



AP VOTECAST

Assessing AP VoteCast 2022

APRIL 17, 2023

For more information, contact:

David Scott
Deputy Managing Editor/
Operations
The Associated Press
200 Liberty Street, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10281
(212) 621-7369

Trevor Tompson
Senior Vice President
NORC at the University of Chicago
55 East Monroe Street, 30th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 759-4000



Table of Contents

AP VoteCast 2022 Executive Summary1

VoteCast 2022 Methodology Overview2

 Sampling and Data Collection Approach4

 Probability-Based Registered Voter Sample4

 Nonprobability Sample5

 AmeriSpeak Sample5

 Weighting Approach6

Innovations Applied in 20227

Summary of Election Results11

Further Research11

Appendix I: Likely Voter Models for 2022 and Summary of Results13

 Questions Used for Likely Voter Model13

 Specifications for Likely Voter Models15

Appendix II: Vote Choice Estimates: 2022 Midterm Elections16

AP VoteCast 2022 Executive Summary

AP VoteCast is a modern, innovative survey of the American electorate conducted in all 50 states. VoteCast extends beyond the traditional battleground states to capture the full picture of the American electorate and helps tell the whole story of the American democracy. In every state with a Senate or gubernatorial election, VoteCast captures the opinions of both people who vote and registered voters who decided not to cast a ballot. With an extensive sample size, VoteCast provides deep insight into representative subsets of the population and captures opinions on a wide range of topics, from health care and climate to economics and the state of democracy.

VoteCast is also designed to evolve with the changing nature of elections to meet voters where they are. Because VoteCast is not based on in-person interviews at the polling booth, its adaptive methodology has accurately captured voter sentiment as the number of early, absentee, and mail ballots has fluctuated from 40% in 2018, to 72% in 2020, and about half in 2022.

Taken together, this means that VoteCast delivers a broader portrait of the American electorate than any other election survey.

VoteCast was developed by NORC at the University of Chicago and The Associated Press—along with partners including Fox News—to provide a new approach to understanding elections. VoteCast debuted successfully for the 2018 midterm elections after years of testing and was conducted again in the 2020 Democratic primaries, 2020 presidential election, 2020 special elections in Georgia, and the 2021 gubernatorial election in Virginia.¹ Using a random, probability-based sample of registered voters to carefully calibrate a very large sample from opt-in, online panels, VoteCast delivers the best of both methods: the accuracy of probability-based surveys combined with the scale provided by an opt-in survey that interviews tens of thousands of people quickly.

AP and NORC are committed to transparency of VoteCast's methods and results and the continual improvement of the VoteCast methodology over time. Leading into the 2022 Midterm Elections, NORC and The AP invested in extensive research to further improve VoteCast and build upon its successes. This report provides the results of a thorough assessment of VoteCast's performance in the 2022 midterm elections. Some highlights include:

- Completed interviews with more than 120,000 registered voters in just nine days leading up to the election;

¹ <https://apnorc.org/projects/ap-votecast/>

- Provided estimates of the electorate nationally and in 48 states, including all 45 states with Senate or gubernatorial races plus Mississippi, New Jersey, and Virginia;
- Correctly projected the winner in 97% of Senate and gubernatorial elections at 5 p.m. on Election Day, which is the critical time for making editorial decisions;
- The estimate of the national House vote at 5 p.m. on Election Day had a 1.3 percentage point advantage for Republican candidates over Democratic candidates, and the final vote count had a 2.8 percentage point advantage for Republican candidates.
- On average, the survey did not demonstrate widespread partisan bias. The survey overestimated the proportion of the electorate reporting to vote for a third party candidate by 4.0 percentage points, underestimated Democratic candidates' share of the vote by 1.3 percentage points, and underestimated the share of the vote for Republican candidates by 2.8 percentage points.

Because of their confidence in VoteCast, The Associated Press and Fox News used the data both to explain the mood of the electorate in their election-night coverage and to inform their race-calling decisions.

VoteCast 2022 Methodology Overview

The VoteCast midterm election survey of 120,896 registered voters nationwide was conducted between October 31st and November 8th, 2022, concluding as polls closed on Election Day.² The survey provided estimates of 35 Senate elections, 36 gubernatorial elections, 4 ballot initiatives, the national House vote, and the opinions of both voters and non-voters nationwide. The AP and Fox News—as well as other customers including the Kaiser Family Foundation—used VoteCast for critical coverage on election night and beyond.

To do this, VoteCast combined three different sample types: probability-based state samples drawn from voter files, nonprobability state samples from online panels, and a national probability-based sample from NORC's AmeriSpeak panel.

The target number of completed interviews varied by state. Table 1 includes the number of completed interviews in each state and for the national sample. In some states that did not have a statewide election in 2022 (Delaware and West Virginia), interviews contributed to national estimates only. The state surveys included 26,856 probability interviews from state voter files completed online (22,457) and via telephone (4,399), 89,764 nonprobability interviews completed online, and the nationally representative AmeriSpeak survey of 4,276 registered voters.

