

**Effects of Interviewer Gender on Survey Responses:  
Findings from a Household Survey in Mexico**

*(forthcoming, International Journal of Public Opinion Research)*

Francisco Flores-Macias  
Ph. D. Candidate  
Department of Political Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room E53-448  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
[fflores@mit.edu](mailto:fflores@mit.edu)

Chappell Lawson  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room E53-439  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
[clawson@mit.edu](mailto:clawson@mit.edu)

**Please direct correspondence here**

**Abstract:** Researchers have speculated that interviewer gender can affect responses to survey questions on social and political issues, but they have been unable to demonstrate the relationship convincingly. Based on a household survey in Mexico, this research note demonstrates that gender-of-interviewer effects do exist for male respondents in certain social contexts. Specifically, male respondents in Mexico City provided significantly more progressive answers on gender-sensitive questions when interviewed by a woman, but these effects were much smaller and statistically not significant in the rest of the country. Female respondents did not provide significantly different answers depending on the gender of the interviewer, either in Mexico City or nationally. Additionally, the effects of gender-of-interviewer were limited to gender-sensitive questions; they did not affect responses to other survey items, nor did they influence item non-response rates.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank Stephen Ansolabehere, Adam Berinsky, Barry Burden, and Andrea Campbell for helpful suggestions on earlier drafts. Additionally, the editors and three anonymous reviewers provided insightful comments. Data is drawn from the Mexico 2006 Panel Study; participants in the Mexico 2006 Panel Study include (in alphabetical order): Andy Baker, Kathleen Bruhn, Roderic Camp, Wayne Cornelius, Jorge Domínguez, Kenneth Greene, Joseph Klesner, Chappell Lawson (Principal Investigator), David Leal, Beatriz Magaloni, James McCann, Alejandro Moreno, Alejandro Poiré, and David Shirk. Funding for the study was provided by the National Science Foundation (SES-0517971) and *Reforma* newspaper; fieldwork was conducted by *Reforma* newspaper's Polling and Research Team, under the direction of Alejandro Moreno. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 59<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the World Association of Public Opinion Research, Montreal, Canada.

## **I. Research on Gender-of-Interviewer Effects**

In the social sciences, most studies on gender-of-interviewer effects have focused on questions dealing with sexual behavior and gender roles, as well as on response rates. Results from these analyses have been mixed, sometimes showing little evidence of effects (Johnson & DeLamater, 1976; Johnson & Moore, 1993) and other times suggesting non-trivial biases (Landis, et al., 1973; Galla, et al., 1981; Lueptow, et al., 1990; Catania, et al., 1996; Tu & Liao, 2007). In addition, response effects have not always been found in the same direction. While Galla, et al. (1981) argue that more “non-traditional” responses occur for both male and female respondents only when facing a female interviewer, Lueptow, et al. (1990) and Huddy, et al. (1997) sustain that effects are stronger among female respondents who are interviewed by another female, and Kane and Macaulay (1993) claim that “more egalitarian” answers are more pervasive among male respondents interviewed by a woman.

Only a few studies have explored the existence of bias attributable to the gender of the interviewer on political questions. Although these analyses have provided invaluable preliminary evidence on gender-of-interviewer effects, they have failed to yield statistically significant effects on the interaction between the gender of the interviewer and the gender of the respondent (Kane & Macaulay, 1993; Huddy, et al., 1997). The one exception is the early study by Landis, et al. (1973), who used a sample of 90 female college students in a town in the Western United States and found statistically significant evidence that female interviewers elicited more feminist responses.

Using a nationally representative telephone survey in the U.S., Kane and Macaulay (1993) analyzed potential interviewer-gender effects for a variety of questions, including some dealing with public policy on women's rights. They found that, although responses to some items appeared to be influenced by the gender of the interviewer, interaction effects between the gender of the interviewer and gender of the respondent were not significant. Thus "despite the tendency for bivariate interviewer-gender effects to be evident for different types of items for male and female respondents, and for the interviewer-gender/respondent-gender interactions to be in the expected directions, [the] multivariate analyses indicate that these interactions do not tend to be statistically significant in [the] sample" (p. 22).

