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The Voter-Poll Worker Relationship and Customer Satisfaction

Ashley Erickson, Amy La Monica, Steven A. Snell, and Patrick Spencer

The 2000 presidential election highlighted several weaknesses in America’s electoral process. Long lines, indeterminable ballots, allegations of vote fraud, and an inability to produce fast and accurate vote results will forever distinguish the Bush-Gore contest. In the aftermath of this election meltdown, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA). This act was designed to fix electoral problems by standardizing provisional voting, mandating statewide voter registration lists, and effectively banning punch cards and lever voting systems. When Congress passed HAVA, it simultaneously established the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to distribute HAVA funds and ensure each state’s compliance. The states were given large discretion in their employment of federal funds and their compliance with HAVA’s minimal standards. The compliance deadlines that HAVA established for these changes expired earlier this year [2007].

Utah readily met these deadlines. First, under the direction of Lieutenant Governor Olene Walker and finally under Lieutenant Governor Gary Herbert, Utah organized an implementation committee and developed a four-year plan to conform to HAVA requirements. The planning committee budgeted more than twenty million dollars for the acquisition of new Diebold touch-screen machines. To better accommodate the limited number of voting machines, Utah adopted no-excuse early voting. Lieutenant Governor Herbert’s office also invested heavily in a voter education campaign. In the first general election since the implementation of final HAVA requirements, Utah experienced minimal complications. The grossest irregularity, a problem with the touch-screen voting machine’s card encoder, was confined to Utah County and quickly remedied.

Other states that met HAVA’s requirements were not as fortunate as Utah. In Maryland’s September primary, voters encountered numerous barriers as they tried to cast their ballots. In some polling locations registration databases failed, voting equipment malfunctioned, precincts ran out of provisional ballots, and voters endured long lines as precinct hours were extended long into the night. As a result of these complications, voters were lost in a maze of errors, especially as some voters had to cast votes on makeshift ballots of plain paper, because the poll workers did not know what to do after they ran out of provisional ballots.

The difference between Utah’s and Maryland’s voting experiences cannot be explained by HAVA itself because both states complied with the same federal guidelines. The disparity between these experiences could be the product of each state’s implementation, but this is also not likely since the two states, both with touch-screen voting machines, provisional ballots, and statewide databases, had much in common. The source of these disparities must lie not in the laws, but in the application of these laws. HAVA, conceived at the federal level and uniquely applied to each state, trickled down to county governments as a fully formed and all-encompassing election reform package. This top-down process required counties to master new election procedures and to train poll workers to operate new equipment, correctly administer provisional ballots, and apply other newly established practices. Perhaps the poll workers bear the heaviest burden of election reform, because they are the ones that apply HAVA on a voter-by-voter basis. Though they received little news coverage before the 2000 election, poll workers now find themselves at the epicenter of post-HAVA election disasters.
In this paper, we discuss the importance of poll workers in applying HAVA. We believe they have a central role in defining the voting experience. Because the election reforms have been most taxing on poll workers, we posit that voters may reasonably judge their post-HAVA voting experience by their interaction with poll workers at their precinct. Employing the voters' judgments of poll workers as a measure of their customer satisfaction, our research investigates what factors lead to a positive rating of poll workers and the voting experience.