² Registered voters in the District of Columbia were not included. The survey was available in English and Spanish.

Table 1: VoteCast 2022 Completed Interview Counts

State	Total Interviews	Probability Interviews	Nonprobability Interviews	Number of Voters	Number of Non-Voters
National	120,896	31,132 ³	89,764	94,296	26,600
Alaska	1,145	817	328	1,037	108
Alabama	2,548	438	2,110	1,905	643
Arkansas	2,767	721	2,046	2,003	764
Arizona	4,483	1,019	3,464	3,230	1,253
California	4,105	668	3,437	3,396	709
Colorado	4,053	676	3,377	2,728	1,325
Connecticut	2,550	340	2,210	1,887	663
Delaware	305	-	305	246	59
Florida	4,297	1,176	3,121	3,379	918
Georgia	4,213	851	3,362	3,234	979
Hawaii	1,175	675	500	881	294
Iowa	2,743	729	2,014	2,064	679
Idaho	1,384	523	861	1,049	335
Illinois	2,497	337	2,160	2,071	426
Indiana	2,519	367	2,152	1,801	718
Kansas	2,332	598	1,734	1,773	559
Kentucky	2,441	414	2,027	1,770	671
Louisiana	2,504	458	2,046	1,816	688
Massachusetts	2,539	293	2,246	2,076	463
Maryland	2,437	354	2,083	1,926	511
Maine	1,475	785	690	1,265	210
Michigan	4,066	941	3,125	3,244	822
Minnesota	3,630	697	2,933	2,904	726
Missouri	2,472	458	2,014	1,845	627
Mississippi	886	562	324	772	114
Montana	887	564	323	749	138
North Carolina	4,080	762	3,318	3,175	905
North Dakota	714	411	303	622	92
Nebraska	1,061	-	1,061	700	361
New Hampshire	1,463	640	823	1,248	215
New Jersey	627	309	318	544	83
New Mexico	1,480	309	1,171	1,042	438

³ The national probability total includes both the AmeriSpeak sample and the probability state survey sample.

State	Total Interviews	Probability Interviews	Nonprobability Interviews	Number of Voters	Number of Non-Voters
Nevada	2,669	633	2,036	2,190	479
New York	3,953	674	3,279	3,156	797
Ohio	4,029	764	3,265	3,152	877
Oklahoma	1,039	-	1,039	697	342
Oregon	2,622	266	2,356	2,138	484
Pennsylvania	3,959	771	3,188	3,179	780
Rhode Island	786	271	515	619	167
South Carolina	3,705	947	2,758	2,830	875
South Dakota	694	346	348	597	97
Tennessee	1,054	-	1,054	741	313
Texas	4,368	1,167	3,201	3,420	948
Utah	2,453	650	1,803	1,904	549
Virginia	679	351	328	602	77
Vermont	833	510	323	682	151
Washington	2,650	326	2,324	2,169	481
Wisconsin	4,250	832	3,418	3,290	960
West Virginia	258	-	258	198	60
Wyoming	741	456	285	638	103

Sampling and Data Collection Approach

Probability-Based Registered Voter Sample

In each of the 45 states in which VoteCast included a probability-based sample, NORC obtained a sample of registered voters from Catalist LLC's registered voter database. This database included demographic information, as well as addresses and phone numbers for registered voters, allowing potential respondents to be contacted via mail⁴ and telephone. The sample was stratified by state, a four-level partisanship variable, and a five-level predicted response propensity variable. In states with a large non-white voter population, race and ethnicity was also a stratifying factor. In addition, NORC attempted to match sampled records to a registered voter database maintained by L2, which provided additional phone numbers and demographic information. After the matching, NORC had phone numbers for 91% of sampled records, including cell phone numbers for 91% of records with a phone number.

⁴ For all registered voter file cases flagged as likely Hispanic households, the postcards had both English and Spanish text introducing the survey and explaining how to complete it.

Prior to dialing, all probability sample records were mailed a postcard inviting them to complete the survey either online using a unique PIN or via telephone by calling a toll-free number. Postcards were addressed by name to the sampled registered voter if that individual was under age 35; postcards were addressed to “[STATE] Registered Voter” in all other cases. Additional outbound dialing was conducted for sampled records in the two lowest predicted response propensity quintiles who had not already responded online. Telephone interviews were conducted with the adult who answered the phone. Both online and telephone respondents provided confirmation of registered voter status in the state. The overall response rate for the probability sample was 2.4% (AAPOR Response Rate 3).

Nonprobability Sample

Nonprobability participants were provided by Dynata, Cint, and Prodege, including members of their third-party panels. Digital fingerprint software and panel-level ID validation was used to prevent respondents from completing the VoteCast survey multiple times. Nonprobability respondents provided confirmation of registered voter status in the state.

