



Methodology Statement:

From October 21-25, 2020 Colby College contacted 894 registered voters in Maine. Respondents were further screened, and only those who indicated they “definitely” or “probably” would be voting in the 2020 general election were included in the survey leading to a sample size of 879 respondents. The results of this survey include interviews conducted over the telephone and online. Sampling design and fielding were managed by researchers at Colby College. A probability-based telephone survey of N=308 likely voters was conducted using a voter file that was obtained from Scientific Telephone Samples (STS). Interviewers from Quantel Research randomly selected numbers to call from the voter file and interviewers asked to speak with the person named in the database. Gender and age verification were performed to ensure the correct respondent was contacted. Both cell phones and landlines were included. All interviews were conducted in English. The sample was stratified by Congressional district, with 50.32 percent of the phone responses coming from the first of Maine’s two Congressional districts. Weighting was used to account for non-response error and weighted to match the geodemographic composition of the voter file on the key variables of age, gender, Congressional district, and partisanship. Additionally, data from the April 2019 Current Population Survey were used to weight the data on the basis of educational attainment using a raking methodology.

These interviews were supplemented with a non-probability-based sample of likely voters in Maine (n=571). The sample for this aspect of the survey was obtained from the Lucid marketplace, and only top-tier providers as determined by their QScore metric were used. Additionally, data were vetted on a case-by-case basis to ensure response quality. For the online sample, stratified matching to the voter file was employed to facilitate age, gender, and party identification sampling quotas. Age and gender quotas were interlocked during the fielding process. A raking methodology was used to both weight the data to geodemographic targets (age, race, gender, county, zip code density, party registration, and education attainment), and calibrated to account for online propensity and other known attitudinal biases present in an online sample. Additionally, calibration included matching to the previous turnout in 2016 and 2018 general elections. The data was then trimmed to remove any cases with outlier weights. For weighting targets, the voter file was used when data were available, and the April 2019 Current Population Survey was used for data not included in the voter file, namely educational attainment.

The telephone and online samples were combined using their established weights. An unequal design effect was computed for both the telephone and online samples. To compute design effects, a variety of factors were used. For the telephone study, non-response bias was the primary weighting factor. Within the non-weighted telephone sample, age and infrequent voting history were the primary factors accounted for in assessing non-response bias. Specifically, the telephone sample lacked coverage of voters who voted in 2016 but did not vote in 2018. For the online sample, non-coverage by age was a primary concern. The two sets of weights were combined in proportion to their design effects. A final weight between the two samples was calculated, and the online sample was weighted to account for 54.5% of respondents and the telephone sample accounted for the remaining 45.5% of respondents. Lastly, the weights were re-raked using both demographic targets for weighting and behavioral targets for calibration.