

FILE COPY -

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
DO NOT CITE WITHOUT THE AUTHORS' PERMISSION

REVALIDATION OF SELF-REPORTED VOTE

Michael W. Traugott
Santa Traugott
The University of Michigan

Stanley Presser
The University of Maryland

This paper was prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, May 16-19, 1992.

One of the most common and persistent concerns of survey researchers has been the accuracy of the reports of survey respondents. Surveys are the most economical and timely way to collect data from large populations. In conjunction with appropriate statistical designs, survey data can be used to model virtually all aspects of social behavior. Such models typically assume, however, that respondents report their behaviors accurately. To the extent that errors are introduced by the data collection process, these models may be flawed due to bias or reduced precision.

Considerable effort has been devoted to assessing reporting errors in surveys. The range of explanations for the error runs the gamut from respondent characteristics, including demography (Abramson and Claggett, 1986), personality type (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964) and cognitive abilities (Loftus and Loftus, 1980), to characteristics of the questionnaire or the individual item (Abelson, Loftus, and Greenwald, 1991; Bradburn et al, 1981; Cronbach, 1946 and 1950; Presser, 1990), to the nature of the interviewing process itself (Billiet and Loosveldt, 1988; Hanson and Marks, 1958; Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986).

Survey responses have often been "validated" by checking them against certain kinds of administrative records that ostensibly keep track of the same phenomenon, usually a behavior. One of the longest traditions of record check studies involves validating self-reports of registration and voting (Parry and Crossley, 1950; Clausen, 1967; Traugott and Katosh, 1979). The centrality of electoral participation in models of social and political behavior and the fact that official records of such behavior are widely and publicly available have contributed to the number of such studies. Across a wide range of samples and surveys conducted by various organizations, the level of misreporting in these studies - the difference between self-reported rates of voting and those validated through administrative records - has consistently been in the range of 13 to 15 percentage points. According to the records, virtually all the error consists of survey overreports; as about

half the population doesn't vote (and is therefore at risk of overreporting), on the order of 25 to 30 percent of nonvoters appear to misreport.

As is true of validation studies in other areas, almost all of this research has assumed that observed discrepancies between reports of voting and the administrative records reflect errors in the responses made by individuals when they were interviewed. However, Presser, Traugott, and Traugott (1990) have recently investigated sources of error in administrative records that are used to validate survey-based reports of registration and voting. Their results suggest the need to reconceptualize the process of validation, to do away with the assumption that administrative records are the "gold standard" against which individual survey responses should be evaluated (Rudd, 1979). Instead, validation efforts should be viewed as a process of matching survey self-reports and administrative records, both of which are imperfect information sources. In such a process, the sources of error that result in an inability to match can usefully be thought of as a combination of characteristics of 1) the individual respondent; 2) the nature of the interviewing process; 3) the quality of, and access to, the administrative records being matched; and 4) the procedures used to perform the match.

Most studies have begun with the assumption that individual respondents are the primary source of error in self-reports of their behavior. The focus has been on problems of memory (Gray, 1955; Loftus and Loftus, 1980; Reiser, Black, and Abelson, 1985) and on the difficulties of the tasks respondents are asked to perform (Bradburn, Rips, and Shevell, 1987; Tulving and Thomson, 1973), as well as on various personal characteristics of the respondents (Cahalan, 1968). These factors have included the respondents' age and implied cognitive ability, although the correlation between chronological age and mental functioning is far from perfect (Rogers and Herzog, 1987).

Researchers have also identified other potential sources of bias in individuals' self-reports. One of the most frequently

cited is "social desirability," or the propensity of the survey respondent to answer a question in a manner or direction that he or she thinks the interviewer wants or that puts him or her in the best light (DeMaio, 1984; Mathiowetz, 1989; Phillips and Clancy, 1972). The concept of social desirability has at least two distinct components. One lies in the personality of the respondent and his or her propensity to disclose personal information or to provide "yeasaying" responses (Cronbach, 1946, 1950; Couch and Keniston, 1960 and 1961). A second component of social desirability lies in the social acceptability of the trait that is being measured, which can influence the direction of reporting errors (Edwards, 1953; Edwards and Walker, 1961a and b). Voting is a highly valued democratic norm, for example; and it is consistently over-reported in surveys.

