EXIT POLLING HISPANIC VOTERS IN TEXAS AND CALIFORNIA: 1984-92

Robert R. Brischetto, Southwest Voter Research Institute, Karol P. Krótki, Temple University*

Robert R. Brischetto, SVRI, 403 E. Commerce, Suite 260, San Antonio, TX 78205

The phenomenal growth of the Latino population over the past decade or so has drawn attention to this group and their influence on the outcome of state and national elections.[1] Those interested in Latino voting patterns turned to pollsters to see what they could learn about this heretofore uncharted group. What the network exit polls had to say about Latino voting was not always reliable. Samples of Latino voters have been too small and no attention has been given to the unique distribution of Latino voters vis-á-vis non-Latinos. Furthermore, no effort has been made by the media pollsters to interview or provide exit instruments in the voters' native language. Hence, media exit poll results on Latinos have varied widely.

To meet the demand for more accurate information about this growing segment of the electorate, the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project (SVREP) began conducting bilingual exit polls among Latino voters in state-wide elections in Texas in 1984. The non-profit organization's progeny, the Southwest Voter Research Institute (SVRI), continued the practice in 1986 and expanded its polling to California and New Mexico.[2]

This paper will present results of polling in general elections since 1984 of Latino voters as they left their voting booths in Texas and California, with particular attention to the 1992 election.[3] By limiting our analysis to these states, we are effectively studying Mexican American voting, since 93% of the Latino votes in Texas and 84% of those in California are of Mexican origin. Approximately 74% of the Mexican American population in the U.S. is concentrated in these two states.[4]

The sampling and polling procedures developed to concentrate specifically on Latino voters are discussed in some detail since they are key to understanding the shortcomings of the media pollsters. Given the unique distribution of the Latino population, we examine the differences in Latino voting patterns by precinct Latino density to answer the question of whether exit pollsters can adequately sample Latino voters without stratifying for Latino density.[5] We present results of the voting and party preference of Latinos from the 1992 surveys in Texas and California and trends over time since we began polling in 1984.

Research Methods

SAMPLING DESIGN

The sample design is a two-stage, stratified, probability-based random sample of Hispanics voting in the November 1992 presidential election. Exactly the same procedures were followed in the Texas and California samples.

In Texas the target population consists of 9,168 precincts in 254 counties with a total of 1,185,783 registered Hispanic voters.

As a first step, all precincts with 5% or fewer Hispanic

voters or 25 or fewer Hispanic voters were eliminated from the universe. This measure was taken in order to reduce screening costs. Clearly, a bias is introduced in that the sample will tend to exclude Hispanics in areas in which they represent a small proportion of the population. However, given the cost of screening in such areas, it was felt that it was necessary to implement a minimum threshold in order to keep the overall budget at a manageable level. The revised target population consists of 3,118 precincts in 178 counties with a total of 1,079,535 registered voters. The coverage of 91% of all Hispanic voters is considered to be acceptable given the cost benefit it engenders in terms of screening.

The 3,118 precincts were ordered by county (alphabetically) and, within county, by percent Hispanic. This implicit stratification was implemented to ensure an adequate representation across counties and levels of Hispanic concentration. As is shown empirically later on, stratification by percent Hispanic is essential not only because the Hispanic population is clustered but also because Hispanic voting behavior varies with levels of concentration. A systematic PPS (probability proportional to size) sampling scheme was applied with the number of registered Hispanic voters being the measure of size. In other words, the probability of selection of a given precinct was proportional to the number of Hispanic voters in that precinct.[6]

A target first-stage sample size of 40 precincts was established based on two considerations. On the one hand, there are field costs of hiring, training and supervising the interviewers and the travel of the field staff. The more dispersed the sample, the higher these costs. On the other hand, the larger the number of PSUs (Primary Sampling Units), or first-stage selection units, in this case precincts, the more precise is the sample likely to be. The target of 40 precincts was considered an optimal level for balancing these two considerations.

At the second stage, within each selected precinct, a sample of 38 completed interviews with Hispanic voters was established as the target, resulting in a total sample of 1,520.

