



Badger Poll@ #15, Release #2
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
University of Wisconsin Madison
May 5, 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.

BUSH AS A LEADER, IRAQ, AND THE CAMPAIGN
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

Evaluations of President Bush's job performance, and consideration of the Wisconsin public's views of the complex issue of Iraq suggest both why this election is likely to be close, and why the criticism of Bush to this point, and developments in Iraq, with escalating casualties, have not been of more benefit to the President's political opponents. Questions from the most recent Badger Poll™, which interviewed 511 randomly chosen respondents by telephone from April 20 to 28, attempted to address these matters.

Moving deeper into Spring, President Bush's job ratings are moderate, with residents roughly equally likely to grade his performance as excellent (15%) or good (35%) as opposed to fair (25%) or poor (23%). Views of Bush relate strongly to partisanship, with fewer than one in six Democrats willing to rate him good or better and only one in eight Republicans prepared to hold him to fair or worse. Independents are much closer to being evenly divided. Distinguishing respondents on whether or not they want Bush re-elected or would prefer someone else in the White House produces about the same "gap" as is observed for Republicans versus Democrats, while using which of the major party candidates respondents preferred if pushed yields a clear, but slightly weaker, distinction. In both cases, the "anti-Bush" group is more negative towards him (roughly half choosing poor) than the "pro-Bush" is positive.

Presidential approval has appeared on every Badger Poll™ to date, and complete results across time are shown in the accompanying chart. The current ratings are very similar to those received over the past several polls, although this is the first survey since last December when excellent and good ratings have outnumbered fair and poor. (It should be noted that the poll to poll movement, including the improvement since March is small enough that one's confidence that it reflects a real shift in population sentiment rather than the fluctuation due to sampling must be limited). In the wake of the initial military victory over Iraq last Spring, Bush was clearly judged more positively overall than he is now.

Views of a President can be quite different depending on what aspect of his job is being probed. This survey presented respondents with a series of areas, and asked respondents to apply the same excellent to poor scale to each.

The specific area of "foreign policy" finds respondents about ten points less likely to rate him good or higher. Precise overall ratings are excellent 9%, good 29%, fair 31%, and poor 29%. Again there is a clear partisan distinction, with seven in eight Democrats willing to go no higher than fair, and two thirds

Overall Presidential Rating
Polls from March 2002 to April 2004

	<---2004--->			<-----2003----->						<---2002--->				
	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB	JAN	SPT	JUN	MAR
Overall														
Exc	15%	16%	11%	17%	15%	14%	27%	31%	18%	19%	16%	19%	25%	28%
Good	35	30	37	35	35	38	35	38	35	39	38	45	44	40
Fair	35	24	28	26	27	28	24	21	30	25	29	23	22	22
Poor	23	30	22	19	21	19	13	10	16	16	14	12	8	7

of all Republicans grading Bush at least good. A similar pattern applies if one looks at predisposition to re-elect or Bush/Kerry choice. Each finds about nine in ten of the anti-Bush side choosing a rating no higher than fair, while two thirds of the pro-Bush respondents put him at least as high as good.

As was the case for overall ratings, how respondents feel on this subject in April is generally similar to how they felt earlier in 2004. (The mild improvement noted overall is not repeated here). Bush had a mini-spike in December of last year but both in late summer and fall he was not much better than he now is. Just prior to the outbreak of Gulf War II, he was rated somewhat higher on this dimension, and in September of 2002, six in ten called his foreign policy performance good or excellent.

If the focus turns to domestic affairs ("problems here at home"), the view is, if anything, a bit less sanguine. Here, Bush garners scores of excellent 6%, good 29%, fair 33%, and poor 32%. Democrats (nine in ten of whom limit Bush to fair) once again are clearly distinguished from Republicans (almost two thirds of whom place him at least as high as good). And both the predisposition to re-elect and the twoway (pushed) choice display similar patterns.

Still, Bush's current ratings seem at least as high as those he received in the recent past. December 2003 also was better here than in either preceding or succeeding polls. The highest rating for domestic performance so far recorded was in September 2002, when it lagged behind ratings for foreign policy.

