Ipsos Public Affairs

1146 19th St., NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 463-7300

Interview dates: Sept 14-18, 2012
Base: 792 registered voters (RV)
Base for Voting Intention: 659 Likely Voters (LV)

Ipsos Poll conducted for Reuters
DAILY ELECTION TRACKING 09.18.12

These are findings from an Ipsos poll conducted for Thomson Reuters from Sept 14-18, 2012. For the survey, a sample of 792 American registered voters (age 18 and over) was interviewed online. The precision of the Reuters/Ipsos online polls is measured using a credibility interval. In this case, the poll has a credibility interval of plus or minus 4.0 percentage points for all respondents. For more information about credibility intervals, please see the appendix.

The data were weighted to the U.S. current population data by gender, age, education, and ethnicity. Statistical margins of error are not applicable to online polls. All sample surveys and polls may be subject to other sources of error, including, but not limited to coverage error and measurement error. Figures marked by an asterisk (*) indicate a percentage value of greater than zero but less than one half of a per cent. Where figures do not sum to 100, this is due to the effects of rounding.

DAILY ELECTION TRACKER

Q1. If the 2012 Presidential Election were being held today and the candidates were [ROTATE] Barack Obama for president and Joe Biden for vice president, the Democrats, and Mitt Romney for president and Paul Ryan for vice president, the Republicans [END ROTATE], for whom would you vote?

	All LIKELY Voters (LV)	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Barack Obama for president and Joe Biden for vice president, the Democrats	47%	48%	83%	7%	35%
Mitt Romney for president and Paul Ryan for vice president, the Republicans	43%	40%	12%	81%	38%
Wouldn't vote	2%	2%	%	3%	8%
None / Other	2%	3%	2%	2%	8%
Don't know / Refused	6%	7%	4%	6%	10%

Q2. How much, if anything, have you heard about the violence in several Middle Eastern countries including Egypt, Libya and Yemen that included attacks on U.S. embassies or consulates?

	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Heard a great deal	41%	39%	46%	42%
Heard a fair amount	37%	39%	38%	36%
Heard a little bit	16%	16%	14%	19%
Not heard anything at all	5%	6%	2%	4%
Heard at least a little	**95%**	**94%**	**98%**	**96%**

Q3a. And how much, if anything, have you heard about the statement released by President Barack Obama in response to that violence?

	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Heard a great deal	26%	29%	25%	23%
Heard a fair amount	30%	33%	32%	26%
Heard a little bit	23%	23%	25%	21%
Not heard anything at all	20%	15%	19%	30%
Heard at least a little	**80%**	**75%**	**81%**	**70%**

[Asked of those who indicated they had heard at least a little about President Obama's statement; n=674]
Q3b. Has what you have heard about President Obama's statement made you more or less favorable towards Barack Obama?

	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Much more favorable	22%	35%	6%	
Somewhat more favorable	15%	24%	3%	
No change	37%	34%	38%	*Base size too small to report*
Somewhat less favorable	8%	4%	15%	
Much less favorable	18%	3%	38%	
More favorable	**37%**	**59%**	**9%**	
Less favorable	**26%**	**7%**	**53%**	

Q4a. And how much, if anything, have you heard about the statement released by Mitt Romney related to that violence?

	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Heard a great deal	22%	22%	25%	20%
Heard a fair amount	25%	22%	31%	23%
Heard a little bit	24%	26%	24%	17%
Not heard anything at all	30%	30%	20%	40%
Heard at least a little	70%	70%	80%	60%

[Asked of those who indicated they had heard at least a little about Mitt Romney's statement; n=609]
Q4b. Has what you have heard about Mitt Romney's statement made you more or less favorable towards Mitt Romney?

	All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
Much more favorable	16%	4%	30%	
Somewhat more favorable	13%	4%	22%	
No change	31%	24%	41%	*Base size too small to report*
Somewhat less favorable	18%	27%	7%	
Much less favorable	22%	41%	1%	
More favorable	**29%**	**8%**	**52%**	
Less favorable	**40%**	**68%**	**8%**	

Q5. As you may know, there have been riots in Egypt, Libya and Yemen that resulted in attacks on U.S. embassies in those countries, and in Libya, resulting in the deaths of 4 American diplomatic officials. Some reports indicate that these riots are related to a film ridiculing the Islamic holy figure Muhammad.

Here are some statements made by American leaders about this issue. Do you personally agree or disagree with each?