Poll Workers Shape and Sell the Voting Experience

The interaction between a citizen and his legislator, Michael Lipsky argues, is not nearly as important as the interaction between the citizen and society's street-level bureaucrats, which includes teachers, police officers, and welfare workers. Lipsky gives them this title because they are the agents who, on behalf of the government, interpret and implement federal, state, and local laws on a daily basis. Common people are more directly affected by the immediate decisions of these makeshift legislators than they are by the official policymakers who pass down the laws. According to Lipsky, the "decisions of street-level bureaucrats, the routines they establish, and the devices they invent to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out." These unofficial policies have the potential to profoundly impact the lives of the citizens under the jurisdiction of street-level bureaucrats. Lipsky sets forth that street-level bureaucrats "implicitly mediate aspects of the constitutional relationship of citizens to the state." Scholars have more recently applied Lipsky's title of street-level bureaucrats to election officials. David Kimball and Martha Kropf grant this status of unofficial policymaker to state and local election workers and argue that election administrators play a key role in linking the government to its citizens. They find that experiences that should be similar across precincts—especially under the uniform requirements of HAVA—vary because of differences in state laws, voting technology, size of jurisdictions, diverse populations, and different cultural norms. Kimball and Kropf are especially interested in the electoral differences that are the products of partisan election officials. They conjecture that Democratic election officials are more likely to apply election law in a way that fosters increased voter turnout, while Republicans engage in activities like purging voter lists to reduce turnout. As the process of choosing election officials varies by state, Kimball and Kropf hypothesize that partisanship and political contests can deter fair and even applications of election law. They suggest that public opinion most strongly favors a uniform, nonpartisan method of selecting election officials. Nevertheless, they refrain from endorsing any particular method because they do not agree that nonpartisanship guarantees accountability. Instead, they recommend further study of the methods of choosing election officials and the resulting neutrality and accountability of such officials.

Anna Bassi, Rebecca Morton, and Jessica Trounstine are also concerned with the policy-making powers of election officials. Bassi, et al. concur with Kimball and Kropf that election officials, as street-level bureaucrats, are positioned to inappropriately grant and deny voting rights. In their discussion of disenfranchisement, Bassi, et al. argue that problems arise when states try to apply different laws and administrative systems. This allows room for error in the enforcement of the laws and regulations regarding voting rights for felons. States may even have identical laws but differ in their enforcement of these laws and policies. Bassi, et al. show how common this error is by reviewing surveys and interviews with election officials, many of which show that even the election officials fail to properly answer questions about their state's felon disenfranchisement laws. They argue that election monitoring is most important when the election environment is not competitive because such an environment escapes the public scrutiny of a more competitive election. They find that there is significantly less fluctuation within the application of disenfranchisement laws when elections are competitive. Election monitoring is important in the absence of competition to ensure that election workers are applying the laws consistently, especially in the authors' example of felon disenfranchisement. Monitoring and competition limit the subjectivity that election officials invoke when making policy decisions.

Thad Hall, Quin Monson, and Kelly Patterson extend the idea of election officials as street-level bureaucrats to entail poll workers as well. Hall, et al. find that poll workers must be street-level bureaucrats because they are the governmental agents that make the final decisions that determine the voters' election experience. That is, after federal, state, and county legislators have made the laws and regulations that decide how elections are to be carried out, poll workers are the ones who implement these laws and actually interact with the voters. Hall, et al. state that "poll workers bridge the gap between what the government intends and what the citizen experiences." Since the implementation of HAVA brought about many reforms—and consequently, many new opportunities to exercise personal discretion in administering election law—poll workers are more important than ever. Their most significant finding is that the voters' perception of poll workers affects their confidence in the electoral process. Hall, et al. also find that views of poll workers help determine the confidence voters have that their vote will be counted accurately and the overall satisfaction that they feel with the present state of democracy. They derive these conclusions by examining data from the Utah Voter Poll, an Internet survey conducted after the 2004 general
election. They then weighted the results to be consistent with the demographic breakdown of the 2004 Utah Colleges Exit Poll.16

We are interested in the conclusion made by Hall, et al., that voters who rated their poll worker as excellent are "more likely to express more confidence in the process and more satisfaction with democracy, "because it highlights a weakness in HAVA."17 Namely, the many reforms that the legislation imposed on states and counties may have no affect on voter confidence if the poll workers fumble and clumsily apply the reforms. Hall, et al. do not, however, address the voter-poll worker relationship. Because they found a significant and consistent relationship between the voters’ assessment of poll workers and voters’ confidence in the electoral system. We hope to expand on their work by highlighting the factors that make voters think more favorably of their poll workers. We want to know what makes voters give their poll workers positive marks because those marks lead to confidence in the system, one of HAVA’s chief aims.

