



Contact:

Aileen Kain, Committee of Seventy
610-331-4107, akain@seventy.org

Nina Hoe, BeHeardPhilly
215 410-0960

Philadelphians Trust Hillary Clinton Three Times as Often as They Do Donald Trump

(Philadelphia, PA, July 29, 2016): The Committee of Seventy, Philadelphia's nonpartisan advocate for better government, and the Temple Institute for Survey Research released the results of a survey of Philadelphians today that found that they trust Hillary Clinton 53.8% of the time and Donald Trump only 14% of the time.

The survey was taken by 986 members of the Institute's BeHeardPhilly panel that consists of a group of community members who have "opted in" and agreed to take surveys and participate in ongoing research driven by local government and nonprofit organizations and initiatives.

The survey was administered prior to the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. Participants were also asked to detail how often they trusted different levels of government including federal (44.3% of the time) state (43% of the time) and city (43.9% of the time). Participants were also asked about their incidence of trust in Pennsylvania Governor Wolf (54.9% of the time) and Philadelphia Mayor Jim Kenney (52.7% of the time).

"Seventy's always been interested in understanding the issue of trust in government, and this survey gives us some great insights. What's striking about the results is that at least in heavily Democratic Philadelphia people are very clear that they trust Secretary Clinton much more often than Mr. Trump. While the overall incidence of trust in government or elected officials doesn't seem particularly high, it's also noteworthy that Philadelphians trust Secretary Clinton just about as often as they do other public officials included in the survey," said David Thornburgh, CEO, Committee of Seventy.

The survey was launched by BeHeardPhilly on Tuesday, July 19 and closed on Sunday, July 24, 2016, the day before the Democratic convention began. A total of 1,063 people began the survey and 986 people completed it. Survey results are attached to this release.

###

About Committee of Seventy

The Committee of Seventy was founded in Philadelphia in 1904 to protect and improve the voting process; encourage honest and capable people to seek public office, and help them make government work better; and engage citizens in the process of making important decisions about their future. In other words, Seventy advocates for better politics, better government, a better Philadelphia and a better Pennsylvania. For more information, go to www.seventy.org

About BeHeardPhilly

BeHeardPhilly is a civic engagement and community access tool used to understand the opinions, thoughts and activities of Philadelphia residents. BeHeardPhilly is a group of community members who have “opted in” and agreed to take surveys and participate in ongoing research, driven by local government, and nonprofit organizations and initiatives. Each member of BeHeardPhilly has initially shared his/her age, home zip code, gender, race and highest level of education. For those working in the social sector, it is a cost-effective and convenient resource for understanding community attitudes and perceptions, and conducting public opinion research in Philadelphia. BeHeardPhilly is owned, managed, and operated by the Institute of Survey Research at Temple University.

Committee of Seventy: Pre-DNC Survey Report

Project Background

The Committee of Seventy

The Committee of Seventy was founded in Philadelphia in 1904 to protect and improve the voting process; encourage honest and capable people to seek public office, and help them make government work better; and engage citizens in the process of making important decisions about their future. In other words, Seventy advocates for better politics, better government, a better Philadelphia and a better Pennsylvania. For more information, go to www.seventy.org

The Survey Project

The City of Philadelphia is hosting the 2016 Democratic National Convention. The Committee of Seventy wanted to administer a survey to Philadelphia residents to better understand their perspectives on local and national political issues of trust in government. The survey was launched by BeHeardPhilly on Tuesday, July 19 and closed on Sunday, July 24, 2016. A total of 1,063 began the survey, and 986 people completed the survey.

About BeHeardPhilly

[BeHeardPhilly](http://www.BeHeardPhilly.com) is a civic engagement and community access tool used to understand the opinions, thoughts and activities of Philadelphia residents. BeHeardPhilly is a group of community members who have “opted in” and agreed to take surveys and participate in ongoing research, driven by local government, and nonprofit organizations and initiatives. Each member of BeHeardPhilly has initially shared his/her age, home zip code, gender, race and highest level of education. For those working in the social sector, it is a cost-effective and convenient resource for understanding community attitudes and perceptions, and conducting public opinion research in Philadelphia. BeHeardPhilly is owned, managed, and operated by the Institute for Survey Research at Temple University. *The Institute for Survey Research at Temple University will retain data ownership and will transfer limited ownership of the resulting data collected. ISR retains the right to publish at least one survey item in each questionnaire to share with panel members. Clients have the right to request non-disclosure of any results.

