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Introduction

One of the most unique features of the American political landscape is the state legislature. Colonial assemblies were the first institutional organizations of democracy in the New World, and their modern counterparts function with similar objectives. State legislative bodies pass thousands of bills annually, governing every aspect of state government, including healthcare, welfare benefits, insurance laws, driving regulations, highway construction, public and private education, taxes, etc (NCSL 2008). There are few issues of interest to the public that are not debated in the various state assemblies, houses of representatives, and senates. Additionally, many budding politicians use positions in the state legislature as preparation to run for federal offices. If one is looking for the national leaders of tomorrow, he or she need look no further than his or her own state capitol; nearly 40 percent of the members of Congress initiated their political careers as state legislators (Fowler and McClure 1989). Clearly, state politics influence and inform political activities at the national level.

Yet, understanding of state legislative politics and elections is minimal. “All politics is local,” stated longtime Congressional Speaker Tip O’Neill (1994). But local political stories are often eschewed by media coverage in favor of more dramatic national races. Most political researchers do not generally explore the dynamics of state legislative politics, with a few exceptions. This neglect is regrettable, because an understanding of politics at the local level will translate to a better understanding of the dynamics of elections at every level. State legislative politics matter, because they influence elections, candidate recruitment, and legislation across the country. Our study attempts to explore the dynamics of the state legislative election. We ask an important question: What affects vote choice in state legislative elections?
Research Context

Relatively little time and few resources have been spent on studying state legislative elections across the country. Part of this literature gap is due to practicality. Various constraints complicate research attempts including lack of political data, demographic data at the legislative district level, funding to conduct full, sample surveys at the district level, and interest in lieu of more appealing state or national elections. What little research exists is largely based on aggregate historical data analysis at the legislative district level, focusing on institutional change over the last few decades (Rosenthal 1996), competitiveness in primary elections (Grau 1981), participation in state legislative elections (Patterson and Caldeira 1982), the effect of candidate spending (Gierzynski and Breaux 1991), gubernatorial coattail effects (Hogan 2005), and the effect of ethics laws on candidate recruitment (Rosenson 2006).

Studies suggest state legislative elections are low information and low saliency contests to most voters and, therefore, generate little interest among the electorate (Gewell and Olsen 1988). When asked, voters cannot respond with relevant information specific to national electoral contests, therefore there is little to no expectation that they will cast informed votes in state legislative races (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996). As suggested by Popkin, voters possessing minimal information about the contest overwhelmingly rely on decision heuristics, especially partisan identification, to inform their ballot (Popkin 1992).

Thus, the question naturally arises, do voters really pay attention to specific state legislative races? Quantitative studies are mute on the subject. There are some qualitative approaches, such as Keith Gaddie’s five-year insertion into the campaigns of nine state legislative candidates (2004). He highlights the fact that nearly every candidate believes the electorate is responsive to the campaign. He wrote, quoting a young politician, “[voters in this district] have been contacted and contacted again, and they know who I am and they will vote for me. . . . You walk these neighborhoods and a lot of people feel like the incumbent has taken them for granted” (Gaddie 2004).

State legislative incumbents frequently affirm the belief that their district and their constituency largely know them and their political history. Are they misguided? Our study attempts to answer that question in the context of closely contested Utah state legislative races. We employ an individual level exit poll survey methodology rarely used in state legislative research to examine candidate and campaign effects on vote choice in two 2008 contests.

Theory and Design

The primary challenge in studying vote choice is explaining how candidates and campaigns can affect voters when voters cannot recall basic information about the election. Historical models of vote choice relied on memory recall to explain voters’ evaluations of candidates (Kelley & Mirer 1974, Enelow & Hinich 1984). These studies painted a bleak picture of the American electorate since subsequent explorations affirmed the collective ignorance of voters about candidate characteristics, race-specific issues, institutional characteristics, and consistent personal preferences (Delli Carpini
and Keeter 1996, Converse 1964). However Lodge, Steenbergen, and Brau produced evidence supporting the theory that voters are influenced by campaign information even when they cannot remember the specific considerations that lead to a vote decision (1995). They hypothesized that citizens keep an "online score" or running tally of political actors. Voters update this affective score every time they receive information relevant to an individual or an election. On election day, some voters may have retained much of the campaign information, others not, but each vote is informed to some extent by exposure to candidates and campaigns.