NOTE: Each speaker was NOT identified in survey questionnaire – has been inserted here for reference		All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Independents (RV)
"Some have sought to justify this vicious behavior as a response to inflammatory material posted on the internet. The United States deplores any intentional effort to denigrate the religious beliefs of others. But let me be clear: There is never any justification for violent acts of this kind." ***(SECRETARY OF STATE HILLARY CLINTON)***	Strongly agree	46%	51%	44%	45%
	Somewhat agree	27%	26%	27%	29%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	19%	17%	19%
	Somewhat disagree	4%	2%	6%	7%
	Strongly disagree	3%	3%	6%	1%
	Total agree	**73%**	**77%**	**71%**	**74%**
	Total disagree	**7%**	**5%**	**12%**	**8%**

CONTINUED		All Registered Voters (RV)	Democrats (RV)	Republicans (RV)	Republicans (RV)
" ... And make no mistake, we will work with the Libyan government to bring to justice the killers who attacked our people. Since our founding, the United States has been a nation that respects all faiths. We reject all efforts to denigrate the religious beliefs of others. But there is absolutely no justification to this type of senseless violence. None. The world must stand together to unequivocally reject these brutal acts." ***(PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA)***	Strongly agree	50%	57%	44%	53%
	Somewhat agree	21%	19%	21%	29%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	20%	21%	12%
	Somewhat disagree	5%	2%	10%	4%
	Strongly disagree	3%	3%	4%	1%
	Total agree	**71%**	**76%**	**65%**	**82%**
	Total disagree	**8%**	**5%**	**14%**	**5%**
"I'm outraged by the attacks on American diplomatic missions in Libya and Egypt and by the death of an American consulate worker in Benghazi. It's disgraceful that the Obama Administration's first response was not to condemn attacks on our diplomatic missions, but to sympathize with those who waged the attacks." ***(REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE MITT ROMNEY)***	Strongly agree	35%	19%	56%	44%
	Somewhat agree	13%	11%	17%	10%
	Neither agree nor disagree	23%	27%	16%	19%
	Somewhat disagree	9%	12%	6%	7%
	Strongly disagree	20%	32%	6%	21%
	Total agree	**48%**	**30%**	**73%**	**54%**
	Total disagree	**29%**	**44%**	**12%**	**28%**
"[We] condemn the continuing efforts by misguided individuals to hurt the religious feelings of Muslims -- as we condemn efforts to offend believers of all religions. Respect for religious beliefs is a cornerstone of American democracy. We firmly reject the actions by those who abuse the universal right of free speech to hurt the religious beliefs of others" ***(US EMBASSY IN CAIRO)***	Strongly agree	37%	47%	27%	37%
	Somewhat agree	20%	20%	22%	20%
	Neither agree nor disagree	27%	26%	24%	27%
	Somewhat disagree	8%	3%	16%	6%
	Strongly disagree	7%	4%	12%	10%
	Total agree	**57%**	**67%**	**49%**	**57%**
	Total disagree	**15%**	**7%**	**28%**	**16%**

PARTY ID (REGISTERED VOTERS)

Strong Democrat	19%
Moderate Democrat	24%
Lean Democrat	5%
Lean Republican	9%
Moderate Republican	14%
Strong Republican	13%
Independent	13%
None of these	2%
DK	2%

Ipsos Public Affairs

How to Calculate Bayesian Credibility Intervals

The calculation of credibility intervals assumes that Y has a binomial distribution conditioned on the parameter θ\, i.e., Y|θ~Bin(n,θ), where n is the size of our sample. In this setting, Y counts the number of "yes", or "1", observed in the sample, so that the sample mean (y □) is a natural estimate of the true population proportion θ. This model is often called the likelihood function, and it is a standard concept in both the Bayesian and the Classical framework. The Bayesian[1] statistics combines both the prior distribution and the likelihood function to create a posterior distribution. The posterior distribution represents our opinion about which are the plausible values for θ adjusted after observing the sample data. In reality, the posterior distribution is one's knowledge base updated using the latest survey information. For the prior and likelihood functions specified here, the posterior distribution is also a beta distribution (π(θ/y)~β(y+a,n-y+b)), but with updated hyper-parameters.

Our credibility interval for ϑ is based on this posterior distribution. As mentioned above, these intervals represent our belief about which are the most plausible values for ϑ given our updated knowledge base. There are different ways to calculate these intervals based on $\pi(\theta/y)$. Since we want only one measure of precision for all variables in the survey, analogous to what is done within the Classical framework, we will compute the largest possible credibility interval for any observed sample. The worst case occurs when we assume that a=1 and b=1 and $y = n/2$. Using a simple approximation of the posterior by the normal distribution, the 95% credibility interval is given by, approximately:

$$\bar{y} \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

..

For this poll, the Bayesian Credibility Interval was adjusted using standard weighting design effect 1+L=1.3 to account for complex weighting[2]

Examples of credibility intervals for different base sizes are below. Ipsos does not publish data for base sizes (sample sizes) below 100.

Sample size	Credibility intervals
2,000	2.5
1,500	2.9
1,000	3.5
750	4.1
500	5.0
350	6.0
200	7.9
100	11.2

[1] *Bayesian Data Analysis, Second Edition, Andrew Gelman, John B. Carlin, Hal S. Stern, Donald B. Rubin, Chapman & Hall/CRC | ISBN: 158488388X | 2003*

[2] *Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for unequal Pi . Journal of Official, Statistics, 8, 2, 183200.*