We agree with Hall, et al. that poll workers are critical in the voters’ perceptions of the fairness and accuracy of the elections. This theory descends logically from the literature surrounding street-level bureaucracy. Voters reasonably link poll worker performance to the quality of elections because poll workers, as street-level bureaucrats, shape the voting experience. We build upon this causal story that poll worker performance affects voters’ perceptions of elections by suggesting that the marks that voters give their poll workers are actually customer service judgments. That is, we view poll workers not only as street-level bureaucrats, but also as the sales associates responsible for selling the post-HAVA voting experience. A voter who says that poll workers were excellent is pleased with the service provided by her poll workers and can be considered a happy customer while a voter who deems his poll workers’ performance is less than excellent is not a fully satisfied customer. To make sense of these judgments, we turn to business journals and other studies of customer satisfaction.

Thomas O. Jones and W. Earl Sasser, Jr. discuss the concepts of satisfaction and the essential principles of customer service and identify three main factors of good service, including, 1) turning around or fixing negative customer experiences, 2) providing information that makes the product easier to use, and 3) customizing the service to fit each individual’s specific needs.18 Since these areas of customer satisfaction closely correspond to the voter-poll worker relationship, we are interested in the authors’ distinction between completely satisfied customers and those who are only partially satisfied. Jones and Sasser find that a completely satisfied customer thinks the product fits their needs exactly and the customer service exceeds their expectations. On the other hand, customers who say they are only satisfied with the services they receive are quite different than the completely satisfied customer in that they view the product as reasonably good, but find that one or several aspects of the company’s service did not meet expectations. The authors reason that these customers refrain from selecting a lower level of satisfaction because they feel some level of sympathy towards the company and its lackluster service.19 Given this distinction, we hope to explain the difference in customer service between voters who said their poll workers were excellent and those who said their poll workers were less than excellent.

In their research on customer satisfaction, Christian Homburg, Nicole Koschate, and Wayne Hoyer discuss the weight consumers give to these two methods in their final determination of satisfaction.20 By studying students’ responses to a new CD-ROM study guide, they show that when first exposed to a new product, though the students express their views in cognitive terms, the emotional response has a more significant effect on their assessment. However, over time the weight of affect decreases because consumers gain more information about the product and thus make increasingly educated and cognitive judgments.21 We find their conclusions very applicable to our study of Utah voters’ judgments of poll workers because the product, or experience that voters had with their poll workers in the 2006 election, was unlike any previous election that they have participated in. Adopting this dynamic model of customer satisfaction we seek to measure the importance of affect, or emotional response, in the job performance ratings that voters assign their poll workers.

Data and Methodology

It is certainly true that the 2006 voting experience was unlike any previous election. There was such wide consensus on this matter that the 2006 Utah Colleges Exit Poll dedicated an entire questionnaire to measure the voter experience in this first round of elections since Utah fully complied with HAVA’s many requirements. Every fifth voter selected to participate in the poll received this specialized questionnaire that asked about voter check-in, the voter’s experience with the new touch screen machines, and their interaction with poll workers. Most important to our study, this questionnaire included a replicate of the question that Hall, et al. asked participants in the Utah Voter Poll about the poll workers. It reads:

- Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at your precinct today: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor

This question, which served as the chief independent variable in the Hall, et al. paper, serves as our dependent variable. We view the voters’ responses to this question as a measure of their satisfaction with the new product, the voting experience as presented to the voters by their poll workers. This question is consistent with
customer satisfaction studies and is a generally accepted measure of satisfaction.\textsuperscript{22}  

In accordance with the Homburg, \textit{et al.} model of dynamic customer satisfaction, we hypothesize that because the 2006 election cycle was the first since HAVA's full implementation, voters will rely heavily on their emotional responses when evaluating their poll workers. We consider the 2006 voting experience to be a new product, since the voters lack prior experience necessary to provide a cognitive evaluation of customer satisfaction, we expect that affect will play a greater role in the voters' level of customer satisfaction.