The characterization of misreporters depends upon the group to which they are being compared and the statistical approach being employed. The most common practice is to treat "accurate reporters" as a single group, combining those who accurately report behaving in a particular way with those who accurately report not behaving in that way. Validation studies of registration status and voting behavior that have used this approach show that misreporting rates were higher for younger respondents compared to older ones, non-whites compared to whites, and those with lower incomes compared to those who earned more (Traugott and Katosh, 1979).

However, all of these characteristics are themselves related to voting. When the research focus shifts to comparing the "misreporters" to the two distinct groups of accurate reporters - those who accurately claim to have voted ("true voters") and those who accurately claim not to have voted ("true nonvoters") - the misreporters tend to resemble the "true voters" in socioeconomic and demographic terms. Furthermore, separate analyses in the United States (Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986) and in Sweden (Granberg and Holmberg, 1991) indicate that those who expressed a pre-election interest in voting are more likely subsequently to

misreport voting than those who were initially undecided or said they did not intend to vote.

But mismatches between survey reports and administrative records can also be due to characteristics of the records. Although it is tempting to assume that electoral records are kept in good order, the reality is more complicated than that. Based on their experiences conducting the American National Election Study (ANES) vote validations, Traugott and Morchio (1991) have reported to the ANES Board of Overseers on the wide variations in practices and record quality that validators have encountered.

Traugott (1989) has noted that vote misreporting - or the inability to match survey responses about behavior with administrative records - stems from two different kinds of validation outcomes. One represents respondents for whom neither a registration record nor a vote record could be found; the other consists of respondents for whom a registration record could be found but not a voting record. These two groups have been of roughly equal size in the ANES series, but may have very different connections to record keeping. For instance, Presser, Traugott, and Traugott (1990) found that women who had a legal name change were more likely than other women to be in the first group (no registration record found) but no more likely than other women to be in the second (no vote record located for those whose registration record was confirmed).

Presser, Traugott, and Traugott (1990) also discovered that office-level variables related differently to the two types of misreporting. For example, offices where files were organized so that an exact address (as opposed to just a name) was needed to access the vote files produced higher levels of the second kind of misreporting (no evidence of having voted for those whose registration record was found), but not of the first kind (no evidence of a registration record).

They constructed an index of record quality and access in the 1988 ANES and related it to the ability to confirm survey reports of voting in administrative records for those whose registration

records were confirmed. Not only were overall levels of "misreporting" (the match rate) related to this index of record quality, but so were personal characteristics of respondents such as race. Many more blacks lived in jurisdictions scoring low on the record quality index; and the traditionally observed race-related differences in misreporting were substantially reduced in the roughly half of the jurisdictions where record keeping and access were of the highest quality. These results seem to run contrary to Abramson and Claggett (1992), who employed a different set of office characteristics in a similar analysis.

This research suggested that the quality of the validators' work and the conditions under which the validation effort was performed in the local office could affect the match rate. In order to evaluate the contributions which these components could make to the total response error, we proposed to the NES Board an experiment to revalidate the same survey responses at more than one point in time, ideally employing different validators as well, by sending out information from 1988 respondents in conjunction with the 1990 validation effort.¹

The revalidation effort provided not only an opportunity to evaluate alternative methodological approaches to reducing survey response error. It also was the occasion to use the results to produce different versions of a dependent variable that measured voting and employ them in typical models used to predict voting. Presser and Traugott (1992), employing a dependent variable that measured frequency of voting in the 1972-74-76 ANES panel study in both self-reported and validated forms, showed that reporting errors can distort conclusions about the correlates of voting. The 1988 revalidation effort provided a basis for assessing whether the same explanatory model employing somewhat different measures of voting in the 1988 election would produce different results as well.

RESEARCH DESIGN

In 1991, the ANES project sent to the field the names and addresses of respondents to the pre-election interviews from their 1988 election study in order to try to determine what behavior was recorded for them in administrative records. This was actually the second time that this behavior was checked in the records, as an initial effort had been undertaken in the summer of 1989.