A specific domestic troublespot, and certainly one which has received a good deal of attention, in the economy. When respondents were asked to rate how Bush has done "handling the economy", fewer than three in ten opt for either excellent (5%) or good (24%), with about seven in ten limiting the President to no higher than fair (35%) or poor (34%). Partisans differ, though it is worth noting that while Democrats are about as hard on Bush on this area as on domestic policy, Republicans are a bit weaker in their endorsement. The same general pattern holds for predisposition to re-elect and pushed twoway choice. This may hint at a somewhat different CONTENT to "problems" here at home for the pro-Bush groups.

Recalling that poll to poll differences tend to be quite small, it is hard to find much of a short run trend in this facet of Bush's perceived performance. He has been slightly better and slightly worse over the past year or so. December of last year found as upbeat an impression on this dimension as we have found. On other areas, September 2002 was the single best showing. That month was relatively strong for the economy as well, but no better than last December.

The single strongest area (among those tapped) was dealing with terrorism. Overall, almost six in ten called Bush's performance here either excellent (22%) or good (37%). Just under four in ten opted for one of the two lower grades of fair (25%) or poor (14%).

Not surprisingly, partisans differ. But here it is the Republicans who have about nine in ten choosing good or better, and the Democrats for who two thirds choose on the two grades on the opposite side of the ladder. (That is, if one views this in terms of those choosing either of the grades on one side versus those on the other, Republicans are more positive than Democrats are negative, the reverse of what we have often commented on above). This is mirrored as well when one distinguishes respondents in terms of predisposition to return Bush to office or to the pushed twoway choice between major party candidates.

The President's current scores here are on a rough par with last December's, which means they are modestly higher than in January or March. At the same time, it should be pointed out that except for January 2003, Bush's grades for fighting terrorism were clearly higher (sometimes markedly so) than they are now for the period up to May of 2003.

That was the period which included the runup to the war against Iraq and the initial military victory. Ratings of Bush's handling of Iraq are clearly lower than those he receives for terrorism. Specifically just under half call it excellent (16%) or good (30%), while just over that proportion feel that fair (21%) or poor (32%) is more apt.

About eight in Democrats rate Bush no higher than fair, while the same proportion of Republicans go no lower than good. This also holds -- or is slightly stronger -- for predisposition about Bush's reelection or the pushed twoway choice. In all cases though, because they are more likely to rate Bush poor than those who back him are to rate him excellent, the views of anti-Bush respondents seem more intense. This suggests that Iraq is an energizing issue for those opposed to the President.

Historically, what was a relatively very bad month in terms of American casualties was reflected only modestly in Bush's ratings. (While the excellent and good versus fair and poor totals are similar, there are now fewer persons rating Bush excellent and more rating him poor than a month ago. But the real story there may be that only a small shift is evident, if any is. January was lower while December was higher. Views in late summer and mid-Fall did not differ appreciably from what we find now. But it is clear that there was something of a falloff from September 2002 until the immediate pre-war period (which was modestly better than now, but ratings jumped with the initial victories, only to retreat some as the occupation began to prove difficult.

Before considering more detailed views of Iraq, one can look at similarities and differences in the grades individuals gave Bush for the different areas. A series of "constructed items" shown in the detailed numerical tables following this summary relate how individuals rated Bush overall compared to each of the five specific areas, and also how they rated him on Iraq compared to each of the other four areas. Respondents fall into four groups: those who rated Bush higher (e.g. excellent compared to good, fair or poor, or good compared to fair or poor), those who rated the two areas the same, and those who rated Bush lower on the one dimension than the other (e.g., fair compared to excellent or good, or good compared to excellent), those who did not rate Bush on one or the other dimensions.

