



UWSC



BADGER POLL™ #19, RELEASE #3
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
University of Wisconsin Madison
JANUARY 28, 2005

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.

IRAQ AT THE START OF BUSH'S SECOND TERM
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

As the second term of George W. Bush gets underway, Iraq continues to be a major concern in Wisconsin as elsewhere. Public opinion is to some extent critical of how things are going, but things have by no means progressed to either a rejection of the goals articulated by the White House, nor to the kind of scepticism about motives and credibility that so debilitated Lyndon Johnson.

Bush's absolute job ratings give him only a limited source of political capital to draw on. Overall, barely under half rates him excellent or good, while barely over half opts for fair or poor. Still, these overall ratings are higher than many specific ratings of areas of his performance, notably Iraq itself. The specific first area was foreign policy, which finds just under four in ten rating him excellent (10%) or good, while six in ten go for fair (30%) or poor (31%). Similar overall results are found for "dealing with problems here at home". In both cases, Democrats are markedly more critical (for instance, fewer than one in ten Democrats give Bush good or better for either area. the comparable figure for Republicans is seven in ten. Independent(s) fall between the two, but closer to the Democrats.

His job ratings seem to be hovering about where they were for much of the campaign. There have been fluctuations, with sometimes a few more rating him good or better than fair or poor, and sometimes the opposite, but the balance simply has not changed very much, as may be seen in the accompanying table. The present ratings fall almost halfway between those recorded in June or September of this last year.

Bush does worse when the focus is specifically on the economy. Just over one in three give him a grade of at least good on that, with a partisan pattern similar to the broader assessments. Terror is a stronger area. Just over half rate the President as either excellent or good with regard to this, leaving just over four in ten making the more critical assessments of fair or poor. All three self-described partisan groups (which differ by about the same amount as on other areas) on balance sees terror as an area where Bush's performance has exceeded that of his handling of his job overall.

Iraq is a relatively weak area. Overall, just under four in ten rate Bush's performance here as either excellent (11%) or good (26%), compared with barely under six in ten who are willing to go no higher than fair (21%) or poor (38%). This distribution means the single most common answer given was "poor". Democrats are onesidedly critical with almost nine in ten of them saying Bush is doing fair or less well. The corresponding figure among Independents is seven

Overall Presidential Rating
Polls from March 2002 to October 2004

	<-----2004----->							<-----2003----->							<---2002--->			
	JAN	OCT	SPT	JUN	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB	JAN	SPT	JUN	MAR
Overall																		
Exc	16%	15%	18%	14%	15%	16%	11%	17%	15%	14%	27%	31%	18%	19%	16%	19%	25%	28%
Good	33	32	32	33	35	30	37	35	35	38	35	38	35	39	38	45	44	40
Fair	26	21	22	27	25	24	28	26	27	28	24	21	30	25	29	23	22	22
Poor	25	31	26	25	23	30	22	19	21	19	13	10	16	16	14	12	8	7

in ten, but among Republicans the figure is three in ten.

Besides comparing the overall distributions (or "marginals") it is possible to compare at the individual level the ratings for the specific areas. For instance, looking at both the overall rating and the rating for foreign policy, a person who rates both (that is does NOT refuse or say he or she has no opinion for either), may have a higher rating for overall performance (e.g. excellent, compared to any other rating, or good compared to fair or poor), the same (identical "grades" applied to both), or a higher rating for the more specific area (e.g., fair compared to poor, good compared to either fair or poor).

Looking this way, Bush often gets higher ratings on his overall performance than on various specific areas. Thus, just shy of six in ten residents give him an identical score on overall job performance and foreign policy. But three in ten rate him higher overall, compared to only 8% who rate foreign policy more positively. Democrats are least likely to single out foreign policy, Republicans (with Independents close behind) most so.

Ratings of Bush overall compared to problems at home, and the economy, show a similar pattern among all respondents. Around one in three rates Bush higher overall. More than half assign the same grade. Fewer than one in ten call the specific area better than overall. On both of these, the tendency to distinguish increases somewhat as one moves across the partisan spectrum. Bush's handling of Iraq also falls under this general pattern.

