## D DATA ORBITAL <br> data expertise political intelligence.

MoE: +/- 4.18
N: 550
Duration: 4/7-4/9

Hello, I am calling from a public opinion research firm and I would like to ask you some questions. I am not trying to sell you anything and I won't be asking for a contribution of any kind. Can I please speak with [READ NAME ON LIST]?
Q) What is your gender? (Observe by voice, do not ask)

| Male | 265 | $48.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 285 | $51.8 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q) Do you vote primarily by mail or in person at the polls?

Primarily by Mail
66.6\%

Primarily in person at the polls
172
31.3\%

| Refused | 12 | $2.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q) Currently there is legislation being considered that would require voters who vote by mail to provide identification, such as a driver's license number along with their signature, prior to voting. For privacy reasons, this information would be able to be concealed. Would you support or oppose requiring those that vote-bymail to provide proof of identification prior to voting?

| Support | 350 | $63.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strongly Support | 261 | $47.5 \%$ |
| Somewhat Support | 89 | $16.1 \%$ |
| Oppose | 146 | $26.6 \%$ |
| Somewhat Oppose | 41 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Strongly Oppose | 105 | $19 \%$ |
| Undecided | 48 | $8.6 \%$ |
| Refused | 6 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

## 2 data orbital <br> data expertise political intelligence.

Q) There is another bill being considered at the legislature related to mail in voting. Under the bill, a person that does not vote by mail in 2 consecutive primary and 2 consecutive general elections may be removed from the early vote-by-mail list unless they return a notice within 30 days from the county indicating they would like to remain. If the individual fails to return the notice, they would still be registered to vote and eligible to rejoin the vote-by-mail list at anytime. Would you favor or oppose this bill as explained?

| Support | 282 | $51.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strongly Support | 201 | $36.5 \%$ |
| Somewhat Support | 81 | $14.7 \%$ |
| Oppose | 209 | $37.9 \%$ |
| Somewhat Oppose | 76 | $13.9 \%$ |
| Strongly Oppose | 132 | $24 \%$ |
| Undecided | 53 | $9.6 \%$ |
| Refused | 7 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Now, I'm going to read you a series of statements and ask if you support or oppose each one. [ROTATE ORDER OF FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS]
Q) Require all voters provide identification in order to vote

| Support | $\mathbf{4 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strongly Support | 388 | $70.5 \%$ |
| Somewhat Support | 64 | $11.6 \%$ |
| Oppose | 75 | $13.6 \%$ |
| Somewhat Oppose | 33 | $6 \%$ |
| Strongly Oppose | 42 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Undecided | 21 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Refused | 3 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

## DATA ORBITAL

data expertise. political intelligence.

## Q) When it comes to the debate over proposed election laws, Which argument do you believe to be more persuasive?

| Election integrity laws such as requiring Voter identification are reasonable measures to prevent fraud |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| and strengthen the integrity of our elections | 256 | $46.5 \%$ |
| Current laws for election integrity are already sufficient and any new election restrictions only serve the |  |  |
| purpose of disenfranchising voters and suppressing turnout in minority communities. | 210 | $38.2 \%$ |
| Neither argument is persuasive | 21 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Both are equally persuasive | 34 | $6.2 \%$ |
| Refused | 29 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

## 2 data orbital
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## DEMOGRAPHICS:

The following questions are for statistical purposes only.
Q) Which of the following age categories do you fall into?

| 18 to 34 | 151 | $27.4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35 to 44 | 81 | $14.8 \%$ |
| 45 to 54 | 81 | $14.6 \%$ |
| 55 to 64 | 92 | $16.6 \%$ |
| 65 and over | 146 | $26.5 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q) How would you classify yourself in terms of race or ethnicity - White, Hispanic, African American, Asian American, Middle Eastern, Native American or something else?

| White | 379 | $69 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hispanic | 116 | $21 \%$ |
| African American | 25 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 16 | $3 \%$ |
| Other | 14 | $2.5 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q) Are you registered as a Republican, Democrat or Independent/Unaffiliated?