About the Institute for Survey Research (ISR)

The Institute for Survey Research at Temple University is a nationally-renowned academic research organization based in Philadelphia. Over the course of the last 47 years, ISR has led or contributed to hundreds of projects on topics related to transportation, safety, crime, health, and education. The majority of these projects have involved working with urban and “hard-to-reach populations,” particularly in Philadelphia, to better understand their opinions, behaviors, and actions. ISR is a leader in the field of data collection and also has expertise in focus group research, phone interviewing, database creation and management, and has pioneered studies using SMS text messaging a mode of data collection. ISR maintains a staff of highly trained field interviewers who specialize in field interviewing and field observations. ISR regularly collaborates with researchers across Temple University and at other institutions throughout Philadelphia and the nation.

Survey Results

The results below are based on the weighted responses from 986 Philadelphians (see Weighting Methodology).

Constructs	Q	Questions	Responses			
Trust In Government	1	We want to know your general feelings on how much you trust the government at the national, state, and city levels. On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust the governments in...? Washington (National): _____ % Harrisburg (State): _____ % Philadelphia (City): _____ %		Weighted N	Mean	SD
			Washington (National)	1,040,494	44.3	26.6
			Harrisburg (State)	1,030,482	43.0	26.4
			Philadelphia (City)	1,027,508	43.9	26.8
Hillary Clinton	2	On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust Hillary Clinton?		Weighted N	Mean	SD
			Hillary Clinton	1,007,730	53.8	33.5
Donald Trump	3	On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust Donald Trump?		Weighted N	Mean	SD
			Donald Trump	1,023,144	14.0	23.6
Governor Wolf	4	On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust Governor Wolf?		Weighted N	Mean	SD
			Governor Wolf	943,818	54.9	29.6
Mayor Kenney	5	On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust Mayor Kenney?		Weighted N	Mean	SD
			Mayor Kenney	982,048	52.7	30.2
Party Affiliation	6	Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat an Independent or Other? 1. Republican 2. Democrat 3. Independent 4. Other		Weighted N	Percentage	
			Republican	108,843	10.4%	
			Democrat	707,660	67.5%	
			Independent	156,980	15.0%	
			Other	74,894	7.1%	
		Total	1,048,377	100.0%		

Weighting Methodology Report

Virtually, all survey data are weighted before they can be used to produce reliable estimates of population parameters. While reflecting the selection probabilities of sampled units, weighting also attempts to compensate for practical limitations of a sample survey, such as differential nonresponse and undercoverage. The weighting process for this survey essentially entailed two major steps. The first step consisted of computation of *base weights* to reflect unequal selection probabilities and selection of one adult per household. In the second step, base weights were adjusted so that the resulting final weights aggregate to reported totals for the target population.

For the second step, final weights were adjusted using the method of *Iterative Proportional Fitting*, which is commonly referred to as *Raking*. Specifically, design weights were simultaneously adjusted along the following raking dimensions using the *WgtAdjust* procedure of SUDAAN. It should be noted that survey data for some of demographic questions used for weighting included missing values. All such missing values were first imputed using a *hot-deck* procedure before construction of the survey weights. As such, respondent counts reflected in the following tables correspond to the post-imputation step.

In some respects, many of the surveys and pools do not properly report their margin of error, on the other it could be argued that computing such statistics from nonprobability samples such as BeHeardPhilly is improper. However, many top-tier sampling statisticians argue that the delineation between probability-based and nonprobability samples is becoming exceedingly blurred when most probability-based samples struggle to secure response rates that are north of 10%.

