Table B-2
The Impact of Voting Equipment on Residual Votes for Public Questions In New Jersey Municipalities, 2006 General Election

	Public Question 1	Public Question 2	Public Question 3
Explanatory Variable	**Coefficient (std. error)**	**Coefficient (std. error)**	**Coefficient (std. error)**
Residual vote in U.S. Senate race	-.59 (.40)	-.39 (.39)	-.36 (.40)
Full-face DRE	13.57*** (1.26)	13.74*** (1.26)	14.29*** (1.29)
Percent of population in poverty	.13** (.05)	.15** (.05)	.12* (.05)
Full-face DRE * percent in poverty	1.86*** (.19)	1.88*** (.19)	1.92*** (.19)
Constant	3.16*** (.40)	3.13*** (.41)	2.88*** (.41)
Number of Cases	566	566	566
R^2	.53	.55	.54

The dependent variable is the residual vote rate (percent) for each ballot question in New Jersey municipalities in the 2006 general election. Each municipality is weighted by the number of ballots cast in the election. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses. ***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, two-tailed t test

The regression results show that residual vote rates on the New Jersey ballot initiatives are substantially higher in municipalities using full-face DREs (even in communities with little or no poverty). In addition, there is a significant interaction between voting technology and poverty. The impact of full-face DREs on residual votes is much stronger in municipalities with high rates of poverty. The regression analysis also controls for residual votes in the Senate contest, in case voters in some municipalities were skipping all statewide contests and concentrating on local races. However, we find no connection between residual votes in the Senate contest and the statewide ballot issues. The results support what we show in Figure 1 of Kimball and Kropf (forthcoming).