigns

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How often does R pay attn to politics and elections	2.57	2.58	0.056	0.813
PRE: How interested in following campaigns	1.65	1.65	0.030	0.862
PRE: Care who wins Presidential Election revised version	1.89	1.86	0.285	0.594
PRE: How interested in following campaigns	1.65	1.65	0.030	0.862

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How often does R pay attn to politics and elections				
1. Always (n=863)	0.23	0.17		
2. Most of the time (n=1,496)	0.30	0.36		
3. About half the time (n=885)	0.17	0.22		
4. Some of the time (n=943)	0.28	0.22		
5. Never (n=84)	0.02	0.03		
			7.631	0.000
PRE: How interested in following campaigns				
1. Very much interested (n=2,230)	0.50	0.49		
2. Somewhat interested (n=1,520)	0.34	0.37		
3. Not much interested (n=521)	0.15	0.14		
			1.206	0.300
PRE: Care who wins Presidential Election revised version				
1. A great deal (n=2,400)	0.53	0.54		
2. A lot (n=856)	0.22	0.21		
3. A moderate amount (n=630)	0.14	0.16		
4. A little (n=218)	0.06	0.06		
5. Not at all (n=160)	0.05	0.04		
			0.657	0.616
PRE: How interested in following campaigns				
1. Very much interested (n=2,230)	0.50	0.49		
2. Somewhat interested (n=1,520)	0.34	0.37		

3. Not much interested (n=521)	0.15	0.14		
			1.206	0.300

Engagement: Knowledge

For this memo, any variables that were not already coded with refusals and 'don't know' options as 'not correct' were recoded as such, except for minumum wage. The minimum wage variable was recoded in one version so that respondents had to provide an answer for minimum wage that matched their state minimum wage (i.e., V162138a C/NC). A second version of the variable took the absolute value of the difference in each respondent's answer from the minimum wage in her/his state (V162138b Distance).

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'engagement: knowledge' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of sixteen variables, thirteen out of fifteen tested displayed significant differences in distribution and the one variable tested for mean displayed a significant difference.
- Overall, the proportion of web respondents that answered correctly was higher than face-to-face respondents for all knowlege questions that displayed differences in distribution.
- Likewise, the mean distance from the correct state minimum wage was lower for web respondents.

More information on the coding schemes for the office recall questions can be found in the *Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study*. More information about how the minimum wage variable was coded can be found in the Appendix; researchers may wish to employ alternate coding schemes for the minimum wage variable.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161513	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Years Senator Elected
V161514	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Political knowledge: program Fed govt spends
V161515	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Party with Most Members In House Before Election
V161516	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Party with Most Members In Senate Before Election
V162073a	POST: Office recall: Speaker of the House Ryan
V162073b	POST: Office recall: Speaker of the House Ryan [Scheme 2]
V162072	POST: Office recall: Vice-President Biden
V162074a	POST: Office recall: Chancellor of Germany Merkel
V162074b	POST: Office recall: Chancellor of Germany Merkel [Scheme 2]
V162076a	POST: Office recall: US Supreme Ct Chief Justice Roberts
V162076b	POST: Office recall: US Supreme Ct Chief Justice Roberts [Scheme 2]
V162075a	POST: Office recall: President of Russia Putin
V162075b	POST: Office recall: President of Russia Putin [Scheme 2]
V162137	POST: What is current unemployment rate
V162138a	POST: What is minimum wage in R state - C/NC
V162138b	POST: What is minimum wage in R state - Distance

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: What is minimum wage in R state - Distance	2.91	0.94	75.014	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Years Senator Elected				

0. Not correct (n=2,498)	0.77	0.55		
1. Correct (n=1,727)	0.23	0.45		
			142.263	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Political knowledge: program Fed govt spends				
0. Not correct (n=3,072)	0.74	0.74		
1. Correct (n=1,151)	0.26	0.26		
			0.003	0.953
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Party with Most Members In House Before Election				
0. Not correct (n=1,227)	0.33	0.30		
1. Correct (n=2,995)	0.67	0.70		
			3.157	0.078
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Party with Most Members In Senate Before Election				
0. Not correct (n=1,481)	0.39	0.34		
1. Correct (n=2,741)	0.61	0.66		
			8.802	0.004
POST: Office recall: Speaker of the House Ryan				
0. Not correct (n=1,608)	0.56	0.42		
1. Correct (n=2,041)	0.44	0.58		
			27.073	0.000
POST: Office recall: Speaker of the House Ryan [Scheme 2]				
0. Not correct (n=1,348)	0.50	0.35		
.5. Partially correct (n=318)	0.09	0.09		
1. Correct (n=1,983)	0.41	0.56		
			15.878	0.000
POST: Office recall: Vice-President Biden				
0. Not correct (n=450)	0.18	0.12		
1. Correct (n=3,199)	0.82	0.88		
			12.388	0.001
POST: Office recall: Chancellor of Germany Merkel				
0. Not correct (n=2,036)	0.74	0.52		
1. Correct (n=1,613)	0.26	0.48		
			80.805	0.000
POST: Office recall: Chancellor of Germany Merkel [Scheme 2]				
0. Not correct (n=2,379)	0.82	0.62		
1. Correct (n=1,270)	0.18	0.38		
			53.158	0.000
POST: Office recall: US Supreme Ct Chief Justice Roberts				
0. Not correct (n=2,176)	0.81	0.52		
.5. Partially correct (n=505)	0.12	0.14		
1. Correct (n=968)	0.07	0.34		
			86.835	0.000
POST: Office recall: US Supreme Ct Chief Justice Roberts [Scheme 2]				
0. Not correct (n=2,728)	0.94	0.68		
1. Correct (n=921)	0.06	0.32		
			110.719	0.000
POST: Office recall: President of Russia Putin				
0. Not correct (n=552)	0.20	0.15		
1. Correct (n=3,097)	0.80	0.85		
			4.808	0.030
POST: Office recall: President of Russia Putin [Scheme 2]				
0. Not correct (n=1,166)	0.42	0.30		
1. Correct (n=2,483)	0.58	0.70		
			20.983	0.000
POST: What is current unemployment rate				

0. Not correct (n=1,599)	0.60	0.39		
1. Correct (n=2,050)	0.40	0.61		
			76.994	0.000
POST: What is minimum wage in R state - C/NC				
0. Not correct (n=2,020)	0.73	0.56		
1. Correct (n=1,203)	0.27	0.44		
			39.934	0.000

Engagement: Media

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'engagement: media' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of nine variables, four of the seven tested displayed significant differences in mean and eight of the nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents reported spending more days in the week following news on any media (PRE: Days in week watch/listen/read news on any media). However, for questions asking how many times ('none', 'just one or two', 'several', 'a good many') respondents got information about the 2016 campaign on the radio, Internet and newspapers, web respondents reported more frequent exposure than face-to-face respondents. Exposure to the campaign on television did not exhibit a difference in mean across mode.
- A higher proportion of face-to-face respondents reported using Facebook in the past month and a higher proportion of web respondents reported not having a Facebook account.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161008	PRE: Days in week watch/listen/read news on any media
V161009	PRE: Attention to news on any media
V162002	POST: How many programs about 2016 campaign did R watch on TV
V162003	POST: How many speeches about 2016 campaign did R listen to on radio
V162004	POST: How many times R got info about 2016 campaign on the Internet
V162005	POST: How many stories R read about 2016 campaign in any newspaper
V162006	POST: Did R visit website of candidate
V162370	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Facebook account used recently
V162257	POST: R follows politics in media

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Days in week watch/listen/read news on any media	5.61	5.35	7.289	0.008
PRE: Attention to news on any media	2.65	2.59	1.875	0.173
POST: How many programs about 2016 campaign did R watch on TV	2.89	2.94	1.585	0.210
POST: How many speeches about 2016 campaign did R listen to on radio	1.97	2.24	28.403	0.000
POST: How many times R got info about 2016 campaign on the Internet	2.74	3.01	20.185	0.000
POST: How many stories R read about 2016 campaign in any newspaper	2.00	2.20	16.682	0.000
POST: R follows politics in media	2.20	2.26	1.475	0.227

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Days in week watch/listen/read news on any media				
0. None (n=73)	0.02	0.02		
1. One day (n=187)	0.05	0.05		
2. Two days (n=213)	0.06	0.06		

3. Three days (n=287)	0.06	0.08		
4. Four days (n=266)	0.05	0.07		
5. Five days (n=641)	0.13	0.16		
6. Six days (n=307)	0.04	0.08		
7. Seven days (n=2,293)	0.60	0.48		
			6.148	0.000
PRE: Attention to news on any media				
1. A great deal (n=909)	0.21	0.18		
2. A lot (n=1,071)	0.22	0.27		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,391)	0.32	0.34		
4. A little (n=749)	0.22	0.19		
5. None at all (n=73)	0.03	0.02		
			3.680	0.007
POST: How many programs about 2016 campaign did R watch on TV				
1. None (n=318)	0.09	0.08		
2. Just one or two (n=837)	0.27	0.22		
3. Several (n=1,248)	0.31	0.37		
4. A good many (n=1,246)	0.33	0.33		
			3.387	0.022
POST: How many speeches about 2016 campaign did R listen to on radio				
1. None (n=1,394)	0.46	0.36		
2. Just one or two (n=817)	0.23	0.23		
3. Several (n=795)	0.18	0.23		
4. A good many (n=643)	0.12	0.18		
			10.470	0.000
POST: How many times R got info about 2016 campaign on the Internet				
1. None (n=510)	0.22	0.11		
2. Just one or two (n=581)	0.17	0.15		
3. Several (n=1,183)	0.28	0.37		
4. A good many (n=1,373)	0.34	0.37		
			17.055	0.000
POST: How many stories R read about 2016 campaign in any newspaper				
1. None (n=1,404)	0.47	0.36		
2. Just one or two (n=817)	0.20	0.25		
3. Several (n=770)	0.18	0.22		
4. A good many (n=658)	0.14	0.17		
			11.331	0.000
POST: Did R visit website of candidate				
0. Never did that (n=2,369)	0.76	0.76		
1. Yes, visited candidate web site(s) (n=768)	0.24	0.24		
			0.012	0.911
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Facebook account used recently				
1. Yes have a Facebook account I have used in the past month (n=2,012)	0.62	0.55		
2. Have a Facebook account but have not used it in past month (n=322)	0.08	0.09		
3. No, do not have a Facebook account (n=1,203)	0.30	0.36		
			4.463	0.014
POST: R follows politics in media				
1. Very closely (n=691)	0.22	0.17		
2. Fairly closely (n=1,696)	0.43	0.47		
3. Not very closely (n=1,023)	0.28	0.30		
4. Not at all (n=229)	0.07	0.06		
			3.068	0.032

Engagement: Participation

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'engagement: participation' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twenty variables, two of the three tested displayed significant differences in mean and five of the nineteen tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Most measures of political participation did not exhibit differences across mode. However, web respondents reported spending more days in the past week discussing politics, and buying/boycotting a product/service for political reasons.
- Web respondents were also more likely to give money to a religious organization, wear a campaign button/post sign/bumper sticker, and send a message on Facebook/Twitter about political issues during the past 12 months.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162011	POST: R go to any political meetings, rallies, speeches
V162012	POST: R wear campaign button or post sign or bumper sticker
V162013	POST: R do any (other) work for party or candidate
V162014	POST: R contribute money to specific candidate campaign
V162014a	POST: Party of candidate for whom R contributed money
V162016	POST: R contribute money to political party
V162016a	POST: Party to which R contributed
V162017	POST: R contribute to any other group for/against a cand
V162018a	POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: joined a protest march
V162018b	POST: DHS: Has Rin past 12 months: signed petition
V162018c	POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: given money to relig org
V162018d	POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: gave money to soc/pol org
V162018e	POST: DHS: sent a message on Facebook/Twitter about polit iss
V162141	POST: How often bought or boycotted product or service for pol/soc reason
V162174	POST: Ever discuss politics with family or friends
V162174a	POST: Days in past week discussed politics
V162194	POST: Number of organizations in which R is a member
V162195	POST: Has R done community work in past 12 months
V162196	POST: Did R attend meeting on school/community issue past 12 months
V162197	POST: Has R done any volunteer work in past 12 months

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Days in past week discussed politics	3.73	4.04	5.272	0.023
POST: How often bought or boycotted product or service for pol/soc reason	1.86	2.02	7.895	0.006
POST: Number of organizations in which R is a member	1.02	1.08	0.548	0.460

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: R go to any political meetings, rallies, speeches				

0. No (n=3,388)	0.93	0.93		
1. Yes (n=260)	0.07	0.07		
			0.243	0.623
POST: R wear campaign button or post sign or bumper sticker				
0. No (n=3,207)	0.91	0.86		
1. Yes (n=441)	0.09	0.14		
			11.748	0.001
POST: R do any (other) work for party or candidate				
0. No (n=3,529)	0.97	0.97		
1. Yes (n=119)	0.03	0.03		
			0.823	0.366
POST: R contribute money to specific candidate campaign				
0. No (n=3,204)	0.88	0.89		
1. Yes (n=442)	0.12	0.11		
			0.237	0.627
POST: Party of candidate for whom R contributed money				
1. Democratic (n=256)	0.66	0.58		
2. Republican (n=157)	0.32	0.34		
3. Both Democratic and Republican (n=13)	0.01	0.03		
5. Other (n=16)	0.02	0.05		
			1.626	0.187
POST: R contribute money to political party				
0. No (n=3,362)	0.91	0.93		
1. Yes (n=284)	0.09	0.07		
			3.692	0.057
POST: Party to which R contributed				
1. Democratic (n=154)	0.61	0.56		
2. Republican (n=118)	0.38	0.38		
3. Both Democratic and Republican parties (n=5)	0.00	0.03		
5. Other (n=7)	0.01	0.03		
			1.412	0.242
POST: R contribute to any other group for/against a cand				
0. No (n=3,507)	0.95	0.97		
1. Yes (n=141)	0.05	0.03		
			1.570	0.212
POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: joined a protest march				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=3,531)	0.97	0.96		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=117)	0.03	0.04		
			0.700	0.404
POST: DHS: Has Rin past 12 months: signed petition				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=2,760)	0.78	0.75		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=887)	0.22	0.25		
			1.509	0.221
POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: given money to relig org				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=2,129)	0.55	0.61		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=1,519)	0.45	0.39		
			9.994	0.002
POST: DHS: Has R in past 12 months: gave money to soc/pol org				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=2,898)	0.81	0.82		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=746)	0.19	0.18		
			0.099	0.752
POST: DHS: sent a message on Facebook/Twitter about polit iss				
0. Have not done this in past 12 months (n=2,436)	0.73	0.64		
1. Have done this in past 12 months (n=1,210)	0.27	0.36		

			14.529	0.000
POST: Ever discuss politics with family or friends				
0. No (n=673)	0.18	0.21		
1. Yes (n=2,973)	0.82	0.79		
			2.181	0.142
POST: Days in past week discussed politics				
0. Zero days (n=164)	0.10	0.03		
1. One day (n=379)	0.15	0.12		
2. Two days (n=468)	0.18	0.16		
3. Three days (n=366)	0.09	0.14		
4. Four days (n=305)	0.07	0.12		
5. Five days (n=315)	0.09	0.12		
6. Six days (n=134)	0.03	0.05		
7. Seven days (n=840)	0.29	0.26		
			7.865	0.000
POST: Has R done community work in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=2,425)	0.70	0.68		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=1,213)	0.30	0.32		
			0.670	0.414
POST: Did R attend meeting on school/community issue past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=2,550)	0.73	0.70		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=1,092)	0.27	0.30		
			0.919	0.339
POST: Has R done any volunteer work in past 12 months				
0. No, have not done this (n=2,021)	0.57	0.58		
1. Yes, have done this in the past 12 months (n=1,616)	0.43	0.42		
			0.263	0.609
POST: How often bought or boycotted product or service for pol/soc reason				
1. Never (n=1,572)	0.49	0.42		
2. Once in a while (n=1,198)	0.30	0.32		
3. About half the time (n=373)	0.10	0.12		
4. Most of the time (n=323)	0.08	0.09		
5. All the time (n=165)	0.03	0.05		
			2.846	0.042

Feeling Thermometers

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'feeling thermometers' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of fifty-two variables, eighteen displayed significant differences in mean.
- Face-to-face respondents felt more warmly toward the Libertarian and Green Party presidential candidates, the Democratic and Republican Vice-Presidential candidates, the Republican Party, the House Democratic and Republican candidates, Christian fundamentalists, big business, conservatives, the Supreme Court, Congress, rich people, Christians, and Black Lives Matter.

It is worth noting that the House candidate comparisons are confounded by sample differences that caused questionnaire differences, as the two modes typically ask about different candidates for different districts. Therefore, apparent mode differences for House candidates may not be due to mode at all.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161086	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Presidential cand
V161087	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Presidential cand
V161088	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Presidential cand
V161089	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Green Party Presidential cand
V161090	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Vice-Pres cand
V161091	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Vice-Pres cand
V161092	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Previous President
V161093	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Bill Clinton
V161094	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Vice-Pres cand
V161095	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Party
V161096	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Party
V162078	POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Presidential candidate
V162079	POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Presidential candidate
V162080	POST: Feeling thermometer: Libertarian Presidential candidate
V162081	POST: Feeling thermometer: Green Party Presidential candidate
V162082	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
V162083	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
V162084	POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE
V162085	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
V162086	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
V162087	POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE
V162088	POST: Feeling thermometer: SR. SENATOR IN STATE WITHOUT RACE
V162089	POST: Feeling thermometer: JR. SENATOR IN STATE WITHOUT RACE
V162090	POST: Feeling thermometer: NONRUNNING SENATOR IN STATE W/RACE
V162091	POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Vice Presidential cand
V162092	POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Vice Presidential cand
V162093	POST: Feeling thermometer: John Roberts
V162094	POST: Feeling thermometer: Pope Francis
V162095	POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS
V162096	POST: Feeling thermometer: FEMINISTS
V162097	POST: Feeling thermometer: LIBERALS
V162098	POST: Feeling thermometer: LABOR UNIONS
V162099	POST: Feeling thermometer: POOR PEOPLE
V162100	POST: Feeling thermometer: BIG BUSINESS
V162101	POST: Feeling thermometer: CONSERVATIVES

V162102	POST: Feeling thermometer: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT
V162103	POST: Feeling thermometer: GAY MEN AND LESBIANS
V162104	POST: Feeling thermometer: CONGRESS
V162105	POST: Feeling thermometer: RICH PEOPLE
V162106	POST: Feeling thermometer: MUSLIMS
V162107	POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIANS
V162108	POST: Feeling thermometer: JEWS
V162109	POST: Feeling thermometer: TEA PARTY
V162110	POST: Feeling thermometer: POLICE
V162111	POST: Feeling thermometer: TRANSGENDER PEOPLE
V162112	POST: Feeling thermometer: SCIENTISTS
V162113	POST: Feeling thermometer: BLACK LIVES MATTER
V162310	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ASIAN-AMERICANS
V162311	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: HISPANICS
V162312	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: BLACKS
V162313	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
V162314	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: WHITES

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Presidential cand	43.49	41.69	0.902	0.344
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Presidential cand	38.58	35.91	1.667	0.199
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Presidential cand	47.61	42.33	25.825	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Green Party Presidential cand	47.74	41.31	26.677	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Vice-Pres cand	49.66	45.04	15.109	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Vice-Pres cand	52.01	47.04	10.769	0.001
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Previous President	53.83	53.72	0.003	0.959
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Bill Clinton	49.50	49.56	0.002	0.968
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Libertarian Vice-Pres cand	51.66	41.57	38.441	0.000
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Party	49.06	48.57	0.138	0.711
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Party	46.59	41.82	15.714	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Presidential candidate	45.84	43.17	2.036	0.156
POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Presidential candidate	45.12	41.20	3.300	0.072
POST: Feeling thermometer: Libertarian Presidential candidate	47.28	43.48	15.731	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: Green Party Presidential candidate	46.10	43.38	6.778	0.010
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	59.29	52.80	19.689	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	55.76	53.28	7.238	0.008
POST: Feeling thermometer: HOUSE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE	49.68	51.77	0.383	0.539
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	54.92	54.03	0.286	0.594
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	53.11	51.18	2.101	0.150
POST: Feeling thermometer: SENATE IND/3rd-PARTY CANDIDATE	56.62	48.67	1.545	0.217
POST: Feeling thermometer: SR. SENATOR IN STATE WITHOUT RACE	55.02	53.55	0.770	0.382
POST: Feeling thermometer: JR. SENATOR IN STATE WITHOUT RACE	53.35	51.92	0.449	0.504
POST: Feeling thermometer: NONRUNNING SENATOR IN STATE W/RACE	53.80	52.67	0.667	0.416
POST: Feeling thermometer: Democratic Vice Presidential cand	49.12	46.92	3.649	0.058
POST: Feeling thermometer: Republican Vice Presidential cand	52.45	50.00	1.614	0.206
POST: Feeling thermometer: John Roberts	53.65	53.57	0.006	0.940
POST: Feeling thermometer: Pope Francis	71.17	68.77	3.702	0.056

POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS	53.07	50.54	4.053	0.046
POST: Feeling thermometer: FEMINISTS	56.74	54.85	2.291	0.133
POST: Feeling thermometer: LIBERALS	52.09	50.76	1.281	0.260
POST: Feeling thermometer: LABOR UNIONS	58.94	56.77	3.236	0.074
POST: Feeling thermometer: POOR PEOPLE	74.23	72.65	2.491	0.117
POST: Feeling thermometer: BIG BUSINESS	52.19	48.88	10.038	0.002
POST: Feeling thermometer: CONSERVATIVES	57.66	55.25	8.276	0.005
POST: Feeling thermometer: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT	60.54	57.45	15.063	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: GAY MEN AND LESBIANS	58.30	60.80	1.689	0.196
POST: Feeling thermometer: CONGRESS	46.94	41.91	25.120	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: RICH PEOPLE	54.74	51.68	12.847	0.000
POST: Feeling thermometer: MUSLIMS	55.61	53.98	0.964	0.328
POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIANS	77.51	75.19	7.557	0.007
POST: Feeling thermometer: JEWS	70.59	71.06	0.169	0.682
POST: Feeling thermometer: TEA PARTY	45.34	44.57	0.489	0.485
POST: Feeling thermometer: POLICE	75.81	74.16	2.194	0.141
POST: Feeling thermometer: TRANSGENDER PEOPLE	55.64	54.72	0.360	0.549
POST: Feeling thermometer: SCIENTISTS	76.60	76.41	0.033	0.857
POST: Feeling thermometer: BLACK LIVES MATTER	52.26	48.15	5.672	0.019
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ASIAN-AMERICANS	67.78	68.58	0.434	0.511
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: HISPANICS	67.59	68.19	0.157	0.693
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: BLACKS	68.46	69.10	0.343	0.559
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS	41.77	41.93	0.009	0.924
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: WHITES	72.06	71.18	0.813	0.369

Government: Approval and Emotion

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'government: approval and emotion' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twenty variables, six of the eleven tested displayed significant differences in mean and eight of the twenty tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Most measures of government approval did not exhibit differences across mode. Approval of Congress's and the President's handling of various policy issues did not exhibit mode differences.
- Face-to-face respondents also expressed that the goverment has done a better job in the last 8 years and were more satisifed with the way democracy works in the US than web respondets.
- Both emotion items exhibited differences across mode. Web respondents were more likely to feel more angry and proud affect for President Obama than face-to-face respondents.