The online candidate evaluation model is especially relevant in the context of state legislative races, because the likelihood of voter recall is relatively low due to a low information exposure. National campaigns attract thousands of hours of media coverage. Interested voters may easily inundate themselves with platform specifics, day-to-day campaign activities, issue debates, and press events. Local politicians do not have that luxury. Many voters may only be contacted once or twice, perhaps reading articles published in the local newspaper prior to the election. Without the repetition of media coverage to encourage memory, voters may not easily recall information relevant to a state legislative race. However, candidate attributes and campaign effects can still affect their vote choice by altering the running score in the minds of the voters.

Essentially, our hypothesis is that campaign and candidate effects do influence vote choice in state legislative elections, especially in close elections or among candidates who deviate from party norms (Lodge, Steenbergen, and Brau 1995). As stated before, research and logic suggest partisanship is the largest determining factor of vote choice, but we submit that it is not the only effect, and candidate and campaign factors do cause voters to cross party lines at the voting booth. Basically, we reassert the conviction, vocalized by V.O. Key, that "voters are not fools" (quoted by Lodge, Steenbergen, and Brau 1995). We argue that many voters are well informed enough to consider a variety of factors when making voting decisions, even in a state legislative race. Even if a voter is no expert in political issues, specific effects from candidate perceptions and campaign efforts are likely to influence the voter's decisions, and we hypothesize that these effects will affect the election outcomes of the races evaluated in this study.

In a state legislative election, campaign effects may include such factors as direct candidate contact, campaign literature, campaign contact (phone calls, canvassing, etc.), or media advertising (radio/local, TV/Internet). We argue that these efforts to educate voters on candidates and their positions often influence voter decisions on election day. Even if voters cannot regurgitate specific information from campaign efforts, the general impressions they receive from these efforts are likely to influence their decisions. Additionally, candidate effects may include any number of perceptions voters have about the candidates in question. For example, a candidate's popularity or "celebrity status" may play an important role in voting outcomes, with better-known candidates receiving a higher percentage of the vote. Perceptions of a candidate's morality, particularly in regard to a potential scandal or corruption accusation, may also bias a voter's opinion toward a certain candidate. Though related to party identification, candidate ideology may be an important deciding factor for voters,
particularly when regarding specific salient issues, such as abortion, gun control, or school vouchers. We expect these variables will, along with party identification, influence how many votes a candidate gets in a state legislative election.

For our dependent variable, we have chosen to look at vote choice for the democratic candidate. Our goal is to determine the effect that different factors, including campaign and candidate effects and party identification, have on the percentage of the vote the democratic candidate receives in each of these races. Since republicans generally dominate the vote in Utah, looking at how campaign and candidate factors influence a democratic candidate's vote percentage will best help us to see the true effects of these factors, as they will likely show deviation from party lines for republican voters. This dependent variable will help us evaluate the direction of changes the campaign and candidate effects cause in vote percentage, as well as the magnitude of these effects.

To evaluate candidate and campaign effects on vote choice, we use a number of independent and control variables. Our major explanatory variables for campaign effects are whether the respondent has heard of the candidates in question, whether they have received literature on the candidates, and whether they have met the candidates personally. We expect if a person has heard of, received literature from, or met the democratic candidate, they will be more likely to vote for him or her, while if they have received the same things from the republican candidate, they will be less likely to vote for the democrat. If these results are obtained, we will confirm our hypothesis that campaign effects influence vote choice. These are the only data on campaign effects available from the 2008 Utah Colleges Exit Poll. Since the legislative districts in question are small, media advertising is not often done, making data on these factors irrelevant. Literature and candidate contact are likely the most significant campaign effects in these state legislative elections, making our chosen explanatory variables quite valid.