AmeriSpeak Sample

During the initial recruitment phase of the AmeriSpeak panel, randomly selected U.S. households were sampled with a known, non-zero probability of selection from the NORC National Sample Frame, supplemented by the USPS Delivery Sequence File, and then contacted by U.S. mail, email, telephone and field interviewers (face-to-face). The panel provides sample coverage of approximately 97% of the U.S. household population. Those excluded from the sample include people with P.O. Box-only addresses, some addresses not listed in the USPS Delivery Sequence File, and some newly constructed dwellings. AmeriSpeak panelists provided confirmation of registered voter status in the state.

A sample of registered voters was selected from the AmeriSpeak Panel using sampling strata based on age, race/Hispanic ethnicity, education, gender, and 2020 vote. The size of the selected sample per sampling stratum was determined by the population distribution for each stratum. In addition, sample selection took into account expected differential survey completion rate by group so that the set of panel members with a completed interview was a representative sample of the target population of registered voters. If a panel household had more than one active adult panel member, only one adult in the household was eligible for selection (random within-household sampling). The overall AmeriSpeak response rate was 9.7% (AAPOR Response Rate 3). VoteCast used likely voter screening to categorize all registered voters as voters or non-voters. Respondents who indicated they had already voted were categorized as voters. All others were screened based on self-reported likelihood to vote, prior vote history, and mail ballot rules in the state. A full description of the models is included in Appendix 1.

Weighting Approach

VoteCast employed a four-step weighting approach that combined the probability sample with the nonprobability sample and refined estimates at a subregional level within each state.

First, weights were constructed separately for the probability sample (when available) and the nonprobability sample for each state survey. These weights were adjusted to population totals to correct for demographic imbalances of the responding sample compared to the population of registered voters in each state. The adjustment targets were derived from a combination of data from the U.S. Census Bureau's November 2020 Current Population Survey Voting and Registration Supplement, Catalist's voter file, and the Census Bureau's 2021 American Community Survey. The categories used for weighting were collapsed in some states based on the sample sizes and population distributions. The variables used included sex, age, race/ethnicity, education, housing tenure, and region.

Prior to adjusting to population totals, the probability-based registered voter list sample weights were adjusted for differential non-response by a four-level partisanship model score variable, a five-level predicted response propensity variable, and Catalist voter file race/ethnicity.

Second, calibration variables were included in weighting for both the probability and nonprobability samples to ensure the nonprobability sample was similar to the probability sample in regard to variables that were predictive of vote choice that could not be fully captured through demographic adjustments.

In 2022, the calibration benchmarks were based on estimates from a combination of national and state linear regression models that made predictions for registered voters at the state-level for Party ID (Democrat, Independent, Republican). The models for the calibration variables were run using an instrumental calibration approach. Models included individual-level variables such as sex, age, race/ethnicity, education, and 2020 presidential vote.

Third, all respondents in each state were weighted to improve estimates for substate geographic regions. This weight combined the weighted probability sample (if available) and the nonprobability sample and then used a small area model to improve the estimate within subregions of a state. We created between 2 and 28 regions (county groupings) for each state based on vote choice in previous elections and the number of expected survey completes in each county. We then used these groupings to generate model-based estimates of vote choice among likely voters. The small domain model was applied to the Senate or gubernatorial election or overall House vote in each state.

There were two models: 1) predicting the percent of vote share that goes for either of the two major parties' candidates, and 2) predicting the percent of major party vote share that goes for the Democratic/Republican candidate. The variables used as potential covariates in the model

included county-level variables related to previous election results, population density, housing type, income, age, education, and race/ethnicity. We included the variables most highly correlated with vote among each of following sets of variables: 1) past vote choice, 2) measure of socioeconomic status, 3) demographic or geographic measure.

Fourth, the survey results were weighted to the certified vote count following the completion of the election. The Senate, governor, or House vote results were used as benchmarks for weighting respondents who were voters. This weighting was done in 2-28 substate regions within each state.

For national estimates, the 50 state surveys and the AmeriSpeak survey were weighted separately and then combined into a survey representative of voters in all 50 states.

The AmeriSpeak survey received a nonresponse-adjusted weight that was then adjusted to national totals for registered voters derived from the U.S. Census Bureau's November 2020 Current Population Survey Voting and Registration Supplement, the Catalist voter file, and the Census Bureau's 2021 American Community Survey. The state surveys were further adjusted to represent their appropriate proportion of the registered voter population for the country and combined with the AmeriSpeak survey. After all votes were counted and certified, the national data file was adjusted to match the vote for Senate, governor, or House within each state.

A detailed methodology statement and public use data file is available at <https://apnorc.org/projects/ap-votecast-2022>.

Innovations Applied in 2022

Following the 2020 election, VoteCast experimented with several options to improve sample representativeness given the systematic underestimation of Republican vote share experienced throughout the industry.

Tested in the 2020 Georgia Senate Run-off Election and applied for the full sample starting with the 2021 Virginia Gubernatorial Election, VoteCast updated its recruitment materials for the probability sample to include additional media sponsorship branding. In the recruitment materials in 2022, Fox News was featured prominently along with AP on materials for sampled voters flagged as Republicans on the voter file, whereas the branding was mentioned minimally for sampled voters flagged as Democrats on the voter file. This change was made based on the results from the experiment in Georgia, along with follow-up testing.

