



Badger Poll™ #6, Release #2
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
University of Wisconsin Madison
February 24, 2003

NOTE: When using material from this release please cite the Badger Poll™ conducted by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center, paid for by private funds at the University. The Capital Times (Madison) and the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel are the poll's media sponsors.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE GOVERNOR AND THE STATE BUDGET PROCESS
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

As Wisconsin enters the months long budget process, the new Governor enjoys good "marks", along with limited optimism that he can solve the budget situation. The public shows signs of not being fully convinced yet that the really hard choices are necessary, and are predisposed to look critically at a variety of measures which might either increase what the state takes in, or reduce what it pays out. These conclusions come from the most recent Badger Poll™, which interviewed 504 state residents between February 11 and 19th, inclusive.

As debate begins over the budget proposal, Governor Doyle brings with him a public with a relatively open mind, but hopeful about his performance. Asked to rate how well he was doing his job, four in ten rated him either excellent (5%) or good (34%), with one in three assigning him a lower grade of fair (27%) or poor (5%). But this left three in ten who either volunteered that it was too soon to tell or otherwise did not answer the question.

Among those with an opinion, one sees little sign of a "gender gap" for the Governor, although men were less likely to venture an opinion. Not surprisingly, when one of the few clear things about an incumbent this early in his term is his party, self-described partisanship IS related to views of Doyle, even around one in four failed to rate him in each group. Among Democrats, good or better ratings outnumber fair or worse grades by three to one. Among Republicans and Independents, lower ratings outnumber higher by four to three.

In January, close after the inauguration, respondents were asked what kind of a job they EXPECTED Doyle to do. Answers then, as may be seen in the accompanying table, were quite positive, with good or better accounting for five respondents for every three who expected him to do a fair or poor job. This table also shows three occasions when Scott McCallum was rated on the same scale. Aside from the fact that respondents were more willing to assign him a "grade" than is so far the case with Doyle, the balance was clearly less flattering on each of the three surveys than Doyle now gets.

This is echoed in the results when Wisconsinites were asked to look back at McCallum and rate him retrospectively. Overall he is now viewed slightly worse than he was last year, heightening the contrast with Doyle. Specifically, three in ten said the job Scott McCallum did was excellent (3%) or good (26%). Almost two thirds said either fair (42%) or poor (22%). Except for Republicans, among whom McCallum is more positively viewed than Doyle, both men and women, and Democrats and Independents, give the current Governor relatively better marks

than they give his GOP predecessor.

Ratings of Governor's (and Predecessors) Across Time

	FEB03	JAN03	SPT02	JUN02	MAR02
Incumbent Governor Rating+					
EXCELLENT	5%	10%	5%	3%	3%
GOOD	34	44	29	32	23
FAIR	27	31	39	35	40
POOR	5	3	17	19	23
TOO SOON TO TELL (VOL)	22		2	4	4
DON'T KNOW	7	9	8	7	7
REFUSED	*	2	*	*	2
Rating of predecessor*					
EXCELLENT				26%	15%
GOOD	26			42	51
FAIR	42			21	23
POOR	22			9	8
DON'T KNOW	7			2	3
REFUSED	*			*	1

+Incumbent was Doyle in FEB03, JAN03, McCallum in others (January rating asked how good a job people thought Doyle WOULD do

*Predecessor referred to Tommy Thompson except for FEB03 when it was McCallum

In this particular time, how the budget is handled will be key. (Doyle's address was given at the end of the interview period, after the vast bulk of interviews was conducted). At the start of the process, the public was divided about his success. When asked, "do you think Doyle will be able to solve Wisconsin's budget problems, or don't you think so", respondents split evenly. Some four in ten (41%) said yes; some four in ten (40%) said now, with a notably high tendency not to come down clearly on either side.

Independents tended to mirror the overall population, splitting evenly. Democrats and Republicans were mirror images of one another, with the former saying he would be able to by about five to three, while the latter said he would not by about the same margin. This month's uncertainty should also be seen in the light of last month's even greater doubt. In January, the identical question produced one in four (25%) who felt he would be able to solve the budget problem, and just over half (54%) who did not think so.