Job Ratings on Specific Areas

	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB	JAN	SEP
Foreign policy												
EXCELLENT	9%	12%	12%	16%	12%	12%			13%		12%	20%
GOOD	29	28	26	29	29	29			33		32	41
FAIR	31	28	27	35	28	34			30		34	23
POOR	29	31	33	19	30	24			23		20	15
Problems here at home												
EXCELLENT	6%	6%	6%	10%	5%	4%			6%		6%	12%
GOOD	29	25	26	31	24	31			33		30	40
FAIR	33	32	31	35	33	36			35		39	29
POOR	32	36	37	23	36	28			25		24	18
Dealing with the economy												
EXCELLENT	5%	6%	6%	12%	5%	3%	4%	7%	5%	4%	4%	6%
GOOD	24	23	23	28	23	23	34	32	22	26	23	30
FAIR	35	32	31	34	34	38	30	32	39	38	38	36
POOR	34	38	39	25	38	35	30	28	32	31	31	25
Dealing with terrorism												
EXCELLENT	22%	23%	18%	22%	19%	17%	29%	34%	20%	20%	18%	32%
GOOD	37	32	35	37	36	42	41	44	46	43	42	40
FAIR	25	23	27	24	25	23	23	14	25	23	26	17
POOR	14	20	19	15	18	16	8	7	9	13	12	11
Dealing with Iraq												
EXCELLENT	16%	22%	12%	18%	14%	15%	30%	40%	18%	19%	11%	22%
GOOD	30	24	27	30	31	32	32	35	31	30	31	30
FAIR	21	24	27	24	24	24	22	13	26	25	28	23
POOR	32	28	33	27	30	27	13	10	23	24	26	20

Note: Don't Know and Refused omitted for space

To begin with, the largest group assigned the same grade to Bush overall as they did to each of the individual ratings (a proportion ranging from 50% to 57%). But for the economy, domestic policy, and foreign policy (in that order) those who rated Bush higher overall outnumbered those who rated the specific area higher. The opposite was true for terrorism (by about the same kind of margin for the first three areas noted). The balance was much closer for Iraq, where those rating Bush higher overall were only half again as numerous as those who rated him higher on the specific area.

Terrorism was the only area where ratings tended to be higher than for Iraq. There, six in ten rated Bush the same on the two areas, one in three rated him higher on fighting terrorism and fewer than one in twenty rated him higher on Iraq. For the other three areas, if there was a discrepancy, respondents tended to rate the other area more highly, although the largest single group chose the same rating.

While the public obviously is not totally supportive of the way George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq, it is far from rejecting the war and its rationale altogether. When respondents were asked "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", almost two in three (63%) say "yes", while three in ten (30%) demur. There are partisan differences, but it is noteworthy that while Republicans overwhelmingly (by almost eight to one) endorse the original rationale of the war, Democrats are much more narrow (five to four) in their opposition, and Independents back it by two to one. As might be expected, respondents who back Bush's re-election tend to endorse the rationale, while those who would like to see someone else in the White House on balance oppose it. This also applies to those favoring Bush over Kerry in a pushed twoway choice contrasted to those opting for the Democrat. But both "anti-Bush" camps are more divided than those backing him.

The present results are quite similar to what we have found on the last several Badger Polls™ (the size of the majority is literally slightly smaller, but so close that poll to poll chance fluctuation due to sampling could easily account for it. One has to go back the period from the initial military victories to last August to get stronger endorsement.

Relatedly, respondents were reminded both of the history of UN resolutions demanding Iraqi compliance and the fact that no resolution explicitly calling for war was obtained. Granted that, by an eight to five majority (57%-35%) margin, Wisconsinites said they supported "the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway".

A similar pattern was observed here for partisanship to that found for the original justification: Republicans are overwhelming in their support; Democrats oppose it, but come closer to being divided (although not quite so close as on the previous item). Independents also back the decision by about five to four. Both those who favor Bush's re-election in the abstract or choose him over Kerry in the twoway choice retroactively back the decision to go to war onesidedly. Those opposed to his re-election oppose it by two to one, those choosing Kerry over Bush by almost three to one, but in both cases these margins are noticeably smaller than that by which Bush's backers support the decision.

The present sentiment, while showing little or no movement compared to the past several surveys, is nonetheless less supportive of the decision to go to war than we found on several instances early. Just before the outbreak of the war, slightly greater majorities favored the decision to go to war. This increased with the initial victories, and then fell back some. In any event, support has never been lower than about three to two.

Basic Views of the War on Iraq across Time

	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB
Original threat of war										
YES, DID RIGHT THING	63%	65%	64%	65%	65%	70%	78%	80%	65%	65%
NO, DID NOT	30	30	28	26	30	26	18	16	26	26
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL)	2	1	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	1
Support US action alone w/o UN										
YES	57%	59%	57%	62%	62%	61%	71%	75%	61%	58%
NO	35	35	35	31	32	34	25	19	31	32

Note: wording changes, primarily tense, to deal with outbreak of war between 3/03 and 4/03 surveys. Don't know and Refused omitted.