Huddy et al. (1997), using two telephone surveys in selected areas of upstate New York, test for interviewer-gender effects on questions dealing with gender equality, activism of women, abortion, affirmative action, and on opinions on female political figures, among others. Out of the eleven items tested, the interaction between interviewer and respondent gender is significant only for one (dealing with the desirability of collective action by women in order to improve their conditions). In all, then, past research has called attention to the issue of interviewer gender but has yet to document large or significant effects that would be relevant for most political science research.

Our findings shed light on several unresolved controversies in survey research. First, they document effects that have long seemed conceptually plausible but had proven empirically elusive. Second, they underscore that gender-of-interviewer effects are likely to be asymmetric—that is, more likely to affect men than women on gender-sensitive items. Third, they show that interviewer effects may also depend on the social context in

which the surveys take place. In Mexico City—a large, politically progressive metropolis—gender-of-interviewer effects are consistently significant; nationally, they are undetectable. Finally, our findings extend the debate over interviewer-induced bias to countries other than the United States, where research has so far been much less extensive.

## **II. Data and Methods**

Our analysis draws on the first (October 2005) wave of the Mexico 2006 Panel Study, a face-to-face household survey designed to measure public opinion during Mexico's 2006 presidential campaign. Respondents included 1,600 adults in a national sample, 500 in an over-sample in Mexico City, and 300 in an over-sample of rural areas in the states of Chiapas, Jalisco, and Oaxaca. Participants were selected within the households based on which eligible adult had the most recent birthday. In the national sample, primary sampling units (PSUs) were determined according to a probability-proportional-to-size criterion, while simple random sampling was used to select sites in the Mexico City and rural oversamples. Each PSU provided a quota of 20 interviews, with households selected through a systematic random process followed by the interviewer. The questionnaire included approximately 80 questions, mostly concerning political opinions. The response rate for the survey, according to the minimum rate described in the guidelines of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, was 34%, and the sampling margin of error within a 95% confidence interval for each question was  $\pm 2.5\%$  for the national sample,  $\pm 4.4\%$  for Mexico City, and  $\pm 5.7\%$  for the rural areas. To ensure high reliability in the data collection process, 33% of the interviews

were directly supervised at the time of the survey, 19% were supervised in person afterwards, 7% were supervised by telephone, and only 41% of the interviews went completely unsupervised.

Due primarily to safety concerns, female interviewers were not assigned in the rural over-sample. Consequently, the present analysis focuses on the national and Mexico City samples. The national sample included 1,600 respondents, clustered in 80 PSUs that were assigned to 75 interviewers (38 female and 37 male). The Mexico City sample included 500 respondents, clustered in 25 PSUs assigned to 33 interviewers (17 female and 16 male). In the urban areas of the national sample and the entire Mexico City sample, interviewers were assigned randomly by gender; some female interviewers were assigned to rural portions of the national sample, but their assignment was not consciously random. (The findings reported here hold when only urban areas are analyzed, as well as when both urban and rural areas of the national sample are included in the analysis.)

Although this design was intended to yield a field experiment, randomization proved only partially successful (as shown by chi-squared tests of basic sociodemographic characteristics). Lack of randomization is partly attributable to the fact that a disproportionate number of female interviewers was assigned to particular regions of the country (out of considerations of safety). Another complication was the fact that supervisors themselves were not assigned randomly by gender, and the presence of these individuals could have muddled the experiment. To address this potential source of contamination, we also collected data on the gender of the supervisor.

In the national sample, 527 of the 1,600 interviews were supervised concurrently, and 163 (approximately 10% of the total) were cases where the gender of the supervisor did not match the gender of the interviewer. In the Mexico City sample, 68 of the 500 interviews were supervised concurrently, and 49 (approximately 10% of the total) were instances where the gender of the interviewer and the gender of the supervisor were different. In all analyses presented here, if an interview was supervised concurrently by a woman, we coded “interviewer gender” as female, even if the interviewer was male. We believe that this is justified since the mere presence of a female supervisor at the time of the interview, overlooking the process, should be enough to elicit any effects. In any case, we tested for robustness and obtained almost identical results to the ones presented here when conducting all regressions in two additional ways: (i) not considering the cases when there was a mismatch between the gender of the interviewer and the gender of the supervisor and (ii) coding only the gender of the interviewer and disregarding that of the supervisor.

