



UWSC



Badger Poll™ #8, Release #1
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
University of Wisconsin Madison
April 18, 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.

IEWS OF THE WAR IN IRAQ
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

The President's overall ratings are quite strong. Seven in ten Wisconsin residents rate his handling of his job as either excellent (31%) or good (38%), while three in ten opt for one of the lower grades -- fair (21%) or poor (10%). Bush does better among men as a group than among women, but there is a strong partisan cast to views of the Chief Executive. Six in ten Republicans call Bush's performance excellent, ten times as many as the corresponding proportion among self-described Democrats.

Selected Questions Related to Presidential Rating
Polls from March 2002 to March 2003

	APR03	MAR03	FEB03	JAN03	SPT02	JUN02	MAR02
Overall rating							
Excellent	31%	18%	19%	16%	19%	25%	28%
Good	38	35	39	38	45	44	40
Fair	21	30	25	29	23	22	22
Poor	10	16	16	14	12	8	7

Answers such as don't know, or refused, omitted for space

These ratings are clearly strong in an absolute sense, but they are by no means unprecedented. Last spring, on each of the two first Badger Polls™ done, the Presidents ratings were in the same ballpark. Since, they have come down amidst uncertainty in the foreign policy arena and concerns over the economy. There has been a noticeable jump since early March survey, which was done before the ultimatum and outbreak of hostilities.

Ratings of Bush's "dealing with Iraq" are even more strong. Overall, three in four think he deserves ratings of excellent (40%) or good (35%). One in four would go no higher than fair (13%) or poor (10%). Again, men as a group are more positive than women as a group (half of the former, one third of the latter think Bush's performance on Iraq is excellent). There is also a partisan cast, but it relates more to the degree of backing than a clear opposition. Majorities of both self-described Democrats and Republicans give Bush ratings of at least good, but the proportion is much higher among Republicans, two thirds of whom call his performance excellent.

The present ratings represent a clear jump since this winter, when war was looking increasingly inevitable, but shooting had not begun. In any event, the past weeks have seen an improvement at least as for the more immediate perception Iraq than on Bush's overall handling of his job.

While the public clearly backs Bush on the war, there is not consensus about broader issues of strategy. For instance, when respondents were asked the consequences for the respect other nations bear us "if the United States is willing to use force to protect its interests", no clear picture emerges. One third (33%) feel others would respect us more, but an equal proportion (33%) expect other countries will respect us less. One in four (25%) foresee little or no difference.

Any "gender gap" here is muffled, although men are if anything slightly more likely than women to think a willingness to use force will be accompanied by more respect. Bigger differences are evident for partisanship, and the balance of opinion differs, against the backdrop of all parties containing wide spectra of views. Thus, on balance, Democrats think -- if anything that a willingness to use force will decrease respect. Fewer Republicans think it will have an impact one way or the other, but if it will, they more onesidedly think an increase of respect will ensue. Independents are more or less in the middle. This question was also included in our January poll, at which point, there was a greater disquiet about using force. Fewer than on in five (18%) then felt others would respect us more, one in three (34%) thought the use of force (of willingness to do so) would lessen respect. Another third (36%) expected no impact.

A related question asked about how ready the United States HAD been to resort to force. By far the largest group (three in four or 72%) felt we had "generally shown good judgment about its use". One in five thought the US had been too ready to use force, and about one in twenty say it had generally not been ready enough. Across groups, there is little evidence of any substantial number which thinks we have been too reticent about using force. And the largest group always feels that American judgement had usually been on target. But the preponderance of this view over the concern that we might be too hasty shifts. Democrats are most critical, with Independents behind. Republicans are the least likely to voice a concern either way. In January, this question also showed a bit more ambiguity. Then, while the largest group (58%) felt US judgement had been good, this is lower than now. Conversely, the four in ten was split about two to one in the direction of feeling we had resorted too easily to the use of force.

Looking back, eight in ten Wisconsin residents say the United States "originally did the right thing in threatening war if Saddam Hussein refused to give up any weapons of mass destruction he might have". One in six (16%) take the contrary view. All groups endorse the earlier strategy on balance in principle, but the onesidedness of opinion does vary some. Thus, three in four women, but seven in eight men feel this was the right thing to have done. Support grows from two in three among Democrats to over nine in ten among Republicans.