Residents are mixed in terms of their assessment of the risks to the US through eventual use of WMD by Iraq. Overall, one in four (24%) say that it is very likely that we would eventually have been attacked by such weapons had we not gone to war. Adding in the one in three (35%) who felt it was somewhat likely brings one to three residents in every ten. By contrast, four in ten view the EVENTUAL (emphasis added) threat as lower (either not very likely -- 24%, or not likely at all -- 15%). On the one hand this means there is no consensus on an eventual threat (not to mention immediate); on the other, there is no rejection of it either.

Democrats are less convinced of a threat, though almost four in ten found it at least somewhat likely, while Republicans were onesidedly likely to fall in this group. Similar patterns obtained for predisposition for or against Bush's re-election or the twoway choice between him and Kerry. But the asymmetry persists.

The present perceived level of risk, had the US not gone to war, is about what it was in January or March, if anything a bit higher. But it began a year ago March with about two in three expecting an eventual attack to be at least somewhat likely, increased during the actual war, and then receded somewhat in the late summer and fall. So, over time, it now stands lower than it did before the occupation, but a majority continue to feel there was some substantial risk that sooner or later Iraq would have attempted such an attack.

One area of contention (including but not limited to the campaign as such) is the long-run impact of the US war in Iraq on the broader risk of terrorism in the world. Residents are quite split on this. Overall, the single largest group (41%) says that the US decision to attack Iraq has decreased this risk. But not that many fewer (29%) say it has increased it, while a group of about the same size (27%) feels it has not made that much difference one way or the other.

Republicans tend to feel (by more than five to one) that the risk has gone down rather than up. Independents are roughly a wash, with those fearing an increase only outnumbering those who look to a decrease by several percentage points. By just over two to one, the Democrats who perceive any change think the long-term risk has been heightened. Separating respondents either by whether or not they would like to see Bush re-elected or by whether they prefer Bush or Kerry in a pushed choice between major party candidates produces broadly similar results with the same overall distinction that Bush people are more onesided in their views than those opposed to Bush (or, put differently, that there is more dissensus among the opponents of the President than among his backers).

Views on this have moved around a fair bit since the immediate pre-war survey (which occurred when war looked inevitable but the final ultimatum had not expired, nor had hostilities commenced). On that survey, the balance of opinion was narrowly that terrorism risk had been increased in the long run. Since then, one first found some greater sense that any change would be an improvement, then a wash in August and since then modest and shifting pluralities thinking the risk had decreased.

When respondents are asked to assess the war in terms of its degree of success and failure, a rather mixed picture emerges. Only a handful (currently 2%) call it "a complete success". Three in ten (29%) think of it as "mostly a success". The single most common view, held by 46% now, is that it was "only partly a success". More pessimistic assessments are less common: one in seven (14%) thinks of it as "mostly a failure", and a group about half that size (7%)

Trend from March 2003

	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR
Use of WMD against US w/o war									
VERY LIKELY	24%	29%	18%	30%	32%	31%	40%	42%	34%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	35	26	34	31	33	31	32	32	33
NOT VERY LIKELY	24	27	26	23	22	24	19	17	23
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	15	16	20	13	13	12	8	8	8
Long-term impact of war									
INCREASED TERROR RISK	29%	29%	25%	27%	25%	33%	24%	25%	42%
DECREASED TERROR RISK	41	39	40	37	39	35	44	46	27
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	27	28	32	32	32	29	31	27	28

Note: wording changes, primarily tense, to deal with outbreak of war between 3/03 and 4/03 surveys. Don't know and Refused omitted.

opts for "a complete failure."

Among all three partisan groups, the most common view is that the war was "only partly a success". But one in three Democrats see it as mostly or completely a failure, contrasted with fewer than one Republican in twenty. On the other side, more than half of all Republicans think of it as mostly or completely a success, contrasted with about one Democrat in eight who takes this position. A generally consistent pattern is found if one distinguishes by predisposition to re-electing Bush or to pushed choice between the major party candidates. And again, the asymmetry we have noted comes into play.