One purpose of the 1991 revalidation effort was to determine the reliability of the record checking process, irrespective of whether or not a respondent had provided information about voting. Therefore, the registration and vote records of those 1988 respondents whose records were looked up in 1989 were rechecked.² Records were checked in both 1989 and 1991 for all pre-election respondents, whether or not they had provided a post-election interview in which they indicated whether they had voted or not. In terms of this reliability check, 87% of the 1989 validation results were reproduced in 1991. The overall marginals for voting were almost the same for each validation effort (68.2% in 1991 and 70.5% in 1989). However, 4% of the respondents shifted from a "found" condition to a "not found" condition between 1989 and 1991, while 3.2% of all respondents were not located in 1989 but were in 1991.

Similarly, 3.4% of all respondents were determined to be voters in 1989, but not in 1991; while 2.2% of respondents seemed not to have voted in 1989, but were coded as having voted in the 1991 revalidation. Whether the 1989 finding was confirmed on recheck was related to the original 1989 result. That is to say, 92.3% of those who were determined to have voted in 1988 in the 1989 validation effort were also recorded as having voted in 1988 in the 1991 record check; only 69.4% of those for whom a registration record was found but who were not shown to have voted in the 1989 record check have the same result in 1991. Some of this discrepancy may have been due to purging of the records in the intervening two years, since non-voters are, other things being equal, more likely to be purged than voters. Theoretically,

interviewers researched the purge records as well as the current registration, but in practice this sometimes turned out to be difficult. Interestingly, there was no difference in locating respondent data depending upon whether the same or a different person checked the records in 1989 and 1991.

Validating self-reported voting involves a somewhat different sample of respondents. Of the total sample of 1,574 respondents who 1) said they were registered, 2) provided a name and address in 1988, and 3) resided in an area where validation of 1990 election study respondents were going to be checked, a substantial number (n=247) could not have their voting behavior validated because they did not participate in the post-election interview and hence no self-reported measure of their voting behavior was obtained. A small number of additional respondents (n=41) were not checked because either access to the offices or to the voting records themselves could not be obtained. This sample of 1,282 respondents form the basis for the analysis that follows.

RESULTS

Data are presented in Table 1 that show the disposition of each of these cases in terms of the correspondence between the respondents' self-reported behavior, the result of the first validation effort in 1989, and the result of the second validation effort in 1991. The columns of this table are the combined results of the 1989 and the 1991 record checks of the subset of 1988 election study respondents. There are nine (non missing data) columns, representing the 3x3 possible outcomes of the two record checks: Voted in 1989, Voted in 1991 (column numbered 1); voted in 89, registered but did not vote in 1991 record check(column 2); shown to have voted in 1989 record check, but registration record not found for this respondent in 1991 (column 3); cases who were not found to have voted in 1989 but who were found in 1991 to have voted (column 4); and so on.

Table 1 about here

The rows of the table divide respondents into three basic groups: those 1988 Pre-election respondents who did not give us a Post-Election interview, and thus no report of whether or not they voted and/or were registered in 1988; those who reported they voted, and those who said they were registered but did not vote in 1988.³ The self-reported voters and self-reported registered non-voters are further subdivided into rows presenting the results of the 1989 voter validation effort. Thus, there are three rows for each of the self-report categories: does the vote check show they voted, are registered but did not vote, or could not be located (are not registered). The confirmation rate -- that is, whether 1991 results confirm 1989 results for the three broad groups of No Post, Self-Reported Voter, and Self-Reported Nonvoter, are 87.9%, 89.1% and 72.0%. The biggest disconfirmation, in other words, comes from self-reported non-voters.

What 1989 results are more or less likely to stand up, and where are the discrepancies located? A total of 990 out of 1,073 voters in 1989 were shown as voting in the 1991 re-check, or 92.3%. A total of 152 out of 219 respondents (69.4%) who were determined in 1989 to be registered but not voting were shown the same way in 1991. Most of the failure to confirm is found among the group who were self-reported voters. That is, of the 80 people (in the revalidated group) who are validated in 1989 as registered but not voting -- but who claimed to have voted -- only 57.5% were reconfirmed as not voting when the records were checked again in 1991. The data presented in Table 1 make it clear that the most discrepant results of the revalidation effort are located in the rows where the result of the original vote validation was at odds with the respondents' self-report.

