

# Vote Wise Nebraska Voter Guide Pilot Weighted Survey Analysis Summary

**Sample Size:** 248 survey responses

**Target Population:** 99,830 registered voters

**Margin of Error (MOE):**  $\sim\pm 6.2\%$  at 95% confidence

**Note:** All demographic variables, including **gender and race/ethnicity**, are **self-reported** in the survey instrument.

---

## 1. Key Demographics

- **Political Affiliation (Weighted to Match Population):**
  - Republican: 41%
  - Democrat: 33%
  - Nonpartisan: 24%
  - Libertarian & Legal Marijuana Now: 2% combined
- **Age Distribution (Weighted to Match Population):**
  - 65 and over: 24%
  - 26–45 years old: 34% combined
  - 18–25: 12%
- **Gender (Self-Reported):**
  - Female: 61%
  - Male: 38%
  - Prefer not to say: 1%
- **Race/Ethnicity (Self-Reported):**
  - White: 88%
  - Other racial/ethnic identities (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic):  $\sim 1\text{--}3\%$  each

These weighted demographics ensure the results reflect the broader electorate in the surveyed jurisdiction.

---

## 2. Voter Guide Impact: Key Findings With Confidence Intervals

### Helpfulness (Q1)

- **51%** said the guide was *extremely helpful* ( $\pm 6.2\%$ , CI: **44.8–57.2%**)

- 35% said *somewhat helpful* ( $\pm 5.9\%$ , CI: 29.1–40.9%)
- Only 4% said it was not helpful ( $\pm 2.4\%$ , CI: 1.6–6.4%)

**Takeaway:** A strong majority found the guide valuable, with negligible negative sentiment.

### Reading Behavior (Q2)

- 34% read the *entire guide* ( $\pm 5.9\%$ )
- 44% read *most of it* ( $\pm 6.2\%$ )
- 9% didn't read any ( $\pm 3.5\%$ )

**Takeaway:** Nearly 80% of voters engaged with most or all of the guide.

### Usage in Vote Preparation (Q3)

- 38% used the guide *extensively* ( $\pm 6.1\%$ )
- 40% used it *somewhat* ( $\pm 6.2\%$ )
- 13% did not use it ( $\pm 4.3\%$ )

**Takeaway:** Over three-quarters relied on it in their decision-making process.

### Ease of Understanding (Q4)

- 69% said the guide was *very easy to understand* ( $\pm 5.6\%$ )
- Only 1% found it difficult

**Takeaway:** The guide succeeded in clarity and accessibility.

### Confusing Content (Q5)

- Only 4% found any part confusing ( $\pm 2.4\%$ )

**Takeaway:** Clarity was a strength. Design and writing choices were effective.

### Layout and Writing Quality (Q6)

- 47% rated it *very good* ( $\pm 6.1\%$ )
- 40% rated it *good* ( $\pm 6.0\%$ )

**Takeaway:** Strong visual and narrative design contributed to favorable reception.

### Timing of Receipt (Q7)

- 87% received the guide *before the election* ( $\pm 4.3\%$ )

**Takeaway:** Operational logistics were successful, ensuring relevance and usability.

### Likelihood to Recommend (Q8)

- 87% would recommend the guide ( $\pm 4.3\%$ )

**Takeaway:** This reflects not just satisfaction, but voter *endorsement* — a powerful sign of impact.

**Expectations (Q9)**

- **63%** said the guide *met their expectations* (**±6.0%**)
- **16%** said it *exceeded them* (**±4.6%**)
- Only **3%** said it *fell short* (**±2.2%**)

**Takeaway:** The guide not only met expectations for most voters — a significant portion found it better than expected.

---

**3. Section-Level Usefulness (Q10 Series)**

- **Candidate Info:** 82% found it useful (**±4.8%**)
- **Ballot Measures:** 77% found them useful (**±5.2%**)
- **Voting Process Overview:** 73% found it useful (**±5.4%**)

**Takeaway:** Core content areas were clearly meeting voter needs. The candidate section was the most valued, suggesting this should remain central.

---

**4. Interest in a statewide voter guide program (Q12)**

- **74%** were interested in statewide is (**±5.3%**)

**Takeaway:** There is high receptivity to educational content beyond the immediate ballot, suggesting expansion opportunities.