Actually the goal of 38 interviews per precinct is achieved by applying a sampling fraction of $38/HISP_i$ to the number of voters found in precinct i. $HISP_i$ is the measure of size used in the PPS selection and represents the total number of Hispanic voters in precinct i.

The sample design theoretically leads to an equal-probability design since the product of the first stage and second probabilities is a constant. This can be seen in the following formulae:

$$P_{i,j} = \frac{40\,HISP_i}{\sum_{i-1}^{A} HISP_i} * \frac{38}{HISP_i}$$

where A is the total number of precincts, 3118.

$$P_{i,j} = \frac{40 * 38}{\sum_{i=1}^{A} HISP_i}$$

$$= \frac{40 * 38}{1,079,535}$$

In order to preserve the equal probability nature of the sample, the second stage sampling fraction, $38/HISP_i$, must be applied to Hispanic voters. If the number of registered Hispanic voters found is equal to $HISP_i$, then 38 completed interviews will be obtained in each precinct. However, the values of $HISP_i$ are based on records and are often quite different from the number of Hispanic voters found in a precinct. If the number found is much larger or much smaller than $HISP_i$, the corresponding sample number will be, respectively, larger or smaller than 38. In practice such wide fluctuations are difficult to absorb and interviewers are given simple instructions for handling these situations. In those precincts likely to yield much more than 38 Hispanic respondents, interviewers were instructed to apply an interval count to Hispanic voters as they left the voting place. In precincts likely to yield fewer than 38 Hispanic respondents, all Hispanic voters were to be approached.

In cases in which it was not feasible to apply the required sampling fraction, weights were calculated to compensate for unequal probabilities of selection.

The sample design for the November 1992 exit poll represents a departure from earlier exit poll sample designs implemented by SVRI (Santos, et al., 1988 & 1989). One of SVRI's primary objectives in carrying out exit polls is to focus on the Hispanic voter. This poses special challenges for the sample design since the Hispanic population, far from being uniformly distributed across tracts and precincts, exhibits very strong clustering patterns both geographically and by social class.

To efficiently sample Hispanic voters, an earlier version of the SVRI sample design applied an optimal allocation technique by which the sample size for each precinct was determined based on the percentage of Hispanic voters in that precinct (Santos, et al., 1988 & 1989). The sample is therefore based on unequal probabilities. Whereas in theory the method of optimal allocation would lead to an optimal design, in practice this method did not work well. First of all, this method caused serious difficulties during the analysis stage since the weights varied tremendously. Second, the calculation of weights was complicated and delayed the production of results, which ideally is done on election night. For these reasons, it was decided to revert to a simpler approach based on equal probability PPS sampling.

The design used by SVRI to survey Latino voters is in contrast to most of the national media surveys that rely on national and state population-wide surveys to provide them with information on subpopulations such as the Hispanics. We would argue that this is misleading since the sample will, for practical reasons, almost inevitably undersample Hispanics in precisely those areas where they are most concentrated. In the state of Texas, for example, a state-wide sample of the entire population will omit many of the important "pockets" of dense Hispanic populations. A state-wide sample is appropriate for inferring about the state's population as a whole. To address issues relevant to subpopulations who are clustered, other designs are necessary.

Earlier surveys by Southwest Voter were conducted among both Latino and non-Latino voters. Many hours were spent distributing, cleaning and entering data on non-Latino samples which were seldom used because the sample was not selected to represent all voters state-wide. In the 1992 exit surveys greater efficiency was achieved by focusing on Latino voters only.

Data used in sampling precincts for the 1992 exit survey show how differently distributed are Latino registered voters vis-a-vis non-Latinos. (See Table 1.)

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Spanish-Surnamed Registered Voters, Total Registered Voters and Precincts by Categories of Precinct Latino Concentrations in Texas and California: Nov. 1992

Percent SSN Concentration	% Distribution of		
	Precincts	Total Regis.	Latino Regis.
Texas			
0-0.9%	22.5	12.9	0.5
1-4.9%	32.1	40.8	7.6
5-9.9%	15.3	16.6	8.0
10-19.9%	11.1	9.6	9.2
20-39.9%	8.4	7.5	14.7
40-59.9%	3.9	4.0	13.7
60-79.9%	3.2	4.1	19.9
80-100%	3.4	4.4	26.4
n	9,168	8,160,144	1,185,783
California			
0-0.9%	14.4	2.0	0.1
1-4.9%	24.5	30.3	8.6
5-9.9%	25.8	32.2	20.0
10-19.9%	19.4	21.8	26.3
20-39.9%	9.9	8.9	21.2
40-59.9%	3.4	2.8	12.0
60-79.9%	1.6	1.4	8.5
80-100%	1.0	0.5	3.3
n	36,922	11,857,714	1,364,391

Eight in ten of all registered voters in Texas live in precincts with less than 20% Latino of registered, whereas only one in four of the Latino registered voters are in these same areas. Indeed, the majority of all persons registered in Texas are found in precents with less than 5% Latino of registered. Conversely, almost half of all Latino voters are in precincts greater than 60% Latino of registered.

In California, 86% of all persons registered to vote live in precincts of less than 20% Latino, but 55% of the Latino registered voters are also in these precincts. Texas Latino voters are clearly more segregated from non-Latino voters than are California Latinos. While as many as one in four Latino voters in Texas are in 80%+ Latino density precincts, only 3% of California Latinos are in those high-density precincts.

Segregation between Latino and non-Latino populations to the extent found in Texas makes a sampling design that is suitable for the entire population entirely inappropriate for the subpopulation of Latino voters. Drawing inferences from the Latino population based on state-wide designs in Texas might lead to serious errors, some of which are demonstrated in the analysis of the data that follows.[7] The same kind of error might be found in

California, although to a lesser degree.

Interviewers

Interviewers were selected with three main qualifications in mind: bilingual ability, literacy, and lack of public identification with a known political faction in the community. This latter qualification was particularly important in small communities where pollsters might be known to many of the voters. The concern was that those with a history of working publicly for a political party or candidate may influence or intimidate potential respondents. Bilingual reading and speaking ability was important for interviewing respondents who were illiterate or reluctant to deal with the printed questionnaire. Interviewer literacy was essential to handle an extensive amount of paper work and reporting.

Polling Procedures

Much was expected of interviewers in the Latino exit polls. The interviewers were hired for the entire day, a half hour before the polls opened to an hour after the polls closed. Their duties were to:
- Call in upon arrival at polling place.
- Screen for Latino voters.
- Keep separate tallies of Latino and non-Latino voters.
- In some precincts, maintain an interval count of Latino voters in order to manage the sample.
- Hand out questionnaires and, when necessary, interview reluctant respondents.
- Obtain counts of registered persons and election-day voters from the election judge.
- Call in results for all questions for data entry at three assigned times during the day.

Training materials included a training manual and a ballot box with bilingual questionnaires and other polling materials. The three-hour training session involved learning several key procedures: gathering data for the interviewer report forms; how to identify and approach Latino voters; how to execute and/or adjust the assigned selection interval; and how to interview in the respondent's language of choice. Roll-playing was an important aspect of the training and particularly useful in identifying which applicants were having trouble with the Spanish version of the questionnaire. Providing interviewers who would conduct the poll in the voter's preferred language was important to achieving a high completion rate.

Interviewers were asked to get completed questionnaires only from Latino voters as they exited the polling place. A potential respondent was asked whether he or she was Latino. If so, the voter was handed a questionnaire on a clip board and a pencil. A tally mark was made on the interviewer report form indicating whether the voter was Latino or non-Latino. These tallies were kept for each of three polling periods of varying lengths, which were staggered and randomly assigned. After each assigned period, the interviewer called in the responses of completed questionnaires to a 1-800 number at the Institute headquarters. The last period ended at 6 p.m. in Texas and 7 p.m. in California, one hour before the voting ended in each state.