The exception is terrorism. Once again, about six in ten rate the President the same overall as on the more specific area. But here, those rating terrorism (the specific) more highly than the overall outnumber those with the opposite distinction by a 25%-16% margin. Further, it is Republicans who most commonly rate the overall and more specific areas the same.

Looked at another way, two thirds of residents assign Bush the same "grade" for both foreign policy and Iraq. Among the three in ten who DO differentiate the areas, there is a close split (13%-17%) with those evaluating Bush more positively on foreign policy the larger group. Comparing Iraq with problems at home finds almost six in ten assigning the same rating. The balance overall among the four in ten making a distinction is even closer (19% Iraq higher, 21% problems at home).

Job Ratings on Specific Areas

	<-----2004----->							<-----2003----->							2002	
	JAN	OCT	SEP	JUN	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB	JAN	SEP
Foreign policy																
EXCELLENT	10%			9%	9%	12%	12%	16%	12%	12%			13%		12%	20%
GOOD	27			30	29	28	26	29	29	29			33		32	41
FAIR	30			30	31	28	27	35	28	34			30		34	23
POOR	31			30	29	31	33	19	30	24			23		20	15
Problems here at home																
EXCELLENT	8%			6%	6%	6%	6%	10%	5%	4%			6%		6%	12%
GOOD	28			28	29	25	26	31	24	31			33		30	40
FAIR	31			34	33	32	31	35	33	36			35		39	29
POOR	32			31	32	36	37	23	36	28			25		24	18
Dealing w/ economy																
EXC	9%	10%	8%	7%	5%	6%	6%	12%	5%	3%	4%	7%	5%	4%	4%	6%
GOOD	27	25	29	26	24	23	23	28	23	23	34	32	22	26	23	30
FAIR	31	27	28	31	35	32	31	34	34	38	30	32	39	38	38	36
POOR	32	37	35	34	34	38	39	25	38	35	30	28	32	31	31	25
Dealing w/ terrorism																
EXC	20%	26%	25%	17%	22%	23%	18%	22%	19%	17%	29%	34%	20%	20%	18%	32%
GOOD	33	33	35	37	37	32	35	37	36	42	41	44	46	43	42	40
FAIR	23	20	20	24	25	23	27	24	25	23	23	14	25	23	26	17
POOR	22	21	18	21	14	20	19	15	18	16	8	7	9	13	12	11
Dealing w/ Iraq																
EXC	11%	18%	18%	12%	16%	22%	12%	18%	14%	15%	30%	40%	18%	19%	11%	22%
GOOD	26	26	25	27	30	24	27	30	31	32	32	35	31	30	31	30
FAIR	21	17	22	22	21	24	27	24	24	24	22	13	26	25	28	23
POOR	38	38	34	38	32	28	33	27	30	27	13	10	23	24	26	20

Note: Don't Know and Refused omitted for space

The comparison of Iraq and the economy produces almost identical results (58% the same, 19% Iraq higher, 20% economy higher). As would be expected from the marginal results, the war on terrorism presents a different pattern. The largest group (60%) gives Bush the same grade on Iraq and terrorism. However, in contrast to the split so often seen on other issues, almost all those who make a distinction (35%) rate the President higher on terror, only 3% make the opposite distinction.

Further, the partisan pattern had tended to have Republicans less likely on balance to rate Bush more highly on the other specific issues than on Iraq. Independents and (a bit more clearly) Democrats tended to single out Iraq more for less positive evaluation. On terrorism, Democrats and Republicans had similar patterns while Independents were almost as likely to rate terrorism higher as to rate Bush the same on the two issues.

Bush's rating on the more specific area of foreign policy has tended to be lower than his overall rating for some time, and this survey is no exception. He was almost in the same place last April. September's scores were so close to what we now get that one can not have much confidence that whatever differences there are were produced by systematic shifts in the population rather than random fluctuation due to sampling.

A similar story is told by the ratings for "dealing with problems here at home". The more specific area has tended to be rated less highly than overall performance, and at or somewhat below the level of foreign policy. Again, comparisons with the two most recent soundings show results very close to what was found then. They as well provide little persuasive evidence of a real shift in the population.