It is important to note that in 13.7% of the cases, a different result was produced by the second validation than the first. For example, there were 47 respondents who said they voted in the 1988 election and who were confirmed as voters in the 1989 validation effort, but who appeared in the records as nonvoters in 1991. There were 134 respondents for whom no record could be found

in 1989, but 36 of them (26.9%) did have a record located in the 1991 effort. At the same time, there were 31 respondents (23.1%) who did have a record in 1989 but for whom no record could be found in 1991. Between the two points in time, therefore, almost as many respondents were "lost" as were "found."

In general, the passage of time can have two quite different predicted effects on locating administrative records to correspond to survey self-reports. For those who claimed to have voted and actually did, additional time might permit records to be updated and hence a match to be made. For misreporters, on the other hand, the passage of time might result in the purging of the records for those who had failed to vote recently. There is a third effect that is possible, resulting from having two different people perform the validation. The quality of the worker may affect the success in matching.

A simple measure was constructed to indicate whether the validator was the same or a different person in 1989 and 1991. However, there was no significant difference in the record check outcomes over time depending upon whether it was the same or a different person who performed the work. There seems to be almost no interviewer effect on the likelihood that results at time one will match the results at time two. In particular, one might have expected some learning effect visible in the reduction of the "not founds" for interviewers who learned about the resources of a particular election records offices in 1989 and again in 1991. But the not-found rate is exactly the same for experienced as for naive validators.

There are two ways in which differences between self-reported and validated measures of voting may cause difficulties for analysts. One is their effect on estimates of turnout. Validated voting rates have consistently been lower than self-reported voting rates. A second is on the estimates of parameters in models predicting voting behavior when the distribution of the dependent variable changes. One consequence of conducting a two-step validation is that differences between the survey reports and the

record check results can be used to create categories of "likely" voters and nonvoters, as well as "true" voters and nonvoters.

One problem that has perplexed analysts of self-reported and validated voting behavior has been the fact that the misreporters tend to look more like voters than nonvoters. The traditional explanations for this have centered on the fact that these individuals think of themselves as voters and ordinarily are. For the sake of the interview, they project themselves to the interviewer as voters. This is where the social desirability of voting comes in to play. However, there is another explanation for this phenomenon. It may be that the respondent actually did vote and a problem arose in the validation process such that the self-report could not be (or does not appear to be) confirmed. This could result from problems of access to the administrative records or difficulties in interpreting them, from differential abilities of the validators to perform their assigned task, or it could even be the result of random transcription errors.

With these notions in mind, the results of the two record matching exercises can be compared by constructing two different validated measures of voting and relating them to the self-reported measure. The self-report data can be used to produce a simple dichotomous measure of voting. In the typical validated measure, there are voters, nonvoters and misreporters. When the validation effort is reproduced, then additional assessments of the survey responses can be made in terms of whether the respondent is a "validated voter" (the self-report is matched two times) or a "likely voter" (the self-report is validated the second time after no match could be made the first time, for example).⁴ By segregating responses in this fashion, it is possible to assess the relative reduction in error that arises from the second validation attempt, as well as address the question of whether "likely voters" look more like true voters but the residual misreporters actually look like "nonvoters."

Data are presented in Table 2 that summarize the result of constructing such dependent measures and looking at their

relationship to three sets of independent variables: politically relevant attitudes, other forms of political behavior, and personal characteristics of the respondents. This analysis is based only upon those 1,263 respondents who provided post-election interviews and could be validated both in 1989 and 1991. The first measure is their simple self-report. The second is the usual validation result, with misreporters forming a middle category. The final variable is derived from the dual validation result, and a category of "likely voters" has been constructed.

Table 2 about here

The characteristics of self-reported voters on political interest in the 1988 election study look like other recent election surveys; self-described voters are much more interested in politics than nonvoters. Employing the 1989 validation results to construct a trichotomous measure, the misreporters typically look more like validated voters than validated nonvoters. For the third dependent variable, the number of misreporters has been reduced by about one-fifth as a category of "likely voters" has been introduced. And the "likely voters" look even more like validated voters in terms of their political interest, while the remaining misreporters look a little less like the voters although still characteristically different from the nonvoters.