It is worth noting that the House candidate comparisons are confounded by sample differences that caused questionnaire differences, as the two modes were typically ask about different candidates for different districts. Therefore, apparent mode differences for House candidates may not be due to mode at all.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161080	PRE: Approval of Congress handling its job
V161080x	PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval Congress handling job
V161081	PRE: Are things in the country on right track
V161082	PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling job as Pres
V161082x	PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling job
V161083	PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling economy
V161083x	PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling economy
V161084	PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling foreign rel
V161084x	PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling foreign rel
V161085	PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling health care
V161085x	PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling health care
V161236	PRE: Affect for Obama - angry
V161237	PRE: Affect for Obama - proud
V162114	POST: Approve or disapprove of House incumbent
V162114a	POST: How much approve House incumbent
V162114b	POST: How much disapprove House incumbent
V162114x	POST: SUMMARY- House incumbent approval
V162115	POST: How good a job does House incumbent do in district
V162277	POST: Gov done a good or bad job in last 8 years
V162290	POST: CSES: Satisfied with way democracy works in the U.S

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval Congress handling job	3.21	3.21	0.024	0.877
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling job	2.47	2.49	0.077	0.782
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling economy	2.52	2.52	0.007	0.931
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling foreign rel	2.65	2.59	0.649	0.422
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling health care	2.79	2.81	0.047	0.828

PRE: Affect for Obama - angry	2.12	2.33	13.272	0.000
PRE: Affect for Obama - proud	2.51	2.67	6.315	0.013
POST: SUMMARY- House incumbent approval	2.30	2.50	12.299	0.001
POST: How good a job does House incumbent do in district	2.51	2.38	10.334	0.002
POST: Gov done a good or bad job in last 8 years	2.57	2.67	9.185	0.003
POST: CSES: Satisfied with way democracy works in the U.S	2.50	2.70	17.993	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Approval of Congress handling its job				
0. Disapprove (n=3,116)	0.74	0.74		
1. Approve (n=1,010)	0.26	0.26		
			0.013	0.908
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval Congress handling job				
1. Approve strongly (n=279)	0.09	0.07		
2. Approve not strongly (n=726)	0.17	0.19		
3. Disapprove not strongly (n=815)	0.19	0.21		
4. Disapprove strongly (n=2,295)	0.56	0.53		
			1.483	0.220
PRE: Are things in the country on right track				
0. Wrong track (n=3,146)	0.74	0.75		
1. Right direction (n=1,089)	0.26	0.25		
			0.033	0.856
PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling job as Pres				
0. Disapprove (n=2,031)	0.47	0.47		
1. Approve (n=2,194)	0.53	0.53		
			0.007	0.931
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling job				
1. Approve strongly (n=1,459)	0.37	0.36		
2. Approve not strongly (n=727)	0.16	0.18		
3. Disapprove not strongly (n=403)	0.11	0.09		
4. Disapprove strongly (n=1,627)	0.37	0.37		
			0.969	0.393
PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling economy				
0. Disapprove (n=2,059)	0.48	0.47		
1. Approve (n=2,161)	0.52	0.53		
			0.291	0.590
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling economy				
1. Approve strongly (n=1,349)	0.34	0.33		
2. Approve not strongly (n=807)	0.18	0.20		
3. Disapprove not strongly (n=416)	0.10	0.09		
4. Disapprove strongly (n=1,641)	0.38	0.38		
			0.757	0.506
PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling foreign rel				
0. Disapprove (n=2,138)	0.53	0.50		
1. Approve (n=2,061)	0.47	0.50		
			1.253	0.265
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling foreign rel				
1. Approve strongly (n=1,200)	0.30	0.30		
2. Approve not strongly (n=857)	0.18	0.21		
3. Disapprove not strongly (n=432)	0.11	0.10		
4. Disapprove strongly (n=1,706)	0.42	0.39		

			0.879	0.443
PRE: Approve or disapprove President handling health care				
0. Disapprove (n=2,480)	0.58	0.58		
1. Approve (n=1,747)	0.42	0.42		
			0.002	0.959
PRE: SUMMARY - Approval/disapproval President handling health care				
1. Approve strongly (n=1,108)	0.29	0.27		
2. Approve not strongly (n=635)	0.13	0.16		
3. Disapprove not strongly (n=358)	0.08	0.08		
4. Disapprove strongly (n=2,120)	0.50	0.49		
			1.016	0.378
PRE: Affect for Obama - angry				
1. Never (n=1,474)	0.39	0.33		
2. Some of the time (n=1,325)	0.34	0.30		
3. About half the time (n=545)	0.09	0.14		
4. Most of the time (n=603)	0.12	0.15		
5. Always (n=291)	0.06	0.08		
			5.699	0.000
PRE: Affect for Obama - proud				
1. Never (n=1,189)	0.28	0.28		
2. Some of the time (n=1,139)	0.32	0.25		
3. About half the time (n=502)	0.10	0.13		
4. Most of the time (n=928)	0.22	0.22		
5. Always (n=481)	0.08	0.13		
			5.944	0.000
POST: Approve or disapprove of House incumbent				
0. Disapprove (n=953)	0.26	0.31		
1. Approve (n=2,320)	0.74	0.69		
			5.689	0.018
POST: How much approve House incumbent				
0. Not strong (n=1,473)	0.56	0.66		
1. Strong (n=834)	0.44	0.34		
			9.452	0.003
POST: How much disapprove House incumbent				
0. Not strong (n=591)	0.59	0.63		
1. Strong (n=354)	0.41	0.37		
			0.671	0.414
POST: SUMMARY- House incumbent approval				
1. Approve strongly (n=834)	0.32	0.23		
2. Approve not strongly (n=1,473)	0.42	0.46		
4. Disapprove not strongly (n=591)	0.15	0.19		
5. Disapprove strongly (n=354)	0.11	0.12		
			5.915	0.001
POST: How good a job does House incumbent do in district				
1. Very good (n=378)	0.10	0.11		
2. Fairly good (n=1,679)	0.45	0.50		
3. Fairly poor (n=1,009)	0.31	0.29		
4. Very poor (n=385)	0.15	0.10		
			4.197	0.006
POST: Gov done a good or bad job in last 8 years				
1. Very good job (n=239)	0.06	0.07		
2. Good job (n=1,417)	0.45	0.38		
3. Bad job (n=1,269)	0.33	0.35		
4. Very bad job (n=687)	0.15	0.20		

			4.854	0.003
POST: CSES: Satisfied with way democracy works in the U.S				
1. Very satisfied (n=343)	0.14	0.08		
2. Fairly satisfied (n=2,068)	0.57	0.56		
4. Not very satisfied (n=963)	0.21	0.29		
5. Not at all satisfied (n=233)	0.07	0.07		
			7.682	0.000

Government: Efficacy

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'government: efficacy' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of fourteen variables, seven out of thirteen tested displayed significant differences in mean and ten out of fourteen tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- The variables that exhibited significant differences concerned internal efficacy, trust in government, and corruption in government. Web respondents were more likely to report higher internal efficacy, feel less trustful towards government and that government is more corrupt. An inconsistency concerned external efficacy, where one item did not exhibit mode differences (Public officials don't care what people think) and web respondents reported lower efficacy for the other item (Have no say about what govt does).
- Variables that did not yield a significant difference in means tended to concern questions about electoral integrity and if government wastes tax money.
- Variables that exhibited differences in distribution but not mean concerned external efficacy (Public officials don't care what people think) where web respondents are more likely to chose 'agree strongly', and electoral integrity (Electoral integrity Post: are votes counted fairly).

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161215	PRE: REV How often trust govt in Wash to do what is right
V161216	PRE: Govt run by a few big interests or for benefit of all
V161217	PRE: Does government waste much tax money
V161218	PRE: How many in government are corrupt
V161220	PRE: Elections make govt pay attention
V162215	POST: [STD] Publ officials don't care what people think
V162216	POST: [STD] Have no say about what govt does
V162217	POST: [REV] Politics/govt too complicated to understand
V162218	POST: [REV] Good understanding of political issues
V162219	POST: Electoral integrity Post: are votes counted fairly
V162220	POST: Electoral integrity Post: do the rich buy elections
V162275	POST: How widespread is corruption among politicians in U.S.
V162281	POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who is in power
V162282	POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who one votes for

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: REV How often trust govt in Wash to do what is right	3.47	3.58	6.494	0.012
PRE: Does government waste much tax money	1.30	1.34	1.983	0.161
PRE: How many in government are corrupt	3.01	2.85	14.690	0.000
PRE: Elections make govt pay attention	1.89	2.04	28.796	0.000
POST: [STD] Publ officials don't care what people think	2.47	2.38	3.267	0.073
POST: [STD] Have no say about what govt does	2.82	2.67	4.647	0.033
POST: [REV] Politics/govt too complicated to understand	3.06	3.22	7.436	0.007
POST: [REV] Good understanding of political issues	3.11	2.85	37.652	0.000
POST: Electoral integrity Post: are votes counted fairly	2.28	2.34	1.575	0.212
POST: Electoral integrity Post: do the rich buy elections	3.21	3.13	2.382	0.125
POST: How widespread is corruption among politicians in U.S.	2.00	2.01	0.115	0.735

POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who is in power	3.97	3.94	0.639	0.426
POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who one votes for	4.12	3.92	20.646	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: REV How often trust govt in Wash to do what is right				
1. Always (n=66)	0.02	0.02		
2. Most of the time (n=429)	0.12	0.09		
3. About half the time (n=1,383)	0.34	0.32		
4. Some of the time (n=1,826)	0.43	0.43		
5. Never (n=545)	0.10	0.14		
			2.756	0.032
PRE: Govt run by a few big interests or for benefit of all				
0. For the benefit of all the people (n=716)	0.21	0.16		
1. Run by a few big interests (n=3,498)	0.79	0.84		
			7.360	0.008
PRE: Does government waste much tax money				
1. Waste a lot (n=3,070)	0.72	0.71		
2. Waste some (n=1,034)	0.25	0.25		
3. Don't waste very much (n=141)	0.02	0.04		
			2.634	0.075
PRE: How many in government are corrupt				
1. All (n=167)	0.04	0.04		
2. Most (n=1,319)	0.26	0.34		
3. About half (n=1,484)	0.36	0.35		
4. A few (n=1,219)	0.34	0.26		
5. None (n=34)	0.01	0.01		
			5.945	0.000
PRE: Elections make govt pay attention				
1. A good deal (n=1,158)	0.35	0.24		
2. Some (n=1,989)	0.41	0.48		
3. Not much (n=1,107)	0.24	0.28		
			22.660	0.000
POST: [STD] Publ officials don't care what people think				
1. Agree strongly (n=763)	0.18	0.23		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,395)	0.42	0.36		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=813)	0.19	0.25		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=534)	0.17	0.13		
5. Disagree strongly (n=130)	0.04	0.04		
			4.989	0.001
POST: [STD] Have no say about what govt does				
1. Agree strongly (n=619)	0.16	0.19		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,200)	0.34	0.32		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=621)	0.13	0.20		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=893)	0.28	0.22		
5. Disagree strongly (n=301)	0.10	0.07		
			6.139	0.000
POST: [REV] Politics/govt too complicated to understand				
1. Agree strongly (n=203)	0.06	0.05		
2. Agree somewhat (n=791)	0.28	0.21		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=994)	0.27	0.30		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=1,317)	0.33	0.35		

5. Disagree strongly (n=329)	0.06	0.09		
			4.347	0.003
POST: [REV] Good understanding of political issues				
1. Extremely well (n=286)	0.07	0.08		
2. Very well (n=814)	0.17	0.24		
3. Moderately well (n=1,675)	0.45	0.47		
4. Slightly well (n=673)	0.23	0.18		
5. Not well at all (n=188)	0.09	0.04		
			13.228	0.000
POST: Electoral integrity Post: are votes counted fairly				
1. All of the time (n=643)	0.16	0.18		
2. Most of the time (n=2,019)	0.58	0.51		
3. About half of the time (n=442)	0.11	0.15		
4. Some of the time (n=373)	0.12	0.11		
5. Never (n=143)	0.03	0.05		
			3.774	0.006
POST: Electoral integrity Post: do the rich buy elections				
1. All of the time (n=355)	0.09	0.11		
2. Most of the time (n=870)	0.25	0.24		
3. About half of the time (n=538)	0.14	0.17		
4. Some of the time (n=1,434)	0.41	0.37		
5. Never (n=400)	0.11	0.11		
			1.613	0.175
POST: How widespread is corruption among politicians in U.S.				
1. Very widespread (n=980)	0.27	0.27		
2. Quite widespread (n=1,647)	0.49	0.47		
3. Not very widespread (n=877)	0.20	0.23		
4. Hardly happens at all (n=95)	0.03	0.03		
			0.494	0.681
POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who is in power				
1. It doesn't make any difference who is in power (n=118)	0.04	0.04		
2. (n=164)	0.04	0.04		
3. (n=763)	0.20	0.23		
4. (n=1,244)	0.34	0.33		
5. It makes a big difference who is in power (n=1,333)	0.38	0.36		
			0.457	0.745
POST: CSES: 5pt scale: make a difference who one votes for				
1. Who people vote for won't make any difference (n=137)	0.04	0.05		
2. (n=190)	0.05	0.06		
3. (n=657)	0.15	0.22		
4. (n=1,148)	0.29	0.29		
5. Who people vote for can make a big difference (n=1,493)	0.48	0.39		
			5.892	0.000

Government: Elite Attitudes

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'government: elite attitudes' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of seven variables, three displayed significant differences in mean and all seven displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Attitudes towards elites differed inconsistenly across mode. Web respondents were more likely to indicate that most politicians do not care about the people, and that politicians are the main problem in the U.S. However, web respondents were also less likely to state that a strong leader is good for the U.S. even if they bend the rules to get things done.
- For all seven items, web respondents were more likely to select 'Neither agree nor disagree' as a response.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162259	POST: Compromise in politics is selling out on one's principles
V162260	POST: Most politicians do not care about the people
V162261	POST: Most politicians are trustworty
V162262	POST: Politicians are the main problem in the U.S.
V162263	POST: Strong leader is good for U.S. even if bends rules to get things done
V162264	POST: People not politicians should make most important policy decisions
V162265	POST: Most politicians only care about interests of rich and powerful

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Compromise in politics is selling out on one's principles	2.96	3.03	1.410	0.237
POST: Most politicians do not care about the people	2.79	2.65	4.757	0.031
POST: Most politicians are trustworty	3.52	3.57	1.196	0.276
POST: Politicians are the main problem in the U.S.	2.84	2.71	6.172	0.014
POST: Strong leader is good for U.S. even if bends rules to get things done	2.97	3.14	7.326	0.008
POST: People not politicians should make most important policy decisions	2.56	2.51	0.810	0.370
POST: Most politicians only care about interests of rich and powerful	2.45	2.40	1.175	0.280

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Compromise in politics is selling out on one's principles				
1. Agree strongly (n=239)	0.09	0.06		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,009)	0.34	0.27		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,069)	0.22	0.36		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=827)	0.24	0.20		
5. Disagree strongly (n=477)	0.12	0.11		
			12.392	0.000
POST: Most politicians do not care about the people				
1. Agree strongly (n=434)	0.12	0.13		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,348)	0.37	0.37		

3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=768)	0.16	0.25		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=895)	0.29	0.20		
5. Disagree strongly (n=187)	0.05	0.04		
			7.605	0.000
POST: Most politicians are trustworty				
1. Agree strongly (n=61)	0.02	0.02		
2. Agree somewhat (n=629)	0.20	0.15		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=841)	0.20	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=1,459)	0.41	0.39		
5. Disagree strongly (n=639)	0.17	0.18		
			3.618	0.008
POST: Politicians are the main problem in the U.S.				
1. Agree strongly (n=396)	0.13	0.11		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,192)	0.31	0.32		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,109)	0.25	0.36		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=695)	0.22	0.16		
5. Disagree strongly (n=239)	0.09	0.05		
			13.206	0.000
POST: Strong leader is good for U.S. even if bends rules to get things done				
1. Agree strongly (n=313)	0.12	0.08		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,029)	0.35	0.26		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=756)	0.13	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=915)	0.26	0.24		
5. Disagree strongly (n=614)	0.15	0.17		
			13.462	0.000
POST: People not politicians should make most important policy decisions				
1. Agree strongly (n=699)	0.20	0.19		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,277)	0.37	0.35		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=824)	0.17	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=624)	0.18	0.15		
5. Disagree strongly (n=201)	0.08	0.04		
			8.890	0.000
POST: Most politicians only care about interests of rich and powerful				
1. Agree strongly (n=610)	0.17	0.18		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,618)	0.46	0.43		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=702)	0.14	0.23		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=570)	0.19	0.13		
5. Disagree strongly (n=133)	0.04	0.03		
			8.436	0.000

Government: Preferences

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'government: preferences' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of fifteen variables, six of the ten tested displayed significant differences in mean and eleven of the fifteen tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents are more likely to think that it's better when one party controls both the presidency and the Congress, whereas face-to-face respondents are more likely to think that it is better when control is split.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to think that legal qualifications matter for Supreme court nominee. There is no difference across mode regarding whether the Senate should hold a vote on a Supreme Court nominee by an outgoing President.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to think that it is important for more women to get elected to political office but there is no difference across mode regarding the importance of Hispanics to get elected.
- Face-to-face respondents are more accepting of political violence (PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Justified to use violence; PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Roughing up protestors).

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161136	PRE: Party Control or split government
V161150a	PRE: VERSION 1A placement- Does R consider voting a duty or choice
V161150b	PRE: VERSION 1B placement- Does R consider voting a choice or duty
V161151a	PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a duty
V161151b	PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a choice
V161151x	PRE: SUMMARY - Voting as duty or choice
V161171	PRE: Prefer government official who compromises
V161172	PRE: How should party nominees be chosen
V161175	PRE: Supreme Court nominee - legal qualifications
V161176	PRE: Supreme Court nominee - likely to vote on controversial issues
V161177	PRE: Senate vote on Supreme Court nominee by outgoing President
V161343	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Roughing up protestors
V161344	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Justified to use violence
V162221	POST: How important that more Hispanics get elected
V162227	POST: How important that more women get elected

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a duty	1.30	1.43	17.404	0.000
PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a choice	1.49	1.64	10.887	0.001
PRE: SUMMARY - Voting as duty or choice	3.56	3.69	1.147	0.286
PRE: Supreme Court nominee - legal qualifications	1.47	1.58	8.431	0.004
PRE: Supreme Court nominee - likely to vote on controversial issues	2.15	2.27	6.955	0.009
PRE: How should party nominees be chosen	1.79	1.72	3.292	0.072
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Justified to use violence	1.36	1.29	2.954	0.088
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Roughing up protestors	2.49	2.34	6.053	0.015
POST: How important that more Hispanics get elected	3.39	3.46	0.971	0.326

POST: How important that more women get elected	2.86	3.05	8.709	0.004

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Party Control or split government				
1. Better when one party controls both (n=1,090)	0.20	0.27		
2. Better when control is split (n=2,110)	0.56	0.47		
3. It doesnt matter (n=1,029)	0.24	0.26		
			12.415	0.000
PRE: VERSION 1A placement- Does R consider voting a duty or choice				
1. Mainly a duty (n=1,062)	0.51	0.46		
2. Mainly a choice (n=847)	0.39	0.42		
3. Neither a duty nor a choice (n=210)	0.10	0.11		
			1.272	0.282
PRE: VERSION 1B placement- Does R consider voting a choice or duty				
1. Mainly a choice (n=770)	0.35	0.38		
2. Mainly a duty (n=1,122)	0.50	0.51		
3. Neither a duty nor a choice (n=249)	0.15	0.11		
			1.788	0.171
PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a duty				
1. Very strongly (n=1,482)	0.74	0.64		
2. Moderately strongly (n=567)	0.21	0.28		
3. A little strongly (n=133)	0.04	0.07		
			7.852	0.001
PRE: How strongly does R feel that voting is a choice				
1. Very strongly (n=805)	0.58	0.49		
2. Moderately strongly (n=626)	0.34	0.38		
3. A little strongly (n=183)	0.07	0.13		
			4.662	0.012
PRE: SUMMARY - Voting as duty or choice				
1. Very strongly feel that voting is a duty (n=1,482)	0.38	0.31		
2. Moderately strongly feel that voting is a duty (n=567)	0.11	0.14		
3. A little strongly feel that voting is a duty (n=133)	0.02	0.04		
4. Feel that voting is neither a duty nor a choice (n=459)	0.12	0.11		
5. A little strongly feel that voting is a choice (n=183)	0.03	0.05		
6. Moderately strongly feel that voting is a choice (n=626)	0.13	0.15		
7. Very strongly feel that voting is a choice (n=805)	0.22	0.20		
			4.320	0.001
PRE: Prefer government official who compromises				
0. Sticks to his or her principles no matter what (n=1,481)	0.40	0.35		
1. Compromises to get things done (n=2,743)	0.60	0.65		
			5.067	0.026
PRE: How should party nominees be chosen				
1. Entirely by voters (n=2,286)	0.51	0.54		
2. Mostly by voters with some say from party leaders (n=1,073)	0.26	0.24		
3. Equally by voters and party leaders (n=752)	0.18	0.19		
4. Mostly by party leaders with some say from voters (n=103)	0.04	0.02		
5. Entirely by party leaders (n=36)	0.02	0.01		
			2.442	0.047
PRE: Supreme Court nominee - legal qualifications				
1. A great deal (n=2,894)	0.71	0.64		
2. A lot (n=796)	0.17	0.20		

3. A moderate amount (n=436)	0.09	0.13		
4. A little (n=62)	0.02	0.02		
5. Not at all (n=57)	0.01	0.02		
			3.923	0.005
PRE: Supreme Court nominee - likely to vote on controversial issues				
1. A great deal (n=1,568)	0.45	0.34		
2. A lot (n=1,010)	0.18	0.26		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,086)	0.23	0.28		
4. A little (n=205)	0.05	0.05		
5. Not at all (n=371)	0.09	0.08		
			7.926	0.000
PRE: Senate vote on Supreme Court nominee by outgoing President				
0. Wait until next year for the new President to nominate someone (n=1,878)	0.47	0.44		
1. Hold a vote on whether to confirm Merrick Garland (n=2,295)	0.53	0.56		
			2.306	0.131
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Justified to use violence				
1. Not at all (n=3,572)	0.80	0.84		
2. A little (n=278)	0.10	0.06		
3. A moderate amount (n=251)	0.07	0.07		
4. A lot (n=57)	0.02	0.01		
5. A great deal (n=58)	0.02	0.02		
			3.573	0.008
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Roughing up protestors				
1. Not at all (n=1,459)	0.31	0.37		
2. A little (n=828)	0.21	0.19		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,077)	0.25	0.26		
4. A lot (n=448)	0.14	0.09		
5. A great deal (n=377)	0.09	0.09		
			4.357	0.002
POST: How important that more women get elected				
1. Extremely important (n=496)	0.14	0.14		
2. Very important (n=819)	0.27	0.20		
3. Moderately important (n=1,179)	0.33	0.33		
4. A little important (n=494)	0.12	0.14		
5. Not at all important (n=633)	0.14	0.19		
			4.381	0.003
POST: How important that more Hispanics get elected				
1. Extremely important (n=233)	0.06	0.07		
2. Very important (n=539)	0.16	0.14		
3. Moderately important (n=1,193)	0.34	0.32		
4. A little important (n=730)	0.22	0.20		
5. Not at all important (n=914)	0.22	0.27		
			1.484	0.209

Government: Spending

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'government: spending' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of sixteen variables, eleven displayed significant differences in mean and fourteen displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Overall, respondents interviewed face-to-face were more likely to indicate that the government should provide more services and increase spending.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161178	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement
V161179	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand
V161180	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand
V161181	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement
V161182	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand
V161183	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand
V161205	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security
V161206	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools
V161207	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology
V161208	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime
V161209	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs
V161210	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care
V161211	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor
V161212	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment
V162193	POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care
V162193x	POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement	4.08	3.90	5.456	0.021
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand	5.32	5.14	7.497	0.007
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand	3.05	2.93	1.465	0.228
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement	4.59	4.49	1.369	0.244
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand	3.74	3.66	1.184	0.279
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand	5.33	5.29	0.347	0.557
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security	2.60	2.51	12.745	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools	2.73	2.60	39.559	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology	2.61	2.45	56.952	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime	2.67	2.51	30.056	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs	1.78	1.72	2.592	0.110
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care	2.53	2.31	73.314	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor	2.44	2.23	54.754	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment	2.49	2.37	21.208	0.000
POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care	2.36	2.15	33.593	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care	3.29	3.66	19.773	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=378)	0.08	0.12		
2. (n=445)	0.09	0.12		
3. (n=598)	0.17	0.15		
4. (n=908)	0.27	0.25		
5. (n=637)	0.20	0.17		
6. (n=367)	0.11	0.10		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=295)	0.08	0.09		
			3.007	0.009
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Dem Presidential cand				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=149)	0.03	0.04		
2. (n=109)	0.03	0.03		
3. (n=204)	0.05	0.05		
4. (n=714)	0.14	0.20		
5. (n=946)	0.24	0.22		
6. (n=974)	0.26	0.21		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=1,094)	0.26	0.25		
			3.785	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services Rep Presidential cand				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=1,012)	0.22	0.26		
2. (n=979)	0.23	0.21		
3. (n=804)	0.20	0.18		
4. (n=722)	0.16	0.19		
5. (n=269)	0.08	0.06		
6. (n=176)	0.05	0.04		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=200)	0.06	0.06		
			1.588	0.163
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=184)	0.04	0.05		
2. (n=249)	0.07	0.06		
3. (n=411)	0.12	0.11		
4. (n=1,008)	0.23	0.29		
5. (n=787)	0.23	0.20		
6. (n=594)	0.19	0.15		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=450)	0.12	0.13		
			1.701	0.124
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Dem Pres cand				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=498)	0.10	0.13		
2. (n=556)	0.12	0.12		
3. (n=674)	0.18	0.15		
4. (n=1,272)	0.28	0.33		
5. (n=682)	0.18	0.15		
6. (n=298)	0.09	0.06		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=191)	0.04	0.05		
			3.843	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending Rep Pres cand				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=170)	0.04	0.05		
2. (n=152)	0.04	0.03		
3. (n=228)	0.07	0.05		
4. (n=572)	0.10	0.16		
5. (n=719)	0.19	0.16		

6. (n=1,137)	0.27	0.25		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=1,191)	0.29	0.29		
			3.508	0.003
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security				
1. Decreased (n=257)	0.05	0.06		
2. Kept the same (n=1,485)	0.30	0.36		
3. Increased (n=2,498)	0.66	0.58		
			7.520	0.001
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools				
1. Decreased (n=326)	0.05	0.08		
2. Kept the same (n=960)	0.18	0.25		
3. Increased (n=2,962)	0.78	0.68		
			15.850	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology				
1. Decreased (n=319)	0.07	0.08		
2. Kept the same (n=1,448)	0.25	0.38		
3. Increased (n=2,475)	0.68	0.54		
			33.063	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime				
1. Decreased (n=341)	0.07	0.09		
2. Kept the same (n=1,215)	0.20	0.31		
3. Increased (n=2,692)	0.73	0.60		
			21.638	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs				
1. Decreased (n=1,984)	0.45	0.46		
2. Kept the same (n=1,477)	0.32	0.36		
3. Increased (n=768)	0.23	0.18		
			4.098	0.021
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care				
1. Decreased (n=566)	0.09	0.14		
2. Kept the same (n=1,619)	0.30	0.40		
3. Increased (n=2,037)	0.61	0.45		
			31.887	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor				
1. Decreased (n=730)	0.12	0.18		
2. Kept the same (n=1,709)	0.33	0.42		
3. Increased (n=1,789)	0.56	0.41		
			24.264	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment				
1. Decreased (n=577)	0.12	0.13		
2. Kept the same (n=1,398)	0.27	0.36		
3. Increased (n=2,265)	0.61	0.50		
			13.017	0.000
POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care				
1. Decrease (n=920)	0.19	0.29		
2. No change (n=988)	0.26	0.28		
3. Increase (n=1,694)	0.55	0.44		
			14.340	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care				
1. Increase a great deal (n=545)	0.15	0.15		
2. Increase a moderate amount (n=908)	0.30	0.23		
3. Increase a little (n=237)	0.10	0.05		
4. No change (n=988)	0.26	0.28		
5. Decrease a little (n=144)	0.04	0.05		