"Handling the economy" has usually moved very closely in tandem with "dealing with problems here at home", with ratings very slightly more "extreme" (excellent versus good and poor versus fair), if anything. This tracking continues. The key is that this is clearly NOT a relatively strong area for Bush.

"Dealing with terrorism" has historically been a strong area for the President. In relative terms, as noted there has been, and still is, the single strongest area. In contrast with the close link between problems here at home and the economy, foreign policy does not tend to move in any such lock step. The present reading is between that Bush got in June and September, it may be a bit lower than he received just before the election (from a sample limited to those planning to vote).

The present rating for Iraq specifically is lower than that for combating terrorism, as has tended generally to be the case. It has usually tracked more closely with overall foreign policy than with terror. One should not overestimate the significance of what are, after all, small differences.

While Wisconsin residents make a less than overwhelming endorsement, to put it mildly, of the way the war in Iraq has been going, they are far from labeling it "the wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place" to borrow Senator Kerry's words. Six in ten (61%) for instance believe that "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 had", which was the basic rationale of Administration Iraqi policy. One in three (34%) demurred. This overall endorsement obscures a partisan pattern that has self-described Republicans onesidedly endorsing the policy, Independents by about three to two and Democrats saying the US did NOT do the right thing by about two to one.

The retrospective view of whether the original threat of force was appropriate or not has fluctuated over the last year or so, with the sense it was the right thing sometimes up a couple of points, and sometimes down. The present balance is close to an average of September and October, with any poll to poll shift tending to be below the threshold of "statistical significance" where by itself it would show convincing evidence of a real shift one way or the other. Nonetheless, up to last March or April, sentiment (while moving some poll to poll) tended to be more clearly backing of Bush's declared rationale than is now the case. But some slippage should not be mistaken for wholesale rejection.

Opinion overall is closer to being divided when respondents were reminded both that there had been a series of UN resolutions demanding Iraqi disarmament and that the US had not been able to get a resolution authorizing force.

Granted that, by about three to two (55%-39%), residents supported "the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway." Republicans were very onesidedly supportive, while Independents were closely split and Democrats opposed the decision if less unambiguously than their GOP counterparts.

Iraq Questions from Multiple Surveys

	<-----2004----->							<-----2003----->						
	JAN	OCT	SEP	JUN	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB
Original war threat														
RIGHT THING	61%	59%	64%	58%	63%	65%	64%	65%	65%	70%	78%	80%	65%	65%
NOT RIGHT	34	35	31	35	30	30	28	26	30	26	18	16	26	26
ONLY W/OTHERS (V)	*	*	1	--	2	1	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	1
Support US action alone w/o UN														
YES	55%	55%	58%	54%	57%	59%	57%	62%	62%	61%	71%	75%	61%	58%
NO	39	40	36	40	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.

The idea that Iraq would ultimately have posed a threat to the US with weapons of mass destruction is one that finds some backing in Wisconsin, although there is certainly no consensus. Just over half now say it is either "very likely" (25%) or "somewhat likely" (28%) that "if the US had decided NOT to go to war" (emphasis in original), that "we would eventually have been attacked with Iraqi weapons of mass destruction". On the other hand, almost half perceive that eventual threat less seriously, either saying it would be "not very likely" (24%) or "not likely at all" (20%) for such an attack to occur at some unspecified point. The level of threat drops as one moves across the partisan spectrum, with eight in ten Republicans, just under half of Independents, and one quarter of Democrats saying such an outcome would be at least "somewhat likely".

Looking across time, the present about the decision to go to war is straddled by September and October and very similar to June last. But the levels found earlier (in 2003) tended to be higher. In any event, even if there is criticism of the conduct of the situation, both the threat of force, and the choice to go to war WITHOUT explicit authorization finds real, if not overwhelming backing in Wisconsin.

Poll to poll, the assessment of ULTIMATE (emphasis added) risk to the US from Iraqi weapons of mass destruction has shown no sharp changes, but the longer term trend has tended to be somewhat lower. January's figures are arguably the lowest so far found -- and around the time of the initial military victory (the "end of large scale operations") three in four felt it would have been at least somewhat likely that such a threat would have materialized without the use of force. That figure now hovers just over half.