In general, the data presented in Table 2 show that the "likely voter" category, which is essentially composed of respondents for whom an initial validation result indicated they were not voters but the second effort suggested that they are, is useful in distinguishing voting groups on the basis of their politically relevant attitudes. For measures of other forms of political behavior, the "likely voter" category smooths the relationship between past presidential voting and voting in 1988, although the same is not true for voting in a primary or paying attention to television news. In general, the construction of the variable based upon the dual validation result does not alter relationships between demography and voting. Race and marital status may be the exceptions here, but additional data collection

resulting in more substantial cell sizes will be necessary to have confidence in these relationships.

Three regressions were run to evaluate the effects of the three different measures of voting behavior on parameters of the independent variables.⁵ These equations are the same as those employed by Presser and Traugott (1992), in order to facilitate comparisons with their results, although the dependent variables employed are somewhat different. Presser and Traugott used a measure of the frequency of voting across three elections as well as a simple dichotomous measure of voting in 1976, while these equations regress predictors on measures of voting in 1988.

The results from these three regressions are presented in Table 3, and they confirm the earlier findings of Presser and Traugott. That is to say, more variance is explained in self-reported vote than in either of the validated measures. And the coefficients vary somewhat depending upon which dependent variable is used. Interest in public affairs is always highly significant in these equations, and education is significant at a somewhat lower level. Income is highly significant for self-reported voting, less so for the dual validation measure, and not significant for the usual validation result variable. Efficacy is not significant for the self-reported vote, quite significant for the usual validation result, and somewhat less significant for the dual validation result.

Table 3 about here

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis presented here strengthens the view that the results of validation attempts employing administrative records should be treated with some care. While it is true that a substantial period of time had elapsed between the two validation efforts, it was nevertheless surprising that information was lost for about as many respondents as was gained. Conditions of the record check changed somewhat, and different interviews performed the validation in some cases. These factors did not explain the

changes over time, although we suspect that characteristics of record keeping in the offices will when they are analyzed in greater detail. We intend to perform office-level analysis of match rates over time, using the index of record quality again.

In substantive terms, the use of different measures of voting can have quite an effect on estimates of turnout levels in a population even though they have only slight effects on the explanatory power of typical models that social scientists use to explain voting behavior. None of these differences suggest the need to alter radically our understanding of the correlates of voting. But they do suggest the need for additional research on who the misreporters are and on distinguishing social desirability effects from problems with the validation process itself.

REFERENCES

- Abelson, Robert P., Elizabeth F. Loftus, and Anthony G. Greenwald. 1991. "Attempts to Improve the Accuracy of Self-Reports of Voting." In Judith M. Tanur, ed., **Questions about Questions**. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Abramson, Paul R., and William Claggett. 1984. "Race-Related Differences in Self-Reported and Validated Turnout." **The Journal of Politics**. 46:719-738.
- Abramson, Paul R., and William Claggett. 1986. "Race-Related Differences in Self-Reported and Validated Turnout in 1984." **The Journal of Politics**. 48:412-422.
- Abramson, Paul R. and William Claggett. 1992. "The Quality of Record Keeping and Racial Differences in Validated Turnout." **The Journal of Politics**. 54:871-880.
- Billiet, Jacques, and Geert Loosveldt. 1988. "Improvement of the Quality of Responses to Factual Survey Questions by Interviewer Training." **Public Opinion Quarterly**. 52:190-211.
- Bradburn, Norman M., Lance J. Rips, and Steven K. Shevell. 1987. "Answering Autobiographical Questions: The Impact of Memory and Inference on Surveys." **Science**. 236:157-161.
- Bradburn, Norman M., Seymour Sudman, and Associates. 1981. **Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cahalan, Don. 1968. "Correlates of Respondent Accuracy in the Denver Validity Study," **Public Opinion Quarterly** 32:607-621.
- Clausen, Aage R. 1967. "Response Validity: Vote Report." **Public Opinion Quarterly** vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1-38.
- Couch, Arthur and Kenneth Keniston. 1960. "Yeasayers and Naysayers: Agreeing Response Set as a Personality Variable." **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**. 60:2:151-174.
- Couch, Arthur and Kenneth Keniston. 1961. "Agreeing Response Set and Social Desirability," **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** 62:175-179.
- Cronbach, Lee J. 1946. "Response Sets and Test Validity," **Educational and Psychological Measurement** 6:475-494.
- Cronbach, Lee J. 1950. "Further Evidence on Response Sets and Test Design," **Educational and Psychological Measurement** 10:3-31.