6. Decrease a moderate amount (n=427)	0.08	0.13		
7. Decrease a great deal (n=347)	0.08	0.11		
			7.176	0.000

Group: Class

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: class' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of nine variables, two of the five tested displayed significant differences in mean and three of the five tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents tend to identify as belonging to groups of lower class than face-to-face respondents. However, it is important to point out that the questions differed by design depending on mode for several of the social class questions (i.e., V161305a PRE: Social Class: working or middle, V161305b PRE: Social Class: had to choose working middle, and V161306 PRE: Social class: average or upper working middle class). Face-to-face respondents could volunteer answers that were not offered as options to the web respondents.
- Feelings towards big business and rich people were more favorable in the face-to-face mode but feelings towards labor unions and poor people did not exhibit differences across mode.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161304	PRE: Think of self as belonging to class
V161305a	PRE: Social Class: working or middle
V161305b	PRE: Social Class: had to choose working middle
V161306	PRE: Social class: average or upper working middle class
V161307	PRE: Social class (2-question version)
V162098	POST: Feeling thermometer: LABOR UNIONS
V162099	POST: Feeling thermometer: POOR PEOPLE
V162100	POST: Feeling thermometer: BIG BUSINESS
V162105	POST: Feeling thermometer: RICH PEOPLE

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Social class (2-question version)	2.51	2.43	2.823	0.095
POST: Feeling thermometer: LABOR UNIONS	58.94	56.77	3.236	0.074
POST: Feeling thermometer: POOR PEOPLE	74.23	72.65	2.491	0.117
POST: Feeling thermometer: BIG BUSINESS	52.19	48.88	10.038	0.002
POST: Feeling thermometer: RICH PEOPLE	54.74	51.68	12.847	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Think of self as belonging to class				
0. No (n=493)	0.29	0.32		
1. Yes (n=1,106)	0.71	0.68		
			1.026	0.313
PRE: Social Class: working or middle				
0. Lower class or poor [volunteered] (n=5)	0.01	0.00		
1. Middle class (n=666)	0.59	0.60		
2. Working class (n=423)	0.38	0.40		
3. Both [volunteered] (n=6)	0.01	0.00		

4. Upper class [volunteered] (n=4)	0.01	0.00		
7. Other specify given as: lower middle class (FTF only) (n=1)	0.00	0.00		
			3.723	0.005
PRE: Social Class: had to choose working middle				
0. Upper class [volunteered] (n=3)	0.02	0.00		
1. Middle class (n=198)	0.33	0.40		
2. Working class (n=265)	0.57	0.60		
3. Neither [volunteered] (n=7)	0.04	0.00		
4. Lower class or poor [volunteered] (n=7)	0.03	0.00		
5. Other SPECIFY (FTF only) (n=1)	0.00	0.00		
7. Other specify given as: lower middle class (FTF only) (n=1)	0.00	0.00		
			5.563	0.000
PRE: Social class: average or upper working middle class				
0. Lower class or poor [volunteered] (n=8)	0.01	0.00		
1. Average middle/working class (n=1,141)	0.70	0.79		
2. Upper middle/working class (n=362)	0.24	0.21		
3. Lower middle/working [volunteered] (n=23)	0.03	0.00		
4. Upper class [volunteered] (n=7)	0.01	0.00		
5. Other SPECIFY (n=4)	0.01	0.00		
			9.776	0.000
PRE: Social class (2-question version)				
1. Lower class (n=277)	0.10	0.12		
2. Working class (n=872)	0.32	0.36		
3. Middle class (n=1,369)	0.53	0.47		
4. Upper class (n=119)	0.04	0.04		
			1.355	0.257

Group: Gender

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: gender' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of thirty-two variables, twelve of the thirty-two tested displayed significant differences in mean and eighteen of the twenty-nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Most variables do not display differences across mode. However, when differences across mode are observed, findings regarding beliefs about gender roles in society tend to be inconsistent. Face-to-face respondents are more likely to favor requiring equal pay for men and women, are more likely to think that it's harder for a working mother to bond with her child, and that it's better if the man works and the woman takes care of the home.
- Inconsistent results in the distributions on the CASI feminism questions suggest potential data quality issues between modes.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161345	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Consider yourself a feminist
V161346	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does feminist describe you
V161347	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being a feminist
V161348	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does anti-feminist describe you
V161349	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being anti-feminist
V161507	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Innocent remarks as sexist
V161508	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women fail to appreciate what men do for them
V161509	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women seek to gain power by getting control over men
V161510	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women put men on a tight leash
V162096	POST: Feeling thermometer: FEMINISTS
V162103	POST: Feeling thermometer: GAY MEN AND LESBIANS
V162111	POST: Feeling thermometer: TRANSGENDER PEOPLE
V162149	POST: Does R favor or oppose requiring equal pay for men and women
V162150x	POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose equl pay for men and women
V162228	POST: Easier or harder for working mother to bond with child
V162229a	POST: How much easier for working mother to bond with child
V162229b	POST: How much harder for working mother to bond with child
V162229x	POST: SUMMARY- Working mother's bond with child
V162230	POST: Better if man works and woman takes care of home
V162230a	POST: How much better if man works and woman at home
V162230b	POST: How much worse if man works and woman at home
V162230x	POST: SUMMARY- Better if man works and woman takes care of home
V162231	POST: Media pay more attention to discrimination
V162231a	POST: How much more attn should media pay to discrim against women
V162231b	POST: How much less attn should media pay to discrim against women
V162231x	POST: SUMMARY- How much attn media should pay to discrim against women
V162232	POST: Do women demanding equality seek special favors
V162233	POST: Do women complaining about discrim cause more problems
V162361	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Gays and Lesbians
V162362	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Women
V162363	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Men
V162366	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Transgender

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Consider yourself a feminist	2.51	2.56	3.333	0.070
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does feminist describe you	3.85	3.94	2.501	0.116
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being a feminist	3.17	3.42	12.453	0.001
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does anti-feminist describe you	4.25	4.39	6.934	0.009
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being anti-feminist	3.93	3.95	0.037	0.847
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Innocent remarks as sexist	2.91	2.90	0.041	0.840
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women fail to appreciate what men do for them	3.20	3.32	2.878	0.092
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women seek to gain power by getting control over men	3.36	3.40	0.460	0.499
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women put men on a tight leash	3.53	3.56	0.175	0.677
POST: Feeling thermometer: FEMINISTS	56.74	54.85	2.291	0.133
POST: Feeling thermometer: GAY MEN AND LESBIANS	58.30	60.80	1.689	0.196
POST: Feeling thermometer: TRANSGENDER PEOPLE	55.64	54.72	0.360	0.549
POST: Does R favor or oppose requiring equal pay for men and women	2.87	2.83	3.755	0.055
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose equl pay for men and women	1.51	1.70	8.591	0.004
POST: Easier or harder for working mother to bond with child	1.35	1.47	19.711	0.000
POST: How much easier for working mother to bond with child	2.44	1.80	6.940	0.011
POST: How much harder for working mother to bond with child	1.86	1.77	3.978	0.048
POST: SUMMARY- Working mother's bond with child	5.40	5.17	14.429	0.000
POST: Better if man works and woman takes care of home	2.39	2.26	17.728	0.000
POST: How much better if man works and woman at home	1.64	1.62	0.278	0.599
POST: How much worse if man works and woman at home	2.49	1.95	21.399	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Better if man works and woman takes care of home	3.06	3.35	16.339	0.000
POST: Media pay more attention to discrimination	2.28	2.23	1.959	0.164
POST: How much more attn should media pay to discrim against women	1.65	1.55	4.383	0.038
POST: How much less attn should media pay to discrim against women	2.14	1.94	4.144	0.044
POST: SUMMARY- How much attn media should pay to discrim against women	3.27	3.37	1.338	0.249
POST: Do women demanding equality seek special favors	3.84	3.83	0.042	0.837
POST: Do women complaining about discrim cause more problems	3.70	3.70	0.014	0.907
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Gays and Lesbians	2.48	2.45	0.277	0.599
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Women	3.05	3.13	2.090	0.151
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Men	4.11	4.15	0.582	0.447
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Transgender	2.31	2.23	1.490	0.224

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Consider yourself a feminist				
1. Strong feminist (n=358)	0.10	0.08		
2. Feminist (n=1,246)	0.30	0.28		
3. Not a feminist (n=2,589)	0.60	0.64		
			1.545	0.215
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does feminist describe you				
1. Extremely well (n=200)	0.05	0.04		

2. Very well (n=385)	0.12	0.08		
3. Somewhat well (n=905)	0.20	0.21		
4. Not very well (n=882)	0.17	0.21		
5. Not at all (n=1,823)	0.45	0.45		
			4.016	0.005
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being a feminist				
1. Extremely important (n=200)	0.10	0.08		
2. Very important (n=412)	0.21	0.15		
3. Somewhat important (n=664)	0.30	0.28		
4. A little important (n=543)	0.20	0.25		
5. Not at all important (n=550)	0.19	0.24		
			3.898	0.005
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How well does anti-feminist describe you				
1. Extremely well (n=123)	0.04	0.03		
2. Very well (n=192)	0.07	0.04		
3. Somewhat well (n=371)	0.09	0.10		
4. Not very well (n=718)	0.20	0.16		
5. Not at all (n=2,785)	0.61	0.66		
			4.859	0.001
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being anti-feminist				
1. Extremely important (n=76)	0.06	0.05		
2. Very important (n=126)	0.10	0.09		
3. Somewhat important (n=275)	0.19	0.21		
4. A little important (n=193)	0.14	0.14		
5. Not at all important (n=727)	0.50	0.50		
			0.195	0.924
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Innocent remarks as sexist				
1. Agree strongly (n=317)	0.08	0.08		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,246)	0.30	0.29		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,520)	0.36	0.38		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=633)	0.15	0.15		
5. Disagree strongly (n=440)	0.11	0.10		
			0.542	0.696
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women fail to appreciate what men do for them				
1. Agree strongly (n=234)	0.07	0.06		
2. Agree somewhat (n=759)	0.23	0.17		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,486)	0.32	0.38		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=774)	0.17	0.18		
5. Disagree strongly (n=901)	0.20	0.22		
			3.791	0.008
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women seek to gain power by getting control over men				
1. Agree strongly (n=207)	0.06	0.05		
2. Agree somewhat (n=717)	0.18	0.17		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,442)	0.34	0.36		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=734)	0.18	0.17		
5. Disagree strongly (n=1,048)	0.24	0.25		
			0.348	0.824
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Women put men on a tight leash				
1. Agree strongly (n=164)	0.04	0.04		
2. Agree somewhat (n=568)	0.17	0.14		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,351)	0.31	0.33		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=769)	0.17	0.18		
5. Disagree strongly (n=1,296)	0.31	0.31		
			0.988	0.408

POST: Does R favor or oppose requiring equal pay for men and women				
1. Oppose (n=138)	0.04	0.04		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=287)	0.04	0.10		
3. Favor (n=3,215)	0.91	0.86		
			9.523	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose equl pay for men and women				
1. Favor a great deal (n=2,634)	0.78	0.68		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=496)	0.12	0.15		
3. Favor a little (n=84)	0.02	0.03		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=287)	0.04	0.10		
5. Oppose a little (n=25)	0.01	0.01		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=47)	0.01	0.02		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=66)	0.02	0.01		
			6.571	0.000
POST: Easier or harder for working mother to bond with child				
1. Harder (n=2,130)	0.67	0.55		
2. Neither easier nor harder (n=1,414)	0.30	0.42		
3. Easier (n=79)	0.03	0.03		
			9.982	0.000
POST: How much easier for working mother to bond with child				
1. A great deal (n=23)	0.12	0.40		
2. Somewhat (n=38)	0.32	0.40		
3. Slightly (n=18)	0.56	0.20		
			3.967	0.034
POST: How much harder for working mother to bond with child				
1. A great deal (n=736)	0.34	0.36		
2. Somewhat (n=1,086)	0.45	0.52		
3. Slightly (n=305)	0.20	0.13		
			5.580	0.005
POST: SUMMARY- Working mother's bond with child				
1. A great deal easier (n=23)	0.00	0.01		
2. Somewhat easier (n=38)	0.01	0.01		
3. Slightly easier (n=18)	0.02	0.00		
4. Neither easier nor harder (n=1,414)	0.30	0.42		
5. Slightly harder (n=305)	0.14	0.07		
6. Somewhat harder (n=1,086)	0.30	0.28		
7. A great deal harder (n=736)	0.23	0.20		
			7.048	0.000
POST: Better if man works and woman takes care of home				
1. Worse (n=191)	0.03	0.07		
2. Makes no difference (n=2,117)	0.55	0.60		
3. Better (n=1,299)	0.42	0.33		
			9.143	0.000
POST: How much better if man works and woman at home				
1. Much (n=663)	0.53	0.49		
2. Somewhat (n=484)	0.30	0.40		
3. Slightly (n=149)	0.17	0.11		
			7.273	0.001
POST: How much worse if man works and woman at home				
1. Much (n=38)	0.11	0.21		
2. Somewhat (n=113)	0.29	0.63		
3. Slightly (n=38)	0.60	0.16		
			13.736	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Better if man works and woman takes care of home				

1. Much better (n=663)	0.22	0.16		
2. Somewhat better (n=484)	0.13	0.13		
3. Slightly better (n=149)	0.07	0.04		
4. Makes no difference (n=2,117)	0.55	0.60		
5. Slightly worse (n=38)	0.02	0.01		
6. Somewhat worse (n=113)	0.01	0.04		
7. Much worse (n=38)	0.00	0.02		
			8.693	0.000
POST: Media pay more attention to discrimination				
1. Less attention (n=618)	0.14	0.18		
2. Same amount of attention (n=1,482)	0.44	0.40		
3. More attention (n=1,506)	0.42	0.41		
			2.838	0.062
POST: How much more attn should media pay to discrim against women				
1. A great deal (n=749)	0.45	0.52		
2. Somewhat (n=623)	0.44	0.40		
3. A little (n=133)	0.10	0.08		
			2.240	0.109
POST: How much less attn should media pay to discrim against women				
1. A great deal (n=174)	0.23	0.28		
2. Somewhat (n=291)	0.39	0.50		
3. A little (n=151)	0.38	0.22		
			4.516	0.014
POST: SUMMARY- How much attn media should pay to discrim against women				
1. A great deal more attention (n=749)	0.19	0.22		
2. Somewhat more attention (n=623)	0.19	0.16		
3. A little more attention (n=133)	0.04	0.03		
4. Same amount of attention (n=1,482)	0.44	0.40		
5. A little less attention (n=151)	0.05	0.04		
6. Somewhat less attention (n=291)	0.05	0.09		
7. A great deal less attention (n=174)	0.03	0.05		
			3.022	0.010
POST: Do women demanding equality seek special favors				
1. Always (n=83)	0.01	0.03		
2. Most of the time (n=328)	0.11	0.09		
3. About half the time (n=618)	0.18	0.19		
4. Some of the time (n=1,477)	0.42	0.39		
5. Never (n=1,083)	0.28	0.30		
			2.509	0.045
POST: Do women complaining about discrim cause more problems				
1. Always (n=111)	0.04	0.04		
2. Most of the time (n=378)	0.12	0.11		
3. About half the time (n=663)	0.17	0.20		
4. Some of the time (n=1,625)	0.45	0.42		
5. Never (n=813)	0.22	0.23		
			0.734	0.551
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Gays and Lesbians				
1. A great deal (n=744)	0.20	0.24		
2. A lot (n=1,104)	0.34	0.30		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,016)	0.28	0.28		
4. A little (n=509)	0.13	0.14		
5. None at all (n=130)	0.05	0.04		
			1.361	0.249
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Women				

1. A great deal (n=264)	0.07	0.08		
2. A lot (n=638)	0.20	0.18		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,259)	0.40	0.35		
4. A little (n=1,113)	0.25	0.31		
5. None at all (n=247)	0.07	0.08		
			2.449	0.055
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Men				
1. A great deal (n=85)	0.02	0.03		
2. A lot (n=125)	0.03	0.04		
3. A moderate amount (n=483)	0.18	0.13		
4. A little (n=1,289)	0.37	0.36		
5. None at all (n=1,527)	0.40	0.44		
			3.676	0.007
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Transgender				
1. A great deal (n=1,084)	0.29	0.33		
2. A lot (n=1,109)	0.32	0.30		
3. A moderate amount (n=791)	0.22	0.22		
4. A little (n=405)	0.12	0.11		
5. None at all (n=126)	0.04	0.04		
			0.838	0.487

Group: Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: immigrants and ethnic minorities' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of five variables, one displayed significant differences in mean and all five displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to select 'Neither agree nor disagree' for all five items.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162266	POST: Minorities should adapt to to customs/traditions of U.S.
V162267	POST: The will of the majority should always prevail
V162268	POST: Immigrants are generally good for America's economy
V162269	POST: America's culture is generally harmed by immigrants
V162270	POST: Immigrants increase crime rates in the U.S.

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Minorities should adapt to to customs/traditions of U.S.	2.46	2.46	0.001	0.977
POST: The will of the majority should always prevail	3.44	3.32	2.575	0.111
POST: Immigrants are generally good for America's economy	2.51	2.64	3.585	0.060
POST: America's culture is generally harmed by immigrants	3.70	3.53	5.742	0.018
POST: Immigrants increase crime rates in the U.S.	3.34	3.26	1.466	0.228

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Minorities should adapt to to customs/traditions of U.S.				
1. Agree strongly (n=880)	0.25	0.23		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,317)	0.37	0.34		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=679)	0.15	0.23		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=465)	0.14	0.11		
5. Disagree strongly (n=286)	0.10	0.08		
			4.408	0.002
POST: The will of the majority should always prevail				
1. Agree strongly (n=250)	0.06	0.07		
2. Agree somewhat (n=680)	0.20	0.18		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=940)	0.23	0.31		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=937)	0.26	0.24		
5. Disagree strongly (n=810)	0.24	0.20		
			4.027	0.005
POST: Immigrants are generally good for America's economy				
1. Agree strongly (n=603)	0.20	0.14		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,338)	0.39	0.34		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=933)	0.17	0.31		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=518)	0.17	0.14		
5. Disagree strongly (n=223)	0.06	0.07		
			8.795	0.000

POST: America's culture is generally harmed by immigrants				
1. Agree strongly (n=170)	0.05	0.05		
2. Agree somewhat (n=507)	0.15	0.14		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=861)	0.17	0.29		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=1,048)	0.33	0.25		
5. Disagree strongly (n=1,035)	0.31	0.26		
			8.923	0.000
POST: Immigrants increase crime rates in the U.S.				
1. Agree strongly (n=214)	0.06	0.06		
2. Agree somewhat (n=779)	0.23	0.22		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,040)	0.24	0.32		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=776)	0.23	0.20		
5. Disagree strongly (n=806)	0.23	0.20		
			3.813	0.006

Group: Nation

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: nation' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of five variables, one displayed significant differences in mean and all five displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to state that to be truly American it is important to speak English. In fact, face-to-face respondents were more likely to select 'very important' for all four questions regarding the importance of certain factors for one to be truly American.
- Web respondents were more likely to select 'Neither agree nor disagree' for the question asking whether it would be better if people from other countries were more like Americans.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162271	POST: To be truly American important to have been born in U.S.
V162272	POST: To be truly American important to have American ancestry
V162273	POST: To be truly American important to speak English
V162274	POST: To be truly American important to follow America's customs/traditions
V162123	POST: Better if rest of world more like America

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: To be truly American important to have been born in U.S.	2.32	2.39	0.886	0.348
POST: To be truly American important to have American ancestry	2.68	2.69	0.025	0.874
POST: To be truly American important to speak English	1.48	1.58	5.923	0.016
POST: To be truly American important to follow America's customs/traditions	1.95	2.02	1.743	0.189
POST: Better if rest of world more like America	3.04	3.10	0.493	0.484

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: To be truly American important to have been born in U.S.				
1. Very important (n=911)	0.34	0.24		
2. Fairly important (n=1,026)	0.23	0.30		
3. Not very important (n=961)	0.19	0.28		
4. Not important at all (n=725)	0.24	0.18		
			14.250	0.000
POST: To be truly American important to have American ancestry				
1. Very important (n=532)	0.20	0.14		
2. Fairly important (n=927)	0.22	0.28		
3. Not very important (n=1,172)	0.28	0.34		
4. Not important at all (n=993)	0.30	0.25		
			6.848	0.000
POST: To be truly American important to speak English				
1. Very important (n=2,187)	0.65	0.58		
2. Fairly important (n=1,034)	0.25	0.29		

3. Not very important (n=281)	0.06	0.09		
4. Not important at all (n=130)	0.04	0.03		
			4.120	0.008
POST: To be truly American important to follow America's customs/traditions				
1. Very important (n=1,239)	0.39	0.32		
2. Fairly important (n=1,415)	0.35	0.40		
3. Not very important (n=725)	0.17	0.21		
4. Not important at all (n=243)	0.08	0.07		
			3.615	0.016
POST: Better if rest of world more like America				
1. Agree strongly (n=308)	0.12	0.08		
2. Agree somewhat (n=797)	0.25	0.22		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=1,272)	0.27	0.38		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=697)	0.21	0.17		
5. Disagree strongly (n=570)	0.16	0.15		
			6.713	0.000

Group: Race

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: race' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of forty variables, five of the thirty-eight tested displayed significant differences in mean and nine of the thirty-four tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Feelings towards Black Lives Matter were more favorable in the face-to-face mode, while feelings towards Asian-Americans, Hispanics, Blacks, illegal immigrants and Whites did not exhibit differences across mode.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to agree that past slavery makes it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class, and that if blacks worked harder they could be just as well off as whites. However, face-to-face respondents are also more likely to state that it is important for everyone in the US to speak English.
- Web respondents are more likely to select 'Neither agree nor disagree' on the racial resentment scale items.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161197	PRE: How important to speak English in US
V162113	POST: Feeling thermometer: BLACK LIVES MATTER
V162211	POST: Agree/disagree: blacks shd work way up w/o special favors
V162212	POST: Agree/disagree: past slavery make more diff for blacks
V162213	POST: Agree/disagree: blacks have gotten less than deserve
V162214	POST: Agree/disagree: blacks must try harder to get ahead
V162222	POST: HISPANIC: news in English or Spanish
V162223	POST: HISPANIC: how much R uses English or Spanish
V162224	POST: Hisp R: life be affected by what happens to Hispanics
V162225	POST: Black R: life be affected by what happens to blacks
V162226	POST: Asian R: life be affected by what happens to Asians
V162310	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ASIAN-AMERICANS
V162311	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: HISPANICS
V162312	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: BLACKS
V162313	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
V162314	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: WHITES
V162316	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How imp whites work...change laws unfair to whites
V162317	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How likely whites unable to find job b/c...minorities
V162322	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do whites have in U.S. politics
V162323	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do blacks have in U.S. politics
V162324	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do Hispanics have in U.S. politics
V162325	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do Asian-Americans have in U.S. politics
V162326	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Hispanic to identity
V162327	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being White to identity
V162328	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Black to identity
V162329	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Native American to identity
V162330	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Asian to identity
V162331	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Pacific Islander to identity
V162345	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Whites hardworking
V162346	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks hardworking
V162347	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics hardworking
V162348	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians hardworking

V162349	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Whites violent
V162350	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks violent
V162351	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics violent
V162352	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians violent
V162357	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Blacks
V162358	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Hispanics
V162359	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Asian-Americans
V162360	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Whites

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How important to speak English in US	1.41	1.50	7.509	0.007
POST: Feeling thermometer: BLACK LIVES MATTER	52.26	48.15	5.672	0.019
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks shd work way up w/o special favors	2.44	2.56	2.069	0.153
POST: Agree/disagree: past slavery make more diff for blacks	2.86	3.07	7.309	0.008
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks have gotten less than deserve	3.21	3.26	0.554	0.458
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks must try harder to get ahead	2.83	3.02	5.797	0.017
POST: Hisp R: life be affected by what happens to Hispanics	2.31	2.26	0.127	0.722
POST: Black R: life be affected by what happens to blacks	1.86	1.92	0.152	0.697
POST: Asian R: life be affected by what happens to Asians	1.83	2.22	2.891	0.093
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ASIAN-AMERICANS	67.78	68.58	0.434	0.511
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: HISPANICS	67.59	68.19	0.157	0.693
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: BLACKS	68.46	69.10	0.343	0.559
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS	41.77	41.93	0.009	0.924
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Feeling thermometer: WHITES	72.06	71.18	0.813	0.369
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How imp whites work...change laws unfair to whites	3.08	3.01	0.744	0.390
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How likely whites unable to find job b/c...minorities	3.50	3.39	3.576	0.061
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do whites have in U.S. politics	1.72	1.71	0.109	0.741
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do blacks have in U.S. politics	2.36	2.33	0.732	0.394
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do Hispanics have in U.S. politics	2.40	2.37	1.073	0.302
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do Asian-Americans have in U.S. politics	2.42	2.39	1.061	0.305
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Hispanic to identity	2.39	2.35	0.030	0.863
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being White to identity	3.41	3.37	0.346	0.557
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Black to identity	1.67	1.94	2.071	0.153
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Native American to identity	2.70	3.18	1.873	0.175
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Asian to identity	2.50	2.79	1.257	0.265
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Pacific Islander to identity	3.93	2.10	12.445	0.002
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Whites hardworking	3.14	3.14	0.001	0.973
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks hardworking	3.83	3.82	0.023	0.879
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics hardworking	2.78	2.75	0.236	0.628
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians hardworking	2.72	2.62	1.778	0.185
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Whites violent	3.31	3.41	1.999	0.160
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks violent	4.28	4.19	2.299	0.132

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics violent	3.53	3.48	0.623	0.432
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians violent	2.92	2.80	2.865	0.093
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Blacks	2.58	2.54	0.557	0.457
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Hispanics	2.99	2.89	2.773	0.098
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Asian-Americans	3.56	3.54	0.476	0.492
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Whites	3.95	3.99	0.567	0.453