The AP- and Fox-prominent branding increased the response rate among registered voters flagged as Republicans on the voter file sample frame. Those Republicans also voted for Republican candidates more often and held more conservative attitudes. In the 2020

experiment, the response yield on VoteCast for the Georgia run-off election among Republican flagged voters on the frame was 2.6% for the AP- and Fox-prominent postcard versus 2.1% for the AP- and Fox-minimal postcard. The AP- and Fox-prominent version of the postcard also increased the share of Republicans who were voting for Republican candidates. In the Senate race between Ossoff (D) and Purdue (R), 81% of the Republican respondents to the AP Fox-prominent postcard voted for Purdue, compared to 73% in the AP Fox-minimal condition.

VoteCast continued to improve the calibration approach used to combine the probability and nonprobability samples in the weighting. In 2022, the approach was updated to generate party identification calibration benchmarks based on estimates from a combination of national and state linear regression models that made predictions for registered voters at the state level for Party ID (Democrat, Independent, Republican). The models for the calibration variables were run using an instrumental calibration approach. Models included individual-level variables such as sex, age, race/ethnicity, education, and 2020 presidential vote. The calibration of the probability and nonprobability sample using the model estimates of partisanship tended to boost Republican vote share, which improved the overall estimates.

VoteCast also implemented several experiments using the registered voter list probability sample in the 2022 survey with the goal of boosting the response rates overall and also boosting representation of Hispanic voters. Those experiments are described below.

With the increasing prevalence of QR codes in recent years, VoteCast explored whether adding a QR code to the invitation postcard would improve response rates. Respondents who received English-only postcards were randomly assigned to one of two groups: 1) a postcard with only the survey URL, or 2) a postcard containing a QR code directing them to the survey in addition to the survey URL.

As shown in Table 2, contrary to expectations, the web yield rate was 8% lower when a QR code was included. Using the design weights, 2.4% of those who did not receive a QR code completed the survey on the web, compared to 2.2% of those who did receive a QR code. The QR code did not increase the web yield rate among any age group, gender, race/ethnicity, or partisanship group, though the QR code performed relatively better for young adults compared to older adults. Among those who completed the survey, there were not significant differences in political attitudes between those who received the QR code and those who did not receive the QR code when controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and partisanship.

Table 2: Design-Weighted Web Yield Rates by Sample Frame Variables and the Presence or Absence of a QR Code

	No QR Code		QR Code		Difference		
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	P-Value
Overall	2.44%	0.033	2.22%	0.032	-0.22	0.046	0.000
Age							
18-29	1.49%	0.058	1.49%	0.055	0.00	0.080	0.481
30-44	1.92%	0.055	1.84%	0.056	-0.08	0.079	0.163
45-64	2.55%	0.060	2.48%	0.058	-0.07	0.084	0.197
65+	3.44%	0.084	2.72%	0.075	-0.72	0.112	0.000
Sex							
Male	2.92%	0.053	2.63%	0.050	-0.29	0.073	0.000
Female	2.77%	0.049	2.46%	0.046	-0.31	0.067	0.000
Race							
Non-Hispanic White	2.77%	0.040	2.51%	0.038	-0.26	0.056	0.000
Non-Hispanic Black	0.99%	0.050	0.90%	0.046	-0.09	0.068	0.088
Non-Hispanic Other	1.56%	0.095	1.53%	0.094	-0.03	0.134	0.416
Partisanship Score							
Strong Republican	3.15%	0.076	2.79%	0.070	-0.36	0.103	0.000
Lean Republican	2.09%	0.052	1.97%	0.050	-0.13	0.073	0.042
Lean Democrat	1.81%	0.050	1.76%	0.050	-0.05	0.070	0.233
Strong Democrat	2.47%	0.067	2.19%	0.063	-0.28	0.092	0.001

VoteCast also conducted a mail recruitment experiment to better reach Hispanic registered voters. The experiment featured more than 92,000 mailings across three key states with higher concentrations of Hispanic voters: Arizona, Florida, and Texas. Hispanic registered voters were randomly assigned into one of four different conditions that varied by the type of mailing and branding used, as well as a targeted messaging approach that mentioned key topics that other surveys have found are important to Hispanic voters.

- **Control group: Standard bilingual postcard.** These postcards used VoteCast’s standard approach for outreach to sample registered voters who are believed to be Hispanic based on the sample frame data. The postcards were the same as the standard recruitment postcards; however, they included a brief paragraph in Spanish in the bottom right corner of the postcard that highlighted the purpose of the survey, who was conducting the survey, the incentive, and branding of the study. The postcards had AP and Fox News branding.

