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The Understanding America Study Methodology

Probability-based internet panel of 9000+ adults

- Founded 2014 at USC Center for Economic and Social Research
- Address-based sample for a representative sample of U.S.
- Internet-connected tablets provided as needed
- Multi-mode & multi-step English/Spanish recruitment
- 14% recruitment rate into the panel, 75%-80% survey RR
- Panel burden is low
  - 1 to 3 surveys a month in English or Spanish
  - Compensation is $3 for every 5 minutes of survey time
  - Almost no one is in another survey panel
- Two-stage weights adjust for sample design, non-response
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Probability of Own Vote

- What is the percent chance that you will vote in the presidential election?
- If you do vote in the election, what is the percent chance that you will vote for Donald Trump? For Joe Biden? And for someone else?

Probability of one’s Social Circle Vote

- What percentage of your social contacts that live in your state are likely to vote in the 2020 U.S. presidential election?
- Of all your social contacts who live in your state and are likely to vote in the 2020 U.S. presidential election, what percentage do you think will vote for Donald Trump? For Joe Biden? And for someone else?

Probability of the vote at State and National Level

Of all people who live in the U.S. / your state and are likely to vote, what percentage do you think will vote for Donald Trump? For Joe Biden? And for someone else?
The Daybreak Poll

Predicted percentage of votes for President (14-day window)

Based on probabilistic voting questions

Election forecast

Probabilistic voting questions
Predicted percentage of votes for President

Difference not statistically significant if the lines are in the gray area
UAS Tracking Poll – 2016

4000+ participants assigned a day of the week
7-day waves, 18 waves starting in July
Graphs updated daily with rolling 7-day averages
Microdata available in real time

3 measures in the tracking + social circle in extra polls
1. Own probability of voting in the election
2. Own probability of voting for each candidate
3. Percent chance that each candidate would win
5500+ participants assigned a day of the week
14-day waves, 6 waves starting in August
Graphs updated daily with rolling 7-day (and then 14-day) averages

6 Measures in the tracking poll:
1. Own probability of voting in the election
2. Own probability of voting for each candidate
3. Prediction of National vote
4. Prediction of State vote
5. Probability of how Social Circle would vote
6. Categorical “if the election were held today”
1. The DNC and RNC party conventions in July ended with Hillary Clinton as the first female nominee for president

2. Clinton called Trump and his supporters a “basket of deplorables”

3. Clinton stumbled due to illness at an event, after Trump saying she was weak

4. Donald Trump was seen on Access Hollywood video making lewd comments about grabbing women

5. The head of the FBI revealed they were investigating Clinton’s use of a personal email server while she was Secretary of State
1. Party conventions were virtual for the first time in history. Democrats nominated the first African America/Asian female vice president in history.

2. Police killed George Floyd in May; months of angry and sometimes violent protests across the country.

3. Changes to the U.S. postal service created slowdowns in service, while voting by mail spiked.

4. Donald Trump and others politicized the U.S. response to the pandemic, belittling people for wearing masks and calling for states to open up.

5. Donald Trump cast doubt on the reliability of voting by mail, and early vs. in person voting was politicized.

6. Liberal U.S. Supreme court justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg died; the majority Republican Senate confirmed a conservative replacement, days before the presidential election.
Other challenges

Election polling comes with the mixed blessing of nearly instant feedback on the accuracy of your approach, in a normal year

• We conduct a post-election poll immediate after the election gives us vital information about how panel members actually voted and to assess their reactions to the outcome
• We also compare our outcomes to the actual vote, and take stock of where things worked and where they did not

This year, the massive turnout, coupled with unprecedented levels of mail voting, slowed the vote count. Challenges by the Trump administration to try to overturn the vote counts in several states also contributed to delayed results.
In 2020, Biden led in our own probability of voting measure, often by double digits, ending at 11 points (factoring in the full wave it is 9 points). Average at FiveThirtyeight.com had similar Biden leads, ending with 8 points.
Post-Election Insights

• Our Own-Probability questions did a great job of
  • predicting overall likelihood of voting (within-person) and actual vote for the candidates.
  • Predicting their likelihood of voting for Trump or Biden
  • So... we seem to be missing some voters

• We measured evidence of voter suppression but not to a level where it could have played a significant role in the outcome

• We are missing some of the late deciders, which would have brought Trump’s percentage up in the own-vote, but not enough to get us to the outcome
  • Trump won among election-day deciders (10% of the electorate)
  • The candidates tied among people who made up their mind within the week before the election (19% of the electorate)
Own Probability of voting for Trump/Biden
9 or 11 point Biden lead

Social Circle Probability of voting for Trump/Biden
4 point Biden lead – Spot On
Why do Social Circle methods work better?

• It may help include people who are otherwise difficult to get to talk to us in a poll. They may not want to answer polling questions, they may not trust universities or the media, or they just may be a hard to reach group.
  • Indirectly increases sample size of the poll

• This is related to, but different than the hidden voters idea, which is that some people may not tell us that they are voting for a very polarizing candidate. The team tested this using social circle methods: low incidence overall, but higher predictions of each of these behaviors for a person’s social circle among Trump voters.
  • Embarrassment (~10%)
  • Fear of harassment (~10%)
  • Wanting to skew poll results (~5%)

• It may help us include votes from people who decide who they will vote for on election day. So far in our data, it looks like that is about 10% of voters. Many of these late deciding voters may well be influenced by the decisions made by their friends and family
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