When it comes to the relation of the US led war in Iraq on terrorism more broadly, the public is split. One in three (32%) of state residents think decision to attack Iraq will increase "the risk of terrorism in the world", which group is only slightly outnumbered by those (37%) who believe it will reduce this risk in the long run. One in four do not think it will "make that much difference one way or the other". These views differ on partisan lines, with Democrats seeing an increase in terror risk and Republicans a decrease (with the margin larger among the latter).

The question of the consequences for terror because the US attacked has moved around in the past a bit more clearly than the previous question. Moreover, it is harder to find a clear trend. At present, while the proportion who do not see an impact one way or the other remains in the general range of one fourth to one third, the balance is especially close between those who think the terror risk is decreased and the slightly smaller group who think that risk has been increased. In June, the gap was the same size, but the direction was reversed. Often, it has been larger, and both September and October (which in turn were close to one another) had the pessimists more outnumbered by optimists than is now the case. But, looking back over this trend, perhaps the most striking consistency is how many believe the US decision to attack has affected the longer term terror risk, along with how divided those who see a difference are in terms of its direction.

Trend from March 2003

	<-----2004----->						<-----2003----->						
	JAN	OCT	SEP	JUN	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR
Use of WMD against US w/o war													
VERY LIKELY	25%	27%	27%	28%	24%	29%	18%	30%	32%	31%	40%	42%	34%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	28	27	33	33	35	26	34	31	33	31	32	32	33
NOT VERY LIKELY	24	27	20	20	24	27	26	23	22	24	19	17	23
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	20	18	18	18	15	16	20	13	13	12	8	8	8
Long-term impact on risk of terror													
INCREASED RISK	32%	30%	27%	38%	29%	29%	25%	27%	25%	33%	24%	25%	42%
DECREASED RISK	37	42	42	33	41	39	40	37	39	35	44	46	27
NOT MUCH DIFF.	28	24	27	26	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.

Not surprisingly, the public is also split on assessments of the degree of success of the war. Fewer than one in four now say the war is either a "complete success" (2%) or mostly such (21%), while one in three comes down on the negative side of its being either mostly (22%) or completely (10%) a failure. The largest single (42%) group chose the middle option among those offered, that the war was "only partly a success." Independents and Republicans both most commonly chose this, though if they moved off in either direction, Republicans almost all claimed the way was at least "mostly a success", while Independents were more likely to see the war as at least "mostly" a failure. This sentiment was strongest among self-described Democrats, two thirds of whom

called the war at least mostly a failure.

Against a backdrop of some poll to poll movement which has not persisted, the present assessment of the war in terms of how much of a success or failure it has been is probably as downbeat as it has been. Thus the 23% saying it has been mostly or completely a success is the lowest it has been -- though June 2004 was surely close. Conversely, the one in three saying the war is mostly or completely a failure rivals the previous low point of last October. (That was also a low point of the proportion saying it was only a partial success). This question and its trend seem to reflect a higher level of criticism which was NOT evident in the views of the rationale for war.

The area of weapons of mass destruction continues to split the public. When respondents were reminded that none had been found and how that squared with the US claim before the war that the Iraqis had them, three in ten (30%) of residents say that the US was wrong about WMD. But one in six (16%) say the Iraqis destroyed them secretly, and almost half (45%) think "that they remain hidden somewhere". Two thirds of Republicans, four in ten Independents, and one in four Democrats think Iraqi WMD do exist, and it is only among Democrats that a majority says the US was wrong about them before the war.

Two questions further emphasize the complexity of views regarding WMD. The public has by no means rejected some of the basic views of Iraq espoused by the Administration. But backing of the position that WMD makes no real difference in the justification for the war is, to put it mildly, limited. Specifically, asked "if the US government had thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore" one in four (26%) said it "was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons", while half again as many (42%) said it was "a bad idea". Three in ten (29%) said they had no opinion (or were torn). This question reflects clear partisan differences, but in this case, Democrats are more united than Republicans, with three fourths of the former calling the war a good idea even in the known absence of WMD while half of Republicans took the opposite stance.