- Crowne, Douglas and David Marlowe. 1964. **The Approval Motive**. New York: Wiley.
- DeMaio, Theresa. 1984. "Social Desirability in Survey Measurement: A Review." In Charles F. Turner and Elizabeth Martin (eds.) **Surveying Subjective Phenomena**. New York: Russell Sage.
- Edwards, Allen L. 1953. "The Relationship between the Judged Desirability of a Trait and the Probability that the Trait Will Be Endorsed," **Journal of Applied Psychology** 37:90-93.
- Edwards, Allen L., and Jerald N. Walker. 1961. "A Note on the Couch and Keniston Measure of Agreement Response Set," **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**. 62:1:173-174
- Edwards, Allen L. and Walker, Jerald N. 1961. "Social Desirability and Agreement Response Set," **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** 62:180-183.
- Granberg, Donald and Soren Holmberg. 1991. "Self-Reported Turnout and Voter Validation," **American Journal of Political Science** 35: 448-459.
- Gray, P.G. 1955. "The Memory Factor in Social Surveys," **Journal of the American Statistical Association** 50:344-363.
- Hanson, R.H. and E.S. Marks. 1958. "Influence of the Interviewer on the Accuracy of Survey Results," **Journal of the American Statistical Association** 53:635-655.
- Loftus, Elizabeth F., and Geoffrey R. Loftus. 1980. "On the Permanence of Stored Information in the Human Brain." **American Psychologist** 35:5:409-420.
- Mathiowetz, Nancy A. 1989. "Discussion Paper: Validity of Reporting in Surveys." **Conference Proceedings: Health Survey Research Methods**. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C., Publication No. (PHS) 89-3447, pp. 91-96.
- Parry, Hugh J., and Helen M. Crossley. 1950. "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions." **Public Opinion Quarterly**. 14:61-80.
- Phillips, Derek L. and Kevin J. Clancy. 1972. "Some Effects of 'Social Desirability' in Survey Studies." **American Journal of Sociology**. 77:921-940.
- Presser, Stanley. 1990. "Can Changes in Context Reduce Vote Over-Reporting in Surveys?" **Public Opinion Quarterly** 54:586-593.
- Presser, Stanley and Michael Traugott. 1992. "Little White Lies and Social Science Models." **Public Opinion Quarterly** 56:77-86.

- Presser, Stanley, Michael Traugott and Santa Traugott. 1990. "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents?" Paper presented at the International Conference on Measurement Errors, Tucson, Arizona, November 12.
- Reiser, Brian J., John B. Black, and Robert P. Abelson. 1985. "Knowledge Structures in the Organization and Retrieval of Autobiographical Memories," **Cognitive Psychology** 17:89-137.
- Rogers, Willard L. and A. Regula Herzog. 1987. "Interviewing Older Adults: The Accuracy of Factual Information," **Journal of Gerontology** 42:387-394.
- Rudd, P. 1979. "Editorial: In Search of the Gold Standard for Compliance Measurement," **Archives of Internal Medicine** 139:627-628.
- Silver, Brian D., Paul R. Abramson, and Barbara A. Anderson. 1986. "The Presence of Others and Overreporting of Voting in American National Elections." **Public Opinion Quarterly**. 50:228-239.
- Traugott, Michael W. and John P. Katosh. 1979. "Response Validity in Surveys of Voting Behavior." **Public Opinion Quarterly**. 43:359-77.
- Traugott, Santa. 1989. "Validating Self-Reported Vote: 1964-1988." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association. Washington D.C., August 7-10th, 1989.
- Traugott, Santa and Giovanna Morchio. 1991. "1990 Vote Validation." Unpublished memorandum. Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Tulving, Endel, and Donald M. Thomson. 1973. "Encoding Specificity and Retrieval Processes in Episodic Memory." **Psychological Review**. 80:5:352-373.