A very similar question (without "originally" and "refuses" in the present tense) was put in surveys in February and March. Support was at a lower level then (65%-26% on both surveys). Of course, the current question was put in the context of an actual war, but the key notion is that the coming of hostilities has been accompanied by an increase in the proportion thinking the basic notion of threatening force was appropriate.

Another question asked (with a change of tense) on earlier surveys addressed whether or not a choice was necessary between allowing Iraq to have weapons of mass destruction or actually going to war. (Prior to the conflict, this asked whether we would have to choose and now asked if we "had to choose"). Two thirds (66%) felt this was indeed the choice, but one in four (25%), did not -- presumably some because they doubted the threat and others because they foresaw ways other than war to deal with it. Men and women are quite similar as groups, Belief in the necessity of the choice moves up from a relatively narrow majority (five to four) among Democrats to about two to one among Independents and a five to one split among Bush's fellow GOP backers. The two middle age groups were somewhat, but only somewhat more likely to see it as being such a choice than those either younger or older.

Prior to the war, the sentiment was a bit MORE onesided that this choice would be necessary. While one cannot be sure why this was, it may be that the non-appearance of weapons of mass destruction (at least while the war was in progress and the fighting was progressing) lowered the salience of the issue for some, since Hussein either would not or could not employ whatever arsenal he possessed.

By a two to one margin (66%-31%) Wisconsin residents believe that the Bush administration did what it could to avoid war. This puts overall sentiment on the side of the President, but leaves a substantial body who believed -- even after the war had begun and was moving to a conclusion so far as high intensity fighting was concerned -- that other alternatives could have been further pursued. While men and women do not appreciably differ, the partisan cast of these views is one of the stronger ones yet noted, with the proportion of Democrats who think Bush tried everything reasonable only have as high as was the case among Republicans. Independents fell in the middle. Earlier results in February and March, before the final decision was taken and the war began, showed more doubt (margins of 51%-41% in February and 56%-36% in March, believed that as much as reasonable had been done), which means that as war became closer and other alternatives either rejected or proving impossible, the sentiment that enough had been done to avoid war increased modestly.

Before the war, Wisconsin residents had tended to discount the idea of a superfast cakewalk, with the typical expected duration of a war being either several months or a year or more. (Seven residents in ten told interviewers on both February and March that they expected any war to continue for several months or more). A question was put on this survey asking "now that the war has started, how much longer do you think it will last". During the field period, only a handful (5%) felt it would last "just a few days", which came close to the actual timeframe. One third (32%) believed that the war would continue "a matter of weeks". But more than half -- even with the suggestion that Iraqi resistance was melting -- felt it would take longer. Almost four in ten (38%) said it would be "several months", and one in five (19%) expected "a year or more".

Women as a group looked to a longer war than men did. There was only a weak trend by party, with Republicans slightly more optimistic about a short war than others. But the key is that to some extent, the notion of more enduring hostilities is "discounted". This MAY mean that, in the wake of the collapse of the Iraqi central authority, low level attacks would at least not shock a populace that counted on everything being over in a very short period of time.

Another dimension of US involvement relates to the need for troops to continue in Iraq even after the military campaign proper comes to an end. In mid April, two thirds (65%) thought it very likely that US soldiers "would be

tied up for a long time afterwards keeping order in Iraq". Virtually all the remainder (28%) felt it was "somewhat likely". Men and women did not differ as a group to any clear extent. Partisan patterns were only moderate, with likelihood dropping as one moved across the spectrum from Democrats to Republicans. Still this meant that almost six in ten Republicans felt a "long" commitment was in the offing, while almost eight in ten Democrats expected this (rather more negative) outcome. One wrinkle is that the biggest age discrepancy on this question was between the youngest group (least likely to expect a long mission) and the group just above them on the age ladder, which is MOST likely to expect a long occupation.

Before the war broke out, sentiment was at least as fearful of a long period of US occupation. Just under three in four in both March (73%) and February (72%) thought a long commitment was very likely. As is the case now, and as may be seen in the table summarizing trends, almost all the remainder felt it was "somewhat likely" that troops would need to remain for the unspecified long term.

Looking back at the question of UN resolutions, three state residents in four (74%) felt the resolutions the United Nations had previously passed were sufficient justification for war. Another one in five (19%) felt "the United States should have tried for another resolution explicitly calling for war" rather than resting on what the UN had already done. All groups come down on the same side, though with varying degrees of agreement. Thus Democrats felt by about five to four that the US did not need to try for the abandoned resolution, the margin increases as one moves across the spectrum until more than nine in ten Republicans think the existing resolutions were enough. Indeed, for the groups examined, it is only Democrats among whom the proportion who would have liked to see another resolution account for more than one in four.

Before the war, a similar question asked if the US "should try" for an explicit war resolution or whether the existing resolutions "are" enough. (At that point, of course, there was still much talk of getting such a resolution from the Security Council. (It was after the March survey finished that Bush withdrew the draft Anglo-American resolution and issued his ultimatum). Both surveys found more people feeling the resolutions were sufficient than wanting another explicit vote, but opinion was more evenly split, with the general population then approximating the Democrats now.

Respondents were reminded that the US was unable to secure a further resolution and then asked whether they favored or opposed the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway. By almost four to one (75%-19%), respondents favor the decision to go to war. This view holds a majority in all demographic groups examined, but men are ten points more likely than women to support it. Half again as many Republicans as Democrats back the decision. The most favorable age group is those from thirty to forty-four, the least are the oldest.

Before the war, a hypothetical question asked respondents to imagine that a majority opposed the resolution or it was blocked by a veto. At that point, in both February and March, a real but scarcely overwhelming majority said they would favor what ultimately happened. March (at about two to one) was quite close to February, and indeed the difference was too small to produce much confidence that the population as a whole had shifted.

In any event, now, in retrospect, the public seems more favorable. Whether this represents a shift in view of what would have been desirable based on events in the war, or acquiescence in what has occurred is harder to say. What

IS clear, is that there is widespread, if not universal, backing of the US (with a limited set of partners) having acted without UN mandate, fitting into a public opinion climate generally favorable to the Administration.

Two questions sought to explore aspects of the impact of the war. Three in four felt it either "very likely" (42%) or "somewhat likely" (32%) that if "the US had decided NOT to go to war" then "we would eventually be attacked with Iraqi weapons of mass destruction". Again, men do not differ sharply from women as groups, although it is noteworthy perhaps that men, who tend generally to be more open to war than women, less commonly viewed an attack on the US if we had not gone to war. Six in ten Democrats thought such an attack would have been somewhat likely or more, and Independents were similar, but the risk perceived by Republicans was higher. This question (or a variant, reading "if the US decides" as opposed to "if the US had decided") was put in March. The perceived likelihood then of such an attack was lower than now but in the same general ballpark.

Finally, what of terrorism? In the long run, what will what some have called Persian Gulf War II, do to the risk of terrorism in the world. The largest single group (46%) now expects that risk to be decreased. They are partially counterbalanced, however, by the one in four (25%) who think it will increase. And another one in four (27%) expect little or no impact. Men are more sanguine than women that the war will lessen the likelihood of terrorism. Democrats are more likely to expect an increase than a decrease, but are torn. Independents split pretty evenly. Only among Republicans is there a strong tendency (to think it will decrease).

Before the war began, the public was also split on the impact "if the US forces attack Iraq". In March, the largest group (42%) felt that terror risk would be heightened, the remainder split evenly (27% to 28%) on whether it would go down or remain the same. Thus, there is no really clear consensus, but some increased optimism that the war will NOT bring with it the cost of more terror later.

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
MALE	49%	100%	--%	36%	58%	58%	46%	56%	51%	42%	49%	44%
FEMALE	51	--	100	64	42	42	54	44	50	58	51	56

Iraq Questions from Three Surveys

	APRIL	MARCH	FEBRUARY
Bush's Dealing with Iraq			
EXCELLENT	40%	18%	19%
GOOD	35	31	30
FAIR	13	26	25
POOR	10	23	24
Original threat of war			
YES, DID RIGHT THING	80%	65%	65%
NO, HAS NOT	16	26	26
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL)	*	1	1
Necessary choice war/permit WMD			
YES, HAVE TO CHOOSE	66%	77%	71%
NO, WILL NOT HAVE TO	25	16	20
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (VOL.)	1	*	1
Steps to avoid war			
DONE ALL REASONABLE	66	56%	51%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	31	36	41
Expected Duration			
JUST A FEW DAYS	5	4%	2%
A MATTER OF WEEKS	32	21	16
SEVERAL MONTHS	38	38	42
A YEAR OR MORE	19	32	33
Longterm presence in Iraq			
VERY LIKELY	65%	72%	73%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	28	23	20
NOT VERY LIKELY	4	3	1
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	2	1	2
Seek additional resolution			
GET ANOTHER	19%	38%	37%
EXISTING RES. ENOUGH	74	53	51
GOOD IDEA IF POSS. (V)	1	*	1
Support US action alone w/o UN			
YES	75%	61%	58%
NO	19	31	32
Use of WMD against US w/o war			
VERY LIKELY	42%	34%	
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	32	33	
NOT VERY LIKELY	17	23	
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	8	8	
Long-term impact of war			
INCREASE TERROR RISK	25%	42%	
DECREASE TERROR RISK	46	27	
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	27	28	

Note: wording changes, primarily tense, to deal with outbreak of war between March and April surveys. Don't know and Refused omitted.

Q02. How would you rate the job George W. Bush is doing as President?
Excellent, good, fair or poor?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
EXCELLENT	31%	36%	26%	6%	20%	62%	29%	32%	35%	24%	32%	39%
GOOD	38	40	35	37	43	33	39	42	36	36	36	32
FAIR	21	18	25	34	27	5	22	21	16	25	21	20
POOR	10	7	14	23	9	--	10	5	13	13	10	9
TOO SOON TO TEL (VOL.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DON'T KNOW	*	--	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	*	--	--
REFUSED	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	*	--

GWB08. (How would you rate the job George Bush is doing...) Dealing with Iraq?
(PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
EXCELLENT	40%	50%	30%	16%	32%	68%	43%	42%	45%	27%	41%	48%
GOOD	35	31	39	44	38	27	35	37	31	39	33	28
FAIR	13	10	16	20	17	3	9	12	13	16	13	16
POOR	10	8	12	19	11	1	13	8	11	12	11	8
DON'T KNOW	1	1	2	1	1	1	--	2	--	4	1	1
REFUSED	1	--	2	--	1	--	--	*	--	2	*	--

FORCE02. In general, if the United States is willing to use force to protect its interests, do you think that will make other countries respect us more, respect us less, or won't it make much of a difference?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
RESPECT US MORE	33%	38%	30%	26%	28%	45%	30%	39%	34%	30%	33%	38%
RESPECT US LESS	33	34	32	52	36	17	39	23	36	33	34	27
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	25	21	28	15	24	29	28	26	22	26	24	26
DEPENDS (VOL.)	6	5	7	5	10	5	2	9	5	7	6	4
DON'T KNOW	3	2	4	2	1	5	1	3	2	3	3	3
REFUSED	1	1	*	1	*	*	1	--	1	1	1	2

FORCE03. The United States has great military power. Do you think that on the whole, we've been too ready to use it to protect our vital interests, not ready enough, or have we generally shown good judgement about its use?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
TOO READY TO USE	20%	17%	22%	34%	25%	5%	20%	19%	19%	22%	21%	20%
NOT READY ENOUGH	6	7	6	4	6	8	3	7	6	7	7	5
GOOD JUDGEMENT	72	75	69	59	69	85	76	71	74	69	71	74
DON'T KNOW	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	2
REFUSED	1	1	1	--	--	*	--	--	--	*	1	--

IRAQ01. Do you think the United States originally did the right thing in threatening war if Saddam Hussein refused to give up any weapons of mass destruction he might have?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
YES, DID RIGHT THING	80%	86%	74%	69%	76%	93%	77%	89%	81%	70%	79%	81%
NO, HAS NOT	16	12	21	26	21	5	23	9	16	22	17	15
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL)	*	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	*	--
DON'T KNOW	3	1	4	5	2	2	--	1	3	6	2	3
REFUSED	1	1	2	*	2	--	--	1	1	2	2	--

IRAQ02X. Do you think the United States had to choose between letting Iraq have weapons of mass destruction or going to war with Iraq?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
YES, HAD TO CHOOSE	66%	68%	64%	50%	62%	80%	57%	73%	69%	61%	66%	62%
NO, DID NOT HAVE TO	25	25	26	39	29	16	34	22	26	22	26	28
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (VOL)	1	1	1	1	2	*	--	1	1	1	1	4
DON'T KNOW	7	5	8	10	7	3	8	4	3	14	6	5
REFUSED	1	1	2	1	--	1	1	--	2	2	1	1

IRAQ03X. Do you think the Bush administration did everything it reasonably could to avoid war with Iraq, or is there something else it should have tried?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
DONE ALL REASONABLE	66%	69%	63%	45%	61%	87%	64%	72%	65%	62%	64%	63%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	31	29	33	51	36	13	32	27	34	31	32	33
DON'T KNOW	3	2	4	4	4	1	4	2	1	5	3	3
REFUSED	1	*	1	1	--	*	--	--	--	1	*	1

IRAQ05X. Now that the war has started, how much longer do you think it will last? Just a few days, a matter of weeks, several months, or a year or more?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
JUST A FEW DAYS	5%	6%	3%	6%	2%	7%	--%	7%	6%	6%	5%	4%
A MATTER OF WEEKS	32	40	25	30	27	39	35	29	34	31	31	30
SEVERAL MONTHS	38	33	42	36	43	37	35	42	37	37	39	36
A YEAR OR MORE	19	15	24	23	23	11	21	17	20	19	20	20
DON'T KNOW	6	6	6	5	5	6	10	5	3	8	6	10
REFUSED	1	1	*	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	*	--

IRAQ07X. Once the war ends, how likely do you think it is that American soldiers will be tied up for a long time afterwards keeping order in Iraq? Very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not likely at all?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
VERY LIKELY	65%	65%	66%	78%	67%	58%	56%	73%	65%	63%	66%	51%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	28	29	28	17	25	35	36	23	30	29	27	33
NOT VERY LIKELY	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	6
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	2	3	1	1	3	2	4	2	1	2	2	6
DON'T KNOW	1	*	1	--	1	*	--	--	--	3	1	4
REFUSED	*	1	*	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--

IRAQ14. Has any member of your immediate family such as a parent, child, brother or sister, ever served in the US military?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
YES	68%	65%	71%	64%	73%	74%	52%	71%	70%	74%	95%	100%
NO	32	35	29	36	27	26	48	29	30	26	5	--
DON'T KNOW	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

IRAQ15. Is any member of your immediate family still in the active service or reserves?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
YES	16%	14%	18%	15%	13%	18%	36%	15%	9%	18%	16%	100%
NO	83	84	82	85	87	80	63	82	91	82	83	--
DON'T KNOW	1	1	*	1	--	2	2	3	--	--	1	--
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
DEMOCRAT	28%	21%	35%	100%	--%	--%	28%	26%	27%	34%	27%	24%
REPUBLICAN	32	37	26	--	--	100	22	38	32	31	34	39
INDEPENDENT	22	26	18	--	100	--	20	19	24	24	24	20
OTHER	11	10	13	--	--	--	17	14	10	4	10	11
NONE	4	4	5	--	--	--	10	2	2	6	4	4
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	2	1	2
REFUSED	2	2	2	--	--	--	2	*	3	*	2	--

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

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				MILITARY	
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	FAM	ACT
18-29	15%	15%	16%	15%	14%	11%	100%	--%	--%	--%	11%	25%
30-44	24	28	21	22	21	30	--	100	--	--	25	24
45-59	32	33	31	31	35	32	--	--	100	--	34	19
60 and over	25	21	28	30	27	24	--	--	--	100	27	31
DK/REFUSED	4	3	4	1	3	3	--	--	--	--	3	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 509 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between April 7 and 15, 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".