We draw measures of customer satisfaction and voter affect from the election-day exit poll data. We made some slight adjustments to the survey question above in order to simplify the analysis of customer satisfaction. More specifically, we collapsed the four-point scale of poll worker job performance into a dichotomous variable. Consistent with the findings of Thomas Jones and W. Earl Sasser, we grouped the voters who said their poll workers were good with the respondents who called their poll workers fair or poor. Given Jones and Sasser's findings about customers who said they were merely satisfied instead of completely satisfied, we feel that voters who called their poll workers good were more like the voters who said the poll workers were fair or poor than those who afforded their poll workers excellent marks.

We derive our chief independent variable, our measure of affect, from the question about the voter-poll worker relationship. Though we originally wanted to ask a short series of questions to unravel this relationship, space limitations required us to concentrate our measure of the relationship in a single question. We modified a question that the Utah Colleges Exit Poll asked in the June primary so it would speak only to personal relationships between voters and poll workers. The November questionnaire asked:

- \textit{Did you personally know any of the poll workers at your precinct today? Yes or no}

By removing the June language about recognizing a poll worker and by underlining the words \textit{personally know}, we hoped to filter out the respondents who did not have a strong enough relationship with the poll worker to merit any affective consideration of that poll worker's job performance.

Using the two questions above as our primary independent and dependent variables, we employ a logistic regression model. We include other independent variables that we believe might affect voters' perceptions of poll workers. The first voter satisfaction control variable is a dichotomous measure of whether or not the poll workers asked the voter to present identification before voting. Utah law has minimal ID requirements, such that a majority of regular in-person voters would not be required to show ID. We do not know what effect this voter-poll worker interaction will have on customer satisfaction, but we feel that it is important to include this variable as a control because the identification process is the voter's initial encounter with poll workers.

We also include a question of whether voters asked for help. Because we are trying to measure how the voter perceives the poll workers' performance, it seems necessary to differentiate between the voters who sought out customer service and those who were more passive. Since most of the people that asked for help also said they got the help they requested, we anticipate that voters who asked for help will be more likely to positively assess their poll workers.

Our next set of variables comes from a matrix of questions on the voter satisfaction survey. The questionnaire asked voters to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements about the voting machine instructions, the ease of machine use, the time required to vote, and the privacy they felt while voting. We include these questions to control for voters who gave their poll workers bad marks because they had a generally poor experience at the polls.

Homburg, \textit{et al.} said that affect is important when a product is new, but cognitive assessments of the service and product are always important. There is not a perfect measure of cognition on the voter satisfaction survey, but we control for a series of questions that asked voters to make cognitive judgments about specific aspects of their interaction with the poll workers. This series asks voters to agree or disagree with statements like the poll workers knew what they were doing, the poll workers were helpful and respectful, and the poll workers knew how to operate the voting machines. Because all of these statements are positive views of the poll workers, we collapsed the set into an index with a minimum value of zero, when the voter strongly disagrees with all four statements, and a maximum value of one, when the voter strongly agrees with all four statements. We expect that voters who gave their poll workers high marks on these statements will be more likely to call their poll workers' general performance excellent. Still, we expect that the affect associated with a personal relationship will remain significant when we control for this cognition.

As a final control, we include a series of demographic questions that we believe are relevant to voters' opinions of poll workers. We include dummy variables for partisanship: democrats are the baseline while republicans and independents are explicitly named in the model. We also added a measure of religion. Our model has dummy variables for active Latter-day Saints, inactive Latter-day Saints, active members of other religions, and inactive members of other religions. This leaves the nonreligious
voters as our baseline in the religion analysis. We include a recoded gender variable that sets females as our base group. We also control for age and education level. Our measure of age is derived from each respondent’s self-reported year of birth. We maintain the intervals and direction of the six-point education scale, but subtract one from each value so that voters with only an eighth grade education or less, our reference group, receive a value of zero.