In May of 2003, six in ten viewed the war as either mostly or completely a success. This was the high water mark, with each subsequent survey having the largest single group take the position that the war was only partly a success, with results not moving around too much. The present result is arguably the single least positive. but the differences are quite small. The typical resident has long felt there are spots on the idea of the war as a success but has never come close to a consensus that it was a failure.

On the central issue of WMD, there remains substantial belief that they both did and do exist, although there is a not insignificant group which doubts that they were real at the time the US was making so much of them at the runup to the war. Specifically, when respondents were reminded that "so far, the United States has not found clear evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction", and asked what the explanation would be if "it turns out none are found", the largest group (52%) say that is because "they remain hidden somewhere". Almost one in six (15%) say "the Iraqis destroyed them secretly", and one in four (24%) think "the US was wrong about Iraq having such weapons".

Among all partisan groups the most common view is that the weapons still exist but are hidden. Sentiment that the US allegations were wrong declines as one moves from Democrat to Republican. A broadly similar pattern obtains as one looks at predisposition concerning Bush being re-elected or the pushed twoway choice between Bush and Kerry, although along both distinctions, among those opposed to Bush, a plurality feels the US was wrong about Iraqi WMD, still leaving a large number who think either they were secretly destroyed or -- more commonly -- still exist.

Each time this question has been asked since last May, the most common answer overall was that Iraqi WMD remain hidden. The proportion thinking the US was wrong has been both higher and lower than it now is, although the surveys where is was clearly lower were all last year. But it is clear that despite much commentary, the Wisconsin public does not and has not come to the conclusion that the WMD were a delusion.

While WMD were prominent in the justification for attacking Iraq (and indeed were central to the UN resolutions passed prior to the attack), other justifications have been advanced. Wisconsinites are sharply divided on whether or not they were sufficient reason to go to war "if the US government thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore" -- that is, assuming both that the WMD did not exist and that the administration had thought they did not exist. Under those (admittedly hypothetical) conditions, one in three (34%) think it was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons. About as many (37%) say it was a bad idea, and more than one in four (27%) said they did not have an opinion.

Here the partisan pattern we have so often seen is modified. True, support for other reasons clearly increases as one moves across the spectrum from Democrat to Republican. But Republicans are weaker in their five to two sentiment that the war would have been a good idea anyway than were Democrats in their three to one opposition. On the other hand, those who back Bush's re-election endorse other reasons by a margin quite similar to that with which those who oppose it. Those backing Kerry in a twoway choice are somewhat more onesided in their view that it was a bad idea than those supporting Bush are in their sense that there were good reasons other than imminent WMD threats for going to war.

Looking Back at War

	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY
Assessment of war							
COMPLETE SUCCESS	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	3%	9%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	29	34	33	35	32	35	52
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	46	39	42	38	45	43	29
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	14	14	15	14	13	6
A COMPLETE FAILURE	7	7	5	7	1	3	1
Why no WMD found							
US WAS WRONG	24%	23%	29	18%	17%	17%	10%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	15	11	15	17	16	14	14
IRAQIS HID THEM	52	53	45	54	60	61	66
If US thought no WMD							
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	34%	40%	39%	36%	38%	35%	47%
BAD IDEA	37	36	39	35	33	37	26
DON'T HAVE OPINION	27	22	19	26	27	28	25
Did Bush believe WMD threat							
YES	76%	73%					
NO	18	22					

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

A final question addressed the dispute over what the President thought and when he thought it. Respondents were reminded that "before the start of the war, President Bush said that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction which would pose a real threat to the US," and asked whether "he believed at the time this was true." Overall, three in four (76%) said he believed it was true. Just under one in five (18%) said they felt he did not believe the case he was making. Among all groups examined, a clear majority -- though of varying sizes -- thinks the President was telling the truth as he saw it. This includes 98% of Republicans, 95% of those who want Bush re-elected, and 94% of those who prefer Bush to Kerry. Little surprise there, perhaps. But it also includes 57% of Democrats, 58% of those who do NOT want Bush re-elected, and 54% of those in Kerry's camp. (Last month the corresponding figure was 73% overall, so there is no evidence of slippage on this dimension.)