Respondents were also asked what they expected would happen to what they paid in to the state. In a question not directly addressed before, over nine in ten said the amount they paid for "things like licenses, permits, and user fees" would go up, 26% by "a lot", 65% by "some". Almost all the remainder expected them to stay the same. There are no very striking demographic patterns.

If the focus is specifically on "your own state taxes", there is also a sense that the burden will rise. Seven in ten thought those would to up (12% a lot, 57% some). Again, virtually all the remainder thought they would stay the same, with only a handful looking actually to a decrease. This question WAS asked last poll as well, and on that survey, results were very similar. This suggests

that in looking forward, respondents had "discounted" some tax increase and they may be surprised at the fact that the speech proposed no hiking of levies, although it did make reference to certain fee hikes.

With the exception of some who advocate use of tax explicitly for redistributing wealth, most people tend to regard taxes as at best a necessary evil, required to fund what they want. Going along with this, when asked about the current level of state taxes in Wisconsin, two thirds (68%) say they are too high, three in ten (29%) say they are about right, only a handful (1%) feels they are too low. Republicans and men are about ten points more likely to say taxes are too high than other gender or partisan groups. Opposition tends to be higher in the middle age groups than in either the younger or older ones, especially the former.

Overall attitudes to spending are quite similar. In a parallel question, two thirds (66%) thought the current level of state spending was "too high". Again, for those venturing an opinion, almost all the others said that spending was about right (21%) as opposed to too low (2%). A bit more often than was the case for taxes, respondents either said it depended on which area was being talked about or otherwise failed to give one of the requested answers. Groups tended to occupy the same relative positions, and the distribution of answers to the two questions tended to be very similar.

One other "table setting" question was put, to gauge the extent to which the public in fact expected that difficult and painful choices were necessary. Specifically, respondents were asked "In order to balance the state budget, do you think a choice will have to be made between serious service cuts and big increases in taxes, or is it possible to both maintain essential services and keep taxes down". Overall sentiment is split. Just under half (46%) say such a choice is necessary, but four in ten (42%) say one can achieve both goals,

Democrats are split, Independents narrowly say one can do both, Republicans narrowly see the need for choice. Belief in the starkness of the choice is strongest among the oldest respondents and weakest among the youngest.

These three question have also been included in earlier Badger Polls™ and results are presented in the accompanying table. What it shows is that resistance to taxes has been high over the last year but does not seem to be increasing, and indeed -- albeit by a small margin -- sentiment that taxes are too high is now at a level which has been somewhat higher in the recent past. But any trend is in a narrow range.

The range for spending is also relatively narrow, but the present sense that outlays are too high is somewhat above what earlier polls found. This means that the "gap" between taxes and spending is now narrower than it has been. (For shorthand purposes, consider the difference between the proportion saying taxes are too high and the corresponding sense that spending is too high. This was ten points in March 2002, nineteen points in June of that year, eleven points in September, and eight points last month. It is now two points.

Where change across time seems clearest is in the perception that hard choices are necessary. The public at large still could use some convincing on that point, to be sure. But there has tended to be a modest upward trend since last March, with the proportion believing real choices are necessary moving from roughly one in four to just under one in two. As noted, there remains doubt, and certainly the public is receptive to ways of saving money that might not actually EITHER increase the tax burden or translate to real cuts, but the present climate is somewhat friendlier to longer term solutions than was the

Short-Run Fiscal Expectations

	FEB03	JAN03
Doyle and fiscal problem		
CAN SOLVE	41%	25%
CAN'T SOLVE	40	54
HELP, NOT SOLVE (VOL.)	4	5
DON'T KNOW	14	15
REFUSED	1	1
Expectation for own taxes		
GO UP A LOT	12%	11%
GO UP SOME	57	57
STAY ABOUT THE SAME	28	24
GO DOWN SOME	1	3
GO DOWN A LOT	*	1
DON'T KNOW	2	3
REFUSED	--	1

case last year.