As described here, with weighted data error margins have to be computed based on the effective sample size and not the raw sample size. This means the reduction in effective sample size due to weighting should be reflected in

all calculation by dividing the raw sample size by the so-called design effect. For this survey our overall design effect is 3.25, which means the effective sample size is 986/ 3.25, which is equal to 303.

Below is the computation for the error margins, which are calculated through supplying raw sample size, design effect, level of confidence, and the value of point estimate you are working with.

Sample Size	986
Design Effect	3.25
Confidence Level	95.0%
Margin of Error	+/- 5.63%

Table 1. First raking dimension for weight adjustments by gender

Gender	Respondents		Population ¹	
Male	404	41.0%	535,945	45.9%
Female	582	59.0%	630,438	54.1%
Total	986	100.0%	1,166,383	100.0%

Table 2. Second raking dimension for weight adjustments by age

Age	Respondents		Population	
18-24	58	5.9%	149,700	12.8%
25-34	278	28.2%	279,609	24.0%
35-44	153	15.5%	191,107	16.4%
45-54	114	11.6%	183,728	15.8%
55-64	180	18.3%	174,046	14.9%
65+	203	20.6%	188,193	16.1%
Total	986	100.0%	1,166,383	100.0%

Table 3. Third raking dimension for weight adjustments by race-ethnicity

Race-Ethnicity	Respondents		Population	
White	636	64.5%	451,742	38.7%
Black	231	23.4%	466,976	40.0%
Hispanic	33	3.4%	140,428	12.0%
Other	86	8.7%	107,237	9.2%
Total	986	100.0%	1,166,383	100.0%

Table 4. Fourth raking dimension for weight adjustments by education

Education	Respondents		Population	
HS or Less	129	13.1%	596282	51.1%
Some College	113	11.5%	283924	24.3%
College Graduate	360	36.5%	173411	14.9%
Beyond College	384	38.9%	112766	9.7%
Total	986	100.0%	1,166,383	100.0%

¹ The needed population totals for weighting have been obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS).

Variance Estimation for Weighted Data:

Survey estimates can only be interpreted properly in light of their associated sampling errors. Since weighting often increases variances of estimates, use of standard variance calculation formulae with weighted data can result in misleading statistical inferences. With weighted data, two general approaches for variance estimation can be distinguished. One method is *Taylor Series* linearization and the second is replication. There are several statistical software packages that can be used to produce design-proper estimates of variances using linearization or replication methodologies, including:

- SAS: <http://www.sas.com>
- SUDAAN: <http://www.rti.org/sudaan>
- WesVar: http://www.westat.com/westat/statistical_software/wesVar
- Stata: <http://www.stata.com>

An Approximation Method for Variance Estimation can be used to avoid the need for special software packages. Researchers who do not have access to such tools for design-proper estimation of standard errors can approximate the resulting variance inflation due to weighting and incorporate that in subsequent calculations of confidence intervals and tests of significance. With W_i representing the final weight of the i^{th} respondent, the inflation due to weighting, which is commonly referred to as *Design Effect*, can be approximated by:

$$\delta = 1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(W_i - \bar{W})^2}{n-1}}{\bar{W}^2}$$

For calculation of a confidence interval for an estimated percentage, \hat{p} , one can obtain the conventional variance of the given percentage $S^2(\hat{p})$, multiply it by the approximated design effect, δ , and use the resulting quantity as adjusted variance. That is, the adjusted variance $\hat{S}^2(\hat{p})$ would be given by:

$$\hat{S}^2(\hat{p}) \approx S^2(\hat{p})(\hat{p}) \times \delta = \frac{\hat{p} \times (1 - \hat{p})}{n-1} \left(\frac{N-n}{N} \right) \times \delta$$

Subsequently, the $(100-\alpha)$ percent confidence interval for P would be given by:

$$\hat{p} - z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \times (1 - \hat{p})}{n-1} \left(\frac{N-n}{N} \right) \times \delta} \leq P \leq \hat{p} + z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \times (1 - \hat{p})}{n-1} \left(\frac{N-n}{N} \right) \times \delta}$$