The most common answer given for why the US found no WMD has been, since this question was first asked, because the weapons were hidden. Still, this poll and the one in October (with only voters) are unique in that only for them does the proportion favoring this explanation fall below one in two. It was as high earlier as two in three. The present three in ten who think the US was wrong in its assessment represent the second highest level of this sentiment so far.

If the US HAD known there were no WMD, justification for the war is undermined. But this is by no means the same thing as concluding that the public was misled into war. Indeed, when respondents were specifically 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", three in four (73%) said that "he believed at the time that this was true", fewer than one in four (22%) think he did not believe what he was saying. While Republicans (94%) are more likely to believe Bush than Independents (63%) or Democrats (57%) this is one question where those in all three self-defined partisan groups come down on the same side.

A particularly high degree of cross-time movement has been found in results when respondents were asked whether, had the US known there were no WMD, it was a good idea to go to war for other reasons. The present reading demonstrates the highest doubt on this subject yet found. Except for May 2003, which found stronger backing for the war on other grounds than we have since found, opinion tended to be closely split up through April of last year. Since then, with a

Looking Back at War

	<-----2004----->						<-----2003----->				
	JAN	OCT	SEP	JUN	APR	MAR	JAN	DEC	OCT	AUG	MAY
Assessment of war											
COMPLETE SUCCESS	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	3%	9%
MOSTLY SUCCESS	21	30	29	25	29	34	33	35	32	35	52
ONLY PARTLY SUC.	42	34	39	44	46	39	42	38	45	43	29
MOSTLY A FAILURE	22	21	19	21	14	14	14	15	14	13	6
COMPLETE FAILURE	10	12	9	6	7	7	5	7	1	3	1
Why no WMD found											
US WAS WRONG	30%	33%	27%	26%	24%	23%	29%	18%	17%	17%	10%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	16	14	11	13	15	11	15	17	16	14	14
IRAQIS HID THEM	45	43	53	54	52	53	45	54	60	61	66
If US thought no WMD at start of war											
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	26%	30%	34%	32%	34%	40%	39%	36%	38%	35%	47%
BAD IDEA	42	44	38	43	37	36	39	35	33	37	26
NO OPINION	29	24	26	24	27	22	19	26	27	28	25
Did Bush believe WMD threat at time											
YES	73%	71%	76%	76%	76%	73%					
NO	22	22	19	19	18	22					

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

blip back to close division in September 2004, those thinking such a war a bad idea (had the US known there were no WMD) have outnumbered those who felt it was a bad idea.

As noted elsewhere, doubts whether the war would be justified by other factors is not the same as being convinced that the United States KNEW the claims of WMD were untrue. Specifically trends show almost no movement at all in responses when those interviewed were reminded that President Bush said there were such weapons and that they constituted a threat. Prior to this survey, the proportion feeling that Bush believed what he was saying at the time had not moved more than a couple of points either way beyond the 70%-75% level. It still has not.

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 NOTE, BUT DO NOT ASK) Gender of Respondent

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
Male	49%	100%	--%	44%	64%	43%	64%	46%	50%	44%
Female	51	--	100	56	36	57	36	54	50	56

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			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	16%	16%	16%	1%	6%	35%	5%	20%	15%	15%
GOOD	33	31	34	12	33	50	36	36	29	33
FAIR	26	27	24	31	32	14	46	26	25	20
POOR	25	25	25	54	29	*	12	16	29	32
TOO SOON TO TELL(vol.)	*	--	*	*	--	--	--	--	*	--
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	1	--	*	1	1	1	--
REFUSED	*	--	1	1	--	--	--	1	1	--

GWB04. How would you rate the job George W. Bush is doing handling foreign policy? Excellent, good, fair or poor?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	10%	11%	9%	1%	4%	21%	2%	16%	7%	10%
GOOD	27	25	29	7	21	50	15	26	30	28
FAIR	30	32	29	31	35	24	54	34	27	25
POOR	31	32	31	60	40	4	30	23	35	35
DON'T KNOW	1	*	2	1	--	1	--	2	1	1
REFUSED	1	--	1	*	--	*	--	--	--	1