For candidate effects, we will look at specific candidate quality variables that are relevant to the elections in this case study. These will especially include perceptions of the candidate's ethical standards and their support of the school voucher issue. This will allow us to evaluate the influence that different aspects of candidate effects have on vote choice. Specifically, we will look at candidate moral perception through the ethics variable and candidate ideology through the voucher variable. These issues are particularly salient to the Utah races in question, making them very relevant to this particular study. Should we find these variables have significant effects on vote percentage, we will confirm the second aspect of our hypothesis, that candidate qualities influence voter decisions. Party identification of the respondent and some demographic information will also be included as control variables in the study.

Case Selection

We chose to study two Utah state legislative races due to their relative visibility and salience, specifically State House District 49 and State Senate District 8. Both legislative districts are competitive. However, Utah House District 49 was not always an election-day battleground. During the 1990s, Sandy City was a republican stronghold.
From 1994 to 2000, incumbent representative Greg Curtis won easy elections and reelections. In 2000, he won with a 14 percent margin. At the two-year mark, the margin increased to 18 percent. In 2004, the political landscape changed dramatically. In the first contest between Greg Curtis and newly minted challenger Jay Seegmiller, Curtis survived with a six-point win. Seegmiller ran again in 2006, and Curtis won by a mere twenty votes (Utah Elections 2008). What changed? In the intervening years, Sandy City had been rapidly expanding. State estimates approximate an almost 7 percent population growth between 2000 and 2006 (Utah Office of Demographic and Economic Analysis 2008). Additionally, a popular democrat successfully gained control of the region’s congressional seat, winning by twenty-two points above the republican in 2006 (Utah Elections 2008). When Seegmiller announced his run against Curtis a third time in 2008, it was expected to be a very close race.

Senate District 8 is a different story. Every race since incumbent Senator Carlene Walker’s first run in 2000 has been competitive (Utah Elections 2008). Her district, while encompassing most of House District 49, also cuts into the western edge of Midvale City, a democratic stronghold (Scottriding.com 2008). The key to reelection lies in the hands of unpredictable moderate voters from both parties. Senator Walker’s 2008 reelection bid was especially interesting, because she was running against a well-known challenger, former representative in the Utah House, Karen Morgan.

Both districts have seen a shift in partisanship over the last decade. House District 49 and Senate District 8 are located in the most urban part of Utah: Salt Lake County. In the 2000 presidential election, Salt Lake County overwhelmingly voted for republican nominee George W. Bush. He took the region by 23 percent. However, in the 2008 presidential election, Barack Obama won the county by .10 percent (Utah Elections 2008). There is a large swath of voters who can be persuaded to vote for either ticket, and both parties work hard to control the capital county.

We collected data by sampling voters on election day in an exit poll. Volunteers from seven Utah colleges solicited voters as they left the polling place to participate in the survey. Respondents were asked a series of questions about campaign interactions, perceptions of candidates, and vote choice. Typical demographic measures were also collected. Exact question wording may be found in Appendix A. Our response rate was near 60 percent, but due to various election day complications, our sample size in both districts was just under three hundred observations. Despite low sample size, these data accurately predict the election results within four percentage points, so we believe the other measurements are helpful in analyzing the individual races.

Results

Statewide

Table 1: Legislative Vote by Party Identification/Statewide Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Candidate</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96 percent</td>
<td>52 percent</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Candidate</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
<td>48 percent</td>
<td>92 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before looking at the election results for the two specific legislative districts, we evaluated the statewide legislative vote. The exit poll asked voters for their party identification and which party’s candidate they voted for in the state legislative election. As Table 1 shows, statewide results showed that most voters followed party lines. Thus, as we have stated earlier, partisan identification remains the major deciding factor in state legislative elections. However, our further analysis explores the effects of other factors, like campaign and candidate effects, on specific election outcomes.