One of the more formidable obstacles for exit pollsters is the marker at a given distance from the polling place within which no electioneering or loitering is permitted. Traditionally, all placards and persons other than voters and election officials have been barred from this zone. In Texas and California, the distance marker is set by law at 100 feet. While First Amendment litigation has for the most part exempted exit pollsters from this requirement, there is sufficient ambiguity in the interpretation to allow local election judges leeway in deciding to permit or to bar pollsters from the election zone.

The approach of the Institute in recent years since the court rulings on this issue has been to provide county election administrators with an advance memorandum from the Secretary of State giving an opinion on the permissability of exit surveying at polling places. Even such a memorandum identifying the Institute's poll as a legitimate exit survey and a letter from the survey director does not prevent some local election judges from protecting this sacred turf. Needless to say, keeping exit pollsters at 100 feet from the door to the polling place has a negative impact on the survey taking process.

Data Entry and Analysis

Data entry operators were on hand all day at a dozen stations equipped with computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) software and linked together in a network. The CATI system made it possible to complete all data entry over the phone by 8 p.m. Approriate weights were applied and statistical analysis of the results were completed prior to the 10 p.m. TV news. Since the local CBS affiliate and the local newspaper were co-sponsors of the exit survey in Texas, these media were provided results first and others were fax-ed a story that evening.

Findings

BY PRECINCT LATINO DENSITY

Table 2 shows a clear association between vote for President and Spanish-surname density of the precinct for Latino voters in both Texas and California.

Table 2. Vote for President by Precinct Latino Density in Texas and California: 1992

| Percent SSN | Vote for President | | | | % of |
of Registered	Clinton	Bush	Perot	Other	Sample
Texas					
10-19.9%	54.8	20.4	24.7	0.0	6.1
20-39.9%	59.5	17.0	23.5	0.0	13.0
40-59.9%	62.2	22.2	15.3	0.4	17.1
60-79.9%	73.6	13.5	12.4	0.5	28.9
80-100%	71.1	15.6	13.2	0.0	35.0
n=1536					
California					
10-19.9%	66.5	22.4	10.4	0.6	16.7
20-39.9%	64.4	16.8	18.2	0.7	39.7
40-59.9%	71.4	12.8	15.3	0.4	20.4
60-79.9%	89.4	5.2	5.2	0.1	7.9
80-100%	81.7	4.7	13.8	0.0	15.3
n=894					

Source:

Southwest Voter Research Institute exit poll of election day voters in Texas and California.

Generally, the higher the concentration of Latinos

among registered voters in the precinct, the greater the support for Bill Clinton. Precincts of low Latino density still supported Clinton, but to a lesser extent than those with high Latino density. In Texas, Latino voters in precincts of low Latino density were more likely to support H. Ross Perot; in California, there was more support for George Bush in these precincts.

Such a correlation between support for the Democratic candidate and Latino density is likely to cause a greater distortion of the overall results for Latino subsamples in the major media polls in Texas than in California, given the unique distribution of Latino voters in that state.

BY ETHNICITY AND GENDER

The results of the Institute exit polls among Latino voters in Texas and California reveal a subgroup which contrasts sharply with the rest of the voters. Latino voters were more likely than non-Latinos to support Bill Clinton for president. The "ethnic gap" in support for Bill Clinton— the percent support by Latinos minus the percent support by other voters— was as much as 38 points in Texas and 28 points in California. Most of the difference was found in the level of support for George Bush. (See Table 3.)

Differences by gender were also found among Latino voters, although not nearly as large as differences by ethnicity. The "gender gap" in Latino support for Clinton was six points in Texas and eight points in California. There was greater female support for Clinton and male support for Perot.

CHANGES IN PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Institute polling of Latino voters over five general elections in Texas and four in California permit us to answer the oft-asked question: Is there a realignment taking place in the Mexican American electorate?