| Republican | 195 | $35.4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Democrat | 177 | $32.1 \%$ |
| Independent/Unaffiliated | 179 | $32.5 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

## D DATA ORBITAL

data expertise political intelligence.
Q) In general, do you consider yourself to be conservative, progressive, or something in between?

| Conservative | 189 | $34.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strong Conservative | 112 | $20.4 \%$ |
| Somewhat Conservative | 77 | $14 \%$ |
| Moderate | 234 | $42.6 \%$ |
| Progressive | 89 | $16.2 \%$ |
| Somewhat Progressive | 42 | $7.7 \%$ |
| Strong Progressive | 47 | $8.5 \%$ |
| Undecided | 26 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Refused | 12 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q) What is your highest level of education completed?

| Less than a high school diploma | 10 | $1.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| High school degree or equivalent | 98 | $17.7 \%$ |
| Some college, no degree | 185 | $33.6 \%$ |
| Bachelor's degree | 148 | $26.9 \%$ |
| Graduate degree or higher | 103 | $18.6 \%$ |
| Refused | 6 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Thank you for your participation, this completes our survey. Have a pleasant evening.
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## Last 4 General Elections:

| 0 of 4 | 148 | $27 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 of 4 | 71 | $13 \%$ |
| 2 of 4 | 77 | $14 \%$ |
| 3 of 4 | 88 | $16 \%$ |
| 4 of 4 | 165 | $30 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Region:

| North | 70 | $12.8 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maricopa | 333 | $60.6 \%$ |
| Pima | 82 | $14.9 \%$ |
| South | 64 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Phone Type:

| Cell | 219 | $39.7 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Land | 331 | $60.3 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |

Congressional District:

| 1 | 62 | $11.3 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 61 | $11.1 \%$ |
| 3 | 51 | $9.3 \%$ |
| 4 | 65 | $11.9 \%$ |
| 5 | 72 | $13.1 \%$ |
| 6 | 67 | $12.2 \%$ |
| 7 | 43 | $7.9 \%$ |
| 8 | 68 | $12.4 \%$ |
| 9 | 59 | $10.8 \%$ |
| Total | 550 | $100.0 \%$ |
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| Education: |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Non-College Grad | 293 | $53.9 \%$ |
| College Grad | 251 | $46.1 \% \%$ |
| Total | 544 | $100.0 \%$ |
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## Methodology and Transparency

## Sponsor

## Target Population

## Sampling Frame \& Methodology

Free Enterprise Club
Registered Voters in Arizona, Statewide.

## Frame:

The sample frame includes registered voters with landline and cell phone telephones.

Methodology:
Live survey; 60\% landline telephone and $40 \%$ cellphone telephone.

Contacted voters were selected randomly from a list of registered voters in the State of Arizona purchased by Data Orbital Consulting, LLC from i360. Of the voters surveyed, $60 \%$ have voted in between two and four of the last four general elections, $13 \%$ have voted in one of the last four general elections, and $27 \%$ have voted in none of the last four general elections. Voters without a valid landline or cellular telephone number were not contacted.

Selected voters were contacted from April $7^{\text {hh }}$ to 9th, using an all Live survey presented in English.
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| Weighting | The sample was weighted for gender, age, race, <br> party affiliation, education attainment and <br> geographic region to mirror the registered voter <br> population in Arizona. Election data was sourced <br> from i 360 and the Arizona Secretary of State. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Number of Respondents | 550 |
| Margin of Error | $\pm 4.18 \%$ ( $95 \%$ confidence interval) <br> Margin of error does not take into consideration <br> design effect. |

The sample was weighted for gender, age, race, party affiliation, education attainment and geographic region to mirror the registered voter population in Arizona. Election data was sourced from i360 and the Arizona Secretary of State.
$\pm 4.18 \%$ ( $95 \%$ confidence interval)
Margin of error does not take into consideration design effect.