**Greg Curtis vs. Jay Seegmiller**

To evaluate the state House race between republican incumbent Greg Curtis and democratic challenger Jay Seegmiller, we used a multivariate logistical model regressing democratic vote choice on various campaign and candidate effect independent variables. The results are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Coefficient (robust standard error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard of Seegmiller</td>
<td>2.7* (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Seegmiller Literature</td>
<td>0 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Seegmiller</td>
<td>0.8 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-1.86 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2.4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of Curtis</td>
<td>-3.7** (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Curtis Literature</td>
<td>1.5 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Curtis</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is more ethical? (1=Seegmiller, 0=Curtis)</td>
<td>4.5** (0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Summary Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.3** (1.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable is binary vote coded as 1 for Seegmiller, 0 for Curtis. The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the *5 percent level or **1 percent significance level using a two-sided test. Data from the Utah Colleges Exit Poll.

In this model, three phenomena stand out as particularly interesting. First, partisan identification is not significant in this race when we control for campaign effects and candidate attributes. That is a significant find, since most political decisions are heavily influenced by the voter’s party affiliation. To better understand that effect, we examined the data and found that 12 percent of the voters who cast a ballot for Seegmiller had also voted for Republican presidential nominee John McCain. A large proportion of republicans crossed over and voted for the democrat in the local race. This switch was not done in ignorance. Of those crossover voters,
a high proportion identified Curtis as the more experienced candidate. However, 94 percent named Seegmiller as the more ethical politician. No party has a monopoly on ethical behavior, and, in this case, ethics triumphed over partisan issues.

That leads us to our second interesting find: candidate attributes, especially perceptions of personal ethics, were a large determining factor in this race overall. A prediction test indicates that Republican voters who viewed Seegmiller as more ethical than Curtis were 58 percent more likely to vote for the Democratic candidate. This aspect of the model is so strong that it overrides the dominant vote choice mantra that partisan identification trumps all other factors. This confirms that voters were paying attention to this race but refutes the portion of our hypothesis that states that partisan identification is always an important factor in these races. In an exceptional race, where a candidate deviates from party norms, personal attributes become particularly important.

Finally, there was a presidential coattail effect for the Democrat in context of the national Democratic landslide. Those who voted for Obama were much more likely to vote for Seegmiller over Curtis. Originally, we assumed this variable would be strongly correlated with party identification, perhaps skewing the regression. However, the party identification variables are not significant even when we leave the Obama vote variable out of the regression.

**Carlene Walker vs. Karen Morgan**

To evaluate the state Senate race between Republican incumbent Carlene Walker and Democratic challenger Karen Morgan, we used a model nearly identical to the one evaluating the Curtis and Seegmiller House race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Coefficient (robust standard error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard of Morgan</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Morgan Literature</td>
<td>1.3** (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Morgan</td>
<td>1.8** (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-2.1** (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1.7** (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of Walker</td>
<td>-2** (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Walker Literature</td>
<td>-0.1 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Walker</td>
<td>-1.9** (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support School Vouchers</td>
<td>-0.8* (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for Obama</td>
<td>1.1* (0.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Summary Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This is a logistical regression, so interpretation of individual coefficients is not straightforward. Dependent variable is binary vote coded as 1 for Morgan, 0 for Walker. The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the *5 percent level or **1 percent significance level using a two-sided test. Data from the Utah Colleges Exit Poll.
The dependent variable, as explained before, was a binary variable for whether the respondent voted for Karen Morgan or not, with one for yes and zero for no. We used a logistic regression model to estimate the effects our various descriptive variables had on the probability someone would vote for Morgan. We found significant positive coefficients on the variables for whether the voter had received literature or met Morgan, for whether the respondent was a democrat, and for whether the respondent also voted for Barack Obama. We found significant negative coefficients for the respondent being a republican, for whether the voter had heard of or met Walker, and for the respondent being in favor of vouchers. Thus, it appears that people who were democrats, who received campaign literature from, or who had met Morgan, were more likely to vote for her. On the other hand, people who were republicans, who had met or heard of Walker, or who were in favor of school vouchers, were less likely to vote for Morgan.