NOTES

1. There were two purposes behind this proposal. The first was that different validators could be expected to produce different results, under some circumstances. The second point was that in some cases, the process of updating the records was not completed by the time the validator went to the office in 1989. There would simply be better information available in some circumstances in 1991 than there was two years before when the 1988 responses were initially validated.

2. In order to control costs, no effort was made in 1991 to return to election administration offices that were not part of the 1990 study's sample frame and where record checks would be performed on those respondents as well.

3. Respondents who indicated in the post-election interview that they were not registered and did not vote were not validated.

4. The combination of responses to the self-reported vote question in 1988 and the results of the validation efforts in 1989 and 1991 resulted in seventeen distinct categories, as follows:

1988 SELF REPORT	1989 VALID	1991 VALID	N
1. VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	895
2. VOTE	VOTE	NV	47
3. VOTE	VOTE	NF	19
4. VOTE	NV	VOTE	25
5. VOTE	NF	VOTE	9
6. VOTE	NV	NV	46
7. VOTE	NV	NF	9
8. VOTE	NF	NV	13
9. VOTE	NF	NF	55

10. NV	NV	NV	72
11. NV	NV	NF	16
12. NV	NF	NV	12
13. NV	NF	NF	43
14. NV	VOTE	NV	6
15. NV	VOTE	NF	3
16. NV	VOTE	VOTE	3
17. NV	NV/NF	VOTE	9

The resulting dependent variable based upon these results was constructed as originally as a five-fold classification, as follows:

1. Validated Voters-- categories 1 and 3
2. Likely voters -- categories 2, 4 and 5
3. Misreporters -- Categories 6, 8 and 9
4. Likely nonvoters -- Categories 14 and 7
5. Validated nonvoters -- Categories 10-13

6. Random error or excluded misreporters -- categories 15,16,17 (MD)

Due to small cell sizes for category 4 ("likely nonvoters"), these responses were combined with the "validated nonvoters."

5. Strictly speaking, a probit analysis should be run when the dependent variable is dichotomous. However, Presser and Traugott (1992) found no difference in parameter estimates in their equations when both ordinary least squares (OLS) and probit analyses were run, and they noted that the coefficients have a more familiar interpretation. For the purposes of comparing their results with ours, an OLS regression was run. Using casewise deletion, the total N for each equation was 1,145 respondents, reflecting primarily the amount of missing data on the income variable.

Table 3. Validated vs. Self-reported Dependent Variables in a Regression Model of Voting in the 1988 Election.

	Self-Reported Vote		Usual Validation Result		Dual Validation Result	
	b	Beta	T	b	Beta	T
Interest in public affairs	.05	.20	7.04 ^a	.04	.14	4.59 ^a
Efficacy	.01	.04	1.26	.03	.07	2.37 ^b
Income	.03	.12	3.71 ^a	.02	.05	1.69
Education	.03	.06	1.96 ^b	.05	.08	2.48 ^b
	R ² = .09		N=1,145	R ² = .05		N=1,145
				R ² = .06		N=1,145

Note: These regressions use the unweighted cases from the 1988 ANES Survey that were validated in 1989 and 1991.

^a p < .001
^b p < .05

Table 2. The Relationship between Personal Characteristics and Alternative Estimates of Voting for the 1988 ANES Respondents.

POLITICALLY RELEVANT ATTITUDES	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
			Voter		Misreporter		Validated Voter		Likely Voter	
	Voter	Nonvoter	Voter	Nonvoter	Misreporter	Nonvoter	Voter	Nonvoter	Misreporter	Nonvoter
Political Interest										
Great Deal	37%	12%	38%	33%	12%	38%	37%	30%	12%	
Some	49	44	48	53	44	48	50	54	44	
Not Much	14	44	14	14	44	14	13	15	44	
	(1,121)	(142)	(960)	(160)	(141)	(913)	(82)	(125)	(141)	
Attention to the Campaign										
Good Deal	39%	11%	40%	29%	11%	40%	42%	29%	11%	
Some	49	44	48	59	44	49	38	61	44	
Not Much	12	45	12	12	45	11	20	10	45	
	(1,116)	(141)	(956)	(160)	(141)	(910)	(81)	(125)	(141)	
Political Efficacy										
Lo	31%	51%	29%	38%	51%	30%	24%	38%	51%	
-	28	23	28	26	23	28	33	26	23	
-	27	17	27	28	17	27	27	29	17	
High	14	8	15	8	9	15	16	6	9	
	(1,121)	(142)	(961)	(160)	(142)	(914)	(82)	(125)	(142)	