- **Treatment group 1: Letter that includes Univision branding.** This version differed from the control group in 3 major ways: 1) It was a letter instead of a postcard. This allowed it to include the name of the registered voter and have identical English and Spanish versions of the body of the letter; 2) This version included a targeting messaging approach that highlighted key topics for Hispanic voters such as, “the economy, immigration, and religion”; and 3) It included a new branding partner: Univision.
- **Treatment group 2: Letter with standard AP and Fox News branding.** This version was similar to the first treatment group in that it used a letter addressed to the individual registered voter and used the targeted message approach with the same key topics. However, this letter had standard AP and Fox News branding but not Univision branding.
- **Treatment group 3: Postcard with Univision branding.** This version was similar to the control group version in that the main text was in English and it included the brief paragraph in the bottom corner in Spanish. However, this version included the Univision branding. The postcard highlighted the AP, Fox News, and Univision brands.

The results of the experiment showed that the two letter groups (Treatment 1 and Treatment 2) had yield rates more than 50% higher than the control group, while the postcard with Univision branding (Treatment 3) had no significant impact on the yield compared to the control group.

Table 3: Design-Weighted Web Yield Rates by Hispanic Recruitment Experimental Condition

Mailing	Yield Rate	95% Lower Bound	95% Upper Bound	Rank
Control, Bilingual Postcards	1.20%	1.08%	1.34%	3
T1 Univision Letter	1.98%	1.80%	2.18%	1
T2 Letter	1.90%	1.72%	2.09%	2
T3 Univision Postcard	1.11%	0.98%	1.26%	4

The experimental treatment groups attracted a younger, more non-college educated, and self-identifying Hispanic set of respondents. In particular, the two letter conditions led to significantly more respondents 18-29 years old and fewer respondents 65 and older. All three treatment groups led to a higher percentage of respondents who said they were Hispanic and a higher percentage of respondents who reported not having a college degree than the control group.

	Control (n=337)	T1 Univision Letter (n=423)	T2 Letter (n=406)	T3 Univision Postcard (n=237)
Education Distribution of Completes				
No college	49.3%	60.8%	64.0%	62.5%
College	50.5%	39.2%	36.0%	37.6%

Summary of Election Results

As of the critical 5 p.m. ET time for editorial decisions on Election Day, VoteCast was correctly predicting the winner of 97% of the 71 Senate and gubernatorial races in 2022.

The estimate of the national House vote at 5 p.m. on Election Day had a 1.3 percentage point advantage for Republican candidates over Democratic candidates, and the final vote count had a 2.8 percentage point advantage for Republican candidates.

On average, the survey underestimated Democratic candidates' share of the vote by 1.3 percentage points and also underestimated the share of the vote for Republican candidates by 2.8 percentage points. VoteCast estimates were within a percentage point of the final winner's vote margin in 7 races including Colorado Senate and governor, Iowa Senate and governor, Ohio governor, and Oklahoma governor. In contrast, there were 26 races in which the survey estimate of the winner's margin was more than 5 percentage points different than the final result, but none were calling the winner incorrectly.

A detailed table of vote choice estimates is included in Appendix 2.

Further Research

AP VoteCast is committed to continuous assessment and research to improve the methodology and product. Based on the results from the 2022 VoteCast experience, we plan to undertake the following additional research to improve the survey for future election cycles:

- Explore potential refinements to the calibration and small area modeling approaches to improve accuracy and reduce variability of the error across states.

- Continue experimenting with approaches for recruitment materials to boost overall response and response among low-propensity subgroups such as racial and ethnic minority groups, young voters, lower education voters, weaker partisans, and infrequent voters.
- Assess the potential of including additional non-demographic variables at various stages of the weighting, including behaviors such as partisan primary election voting history, values such as religiousity, and attitudes such as media perceptions.
- Conduct a voter validation study once all state voter files and the 2022 CPS Voter supplement data are available to assess VoteCast’s estimates of the composition of the electorate.

AP VoteCast is also committed to full transparency. A complete public use data file from the 2022 midterm election—along with a methodology statement and codebook—is available at: <https://apnorc.org/projects/ap-votecast-2022>.

Appendix I: Likely Voter Models for 2022 and Summary of Results

Questions Used for Likely Voter Model

LVB.

There are a range of reasons why people do or do not vote. We're interested in hearing from voters and non-voters. How likely are you to vote in the election?

RESPONSE OPTIONS:

1. Definitely will vote
2. Probably will vote
3. Probably will not vote
4. Definitely will not vote
5. I already voted

WVA.

[SHOW IF LVB=5 AND STATENAM<>OREGON OR (LVB=5 AND ELECTIONDAY=1 AND NOINEARLYVOT=0)]

[IF LVB=5 AND STATENAM<>OREGON AND ELECTIONDAY=1 AND NOINEARLYVOT=1, THEN FILL WVA=2]

Which best describes how you voted?

RESPONSE OPTIONS:

1. [IF STATE HAS EARLY IN PERSON VOTING] I voted in person at a polling place BEFORE Election Day
2. I voted by mail BEFORE Election Day
3. [IF ELECTION DAY] I voted in person at a polling place TODAY
4. [IF ELECTION DAY] I voted by mail TODAY

WVB.