We argue that these results make two significant contributions to our study. The first major point is that party identification has a substantial impact on this race, even though this particular Senate district has a reputation as a “swing” area. Clearly, the respondents’ party identification had a significant influence on the probability that they would vote for Morgan, with democrats being much more likely to vote for her and republicans much less. Though we hypothesize that campaign and candidate factors influence elections, it is clear that partisan identification remains the primary influencing factor in vote choice, and the other factors are secondary, especially among strong partisans. We also see those who voted for Barack Obama were more likely to vote for Morgan as well, suggesting Obama may have had a coattail effect on this election. This suggests those who identified with or at least voted for Barack Obama, regardless of party identification, were more willing to vote for another democrat, Karen Morgan. Thus, it appears partisan effects, even those from outside of this particular race, played an important role in vote choice in this district.

Our other important conclusion is that despite the influence of partisanship, campaign effects likely had a real impact on this election. We see that those who received literature from or met Morgan were much more likely to vote for her, with our data showing positive coefficients significant at the 1 percent level. Receipt of campaign literature and candidate contact are two of our important variables for measuring campaign effects, making a real case that Morgan’s campaign was at least somewhat successful at persuading voters in her favor. We also see people who had heard of or met Walker were significantly less likely to vote for Morgan, meaning Walker’s campaign also had some favorable effects for her. In such a vigorously contested race, literature, canvassing, and other campaign efforts were likely quite prevalent, and the data suggests these efforts were not in vain.

Furthermore, it appears the campaigns were successful at making school vouchers an important issue in the election. We found a significant negative coefficient for the school voucher binary variable, telling us those who were in favor of vouchers were substantially less likely to vote for Morgan. Thus, it appears Morgan was effectively associated with being against vouchers, and Walker was profiled as pro-voucher.
Though our coefficient shows a negative effect on the Morgan vote for pro-voucher voters, it may be this association actually hurt Walker in the end. Exit poll data showed that 48.28 percent of republican respondents were against school vouchers. Thus, it seems likely that some of these republicans who were against vouchers chose to vote for Morgan instead of Walker.

To explore this possibility, we predicted the change in probability of voting for Morgan between a pro-voucher and an anti-voucher republican. We found that an anti-voucher republican was over 18 percent more likely to vote for Morgan than a pro-voucher republican. This makes the case that vouchers were a substantial issue in this election—important enough that people were willing to cross party lines to vote against it. With such a large proportion of republicans in opposition to vouchers, this may have been a critical deciding factor in this close election. Likely, vouchers became a large issue because of the campaigns and the efforts to publicize issue differences between the candidates, and it appears to have become one of the significant deciding factors in the election. Following our logic that campaigns influence state legislative elections, it seems this potent voucher issue, a salient campaign effect, had a real influence on the outcome of the election, confirming our hypothesis that campaign and candidate effects do affect vote choice.

*Figure 1: Republican Views on Utah Voucher Legislation in Senate District 8*

Another interesting topic to address for both the Curtis/Seegmiller and Walker/Morgan races deals with campaign finances. Since we are only looking at vote choice in one election, it was not possible for us to include campaign data spending in our regression model. However, it is interesting to look at the differences in spending between the various candidates. Looking at the comparison between Curtis and Seegmiller spending (below), we see that Curtis spent over twelve thousand dollars
more than Seegmiller on the election, but still lost by a substantial margin. This is further evidence that effects besides partisanship and campaign spending—in this case, specific candidate perceptions—had a large impact on voter choice.