General Budget-Related Perceptions Across Time

	FEB03	JAN03	SPT02	JUN02	MAR02
Current level of taxes					
TOO HIGH	68%	71%	74%	77%	71%
TOO LOW	1	1	2	1	2
JUST ABOUT RIGHT	29	26	22	19	24
DEPENDS ON TAX (VOL.)	1	*	*	1	1
DON'T KNOW	1	1	2	2	2
REFUSED	--	1	--	*	*
Current level of spending					
TOO HIGH	66%	63%	63%	58%	61%
TOO LOW	2	3	3	5	5
JUST ABOUT RIGHT	21	22	23	25	25
DEPENDS ON PROG. (VOL.)	2	3	2	3	5
DON'T KNOW	9	8	9	9	5
REFUSED	*	1	1	1	*
Serious budget choices					
HAVE TO CHOOSE	46%	41%	30%	34%	28%
DOESN'T HAVE TO CHOOSE	42	46	56	55	56
SOME OF EACH (VOL.)	5	4	3	5	6
DON'T KNOW	6	9	10	6	8
REFUSED	1	1	1	--	2

A final series presented respondents with a number of ways of shrinking the gap between money coming into the state and money being spent. For each, respondents were asked whether they strongly favored, somewhat favored, somewhat opposed or strongly opposed the option. Both "revenue enhancement" and

"expenditure amelioration" measures were included.

Only one idea stands out in terms of support (or lack of opposition), which is to "reduce the number of branch offices of state agencies". Seven in ten favor this (32% strongly, 39% somewhat), and one in five oppose it (19% somewhat, 6% strongly). But one should caution that the idea of closing non-specified branch offices may go down more easily in theory than closing "my office" would in practice. Thus, this is very much in keeping with a mentality of cut expenditures but not program.

Several other areas have more people coming down on the favorable side than opposition, but much more closely divided. One may be surprising: "reduce revenue sharing for 'other local spending' (i.e. NOT "state aid for local public schools"). Almost six in ten favored this (14% strongly, 44% somewhat), contrasted with one in three who opposed it (23% somewhat, 12% strongly). Two aspects of this should be noted. First, as will be discussed below, the contrast with schools is crucial. Second, because this discussed spending in general -- with the one key exception -- it may be easier to agree to than a more specific reference, just as people often say cut in general but then find it hard to say what specifically should be cut. Still, it is evident that revenue sharing for non-school purposes may not be quite so much a sacred cow as some have supposed.

The other areas with relatively high support/low opposition are "charge for services the state now provides for free, and increase user fees", favored by six in ten (11% strongly, 46% somewhat) and opposed by one in three (19% somewhat, 16% strongly).

"Cut the hours state agencies are open", is favored by five (13% strongly, 40% somewhat) for every five who oppose the notion (27% somewhat, 16% strongly). An even balance is found for "increase the costs of licenses and permits issued by the state" (11% strongly favor, 39% somewhat favor, 25% somewhat oppose, 24% strongly oppose). This measure, along with "fees" has the "advantage of affecting those who use the services directly, transferring some of the cost from general revenues from all taxpayers.

Four other areas come next, on balance opposed by a modest to moderate number more than favor them in principle. They are, in descending order, "reduce the sales tax exemptions so you pay tax on some things that are now tax free", "lay off state workers", "cut all state programs by the same percentage across the board", and "reduce the money spent on state prisons by shortening terms, letting more people out on work-release programs" and the like.

None can be said to be popular. The most closely "balanced" is broadening the sales tax (11% strongly favor, 34% somewhat favor, 25% somewhat oppose, 26% strongly oppose). The least is prisons (14% strongly favor, 24% somewhat favor, 27% somewhat oppose, 33% strongly oppose). But opposition tends to be more intense than favorable opinion, and as noted, on balance each finds more residents opposed than favoring the idea.