Realignment is too strong a characterization of the change that occurred only in 1992. There was a clear increase in the proportion of "independent and other" Latino voters in the recent election, perhaps attributable to the independent candidacy of Texas billionaire H. Ross Perot or a reflection of disenchantment with party politics in general. Identification with both Democrats and Republicans dropped among Latinos and "independent and other" increased by 15 and 14 points, respectively, in Texas and California between 1990 and 1992. The loss in Latinos was greatest among Democrats in Texas and

among Republicans in California.[8] (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Party Identification of Texas and California Latino Voters: 1984-1992

| | Percent Identifying as | | | |
	Democrat	Republican	Ind/Other	n
Texas				
1984	71	6	23	2108
1986	81	13	6	910
1988	76	9	15	2694
1990	79	9	12	2386
1992	66	7	27	1900
California				
1986	78	17	5	373
1988	72	18	10	1716
1990	68	23	8	557
1992	65	12	22	898

Source Questions:
1984: "Regardless of how you voted, which of the following best describes your political preference? Strong Democrat; Not so Strong Democrat; Independent, Closer to Democrat; Strictly Independent; Independent, Closer to Republican; Not so Strong Republican; Strong Republican; Not Sure; Other Party."
1986: "Regardless of how you voted, in politics today do you consider yourself a: Democrat; Republican; Other (Specify)"
1988, 1992: "Regardless of how you voted today, do you consider yourself a: Democrat; Republican; Independent (Closer to Democrat); Independent (Closer to Republican); Other Party (Specify)"
1990: "Regardless of how you voted today, do you consider yourself a: Democrat; Republican; Independent; Other (Specify)"

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN VOTE FOR PRESIDENT

Jobs and the economy were foremost in the minds of Latino voters when they cast their votes for President. This was the most important issue by more than two to one over any other issue in both Texas and California.

When we examine the responses by choice for President, it is clear there are distinct differences among Latino voters. Clinton and Perot supporters saw the economy as the top issue; those voting for Bush mentioned leadership and integrity most often. The same pattern was found in both Texas and California.

Second most frequently mentioned as a top concern in voting for President by Latinos voting for Clinton and those supporting Perot was education. Among Bush voters it was the economy.

Abortion is third most often mentioned by Bush voters, but far down the list among supporters of Clinton

Table 3. Vote for President by Ethnicity and Gender in Texas and California: 1992

	All Voters	Non-Latino Voters	Latino Voters	Ethnic Gap	Male Latinos	Female Latinos	Latino Gender Gap
Texas							
Bill Clinton	37	32	70	38	67	73	6
George Bush	41	45	15	-30	16	14	-2
H. Ross Perot	22	23	15	-8	16	13	-3
n=1900							
California							
Bill Clinton	46	43	71	28	67	75	8
George Bush	32	34	14	-20	14	13	-1
H. Ross Perot	21	21	15	-6	19	11	-8
n=898							

Source:
Southwest Voter Research Institute exit poll of early and election day voters in Texas and election day voters in California.

979

Table 5. Most Important Issues in Presidential Vote in Texas and California: 1992

	Texas Latinos	Texas Latino Voters for:			California Latinos	California Latino Voters for:		
		Clinton	Bush	Perot		Clinton	Bush	Perot
Jobs/Economy	54	60	26	58	66	71	36	75
Change	23	26	10	23	22	26	5	19
Education	15	18	7	8	29	33	13	24
Leadership/Integrity	8	7	43	17	14	9	39	15
Health Care	7	9	3	5	10	12	6	3
Budget Deficit	7	6	4	16	7	5	9	14
Abortion	6	3	23	3	7	6	19	2
Taxes	3	5	7	4	5	3	17	3
Dont' Like Others	2	2	7	5	6	4	15	8
N	1900				898			

Source:
Southwest Voter Research Institute exit poll of early and election day voters in Texas and election day voters in California.
Source Question:
"What one or two issues mattered most in deciding how you voted for president?"

and Perot. (See Table 5.)

PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL PROBLEMS

In each election since 1984, with the exception of 1986, the Institute has asked Latino voters to identify "the single most important problem facing people in your neighborhood." The response is open-ended and only one response is coded, the first response. (See Table 6.)