OTHER FORMS OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Voted in Primary?

	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>		<u>Validated Voter</u>	<u>Likely Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>
Yes	51%	15%	52%	42%	15%		53%	43%	44%	15%
No	49	85	48	58	85		47	57	56	85
	(1,107)	(142)	(949)	(158)	(142)		(903)	(81)	(123)	(142)

Voted in 1984?

	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>		<u>Validated Voter</u>	<u>Likely Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>
Yes	89%	40%	90%	80%	40%		91%	86%	78%	40%
No	11	60	10	20	60		9	14	22	60
	(1,105)	(135)	(948)	(157)	(135)		(904)	(79)	(122)	(135)

Attention to TV News

	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>		<u>Validated Voter</u>	<u>Likely Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>
More	20%	9%	20%	20%	9%		19%	19%	21%	9%
-	35	28	35	32	28		35	32	32	28
-	33	34	33	34	34		33	35	34	34
-	10	18	10	12	18		10	13	11	18
Less	2	10	3	1	10		3	1	2	10
	(1,000)	(120)	(857)	(143)	(120)		(819)	(69)	(112)	(120)

**PERSONAL
CHARACTERISTICS**

	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>		<u>Validated Voter</u>	<u>Likely Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>
Bracketed Education										
<H.S.	15%	33%	14%	18%	33%		15%	14%	18%	33%
H.S.	51	52	51	56	52		51	51	57	52
H.S. +	34	16	35	26	16		35	35	25	16
	(1,102)	(141)	(945)	(157)	(141)		(900)	(80)	(122)	(141)
Recoded Race										
White	86%	72%	89%	71%	72%		89%	83%	69%	72%
Black	11	20	9	27	20		9	15	28	20
Other	3	8	2	2	8		2	2	3	8
	(1,121)	(142)	(961)	(160)	(142)		(914)	(82)	(125)	(142)
Sex										
Male	43%	44%	44%	41%	44%		44%	38%	43%	44%
Female	57	56	56	59	56		56	62	58	56
	(1,121)	(142)	(961)	(160)	(142)		(914)	(82)	(126)	(142)
Marital Status										
Married	62%	47%	64%	49%	47%		64%	62%	42%	47%
Other	38	53	36	51	53		36	38	58	53
	(1,120)	(142)	(960)	(160)	(142)		(913)	(82)	(125)	(142)
Region										
East	18%	12%	18%	18%	12%		17%	18%	18%	12%
Midwest	33	20	35	21	20		35	27	17	20
South	28	56	26	40	56		25	33	40	56
West	22	12	22	22	12		22	22	26	12
	(1,121)	(142)	(961)	(160)	(142)		(914)	(82)	(125)	(142)

	Self-Reported		Usual Validation Result				Dual Validation Result			
	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>	<u>Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>		<u>Validated Voter</u>	<u>Likely Voter</u>	<u>Misreporter</u>	<u>Nonvoter</u>
Length in Dwelling Unit										
1	17%	24%	16%	21%	24%		16%	30%	19%	24%
2	10	13	9	13	13		9	14	14	13
3	25	32	24	28	32		25	21	30	32
4	27	21	28	23	21		28	12	24	21
5	22	10	23	16	10		23	24	13	10
	(1,120)	(142)	(961)	(159)	(142)		(914)	(81)	(125)	(142)
Female Name Change										
Yes	6%	14%	6%	8%	14%		5%	11%	10%	14%
No	94	86	94	92	86		95	89	90	86
	(539)	(72)	(456)	(83)	(72)		(429)	(47)	(63)	(72)