We include in Appendix 1 the question wording for each of our variables as stated on the Utah Colleges Exit Poll questionnaire, and Appendix 2 contains summary statistics of each of these variables.

Data Analysis

Before examining the complexities of our logistic regression model, we offer some simple statements about our variables and the interactions between them. In general, most voters had very favorable views of their poll workers. Almost 80 percent of election-day voters said the poll workers at their precinct did an excellent job. A vast majority of the dissenters said their workers did a good job and the remaining 1.6 percent of respondents said their poll workers did a fair or poor job. A crosstab with our chief independent variable reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know Poll Workers at Your Precinct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than excellent</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N 716</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, the 44.6 percent of voters who said they personally knew their poll workers were more likely to say their poll workers did an excellent job. The table above shows a 15 percentage point jump in rating poll workers as excellent when the voter personally knows a poll worker at the precinct. This is the relationship we hope to learn more about in our logistic regression model.

Evaluating the model as a whole, there are some very important findings with regard to the voter-poll worker relationship. Though the model highlights some counterintuitive relationships, which we discuss at length below, it accurately predicts about 80 percent of the cases. Our full logit model has a Cox and Snell R-square of .129 and a Nagelkerke R-square of .207, which means our model explains somewhere between 13 percent and 20 percent of the variance in the voters’ assessments of poll workers. (The model produces the results shown in the next chart.)

We see that the three variables that we predicted to have a positive effect on voters’ assessment of poll workers—the measures of personal relationship, the index, and the measure of whether the voter asked for help—all have the anticipated effect. Furthermore, these three variables are each statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level. That means that knowing a poll worker at your precinct, asking for help, and agreeing with a series of positive statements about the poll workers leads to an excellent rating of poll workers. Voters who were asked to present ID were also more likely to say their poll workers were excellent, but this relationship is only significant at the 80 percent confidence level.

When all factors are held at their mean values, the predicted probability of rating the poll workers as excellent is an impressive .85. If all other factors are maintained at their mean values, but the voter does not know any of the poll workers at the precinct, the predicted probability falls to .79. However, if the voter knows a poll worker at the precinct and all other factors are at their mean value, the predicted probability of calling the poll workers excellent increases to .89—a sizable jump. This probability further climbs to .97 when the voter knows the poll worker, gives their workers the highest marks on the cognitive index, asks for help, and presents ID to the poll worker. When these four variables are held at zero, the model predicts that the probability of rating the poll workers as excellent plummets to .24. Nevertheless, this last estimate seems to be too conservative because fifteen of the sixteen voters in the sample who actually received a zero value for each of these variables still said their poll workers did an excellent job. This highlights how our model does a better job at predicting excellent ratings—we accurately predict about 96 percent of cases where voters say poll workers were
excellent—than the less than excellent ratings, which our model accurately predicts only 13 percent of the time.

Other findings from the logistic regression show that voters who said the instructions for using the machines were confusing and voters that said it took too much time to vote are less likely to say their poll workers were excellent. This is a likely story because these voters could reasonably attribute some of their confusion and long time spent at the polls to poll worker inefficiency. We note that while the first variable lacks significance at any standard level, the second is statistically significant beyond the 99 percent level. Voters who agreed that they felt like they voted in privacy were also more likely to say the poll workers did an excellent job, but this finding is called into question by its very low significance level.

The final question in this series of control variables yields a statistically significant but counterintuitive result. There is a strange negative relationship that exists when voters agree that the voting machines were easy to use. Voters are for some reason less likely to call their poll workers excellent. We thought that this relationship might be negative because voters who had no trouble with the machines probably did not ask for help and therefore had less interaction with the poll workers; however, this explanation fails because our model already controls for whether or not the voter asked for help. We modified our model several times—omitting or adding different variables each time—but this negative relationship remained.