Table 6. Most Important Neighborhood Problem for Latino Voters: 1984-1992

	Crime /Drugs	Economy /Jobs	Muni. Services	Education	n
Texas					
1984	20	39	17	4	2108
1988	55	24	10	3	2694
1992	47	31	3	6	1900
California					
1988	57	16	8	3	1716
1992	43	33	1	7	898

Source Questions:
1984: "What are the two most important problems facing people in your neighborhood?"
1988: What is the most important problem facing people in your neighborhood?"
1992: "What is the single most important problem facing people in your neighborhood?"

While this question asks about local problems, it clearly reflects what is on the minds of Latino voters when they cast their votes for President. From 1984 to 1988, Texas Latino voters went from the economy to crime as the most important neighborhood problem. From 1988 to 1992, that trend reversed and the economy regained importance, although crime remained the most important problem mentioned most often by Texas Latinos.

In California, where only 1988 and 1992 data were available on this question, the increasing importance of the economy was once again reflected in the 1992 poll of Latino voters.

COMPARISONS WITH MEDIA POLLS

Latino voting for President as reported by the major media polls conducted in Texas and California were usually within the large range of statistical error variance, given the small size of their Latino subsamples. However, comparisons with SVRI exit poll samples, of much larger size, in some cases resulted in variations outside the range of sampling error. (See Table 7.)

In Texas, the Latino vote in 1984 for Walter Mondale ranged from 65% as extimated by NBC News to 76% by ABC/Washington Post, compared to 74% by SVRI. In 1988, the network pollsters were very close in their estimates, range from 74% by CBS/New York Times to 76% by NBC News. But the Southwest Voter Research Institute found as much as 83% support for Dukakis. In 1992 the major networks consolidated exit polling under a single operation and founded Voter Research and Surveys (VRS). In 1992, there was a 12 point difference between VRS and SVRI exit polls in Texas.

In California, the variations were in some cases larger than could be explained by chance. In 1980 Latino support for Carter ranged from 52% by CBS/NY Times to 59% by NBC, not statistically significant. In 1984 the Latino vote for Mondale was estimated at 57% by both CBS and ABC, but 76% by NBC. In 1988 Latino support for Dukakis ranged from 64% as reported by ABC to 74% by SVRI. In 1992 the vote for Clinton varied from 52% by the Los Angeles Times to 71% by SVRI.

Discussion

While there is considerable variation in Latino vote estimates provided by the various polling organizations, one pattern seems clear. SVRI estimates are consistently higher for the Democratic candidate than those of the media polls, usually higher than would be expected to occur by chance.

When differences among subgroups are larger than can be explained by sampling variability, other explanations must be explored. Some of the more plausible influences on the outcomes of polling among Latinos deserve further exploration:

• Response rates may be different for Latino and non-Latino voters.

• Not all pollsters approach their respondents with the same data collection procedures and with bilingual interviewers. For example, whether or not pollsters are instructed to interview persons who are illiterate or non-English speaking, whether or not the pollsters are bilingual, and whether or not the questionnaire is in both English and Spanish, all are factors which may contribute

Table 7. Exit Poll Estimates of Latino Vote for President in Texas and California: 1980-1992

	NBC News	CBS /NYT	ABC /W Post	LA Tim. /CNN	SVRI
Texas					
1984					
Mondale	65	66	76	na	74
Reagan	35	34	24		25
N	288	142	25		1939
% of Total N	10	7	7		100
1988					
Dukakis	76	74	75	na	83
Bush	24	26	24		117
N	295	88	252		2654
% of Total N	10	12	10		100
1992		VRS			
Clinton		58		na	70
Bush		26			15
Perot		17			15
N		212			1900
% of Total N		10			100
California					
1984					
Mondale	76	57	57	na	na
Reagan	24	43	42		
N	206	216	95		
% of Total N	7	6	na		
1988					
Dukakis	66	70	64	na	74
Bush	34	28	34		25
N	208	86	210		1615
% of Total N	7	7	7		100
1992		VRS			
Clinton		65		52	71
Bush		23		27	14
Perot		12		21	15
N		265		257	898
% of Total N		8		9	100

Notes:
Other candidates and "none of the above": not shown.
N's are estimates from percents of total in some cases.
Any incidental responses by non-Latinos in the SVRI polls were screened out before analysis and are not included in N's.
"n.a." indicates poll was not taken or is not available.
1992 SVRI Texas poll includes 31.95% early voters.

to differences in the responses and in the response rates.