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How important to speak English in US				
1. Very important (n=2,848)	0.70	0.65		
2. Somewhat important (n=999)	0.22	0.25		
3. Not very important (n=267)	0.06	0.06		
4. Not at all important (n=150)	0.02	0.04		
			3.187	0.025
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks shd work way up w/o special favors				
1. Agree strongly (n=1,110)	0.32	0.30		
2. Agree somewhat (n=912)	0.30	0.22		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=647)	0.14	0.21		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=474)	0.12	0.13		
5. Disagree strongly (n=487)	0.13	0.13		
			6.169	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: past slavery make more diff for blacks				
1. Agree strongly (n=645)	0.22	0.16		
2. Agree somewhat (n=986)	0.28	0.25		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=512)	0.11	0.18		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=707)	0.21	0.18		
5. Disagree strongly (n=785)	0.18	0.23		
			7.009	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks have gotten less than deserve				
1. Agree strongly (n=410)	0.14	0.11		
2. Agree somewhat (n=695)	0.20	0.18		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=936)	0.21	0.29		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=712)	0.21	0.18		
5. Disagree strongly (n=878)	0.24	0.24		
			3.928	0.005
POST: Agree/disagree: blacks must try harder to get ahead				
1. Agree strongly (n=629)	0.23	0.16		
2. Agree somewhat (n=872)	0.26	0.22		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=785)	0.15	0.25		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=668)	0.19	0.18		
5. Disagree strongly (n=673)	0.18	0.19		
			8.954	0.000
POST: HISPANIC: news in English or Spanish				
1. English more (n=298)	0.78	0.82		
2. Spanish more (n=61)	0.15	0.18		
3. Both equally (n=14)	0.06	0.00		
			6.842	0.002
POST: HISPANIC: how much R uses English or Spanish				
1. English and little or no Spanish (n=115)	0.31	0.31		
2. Mostly English but Spanish at least some of the time (n=108)	0.33	0.27		

3. Both English and Spanish about equally (n=107)	0.22	0.32		
4. Mostly Spanish but English at least some of the time (n=31)	0.10	0.06		
5. Spanish and little or no English (n=12)	0.04	0.03		
			0.912	0.448
POST: Hisp R: life be affected by what happens to Hispanics				
1. A lot (n=97)	0.26	0.24		
2. Some (n=141)	0.34	0.38		
3. Not very much (n=83)	0.21	0.28		
4. Not at all (n=51)	0.18	0.11		
			1.266	0.286
POST: Black R: life be affected by what happens to blacks				
1. A lot (n=185)	0.46	0.42		
2. Some (n=125)	0.34	0.34		
3. Not very much (n=57)	0.09	0.17		
4. Not at all (n=34)	0.11	0.08		
			1.138	0.332
POST: Asian R: life be affected by what happens to Asians				
1. A lot (n=43)	0.40	0.28		
2. Some (n=52)	0.46	0.37		
3. Not very much (n=23)	0.06	0.21		
4. Not at all (n=14)	0.08	0.15		
			1.386	0.250
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How imp whites work...change laws unfair to whites				
1. Extremely important (n=394)	0.15	0.16		
2. Very important (n=571)	0.22	0.22		
3. Moderately important (n=728)	0.27	0.30		
4. A little important (n=319)	0.13	0.12		
5. Not at all important (n=551)	0.23	0.21		
			0.532	0.703
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How likely whites unable to find job b/c...minorities				
1. Extremely likely (n=187)	0.07	0.08		
2. Very likely (n=342)	0.14	0.14		
3. Moderately likely (n=691)	0.27	0.28		
4. Slightly likely (n=837)	0.28	0.33		
5. Not at all likely (n=516)	0.25	0.18		
			2.787	0.030
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do whites have in U.S. politics				
1. Too much influence (n=1,226)	0.35	0.36		
2. Just about the right amount of influence (n=2,121)	0.57	0.58		
3. Too little influence (n=216)	0.08	0.06		
			0.313	0.698
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do blacks have in U.S. politics				
1. Too much influence (n=334)	0.09	0.10		
2. Just about the right amount of influence (n=1,681)	0.46	0.48		
3. Too little influence (n=1,551)	0.45	0.42		
			0.471	0.618
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much influence do Hispanics have in U.S. politics				
1. Too much influence (n=251)	0.07	0.07		
2. Just about the right amount of influence (n=1,704)	0.45	0.49		
3. Too little influence (n=1,608)	0.47	0.44		
			1.132	0.318
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How much infl do Asian-Amer have in US pol				
1. Too much influence (n=111)	0.03	0.04		
2. Just about the right amount of influence (n=1,900)	0.51	0.53		

3. Too little influence (n=1,546)	0.46	0.43		
			0.611	0.540
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Hispanic to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=126)	0.35	0.34		
2. Very important (n=97)	0.30	0.24		
3. Moderately important (n=65)	0.13	0.25		
4. A little important (n=23)	0.04	0.07		
5. Not at all important (n=43)	0.17	0.10		
			2.177	0.078
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being White to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=307)	0.11	0.11		
2. Very important (n=485)	0.17	0.17		
3. Moderately important (n=767)	0.24	0.26		
4. A little important (n=494)	0.18	0.16		
5. Not at all important (n=838)	0.31	0.30		
			0.437	0.769
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Black to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=225)	0.61	0.54		
2. Very important (n=77)	0.23	0.17		
3. Moderately important (n=55)	0.11	0.17		
4. A little important (n=15)	0.00	0.06		
5. Not at all important (n=23)	0.05	0.06		
			1.708	0.164
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Native American to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=26)	0.26	0.18		
2. Very important (n=21)	0.24	0.15		
3. Moderately important (n=26)	0.22	0.25		
4. A little important (n=13)	0.08	0.15		
5. Not at all important (n=25)	0.19	0.27		
			0.764	0.530
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Asian to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=20)	0.14	0.18		
2. Very important (n=40)	0.41	0.26		
3. Moderately important (n=42)	0.31	0.31		
4. A little important (n=12)	0.09	0.08		
5. Not at all important (n=17)	0.05	0.17		
			0.749	0.554
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How important is being Pacific Islander to identity				
1. Extremely important (n=4)	0.00	0.29		
2. Very important (n=7)	0.24	0.44		
3. Moderately important (n=6)	0.16	0.20		
4. A little important (n=1)	0.04	0.00		
5. Not at all important (n=7)	0.57	0.06		
			2.656	0.046
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: stereotype: Whites hardworking				
1. Hard-working (n=457)	0.12	0.14		
2. (n=700)	0.20	0.18		
3. (n=865)	0.24	0.24		
4. (n=1,189)	0.35	0.32		
5. (n=254)	0.06	0.08		
6. (n=67)	0.02	0.02		
7. Lazy (n=33)	0.01	0.01		
			1.355	0.238
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks hardworking				

1. Hard-working (n=258)	0.07	0.09		
2. (n=333)	0.10	0.09		
3. (n=698)	0.19	0.20		
4. (n=1,257)	0.37	0.34		
5. (n=605)	0.16	0.16		
6. (n=277)	0.08	0.07		
7. Lazy (n=136)	0.04	0.04		
			0.663	0.648
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics hardworking				
1. Hard-working (n=767)	0.22	0.23		
2. (n=835)	0.23	0.22		
3. (n=816)	0.21	0.23		
4. (n=855)	0.25	0.24		
5. (n=194)	0.06	0.06		
6. (n=57)	0.01	0.01		
7. Lazy (n=37)	0.01	0.01		
			0.337	0.883
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians hardworking				
1. Hard-working (n=877)	0.24	0.25		
2. (n=989)	0.25	0.26		
3. (n=722)	0.20	0.21		
4. (n=737)	0.22	0.21		
5. (n=163)	0.06	0.05		
6. (n=49)	0.02	0.01		
7. Lazy (n=23)	0.02	0.01		
			0.902	0.473
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: stereotype: Whites violent				
1. Peaceful (n=317)	0.10	0.09		
2. (n=723)	0.20	0.19		
3. (n=776)	0.20	0.22		
4. (n=1,176)	0.34	0.31		
5. (n=371)	0.11	0.12		
6. (n=114)	0.03	0.04		
7. Violent (n=74)	0.01	0.03		
			1.356	0.236
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Blacks violent				
1. Peaceful (n=132)	0.03	0.05		
2. (n=233)	0.06	0.06		
3. (n=551)	0.14	0.16		
4. (n=1,246)	0.34	0.34		
5. (n=841)	0.27	0.23		
6. (n=369)	0.11	0.10		
7. Violent (n=182)	0.05	0.06		
			1.565	0.160
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Hispanics violent				
1. Peaceful (n=238)	0.07	0.08		
2. (n=527)	0.14	0.14		
3. (n=871)	0.22	0.25		
4. (n=1,347)	0.39	0.38		
5. (n=418)	0.13	0.12		
6. (n=96)	0.03	0.03		
7. Violent (n=57)	0.02	0.02		
			0.661	0.662
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Asians violent				

1. Peaceful (n=583)	0.14	0.18		
2. (n=928)	0.25	0.24		
3. (n=875)	0.25	0.25		
4. (n=1,009)	0.28	0.29		
5. (n=110)	0.05	0.03		
6. (n=30)	0.02	0.01		
7. Violent (n=18)	0.01	0.01		
			1.931	0.087
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Blacks				
1. A great deal (n=661)	0.18	0.21		
2. A lot (n=1,001)	0.29	0.28		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,157)	0.35	0.31		
4. A little (n=582)	0.15	0.16		
5. None at all (n=116)	0.04	0.04		
			1.410	0.233
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Hispanics				
1. A great deal (n=298)	0.08	0.10		
2. A lot (n=801)	0.20	0.23		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,412)	0.43	0.39		
4. A little (n=854)	0.24	0.23		
5. None at all (n=149)	0.05	0.05		
			1.498	0.208
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Asian-Americans				
1. A great deal (n=109)	0.02	0.04		
2. A lot (n=260)	0.07	0.08		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,140)	0.36	0.32		
4. A little (n=1,585)	0.42	0.44		
5. None at all (n=416)	0.13	0.12		
			2.293	0.063
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Whites				
1. A great deal (n=94)	0.02	0.03		
2. A lot (n=170)	0.04	0.06		
3. A moderate amount (n=599)	0.19	0.16		
4. A little (n=1,495)	0.45	0.40		
5. None at all (n=1,142)	0.29	0.35		
			2.890	0.026

Group: Religion

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'group: religion' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eleven variables, two of the ten tested displayed significant differences in mean and one of the seven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Feelings towards Christian fundamentalists and Christians were more favorable in the face-to-face mode, while feelings towards Mulsims and Jews did not exhibit differences across mode.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to consider themselves to be born-again Christians.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161263	PRE: Does Christian R consider self born again
V162095	POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS
V162106	POST: Feeling thermometer: MUSLIMS
V162107	POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIANS
V162108	POST: Feeling thermometer: JEWS
V162353	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims violent
V162354	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians violent
V162355	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims patriotic
V162356	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians patriotic
V162364	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Muslims
V162365	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Christians

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS	53.07	50.54	4.053	0.046
POST: Feeling thermometer: MUSLIMS	55.61	53.98	0.964	0.328
POST: Feeling thermometer: CHRISTIANS	77.51	75.19	7.557	0.007
POST: Feeling thermometer: JEWS	70.59	71.06	0.169	0.682
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims violent	4.10	4.00	1.849	0.176
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians violent	2.68	2.80	2.538	0.113
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims patriotic	4.37	4.38	0.004	0.951
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians patriotic	2.48	2.56	1.616	0.206
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Muslims	2.34	2.26	1.429	0.234
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Christians	3.68	3.67	0.008	0.929

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Does Christian R consider self born again				
0. No (n=1,596)	0.48	0.54		
1. Yes (n=1,360)	0.52	0.46		
			5.220	0.024
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims violent				
1. Peaceful (n=199)	0.06	0.06		
2. (n=376)	0.09	0.10		

3. (n=614)	0.17	0.18		
4. (n=1,191)	0.33	0.33		
5. (n=578)	0.17	0.15		
6. (n=336)	0.10	0.10		
7. Violent (n=250)	0.09	0.07		
			0.600	0.701
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians violent				
1. Peaceful (n=800)	0.25	0.23		
2. (n=908)	0.28	0.24		
3. (n=651)	0.16	0.19		
4. (n=855)	0.22	0.24		
5. (n=230)	0.06	0.06		
6. (n=69)	0.02	0.02		
7. Violent (n=46)	0.02	0.02		
			1.598	0.159
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Muslims patriotic				
1. Patriotic (n=208)	0.07	0.06		
2. (n=281)	0.07	0.07		
3. (n=465)	0.13	0.13		
4. (n=1,117)	0.30	0.32		
5. (n=521)	0.14	0.15		
6. (n=404)	0.14	0.10		
7. Unpatriotic (n=534)	0.15	0.16		
			1.173	0.321
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Stereotype: Christians patriotic				
1. Patriotic (n=1,001)	0.30	0.28		
2. (n=970)	0.27	0.26		
3. (n=624)	0.16	0.18		
4. (n=771)	0.22	0.22		
5. (n=116)	0.03	0.04		
6. (n=26)	0.00	0.01		
7. Unpatriotic (n=43)	0.01	0.02		
			0.706	0.612
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Muslims				
1. A great deal (n=1,017)	0.27	0.31		
2. A lot (n=1,141)	0.33	0.32		
3. A moderate amount (n=815)	0.24	0.22		
4. A little (n=395)	0.11	0.11		
5. None at all (n=137)	0.05	0.04		
			0.908	0.445
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination in the U.S. against Christians				
1. A great deal (n=166)	0.06	0.05		
2. A lot (n=335)	0.08	0.10		
3. A moderate amount (n=807)	0.24	0.23		
4. A little (n=1,325)	0.39	0.36		
5. None at all (n=872)	0.24	0.25		
			1.062	0.371

Issues: Campaign Finance

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: campaign finance' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of three variables, two displayed significant differences in mean and three displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to think that Congress passes laws that benefit contributor organizations, whereas face-to-face respondents were more likely to think Congress passes laws that benefit contributor individuals.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to either favor or oppose limits on campaign spending. Web respondents were more likely to neither favor nor oppose.

There was randomization in the question wording for V162236 (POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor individuals). Although the expected effect of the randomization is zero, any mode difference in the randomization due to chance could affect the mode differences for this item.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162234	POST: Does R favor or oppose limits on campaign spending
V162235	POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor organizations
V162236	POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor individuals

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Does R favor or oppose limits on campaign spending	2.63	2.62	0.083	0.773
POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor organizations	2.92	2.78	6.113	0.015
POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor individuals	2.99	3.44	67.478	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Does R favor or oppose limits on campaign spending				
1. Oppose (n=250)	0.09	0.07		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=761)	0.19	0.24		
3. Favor (n=2,613)	0.72	0.69		
			3.178	0.046
POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor organizations				
1. A great deal (n=504)	0.12	0.14		
2. A lot (n=857)	0.24	0.24		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,300)	0.32	0.39		
4. A little (n=643)	0.23	0.16		
5. Not at all (n=258)	0.09	0.07		
			6.235	0.000
POST: How much does Cong pass laws that benefit contributor individuals				
1. A great deal (n=322)	0.14	0.07		
2. A lot (n=533)	0.24	0.12		

3. A moderate amount (n=1,022)	0.26	0.32		
4. A little (n=946)	0.22	0.27		
5. Not at all (n=720)	0.14	0.22		
			23.583	0.000

Issues: Economy

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: economy' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eleven variables, three displayed significant differences in mean and nine displayed significant differences in distribution.
- In many cases, mode differences favored more negative and pessimistic evaluations of the economy on the web, both in general and in relation to the recent past.
- For some questions, web respondents expressed more extreme opinions in both directions (e.g. SUMMARY - economy better/worse in last year) or more endorsement of the status quo/middle option (e.g. SUMMARY: more/less unemployment in last year).
- The only variables that did not yield a significant difference in distribution were whether more or less unemployment was predicted in the next year than currently, and whether the government should do more or less to regulate banks. These items also used one of the shorter scales (3 points).

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161139	PRE: Current economy good or bad
V161140x	PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in last year
V161141x	PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in next year
V161142x	PRE: SUMMARY: more/less unemployment in last year
V161143	PRE: More or less unemployment in next year
V161138x	PRE: SUMMARY - larger/smaller income gap today
V162148	POST: Does R favor or oppose govt reducing income ineqality
V162134	POST: How much opportunity in America to get ahead
V162136x	POST: SUMMARY- Economic mobility easier/harder compared to 20 yrs ago
V161235x	PRE: SUMMARY - Economy since 2008
V162180	POST: Should gov do more or less to regulate banks

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - larger/smaller income gap today	1.72	1.70	0.108	0.743
PRE: Current economy good or bad	3.23	3.34	3.776	0.054
PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in last year	3.10	3.11	0.122	0.728
PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in next year	2.88	3.01	12.568	0.001
PRE: SUMMARY: more/less unemployment in last year	2.87	2.91	0.506	0.478
PRE: More or less unemployment in next year	2.01	1.97	1.923	0.168
PRE: SUMMARY - Economy since 2008	2.89	2.96	1.181	0.279
POST: How much opportunity in America to get ahead	2.93	3.12	13.747	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Economic mobility easier/harder compared to 20 yrs ago	5.31	5.59	9.442	0.003
POST: Does R favor or oppose govt reducing income ineqality	2.08	2.14	3.040	0.084
POST: Should gov do more or less to regulate banks	2.38	2.33	3.003	0.085

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - larger/smaller income gap today				
1. Much larger (n=2,487)	0.53	0.58		
2. Somewhat larger (n=970)	0.29	0.21		
3. About the same (n=568)	0.12	0.15		
4. Somewhat smaller (n=145)	0.04	0.03		
5. Much smaller (n=76)	0.01	0.02		
			5.634	0.000
PRE: Current economy good or bad				
1. Very good (n=69)	0.02	0.02		
2. Good (n=965)	0.26	0.21		
3. Neither good nor bad (n=1,377)	0.30	0.33		
4. Bad (n=1,372)	0.32	0.33		
5. Very bad (n=479)	0.11	0.12		
			2.473	0.049
PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in last year				
1. Much better (n=249)	0.04	0.06		
2. Somewhat better (n=951)	0.24	0.21		
3. About the same (n=1,806)	0.42	0.42		
4. Somewhat worse (n=670)	0.18	0.15		
5. Much worse (n=576)	0.12	0.15		
			2.532	0.044
PRE: SUMMARY - economy better/worse in next year				
1. Get much better (n=256)	0.07	0.06		
2. Get somewhat better (n=798)	0.22	0.17		
3. About the same (n=2,228)	0.51	0.54		
4. Get somewhat worse (n=592)	0.13	0.14		
5. Get much worse (n=311)	0.06	0.09		
			3.849	0.006
PRE: SUMMARY: more/less unemployment in last year				
1. Much better (n=329)	0.09	0.08		
2. Somewhat better (n=1,251)	0.33	0.27		
3. About the same (n=1,679)	0.32	0.43		
4. Somewhat worse (n=544)	0.16	0.11		
5. Much worse (n=447)	0.11	0.11		
			8.521	0.000
PRE: More or less unemployment in next year				
1. More (n=789)	0.18	0.19		
2. About the same (n=2,685)	0.62	0.65		
3. Less (n=741)	0.20	0.16		
			2.100	0.127
PRE: SUMMARY - Economy since 2008				
1. Much better (n=839)	0.18	0.20		
2. Somewhat better (n=916)	0.22	0.20		
3. About the same (n=1,044)	0.27	0.25		
4. Somewhat worse (n=659)	0.18	0.16		
5. Much worse (n=783)	0.15	0.20		
			3.025	0.023
POST: How much opportunity in America to get ahead				
1. A great deal (n=347)	0.14	0.08		
2. A lot (n=608)	0.16	0.16		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,448)	0.38	0.38		

4. A little (n=1,059)	0.29	0.30		
5. None (n=177)	0.03	0.07		
			6.522	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Economic mobility easier/harder compared to 20 yrs ago				
1. A great deal easier (n=95)	0.03	0.02		
2. A moderate amount easier (n=253)	0.10	0.06		
3. A little easier (n=118)	0.04	0.03		
4. The same (n=522)	0.13	0.14		
5. A little harder (n=226)	0.07	0.06		
6. A moderate amount harder (n=1,140)	0.33	0.31		
7. A great deal harder (n=1,277)	0.31	0.38		
			3.367	0.004
POST: Does R favor or oppose govt reducing income ineqality				
1. Oppose (n=1,137)	0.34	0.29		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=954)	0.24	0.28		
3. Favor (n=1,526)	0.42	0.43		
			4.366	0.014
POST: Should gov do more or less to regulate banks				
1. Less (n=481)	0.11	0.14		
2. The same (n=1,414)	0.40	0.39		
3. More (n=1,702)	0.49	0.47		
			1.874	0.158

Issues: Environment

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: environment' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of seven variables, one of the six tested displayed significant differences in mean and four of the seven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- The only variable that exhibited significant difference in mean concerned federal budget spending. Web respondents were more likely to favor decreasing federal budget spending to protect the environment.
- Variables that exhibited differences in distribution but not mean concerned anthropogenic climate change and government action about rising temperatures. Face-to-face respondents were more likely to think that global warming is caused equally by human activity and natural causes, and less likely to think that global warming is caused mostly by human activity.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161201	PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff self-placement
V161212	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment
V161221	PRE: Is global warming happening or not
V161222	PRE: Anthropogenic climate change
V161223	PRE: Approve or disapprove fracking
V161224	PRE: Govt action about rising temperatures
V161225x	PRE: SUMMARY - Govt action about rising temperatures

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff self-placement	3.08	3.17	1.217	0.272
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment	2.49	2.37	21.208	0.000
PRE: Anthropogenic climate change	2.17	2.22	1.785	0.184
PRE: Approve or disapprove fracking	1.82	1.81	0.082	0.775
PRE: Govt action about rising temperatures	2.30	2.33	0.797	0.374
PRE: SUMMARY - Govt action about rising temperatures	3.25	3.12	1.884	0.172

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale environment-jobs tradeoff self-placement				
1. Regulate business to protect the environment and create jobs (n=896)	0.25	0.26		
2. (n=616)	0.19	0.16		
3. (n=561)	0.17	0.15		
4. (n=664)	0.18	0.20		
5. (n=349)	0.10	0.09		
6. (n=278)	0.07	0.08		
7. No regulation because it will not work and will cost jobs (n=184)	0.04	0.06		
			1.346	0.241
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: protecting the environment				
1. Decreased (n=577)	0.12	0.13		
2. Kept the same (n=1,398)	0.27	0.36		

3. Increased (n=2,265)	0.61	0.50		
			13.017	0.000
PRE: Is global warming happening or not				
0. Probably hasn't been happening (n=756)	0.17	0.20		
1. Has probably been happening (n=3,459)	0.83	0.80		
			3.972	0.048
PRE: Anthropogenic climate change				
1. Mostly by natural causes (n=751)	0.16	0.19		
2. About equally by human activity and natural causes (n=1,825)	0.51	0.40		
3. Mostly by human activity (n=1,660)	0.33	0.41		
			8.977	0.000
PRE: Approve or disapprove fracking				
1. Oppose (n=1,593)	0.38	0.37		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,807)	0.42	0.45		
3. Favor (n=815)	0.20	0.18		
			0.936	0.392
PRE: Govt action about rising temperatures				
1. Less secure (n=733)	0.17	0.18		
2. No change (n=1,351)	0.36	0.31		
3. More secure (n=2,100)	0.47	0.51		
			2.670	0.074
PRE: SUMMARY - Govt action about rising temperatures				
1. Should be doing a great deal more (n=1,139)	0.23	0.29		
2. Should be doing a moderate amount more (n=824)	0.20	0.20		
3. Should be doing a little more (n=135)	0.04	0.03		
4. Currently doing the right amount (n=1,351)	0.36	0.31		
5. Should be doing a little less (n=117)	0.04	0.03		
6. Should be doing a moderate amount less (n=290)	0.06	0.08		
7. Should be doing a great deal less (n=324)	0.07	0.07		
			2.788	0.017

Issues: Foreign Policy

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: foreign policy' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twelve variables, one displayed significant differences in mean and four displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to state that there has been 'No change' in the security of the U.S. since the President took office, and that the level of U.S. support towards Israel is 'About right'. Web respondents are more likely to state 'Neither favor nor oppose' sending more troops to fight ISIS.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161152	PRE: During last year, U.S. position in world weaker str
V161153	PRE: Country would be better off if we just stayed home
V161154	PRE: Force to solve international problems
V161234	PRE: U.S. more or less secure than when Pres took office
V161181	PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement
V161213	PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS
V161213a	PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS follow-up
V161213x	PRE: SUMMARY - send troops to fight ISIS
V162153	POST: Is U.S. too supportive of Israel or not supportive enough
V162155x	POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Israelis
V162156x	POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Palestinians
V162159	POST: China military threat

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: During last year, U.S. position in world weaker str	1.54	1.55	0.034	0.854
PRE: Country would be better off if we just stayed home	0.31	0.34	1.052	0.307
PRE: Force to solve international problems	3.13	3.16	0.739	0.392
PRE: U.S. more or less secure than when Pres took office	1.68	1.68	0.008	0.930
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement	4.59	4.49	1.369	0.244
PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS	2.07	2.01	1.993	0.160
PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS follow-up	1.69	1.62	4.421	0.037
PRE: SUMMARY - send troops to fight ISIS	3.88	4.01	2.184	0.142
POST: Is U.S. too supportive of Israel or not supportive enough	1.99	1.96	0.833	0.363
POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Israelis	2.95	3.02	1.585	0.210
POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Palestinians	3.82	3.83	0.071	0.790
POST: China military threat	1.67	1.65	0.652	0.421

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: During last year, U.S. position in world weaker str				
1. Weaker (n=2,325)	0.55	0.53		
2. Stayed about the same (n=1,603)	0.37	0.39		
3. Stronger (n=326)	0.09	0.08		
			0.852	0.426