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	8%	8%	8%	--%	4%	18%	--%	9%	8%	8%
GOOD	28	25	31	6	21	55	20	33	25	31
FAIR	31	32	30	35	32	22	51	31	32	24
POOR	32	34	30	59	42	5	30	26	34	37
DON'T KNOW	1	*	1	--	--	*	--	1	1	*
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GWB06. How would you rate the job George W. Bush is doing handling the economy?
(PROMPT FOR CATEGORIES AS NECESSARY)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	9%	11%	7%	--%	5%	20%	--%	10%	9%	9%
GOOD	27	25	28	5	20	50	13	32	25	28
FAIR	31	33	30	35	33	24	59	29	31	24
POOR	32	31	34	60	42	6	27	28	34	38
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	--	*	*	--	1	1	2
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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	20%	24%	16%	1%	19%	37%	17%	24%	19%	18%
GOOD	33	31	35	19	30	47	34	36	32	33
FAIR	23	25	22	31	27	14	30	20	24	24
POOR	22	20	24	47	24	3	18	18	26	24
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	1	1	--	--	2	1	1
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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	11%	12%	11%	*%	6%	24%	6%	12%	12%	12%
GOOD	26	24	28	10	22	46	19	32	25	24
FAIR	21	22	21	17	19	23	28	26	20	18
POOR	38	41	36	71	51	7	47	28	42	41
DON'T KNOW	2	2	2	1	2	1	--	2	1	4
REFUSED	1	--	1	*	--	--	--	--	--	1

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

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
OVERALL HIGHER	30%	32%	28%	18%	33%	38%	49%	30%	30%	23%
BOTH SAME	59	58	60	71	60	53	44	58	59	66
FOREIGN HIGHER	8	9	8	8	7	8	5	9	9	8
ONE/BOTH DK	3	1	4	3	--	1	1	3	2	3

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

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
OVERALL HIGHER	32%	36%	28%	20%	34%	40%	45%	39%	29%	26%
BOTH SAME	59	56	62	70	60	53	51	56	60	64
DOMESTIC HIGHER	7	6	7	8	6	6	2	3	9	9
ONE/BOTH DK	2	1	3	2	--	1	1	2	2	*

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
OVERALL HIGHER	34%	34%	33%	23%	33%	43%	52%	42%	30%	26%
BOTH SAME	56	52	60	66	58	49	42	49	57	66
ECONOMY HIGHER	8	12	4	10	8	7	5	7	11	6
ONE/BOTH DK	2	1	3	2	*	1	1	2	2	2

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
OVERALL HIGHER	16%	13%	19%	16%	12%	20%	17%	15%	16%	15%
BOTH SAME	57	58	56	55	53	63	58	61	54	58
TERRORISM HIGHER	25	28	22	26	35	17	24	20	28	26
ONE/BOTH DK	2	2	3	3	1	*	1	3	2	1

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
OVERALL HIGHER	33%	36%	30%	27%	39%	38%	55%	35%	32%	25%
BOTH SAME	54	53	56	61	48	53	34	55	54	62
IRAQ HIGHER	9	8	9	8	10	8	10	6	11	8
ONE/BOTH DK	4	3	4	3	2	1	1	3	2	5

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
IRAQ HIGHER	13%	13%	13%	10%	12%	16%	13%	12%	14%	11%
BOTH SAME	67	66	69	71	68	66	65	66	69	69
FOREIGN POL. HIGHER	17	20	14	18	18	16	22	20	16	13
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	2	2	2	--	3	1	6

GWBI2. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of Iraq rating with dealing with problems at home

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
IRAQ HIGHER	19%	19%	18%	15%	16%	23%	23%	21%	19%	16%
BOTH SAME	57	58	57	62	56	54	47	58	58	59
PROBLEMS HOME HIGHER	21	21	21	22	26	21	30	19	22	20
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	1	2	1	--	2	1	5

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

	GENDER			PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
	TOT	M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
IRAQ HIGHER	19%	18%	20%	13%	16%	24%	23%	21%	20%	15%
BOTH SAME	58	55	62	68	56	55	49	60	59	61
ECONOMY HIGHER	20	25	15	19	25	20	29	17	20	18
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	1	3	1	--	2	1	6