---

**5. Summary of Party & Age-Based Perceptions**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Most Likely To...</u>	<u>Less Likely To...</u>
Republicans	Read most/all of the guide, rate highly	Report “not helpful”
Democrats	Use guide extensively to prepare vote	Report confusion
Nonpartisans	Skim or not read at all	Rate the guide “extremely helpful”

<b>Older voters</b>	Read full guide, use it for vote prep	Need design simplification
<b>Younger voters</b>	Less engaged, more likely to skip	Report guide as central to preparation

## 6. Final Reflections

This analysis strongly supports the effectiveness of the voter guide as an information tool across political, age, and gender lines. The **high engagement, usability, and satisfaction levels** — validated through statistically weighted and confidence-adjusted results — suggest the guide was **not only well-produced but genuinely influential**.

Engagement with the voter guide varied by political affiliation and age. **Republicans and Democrats were significantly more likely than Nonpartisans** to find the guide extremely helpful, read most or all of it, and use it extensively in preparing to vote. Nonpartisans showed lower engagement and rated the guide as less helpful overall, suggesting future versions may need to better address their needs or skepticism.

Age also played a role in guide usage. **Older voters, particularly those 65 and up, were more likely to read the entire guide and rely on it during voting**, while younger voters (18–25) were less likely to engage deeply. These patterns suggest that while the guide was broadly effective, outreach strategies may need to be tailored to boost participation and perceived usefulness among Nonpartisan and younger voters.

Although weighting reduced some potential biases, it's important to remember that **self-reported demographic data** (especially on gender and race/ethnicity) may introduce limitations. Likewise, the MOE of  $\pm 6.2\%$  implies caution when interpreting small differences or subgroup breakdowns.

Still, the guide clearly:

- Reached voters in time,
- Was read and used in decision-making,
- Was broadly viewed as clear and helpful, and
- Inspired confidence and trust.

This positions our team extremely well for **scaling future editions**, deepening outreach, and securing **funding or legislative support** based on demonstrable impact.

## 7. Overview & Methodological Approach

This analysis employed **weighted survey design** techniques to adjust for demographic imbalances between the small sample of respondents and the full voter population. Using **raking** via R's *survey* and *srvyr* packages, responses were weighted to reflect actual distributions across **age groups** and **political party affiliation**, two key dimensions of potential bias.

In addition, a **nonresponse analysis** was conducted, comparing demographic characteristics of survey respondents to the full list of voters who were sent the guide. This helps contextualize how weighting mitigates (but does not eliminate) potential participation bias.

The result is a statistically valid estimate of how the voter guide performed across a diverse population — but like all survey data, it comes with margins of uncertainty that must be accounted for.

## 8. Analyst Profile



### Ailiya Rizvi

📍 Address: Biborgsgatan 4 Lgh 1401, 152 41, Södertälje, Sweden

✉ Email address: [shanze\\_ali@hotmail.com](mailto:shanze_ali@hotmail.com) 📞 Phone number: (+46) 737157142

Gender: Female Date of birth: 12/10/1989

The weighted analysis included in this report was conducted by **Ailiya Rizvi**, a research and data professional with a strong foundation in **management sciences, organizational research, and statistical analysis**. Ailiya holds an **M.Phil. in Management Sciences** with a focus on **human resources and organizational behavior** from the University of Stockholm, where she completed a thesis involving advanced statistical modeling using tools such as SPSS.

Her professional experience spans over a decade and includes roles in **data analysis, academic research, and global recruitment**, with demonstrated expertise in designing and evaluating programs across diverse sectors. Ailiya's strengths in **quantitative and qualitative methods**, including **regression analysis, ANOVA, and survey data interpretation**, were instrumental in ensuring the methodological rigor and reliability of this project's findings.

Her work reflects a deep commitment to **evidence-based practices** and the **ethical use of data** to inform public-facing initiatives. With international experience across Sweden, the UK, and the U.S., Ailiya brings a global perspective and a strong track record of delivering research that supports **accountable, equity-centered programs**—values that align directly with the goals of many philanthropic and civic-minded organizations.