PRE: Country would be better off if we just stayed home				
0. Disagree (n=2,911)	0.69	0.66		
1. Agree (n=1,320)	0.31	0.34		
			1.029	0.312
PRE: Force to solve international problems				
1. Extremely willing (n=188)	0.06	0.04		
2. Very willing (n=529)	0.12	0.12		
3. Moderately willing (n=2,204)	0.52	0.52		
4. A little willing (n=1,051)	0.24	0.25		
5. Not at all willing (n=266)	0.06	0.06		
			0.726	0.560
PRE: U.S. more or less secure than when Pres took office				
1 (n=2,208)	0.47	0.52		
2 (n=1,268)	0.38	0.28		
3 (n=760)	0.15	0.20		
			14.366	0.000
PRE: 7pt scale defense spending self-placement				
1. Govt should decrease defense spending (n=184)	0.04	0.05		
2. (n=249)	0.07	0.06		
3. (n=411)	0.12	0.11		
4. (n=1,008)	0.23	0.29		
5. (n=787)	0.23	0.20		
6. (n=594)	0.19	0.15		
7. Govt should increase defense spending (n=450)	0.12	0.13		
			1.701	0.124
PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS				
1. Oppose (n=1,399)	0.35	0.33		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,264)	0.22	0.33		
3. Favor (n=1,569)	0.42	0.34		
			13.554	0.000
PRE: Sending troops to fight ISIS follow-up				
1. A great deal (n=1,344)	0.43	0.47		
2. A moderate amount (n=1,317)	0.44	0.43		
3. A little (n=306)	0.13	0.09		
			2.494	0.086
PRE: SUMMARY - send troops to fight ISIS				
1. Favor a great deal (n=648)	0.17	0.15		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=744)	0.20	0.16		
3. Favor a little (n=177)	0.05	0.04		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,264)	0.22	0.33		
5. Oppose a little (n=129)	0.05	0.02		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=573)	0.14	0.13		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=696)	0.17	0.17		
			5.991	0.000
POST: Is U.S. too supportive of Israel or not supportive enough				
1. Not supportive enough (n=882)	0.22	0.28		
2. About right (n=1,823)	0.56	0.48		
3. Too supportive (n=837)	0.21	0.24		
			6.268	0.002
POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Israelis				
1. Support Israelis a great deal (n=545)	0.16	0.15		
2. Support Israelis a lot (n=508)	0.15	0.14		
3. Support Israelis a moderate amount (n=1,395)	0.39	0.40		
4. Support Israelis a little (n=598)	0.16	0.16		

5. Support Israelis not at all (n=499)	0.13	0.15		
			0.618	0.630
POST: SUMMARY- How much should U.S. support Palestinians				
1. Support Palestinians a great deal (n=87)	0.03	0.03		
2. Support Palestinians a lot (n=169)	0.06	0.04		
3. Support Palestinians a moderate amount (n=1,170)	0.32	0.35		
4. Support Palestinians a little (n=808)	0.25	0.22		
5. Support Palestinians not at all (n=1,216)	0.34	0.36		
			1.536	0.203
POST: China military threat				
1. Major threat (n=1,636)	0.46	0.46		
2. Minor threat (n=1,560)	0.41	0.43		
3. Not a threat (n=389)	0.13	0.11		
			1.547	0.215

Issues: Global

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: global' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of five variables, none of the three tested displayed significant differences in mean and three of the five tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to neither favor nor oppose free trade agreements with other countries. Overall, they were more likely to be favorable toward free trade agreements.
- Web respondents were more likely to discourage outsourcing, while face-to-face respondents were more likely to think the government should stay out of this issue.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162152b	POST: Does R favor or oppose limits on foreign imports [STD]
V162176	POST: Does R favor or oppose free trade agreements w/other countries
V162176a	POST: How strongly favor/oppose free trade agreements w/other countries
V162176x	POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose free trade agreements
V162177	POST: Should govt encourage/discourage outsourcing

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Does R favor or oppose free trade agreements w/other countries	2.21	2.15	2.306	0.131
POST: How strongly favor/oppose free trade agreements w/other countries	1.92	1.89	0.529	0.468
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose free trade agreements	3.57	3.71	2.569	0.111

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: Does R favor or oppose limits on foreign imports [STD]				
0. Oppose (n=351)	0.31	0.36		
1. Favor (n=673)	0.69	0.64		
			2.025	0.157
POST: Does R favor or oppose free trade agreements w/other countries				
1. Oppose (n=726)	0.22	0.21		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,449)	0.36	0.43		
3. Favor (n=1,421)	0.43	0.36		
			5.677	0.004
POST: How strongly favor/oppose free trade agreements w/other countries				
1. A great deal (n=602)	0.28	0.28		
2. Moderately (n=1,161)	0.52	0.55		
3. A little (n=383)	0.20	0.17		
			0.851	0.425
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose free trade agreements				
1. Favor a great deal (n=354)	0.11	0.08		
2. Favor moderately (n=821)	0.24	0.21		
3. Favor a little (n=245)	0.08	0.06		

4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,449)	0.36	0.43		
5. Oppose a little (n=138)	0.05	0.03		
6. Oppose moderately (n=340)	0.10	0.10		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=248)	0.07	0.07		
			2.517	0.025
POST: Should govt encourage/discourage outsourcing				
1. Discourage (n=2,523)	0.64	0.71		
2. Encourage (n=152)	0.04	0.05		
3. Should stay out of this matter (n=946)	0.32	0.24		
			9.685	0.000

Issues: Health Care

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: health care' issues reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of thirteen variables, seven displayed significant differences in mean and eleven displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents were more favorable toward the 2010 health care law and more likely to support government medical insurance plans as opposed to private plans.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to believe the 2010 health care law had positive effects on health care services and number of insured people. They were also more likely to believe the law generally increased healthcare costs, although they were less likely to believe it increased their individual cost.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161113	PRE: Favor or oppose 2010 health care law
V161114a	PRE: Strength favor 2010 health care law
V161114b	PRE: Strength oppose 2010 health carelaw
V161114x	PRE: Summary: favor/oppose 2010 health care law
V162146	POST: Does R favor or oppose vaccines in schools
V162147x	POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose vaccines in schools
V162161	POST: Health benefits of vaccinations outweigh risks
V162162	POST: Vaccinations benefit/risk strength
V161184	PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: self-plmt
V162142	POST: Health Care Law effect on health care services
V162143	POST: Health Care Law effect on number insured
V162144	POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of health care
V162145	POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of R's health care

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Favor or oppose 2010 health care law	2.05	1.93	10.193	0.002
PRE: Strength favor 2010 health care law	1.61	1.58	0.278	0.599
PRE: Strength oppose 2010 health carelaw	1.44	1.36	3.941	0.049
PRE: Summary: favor/oppose 2010 health care law	3.94	4.27	9.797	0.002
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: self-plmt	3.98	4.06	0.696	0.406
POST: Health Care Law effect on health care services	1.98	1.78	25.090	0.000
POST: Health Care Law effect on number insured	2.69	2.54	21.967	0.000
POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of health care	2.66	2.59	4.261	0.041
POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of R's health care	2.37	2.44	4.938	0.028
POST: Does R favor or oppose vaccines in schools	2.70	2.66	1.547	0.216
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose vaccines in schools	2.10	2.17	0.622	0.432
POST: Health benefits of vaccinations outweigh risks	1.43	1.40	1.123	0.291
POST: SUMMARY- Benefits/risks of vaccinations	2.46	2.45	0.017	0.895

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Favor or oppose 2010 health care law				
1. Oppose (n=1,808)	0.40	0.41		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=881)	0.16	0.25		
3. Favor (n=1,578)	0.45	0.34		
			17.878	0.000
PRE: Strength favor 2010 health care law				
1. A great deal (n=752)	0.49	0.47		
2. Moderately (n=712)	0.41	0.48		
3. A little (n=111)	0.10	0.05		
			4.282	0.016
PRE: Strength oppose 2010 health carelaw				
1. A great deal (n=1,208)	0.63	0.68		
2. Moderately (n=524)	0.30	0.28		
3. A little (n=76)	0.07	0.04		
			3.117	0.047
PRE: Summary: favor/oppose 2010 health care law				
1. Favor a great deal (n=752)	0.22	0.16		
2. Favor moderately (n=712)	0.18	0.16		
3. Favor a little (n=111)	0.04	0.02		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=881)	0.16	0.25		
5. Oppose a little (n=76)	0.03	0.02		
6. Oppose moderately (n=524)	0.12	0.12		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=1,208)	0.25	0.28		
			8.745	0.000
PRE: 7pt scale govt-private medical insur scale: self-plmt				
1. Govt insurance plan (n=640)	0.14	0.19		
2. (n=389)	0.12	0.09		
3. (n=393)	0.12	0.10		
4. (n=745)	0.21	0.20		
5. (n=478)	0.16	0.12		
6. (n=497)	0.12	0.13		
7. Private insurance plan (n=624)	0.13	0.18		
			4.858	0.000
POST: Health Care Law effect on health care services				
1. Worsened (n=1,747)	0.42	0.52		
2. Had no effect (n=624)	0.18	0.18		
3. Improved (n=1,215)	0.40	0.30		
			10.649	0.000
POST: Health Care Law effect on number insured				
1. Decreased (n=495)	0.11	0.16		
2. Had no effect (n=422)	0.08	0.14		
3. Increased (n=2,671)	0.80	0.70		
			14.431	0.000
POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of health care				
1. Decreased (n=431)	0.12	0.13		
2. Had no effect (n=457)	0.10	0.14		
3. Increased (n=2,679)	0.78	0.72		
			3.554	0.030
POST: Health Care Law effect on cost of R's health care				
1. Decreased (n=275)	0.06	0.09		
2. Had no effect (n=1,508)	0.51	0.38		

3. Increased (n=1,829)	0.43	0.53		
			18.004	0.000
POST: Does R favor or oppose vaccines in schools				
1. Oppose (n=289)	0.08	0.09		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=531)	0.14	0.16		
3. Favor (n=2,815)	0.78	0.75		
			1.272	0.282
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose vaccines in schools				
1. Favor a great deal (n=2,067)	0.56	0.56		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=643)	0.18	0.17		
3. Favor a little (n=105)	0.04	0.03		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=531)	0.14	0.16		
5. Oppose a little (n=40)	0.02	0.01		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=105)	0.02	0.03		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=144)	0.04	0.04		
			1.117	0.350
POST: Health benefits of vaccinations outweigh risks				
1. Benefits outweigh risks (n=2,677)	0.66	0.73		
2. No difference (n=540)	0.24	0.14		
3. Risks outweigh benefits (n=390)	0.10	0.13		
			12.769	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Benefits/risks of vaccinations				
1. Benefits much greater (n=1,687)	0.46	0.43		
2. Benefits moderately greater (n=726)	0.14	0.22		
3. Benefits slightly greater (n=258)	0.06	0.08		
4. No difference (n=540)	0.24	0.14		
5. Risks slightly greater (n=96)	0.03	0.03		
6. Risks moderately greater (n=211)	0.04	0.08		
7. Risks much greater (n=82)	0.02	0.02		
			8.284	0.000

Issues: Immigration

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: immigration' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eleven variables, five of ten tested displayed significant differences in mean and nine of eleven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- In many cases, mode differences favored stricter immigration policies on the web, particularly in terms of economic migrants (e.g. favor ending birthright citizenship, favor building a wall with Mexico).
- Variables that exhibited differences in distribution but not mean concerned refugee migration (e.g. Syrian refugees being allowed to come to the U.S.) and what immigration levels should be. While opposition to Syrian refugees is similar across mode, web respondents are more likely to offer 'neither favor nor oppose' responses and are also less likely to favor accepting Syrian refugees.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161192	PRE: U.S. government policy toward unauthorized immigrants
V161193	PRE: Favor or oppose ending birthright citizenship
V161194x	PRE: SUMMARY - birthright citizenship
V161195	PRE: Children brought illegally sent back
V161195x	PRE: SUMMARY - Children brought illegally
V161196	PRE: Build a wall with Mexico
V161196x	PRE: SUMMARY - Build wall with Mexico
V162157	POST: What should immigration levels be
V162158	POST: How likely immigration will take away jobs
V161214	PRE: Should Syrian refugees be allowed to come to the U.S.
V161214x	PRE: SUMMARY - Allow Syrian refugees

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: U.S. government policy toward unauthorized immigrants	2.62	2.60	0.100	0.752
PRE: Favor or oppose ending birthright citizenship	1.76	1.95	27.477	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - birthright citizenship	4.60	4.13	24.611	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - Children brought illegally	4.92	4.54	32.227	0.000
PRE: Build a wall with Mexico	1.78	1.91	6.741	0.010
PRE: SUMMARY - Build wall with Mexico	4.65	4.29	6.484	0.012
PRE: Should Syrian refugees be allowed to come to the U.S.	1.75	1.73	0.271	0.603
PRE: SUMMARY - Allow Syrian refugees	4.74	4.79	0.152	0.697
POST: What should immigration levels be	3.38	3.50	3.021	0.085
POST: How likely immigration will take away jobs	2.73	2.70	0.555	0.458

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: U.S. government policy toward unauthorized immigrants				
1. Make all unauthorized immigrants felons and... (n=703)	0.17	0.18		
2. Have a guest worker program in order to work (n=644)	0.14	0.15		
3. Allow to remain and eventually qualify... if... (n=2,448)	0.62	0.57		

4. Allow to remain and eventually qualify... without penalties (n=417)	0.08	0.10		
			1.513	0.213
PRE: Favor or oppose ending birthright citizenship				
1. Oppose (n=1,688)	0.48	0.38		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,210)	0.27	0.30		
3. Favor (n=1,352)	0.25	0.32		
			12.443	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - birthright citizenship				
1. Favor a great deal (n=773)	0.13	0.18		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=475)	0.09	0.12		
3. Favor a little (n=103)	0.03	0.02		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,210)	0.27	0.30		
5. Oppose a little (n=135)	0.04	0.03		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=557)	0.17	0.12		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=994)	0.27	0.22		
			5.042	0.000
PRE: Children brought illegally sent back				
0. Should be allowed to live and work in the U.S. (n=3,426)	0.87	0.79		
1. Should be sent back where they came from (n=774)	0.13	0.21		
			20.422	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - Children brought illegally				
1. Should send back - favor a great deal (n=329)	0.06	0.09		
2. Should send back - favor a moderate amount (n=332)	0.06	0.09		
3. Should send back - favor a little (n=112)	0.02	0.03		
4. Should allow to stay - favor a little (n=435)	0.09	0.11		
5. Should allow to stay - favor a moderate amount (n=1,437)	0.34	0.34		
6. Should allow to stay - favor a great deal (n=1,550)	0.44	0.34		
			8.076	0.000
PRE: Build a wall with Mexico				
1. Oppose (n=1,947)	0.52	0.43		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=934)	0.19	0.24		
3. Favor (n=1,370)	0.30	0.33		
			6.350	0.003
PRE: SUMMARY - Build wall with Mexico				
1. Favor a great deal (n=880)	0.20	0.22		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=407)	0.08	0.10		
3. Favor a little (n=82)	0.02	0.02		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=934)	0.19	0.24		
5. Oppose a little (n=87)	0.03	0.02		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=347)	0.08	0.08		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=1,511)	0.41	0.32		
			2.849	0.014
PRE: Should Syrian refugees be allowed to come to the U.S.				
1. Oppose (n=2,056)	0.51	0.48		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,197)	0.22	0.31		
3. Favor (n=981)	0.27	0.21		
			8.250	0.001
PRE: SUMMARY - Allow Syrian refugees				
1. Favor a great deal (n=389)	0.10	0.09		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=434)	0.12	0.09		
3. Favor a little (n=158)	0.05	0.03		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,197)	0.22	0.31		
5. Oppose a little (n=159)	0.04	0.04		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=523)	0.13	0.12		

7. Oppose a great deal (n=1,374)	0.34	0.33		
			4.309	0.001
POST: What should immigration levels be				
1. Increased a lot (n=203)	0.06	0.06		
2. Increased a little (n=382)	0.10	0.09		
3. Left the same as it is now (n=1,443)	0.46	0.38		
4. Decreased a little (n=688)	0.17	0.20		
5. Decreased a lot (n=906)	0.22	0.26		
			2.947	0.024
POST: How likely immigration will take away jobs				
1. Extremely likely (n=553)	0.15	0.17		
2. Very likely (n=737)	0.21	0.20		
3. Somewhat likely (n=1,474)	0.38	0.40		
4. Not at all likely (n=866)	0.25	0.23		
			0.807	0.482

Issues: Law and Order

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: law and order' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of six variables, three of five tested displayed significant differences in mean and four of six tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- The variables that exhibited significant differences concerned whether the federal government should make it more difficult to buy a gun, the importance of gun access, if federal budget spending should be changed to deal with crime, and support for the death penalty. Face-to-face respondents were more likely to favor increasing federal budget spending to deal with crime, and the gun access issue was more important to them than web respondents. Web respondents were more likely to favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161187	PRE: Should fed govt make it more difficult to buy a gun
V161188	PRE: Importance of gun access issue to R
V161208	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime
V161233	PRE: R favor oppose death penalty
V161233x	PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose death penalty
V162179	POST: Should marijuana be legal

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Should fed govt make it more difficult to buy a gun	2.48	2.46	0.483	0.488
PRE: Importance of gun access issue to R	2.11	2.20	6.612	0.011
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime	2.67	2.51	30.056	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose death penalty	2.05	1.88	6.788	0.010
POST: Should marijuana be legal	2.12	2.18	1.772	0.185

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Should fed govt make it more difficult to buy a gun				
1. Easier (n=275)	0.05	0.08		
2. Keep these rules about the same (n=1,702)	0.42	0.39		
3. More difficult (n=2,270)	0.53	0.53		
			3.691	0.032
PRE: Importance of gun access issue to R				
1. Extremely important (n=1,393)	0.35	0.32		
2. Very important (n=1,347)	0.33	0.30		
3. Somewhat important (n=1,066)	0.22	0.26		
4. Not too important (n=312)	0.07	0.07		
5. Not important at all (n=140)	0.03	0.04		
			1.816	0.135
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: dealing with crime				
1. Decreased (n=341)	0.07	0.09		
2. Kept the same (n=1,215)	0.20	0.31		

3. Increased (n=2,692)	0.73	0.60		
			21.638	0.000
PRE: R favor oppose death penalty				
0. Oppose (n=1,292)	0.34	0.29		
1. Favor (n=2,888)	0.66	0.71		
			5.185	0.024
PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose death penalty				
1. Favor strongly (n=2,236)	0.50	0.56		
2. Favor not strongly (n=649)	0.15	0.15		
3. Oppose not strongly (n=557)	0.13	0.13		
4. Oppose strongly (n=734)	0.21	0.16		
			3.311	0.022
POST: Should marijuana be legal				
1. Oppose (n=1,057)	0.31	0.28		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=927)	0.25	0.26		
3. Favor (n=1,648)	0.44	0.46		
			1.079	0.338

Issues: LGBT

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: LGBT' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eight variables, two displayed significant differences in distribution and none of the three variables that were tested for differences in mean were significant.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to feel that business owners who provide wedding-related services should be required to provide services to same-sex couples if same-sex marriage violates their religious beliefs.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161227	PRE: Services to same sex couples
V161227x	PRE: SUMMARY - Services to same sex couples
V161228	PRE: Transgender bathroom policy
V161228x	PRE: SUMMARY - Transgender policy
V161229	PRE: Should laws protect gays lesbians against job discrim
V161229x	PRE: SUMMARY - Laws to protect gays and lesbians against job discrim
V161230	PRE: Should gay and lesbian couples be allowed to adopt
V161231	PRE: R position on gay marriage

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - Services to same sex couples	3.55	3.41	3.432	0.066
PRE: SUMMARY - Transgender policy	3.28	3.22	0.214	0.644
PRE: SUMMARY - Laws to protect gays and lesbians against job discrim	1.61	1.64	0.256	0.614

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Services to same sex couples				
0. Should be required to provide services (n=1,983)	0.52	0.48		
1. Should be allowed to refuse (n=2,203)	0.48	0.52		
			5.003	0.027
PRE: SUMMARY - Services to same sex couples				
1. Feel very strongly- should be allowed to refuse (n=1,297)	0.31	0.30		
2. Feel moderately strongly- should be allowed to refuse (n=649)	0.13	0.15		
3. Feel a little strongly- should be allowed to refuse (n=257)	0.05	0.06		
4. Feel a little strongly - should be required to provide services (n=180)	0.06	0.05		
5. Feel moderately strongly - should be required to provide services (n=634)	0.16	0.16		
6. Feel very strongly - should be required to provide services (n=1,169)	0.31	0.27		
			1.873	0.110
PRE: Transgender bathroom policy				
0. Be allowed to use the bathrooms of their identified gender (n=1,985)	0.50	0.48		
1. Have to use the bathrooms of the gender they were born with (n=2,108)	0.50	0.52		
			0.737	0.392
PRE: SUMMARY - Transgender policy				

1. Feel very strongly- bathroom of the gender born with (n=1,472)	0.38	0.36		
2. Feel moderately strongly- bathroom of the gender born with (n=473)	0.09	0.13		
3. Feel a little strongly- bathroom of the gender born with (n=161)	0.03	0.04		
4. Feel a little strongly - bathroom of identified gender (n=328)	0.09	0.08		
5. Feel moderately strongly - bathroom of identified gender (n=807)	0.19	0.19		
6. Feel very strongly - bathroom of identified gender (n=848)	0.22	0.20		
			1.635	0.166
PRE: Should laws protect gays lesbians against job discrim				
0. Oppose (n=711)	0.18	0.18		
1. Favor (n=3,480)	0.82	0.82		
			0.000	0.980
PRE: SUMMARY - Laws to protect gays and lesbians against job discrim				
1. Favor strongly (n=2,802)	0.69	0.65		
2. Favor not strongly (n=674)	0.13	0.18		
3. Oppose not strongly (n=223)	0.04	0.06		
4. Oppose strongly (n=487)	0.13	0.11		
			3.657	0.014
PRE: Should gay and lesbian couples be allowed to adopt				
0. No (n=1,118)	0.24	0.28		
1. Yes (n=3,048)	0.76	0.72		
			2.763	0.099
PRE: R position on gay marriage				
1. ... allowed to legally marry (n=2,453)	0.61	0.59		
2. ... allowed to form civil unions but not legally marry (n=982)	0.24	0.22		
3. There should be no legal recognition... (n=767)	0.15	0.19		
			2.837	0.061

Issues: Other

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: other' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of three variables, all displayed significant differences in distribution and both variables that were tested for differences in mean were significant.
- For both items related to federal budget spending, face-to-face respondents were more likely to support increased spending on social programs. Web respondents were more likely to feel that spending should be kept the same or decreased.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161206	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools
V161207	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology
V161232	PRE: STD Abortion: self-placement

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools	2.73	2.60	39.559	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology	2.61	2.45	56.952	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: public schools				
1. Decreased (n=326)	0.05	0.08		
2. Kept the same (n=960)	0.18	0.25		
3. Increased (n=2,962)	0.78	0.68		
			15.850	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: science and technology				
1. Decreased (n=319)	0.07	0.08		
2. Kept the same (n=1,448)	0.25	0.38		
3. Increased (n=2,475)	0.68	0.54		
			33.063	0.000
PRE: STD Abortion: self-placement				
1. By law, abortion should never be permitted (n=544)	0.14	0.14		
2. By law, only in case of rape, incest, or woman's life in danger. (n=1,116)	0.30	0.26		
3. By law, for reasons other than... (n=616)	0.12	0.15		
4. By law, abortion as a matter of personal choice. (n=1,932)	0.44	0.45		
5. Other SPECIFY (n=6)	0.00	0.00		
			3.844	0.011

Issues: Race

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: race' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twelve variables, six displayed significant differences in distribution and one out of nine variables that were tested for differences in mean were significant.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to feel that the police and federal government treats whites better. For both items, web respondents we more likely to feel that whites and blacks are treated the same. For affirmative action, web respondents were also more likely to select neither favor nor oppose.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161198	PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: self-placemt
V161204	PRE: Does R favor or oppose affirmative action in universities
V161204a	PRE: How much does R favor affirmative action in universities
V161204x	PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose affirmative action in universities
V162238	POST: For or against preferential hiring/promotion of blacks
V162238a	POST: Strength favor preferential hiring/promotion of blacks
V162238b	POST: Strength oppose preferential hiring/promotion blacks
V162238x	POST: SUMMARY- Favor preferential hiring and promotion of blacks
V162318	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Federal gov treats blacks or whites better
V162318x	POST SUMMARY- How much federal gov treats blacks or whites better
V162320	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Police treat blacks or whites better
V162320x	POST SUMMARY- How much police treat blacks or whites better

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: self-placemt	4.34	4.41	0.558	0.457
PRE: Does R favor or oppose affirmative action in universities	1.80	1.74	2.128	0.147
PRE: How much does R favor affirmative action in universities	1.67	1.66	0.000	0.990
PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose affirmative action in universities	4.53	4.67	2.249	0.136
POST: SUMMARY- Favor preferential hiring and promotion of blacks	3.92	3.83	1.949	0.165
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Federal gov treats blacks or whites better	1.76	1.80	1.656	0.200
POST SUMMARY- How much federal gov treats blacks or whites better	3.42	3.47	0.316	0.575
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Police treat blacks or whites better	1.40	1.47	4.555	0.035
POST SUMMARY- How much police treat blacks or whites better	2.56	2.71	3.042	0.083

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale govt assistance to blacks scale: self-placemt				
1. Govt should help Blacks (n=370)	0.10	0.12		
2. (n=323)	0.10	0.08		
3. (n=398)	0.11	0.10		
4. (n=874)	0.23	0.23		
5. (n=478)	0.15	0.11		
6. (n=573)	0.15	0.15		