GWBI4. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM) Comparison of Iraq rating with dealing with terrorism

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
IRAQ HIGHER	3%	3%	2%	3%	--%	5%	--%	3%	2%	4%
BOTH SAME	60	52	67	64	50	63	48	61	62	61
TERRORISM HIGHER	35	43	27	31	47	31	52	34	34	29
ONE/BOTH DK	3	2	4	2	2	1	--	2	1	6

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 had?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, DID RIGHT THING	61%	62%	59%	31%	59%	86%	68%	71%	59%	48%
NO, DID NOT	34	35	33	65	37	10	28	24	37	43
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL.)	*	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--
DON'T KNOW	4	3	6	4	3	3	3	2	2	9
REFUSED	1	*	1	1	1	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	55%	60%	51%	24%	44%	88%	64%	64%	52%	46%
OPPOSE	39	36	41	71	51	7	35	28	44	46
DON'T KNOW	4	3	6	5	4	3	1	5	3	6
REFUSED	2	1	2	1	1	2	--	3	1	2

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	25%	20%	31%	7%	20%	44%	11%	30%	23%	28%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	28	26	30	20	24	37	49	29	25	25
NOT VERY LIKELY	24	25	24	36	32	11	26	29	23	21
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	20	27	13	35	19	8	15	11	28	20
DON'T KNOW	2	2	2	2	5	1	--	--	1	5
REFUSED	*	*	*	*	--	--	--	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	32%	35%	29%	50%	42%	12%	39%	24%	39%	29%
REDUCE	37	38	37	13	29	62	34	45	37	32
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	28	26	29	34	28	23	24	28	22	36
DON'T KNOW	2	*	4	2	*	2	--	2	2	3
REFUSED	1	1	1	1	--	1	3	1	--	--

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	2%	4%	--%	*%	--%	5%	--%	3%	1%	2%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	21	18	25	6	12	41	16	28	20	19
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	42	42	43	27	44	50	59	43	42	36
MOSTLY A FAILURE	22	26	19	43	32	2	19	16	25	25
A COMPLETE FAILURE	10	9	11	23	11	--	3	8	10	14
DON'T KNOW	2	1	2	*	1	2	2	2	1	2
REFUSED	*	--	*	--	--	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?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
US WAS WRONG	30%	35%	25%	56%	34%	6%	24%	26%	32%	34%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	16	14	18	9	19	21	18	12	16	21
IRAQIS HID THEM	45	44	46	27	41	64	52	51	42	39
DON'T KNOW	7	6	9	6	6	8	3	10	8	5
REFUSED	2	1	2	2	--	1	3	1	1	1

IRAQ12B. If the US government had 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	26%	30%	23%	10%	16%	47%	27%	40%	23%	19%
BAD IDEA	42	46	39	74	50	14	48	36	47	42
DON'T HAVE OPINION	29	22	35	16	31	36	23	22	28	35
DON'T KNOW	2	2	2	--	2	2	2	1	1	4
REFUSED	1	--	2	--	--	1	--	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?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, BELIEVED WAS TRUE	73%	75%	71%	57%	63%	94%	67%	82%	72%	68%
NO, DID NOT	22	21	23	39	27	5	27	13	23	28
DON'T KNOW	5	4	6	3	10	1	6	5	4	4
REFUSED	1	--	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	30%	26%	33%	100%	--%	--%	30%	28%	31%	32%
REPUBLICAN	37	33	40	--	--	100	28	43	34	36
INDEPENDENT	23	30	16	--	100	--	32	12	24	27
OTHER	7	8	7	--	--	--	2	14	9	3
NONE	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	2	2	1
DON'T KNOW	1	1	*	--	--	--	2	1	1	--
REFUSED	2	1	3	--	--	--	6	1	1	2

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

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
18-29	10%	13%	7%	10%	14%	7%	100%	--%	--%	--%
30-44	24	23	26	23	13	29	--	100	--	--
45-59	37	38	35	38	39	34	--	--	100	--
60 and over	27	25	30	29	32	27	--	--	--	100
DK/REFUSED	2	2	2	--	2	3	--	--	--	--

* 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 503 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between January 4 and 12, 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".