Two questions in the survey instrument are considered gender-sensitive and thus most likely to be influenced by the gender of the interviewer. The first of these asked whether or not abortion should be legal in cases of rape. (See Appendix 1 for all question wordings.) The second item was part of a battery in which respondents were asked to rate the urgency of different policy priorities for the next president. “Women’s rights” was included among these, mixed with “poverty,” “corruption,” “education,” “modernization of the electricity sector,” “trade relations between Mexico and the United States,” and others. The response options were “very urgent,” “urgent,” and “not so urgent.”

As with most of the policy priorities mentioned, only a small number of respondents rated women's rights as "not so urgent"; consequently, both "urgent" and "not so urgent" were coded as 0 and "very urgent" was coded as 1. (Our conclusions do not change if we code the responses on a 1-3 scale and conduct our multivariate analysis using either ordinary least squares or ordered probit.) For the question on abortion, a zero meant that abortion should be illegal in cases of rape and a one that it should be legal. Thus a higher score indicated a more socially progressive response.

### **III. Results**

With these issues in mind, we first report the bivariate results and then turn to the multivariate analysis, controlling for the main factors that might influence attitudes on gender-sensitive topics. As the data in Table 1 indicate, male respondents in Mexico City appear to have been more susceptible to gender-of-interview effects. For instance, approximately 30% of men interviewed by men identified women's rights as a "very urgent" priority for the next president, compared to 40% who were interviewed by women. Likewise, men interviewed by men were about nine percentage points more likely to favor criminalizing abortion in the case of rape than men interviewed by women. On the other hand, in the national sample there were virtually no differences among male respondents by gender of interviewer. Women appear to become more progressive when interviewed by men in the national sample; in Mexico City, however, they are almost equally progressive for male and female interviewers in the abortion question and less progressive when interviewed by a man in the women's rights question.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

We next turn to the multivariate analysis: a binary probit model that controls for socio-demographic variables, as well as for the presence of a third party—other than the supervisor—at the time of the interview. (This third party was generally a family member.) Cluster-robust standard errors are used in order to take into account clustering in the sampling units. The few cases of item non-response are not included in the analysis. Deleting these cases does not affect the results, as shown by a binary probit model analogous to the general model with item non-response as the dependent variable (1=doesn't know/refused and 0=valid response). Item non-response to these two questions was not significantly related to the interviewer's gender.

The independent variables are described below (for descriptive statistics of the independent variables, see Appendix 2):

- **Age.** Age of the respondent, ranging from 17 (for those eligible respondents who would turn 18 prior to election day) to 92.
- **Education.** Educational level of the respondent, on the following nine-point scale: none, incomplete primary, complete primary, incomplete secondary, complete secondary, incomplete preparatory, complete preparatory, incomplete college, complete college or more.
- **Church attendance.** Frequency of church attendance of the respondent, on a five-point scale—more than once a week, once a week, once a month, only on special occasions, never— so that higher scores indicate less religiosity. This variable is included as control only for the abortion question.

- **Socioeconomic status.** Interviewer's assessment of the socioeconomic status of the respondent's household, on a five-point scale. (This measure correlates closely with an index of household items—whether the respondent owns a telephone, refrigerator, car, etc.—but offers slightly greater spread. Using one measure rather than the other does not affect our conclusions.)
- **Ideology.** Ideological self-placement of the respondent on a seven-point scale, ranging from strong right (-3) to strong left (3). Many respondents (35% in the national sample and 24% in the Mexico City sample) were unable to place themselves on the ideological spectrum and are coded in the middle of the scale. (Treating these respondents as missing does not affect our conclusions.)
- **Third person.** Presence of a third person, other than the interviewer, during the interview. Normally, the person in question was another member of the respondent's household.
- **Interviewer.** Dummy variable for the gender of the interviewer (1=female and 0=male). As explained above, if the supervisor was female and present during the interview, the interviewer is coded as “female,” even if the person asking the questions was male.