7. Blacks should help themselves (n=738)	0.16	0.21		
			2.444	0.028
PRE: Does R favor or oppose affirmative action in universities				
1. Oppose (n=1,884)	0.45	0.42		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,558)	0.31	0.41		
3. Favor (n=782)	0.25	0.17		
			17.484	0.000
PRE: How much does R favor affirmative action in universities				
1. A great deal (n=345)	0.43	0.46		
2. A moderate amount (n=346)	0.47	0.41		
3. A little (n=89)	0.10	0.13		
			1.015	0.363
PRE: SUMMARY - Favor or oppose affirmative action in universities				
1. Favor a great deal (n=345)	0.11	0.08		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=346)	0.12	0.07		
3. Favor a little (n=89)	0.02	0.02		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,558)	0.31	0.41		
5. Oppose a little (n=158)	0.05	0.04		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=626)	0.15	0.14		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=1,100)	0.25	0.25		
			6.460	0.000
POST: For or against preferential hiring/promotion of blacks				
1. For preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (n=868)	0.24	0.27		
2. Against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (n=2,684)	0.76	0.73		
			1.575	0.212
POST: Strength favor preferential hiring/promotion of blacks				
0. Not strong (n=419)	0.42	0.50		
1. Strong (n=448)	0.58	0.50		
			2.562	0.112
POST: Strength oppose preferential hiring/promotion blacks				
0. Not strong (n=786)	0.26	0.30		
1. Strong (n=1,893)	0.74	0.70		
			3.429	0.066
POST: SUMMARY- Favor preferential hiring and promotion of blacks				
1. Strongly for preferential hiring (n=448)	0.14	0.14		
2. Not strongly for preferential hiring (n=419)	0.10	0.13		
4. Not strongly against preferential hiring (n=786)	0.20	0.22		
5. Strongly against preferential hiring (n=1,893)	0.56	0.51		
			2.368	0.075
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Federal gov treats blacks or whites better				
1. Treat whites better (n=1,359)	0.43	0.38		
2. Treat both the same (n=1,539)	0.38	0.44		
3. Treat blacks better (n=672)	0.19	0.18		
			3.981	0.021
POST SUMMARY- How much fed gov treats blacks or whites better				
1. Treats whites much better (n=606)	0.17	0.18		
2. Treats whites moderately better (n=539)	0.18	0.15		
3. Treats whites a little better (n=213)	0.08	0.05		
4. Treats both the same (n=1,539)	0.38	0.44		
5. Treats blacks a little better (n=187)	0.06	0.05		
6. Treats blacks moderately better (n=298)	0.07	0.08		
7. Treats blacks much better (n=185)	0.06	0.05		
			3.025	0.010
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Police treat blacks or whites better				

1. Treat whites better (n=2,056)	0.61	0.55		
2. Treat both the same (n=1,471)	0.38	0.44		
3. Treat blacks better (n=54)	0.01	0.02		
			2.763	0.068
POST SUMMARY- How much police treat blacks or whites better				
1. Treats whites much better (n=1,066)	0.31	0.30		
2. Treats whites moderately better (n=711)	0.23	0.17		
3. Treats whites a little better (n=274)	0.07	0.07		
4. Treats both the same (n=1,471)	0.38	0.44		
5. Treats blacks a little better (n=18)	0.01	0.00		
6. Treats blacks moderately better (n=31)	0.00	0.01		
7. Treats blacks much better (n=5)	0.00	0.00		
			3.229	0.009

Issues: Terrorism

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: terrorism' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eight variables, three displayed significant differences in both mean and distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to feel worried that the United States will experience a terrorist attack in the near future. Regarding support for torture of suspected terrorists, web respondents were more likely to select 'neither favor nor oppose' torture.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162160	POST: How worried about terrist attack next 12 months
V162294	POST: DHS: How worried about terrorist attack in next 12 months
V162295	POST: DHS: Favor or oppose torture for suspected terrorists
V162295a	POST: DHS: How much favor torture for suspected terrorists
V162295b	POST: DHS: How much oppose torture for suspected terrorists
V162295x	POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose torture for suspected terrorists
V162151	POST: Changes in security at public places
V162178	POST: Has increase in govt wiretap powers gone too far

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: How worried about terrist attack next 12 months	2.85	2.68	10.419	0.002
POST: DHS: How worried about terrorist attack in next 12 months	3.05	3.01	0.543	0.463
POST: DHS: Favor or oppose torture for suspected terrorists	1.76	1.84	4.812	0.030
POST: DHS: How much favor torture for suspected terrorists	1.88	1.79	1.358	0.246
POST: DHS: How much oppose torture for suspected terrorists	1.50	1.49	0.066	0.798
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose torture for suspected terrorists	4.70	4.46	5.303	0.023
POST: Changes in security at public places	2.08	2.05	1.270	0.262
POST: Has increase in govt wiretap powers gone too far	1.82	1.78	0.943	0.333

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: How worried about terrist attack next 12 months				
1. Extremely worried (n=645)	0.15	0.19		
2. Very worried (n=844)	0.21	0.24		
3. Moderately worried (n=1,225)	0.35	0.32		
4. Slightly worried (n=682)	0.19	0.18		
5. Not at all worried (n=244)	0.09	0.06		
			3.682	0.006
POST: DHS: How worried about terrirst attack in next 12 months				
1. Extremely likely (n=342)	0.10	0.10		
2. Very likely (n=774)	0.21	0.21		
3. Moderately likely (n=1,285)	0.32	0.37		
4. Slightly likely (n=961)	0.28	0.26		
5. Not likely at all (n=244)	0.09	0.07		
			1.477	0.212

POST: DHS: Favor or oppose torture for suspected terrorists				
1. Oppose (n=1,571)	0.49	0.39		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,178)	0.27	0.37		
3. Favor (n=870)	0.25	0.24		
			11.946	0.000
POST: DHS: How much favor torture for suspected terrorists				
1. A great deal (n=318)	0.34	0.40		
2. Moderately (n=376)	0.44	0.42		
3. A little (n=173)	0.22	0.19		
			0.829	0.435
POST: DHS: How much oppose torture for suspected terrorists				
1. A great deal (n=943)	0.58	0.59		
2. Moderately (n=501)	0.33	0.34		
3. A little (n=122)	0.09	0.08		
			0.139	0.869
POST: SUMMARY- Favor/oppose torture for suspected terrorists				
1. Favor a great deal (n=318)	0.08	0.09		
2. Favor moderately (n=376)	0.11	0.10		
3. Favor a little (n=173)	0.05	0.04		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=1,178)	0.27	0.37		
5. Oppose a little (n=122)	0.04	0.03		
6. Oppose moderately (n=501)	0.16	0.13		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=943)	0.29	0.23		
			4.613	0.000
POST: Changes in security at public places				
1. Have gone too far (n=560)	0.13	0.17		
2. Are just about right (n=2,289)	0.66	0.62		
3. Do not go far enough (n=769)	0.21	0.21		
			1.942	0.146
POST: Has increase in govt wiretap powers gone too far				
1. Have gone too far (n=1,241)	0.34	0.36		
2. Are just about right (n=1,770)	0.50	0.50		
3. Do not go far enough (n=543)	0.16	0.14		
			0.713	0.490

Issues: Taxes, Spending, and Budget

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: taxes, spending, and budget' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of three variables, one displayed significant differences in mean and two displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents were more likely to feel that the government should provide more services.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161178	PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement
V162139	POST: Importance of reducing deficit
V162140	POST: Does R favor or oppose tax on millionaires

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement	4.08	3.90	5.456	0.021
POST: Importance of reducing deficit	1.84	1.91	2.840	0.094
POST: Does R favor or oppose tax on millionaires	2.52	2.51	0.058	0.811

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale spending and Services self-placement				
1. Govt should provide many fewer services (n=378)	0.08	0.12		
2. (n=445)	0.09	0.12		
3. (n=598)	0.17	0.15		
4. (n=908)	0.27	0.25		
5. (n=637)	0.20	0.17		
6. (n=367)	0.11	0.10		
7. Govt should provide many more services (n=295)	0.08	0.09		
			3.007	0.009
POST: Importance of reducing deficit				
1. Extremely important (n=1,464)	0.45	0.39		
2. Very important (n=1,318)	0.32	0.38		
3. Moderately important (n=672)	0.18	0.19		
4. A little important (n=135)	0.03	0.04		
5. Not at all important (n=41)	0.01	0.01		
			2.569	0.045
POST: Does R favor or oppose tax on millionaires				
1. Oppose (n=549)	0.16	0.15		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=644)	0.16	0.19		
3. Favor (n=2,443)	0.68	0.66		
			1.046	0.351

Issues: Welfare

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'issues: welfare' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of ten variables, eight displayed significant differences in mean and eight of nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- For all items related to federal budget and government spending, face-to-face respondents were more likely to support increased spending on social programs. Web respondents were more likely to feel that spending should be kept the same or decreased.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161189	PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: self-placement
V161205	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security
V161209	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs
V161210	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care
V161211	PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor
V162192	POST: Should the minimum wage be raised
V162193	POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care
V162193x	POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care
V161226	PRE: Require employers to offer paid leave to parents of new children
V161226x	PRE: SUMMARY - require employers to offer paid leave to new parents

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: self-placement	4.31	4.21	1.438	0.233
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security	2.60	2.51	12.745	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs	1.78	1.72	2.592	0.110
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care	2.53	2.31	73.314	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor	2.44	2.23	54.754	0.000
PRE: Require employers to offer paid leave to parents of new children	2.68	2.54	23.925	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - require employers to offer paid leave to new parents	2.15	2.57	27.573	0.000
POST: Should the minimum wage be raised	1.38	1.48	8.345	0.005
POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care	2.36	2.15	33.593	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care	3.29	3.66	19.773	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale guaranteed job-income scale: self-placement				
1. Govt should see to jobs and standard of living (n=368)	0.08	0.11		
2. (n=327)	0.09	0.09		
3. (n=509)	0.14	0.14		
4. (n=824)	0.20	0.22		
5. (n=638)	0.20	0.16		
6. (n=611)	0.17	0.15		
7. Govt should let each person get ahead on own (n=497)	0.12	0.14		

			1.962	0.074
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: Social Security				
1. Decreased (n=257)	0.05	0.06		
2. Kept the same (n=1,485)	0.30	0.36		
3. Increased (n=2,498)	0.66	0.58		
			7.520	0.001
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: welfare programs				
1. Decreased (n=1,984)	0.45	0.46		
2. Kept the same (n=1,477)	0.32	0.36		
3. Increased (n=768)	0.23	0.18		
			4.098	0.021
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: child care				
1. Decreased (n=566)	0.09	0.14		
2. Kept the same (n=1,619)	0.30	0.40		
3. Increased (n=2,037)	0.61	0.45		
			31.887	0.000
PRE: Federal Budget Spending: aid to the poor				
1. Decreased (n=730)	0.12	0.18		
2. Kept the same (n=1,709)	0.33	0.42		
3. Increased (n=1,789)	0.56	0.41		
			24.264	0.000
PRE: Require employers to offer paid leave to parents of new children				
1. Oppose (n=467)	0.10	0.11		
2. Neither favor nor oppose (n=876)	0.12	0.24		
3. Favor (n=2,897)	0.78	0.65		
			24.045	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - require employers to offer paid leave to new parents				
1. Favor a great deal (n=1,825)	0.54	0.41		
2. Favor a moderate amount (n=934)	0.21	0.22		
3. Favor a little (n=137)	0.04	0.03		
4. Neither favor nor oppose (n=876)	0.12	0.24		
5. Oppose a little (n=73)	0.02	0.02		
6. Oppose a moderate amount (n=206)	0.04	0.05		
7. Oppose a great deal (n=188)	0.04	0.04		
			11.217	0.000
POST: Increase or decrease gov spending to help people pay for health care				
1. Decrease (n=920)	0.19	0.29		
2. No change (n=988)	0.26	0.28		
3. Increase (n=1,694)	0.55	0.44		
			14.340	0.000
POST: SUMMARY- Increase/decrease gov spending for health care				
1. Increase a great deal (n=545)	0.15	0.15		
2. Increase a moderate amount (n=908)	0.30	0.23		
3. Increase a little (n=237)	0.10	0.05		
4. No change (n=988)	0.26	0.28		
5. Decrease a little (n=144)	0.04	0.05		
6. Decrease a moderate amount (n=427)	0.08	0.13		
7. Decrease a great deal (n=347)	0.08	0.11		
			7.176	0.000

Party: Affect

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'party: affect' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of ten variables, three of the six tested displayed significant differences in mean and seven of the eight tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Feelings towards the Republican Party were more favorable in the face-to-face mode, while feelings towards the Democratic Party did not exhibit differences across mode. At the same time, face-to-face respondents expressed that they like the Democratic Party and the Democratic Presidential candidate more than web respondents. Ratings for the Republican Party and Republican Presidential candidate did not differ across mode.
- The four questions regarding whether there is anything respondents like/dislike about the two parties exhibit answering patterns consistent with acquiescence response bias in the face-to-face mode; face-to-face respondents are more likely to respond with 'Yes' to whether there is anything they like, and dislike, about both the Republican Party and Democratic Party.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161095	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Party
V161096	PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Party
V161097	PRE: Is there anything R likes about Democratic Party
V161100	PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic Party
V161103	PRE: Is there anything R likes about Republican Party
V161106	PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Republican Party
V162283	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Party
V162284	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Party
V162285	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Pres cand
V162286	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Pres cand

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Democratic Party	49.06	48.57	0.138	0.711
PRE: Feeling Thermometer: Republican Party	46.59	41.82	15.714	0.000
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Party	5.35	5.03	4.647	0.033
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Party	5.07	4.81	3.153	0.078
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Pres cand	4.58	4.21	3.968	0.048
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Pres cand	4.25	4.01	1.362	0.245

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Is there anything R likes about Democratic Party				
0. No (n=2,184)	0.44	0.56		
1. Yes (n=2,058)	0.56	0.44		
			19.673	0.000
PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic Party				
0. No (n=1,928)	0.41	0.52		

1. Yes (n=2,304)	0.59	0.48		
			14.589	0.000
PRE: Is there anything R likes about Republican Party				
0. No (n=2,279)	0.48	0.59		
1. Yes (n=1,957)	0.52	0.41		
			21.050	0.000
PRE: Is there anything R dislikes about Republican Party				
0. No (n=1,692)	0.35	0.46		
1. Yes (n=2,541)	0.65	0.54		
			15.547	0.000
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Party				
0. Strongly dislike (n=368)	0.08	0.12		
1. (n=189)	0.05	0.05		
2. (n=292)	0.06	0.08		
3. (n=318)	0.10	0.09		
4. (n=245)	0.09	0.06		
5. (n=573)	0.16	0.18		
6. (n=240)	0.06	0.07		
7. (n=330)	0.10	0.08		
8. (n=435)	0.12	0.11		
9. (n=230)	0.06	0.06		
10. Strongly like (n=337)	0.12	0.10		
			2.064	0.034
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Party				
0. Strongly dislike (n=404)	0.08	0.13		
1. (n=231)	0.07	0.06		
2. (n=301)	0.08	0.08		
3. (n=279)	0.08	0.08		
4. (n=303)	0.08	0.08		
5. (n=599)	0.17	0.18		
6. (n=299)	0.11	0.08		
7. (n=319)	0.09	0.09		
8. (n=411)	0.11	0.11		
9. (n=217)	0.06	0.06		
10. Strongly like (n=237)	0.07	0.07		
			2.293	0.018
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Democratic Pres cand				
0. Strongly dislike (n=830)	0.17	0.25		
1. (n=300)	0.08	0.08		
2. (n=262)	0.09	0.07		
3. (n=241)	0.09	0.06		
4. (n=179)	0.06	0.05		
5. (n=351)	0.09	0.11		
6. (n=263)	0.09	0.07		
7. (n=323)	0.09	0.08		
8. (n=331)	0.09	0.08		
9. (n=227)	0.08	0.06		
10. Strongly like (n=295)	0.08	0.09		
			3.168	0.002
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: like-dislike Republican Pres cand				
0. Strongly dislike (n=996)	0.23	0.30		
1. (n=282)	0.09	0.07		
2. (n=225)	0.07	0.06		
3. (n=205)	0.07	0.05		

4. (n=193)	0.06	0.05		
5. (n=357)	0.10	0.11		
6. (n=252)	0.08	0.07		
7. (n=297)	0.08	0.08		
8. (n=343)	0.10	0.09		
9. (n=211)	0.06	0.06		
10. Strongly like (n=245)	0.08	0.07		
			1.742	0.084

Party: Other

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'party: other' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of nine variables, the only one tested did not display significant differences in mean and three of the nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to state that there are important differences in what major parties stand for. Web respondents were also more likely than face-to-face respondents to state that the Democrats would do a better job of handling the economy, and with the first mention of the most important problem.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161144	PRE: Which party better: handling nations economy
V161173	PRE: Rep and Dem adequate parties
V161174	PRE: Serious third party or independent Pres cand choice
V162117	POST: Party to deal with mention 1 MIP
V162119	POST: Party to deal with mention 2 MIP
V162121	POST: Party to deal with mention 3 MIP
V162190	POST: Important differences in what major parties stand for
V162191	POST: Is one of the parties more conservative than the other
V162191a	POST: Which is the party that is more conservative

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Serious third party or independent Pres cand choice	2.72	2.80	1.537	0.217

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Which party better: handling nations economy				
1. Democrats (n=1,347)	0.29	0.33		
2. Republicans (n=1,449)	0.34	0.33		
3. Not much difference between them (n=1,431)	0.36	0.34		
4. Neither party (n=10)	0.01	0.00		
			7.692	0.000
PRE: Rep and Dem adequate parties				
0. Such a poor job that a third major party is needed (n=2,393)	0.58	0.56		
1. Adequate job (n=1,791)	0.42	0.44		
			1.500	0.223
PRE: Serious third party or independent Pres cand choice				
1. A great deal (n=1,185)	0.30	0.26		
2. A lot (n=723)	0.17	0.16		
3. A moderate amount (n=1,005)	0.21	0.26		
4. A little (n=532)	0.13	0.12		
5. Not at all (n=801)	0.18	0.18		
			2.224	0.069
POST: Party to deal with mention 1 MIP				

1. Democrats (n=1,066)	0.26	0.32		
2. Republicans (n=1,290)	0.35	0.35		
3. Wouldn't be much difference (n=1,223)	0.39	0.33		
			5.229	0.006
POST: Party to deal with mention 2 MIP				
1. Democrats (n=1,048)	0.29	0.32		
2. Republicans (n=1,241)	0.37	0.36		
3. Wouldn't be much difference (n=1,050)	0.34	0.32		
			0.774	0.456
POST: Party to deal with mention 3 MIP				
1. Democrats (n=866)	0.29	0.32		
2. Republicans (n=958)	0.36	0.32		
3. Wouldn't be much difference (n=1,007)	0.35	0.36		
			1.328	0.267
POST: Important differences in what major parties stand for				
0. No, no differences (n=551)	0.21	0.14		
1. Yes, differences (n=3,069)	0.79	0.86		
			12.348	0.001
POST: Is one of the parties more conservative than the other				
0. No, one party not more conservative (n=441)	0.12	0.14		
1. Yes, one party more conservative (n=3,164)	0.88	0.86		
			0.703	0.403
POST: Which is the party that is more conservative				
1. Democrats (n=438)	0.17	0.15		
2. Republicans (n=2,712)	0.83	0.85		
			0.334	0.564

Party: Placement

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'party: placement' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of four variables, none displayed significant differences in mean and two displayed significant differences in distribution.
- The placement of the Democratic and Republican parties on liberal-conservative and left-right continua did not differ across mode.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161130	PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Dem party
V161131	PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Rep party
V162287	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Democratic Party
V162288	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Republican Party

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Dem party	2.84	2.74	1.425	0.235
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Rep party	5.18	5.22	0.134	0.715
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Democratic Party	3.52	3.48	0.051	0.823
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Republican Party	6.95	6.67	2.780	0.098

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Dem party				
1. Extremely liberal (n=920)	0.19	0.22		
2. Liberal (n=1,497)	0.35	0.34		
3. Slightly liberal (n=603)	0.14	0.14		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=696)	0.17	0.18		
5. Slightly conservative (n=181)	0.07	0.04		
6. Conservative (n=203)	0.06	0.06		
7. Extremely conservative (n=77)	0.02	0.02		
			1.893	0.092
PRE: 7pt scale liberal conservative Rep party				
1. Extremely liberal (n=122)	0.04	0.04		
2. Liberal (n=244)	0.05	0.07		
3. Slightly liberal (n=185)	0.05	0.04		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=574)	0.15	0.15		
5. Slightly conservative (n=568)	0.16	0.12		
6. Conservative (n=1,507)	0.37	0.35		
7. Extremely conservative (n=963)	0.18	0.23		
			2.182	0.059
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Democratic Party				
0. Left (n=595)	0.16	0.18		
1. (n=409)	0.11	0.12		
2. (n=565)	0.16	0.14		

3. (n=453)	0.13	0.12		
4. (n=299)	0.10	0.07		
5. (n=500)	0.12	0.18		
6. (n=125)	0.05	0.04		
7. (n=123)	0.05	0.04		
8. (n=158)	0.04	0.05		
9. (n=94)	0.03	0.03		
10. Right (n=144)	0.05	0.05		
			2.091	0.033
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right Republican Party				
0. Left (n=138)	0.04	0.05		
1. (n=73)	0.02	0.02		
2. (n=122)	0.02	0.04		
3. (n=122)	0.04	0.04		
4. (n=132)	0.05	0.04		
5. (n=431)	0.11	0.16		
6. (n=245)	0.09	0.06		
7. (n=383)	0.11	0.10		
8. (n=658)	0.19	0.17		
9. (n=542)	0.17	0.15		
10. Right (n=621)	0.16	0.18		
			2.206	0.029

Personal: Experience

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'personal: experience' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of seven variables, the only one tested did not display a significant difference in mean and one of the seven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to state that they've been arrested.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161275x	PRE: SUMMARY - R occupation status 2 digit
V161276x	PRE: SUMMARY - R occupation status 1 digit
V161302	PRE: Anyone in HH belong to labor union
V161303	PRE: Who in HH belongs to labor union
V162297	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: In past 12 months any family member stopped/questioned by police
V162298	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Has R ever been arrested
V162369	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination due to skintone

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination due to skintone	4.33	4.28	1.373	0.243

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - R occupation status 2 digit				
10. Working now only (n=2,547)	0.61	0.60		
15. Working now and retired, working >=20 hours per wk (n=46)	0.01	0.01		
16. Working now and perm. Disabled, working >2=0 hours per wk (n=5)	0.00	0.00		
17. Working now and homemaker, working >=20 hours per wk (n=9)	0.00	0.00		
18. Working now and student, working >=20 hours per wk (n=16)	0.00	0.01		
20. Temporarily laid off (n=49)	0.01	0.01		
40. Unemployed, no mention of retired, disabled, homemaker, (n=220)	0.04	0.07		
50. Retired, no other occupation (n=819)	0.15	0.16		
51. Retired and working now, working <20 hours per wk or DK/RF (n=57)	0.01	0.01		
60. Permanently disabled, not working (n=174)	0.06	0.04		
61. Perm disabled and working now, working <20 hours per wk or DK/ (n=3)	0.00	0.00		
70. Homemaker, no other occupation (n=198)	0.05	0.05		
71. Homemaker and working now, working <20 hours per wk or DK/ (n=15)	0.01	0.00		
80. Student, no other occupation (n=86)	0.03	0.03		
81. Student and working now, working <20 hours per wk or DK/RF (n=11)	0.01	0.00		
			1.635	0.101
PRE: SUMMARY - R occupation status 1 digit				
1. R working now (if also retired, disabled...> 20 hrs/wk) (n=2,623)	0.63	0.62		
2. R temporarily laid off (n=49)	0.01	0.01		
4. R unemployed (n=220)	0.04	0.07		
5. R retired (if also working, working <20 hrs/wk) (n=876)	0.16	0.17		
6. R permanently disabled (if also working, working <20 hrs/wk) (n=177)	0.06	0.04		

7. R homemaker (if also working, working <20 hrs/wk... (n=213)	0.06	0.06		
8. R student (if also working, working <20 hrs/wk) (n=97)	0.04	0.03		
			0.790	0.554
PRE: Anyone in HH belong to labor union				
0. No (n=3,665)	0.85	0.85		
1. Yes (n=579)	0.15	0.15		
			0.027	0.868
PRE: Who in HH belongs to labor union				
1. Respondent only (n=322)	0.53	0.45		
2. Respondent and spouse/partner (n=39)	0.03	0.08		
3. Respondent and someone else (n=3)	0.01	0.00		
4. Spouse/partner only (n=152)	0.25	0.29		
6. Someone else only (n=63)	0.18	0.18		
			1.054	0.374
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: In past 12 months family member stopped by pol				
0. Was not stopped or questioned in the past 12 months (n=2,773)	0.74	0.77		
1. Was stopped or questioned in the past 12 months (n=826)	0.26	0.23		
			2.947	0.088
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Has R ever been arrested				
0. Never arrested (n=2,861)	0.75	0.81		
1. Have been arrested (n=736)	0.25	0.19		
			6.868	0.010
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: Discrimination due to skintone				
1. A great deal (n=91)	0.02	0.03		
2. A lot (n=107)	0.04	0.03		
3. A moderate amount (n=384)	0.11	0.13		
4. A little (n=924)	0.27	0.25		
5. None at all (n=2,077)	0.56	0.56		
			1.607	0.179

Personal: Financial

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'personal: financial' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eleven variables, six of the seven tested displayed significant differences in mean and eight of the eleven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Assessments of personal financial situations tend to be more optimistic in the face-to-face mode. Face-to-face respondents are more likely than web respondents to feel that today they are better off financially than a year ago, and that in a year they will be better off than now. Furthermore, web respondents are more worried about being able to pay their health costs, to make housing payments, and their current financial situation more generally.
- Among respondents that are not working, web respondents are more worried about being able to find a job in the near future.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161110	PRE: R how much better worse off than 1 year ago
V161111	PRE: R how much better worse off next year
V161290	PRE: Init status nonworkg ret dis unemp hmkr st: worry find job
V161297	PRE: Working TLO now: worry about losing job in near future
V161334	PRE: Home ownership
V161350	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Money invested in Stock Market
V162163	POST: Put off checkup and vaccines
V162164	POST: Will you pay all costs
V162165	POST: Worry about financial situation
V162166	POST: Able to make housing payments
V162167	POST: Anyone lost jobs