All this suggests several things. First, while ratings of Bush's handling of Iraq leave much for his backers to desire, and hence provide an opening for his opponents, the public is far from having turned it back and rejected the war as bad business from the start. This means that is important that challengers (and Kerry in particular) explain why what they might do would be an improvement without contravening some of the original goals, which the public continues to endorse. Second, since there is more consensus on Iraq among pro-Bush forces than among anti-Bush forces it is easier for him to mobilize support with his positions than is the case for Kerry. Arguing that WMD never existed, or that Bush knowingly misled the public on the case for war is more popular among Kerry's constituency than Bush's, but still flies in the face of what many in his camp believe, and thus would be limited in effectiveness than if they agreed with these attacks. Finally, since the public believes that WMD did exist (and many think they still do) and believes that Bush was sincere in his arguments prior to the war, clear evidence to the contrary might have a major impact.

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				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
MALE	49%	100%	--%	41%	61%	51%	41%	54%	49%	45%	52%	45%	54%	44%
FEMALE	51	--	100	59	39	49	59	46	51	55	48	55	46	56

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
EXCELLENT	15%	17%	12%	2%	9%	34%	14%	13%	12%	21%	31%	1%	27%	1%
GOOD	35	35	34	13	34	54	35	35	37	31	56	12	56	10
FAIR	25	25	25	34	27	11	25	33	24	17	13	36	17	35
POOR	23	20	26	49	27	1	22	16	26	27	--	48	--	51
TOO SOON TO TELL (VOL.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DON'T KNOW	1	--	2	1	*	*	4	1	*	1	--	2	--	2
REFUSED	1	2	1	1	2	*	--	2	1	3	*	1	*	2

VOTE24. This November, the ballot for President will probably be George W. Bush as a Republican, John Kerry as a Democrat, and Ralph Nader as an Independent. As of now, which one, if any, do you plan to vote for?

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
GEORGE W. BUSH	45%	50%	40%	8%	35%	87%	44%	47%	47%	43%	88%	5%	85%	--%
JOHN KERRY	33	30	36	74	35	2	34	29	35	33	1	68	--	77
RALPH NADER	4	5	3	3	8	2	8	3	4	2	1	7	2	5
NONE OF THEM	5	6	4	4	8	2	1	7	3	7	2	5	3	5
INSISTS ON "OTHER"	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
WILL NOT VOTE	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	*	1	2	1	2
DON'T KNOW	10	8	12	9	12	5	11	10	9	12	5	12	6	12
REFUSED	2	1	2	--	2	2	--	2	1	3	2	1	3	--

VOTE25. (IF DID NOT NAME ONE OF THREE) If you had to make up your mind among these three, as of now who would you prefer?

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
NOT ASKED	82%	84%	80%	85%	78%	91%	86%	79%	86%	78%	90%	80%	87%	82%
GEORGE W. BUSH	5	6	5	2	7	6	4	7	5	4	8	2	10	--
JOHN KERRY	6	5	6	8	6	2	10	6	5	4	*	10	--	13
RALPH NADER	2	3	1	--	6	1	1	2	--	5	1	2	1	2
NONE OF THEM	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
INSISTS ON "OTHER"	1	*	2	2	--	--	--	2	2	1	1	2	1	2
DON'T KNOW	3	2	4	2	2	1	--	1	2	7	--	3	*	1
REFUSED	1	1	2	1	1	1	--	2	1	2	--	1	1	*

VOTE26. (UNLESS NAMED BUSH/KERRY IN VOTE24. OR VOTE25.) Suppose you were choosing just between Bush and Kerry? Which would you prefer?

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
NOT ASKED	89%	90%	88%	92%	83%	95%	91%	89%	91%	84%	98%	85%	95%	90%
GEORGE W. BUSH	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	5	--
JOHN KERRY	4	4	5	4	11	--	5	4	5	5	--	8	--	10
NONE OF THEM	2	2	2	2	1	1	--	2	--	5	*	3	--	--
INSISTS ON "OTHER"	*	*	--	--	*	--	--	*	--	--	--	*	--	--
DON'T KNOW	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	4	--	2	--	--
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	1	--	--	*	--	--

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

	GENDER				PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK	
EXCELLENT	5%	6%	5%	1%	1%	14%	8%	5%	3%	8%	11%	1%	10%	1%	
GOOD	24	27	21	6	20	42	21	29	22	25	44	6	41	5	
FAIR	35	36	35	27	39	36	35	37	39	30	37	30	41	29	
POOR	34	30	37	64	39	7	36	28	35	35	6	62	7	65	
DON'T KNOW	1	*	2	1	--	1	--	1	1	2	2	1	1	--	
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	