Once these confounding factors are taken into account, the effect of interviewer gender for male respondents living in Mexico City is highly significant for both questions. In keeping with previous empirical research on the topic, the results are not statistically significant for male respondents in the national sample. Likewise, interviewer gender has no significant effect on female respondents on either question, in either

sample. Table 2 presents these results, disaggregated by type of sample and by gender of respondent in order to make the interactions among these dummy variables more clear.

The control variables generally operate in the expected direction. Education is highly significant and positively associated with favoring legal abortion in the event of rape in all the models run; church attendance is also significant in the expected direction in the national sample. The presence of a third party is never significant, and socioeconomic status and ideology are significant at the 5% level in only one instance each.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

To give a sense of the magnitude of the effect of interviewer gender, we follow the standard practice of holding all coefficients at their means (or modes for binary variables) while manipulating the value of one independent variable. For a male living in Mexico City, the difference between being interviewed by a woman rather than by a man on the issue of abortion rights is roughly equivalent to the difference between being 25 years old and being 60, between having had a few years of high school and having completed only primary school, between attending church regularly and never attending at all, or between being a leftist and a rightist (all other things equal). Although these effects are not dramatic, neither are they trivial. The effects on attitudes toward women's rights are somewhat greater for the same variables. For instance, in terms of education, being interviewed by a woman rather than a man is roughly equal to the difference between not having completed primary school and having finished college.

### **Non-gender-sensitive items and response rates**

The next step in our analysis addressed whether the effects observed for male respondents in Mexico City are present only on the gender-sensitive questions or whether they also affect responses to other items—in other words, whether the effects of interviewer gender are pervasive or restricted to particular topics. Accordingly, we ran binary probit regressions for all other survey questions on issues not considered to be gender-sensitive, using the same statistical model of the women’s rights question. Out of the fourteen questions examined, the coefficient for the gender of the interviewer was never significant at the 5% level. Gender-of-interviewer effects thus appear to be limited to gender-sensitive items.

To further clarify the scope of gender-of-interviewer effects, we tested whether the gender of the interviewer was a significant determinant of the total count of item non-responses in the whole survey. The interaction between interviewer and respondent gender was not significantly related to item non-response throughout the survey. This result is consistent with previous findings by Groves and Fultz (1985) and Kane and Macaulay (1993).

### **IV. Discussion**

Our findings suggest two conclusions and one area for future research. First, in the research of interviewer-induced bias, the use of national samples may conceal or “cancel out” differences that exist across different regions or between large cities and other areas. Conversely, samples from a particular region may not be readily generalizable to other settings. In this case, there are reasons why male respondents in

Mexico City react differently to female interviews than do their counterparts in other areas of the country. Mexico City is a cosmopolitan metropolis whose residents hold markedly different political views from most other Mexicans (see, for example, Flores-Macias & Lawson, 2006; Klesner, 2004); and it is the bastion of the leftist Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD), other leftist splinter parties, and progressive social movements (including feminist groups). By contrast, other large urban centers—Guadalajara, Monterrey, Puebla, Mérida—are known for their conservative politics. What applies to one region is unlikely to hold true in another. Presumably, the same conclusion would hold for many large countries, and we speculate, for example, that a similar experiment in the United States, comparing a national sample with a sample in a large, politically progressive metropolis such as New York City, could produce results similar to the ones presented here.

Second, on a practical level, our results suggest that survey researchers should take into account potential gender-of-interviewer effects where they might reasonably be suspected. The gold standard for survey research would be to randomize the assignment of interviewers by gender in situations where gender-of-interviewer effects seem likely. Additionally, and far easier in practice than randomization, the gender of the interviewer and the supervisor should be recorded so that researchers can control for potential biases after the fact in their analyses. Indeed, we believe that collecting information on the basic demographic characteristics of the interviewer and the supervisor should be standard practice in all surveys, given the possibility of differentiated effects.

One issue not addressed by our research concerns the cognitive processes that underlie interviewer-induced effects (for competing theories on this issue, see, Zaller &

Feldman [1992] and, *inter alia*, Holbrook, Green, & Krosnick [2003]). Are these effects the product of certain respondents providing answers that they expect will please the interviewer, thus avoiding potential social sanctions? Or are they the product of the fact that certain characteristics of the interviewer may render more salient considerations respondents already hold, and thus how they approach the question that confronts them? This research note is agnostic as to the mechanism involved, the investigation of which we leave to future research.