A cluster of four other areas comes in for clear opposition, even when -- as for this question -- each was put in the context not of whether it was something people wanted to see happen in the abstract, but whether how it was viewed as a way to cut the gap. One was local schools, "cut state aid for local public schools, and giving towns the choice of raising taxes or cutting their own education budgets". Only one quarter favored this (7% strongly, 20% somewhat), while two thirds opposed it (26% somewhat, 41% strongly). The contrast with more general revenue sharing cuts above is striking, as is the fact that the

largest single group is in strong opposition.

Also unpopular was a broad based revenue raiser "raise the rate on the sales tax", about which about one quarter were in favor (6% strongly, 22% somewhat), and seven in ten opposed (34% somewhat, 37% strongly). "Cut the amount of money available for poor families by paying for fewer services" also finds about a quarter in favor (5% strongly, 21% somewhat). Here as well, however, around seven in ten are opposed (38% somewhat, 31% strongly). This is a little different from the previous areas in that the strongly opposed group is not the largest.

The final area in this cluster, and the least popular is "increase the tuition students pay at public colleges and universities". Overall, one in four favor this (6% strongly, 19% somewhat). But three in four stand in opposition (23% somewhat, 50% strongly). This last number is the largest such group so far discussed. In the abstract, this is not seen as a good way to raise revenue.

Two other areas were included in the laundry list of example areas presented, Opposition to both was marked. Only about one in six residents favored "raise the income tax rates" (1% strongly, 17% somewhat), while this idea was opposed by eight in ten (31% somewhat, 50% strongly).

The one remaining area, "cut the amount of money available for health care for elderly people for such things as nursing home care", found near universal rejection. Only one in twenty were at all in favor (2% strongly, 3% somewhat). On the other side were almost nineteen residents in twenty (23% somewhat and 71% strongly). This -- the seven in ten in strong opposition -- clearly distinguishes this issue even from the income tax and raising public college tuition, to which half the residents are strongly opposed.

It should be noted that these are "tests" of general ideas, and attitudes could certainly shift once one got more into specifics, especially if the public more closely looks at the implications for what they and others either pay in or receive directly or indirectly in services. Other considerations will be the tradeoffs which may become evident. But, taken along with earlier questions on priorities, with which these are not inconsistent, they suggest the mindset with which the public enters the budget debate.

Statewide Marginals and Percentages for Key Groups

What follows is the exact question wording for each of the items referred to in the release. All results shown are for the basic sample of state residents. The first column is the percentage of the entire sample giving each response. The second and third reports the percentages for men and women separately. The fourth, fifth, and sixth columns show self-described Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. Columns seven through ten group respondents by age.

Q01. INTERVIEWER: (DO NOT ASK) Enter respondent's gender

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
MALE	49%	100%	--%	40%	52%	55%	48%	53%	48%	44%
FEMALE	51	--	100	61	48	45	52	47	52	56

DOYLE07. And do you think your own state taxes next year will go up a lot, go up some, stay about the same, go down some, or go down a lot?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
GO UP A LOT	12%	10%	13%	8%	14%	16%	22%	13%	8%	10%
GO UP SOME	57	58	55	60	49	55	56	62	59	48
STAY ABOUT THE SAME	28	28	27	28	31	27	20	22	30	36
GO DOWN SOME	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	2	--	2
GO DOWN A LOT	*	*	*	*	--	--	--	--	*	--
DON'T KNOW	2	2	3	3	4	2	--	1	3	4
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TAX01. Right now do you think the level of state taxes in Wisconsin is too high, too low, or just about right?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
TOO HIGH	68%	73%	63%	64%	62%	74%	49%	70%	77%	66%
TOO LOW	1	3	*	3	1	1	--	2	1	2
JUST ABOUT RIGHT	29	23	35	31	35	25	50	27	21	30
DEPENDS ON TAX (VOL.)	1	--	1	1	1	--	1	1	--	--
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	2	1	*	1	1	1	2
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TAX02. How about the level of state spending, is that too high, too low, or just about right?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
TOO HIGH	66%	71%	61%	61%	65%	77%	56%	63%	79%	60%
TOO LOW	2	3	2	1	3	1	8	1	2	1
JUST ABOUT RIGHT	21	18	23	29	23	12	26	25	11	25
DEPENDS ON PROG. (VOL.)	2	1	3	1	4	1	--	1	2	3
DON'T KNOW	9	7	11	8	6	8	10	11	6	10
REFUSED	*	--	*	--	--	1	--	--	--	1