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: R how much better worse off than 1 year ago	2.78	3.05	41.738	0.000
PRE: R how much better worse off next year	2.58	2.77	29.443	0.000
PRE: Init status nonworkg ret dis unemp hmkr st: worry find job	3.00	3.27	1.478	0.226
PRE: Working TLO now: worry about losing job in near future	1.68	1.90	13.193	0.000
POST: Will you pay all costs	2.38	2.72	23.276	0.000
POST: Worry about financial situation	3.56	3.14	44.579	0.000
POST: Able to make housing payments	1.73	2.10	33.689	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: R how much better worse off than 1 year ago				
1. Much better off (n=298)	0.10	0.05		
2. Somewhat better off (n=905)	0.24	0.20		
3. About the same (n=1,981)	0.47	0.47		
4. Somewhat worse off (n=763)	0.12	0.20		
5. Much worse off (n=311)	0.05	0.08		

			12.177	0.000
PRE: R how much better worse off next year				
1. Much better off (n=377)	0.14	0.07		
2. Somewhat better off (n=1,115)	0.27	0.27		
3. About the same (n=2,109)	0.47	0.51		
4. Somewhat worse off (n=497)	0.10	0.12		
5. Much worse off (n=124)	0.02	0.03		
			10.989	0.000
PRE: Init status nonworkg ret dis unemp hmkr st: worry find job				
1. Not at all (n=45)	0.25	0.12		
2. A little (n=46)	0.18	0.18		
3. Moderately (n=57)	0.21	0.23		
4. Very (n=47)	0.04	0.23		
5. Extremely (n=69)	0.32	0.24		
			3.492	0.011
PRE: Working TLO now: worry about losing job in near future				
1. Not at all (n=1,504)	0.63	0.51		
2. A little (n=638)	0.19	0.24		
3. Moderately (n=358)	0.09	0.14		
4. Very (n=120)	0.04	0.05		
5. Extremely (n=137)	0.05	0.06		
			5.746	0.000
PRE: Home ownership				
1. Pay rent (n=1,286)	0.29	0.29		
2. Pay mortgage (n=1,754)	0.41	0.41		
3. Own home with no payments due (n=886)	0.20	0.20		
4. Some other arrangement (n=308)	0.10	0.11		
			0.042	0.977
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Money invested in Stock Market				
0. No (n=2,219)	0.56	0.59		
1. Yes (n=1,950)	0.44	0.41		
			1.904	0.170
POST: Put off checkup and vaccines				
1. Someone has put off health care (n=1,052)	0.18	0.36		
2. No one has put off health care (n=2,584)	0.82	0.64		
			72.682	0.000
POST: Will you pay all costs				
1. Extremely likely (n=1,089)	0.35	0.25		
2. Very likely (n=878)	0.26	0.23		
3. Moderately likely (n=733)	0.16	0.23		
4. Slightly likely (n=433)	0.12	0.13		
5. Not likely at all (n=500)	0.11	0.16		
			9.294	0.000
POST: Worry about financial situation				
1. Extremely worried (n=402)	0.10	0.13		
2. Very worried (n=444)	0.08	0.13		
3. Moderately worried (n=1,104)	0.26	0.33		
4. A little worried (n=1,040)	0.29	0.27		
5. Not at all worried (n=652)	0.27	0.13		
			18.952	0.000
POST: Able to make housing payments				
1. Extremely likely (n=1,192)	0.53	0.39		
2. Very likely (n=738)	0.31	0.28		
3. Moderately likely (n=416)	0.09	0.21		

4. Slightly likely (n=161)	0.05	0.08		
5. Not likely at all (n=81)	0.02	0.04		
			10.786	0.000
POST: Anyone lost jobs				
1. Someone lost a job (n=1,580)	0.42	0.46		
2. No one lost a job (n=2,061)	0.58	0.55		
			2.529	0.114

Personal: Other

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'personal: other' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of thirteen variables, one of the two tested displayed significant differences in mean and eleven of the thirteen tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents report less satisfaction with their life than face-to-face respondents.
- Eight of the ten Wordsum vocabulary test questions exhibited mode differences, as web respondents were more likely to answer correctly.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161112	PRE: Does R have health insurance
V161115	PRE: Self-evaluation of R health
V161497	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set B
V161498	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set D
V161499	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set E
V161500	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set F
V161501	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set G
V161502	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set H
V161503	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set J
V161504	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set K
V161505	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set L
V161506	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set O
V161522	PRE: How satisfied is R with life

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Self-evaluation of R health	2.58	2.52	1.175	0.280
PRE: How satisfied is R with life	2.23	2.56	43.657	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Does R have health insurance				
0. No (n=374)	0.10	0.10		
1. Yes (n=3,891)	0.90	0.90		
			0.068	0.795
PRE: Self-evaluation of R health				
1. Excellent (n=742)	0.19	0.16		
2. Very good (n=1,429)	0.30	0.34		
3. Good (n=1,342)	0.30	0.33		
4. Fair (n=604)	0.17	0.13		
5. Poor (n=146)	0.04	0.03		
			3.356	0.011
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set B				
0. Not correct (n=443)	0.14	0.11		

1. Correct (n=3,695)	0.86	0.89		
			2.680	0.104
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set D				
0. Not correct (n=251)	0.09	0.05		
1. Correct (n=3,902)	0.91	0.95		
			8.549	0.004
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set E				
0. Not correct (n=691)	0.24	0.16		
1. Correct (n=3,466)	0.76	0.84		
			8.915	0.003
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set F				
0. Not correct (n=350)	0.14	0.08		
1. Correct (n=3,804)	0.86	0.92		
			25.001	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set G				
0. Not correct (n=2,292)	0.63	0.56		
1. Correct (n=1,844)	0.37	0.44		
			9.711	0.002
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set H				
0. Not correct (n=2,303)	0.67	0.56		
1. Correct (n=1,809)	0.33	0.44		
			18.174	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set J				
0. Not correct (n=2,196)	0.62	0.53		
1. Correct (n=1,949)	0.38	0.47		
			12.829	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set K				
0. Not correct (n=1,185)	0.37	0.28		
1. Correct (n=2,954)	0.63	0.72		
			12.763	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set L				
0. Not correct (n=1,453)	0.45	0.35		
1. Correct (n=2,696)	0.55	0.65		
			23.568	0.000
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: Correct or incorrect- WORDSUM set O				
0. Not correct (n=1,324)	0.39	0.34		
1. Correct (n=2,822)	0.61	0.66		
			4.077	0.045
PRE: How satisfied is R with life				
1. Extremely satisfied (n=679)	0.25	0.13		
2. Very satisfied (n=1,590)	0.39	0.36		
3. Moderately satisfied (n=1,418)	0.27	0.37		
4. Slightly satisfied (n=366)	0.07	0.10		
5. Not satisfied at allrun (n=132)	0.02	0.04		
			17.953	0.000

Personal: Possessions

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'personal: possessions' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of eight variables, the only variable tested did not display a significant difference in mean and two of the seven tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Face-to-face respondents are more likely to report having a non-expired driver's license and a cell phone. No other variables exhibited a difference across mode.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161326	PRE: Internet use at home
V161327	PRE: Cell or Landline service
V161328	PRE: Does R personally have a cell phone
V161329	PRE: Is R's cell phone a smartphone
V161339	PRE: Does R have unexpired govt Drivers license
V161340	PRE: Does R have unexpired govt Passport
V161341	PRE: Does R have other govt ID
V161496	PRE FTF CASI / WEB: How many Guns owned

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI / WEB: How many Guns owned	1.47	1.60	0.440	0.508

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Internet use at home				
0. No (n=462)	0.10	0.10		
1. Yes (n=3,790)	0.90	0.90		
			0.162	0.688
PRE: Cell or Landline service				
1. Only landline service (n=247)	0.05	0.06		
2. Only cell service (n=2,304)	0.55	0.52		
3. Both landline and cell service (n=1,689)	0.40	0.42		
			1.190	0.305
PRE: Does R personally have a cell phone				
0. No, do not have a cell phone (n=128)	0.03	0.05		
1. Yes, have a cell phone (n=3,862)	0.97	0.95		
			4.967	0.028
PRE: Is R's cell phone a smartphone				
0. No smartphone (n=544)	0.14	0.14		
1. Yes, have a smartphone (n=3,316)	0.86	0.86		
			0.071	0.789
PRE: Does R have unexpired govt Drivers license				
1. Have a non-expired driver's license (n=3,852)	0.93	0.87		
2. Do not have one (n=387)	0.07	0.13		
			19.169	0.000

PRE: Does R have unexpired govt Passport				
1. Have a non-expired U.S. passport (n=2,087)	0.46	0.45		
2. Do not have one (n=2,144)	0.54	0.55		
			0.099	0.753
PRE: Does R have other govt ID				
1. Have another form of ID (n=192)	0.64	0.65		
2. Do not have (n=118)	0.36	0.35		
			0.021	0.883

Predispositions: Ideology

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'predispositions: ideology' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of nine variables, none of the six tested displayed significant differences in mean and four of the nine tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- The 7-point Liberal-conservative and 10-point left-right self-identification questions did not exhibit mode differences. It should be noted that there were differences in the two component questions asking respondents what they would select if they had to choose their placement (PRE: If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-placemt; POST: If had to choose, liberal or conservative); web respondents were offered the choice of 'moderate' but face-to-face respondents had to volunteer that answer.
- Three of the four questions on government regulation did not exhibit mode differences (POST: Need strong govt for complex problems OR free market; POST: Less govt better OR more that govt should be doing; POST: Regulation of Business). Web respondents were more likely to report that government is bigger because it's involved in things people should handle themselves.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161126	PRE: 7pt scale Liberal conservative self-placement
V161127	PRE: If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-placemt
V162171	POST: 7pt scale liberal-Conservate: self placement
V162171a	POST: If had to choose, liberal or conservative
V162183	POST: Govt bigger because too involved OR bigger problems
V162184	POST: Need strong govt for complex problems OR free market
V162185	POST: Less govt better OR more that govt should be doing
V162186	POST: Regulation of Business
V162289	POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right self placement

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale Liberal conservative self-placement	4.21	4.15	0.640	0.425
PRE: If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-placemt	2.14	2.10	0.499	0.481
POST: 7pt scale liberal-Conservate: self placement	4.16	4.15	0.042	0.839
POST: If had to choose, liberal or conservative	2.17	2.10	1.970	0.163
POST: Regulation of Business	2.99	3.01	0.341	0.560
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right self placement	5.84	5.79	0.104	0.748

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: 7pt scale Liberal conservative self-placement				
1. Extremely liberal (n=146)	0.04	0.04		
2. Liberal (n=506)	0.14	0.15		
3. Slightly liberal (n=380)	0.12	0.12		
4. Moderate, middle of the road (n=895)	0.26	0.27		
5. Slightly conservative (n=508)	0.18	0.14		
6. Conservative (n=703)	0.21	0.21		

7. Extremely conservative (n=166)	0.05	0.05		
			0.753	0.589
PRE: If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-placemt				
1. Liberal (n=315)	0.31	0.13		
2. Moderate (n=993)	0.25	0.65		
3. Conservative (n=485)	0.44	0.22		
			69.189	0.000
POST: 7pt scale liberal-Conservate: self placement				
1. Extremely liberal (n=110)	0.04	0.04		
2. Liberal (n=474)	0.16	0.14		
3. Slightly liberal (n=413)	0.12	0.14		
4. Moderate/ middle of the road (n=841)	0.27	0.30		
5. Slightly conservative (n=442)	0.17	0.13		
6. Conservative (n=652)	0.21	0.20		
7. Extremely conservative (n=118)	0.04	0.04		
			1.115	0.351
POST: If had to choose, liberal or conservative				
1. Liberal (n=260)	0.35	0.13		
2. Moderate (n=700)	0.13	0.64		
3. Conservative (n=427)	0.52	0.23		
			119.966	0.000
POST: Govt bigger because too involved OR bigger problems				
0. Gov't bigger because problems are bigger (n=1,645)	0.52	0.43		
1. Gov't bigger b/c involved in things ppl should handle themselves (n=1,972)	0.48	0.57		
			18.863	0.000
POST: Need strong govt for complex problems OR free market				
0. Free market can handle without gov't involvement (n=1,320)	0.35	0.36		
1. Need a strong gov't to handle complex economic problems (n=2,299)	0.65	0.64		
			0.303	0.583
POST: Less govt better OR more that govt should be doing				
0. More things government should be doing (n=1,842)	0.56	0.51		
1. Less government the better (n=1,779)	0.44	0.49		
			3.201	0.076
POST: Regulation of Business				
1. A great deal (n=228)	0.09	0.06		
2. A lot (n=415)	0.11	0.12		
3. A moderate amount (n=2,174)	0.56	0.61		
4. A little (n=710)	0.21	0.18		
5. None at all (n=101)	0.03	0.03		
			2.534	0.044
POST: CSES: 10pt scale: left-right self placement				
0. Left (n=88)	0.02	0.03		
1. (n=110)	0.02	0.03		
2. (n=192)	0.04	0.05		
3. (n=217)	0.07	0.06		
4. (n=240)	0.07	0.07		
5. (n=1,003)	0.28	0.29		
6. (n=375)	0.11	0.10		
7. (n=344)	0.12	0.09		
8. (n=423)	0.10	0.12		
9. (n=228)	0.06	0.07		
10. Right (n=283)	0.10	0.09		
			0.944	0.480

Predispositions: Party Identification

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'predispositions: party identification' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of ten variables, none of the two tested displayed significant differences in mean and four of the ten tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Party identification did exhibit mode differences in the distribution (PRE: SUMMARY - Party ID); however, it is important to point out that V161155 (PRE: Party ID: Does R think of self as Dem, Rep, Ind or what) and V161157 (PRE: No Party Identification - closer to Dems or Reps) differed by mode. For V161155, respondents could volunteer that they had no preference, but this was not offered as a response option in the online version of the question. Likewise, for V161157, the 'Neither' category was not offered in the face-to-face questionnaire but was accepted as a volunteered response, whereas the 'Neither' category appeared on the Web questionnaire. These caveats also apply to V161158x (PRE: SUMMARY - Party ID).
- Web respondents are more likely to state that there are no parties in the U.S. that represent their views (POST: Any parties in the U.S. represent R's views).

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161155	PRE: Party ID: Does R think of self as Dem, Rep, Ind or what
V161156	PRE: Party Identification strong - Democrat Republican
V161157	PRE: No Party Identification - closer to Dems or Reps
V161158x	PRE: SUMMARY - Party ID
V162278	POST: Any parties in the U.S. represent R's views
V162279	POST: Which party represents views best
V162291	POST: CSES: Close to any political party
V162292a	POST: CSES: Which party R is closest to
V162292b	POST: CSES: Degree closeness
V162293	POST: CSES: Closer to one party

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: SUMMARY - Party ID	3.91	3.79	1.420	0.236
POST: CSES: Degree closeness	1.74	1.76	0.229	0.633

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Party ID: Does R think of self as Dem, Rep, Ind or what				
0. No preference (FTF ONLY) (n=49)	0.04	0.00		
1. Democrat (n=1,451)	0.31	0.36		
2. Republican (n=1,231)	0.28	0.28		
3. Independent (n=1,367)	0.35	0.32		
5. Other party SPECIFY (n=148)	0.02	0.04		
			17.544	0.000
PRE: Party Identification strong - Democrat Republican				
0. Not very strong (n=1,068)	0.43	0.40		

1. Strong (n=1,611)	0.57	0.60		
			1.085	0.299
PRE: No Party Identification - closer to Dems or Reps				
1. Closer to Republican (n=500)	0.39	0.27		
2. Neither (n=579)	0.24	0.46		
3. Closer to Democratic (n=490)	0.37	0.27		
			30.568	0.000
PRE: SUMMARY - Party ID				
1. Strong Democrat (n=890)	0.18	0.22		
2. Not very strong Democract (n=560)	0.13	0.14		
3. Independent-Democrat (n=490)	0.15	0.09		
4. Independent (n=579)	0.10	0.16		
5. Independent-Republican (n=500)	0.16	0.09		
6. Not very strong Republican (n=508)	0.12	0.12		
7. Strong Republican (n=721)	0.16	0.17		
			10.589	0.000
POST: Any parties in the U.S. represent R's views				
0. No (n=1,494)	0.37	0.45		
1. Yes (n=2,109)	0.63	0.55		
			15.939	0.000
POST: Which party represents views best				
1. Democratic (n=1,057)	0.50	0.51		
5. Republican (n=931)	0.43	0.44		
7. Other (n=107)	0.06	0.05		
			0.535	0.584
POST: CSES: Close to any political party				
0. No (n=1,629)	0.43	0.48		
1. Yes (n=1,997)	0.57	0.52		
			3.402	0.067
POST: CSES: Which party R is closest to				
1. Democratic (n=1,016)	0.52	0.52		
3. Republican (n=912)	0.44	0.44		
7. Other (n=67)	0.03	0.03		
			0.000	0.999
POST: CSES: Degree closeness				
1. Very close (n=642)	0.33	0.32		
2. Somewhat close (n=1,210)	0.60	0.59		
3. Not very close (n=142)	0.07	0.08		
			0.293	0.742
POST: CSES: Closer to one party				
1. Democratic (n=601)	0.34	0.42		
3. Republican (n=565)	0.40	0.39		
7. Other (n=299)	0.26	0.19		
			2.922	0.056

Predispositions: Traits

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'predispositions: traits' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of twenty-six variables, thirteen of the twenty-two tested displayed significant differences in mean and twenty-one of the twenty-six tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Regarding the *Need to Evaluate Scale*, face-to-face respondents are more likely to state that the statement is characteristic of themselves for three of the six items (POST: R forms opinions about everything; POST: Important for R to hold strong opinions; POST: R would rather have strong opinion than no opinion).
- For the *Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale*, face-to-face respondents are more likely to agree with all of the statements. Face-to-face respondents agree with the authoritarian position for two of the three items (POST: Country would be great by getting rid of rotten apples; POST: Country needs strong leader to take us back to true path). However, face-to-face respondents are also more likely to agree with the non-authoritative statement (POST: Country needs free thinkers). For all three items, web respondents are more likely to select the 'Neither agree nor disagree' statement.
- For eight of the ten personality measures (TIPI), face-to-face respondents were more likely to state that the statement describes them well.
- Although the child rearing measures (V162239 POST: Child trait more important: independence or respect - V162242 Child trait more important: considerate or well-behaved) all show large differences, it should be noted that the questions differed by design depending on mode. Web respondents were not offered the option to select 'both' but this was accepted as an answer from face-to-face respondents.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161219	PRE: How often can people be trusted
V162168	POST: Country needs free thinkers
V162169	POST: Country would be great by getting rid of rotten apples
V162170	POST: Country needs strong leader to take us back to true path
V162239	POST: Child trait more important: independence or respect
V162240	POST: Child trait more important: curiosity or good manners
V162241	POST: Child trait more important: obedience or self-reliance
V162242	POST: Child trait more important: considerate or well-behaved
V162248	POST: R likes to have strong opinions even when not personally involved
V162249	POST: R forms opinions about everything
V162250	POST: Important for R to hold strong opinions
V162251	POST: It bothers R to remain neutral
V162252	POST: R has many more opinions than the average person
V162253	POST: R would rather have strong opinion than no opinion
V162333	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI extraverted, enthusiastic
V162334	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI critical, quarrelsome
V162335	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI dependable, self-disciplined
V162336	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI anxious, easily upset
V162337	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI open to new experiences
V162338	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI reserved, quiet
V162339	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI sympathetic, warm
V162340	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI disorganized, careless
V162341	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI calm, emotionally stable
V162342	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI conventional, uncreative

V162343	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How hard is it for R to control temper
V162344	POST: FTF CASI/WEB: When provoked, how likely for R to hit someone

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How often can people be trusted	2.89	2.94	0.897	0.345
POST: Country needs free thinkers	2.09	2.27	7.337	0.008
POST: Country would be great by getting rid of rotten apples	2.65	2.87	8.467	0.004
POST: Country needs strong leader to take us back to true path	2.55	2.64	1.514	0.221
POST: R likes to have strong opinions even when not personally involved	3.23	3.20	0.216	0.643
POST: R forms opinions about everything	2.92	2.64	20.604	0.000
POST: Important for R to hold strong opinions	3.59	3.36	22.609	0.000
POST: It bothers R to remain neutral	3.44	3.96	1.234	0.271
POST: R has many more opinions than the average person	3.50	3.52	0.008	0.930
POST: R would rather have strong opinion than no opinion	3.67	3.41	23.107	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI extraverted, enthusiastic	4.94	4.67	13.806	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI critical, quarrelsome	3.48	3.32	4.142	0.044
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI dependable, self-disciplined	6.09	5.86	18.279	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI anxious, easily upset	3.69	3.47	6.861	0.010
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI open to new experiences	5.46	5.17	24.871	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI reserved, quiet	4.38	4.35	0.159	0.690
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI sympathetic, warm	5.79	5.57	14.648	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI disorganized, careless	2.79	2.60	4.462	0.037
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI calm, emotionally stable	5.47	5.29	9.074	0.003
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI conventional, uncreative	3.27	3.24	0.123	0.726
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How hard is it for R to control temper	4.28	4.26	0.135	0.714
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: When provoked, how likely for R to hit someone	4.61	4.58	0.504	0.479

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How often can people be trusted				
1. Always (n=50)	0.01	0.01		
2. Most of the time (n=1,766)	0.43	0.37		
3. About half the time (n=1,305)	0.26	0.34		
4. Some of the time (n=947)	0.26	0.22		
5. Never (n=188)	0.04	0.05		
			4.204	0.004
POST: Country needs free thinkers				
1. Agree strongly (n=1,081)	0.35	0.27		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,421)	0.39	0.37		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=688)	0.13	0.24		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=299)	0.08	0.09		
5. Disagree strongly (n=147)	0.05	0.04		
			9.892	0.000
POST: Country would be great by getting rid of rotten apples				
1. Agree strongly (n=702)	0.24	0.17		
2. Agree somewhat (n=998)	0.30	0.26		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=747)	0.16	0.24		

4. Disagree somewhat (n=631)	0.16	0.17		
5. Disagree strongly (n=561)	0.14	0.16		
			7.121	0.000
POST: Country needs strong leader to take us back to true path				
1. Agree strongly (n=926)	0.32	0.24		
2. Agree somewhat (n=978)	0.25	0.27		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=699)	0.16	0.22		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=459)	0.11	0.12		
5. Disagree strongly (n=573)	0.16	0.14		
			5.393	0.000
POST: Child trait more important: independence or respect				
1. Independence (n=919)	0.20	0.26		
2. Respect for elders (n=2,643)	0.74	0.74		
3. Both (n=68)	0.06	0.00		
			49.780	0.000
POST: Child trait more important: curiosity or good manners				
1. Curiosity (n=1,265)	0.29	0.35		
2. Good manners (n=2,295)	0.64	0.65		
3. Both (n=76)	0.07	0.00		
			42.269	0.000
POST: Child trait more important: obedience or self-reliance				
1. Obedience (n=1,684)	0.46	0.49		
2. Self-reliance (n=1,871)	0.48	0.51		
3. Both (n=70)	0.07	0.00		
			46.338	0.000
POST: Child trait more important: considerate or well-behaved				
1. Being considerate (n=2,375)	0.56	0.66		
2. Well behaved (n=1,150)	0.34	0.34		
3. Both (n=108)	0.10	0.00		
			72.872	0.000
POST: R likes to have strong opinions even when not personally involved				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=320)	0.10	0.08		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=883)	0.24	0.23		
3. Uncertain (n=590)	0.12	0.21		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=1,452)	0.42	0.38		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=379)	0.13	0.10		
			8.600	0.000
POST: R forms opinions about everything				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=381)	0.13	0.16		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=881)	0.32	0.35		
3. Uncertain (n=431)	0.16	0.22		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=619)	0.28	0.24		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=146)	0.10	0.04		
			9.929	0.000
POST: Important for R to hold strong opinions				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=213)	0.04	0.06		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=768)	0.18	0.20		
3. Uncertain (n=561)	0.11	0.19		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=1,568)	0.46	0.41		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=520)	0.20	0.14		
			10.507	0.000
POST: It bothers R to remain neutral				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=12)	0.26	0.06		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=11)	0.04	0.14		

3. Uncertain (n=6)	0.09	0.06		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=24)	0.21	0.26		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=43)	0.40	0.48		
			1.861	0.126
POST: R has many more opinions than the average person				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=44)	0.12	0.03		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=132)	0.12	0.11		
3. Uncertain (n=379)	0.18	0.32		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=442)	0.31	0.39		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=177)	0.27	0.15		
			3.371	0.011
POST: R would rather have strong opinion than no opinion				
1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me (n=265)	0.06	0.08		
2. Somewhat uncharacteristic of me (n=600)	0.15	0.17		
3. Uncertain (n=602)	0.13	0.20		
4. Somewhat characteristic of me (n=1,386)	0.39	0.38		
5. Extremely characteristic of me (n=676)	0.27	0.18		
			8.200	0.000
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI extraverted, enthusiastic				
1. Extremely poorly (n=125)	0.03	0.04		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=272)	0.07	0.08		
3. A little poorly (n=317)	0.08	0.09		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=681)	0.16	0.22		
5. A little well (n=739)	0.21	0.20		
6. Somewhat well (n=1,046)	0.31	0.27		
7. Extremely well (n=412)	0.14	0.10		
			3.606	0.004
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI critical, quarrelsome				
1. Extremely poorly (n=690)	0.18	0.18		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=730)	0.17	0.19		
3. A little poorly (n=422)	0.12	0.12		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=818)	0.21	0.25		
5. A little well (n=569)	0.20	0.15		
6. Somewhat well (n=301)	0.12	0.08		
7. Extremely well (n=62)	0.01	0.02		
			3.356	0.004
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI dependable, self-disciplined				
1. Extremely poorly (n=25)	0.00	0.01		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=38)	0.01	0.01		
3. A little poorly (n=85)	0.02	0.03		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=267)	0.05	0.10		
5. A little well (n=382)	0.10	0.12		
6. Somewhat well (n=1,389)	0.40	0.36		
7. Extremely well (n=1,414)	0.41	0.37		
			4.034	0.001
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI anxious, easily upset				
1. Extremely poorly (n=548)	0.12	0.15		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=728)	0.20	0.19		
3. A little poorly (n=478)	0.12	0.14		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=748)	0.17	0.23		
5. A little well (n=642)	0.22	0.17		
6. Somewhat well (n=340)	0.13	0.08		
7. Extremely well (n=117)	0.04	0.04		
			4.711	0.000