• Because of the different ways in which Latinos and non-Latinos are distributed geographically, a random sample of the general population of all voters does not produce a representative sample of Latino voters.

While no attempt is made in this paper to explore all of these factors, they are worthy of note and should be considered when studying culturally and linguistically different populations. We explored one of them: whether the differences in the geographic distribution of the Latino and non-Latino populations can explain differences in the results of Latino samples drawn from the general population at random and those drawn from samples which are stratified by number and density of Latino voters.

Indeed, there is very little geography shared by large numbers of Latinos and non-Latinos in Texas. Comparing choice for president across categories of Latino density, there is sufficient correlation between Latino density and vote for President to provide a plausible explanation for variations found between SVRI and other polls.

Endnotes

*Production by Allen J. Moy, SVRI.

1. Latinos grew six times the rate of non-Latinos during the 1980s. The terms "Latino" and "Hispanic" are used interchangeably.

2. The exit poll research conducted by the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project and the Southwest Voter Research Institute has been supported by the Ford Foundation. Supplemental funding has come from the U.S. Government's General Accounting Office for the 1984 poll and from the San Antonio Express-News and KENS-TV, the San Antonio CBS affiliate, for the 1992 poll.

3. The 1992 Texas Hispanic exit poll included a sample of early voters, who comprised one-third of all voters. The results of the early voters poll are not separated here, but are included in with election day Hispanic votes in the tables.

4. Southwest Voter Research Notes, Vol VI, No. 3, Special Edition: 1992 Presidential Election in Texas , p. 2 and No. 4: 1992 Presidential Election in California, p. 5.

5. For additional research into the question of differences in voting by Hispanic density, see: James W. Loewen, Orville Vernon Burton, Robert R. Brischetto and Terence Finnegan, "It Ain't Broke, So Don't Fix It: The Legal and Factual Importance of Recent Attacks on Methods Used in Vote Dilution Litigation," University of San Francisco Law Review, 27 (Summer, 1993).

6. See Kish (1965), Chapter 5, for a discussion of PPS.

7. For analysis of earlier surveys by SVRI on this question, see: Robert L. Santos, Lorraine Porcellini and Robert Brischetto, "Southwest Hispanic Voting in the 1988 Election," paper presented at the Winter meeting of the American Statistical Association, San Diego, CA, Jan.6.

8. The New York Times (Berke, 1983: 1)featured these data in a front page story entitled, "Republicans Make Strong Gains from Appeals to Hispanic Voters." Unfortunately, the Times graphic of SVRI data switched the labels on the trend lines for "Republican" and "Independent," thus confusing a surge in independent voters in 1992 with a change to Republican party identification.

References

Berke, R. L. (1993)
"Republicans make strong gains from appeals to Hispanic voters." New York Times, July 5: 1.

Kalton, G., and D. W. Anderson (1984)
"Sampling rare populations for health surveys." Proceedings of the American Statistical Association.

Kish, L. (1965)
Survey Sampling. New York: Wiley.

Loewen, James W., Orville Vernon Burton, Robert R. Brischetto and Terence Finnegan
"It Ain't Broke, So Don't Fix It: The Legal and Factual Importance of Recent Attacks on Methods Used in Vote Dilution Litigation," University of San Francisco Law Review, 27 (Summer, 1993).

Santos, R.L., L. Porcellini and R. R. Brischetto (1988)
"Sampling issues in the design and implementation of Hispanic exit polls." Proceedings Survey Research Methods Section of the American Statistical Association.
——— (1989)
"Southwest Hispanic voting in the 1988 election." Invited paper presented in the 1989 Winter Meeting of the American Statistical Association, San Diego.

Southwest Voter Research Institute (1992)
"Special Edition: 1992 Presidential Election in California," Southwest Voter Research Notes VI, No. 4: 1-8.
——— (1992)
"Special Edition: 1992 Presidential Election in Texas," Southwest Voter Research Notes VI, No. 3: 1-8.