BUDG02. In order to balance the state budget, do you think a choice will have to be made between serious service cuts and big increases in taxes, or is it possible to both maintain essential services and keep taxes down?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
HAVE TO CHOOSE	46%	50%	42%	45%	43%	52%	38%	44%	47%	53%
DOESN'T HAVE TO CHOOSE	42	41	44	44	50	40	56	45	44	28
SOME OF EACH (VOL.)	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	6	5	5
DON'T KNOW	6	4	8	6	3	3	3	5	4	12
REFUSED	1	1	1	*	1	1	--	1	--	2

GAP02. There are a number of things the state could do to close the gap between what it spends and what it takes in. For each of the following, please tell me if you strongly favor it, somewhat favor it, somewhat oppose it or strongly oppose it as a way to reduce the budget gap. First raise the income tax rates? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY).

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	*%	--%	1%	1%	1%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	16	14	19	26	15	10	19	14	12	23
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	31	31	30	33	31	28	45	31	25	30
STRONGLY OPPOSE	50	53	47	38	51	60	33	52	61	43
DON'T KNOW	2	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	3
REFUSED	*	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1

GAP03. Raise the rate on the sales tax? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	6%	7%	6%	6%	10%	5%	2%	3%	10%	7%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	22	23	22	21	21	26	15	28	20	22
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	34	31	36	38	30	29	49	36	29	28
STRONGLY OPPOSE	37	38	36	33	38	40	33	33	41	40
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	2	1	*	2	1	--	3
REFUSED	*	*	--	*	--	--	--	--	--	1

GAP04. Reduce the sales tax exemptions so you pay tax on some things that are now tax free? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	11%	12%	10%	12%	9%	10%	7%	7%	15%	12%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	34	38	30	34	41	29	45	33	30	33
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	25	22	28	25	25	28	26	31	20	21
STRONGLY OPPOSE	26	24	28	26	21	28	19	27	32	25
DON'T KNOW	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	9
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GAP05. Increase tuition students pay at public colleges and universities. (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	6%	7%	5%	4%	9%	6%	8%	4%	5%	7%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	19	24	15	13	22	22	11	15	25	24
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	23	23	23	25	19	27	20	27	23	16
STRONGLY OPPOSE	50	44	55	54	48	42	60	52	45	44
DON'T KNOW	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	1	2	8
REFUSED	*	*	--	*	--	--	--	--	--	1

GAP10. Reduce the number of branch offices of state agencies? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	32%	34%	30%	27%	33%	37%	29%	25%	38%	34%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	39	40	38	39	37	45	44	40	43	29
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	19	16	22	20	20	11	20	23	12	23
STRONGLY OPPOSE	6	7	6	10	7	4	4	7	6	8
DON'T KNOW	4	3	5	4	4	3	4	4	2	5
REFUSED	*	*	--	*	--	--	--	--	--	1

GAP11. Cut the hours state agencies are open? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	13%	16%	11%	11%	12%	17%	13%	10%	15%	17%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	40	40	39	35	41	46	51	44	39	29
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	27	24	29	29	28	26	19	28	26	31
STRONGLY OPPOSE	16	15	17	20	15	8	13	17	17	17
DON'T KNOW	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	3	6
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GAP12. Cut state aid for local public schools, and giving towns the choice of raising taxes or cutting their own education budgets. (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	7%	7%	8%	6%	8%	11%	8%	7%	6%	11%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	20	21	20	15	19	32	24	18	18	24
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	26	28	24	29	24	21	33	32	21	20
STRONGLY OPPOSE	41	39	42	49	45	30	35	41	46	37
DON'T KNOW	5	3	6	2	4	6	1	3	6	7
REFUSED	1	2	*	*	1	1	--	--	2	2