[SHOW IF LVB=1, 2, 3 AND STATENAM<>OREGON]

If you do vote in this election, how will you cast your ballot?

RESPONSE OPTIONS:

1. [IF BEFORE ELECTION DAY] I will vote by mail
 2. [IF BEFORE ELECTION DAY AND STATE HAS EARLY IN PERSON VOTING] I will vote in person before Election Day
 3. [IF BEFORE ELECTION DAY] I will vote in person at a polling place on Election Day
 4. [ELECTION DAY] I will vote by mail today
 5. [ELECTION DAY] I will vote in person at a polling place today
-

QPVVOTE20.

What about voting in the 2020 election for president? Which one of the following statements best describes you?

RESPONSE OPTIONS:

1. I did not vote in the 2020 presidential election.
 2. I thought about voting in the 2020 presidential election but didn't.
 3. I usually vote, but I didn't in the 2020 presidential election.
 4. I'm sure I voted.
-

QPVVOTE18.

What about voting in the 2018 midterm election? Which one of the following statements best describes you?

RESPONSE OPTIONS:

1. I did not vote in the 2018 midterm election.
 2. I thought about voting in the 2018 midterm election, but didn't.
 3. I usually vote, but I didn't in the 2018 midterm election.
 4. I'm sure I voted.
-

Specifications for Likely Voter Models

LV_alt1 – Alaska, California, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Jersey, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

- Likely voters: The respondent said they will definitely vote to LVB; or
- Likely voters: The respondent said they will probably vote to LVB, and they voted in either the 2018 midterm election or they voted in the 2020 presidential election; or
- Likely voters: The respondent said they already voted to LVB.

LV_alt9 – Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- Likely voters: The respondent said they already voted to LVB and:
 - The respondent said they voted by mail before Election Day to WVA; or
 - The respondent said they voted in person before or on Election Day to WVA; or
- Likely voters: The respondent said they definitely will vote to LVB and:
 - The respondent said they will vote in person before Election Day to WVB; or
 - The respondent said they will vote in person at a polling place on Election Day to WVB; or
 - The respondent said they will vote by mail to WVB and the interview was conducted between October 31 and November 5; or
- Likely voters: The respondent said they will probably vote to LVB, and voted in either the 2018 midterm election or they voted in the 2020 presidential election, and:
 - The respondent said they will vote in person before Election Day to WVB; or
 - The respondent said they will vote in person at a polling place on Election Day to WVB; or
 - The respondent said they will vote by mail to WVB and the interview was conducted between October 31 and November 5.

Appendix II: Vote Choice Estimates: 2022 Midterm Elections

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
AK	GOV	Democratic	22	25.3	23.1
AK	GOV	Republican	57.4	52.6	55.2
AK	GOV	Other	20.6	22	21.7
AK	SEN	Democratic	12.7	19	10.4
AK	SEN	Republican	85.6	79.5	88.9
AK	SEN	Other	1.8	1.4	0.8
AL	GOV	Democratic	27.1	29.4	29.3
AL	GOV	Republican	63.2	67.4	67.1
AL	GOV	Other	9.7	3.3	3.6
AL	SEN	Democratic	29.8	30.9	30.8
AL	SEN	Republican	60.4	66.8	66.4
AL	SEN	Other	9.8	2.3	2.8
AR	GOV	Democratic	32.9	35.2	34.3
AR	GOV	Republican	62.6	63	62.4
AR	GOV	Other	4.5	1.8	3.3
AR	SEN	Democratic	30.8	31.1	30.9
AR	SEN	Republican	62.4	65.7	65.4
AR	SEN	Other	6.8	3.2	3.7
AZ	GOV	Democratic	46.4	50.3	50
AZ	GOV	Republican	49.6	49.7	49.4
AZ	GOV	Other	4	0	0.6
AZ	SEN	Democratic	47.7	51.4	51.1
AZ	SEN	Republican	46.5	46.5	46.3
AZ	SEN	Other	5.8	2.1	2.6
CA	GOV	Democratic	62.5	59.2	58.7
CA	GOV	Republican	37.5	40.8	41.3
CA	GOV	Other	0	0	0
CA	SEN	Democratic	63.4	61.1	61.1
CA	SEN	Republican	36.6	38.9	38.9
CA	SEN	Other	0	0	0
CO	GOV	Democratic	58.3	58.5	58.6
CO	GOV	Republican	37.7	39.2	39.3

⁵ Poll close estimates are the final vote choice estimate with all cases collected through poll close but prior to adjusting results to the final vote count.

⁶ Survey estimates were adjusted to match certified vote count data as of January 13, 2023.