The demographic controls also have strange relationships. An increase in age or education level makes a voter more likely to deem the poll workers' performance as excellent. These relationships are both highly, statistically significant. However, males seem to be less willing than women to call their poll workers excellent and only active Latter-day Saints are more likely than voters with no religious preference to call their poll workers excellent. The most peculiar finding in the demographic controls is that republicans and independents were less likely than democrats to call their poll workers excellent. Though only the relationship of independents was statistically significant, we were surprised to find that democrats, a longtime minority in Utah, would be more likely than independents or republicans to call poll workers excellent because virtually all of the elections in Utah are managed by republican county governments.

Discussion

In order to account for the strange relationship of partisan identification on the voters' perception of poll workers, and in an effort to show a positive relationship between ease of using the voting machines and the perceived poll worker performance, we tested the correlation of all of the variables in the model. A full table of these correlations is included in Appendix 3. We suspected that identifying as a republican might correlate very strongly with being an active Latter-day Saint; however, this relationship—the strongest in our model—has less than a .50 correlation. Therefore, we feel confident that controlling for partisanship and religious identification does not introduce multicollinearity into the model.

We found some profound irregularities in the series of questions pertaining to specific aspects of poll worker performance: a significant number of voters who strongly disagreed with the positive statements about poll workers surprisingly said that their poll workers did an excellent job. We performed crosstabs of these agree/disagree statements with many other questions on the voter satisfaction survey. We found that voters who strongly disagreed with the questions in the poll worker matrix were most similar to the respondents who strongly agreed with the same statements. From these findings, we are inclined to say that the matrix of specific poll worker judgments has greater error than the stand-alone job performance question because the respondents had response set problems. It may be that many respondents did not read the instructions for the matrix closely and as a result marked the extreme responses that they assumed to be positive when they were in fact choosing the most negative options. To mitigate some of this error and to simplify our analysis we collapsed this matrix into a single index. Voters who strongly agreed with all four statements received a value of one, those who strongly disagreed with all statements were coded as a zero, and voters who gave mixed responses accordingly received some value between zero and one.

We were also concerned that our model might have endogeneity, because we use an index of specific poll worker judgments to explain whether voters think overall poll worker performance is excellent. The correlation between the poll worker index and the voters' judgment of overall job performance is indeed statistically significant at .01 level, but the Pearson Correlation measure is less than .20. Removing the poll worker index from the logistic regression model slightly diminishes the R-square, but it also reverses the signs of the republican dummy variable and the dummy variable for active Latter-day Saints. Since these newly reversed relationships still fail to reach standard thresholds of statistical significance, we think the cost of losing this information in our analysis outweighs the benefit of reversing the partisan effect.

In order to more clearly explain the voter-poll worker relationship, we recommend that future researchers make use of additional measures of affect. We also recommend that future surveys break down the statements about specific aspects of poll worker performance into stand-alone questions or otherwise improve the matrix format by alternating the direction of the statements. We predict that either improvement would decrease response set issues with that matrix.
Conclusion

The final implementation of HAVA has delegated new and diverse responsibilities to poll workers. Surely the reforms have been taxing on Utah’s poll workers, an older group—with a median age of fifty-nine. Less than 50 percent of Utah’s poll workers say they are very comfortable using computers. As street-level bureaucrats, this group had to adapt to new policies by mastering new voting equipment procedures, applying provisional ballot laws, and implementing new state procedures for verifying voter identification. Overall, voters gave their poll workers high marks. Hall, et al. previously established that such perceptions of poll workers increased the confidence and satisfaction that voters feel in the electoral process. Building on their research, we have highlighted that these perceptions of poll workers are actually customer satisfaction measures of the new voting experience. Since this experience is a new product, customer satisfaction literature has suggested that affect is a highly significant determinant of initial customer satisfaction. Our analysis of data from the 2006 Utah Colleges Exit Poll confirms that affect has a large effect on the ratings voters assign to their poll workers. According to our logistic regression model, the impact of personally knowing at least one poll worker at the precinct raises the predicted probability of rating the poll workers as excellent by .10.