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

	GENDER				PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK	
EXCELLENT	22%	25%	20%	6%	20%	43%	23%	27%	21%	19%	41%	5%	37%	6%	
GOOD	37	45	30	26	37	46	36	39	37	36	48	25	50	23	
FAIR	25	22	28	41	25	10	31	23	24	28	9	41	11	41	
POOR	14	8	19	24	18	1	10	11	17	13	2	26	1	29	
DON'T KNOW	2	1	2	2	--	1	--	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	
REFUSED	*	--	*	*	--	--	--	--	--	*	--	*	--	*	

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

	GENDER				PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK	
EXCELLENT	16%	17%	15%	3%	14%	33%	14%	20%	14%	17%	31%	2%	28%	3%	
GOOD	30	33	26	17	22	47	31	31	33	23	46	15	47	10	
FAIR	21	19	23	23	23	14	27	19	17	25	18	22	20	23	
POOR	32	30	35	55	42	6	28	30	34	33	4	61	5	64	
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	2	--	1	--	1	2	1	1	1	1	*	
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	

GWBX1. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of overall rating with foreign policy

	GENDER				PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK	
OVERALL HIGHER	30%	35%	26%	19%	31%	38%	25%	30%	31%	29%	36%	23%	37%	21%	
BOTH SAME	56	52	59	62	58	52	57	52	57	59	54	60	53	61	
FOREIGN HIGHER	10	10	11	13	9	9	15	14	7	7	8	13	9	12	
ONE/BOTH DK	4	4	4	6	3	1	4	3	5	4	1	5	2	6	

GWBX2. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of overall rating with domestic problems

	GENDER				PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY	
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK	
OVERALL HIGHER	36%	37%	35%	24%	36%	48%	39%	37%	36%	32%	48%	23%	49%	21%	
BOTH SAME	52	52	52	62	48	46	50	48	56	53	44	62	43	63	
DOMESTIC HIGHER	9	9	9	11	13	4	7	11	6	11	6	12	7	13	
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	3	3	1	4	3	2	4	1	3	2	4	

GWBX3. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of overall rating with handling economy

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
OVERALL HIGHER	39%	40%	38%	25%	38%	55%	38%	37%	43%	38%	53%	24%	53%	22%
BOTH SAME	51	51	51	67	50	37	53	51	51	48	39	65	39	67
ECONOMY HIGHER	7	7	6	5	9	6	5	9	4	8	6	8	6	7
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	2	5	2	3	2	4

GWBX4. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of overall rating with dealing with terrorism

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
OVERALL HIGHER	12%	10%	14%	6%	16%	15%	13%	7%	10%	18%	15%	11%	13%	11%
BOTH SAME	50	48	51	46	39	61	49	53	53	45	58	42	60	39
TERRORISM HIGHER	34	39	30	44	42	23	34	38	34	30	26	43	26	45
ONE/BOTH DK	4	3	5	4	3	1	4	2	2	7	1	5	1	5

GWBX5. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of overall rating with dealing with Iraq

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
OVERALL HIGHER	24%	26%	22%	19%	32%	20%	24%	21%	22%	27%	23%	24%	24%	23%
BOTH SAME	57	54	59	56	48	66	54	56	59	57	61	56	60	56
IRAQ HIGHER	16	17	14	21	17	13	19	19	16	11	15	17	15	17
ONE/BOTH DK	3	3	4	3	3	1	4	3	2	4	2	4	1	4

GWBI1. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of Iraq rating with foreign policy

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
IRAQ HIGHER	23%	29%	18%	22%	19%	32%	14%	28%	24%	22%	30%	17%	29%	16%
BOTH SAME	62	59	64	60	68	60	75	55	64	63	58	66	58	69
FOREIGN HIGHER	12	10	15	14	14	8	9	15	8	14	10	14	10	13
ONE/BOTH DK	2	2	3	4	--	1	2	2	5	1	2	3	2	3

GWBI2. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of Iraq rating with domestic problems