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
CO	GOV	Other	4	2.3	2.1
CO	SEN	Democratic	55.3	55.9	55.9
CO	SEN	Republican	39.9	41.3	41.3
CO	SEN	Other	4.8	2.9	2.9
CT	GOV	Democratic	56.9	56	55.4
CT	GOV	Republican	38.3	43	43
CT	GOV	Other	4.8	1	1.6
CT	SEN	Democratic	58.9	57.5	57.2
CT	SEN	Republican	36.3	42.5	42.3
CT	SEN	Other	4.8	0	0.5
FL	GOV	Democratic	43.4	40	39.6
FL	GOV	Republican	53.6	59.4	59.1
FL	GOV	Other	3	0.7	1.3
FL	SEN	Democratic	45.7	41.4	41.3
FL	SEN	Republican	51.2	57.8	57.7
FL	SEN	Other	3.1	0.8	1.1
GA	GOV	Democratic	45.2	45.9	45.3
GA	GOV	Republican	51.5	53.4	53.6
GA	GOV	Other	3.4	0.7	1.1
GA	SEN	Democratic	47.9	49.4	49.2
GA	SEN	Republican	46.2	48.5	48.3
GA	SEN	Other	6	2.1	2.6
HI	GOV	Democratic	61.3	63.2	63.5
HI	GOV	Republican	38.7	36.8	36.5
HI	GOV	Other	0	0	0
HI	SEN	Democratic	63.8	71.2	71.2
HI	SEN	Republican	27.7	26	26
HI	SEN	Other	6.5	2.7	1.7
IA	GOV	Democratic	37.5	39.5	39.1
IA	GOV	Republican	56.4	58.1	57.7
IA	GOV	Other	6	2.4	3.2
IA	SEN	Democratic	42.2	43.9	43.7
IA	SEN	Republican	54.3	56.1	55.8
IA	SEN	Other	3.5	0	0.5
ID	GOV	Democratic	19.8	20.3	21
ID	GOV	Republican	63	60.5	59.6
ID	GOV	Other	17.2	19.2	19.4
ID	SEN	Democratic	22.3	28.7	28.6
ID	SEN	Republican	63.5	60.7	60.4

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
ID	SEN	Other	14.2	10.6	11
IL	GOV	Democratic	57.5	54.6	54.7
IL	GOV	Republican	37.1	42.6	41.8
IL	GOV	Other	5.4	2.8	3.5
IL	SEN	Democratic	57.2	56.4	56.5
IL	SEN	Republican	37.8	41.9	41.3
IL	SEN	Other	5.1	1.7	2.2
IN	SEN	Democratic	38.9	37.9	37.7
IN	SEN	Republican	54.5	58.7	58.4
IN	SEN	Other	6.6	3.4	3.9
KS	GOV	Democratic	47.3	49.5	49.3
KS	GOV	Republican	47.2	47.4	47.1
KS	GOV	Other	5.6	3.1	3.6
KS	SEN	Democratic	34.3	36.9	37.4
KS	SEN	Republican	60.1	60.1	59.6
KS	SEN	Other	5.6	2.9	3
KY	SEN	Democratic	37.2	38.2	38
KY	SEN	Republican	59.9	61.8	61.5
KY	SEN	Other	2.9	0	0.5
LA	SEN	Democratic	34.4	22	33.4
LA	SEN	Republican	60.2	76	63.4
LA	SEN	Other	5.4	2	3.3
MA	GOV	Democratic	58.3	63.5	63.5
MA	GOV	Republican	36.9	34.9	34.5
MA	GOV	Other	4.8	1.6	2.1
MD	GOV	Democratic	61.7	64.7	63.7
MD	GOV	Republican	31.8	32.2	32.9
MD	GOV	Other	6.6	3.1	3.4
MD	SEN	Democratic	60.3	65.9	65.5
MD	SEN	Republican	34.6	34.1	34
MD	SEN	Other	5.2	0	0.5
ME	GOV	Democratic	53	55.4	55.4
ME	GOV	Republican	43.9	42.5	42.2
ME	GOV	Other	3.1	2	2.4
MI	GOV	Democratic	53.2	54.5	54.5
MI	GOV	Republican	43.2	43.9	43.9
MI	GOV	Other	3.6	1.6	1.6
MN	GOV	Democratic	54.9	52.3	52.3
MN	GOV	Republican	42.2	44.6	44.6