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI open to new experiences				
1. Extremely poorly (n=25)	0.01	0.01		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=122)	0.03	0.04		
3. A little poorly (n=178)	0.04	0.06		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=554)	0.12	0.18		
5. A little well (n=849)	0.23	0.25		
6. Somewhat well (n=1,224)	0.38	0.31		
7. Extremely well (n=646)	0.19	0.16		
			4.214	0.001
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI reserved, quiet				
1. Extremely poorly (n=284)	0.10	0.07		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=419)	0.12	0.12		
3. A little poorly (n=388)	0.10	0.11		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=648)	0.14	0.20		
5. A little well (n=761)	0.21	0.20		
6. Somewhat well (n=726)	0.21	0.19		
7. Extremely well (n=372)	0.12	0.11		
			2.378	0.033
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI sympathetic, warm				
1. Extremely poorly (n=25)	0.00	0.01		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=57)	0.02	0.02		
3. A little poorly (n=127)	0.04	0.04		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=372)	0.08	0.13		
5. A little well (n=667)	0.18	0.19		
6. Somewhat well (n=1,354)	0.37	0.36		
7. Extremely well (n=997)	0.32	0.26		
			3.447	0.004
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI disorganized, careless				
1. Extremely poorly (n=1,149)	0.28	0.31		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=910)	0.24	0.26		
3. A little poorly (n=507)	0.14	0.15		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=535)	0.15	0.16		
5. A little well (n=315)	0.12	0.08		
6. Somewhat well (n=149)	0.06	0.04		
7. Extremely well (n=32)	0.01	0.01		
			2.119	0.057
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI calm, emotionally stable				
1. Extremely poorly (n=31)	0.01	0.01		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=91)	0.02	0.04		
3. A little poorly (n=187)	0.05	0.06		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=550)	0.14	0.18		
5. A little well (n=686)	0.21	0.18		
6. Somewhat well (n=1,300)	0.35	0.34		
7. Extremely well (n=752)	0.22	0.20		
			2.527	0.024
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI conventional, uncreative				
1. Extremely poorly (n=552)	0.14	0.16		
2. Somewhat poorly (n=762)	0.22	0.19		
3. A little poorly (n=687)	0.19	0.19		
4. Neither poorly nor well (n=877)	0.23	0.27		
5. A little well (n=407)	0.12	0.10		
6. Somewhat well (n=244)	0.07	0.07		
7. Extremely well (n=62)	0.02	0.02		
			1.223	0.295

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: How hard is it for R to control temper				
1. Extremely hard (n=43)	0.02	0.01		
2. Very hard (n=79)	0.02	0.03		
3. Moderately hard (n=434)	0.13	0.13		
4. A little bit hard (n=1,214)	0.32	0.33		
5. Not hard at all (n=1,826)	0.51	0.49		
			0.344	0.827
POST: FTF CASI/WEB: When provoked, how likely for R to hit someone				
1. Extremely likely (n=44)	0.01	0.02		
2. Very likely (n=65)	0.02	0.02		
3. Moderately likely (n=211)	0.06	0.07		
4. Slightly likely (n=447)	0.16	0.13		
5. Not very likely (n=2,828)	0.75	0.75		
			1.028	0.390

Predispositions: Values

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'predispositions: values' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Of nine variables, six displayed significant differences in mean and eight displayed significant differences in distribution.
- For three of the four items that measure Traditionalism, face-to-face respondents are more likely to agree with the statement, irrespective of whether it espouses traditional or cosmopolitan values.
- Similarly, for three of the four items measuring Egalitarianism, face-to-face respondents are more likely to agree with the statement, irrespective of whether it espouses egalitarian or non-egalitarian values.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161362	PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Need to be...sensitive...or ppl...easily offended
V162207	POST: Agree/disagree: world is changing and we should adjust
V162208	POST: Agree/disagree: newer lifestyles breaking down society
V162209	POST: Agree/disagree: be more tolerant of other moral stds
V162210	POST: Agree/disagree: more emphasis on traditional family values
V162243	POST: Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity
V162244	POST: We'd be better off if worried less about equality
V162245	POST: Not a big problem if some have more chance in life
V162246	POST: If people were treated more fairly would be fewer probs

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Need to be...sensitive...or ppl...easily offended	2.69	2.64	1.414	0.236
POST: Agree/disagree: world is changing and we should adjust	2.77	3.01	15.593	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: newer lifestyles breaking down society	2.66	2.73	0.860	0.355
POST: Agree/disagree: be more tolerant of other moral stds	2.23	2.51	32.257	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: more emphasis on traditional family values	2.23	2.42	5.770	0.018
POST: Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity	1.65	1.89	34.714	0.000
POST: We'd be better off if worried less about equality	2.90	3.14	10.647	0.001
POST: Not a big problem if some have more chance in life	3.42	3.48	0.841	0.361
POST: If people were treated more fairly would be fewer probs	2.10	2.31	17.943	0.000

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE FTF CASI/WEB: Need to be...sensitive...or ppl...easily offended				
1. The way people talk needs to change a lot (n=802)	0.18	0.21		
2. The way people talk needs to change a little (n=994)	0.22	0.23		
3. People are a little too easily offended (n=1,201)	0.32	0.28		
4. People are much too easily offended (n=1,186)	0.28	0.28		
			1.486	0.218
POST: Agree/disagree: world is changing and we should adjust				
1. Agree strongly (n=543)	0.19	0.14		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,136)	0.38	0.28		

3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=591)	0.10	0.21		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=596)	0.16	0.16		
5. Disagree strongly (n=774)	0.18	0.21		
			14.784	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: newer lifestyles breaking down society				
1. Agree strongly (n=751)	0.24	0.20		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,081)	0.32	0.28		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=753)	0.15	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=499)	0.14	0.12		
5. Disagree strongly (n=550)	0.16	0.14		
			6.611	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: be more tolerant of other moral stds				
1. Agree strongly (n=903)	0.30	0.22		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,278)	0.38	0.32		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=756)	0.16	0.25		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=436)	0.10	0.12		
5. Disagree strongly (n=259)	0.06	0.08		
			10.415	0.000
POST: Agree/disagree: more emphasis on traditional family values				
1. Agree strongly (n=1,167)	0.38	0.29		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,061)	0.29	0.29		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=717)	0.15	0.24		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=360)	0.09	0.10		
5. Disagree strongly (n=330)	0.09	0.09		
			7.230	0.000
POST: Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity				
1. Agree strongly (n=1,824)	0.60	0.48		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,025)	0.24	0.27		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=459)	0.08	0.16		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=228)	0.05	0.06		
5. Disagree strongly (n=96)	0.02	0.03		
			12.858	0.000
POST: We'd be better off if worried less about equality				
1. Agree strongly (n=541)	0.20	0.12		
2. Agree somewhat (n=892)	0.28	0.23		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=794)	0.16	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=594)	0.16	0.16		
5. Disagree strongly (n=809)	0.21	0.23		
			12.865	0.000
POST: Not a big problem if some have more chance in life				
1. Agree strongly (n=190)	0.06	0.05		
2. Agree somewhat (n=644)	0.21	0.16		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=954)	0.22	0.30		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=959)	0.27	0.24		
5. Disagree strongly (n=880)	0.24	0.25		
			4.940	0.001
POST: If people were treated more fairly would be fewer probs				
1. Agree strongly (n=1,085)	0.38	0.27		
2. Agree somewhat (n=1,208)	0.34	0.32		
3. Neither agree nor disagree (n=786)	0.12	0.26		
4. Disagree somewhat (n=412)	0.12	0.11		
5. Disagree strongly (n=138)	0.04	0.04		
			14.563	0.000

Vote Choice

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'vote choice' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of nine variables, one displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Web respondents were more likely to vote for the Republican gubernatorial candidate.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V162058x	POST: SUMMARY -Post-election Presidential vote/pref
V162059x	POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election U.S. House vote/preference
V162060x	POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election U.S. Senate vote/preference
V162061x	POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election gubernatorial vote/pref
V162062x	2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: 2016 Presidential vote
V162066x	2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: 2016 Presidential vote w/strength
V162067x	2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 U.S. House vote
V162068x	2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 U.S. Senate vote
V162069x	2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 Governor vote

Table 2: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: SUMMARY -Post-election Presidential vote/pref				
10. Democratic Presidential candidate: voted for candidate (n=1,290)	0.41	0.40		
11. Republican Presidential candidate: voted for candidate (n=1,178)	0.35	0.37		
12. Other Presidential candidate: voted for candidate (n=185)	0.07	0.05		
30. Democratic Presidential candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=219)	0.08	0.07		
31. Republican Presidential candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=219)	0.08	0.08		
32. Other Presidential candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=43)	0.01	0.02		
			0.604	0.666
POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election U.S. House vote/preference				
10. Democratic House candidate: voted for candidate (n=1,099)	0.45	0.45		
11. Republican House candidate: voted for candidate (n=1,134)	0.45	0.46		
12. Other House candidate: voted for candidate (n=65)	0.04	0.02		
30. Democratic House candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=58)	0.03	0.03		
31. Republican House candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=65)	0.03	0.03		
32. Other House candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=7)	0.00	0.00		
			0.527	0.745
POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election U.S. Senate vote/preference				
10. Democratic Senate candidate: voted for candidate (n=931)	0.50	0.50		
11. Republican Senate candidate: voted for candidate (n=763)	0.38	0.39		
12. Other Senate candidate: voted for candidate (n=70)	0.04	0.04		
30. Democratic Senate candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=61)	0.03	0.03		
31. Republican Senate candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=52)	0.03	0.03		
32. Other Senate candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=8)	0.01	0.00		
			0.345	0.881
POST: SUMMARY - party of Post-election gubernatorial vote/pref				
10. Democratic gubernatorial candidate: voted for candidate (n=217)	0.58	0.54		
11. Republican gubernatorial candidate: voted for candidate (n=146)	0.33	0.36		
12. Other gubernatorial candidate: voted for candidate (n=1)	0.02	0.00		

30. Democratic gubernatorial candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=14)	0.04	0.03		
31. Republican gubernatorial candidate: preference (nonvoter) (n=23)	0.04	0.07		
			1.357	0.257
2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: 2016 Presidential vote				
1. Hillary Clinton (n=1,364)	0.48	0.49		
2. Donald Trump (n=1,245)	0.43	0.44		
3. Gary Johnson (n=118)	0.05	0.04		
4. Jill Stein (n=32)	0.01	0.01		
5. Other candidate SPECIFY (n=52)	0.02	0.02		
			0.496	0.725
2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: 2016 Presidential vote w/strength				
10. Voted for Hillary Clinton - not strong preference (n=363)	0.16	0.12		
11. Voted for Hillary Clinton - strong preference (n=999)	0.32	0.37		
20. Voted for Donald Trump - not strong preference (n=334)	0.12	0.12		
21. Voted for Donald Trump - strong preference (n=910)	0.32	0.32		
30. Voted for Gary Johnson - not strong preference (n=79)	0.03	0.02		
31. Voted for Gary Johnson - strong preference (n=39)	0.02	0.01		
40. Voted for Jill Stein - not strong preference (n=16)	0.00	0.00		
41. Voted for Jill Stein - strong preference (n=16)	0.01	0.01		
50. Voted for other candidate - not strong preference (n=17)	0.01	0.00		
51. Voted for other candidate - strong preference (n=35)	0.01	0.01		
			1.113	0.352
2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 U.S. House vote				
1. Voted for Democratic House candidate (n=1,155)	0.47	0.48		
2. Voted for Republican House candidate (n=1,195)	0.50	0.49		
3. Voted for other House candidate (n=70)	0.04	0.03		
			0.773	0.462
2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 U.S. Senate vote				
1. Voted for Democratic Senate candidate (n=973)	0.53	0.53		
2. Voted for Republican Senate candidate (n=802)	0.43	0.42		
3. Voted for other House candidate (n=79)	0.04	0.05		
			0.224	0.793
2016 PRE-POST VOTE SUMMARY: party of 2016 Governor vote				
1. Voted for Democratic gubernatorial candidate (n=220)	0.60	0.60		
2. Voted for Republican gubernatorial candidate (n=153)	0.39	0.40		
3. Voted for other gubernatorial candidate (n=1)	0.02	0.00		
			3.473	0.041

Voter Turnout

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'voter turnout' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of twenty-five variables, the single variable tested for mean differences displayed no significant differences and nine of the twenty-five tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Respondents interviewed face-to-face were more likely to report having voted early, voting for the House and Senate, and voting in the November 2016 elections.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161005	PRE: Did R vote for President in 2012
V161011	PRE: Is R registered to vote (pre-election)
V161016	PRE: Is R registered to vote in preload county (resid)
V161020	PRE: Does R intend to register to vote
V161021	PRE: Did R vote in a Presidential primary or caucus
V161022	PRE: Already voted in General Election
V161022a	PRE: Confirmation voted (early) in November 8 election
V161026	PRE: Did R vote for President in 2016
V161030	PRE: Does R intend to vote for President
V161036	PRE: Did R vote for U.S. House of Representatives
V161039	PRE: Does R intend to vote for U.S. House
V161046	PRE: Did R vote for U.S. Senate
V161049	PRE: Does R intend to vote for U.S. Senate
V161055	PRE: Did R vote for governor
V161058	PRE: Does R intend to vote for governor
V161133	PRE: PLACEMENT 1: How likely is it R will vote in Nov
V162027	POST: Is R registered to vote in preload county (not reg at sample address)
V162031	POST: Did R vote in the November 2016 elections
V162031x	PRE-POST: SUMMARY -Did R vote in 2016
V162032x	POST: SUMMARY -Post vote status for registered respondents
V162034	POST: Did R vote for President
V162039	POST: Did R vote for U.S. House of Representatives
V162046	POST: Did R vote for U.S. Senate
V162052	POST: Did R vote for governor
V162065x	PRE-POST REG/TURNOUT SUMMARY: 2016 registration-turnout status

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: PLACEMENT 1: How likely is it R will vote in Nov	1.86	1.85	0.047	0.828

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: Did R vote for President in 2012				
0. No (n=1,138)	0.29	0.32		
1. Yes (n=3,117)	0.71	0.68		
			1.291	0.258

PRE: Is R registered to vote (pre-election)				
1. Registered at this address (n=3,251)	0.75	0.75		
2. Registered at a different address (n=406)	0.11	0.08		
3. Not currently registered (n=606)	0.14	0.16		
			2.628	0.076
PRE: Is R registered to vote in preload county (resid)				
0. No, registered in other county (n=89)	0.27	0.27		
1. Yes, registered in [county of sample address] (n=232)	0.73	0.73		
			0.000	0.998
PRE: Does R intend to register to vote				
0. No, do not intend to register (n=375)	0.67	0.66		
1. Yes, intend to register (n=231)	0.33	0.34		
			0.016	0.899
PRE: Did R vote in a Presidential primary or caucus				
0. No, do not intend to register (n=2,383)	0.61	0.57		
1. Yes, intend to register (n=1,882)	0.39	0.43		
			2.689	0.103
PRE: Already voted in General Election				
0. No, have not voted (n=3,467)	0.94	0.95		
1. Yes, voted (n=189)	0.06	0.05		
			0.384	0.536
PRE: Confirmation voted (early) in November 8 election				
1. Yes, voted (n=156)	0.95	0.78		
2. No, have not voted (n=33)	0.05	0.22		
			7.530	0.007
PRE: Did R vote for President in 2016				
0. No, didn't vote for President (n=3)	0.02	0.00		
1. Yes, voted for President (n=153)	0.98	1.00		
			1.975	0.163
PRE: Does R intend to vote for President				
0. No (n=221)	0.05	0.07		
1. Yes (n=3,484)	0.95	0.93		
			4.672	0.032
PRE: Did R vote for U.S. House of Representatives				
0. No, didn't vote for House of Representatives (n=29)	0.02	0.28		
1. Yes, voted for House of Representatives (n=125)	0.98	0.72		
			17.601	0.000
PRE: Does R intend to vote for U.S. House				
0. No (n=767)	0.17	0.25		
1. Yes (n=2,919)	0.83	0.75		
			14.359	0.000
PRE: Did R vote for U.S. Senate				
0. No, didn't vote for Senate (n=17)	0.02	0.26		
1. Yes, voted for Senate (n=93)	0.98	0.74		
			12.378	0.001
PRE: Does R intend to vote for U.S. Senate				
0. No (n=490)	0.14	0.23		
1. Yes (n=2,151)	0.86	0.77		
			15.060	0.000
PRE: Did R vote for governor				
0. No, didn't vote for Governor (n=1)	0.00	0.15		
1. Yes, voted for Governor (n=10)	1.00	0.85		
			0.744	0.411
PRE: Does R intend to vote for governor				

0. No (n=73)	0.11	0.17		
1. Yes (n=456)	0.89	0.83		
			1.561	0.214
PRE: PLACEMENT 1: How likely is it R will vote in Nov				
1. Extremely likely (n=1,391)	0.64	0.64		
2. Very likely (n=259)	0.13	0.13		
3. Moderately likely (n=132)	0.06	0.07		
4. Slightly likely (n=87)	0.04	0.05		
5. Not likely at all (n=203)	0.12	0.11		
			0.256	0.891
POST: Is R registered to vote in preload county (not reg at sample address)				
0. No, registered in other county (n=6)	0.51	0.24		
1. Yes, registered in [county of sample address] (n=15)	0.49	0.76		
			1.071	0.312
POST: Did R vote in the November 2016 elections				
1. I did not vote (in the election this November) (n=162)	0.03	0.07		
2. I thought about voting this time, but didn't (n=125)	0.05	0.04		
3. I usually vote, but didn't this time (n=157)	0.06	0.05		
4. I am sure I voted (n=2,731)	0.87	0.84		
			4.841	0.003
PRE-POST: SUMMARY -Did R vote in 2016				
0. Did not vote in 2016 (n=444)	0.13	0.16		
1. Voted in 2016 (n=2,887)	0.87	0.84		
			2.604	0.109
POST: SUMMARY -Post vote status for registered respondents				
1. Post status not (or DK/RF if) registered, didnt (or DK/RF) vote (n=342)	0.12	0.11		
2. Post status registered, did not vote (n=445)	0.12	0.14		
3. Post status registered and voted (n=2,731)	0.77	0.74		
			1.072	0.344
POST: Did R vote for President				
0. No, didn't vote for President (n=39)	0.01	0.02		
1. Yes, voted for President (n=2,691)	0.99	0.98		
			1.649	0.201
POST: Did R vote for U.S. House of Representatives				
0. No (n=356)	0.09	0.15		
1. Yes (n=2,365)	0.91	0.85		
			10.060	0.002
POST: Did R vote for U.S. Senate				
0. No (n=180)	0.07	0.11		
1. Yes (n=1,793)	0.93	0.89		
			5.340	0.022
POST: Did R vote for governor				
0. No (n=20)	0.11	0.05		
1. Yes (n=368)	0.89	0.95		
			1.507	0.222
PRE-POST REG/TURNOUT SUMMARY: 2016 registration-turnout status				
1. Did not register and did not vote (n=342)	0.11	0.11		
2. Registered but did not vote (n=445)	0.11	0.14		
3. Registered and voted (n=2,887)	0.78	0.75		
			1.283	0.279

Voting Registration

Examination of mode differences on questions relating to 'voting registration' reveals the following preliminary conclusions:

- Out of five variables, one of the three tested displayed significant differences in mean and one of the four tested displayed significant differences in distribution.
- Respondents interviewed face-to-face reported having been registered to vote at their registration location for a longer period than Web respondents.

Table 1: Variables Used

Variable Name	Variable Label
V161017	PRE: How many years has R been registered at registration location
V162028	POST: How many years has R been registered at registration location
V162028x	PRE-POST: SUMMARY- years has R been registered at registration location
V162030	POST: Party of registration
V162030x	PRE-POST: SUMMARY - Party of registration

Table 2: Means by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
PRE: How many years has R been registered at registration location	2.37	2.31	2.657	0.105
POST: How many years has R been registered at registration location	1.64	1.54	0.320	0.573
PRE-POST: SUMMARY- years has R been registered at registration location	2.35	2.25	6.075	0.015

Table 3: Proportions by Mode

Variable	FTF	Web	F Stat.	P Val.
POST: How many years has R been registered at registration location				
1. 0-1 years (n=102)	0.53	0.63		
2. 2-5 years (n=38)	0.29	0.19		
3. 5 years or more (n=27)	0.18	0.18		
			0.674	0.498
PRE-POST: SUMMARY- years has R been registered at registration location				
1. 0-1 years (n=905)	0.21	0.27		
2. 2-5 years (n=869)	0.23	0.22		
3. 5 years or more (n=2,038)	0.56	0.51		
			3.894	0.023
POST: Party of registration				
1. Democratic Party (n=37)	0.50	0.40		
2. Republican Party (n=21)	0.21	0.25		
4. None or 'independent' (n=32)	0.28	0.35		
5. Other party SPECIFY (n=1)	0.01	0.00		
			0.683	0.515
PRE-POST: SUMMARY - Party of registration				
1. Democratic Party (n=961)	0.49	0.45		
2. Republican Party (n=703)	0.30	0.31		
4. None or 'independent' (n=503)	0.20	0.23		
5. Other party SPECIFY (n=23)	0.01	0.01		

	0.563	0.601

Acknowledgments

This report on mode comparisons was supported with funds from the National Science Foundation for the purposes of carrying out and analyzing the 2016 ANES Time Series Study. The National Science Foundation supported the ANES 2016 Time Series study with grants to the University of Michigan and Stanford University (grant nos. SES-1444721 and SES-1444910 respectively).

Matthew DeBell provided feedback on drafts of the mode comparison report. Marzia Oceno, Patricia Luevano, and Jaime Ventura provided research support for the report. The first three authors contributed equally to the analysis and writing of this report.

Opinion, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, Stanford University, the University of Michigan, Westat, Inc., or other individuals who worked on the ANES 2016 Time Series study.

Appendix

Recoding Minimum Wage

The 'Engagement: Knowledge' memo provides an analysis of V162138 (POST: What is the minimum wage in R state) by mode. This was coded two ways: (1) by an exact match to the minimum wage in a respondent's state and (2) by the absolute value of the distance of the respondent's answer from the minimum wage.

Coding was done by first finding the 2016 minimum wage in each state according to https://www.dol.gov/whd/state/stateMinWageHis.htm. States with a range of applicable wages (e.g., different minimum wages for different business profit categories) were excluded from the analysis; states with no minimum wage (i.e., that use the federal standard) were included in analysis using the federal minimum; and states with wages only applicable to businesses of x or more employees were included using that wage. Next, coding proceeded by using V163001b (sample location state postal abbreviation) for matching.

Stata code for replication:

```
gen minwage = .
replace minwage = 9.75 if (V163001b == "AK")
replace minwage = 8.05 if (V163001b == "AZ")
replace minwage = 8 if (V163001b == "AR")
replace minwage = 10 if (V163001b == "CA")
replace minwage = 8.31 if (V163001b == "CO")
replace minwage = 9.6 if (V163001b == "CT")
replace minwage = 8.25 if (V163001b == "DE")
replace minwage = 8.05 if (V163001b == "FL")
replace minwage = 5.15 if (V163001b == "GA")
replace minwage = 8.5 if (V163001b == "HI")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "ID")
replace minwage = 8.25 if (V163001b == "IL")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "IN")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "IA")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "KS")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "KY")
replace minwage = 7.5 if (V163001b == "ME")
replace minwage = 8.75 if (V163001b == "MD")
replace minwage = 10 if (V163001b == "MA")
replace minwage = 8.5 if (V163001b == "MI")
replace minwage = 7.65 if (V163001b == "MO")
replace minwage = 8.05 if (V163001b == "MT")
replace minwage = 9 if (V163001b == "NE")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "NH")
replace minwage = 8.38 if (V163001b == "NJ")
replace minwage = 7.5 if (V163001b == "NM")
replace minwage = 9 if (V163001b == "NY")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "NC")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "ND")
replace minwage = 9.75 if (V163001b == "OR")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "PA")
replace minwage = 9.6 if (V163001b == "RI")
replace minwage = 8.55 if (V163001b == "SD")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "TX")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "UT")
replace minwage = 9.6 if (V163001b == "VT")
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == "VA")
replace minwage = 9.47 if (V163001b == "WA")
```

```
replace minwage = 8.75 if (V163001b == “WV”)
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “WI”)
replace minwage = 5.15 if (V163001b == “WY”)
replace minwage = 11.5 if (V163001b == “DC”)

*add the states with a federal minimum
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “AL”)
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “LA”)
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “MS”)
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “SC”)
replace minwage = 7.25 if (V163001b == “TN”)

gen minwage_correct = .
replace minwage_correct = 1 if (V162138==minwage)
replace minwage_correct = 0 if (V162138!=minwage & minwage!=. & (V162138>=0 | V162138==-8))

gen mindiff=abs(V162138-minwage)
tab mindiff
gen minwage_correct_fix = .
replace minwage_correct_fix = 1 if (mindiff<.01 & V162138>0 & minwage!=. )
replace minwage_correct_fix = 0 if (mindiff>.01 & minwage!=. & (V162138>0 | V162138==-8))

ren minwage_correct_fix V162138a
label variable V162138a “POST: What is minimum wage in R state - C/NC”
label define V162138a 0 “0. Not correct” 1 “1. Correct”
label values V162138a V162138a
ren mindiff V162138b
label variable V162138b “POST: What is minimum wage in R state - Distance”
```

References

DeBell, M., Amsbary, M., Meldener, V., Brock, S. and Maisel, N. (2018). *Methodology Report for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study.* Palo Alto, CA, and Ann Arbor, MI: Stanford University and the University of Michigan.

Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr., F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E. and Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey Methodology.* Second Edition, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Heeringa, S., West, B., and Berglund, P. (2010). *Applied Survey Data Analysis.* Chapman & Hall: CRC.

StataCorp (2017). *Stata Survey Data Reference Manual Release 15.* College Station, TX: Stata Press. Accessed from: https://www.stata.com/manuals/svy.pdf