*Figure 2: Candidate Spending in the 2008 General Election in Utah House District 49*

Looking at the comparison between Walker and Morgan’s spending (below), we see an even larger disparity. Incumbent Walker spent $90,191.20, compared to $43,073.36 from challenger Morgan. Though Walker’s spending more than doubled

*Figure 3: Candidate Spending in the 2008 General Election in Utah Senate District 8*
her opponent's, Morgan still won the race with 52 percent of the vote, compared to Walker's 46 percent. This further confirms our hypothesis that factors besides the oft-mentioned party identification and candidate spending factors clearly influence election outcomes, even in local state legislative elections like these.

**Limitations**

Though we have sought to build the most robust model possible, significant limitations affect the validity of our study. As our data is solely from the 2008 Utah general election, it may not have broad applications across other states. Behaviorally and demographically, Utah is quite different from many other states; data from Utah voters may not be representative of national voters. However, our argument that voters do consider many factors in state legislative vote choice is a compelling one that should be applied to a broad selection of states. As we stated before, our exit poll data has a fairly low number of observations, which results in higher standard errors than we would prefer. However, the data are still sufficient for making accurate predictions. Furthermore, our data are not historical and only contain information for the 2008 election. A study of vote choice over several elections would likely give a more accurate indication of how different factors truly influence voter decisions. Finally, the two legislative districts in our case study are not highly representative of the general Utah population. Both are swing districts with a higher proportion of democratic voters than the Utah norm. Also, both races were fairly high profile, competitive, and charged with issues such as school vouchers and corruption. There may have been more voter attention to these races than is common for the usual Utah election. However, our theoretical framework focuses on elections that break partisan norms and our hypothesis was specifically directed at these two interesting elections. Our significant results beg the question: How many other state legislative elections “break the norm,” and what influences voter choice in these races?

**Conclusion**

Clearly, much work remains to be done in the state legislative sphere. With their power to influence citizens’ lives, it is surprising that such little effort has been made to understand state legislative election dynamics. Through our study, we sought to determine the factors that influence voter decisions in state legislature elections. Though party identification remains the dominant factor in explaining state legislative decisions, we find that campaign and candidate effects do influence voter decisions, especially in highly contested elections or when candidates break partisan norms. Specifically, we found robust evidence that corruption allegations significantly influenced the Curtis/Seegmiller race, and many voters’ perceptions of Curtis as corrupt caused them to vote for Seegmiller, even when this meant voting outside of their party. We also found significant evidence the voucher issue was salient to the Walker/Morgan competition, and many voters may have based their decisions on this issue, again crossing party lines in certain situations. We also found significant effects for whether voters had met, heard of, or received literature from the candidates in question. We quite confidently assert that candidate and campaign
effects influenced the outcomes of these elections. Though only focused on one Utah state legislative election, our analysis suggests legislative vote choice is a relevant area that should be explored by further research.
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APPENDIX OF SURVEY QUESTIONS

(Identical questions were used for the Curtis/Seegmiller race with the names changed)

In today's election for Utah State Senate, did you vote for
1. Karen W. Morgan, Democrat
2. Carlene M. Walker, Republican
3. Someone else

Thinking about the Morgan/Walker State Senate race, please mark all that apply:
a. I have heard of this candidate.
b. I have received campaign literature from this candidate.
c. I have personally met this candidate.

For each of the following statements, please indicate whether it best describes Karen Morgan or Carlene Walker. Please mark only one box per line.
a. Has the better experience to be a representative.
b. Has higher personal and ethical standards.
c. Has a better personality and temperament to be a representative.
d. Can be trusted to put our district's interests above personal interests.
e. Shares my values.

Some people in Utah had a race for the Utah State Senate. If you had a race for the Utah State Senate, did you vote for the
1. Democratic Candidate
2. Republican Candidate
3. I decided not to vote in that race
4. There wasn't a race for the Utah State Senate on my ballot
5. Don't know / Can't remember

In today's election for Utah's House of Representatives, did you vote for the
1. Democratic Candidate
2. Republican Candidate
3. I decided not to vote in that race
4. Don't know / Can't remember