

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

State

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	South Carolina	507	100.0	100.0	100.0

2002. How likely are you to vote in statewide elections?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definitely	404	79.6	79.6	79.6
	Very likely	75	14.7	14.7	94.3
	Somewhat likely	29	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Party

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democratic	142	28.0	28.0	28.0
	Republican	233	46.0	46.0	74.0
	Independent	132	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

1. The plan is designed to stop illegal immigration by adding 400 miles of fencing and other security enhancements, and improve screening to stop the smuggling of human beings and drugs through legal ports of entry along the southern border. Do you support or oppose these proposals to improve security along the border?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	240	47.3	47.3	47.3
	Somewhat support	118	23.2	23.2	70.5
	Somewhat oppose	54	10.6	10.6	81.2
	Strongly oppose	79	15.6	15.6	96.8
	Not sure	16	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

2. The President says his plan will restore the integrity of our broken asylum system by preventing migrants from making fraudulent claims and being released into the country. He says those with legitimate claims will quickly be admitted; if they're not, they will promptly be returned home. Do you support or oppose this part of the plan?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	247	48.7	48.7	48.7
	Somewhat support	107	21.0	21.0	69.7
	Somewhat oppose	57	11.3	11.3	81.1
	Strongly oppose	64	12.6	12.6	93.7
	Not sure	32	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

3. Many new immigrants make low-wages and have low-skills and this strains our safety net and generous welfare programs. To prevent that, the president's plan gives priority to higher-wage workers who are self-sufficient. Do you support or oppose this part of the plan?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	192	37.8	37.8	37.8
	Somewhat support	133	26.3	26.3	64.1
	Somewhat oppose	72	14.3	14.3	78.4
	Strongly oppose	66	12.9	12.9	91.3
	Not sure	44	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

4. Currently, about 66 percent of immigrants are admitted to the United States based on having relatives, including extended family members, in this country. Only about 12 percent are admitted based on their job skills and education. Do you support or oppose the recommendation that we give greater preference to immigrants with needed skills, and limit family-based immigration to spouses and minor children?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	174	34.3	34.3	34.3
	Somewhat support	112	22.0	22.0	56.3
	Somewhat oppose	84	16.5	16.5	72.9
	Strongly oppose	80	15.7	15.7	88.6
	Not sure	58	11.4	11.4	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

5. What also may be in the immigration plan is a requirement that all U.S. employers use E-Verify to make sure that all new employees are lawfully present in the U.S. and legally eligible to work. Do you support or oppose this requirement?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	315	62.2	62.2	62.2
	Somewhat support	115	22.6	22.6	84.8
	Somewhat oppose	28	5.4	5.4	90.3
	Strongly oppose	26	5.2	5.2	95.4
	Not sure	23	4.6	4.6	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

6. Finally, would you support or oppose a candidate in the next election who endorses most, if not all, of these concepts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	223	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Somewhat support	106	20.9	20.9	65.0
	Somewhat oppose	56	11.1	11.1	76.1
	Strongly oppose	61	12.1	12.1	88.2
	Not sure	60	11.8	11.8	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

AgeGroup

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-29	90	17.8	18.0	18.0
	30-49	200	39.4	40.0	58.0
	50-64	140	27.6	28.0	86.0
	65+	70	13.8	14.0	100.0
	Total	500	98.6	100.0	
Missing	.00	7	1.4		
Total		507	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

AgeGroup-B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-24	38	7.4	7.6	7.6
	25-34	89	17.5	17.7	25.3
	35-54	206	40.6	41.2	66.5
	55-69	127	25.0	25.3	91.8
	70+	41	8.1	8.2	100.0
	Total	500	98.6	100.0	
Missing	.00	7	1.4		
Total		507	100.0		

Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No College Degree	264	52.0	52.0	52.0
	College Degree+	243	48.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	370	73.0	74.0	74.0
	Hisp	20	3.9	4.0	78.0
	AfrAmer	95	18.7	19.0	97.0
	Asian	5	1.0	1.0	98.0
	Other	10	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	500	98.6	100.0	
Missing	.00	7	1.4		
Total		507	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	312	61.5	62.0	62.0
	Single, never married	106	20.9	21.1	83.0
	Divorced/separated/widowed	68	13.4	13.4	96.5
	Civil union or domestic partnership	18	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	504	99.3	100.0	
Missing	0	3	.7		
Total		507	100.0		

Live

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Large city (greater than 500,000 residents)	34	6.6	6.6	6.6
	Medium city (100,000-500,000 residents)	124	24.4	24.5	31.2
	Small city (less than 100,000 residents)	98	19.3	19.4	50.5
	Suburbs	125	24.6	24.8	75.3
	Rural area	125	24.6	24.7	100.0
	Total	504	99.5	100.0	
Missing	0	3	.5		
Total		507	100.0		

Ideology Recoded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Liberal	86	17.0	17.5	17.5
	Moderate	142	28.1	28.9	46.4
	Conservative	261	51.5	53.0	99.4
	Populist	3	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	492	97.1	100.0	
Missing	.00	15	2.9		
Total		507	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

Religion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Catholic	64	12.6	12.6	12.6
	Protestant	287	56.6	56.6	69.2
	Jewish	14	2.8	2.8	72.0
	Other/None	142	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Born Again

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	171	33.8	59.7	59.7
	No/NS	116	22.8	40.3	100.0
	Total	287	56.6	100.0	
Missing	0	220	43.4		
Total		507	100.0		

Union

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	19	3.8	3.8	3.8
	No	484	95.4	96.2	100.0
	Total	503	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	4	.8		
Total		507	100.0		

Child<17

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	177	34.9	35.2	35.2
	No	326	64.2	64.8	100.0
	Total	503	99.1	100.0	
Missing	0	4	.9		
Total		507	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

Employment Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Working full time	274	54.0	54.6	54.6
	Working part time	57	11.3	11.4	65.9
	Temporarily unemployed and looking for work	12	2.4	2.4	68.3
	Temporarily unemployed and not looking for work	6	1.2	1.2	69.6
	Student	15	3.0	3.1	72.6
	Stay at home parent/spouse	51	10.1	10.2	82.8
	Retired	86	17.0	17.2	100.0
	Total	502	99.1	100.0	
Missing	0	5	.9		
Total		507	100.0		

Veteran/Armed Forces?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	124	24.5	24.5	24.5
	No	383	75.5	75.5	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Resident

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My city or town	152	29.9	30.5	30.5
	America	259	51.0	52.1	82.6
	The planet Earth	86	17.0	17.4	100.0
	Total	496	97.9	100.0	
Missing	0	11	2.1		
Total		507	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in South Carolina  
5/23/19 - 5/29/19 MOE +/- 4.4 Percentage Points

Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$25,000	46	9.1	9.5	9.5
	\$25001 - 35000	49	9.7	10.1	19.7
	\$35001 - 50000	70	13.7	14.3	34.0
	\$50001 - 75000	103	20.2	21.1	55.1
	\$75001 - 100000	72	14.3	14.9	70.0
	\$100001 - 150000	95	18.7	19.5	89.5
	Greater than \$150000	51	10.0	10.5	100.0
	Total	486	95.9	100.0	
Missing	0	21	4.1		
Total		507	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	233	46.0	46.0	46.0
	Female	274	54.0	54.0	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative