



**UWSC**



Badger Poll™ #13, Release #3  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
University of Wisconsin Madison  
February 11, 2004

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.

EVOLVING VIEWS OF IRAQ  
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

In mid to late winter, administration policy in Iraq gets mixed reviews. The public seems unsure of the long-term impact of the war and there are signs of questioning some of the original justifications. At the same time, there is no wholesale rejection of administration policy, and in particular the questions of WMD seems less sharp and obvious to the public at large than it sometimes does for activists on either side, with increased doubts about these weapons unaccompanied by major shifts in position about the war itself. These are some of the conclusions which may be drawn from the most recent Badger Poll™, which asked a series of questions about Iraq of a sample of 502 state randomly chosen state residents between January 27th and February 4, inclusive.

The Wisconsin public seems somewhat critical of the President's performance as regards Iraq. As January was turning to February, just under four in ten rated his "dealing with Iraq" as either excellent (12%) or good (27%). On the other hand, almost six in ten called it either fair (26%) or poor (33%). As may be seen in the detailed tables following this summary, men are modestly more positive than women, those sixty and older are less upbeat than their younger fellow residents. But it is partisanship along which lines views of Bush's performance are most closely aligned. Almost eight in ten Republicans rate him at least good; the corresponding proportion among Democrats is only about one in eight. Independents fall in the middle.

These ratings are the lowest we have so far encountered since a question about Iraq first appeared on a Badger Poll in September 2002. (An accompanying table gives the complete trend). The closest was in January of last year, following which appraisals tended to become more positive as war neared, and spiked with the initial military victory. They then headed in a more critical direction through October 2002, with December (just before the capture of Hussein) hinting at a rebound. Since then, one major event (the capture) might be expected to improve views of Bush, but increasing questions about intelligence and Iraqi WMD, along with the attacks of all the Democrats as primary season advanced, might be expected to make them worse.

Bush was also rated overall (where opinion split roughly evenly between excellent or good on the one hand and fair and poor on the other) and several other policy areas. Clearly, Iraq does not now stand out as a strength for him related to overall evaluations.

That is NOT to say the ratings of Bush with regard to Iraq are especially weak compared to other more specific areas. Thus, foreign policy overall is

almost identical in opinion profile to Iraq. Individual categories either rounded to the same proportion on both questions or were at most one point different, which is identical for almost all intents and purposes. The actual figures were excellent 12%, good 26%, fair 27% and poor 33%.

When the focus turns homeward, evaluations are, if anything less positive. Thus, in "dealing with problems here at home", one in three call Bush either excellent (6%) or good (26%) marks, while two thirds thought fair (31%) or poor (37%) was more like it. Partisan splits were evident here as well, as they had been for foreign policy, with Independents tending to be closer to Democrats.

Ratings on "handling the economy" are generally similar to those for domestic issues generally, indicating that this more specific area is quite important to the more general perception. Differences are small, but -- if anything -- "the economy" produces a slightly more critical evaluation, with fewer than three in ten rating Bush excellent (6%) or good (23%), while seven in ten opt for fair (31%) or poor (39%).

#### Job Ratings on Specific Areas

	1/04	12/03	10/03	8/03	5/03	4/03	3/03	2/03	1/03	9/02
Foreign policy										
EXCELLENT	12%	16%	12%	12%			13%		12%	20%
GOOD	26	29	29	29			33		32	41
FAIR	27	35	28	34			30		34	23
POOR	33	19	30	24			23		20	15
Problems here at home										
EXCELLENT	6%	10%	5%	4%			6%		6%	12%
GOOD	26	31	24	31			33		30	40
FAIR	31	35	33	36			35		39	29
POOR	37	23	36	28			25		24	18
Dealing with the economy										
EXCELLENT	6%	12%	5%	3%	4%	7%	5%	4%	4%	6%
GOOD	23	28	23	23	34	32	22	26	23	30
FAIR	31	34	34	38	30	32	39	38	38	36
POOR	39	25	38	35	30	28	32	31	31	25
Dealing with terrorism										
EXCELLENT	18%	22%	19%	17%	29%	34%	20%	20%	18%	32%
GOOD	35	37	36	42	41	44	46	43	42	40
FAIR	27	24	25	23	23	14	25	23	26	17
POOR	19	15	18	16	8	7	9	13	12	11
Dealing with Iraq										
EXCELLENT	12%	18%	14%	15%	30%	40%	18%	19%	11%	22%
GOOD	27	30	31	32	32	35	31	30	31	30
FAIR	27	24	24	24	22	13	26	25	28	23
POOR	33	27	30	27	13	10	23	24	26	20

Note: Don't Know and Refused omitted for space

One relatively strong (or less critical) area for the President is "dealing with terrorism". Just over half rate him excellent (18%) or good (35%) in this

respect. Slightly under half opt for either of the two lower ratings (fair 27% and poor 19%). Here, just shy of nine in ten Republicans call Bush's performance at least good. While self-described Democrats are by no means as positive, this is the area where they clearly give the President better evaluations than elsewhere.

Overall, adherents of both major party's tend to distinguish roughly similarly across the areas. That is, Bush does better on terrorism than Iraq for all three groups; domestic issues on balance are rated quite similarly to "the economy", with both weaker than Iraq, which is broadly similar to foreign policy overall.

These other issues have been traced across time as well, as may be seen in the accompanying table. Perceptions of Iraq and foreign policy seem to have moved more than some. Overall, his present ratings in each area tend to be at or close to the lowest, but distinctions are smaller for domestic issues. December showed what now looks more like it might have been a blip upward: current figures are almost identical with those from October.

The survey also included a variety of more specific questions about Iraq. Overall, when asked whether 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", which was a central rationale of the war, two thirds (64%) say it did, while just over one in four (28%) reject this.

This figure is quite similar to what we have found over the past several polls, and well as in the period leading up to the war. Endorsement tended to rise with the outbreak of hostilities and the initial military success, but was declining somewhat by the end of the summer. Republicans onesidedly say the policy was initially correct, while Democrats are split evenly, and Independents fall between the two other groups.

Opinion is more closely divided when the issue is whether "the United States had to choose between letting Iraq have weapons of mass destruction or going to war with Iraq". Half (50%) say such a choice was necessary, but just shy of four in ten (37%) say it was not. Democrats say no by about five to three, Independents split, and Republicans say this choice was indeed necessary by a seven to two margin. Every time we have asked this question, more have said the choice was necessary than took the opposite position, but the size of the majority has been shrinking since the time just before hostilities broke out in March, although recent poll to poll shifts have been quite small.

The Wisconsin public seems torn by the issue of whether the administration in fact treated war as the last resort. When the question was "do you think the Bush Administration did everything it reasonably could to avoid war with Iraq, or is there something else it should have done", those who believe it held back as much as it could are slightly outnumbered (50%-46%) by those who feel something else should have been tried.

As on many issues there is a clear partisan divide here. Only one in four Democrats think everything reasonable was done. But the corresponding proportion among self-described Republicans was eight in ten. Independents are in between, but closer to Democrats. While this survey is the first to find a plurality saying more should have been tried, the difference from December (when there was a two point plurality on the other side) and October (for which there was a five point plurality) is striking. Opinion on this item, however, has never been overwhelmingly pro-administration. Even at the time of the greatest military success, roughly a third thought more should have been done.

## Iraq Questions from Seven Surveys

	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB
Original threat of war								
YES, DID RIGHT THING	64%	65%	65%	70%	78%	80%	65%	65%
NO, DID NOT	28	26	30	26	18	16	26	26
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL)	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	1
Necessary choice war/permit WMD								
YES, HAVE TO CHOOSE	50%	53%	54%	57%	66%	66%	77%	71%
NO, NOT NECESSARY	37	36	35	32	28	25	16	20
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (V.)	2	2	2	2	1	1	*	1
Steps to avoid war								
DONE ALL REASONABLE	46%	48%	51%	55%	65%	66%	56%	51%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	50	46	46	41	32	31	36	41
Support US action alone w/o UN								
YES	57%	62%	62%	61%	71%	75%	61%	58%
NO	35	31	32	34	25	19	31	32

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

Respondents were reminded that "although the UN had passed many resolutions demanding that Iraq disarm, the US was not able to get a final resolution explicitly calling for war". In that context, residents were asked if they supported or opposed "the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway". By about three to two (57%-35%) Wisconsinites say they support it. Democrats oppose it by about the same margin Independents support it, while those favoring the GOP are overwhelmingly in support. Still, while opinion overall is favorable to what the administration did in beginning the war, views are now more divided than they have been since before the war, with the current results quite close to what was found last February.

There has been much debate, especially of late, concerning the necessity of the war originally related to the issue of Iraqi WMD and of the impact of having attacked Iraq. On balance, the public here seems quite divided on whether or not ULTIMATELY there was a strategic threat from Iraq. When respondents were asked how likely it is that "if the US had decided NOT to go to war with Iraq" then "we would EVENTUALLY (emphasis added) have been attacked with Iraqi weapons of mass destruction," half felt it either very (18%) or somewhat (34%) likely, while one in four (26%) thought it not very likely and 20% not likely at all. So there is perception of some, but on balance, limited risk. Republicans tend to voice more concern than either of the other two groups, who are quite close to one another. Previously, the proportion saying there was at least some eventual risk had never fallen below six in ten and had been as high as three in four at the time of the initial military victory.

There is also some disagreement over the impact of the invasion when it comes to "the risk of terrorism in the world". One in four (25%) feel it has increased, but four in ten (40%) say it has decreased, while one resident in three (32%) sees no difference. On balance, Democrats think this risk has gone up if anything, Independents are split, but those saying the risk is reduced

slightly outnumber those who think it is worse. Republicans rather onesidedly see the terror risk as reduced. This aspect of views about Iraq has moved from a sense on balance the risk would be increased just before hostilities, to some evidence of mild optimism in late spring, a balance in August, and similar results (mild optimism on balance) since last October. In any event, this area shows no recent erosion of pro-Administration positions.

## Trend from March

	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR
Use of WMD against US w/o war							
VERY LIKELY	18%	30%	32%	31%	40%	42%	34%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	34	31	33	31	32	32	33
NOT VERY LIKELY	26	23	22	24	19	17	23
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	20	13	13	12	8	8	8
Long-term impact of war							
INCREASED TERROR RISK	25%	27%	25%	33%	24%	25%	42%
DECREASED TERROR RISK	40	37	39	35	44	46	27
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	32	32	32	29	31	27	28

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

Three questions have appeared on multiple polls since last May. The first asked for an assessment of the war on a scale ranging from "a complete success" to "a complete failure". Currently, only a handful (4%) see the war as a complete success, which group is balanced by the similarly sized one which views it as a complete failure (5%). One in three (33%) opt for "mostly a success", while four in ten think "only partly a success" is more apt, and one in seven (14%) view it as "mostly a failure". Overall, these views are clearly mixed with a very common sense that some things have been successful but (many) others have not. Since May, when six in ten said the war was "mostly" or completely a success, results have not really moved very much at all -- so the long-term jury is still very much out. It should be pointed out that while few buy the argument that the war has been a complete success, the constituency feeling it has more appropriate to use the word failure on balance remains only about one in five, and there is no sign of recent erosion.

The issue of WMD (or the lack thereof) has always been part of the Iraq debate and has received much attention as not only more time has gone by without finding any but the suggestion is increasingly made that they never existed. Respondents were reminded that the US "has not found clear evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction" and then asked, "if it turns out none are found, do you think this means the US was wrong about Iraq having such weapons, that the Iraqis destroyed them secretly, or that they remain hidden somewhere."

The most common view (held by just under half or 45%) is that WMD remain hidden, which view is shared by half of Independents and Republicans and about one third of Democrats. The next most common view, held by three in ten (29%) is that the US was wrong and the weapons did not exist; Democrats are the only partisan group among whom this view is the most common One in six (15%) think they did exist but were secretly destroyed. At each point this question has been put, the most common view is that the WMD remain hidden. But this has fallen from the view of two thirds back last spring to fewer than half now.

Perhaps the most telling question for examining how this issue is playing out politically now, is the final question in the Iraq series. Residents were asked, "if the US government thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore, do you think it was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons, a bad idea, or don't you have an opinion". (This question did not directly address whether or not the government believed the WMD existed or not, it should be noted, but went to the issue of other justifications for war).

Opinions split. Just under four in ten (39%) say going to war for other reasons would have been a good idea, but another four in ten (39%) say such a war decision would have been a bad idea. It is perhaps important that one in five fail to come down on one side or the other. Clearly neither the sense that a real WMD threat was necessary to justify the war, nor the idea that it was irrelevant granted other considerations holds sway.

Democrats (by three to one) say the war was a bad idea under these circumstances -- where the administration is presumed to know that WMD did not exist. Republicans by about four to one come down on the other side. A four to three plurality among Independents finds other reasons insufficient. Last May, in the immediate wake of initial military victory, those choosing either answer felt other reasons would make the war a good idea by about two to one. Since then, opinion has tended to be quite split, with no plurality in either direction greater than five percentage points.

#### Looking Back at War

	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY
Assessment of war					
COMPLETE SUCCESS	4%	2%	4%	3%	9%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	33	35	32	35	52
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	42	38	45	43	29
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	15	14	13	6
A COMPLETE FAILURE	5	7	1	3	1
Why no WMD found					
US WAS WRONG	29%	18%	17%	17%	10%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	15	17	16	14	14
IRAQIS HID THEM	45	54	60	61	66
If US thought no WMD					
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	39%	36%	38%	35%	47%
BAD IDEA	39	35	33	37	26
DON'T HAVE OPINION	19	26	27	28	25

Note: Answers such as Don't know and Refused omitted

What one sees here is a public divided over the war and its aftermath, with no clear consensus. Weapons of mass destruction, which were so central in the arguments leading up to war in particular seem the object of some complicated views. The public clearly has not come down on one side or the other on whether they existed at the time the US went to war (though that they did and remain hidden is the single most common view). But they have not dismissed the notion that they might have posed at least a long-term threat which the war lessened. Even among Democrats, the idea that the situation in Iraq is a "mess" has not



GWB05. How would you rate the job George W. Bush is doing dealing with problems here at home? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	6%	5%	6%	2%	3%	14%	5%	9%	4%	6%
GOOD	26	29	22	9	21	51	16	25	33	19
FAIR	31	30	32	23	39	31	46	34	27	26
POOR	37	35	38	66	36	4	33	29	36	48
DON'T KNOW	1	--	2	1	--	--	--	2	--	1
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GWB06. Handling the economy? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	6%	6%	6%	2%	1%	16%	11%	6%	5%	4%
GOOD	23	28	19	8	18	45	15	24	27	19
FAIR	31	31	31	24	42	32	36	34	29	30
POOR	39	35	42	66	39	6	39	33	38	45
DON'T KNOW	1	--	2	1	--	1	--	2	*	2
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GWB07. Dealing with terrorism? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	18%	24%	13%	6%	17%	38%	18%	22%	18%	15%
GOOD	35	35	36	22	34	51	38	36	39	24
FAIR	27	25	28	39	33	7	17	31	26	28
POOR	19	16	21	32	16	4	23	8	17	31
DON'T KNOW	1	--	2	1	--	--	2	2	--	1
REFUSED	*	*	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--

GWB08. Dealing with Iraq? (PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	12%	16%	9%	5%	11%	25%	13%	14%	11%	13%
GOOD	27	28	26	8	25	52	30	26	33	14
FAIR	26	26	26	30	31	18	23	31	24	26
POOR	33	30	37	56	33	4	33	25	31	46
DON'T KNOW	1	--	2	1	--	--	1	3	--	--
REFUSED	*	--	*	*	--	--	--	--	--	*

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			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, DID RIGHT THING	64%	68%	59%	42%	66%	87%	64%	73%	66%	49%
NO, DID NOT	28	25	31	48	28	6	28	20	26	41
ONLY WITH OTHERS	1	2	1	1	2	2	--	2	1	3
DON'T KNOW	6	4	8	8	5	4	8	5	7	6
REFUSED	1	*	1	1	--	1	--	1	--	1



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			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, HAD TO CHOOSE	50%	52%	48%	34%	45%	71%	47%	50%	55%	42%
NO, DID NOT HAVE TO	37	40	34	50	44	19	46	39	32	38
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (VOL)	2	2	3	5	2	--	--	--	2	6
DON'T KNOW	9	6	12	9	9	6	7	10	9	11
REFUSED	2	*	3	2	*	3	--	1	2	3

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			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
DONE ALL REASONABLE	46%	48%	43%	23%	38%	80%	48%	48%	51%	32%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	50	49	51	70	60	20	51	45	47	64
DON'T KNOW	4	2	5	6	2	*	1	7	2	3
REFUSED	*	*	*	1	--	--	--	1	--	1

IRAQ09Z. Although the UN had passed many resolutions demanding that Iraq disarm, the US was not able to get a final resolution explicitly calling for war. Do you support or oppose the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
SUPPORT	57%	62%	52%	30%	59%	89%	53%	63%	63%	42%
OPPOSE	35	34	37	60	33	9	34	29	32	46
DON'T KNOW	7	4	9	8	6	3	13	8	3	10
REFUSED	1	*	2	2	1	--	--	--	2	1

IRAQ10X. If the US had decided NOT to go to war, how likely do you think it is that we would eventually have been attacked with Iraqi weapons of mass destruction? Very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not likely at all?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
VERY LIKELY	18%	15%	20%	12%	14%	30%	6%	19%	20%	17%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	34	31	38	23	33	44	47	36	32	29
NOT VERY LIKELY	26	30	23	32	31	20	23	27	26	29
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	20	23	17	31	22	5	21	15	20	23
DON'T KNOW	2	1	2	2	--	*	2	2	1	1
REFUSED	*	--	1	*	*	--	--	--	*	1

IRAQ10Y. In the long run, will the US decision to attack Iraq increase the risk of terrorism in the world, reduce it, or not make that much difference one way or the other?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
INCREASE	25%	24%	25%	34%	29%	8%	29%	21%	24%	29%
DECREASE	40	44	37	21	36	69	30	46	44	33
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	32	30	33	39	36	22	39	29	30	34
DON'T KNOW	3	1	5	6	--	1	2	4	3	3
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

IRAQ10Z. Would you call the US led war in Iraq a complete success, mostly a success, only partly a success, mostly a failure, or a complete failure?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
COMPLETE SUCCESS	4%	4%	3%	2%	3%	7%	4%	5%	5%	1%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	33	34	31	16	31	59	33	39	33	26
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	42	41	43	45	49	31	43	43	41	42
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	16	12	24	13	2	17	9	12	21
A COMPLETE FAILURE	5	4	7	11	4	--	3	2	8	6
DON'T KNOW	2	*	4	2	*	2	--	3	1	3
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

IRAQ12A. So far, the United States has not found clear evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. If it turns out that none are found, do you think this means the US was wrong about Iraq having such weapons, that the Iraqis destroyed them secretly, or that they remain hidden somewhere?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
US WAS WRONG	29%	30%	28%	43%	31%	13%	28%	21%	28%	38%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	15	14	16	13	17	18	22	18	15	10
IRAQIS HID THEM	45	46	44	35	47	51	42	49	45	41
DON'T KNOW	10	8	12	10	5	15	8	12	10	10
REFUSED	1	1	1	*	--	2	--	--	2	*

IRAQ12B. If the US government thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore, do you think it was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons, a bad idea, or don't you have an opinion?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	39%	42%	37%	19%	31%	69%	36%	50%	44%	21%
BAD IDEA	39	38	41	60	44	16	30	29	40	54
DON'T HAVE OPINION	19	18	19	18	22	15	32	18	14	22
DON'T KNOW	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	4	1	2
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	*	1

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	33%	25%	40%	100%	--%	--%	39%	33%	27%	39%
REPUBLICAN	27	32	21	--	--	100	27	30	24	26
INDEPENDENT	26	30	22	--	100	--	10	21	34	24
OTHER	10	9	10	--	--	--	18	9	10	6
NONE	3	2	4	--	--	--	1	3	4	2
DON'T KNOW	2	1	2	--	--	--	5	2	1	1
REFUSED	1	*	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	1

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	11%	11%	11%	13%	4%	11%	100%	--%	--%	--%
30-44	25	23	26	25	21	28	--	100	--	--
45-59	39	42	35	32	50	36	--	--	100	--
60 and over	23	22	24	28	21	23	--	--	--	100
DK/REFUSED	2	1	2	1	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 502 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between January 27 and February 3, 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".