As Congress adjourns for the year, there has been some discussion of modifying HAVA. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Utah will have to make drastic changes to the electoral process in the coming years. Assuming that the election process remains largely the same, the dynamic model of customer satisfaction suggests that the effect of affect will decrease as voters become accustomed to the post-HAVA experience. We recommend that social scientists continue to study the role of affect and cognition in voter satisfaction. As the importance of affect declines, we expect that voters will increasingly ground their judgments of poll workers on cognitive evaluations. In order for poll workers to maintain the high marks that Hall, et al. say are important for high voter confidence and satisfaction in the electoral process, poll workers will have to exhibit higher competence. We recommend that election officials recruit qualified poll workers, offer thorough training, and provide incentives for poll workers to volunteer in subsequent elections so that counties can fill their precincts with qualified workers.
Appendix 1

[B] Were you asked to present any identification before voting?
1. Yes, and the election official accepted my identification
2. Yes, but the election official rejected my identification
3. No, I was not asked to present any form of identification

[F] Did you ask for help using the touch screen voting system?
1. Yes, and I got help
2. Yes, but I did not get help
3. No, I did not ask for help

[H] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your voting experience? Please circle one number per line.
   a. The instructions for using the voting machines were confusing
   b. The touch screen voting machines were easy to use
   c. It took too much time to vote
   d. I felt like I voted in privacy

[P] Please rate the job performance of the poll workers at your precinct today:
1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

[Q] Do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the poll workers at your precinct? Please circle one number per line.
   a. The poll workers knew what they were doing
   b. The poll workers were helpful
   c. The poll workers treated me with respect
   d. The poll workers knew how to operate the voting machines

[R] Did you personally know any of the poll workers at your precinct today?
1. Yes
2. No

[V] What year were you born?
19

[W] Are you?
1. Male
2. Female

[X] Generally speaking, do you consider yourself to be a(n):
1. Strong Democrat
2. Not so strong Democrat
3. Independent leaning Democrat
4. Independent
5. Independent leaning Republican
6. Not so strong Republican
7. Strong Republican
8. Other
9. Don’t know

[Z] What was the last year of school you completed?
1. Eighth grade or less
2. Some high school
3. High school graduate
4. Some college
5. College graduate
6. Post-graduate

[AA] What, if any, is your religious preference?
1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. LDS / Mormon
4. Jewish
5. Other
6. No preference / No religious affiliation
7. Prefer not to say

[BB] How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religious preference?
1. Very active
2. Somewhat active
3. Not very active
4. Not active
5. Does not apply/Prefer not to say
## Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate the performance of the poll workers</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=excellent, 0=less than excellent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally knew a poll worker at the precinct</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=yes, 0=no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's gender (1=male, 0=female)</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether voter asked for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for and received help</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for, but did not receive help</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that instructions for voting machine were confusing*</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that the voting machines were easy to use*</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that it took too much time to vote</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that voted in privacy*</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of poll worker judgments</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level*</td>
<td>3.517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active LDS</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-active LDS</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active other religion</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-active other religion</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variable labels and response order are taken from the exit poll, but each value has been reduced by one so that the base of the variable is zero instead of one.
**Appendix 3**

### Correlations

| Sex   | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation (N) | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| male  | 0.96*                   | 0.01*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           |
| female| 0.96*                   | 0.01*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           |
| total  | 0.96*                   | 0.01*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           | 0.44*                   | 0.07*           | 0.43*                   | 0.08*           |

**Notes:**
- **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
- **Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**


---

**Reference:**