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
MN	GOV	Other	3	3.1	3.1
MO	SEN	Democratic	37.7	42.1	42
MO	SEN	Republican	53.6	55.5	55.2
MO	SEN	Other	8.8	2.4	2.9
NC	SEN	Democratic	46.1	47.3	47.1
NC	SEN	Republican	48	50.5	50.3
NC	SEN	Other	4.9	2.2	1.9
ND	SEN	Democratic	21.9	25	24.9
ND	SEN	Republican	59.1	56.5	56.2
ND	SEN	Other	19	18.5	18.9
NE	GOV	Democratic	38.9	36.1	36.1
NE	GOV	Republican	55.2	59.9	59.4
NE	GOV	Other	5.9	4	4.5
NH	GOV	Democratic	38.8	41.8	40.8
NH	GOV	Republican	57.9	57.3	57.6
NH	GOV	Other	3.3	0.8	1.5
NH	SEN	Democratic	51.2	53.6	53.3
NH	SEN	Republican	45.1	44.4	44.3
NH	SEN	Other	3.7	2	2.5
NM	GOV	Democratic	56.2	52	52
NM	GOV	Republican	37.6	45.6	45.6
NM	GOV	Other	6.3	2.4	2.4
NV	GOV	Democratic	44.6	47.4	47.3
NV	GOV	Republican	47.4	48.8	48.9
NV	GOV	Other	4.7	3.9	2.1
NV	SEN	Democratic	44.9	48.9	48.8
NV	SEN	Republican	47	48	48
NV	SEN	Other	4.7	3.1	1.9
NY	GOV	Democratic	55.4	52.9	52.9
NY	GOV	Republican	39.9	47.1	46.6
NY	GOV	Other	4.6	0	0.5
NY	SEN	Democratic	57.9	56.4	56.9
NY	SEN	Republican	36.1	43.2	42.2
NY	SEN	Other	6.1	0.5	1
OH	GOV	Democratic	34.2	37.2	36.4
OH	GOV	Republican	59.9	62.8	62.9
OH	GOV	Other	5.9	0	0.7
OH	SEN	Democratic	45.4	46.7	46.7
OH	SEN	Republican	48.8	53.3	52.8

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
OH	SEN	Other	5.8	0	0.5
OK	GOV	Democratic	39.3	41.8	41.5
OK	GOV	Republican	52.7	55.5	52.9
OK	GOV	Other	8	2.8	5.6
OK	SEN	Democratic	26.3	32.1	32.1
OK	SEN	Republican	66.2	64.3	64.3
OK	SEN	Other	7.5	3.6	3.6
OK	SEN-spec	Democratic	31.8	35.2	31.8
OK	SEN-spec	Republican	62.5	61.8	62.5
OK	SEN-spec	Other	5.7	3	5.7
OR	GOV	Democratic	43.6	47	47
OR	GOV	Republican	38.3	43.6	43.6
OR	GOV	Other	18.1	9.4	9.4
OR	SEN	Democratic	51.6	55.9	55.9
OR	SEN	Republican	36.6	41	40.7
OR	SEN	Other	11.8	3.1	3.4
PA	GOV	Democratic	57	56.5	56.8
PA	GOV	Republican	39	41.7	41.4
PA	GOV	Other	4	1.8	1.8
PA	SEN	Democratic	52	51.2	51.3
PA	SEN	Republican	42.8	46.3	46.3
PA	SEN	Other	5.3	2.4	2.4
RI	GOV	Democratic	54.9	58.6	58.1
RI	GOV	Republican	40.8	39.3	39
RI	GOV	Other	4.3	2.1	2.9
SC	GOV	Democratic	40	40.7	41.1
SC	GOV	Republican	54.5	58.1	57.2
SC	GOV	Other	5.5	1.2	1.8
SC	SEN	Democratic	36.8	37.1	36.9
SC	SEN	Republican	58.6	62.9	62.6
SC	SEN	Other	4.6	0	0.5
SD	GOV	Democratic	39.6	35.2	36.6
SD	GOV	Republican	54.9	62	61
SD	GOV	Other	5.5	2.9	2.4
SD	SEN	Democratic	29.9	26.2	26.2
SD	SEN	Republican	64.3	69.6	69.6
SD	SEN	Other	5.8	4.2	4.2
TN	GOV	Democratic	37.5	33.4	32.9
TN	GOV	Republican	59.6	65.8	64.9

State	Race	Party	AP VoteCast Poll Close Estimate ⁵	Actual Result (via AP Vote Count)	AP VoteCast Estimate After Final Vote Count ⁶
TN	GOV	Other	2.9	0.9	2.1
TX	GOV	Democratic	44.2	43.8	43.7
TX	GOV	Republican	51.8	54.8	54.5
TX	GOV	Other	3.2	1.4	1.5
UT	SEN	Democratic	N/A	N/A	N/A
UT	SEN	Republican	53.2	37.2	52.9
UT	SEN	Other	46.8	32.8	47.1
VT	GOV	Democratic	28.4	24.7	24.3
VT	GOV	Republican	64.7	73.1	72.1
VT	GOV	Other	6.9	2.2	3.6
VT	SEN	Democratic	65.3	69.8	68.6
VT	SEN	Republican	32.9	28.7	28.1
VT	SEN	Other	1.9	1.5	3.3
WA	SEN	Democratic	56.1	57.3	57
WA	SEN	Republican	40	42.7	42.5
WA	SEN	Other	3.9	0	0.5
WI	GOV	Democratic	47.9	51.2	51.1
WI	GOV	Republican	47.9	47.8	47.4
WI	GOV	Other	4.2	1	1.5
WI	SEN	Democratic	46.3	49.5	49.3
WI	SEN	Republican	50.8	50.5	50.3
WI	SEN	Other	2.8	0	0.5
WY	GOV	Democratic	18.7	16.8	16.7
WY	GOV	Republican	74.1	78.7	78.3
WY	GOV	Other	7.2	4.5	5