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
IRAQ HIGHER	33%	38%	28%	27%	27%	47%	33%	38%	37%	23%	43%	22%	44%	20%
BOTH SAME	49	43	55	56	56	40	54	44	46	58	43	57	42	60
DOMESTIC HIGHER	16	18	15	16	17	12	13	15	15	18	12	20	13	20
ONE/BOTH DK	2	1	2	2	--	1	--	3	2	2	2	1	2	*

GWBI3. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of Iraq rating with handling economy

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TWOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
IRAQ HIGHER	38%	38%	37%	32%	32%	52%	39%	42%	41%	30%	50%	26%	50%	23%
BOTH SAME	45	43	47	53	50	34	44	42	43	50	35	55	34	59
ECONOMY HIGHER	16	18	14	14	18	12	17	14	14	17	13	18	14	18
ONE/BOTH DK	2	1	2	2	--	2	--	2	2	2	2	1	2	*

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?

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
INCREASE	29%	32%	26%	45%	37%	13%	20%	27%	31%	31%	12%	44%	13%	47%
DECREASE	41	42	39	21	34	66	45	42	42	35	65	18	62	16
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	27	24	30	32	28	18	34	27	25	30	20	34	23	34
DON'T KNOW	3	2	5	2	2	3	1	4	2	4	2	4	2	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?

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
COMPLETE SUCCESS	2%	3%	2%	2%	*%	4%	4%	2%	3%	*%	4%	1%	3%	1%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	29	32	26	11	26	49	41	30	23	30	50	10	47	8
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	46	45	47	48	44	44	44	49	48	39	41	48	44	47
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	13	14	21	19	3	9	12	13	18	3	24	3	26
A COMPLETE FAILURE	7	7	8	15	10	--	2	4	11	10	--	16	--	17
DON'T KNOW	1	*	2	2	--	*	--	1	2	3	1	1	1	1
REFUSED	*	--	1	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	--

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?

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
US WAS WRONG	24%	24%	24%	37%	28%	11%	25%	17%	29%	25%	7%	42%	9%	43%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	15	18	12	11	18	19	15	14	15	15	18	12	17	12
IRAQIS HID THEM	52	50	55	43	47	62	53	61	50	48	67	37	66	36
DON'T KNOW	9	8	9	8	7	9	7	8	7	11	8	8	8	9
REFUSED	*	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--

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?

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	34%	38%	30%	19%	28%	51%	46%	39%	35%	24%	54%	16%	51%	14%
BAD IDEA	37	34	40	60	43	19	27	35	39	42	17	58	18	62
DON'T HAVE OPINION	27	25	28	21	26	28	25	24	24	32	27	24	29	23
DON'T KNOW	2	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
REFUSED	*	*	*	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	*	--	*	--

IRAQ12C. Before the start of the war, President Bush said that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction which would pose a real threat to the US. Do you think he believed at the time this was true?

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
YES, BELIEVED WAS TRUE	76%	77%	75%	57%	69%	98%	77%	79%	77%	71%	95%	58%	94%	54%
NO, DID NOT	18	19	18	36	22	1	23	17	16	21	2	33	3	37
DON'T KNOW	6	4	7	7	9	1	1	4	7	8	3	9	2	9
REFUSED	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
DEMOCRAT	29%	25%	34%	100%	--%	--%	27%	30%	29%	28%	6%	54%	6%	59%
REPUBLICAN	32	34	31	--	--	100	34	32	33	32	60	5	58	2
INDEPENDENT	23	29	18	--	100	--	22	18	27	26	20	27	20	28
OTHER	11	9	12	--	--	--	16	15	7	9	10	10	12	8
NONE	3	3	3	--	--	--	2	4	3	3	2	4	2	2
DON'T KNOW	1	*	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	1	--	1	--
REFUSED	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	*

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

	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS				RE-ELEC		TOWAY		
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+	YES	NO	GWB	JK
18-29	13%	11%	15%	12%	12%	14%	100%	--%	--%	--%	12%	15%	12%	15%
30-44	27	30	24	27	21	27	--	100	--	--	29	26	29	24
45-59	31	31	31	31	36	32	--	--	100	--	32	31	32	32
60 and over	26	24	28	25	29	26	--	--	--	100	26	24	25	25
DK/REFUSED	3	4	2	5	2	1	--	--	--	--	2	4	2	4

* 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 511 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between April 20 and 28, 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".