GAP13. Reduce revenue sharing for other local programs and let towns choose whether to cut services or raise the money elsewhere themselves. (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	14%	15%	13%	6%	17%	22%	18%	12%	17%	13%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	44	44	44	48	38	47	45	50	41	40
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	23	24	23	27	21	19	32	23	22	19
STRONGLY OPPOSE	12	11	13	14	17	7	4	12	16	12
DON'T KNOW	6	5	6	5	6	4	1	3	4	14
REFUSED	1	1	1	*	1	1	--	--	1	3

GAP14. Cut the amount of money available for poor families by paying for fewer services? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	5%	7%	3%	3%	7%	7%	4%	7%	7%	1%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	21	20	22	16	14	31	20	22	23	16
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	38	38	38	28	42	42	39	43	37	34
STRONGLY OPPOSE	31	30	33	49	30	17	38	24	31	39
DON'T KNOW	4	3	4	4	5	3	--	4	2	7
REFUSED	1	1	*	*	1	1	--	1	--	3

GAP15. Lay off state workers. (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	9%	13%	5%	7%	9%	13%	11%	8%	8%	14%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	35	40	31	27	37	49	18	33	43	39
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	32	28	36	38	30	25	44	33	28	30
STRONGLY OPPOSE	20	15	24	26	19	9	27	23	16	12
DON'T KNOW	3	2	3	2	5	2	--	3	3	3
REFUSED	1	2	*	--	1	1	--	*	3	2

GAP16. Charge for services the state now provides for free, and increase user fees. (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
STRONGLY FAVOR	11%	13%	9%	7%	9%	17%	5%	10%	11%	15%
SOMEWHAT FAVOR	46	45	47	42	51	55	44	50	50	36
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	19	19	20	20	17	14	23	21	17	18
STRONGLY OPPOSE	16	15	16	21	14	8	26	12	14	17
DON'T KNOW	7	6	7	9	7	5	2	6	7	11
REFUSED	1	2	1	1	2	2	--	1	1	2

QD05. Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or something else?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
DEMOCRAT	30%	25%	36%	100%	--%	--%	30%	28%	28%	40%
REPUBLICAN	29	33	26	--	--	100	33	31	27	28
INDEPENDENT	25	27	24	--	100	--	21	26	28	21
OTHER	9	8	9	--	--	--	7	11	10	4
NONE	5	6	4	--	--	--	5	3	7	5
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	--	--	--	4	1	--	1
REFUSED	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	*	2

QD11. In what year were you born? (ENTER FOUR-DIGIT YEAR) (Calculated and grouped as below)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
18-29	14%	14%	14%	13%	12%	15%	100%	--%	--%	--%
30-44	31	33	28	28	32	33	--	100	--	--
45-59	33	33	34	31	36	30	--	--	100	--
60 and over	20	18	22	27	17	19	--	--	--	100
DK/REFUSED	3	3	3	2	4	2	--	--	--	--

* denotes less than .5%

-- denotes 0%

HOW THE POLL WAS DONE

This BADGER POLL™ was conducted by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center as part of its ongoing program of research designed to benefit the research community and the people of Wisconsin, under the direction of G. Donald Ferree, Jr., Associate Director for Public Opinion Research of the Center. The media sponsors of the survey are the (Madison) Capital Times, and the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. The BADGER POLL™ is intended to be a "poll of record" for the state, investigating matters of concern to Wisconsinites including politics, culture, and their daily lives, adhering to the highest standards of polling methodology and rigorous independence.

A total of 504 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between February 11 and 19, inclusive. Telephone numbers were generated by computer in proportion to the number of adults living in each area of the state. Theoretically, results from this survey have a "margin of error" of a little over +/- 4%. This means that, had we asked every eligible resident in Wisconsin, exactly these questions at the time the survey was conducted, there is only a one in twenty chance that the answers would differ by more than that in either direction from what we report here. There could be differences because of changes in question wording, events occurring in the meantime, or any of the practical difficulties involved in taking a scientific survey. Results based on subgroups are subject to a larger "margin of error".