## References

- American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2006. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Lenexa, KS: AAPOR.
- Catania, J., et al. (1996). Effects of Interviewer Gender, Interviewer Choice, and Item Wording on Responses to Questions Concerning Sexual Behavior. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 60, 345-375.
- Flores-Macias, F., & Lawson, C. (2006). Mexican Democracy and Its Discontents. *Review of Policy Research*. 23, 287-293.
- Galla, J. P., et al. (1981). Effect of Experimenter's Gender on Responses to a Sex-Role Attitude Questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*. 49, 935-940.
- Groves, R. M., & Fultz, N. H. (1985). Gender Effects among Telephone Interviewers in a Survey of Economic Attitudes. *Sociological Methods and Research*. 14, 31-52.
- Holbrook, A., Green, M., & Krosnick, J. (2003). Telephone versus Face-to-Face Interviewing of National Probability Samples with Long Questionnaires: Comparisons of Respondent Satisficing and Social Desirability Response Bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 67, 79-125.
- Huddy, L., et al. (1997). The Effect of Interviewer Gender on the Survey Response. *Political Behavior*. 19, 197-220.
- Johnson, W., & DeLamater, J. (1976). Response Effects in Sex Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 40, 165-181.

- Johnson, T. P., & Moore, R. W. (1993). Gender Interactions between Interviewer and Survey Respondents: Issues of Pornography and Community Standards. *Sex Roles*. 28, 243-261.
- Kane, E. & Macaulay, L. (1993). Interviewer Gender and Gender Attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 57, 1-28.
- Klesner, J. (2004). "The Structure of the Mexican Electorate: Social, Attitudinal, and Partisan Bases of Vicente Fox's Victory." In *Mexico's Pivotal Democratic Election: Candidates, Voters, and the Presidential Campaign of 2000*, ed. Jorge I. Dominguez and Chappell Lawson, pp. 91-122. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Landis, J., Sullivan, D., & Sheley, J. (1973). Feminist Attitudes as Related to Sex of the Interviewer. *Pacific Sociological Review*. 16, 305-314.
- Lueptow, L. B., Moser, S. L., & Pendleton, B. F. (1990). Gender and Response Effects in Telephone Interviews about Gender Characteristics. *Sex Roles*. 22, 29-42.
- Tu, S. H. & Liao, P. S. (2007). Social Distance, Respondent Cooperation and Item Nonresponse in Sex Survey. *Quality and Quantity*. 41, 177-199.
- Zaller, J. & Feldman, S. (1992). A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*. 36, 579-616.

**Table 1. Responses by Gender of Interviewer and Gender of Respondent (Percentages)**

	National Sample			
	Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
	Female interviewer	Male interviewer	Female interviewer	Male interviewer
<i>Abortion question</i>				
Legal	53.11	54.52	55.56	61.78
Illegal	38.44	37.32	35.95	31.32
Doesn't Know/Refused	8.44	8.16	8.50	6.90
N	450	343	459	348
$\chi^2$ (df)		0.16 (2)		3.21 (2)
p-value		0.92		0.20
<i>Women's rights question</i>				
Very urgent	36.22	34.40	42.92	50.57
Urgent/Not so urgent	61.56	63.56	54.68	48.28
Doesn't Know/Refused	2.22	2.04	2.40	1.15
N	450	343	459	348
$\chi^2$ (df)		0.33 (2)		5.73 (2)
p-value		0.85		0.06
Mexico City Sample				
	Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
	Female interviewer	Male interviewer	Female interviewer	Male interviewer
	<i>Abortion question</i>			
Legal	76.34	67.61	78.30	79.87
Illegal	18.28	29.58	16.98	16.98
Doesn't Know/Refused	5.38	2.82	4.72	3.14
N	93	142	106	159
$\chi^2$ (df)		4.42 (2)		0.43 (2)
p-value		0.11		0.80
<i>Women's rights question</i>				
Very urgent	39.78	29.58	42.45	36.48
Urgent/Not so urgent	60.22	70.42	56.60	62.89
Doesn't Know/Refused	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.63
N	93	142	106	159
$\chi^2$ (df)		2.62 (1)		1.08 (2)
p-value		0.11		0.58

**Table 2. Multivariate Analysis for Responses to Gender-Sensitive Questions (Binary Probit)**

	National Sample			
	Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
	Abortion Question	Women's Rights Question	Abortion Question	Women's Rights Question
Female Interviewer	-0.147 [0.126]	0.155 [0.133]	-0.198 [0.113]	-0.100 [0.109]
Age	-0.003 [0.004]	-0.001 [0.003]	-0.008 [0.005]	-0.008 * [0.003]
Socioeconomic status	0.011 [0.070]	0.071 [0.065]	0.056 [0.077]	0.128 [0.071]
Ideology	0.048 [0.035]	0.011 [0.032]	-0.015 [0.040]	-0.003 [0.031]
Third Person	0.034 [0.109]	0.087 [0.091]	-0.151 [0.099]	0.048 [0.093]
Education	0.159 ** [0.025]	-0.020 [0.023]	0.106 ** [0.027]	-0.011 [0.025]
Church attendance	0.108 * [0.042]		0.189 ** [0.046]	
(Constant)	-0.749 * [0.339]	-0.501 [0.274]	-0.242 [0.310]	0.074 [0.252]
Log pseudo-likelihood	-435.91	-501.83	-440.51	-538.33
N	711	770	733	787
Mexico City Sample				
	Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
	Abortion Question	Women's Rights Question	Abortion Question	Women's Rights Question
Female Interviewer	0.355 * [0.150]	0.455 ** [0.165]	-0.040 [0.141]	0.211 [0.187]
Age	-0.010 * [0.007]	-0.003 [0.005]	0.000 [0.007]	-0.006 [0.005]
Socioeconomic status	-0.012 [0.094]	-0.240 * [0.105]	-0.059 [0.122]	0.011 [0.084]
Ideology	-0.102 [0.055]	-0.071 [0.071]	0.149 * [0.062]	-0.017 [0.058]
Third Person	-0.034 [0.222]	-0.341 [0.264]	-0.063 [0.194]	0.111 [0.189]
Education	0.138 ** [0.04]	0.056 [0.042]	0.139 ** [0.051]	-0.019 [0.044]
Church attendance	0.058 [0.108]		0.152 [0.096]	
(Constant)	-0.055 [0.566]	-0.186 [0.376]	-0.167 [0.511]	-0.010 [0.359]
Log pseudo-likelihood	-115.53	-143.39	-106.29	-174.60
N	224	235	249	263

Note: Cluster-robust standard errors in brackets

\* p &lt; .05

\*\* p &lt; .01

## **Appendix 1. Question Wording**

Abortion question: “In your opinion, should abortion in the case of rape be legal or illegal?” (Authors’ translation.) [Note: Abortion is currently legal in all Mexican states in the case of rape and to save the life of the mother. Abortion is normally illegal under other circumstances, though the prohibition is not systematically enforced.]

Women’s rights question: “I am going to read to you several issues that can be addressed by the next president of the country, and I would like you to tell me how urgent each one is. Maybe they are all urgent, but some might be more urgent than others. Would you say that [read issue] is very urgent, urgent, or not so urgent?” (Authors’ translation.) The policy issues mentioned were: a) crime and public safety; b) government corruption; c) poverty; d) unemployment; e) economic stability; f) water supply; g) education; h) modernization of the electricity sector; i) trade relations between Mexico and the United States; and j) women’s rights. [Note: The order of items was rotated by the interviewer.]

---

---

**Appendix 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Control Variables (Non-Responses not Included)**

---

## National Sample

---

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age	1599	40.24	16.07	17	92
Education	1593	4.93	2.48	1	9
Church attendance	1579	2.85	1.14	1	5
Socioeconomic status	1598	2.13	0.85	1	5
Ideology	1600	0.03	1.43	-3	3
Third person	1597	0.39	0.49	0	1

---

## Mexico City Sample

---

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age	500	40.11	15.71	17	84
Education	500	6.09	2.34	1	9
Church attendance	492	3.09	1.14	1	5
Socioeconomic status	500	2.44	0.89	1	5
Ideology	500	0.28	1.45	-3	3
Third person	500	0.25	0.43	0	1

---