

NNSP

NUMBER 41, SUMMER 2000

A quarterly publication of the National Network of State Polls

NEWSLETTER

Another Experience with Windows-Based CATI Systems

by Christopher McCarty

Survey Program, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida

In the spring 2000 issue of the *NNSP Newsletter*, Ashley Bowers and Benjamin Vaughn described their experience in choosing a Windows-based CATI system for the Survey Research Unit at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. We at the University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) Survey Program also recently decided to upgrade to a CATI system, but our experience with this transition was much different than the one described in the spring article.

The University of Florida Survey Program began in 1983 and has since grown from an 8-station lab that was not networked to a 55-station lab networked using Microsoft NT. In addition to a monthly economic survey of 500 Floridians, we do a variety of surveys for state agencies, local governments, and grant-funded research.

When I first started working with the survey in 1990, our CATI software had been written by a graduate student. The programming was done in Pascal and was designed to allow for simple survey programming. Cases were distributed onto diskettes which interviewers then took to individual computers and worked until the cases were exhausted. The software then aggregated those cases and uploaded them to a mainframe database for cleaning and analysis.

(Continued on pages 2-4)

NATIONAL NETWORK OF STATE POLLS

Chair: Beverly Wiggins (bwiggins@irss.unc.edu)

Editor: Jennifer Drolet (jdrolet@irss.unc.edu)

Odum Institute for Research in Social Science, 107 Manning Hall, CB #3355

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355

phone: 919-966-2350 ~ fax: 919-962-4777 ~ <http://www.irss.unc.edu/nns>

Executive Council:

James Bason
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia

Patricia Gwartney
Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon

John Kennedy
Center for Survey Research
Indiana University

Ronald E. Langley
Survey Research Center
University of Kentucky

Robert Oldendick
Institute of Public Affairs
University of South Carolina

Fred Solop
Social Research Laboratory
Northern Arizona University

This will be the last issue of the *NNSP Newsletter* published by the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill's Odum Institute for Research in Social Science. See page 6 for more information about the new NNSP headquarters.

300 copies of this document were printed at a cost of \$200.

As with many in-house systems, there was a problem of maintenance. The program was written by a single graduate student. Although he was a clever programmer, he did not document the software sufficiently. Eventually he graduated, the survey came under new management, and questions about certain functions of the software arose that could not be answered. It was clear that we needed a new system.

We had two choices. We could either commission the writing of a new CATI program, or we could buy or license an existing system that somebody else would maintain. Based on our previous experience we decided that our money would be better spent on an existing system. Supporting and maintaining a new program would be costly, and whoever wrote it would eventually leave, putting us in exactly the same predicament as before. It made more sense to take advantage of the software developers' years of experience, contact with other facilities, and resultant functionality. Since our CATI needs were not much different from those of any other call center, a custom CATI product did not make sense.

When we were shopping for existing packages in 1991, there were not many choices beyond Sawtooth and CASES. We quickly decided to go with CASES, which was very popular with government- and university-based survey labs. Further, it was affordable, had a track record, and offered many advantages over our locally written package.

The biggest advantage CASES provided over our locally written software was the ability to let the CATI software assist us in managing the sample. Prior to CASES, we had to hire a graduate student to assemble a night's work from diskettes and update a set of paper files and labels that were used to assign cases to interviewers. This was an expensive, cumbersome, and tedious process. CASES allowed us to write a front end to the substantive questionnaire that scheduled callbacks

and set priorities for cases based on their current dispositions and call histories.

There were some disadvantages to CASES as well. CASES provided a survey programming language, not a complete sample management system. The programming language contained some powerful tools for managing the sample, but the burden fell on us to program the software to manage the sample correctly and efficiently. Although we used CASES over several years, we continued to encounter unusual instances of sample scheduling that baffled us. In the end we concluded that programming the scheduling was often complicated and there was some doubt as to whether we could ever completely master it.

We used CASES for nearly eight years. But an opportunity to upgrade our lab to Windows computers and an NT network made us consider whether it was wise to maintain a DOS-based system. The decision to move away from DOS was by no means unanimous. From the perspective of the system administrator, DOS-based CATI was a known product. DOS was simple and rarely ever resulted in fatal errors. Programmers liked CASES because they already knew how to write programs, and from past surveys they had built up a library of useful CASES code. We also had fixes for many of the peculiarities of CASES. Everybody anticipated a huge learning curve with new software, and they were right.

Ultimately, the decision was made to look for a new system. There were two main reasons. Although DOS was simple and stable, it was clear that support for DOS would eventually end. We also noticed that the introduction of object-oriented languages had increased the number of available packages that now included far more functionality than DOS CASES. It was time for a change.

Another Experience with Windows-Based CATI Systems

We considered an upgrade to CASES. Unfortunately there was no Windows version of CASES available when we first decided to upgrade to Windows. While the programmers at Berkeley had provided some interesting graphical capability in their DOS- and UNIX-based product, it was not clear when a Windows product would be available. There is a Windows version now, but we have no experience with that and cannot comment on it.

A significant factor in our decision was cost. The only Windows-based product that was in our price range was WinCati by Sawtooth Technologies. Unlike most packages, WinCati could be purchased by station, not licensed. Thus, after an initial outlay of approximately \$27,000 we owned the CATI software for a 60-station lab.

Useful WinCati Features

- Disposition reports that come with AAPOR codes as the default
- Automatic calculation of several types of AAPOR approved response rates
- Status reports of that show available sample and the timetable of callbacks
- Productivity reports that show, by interviewer, the average completes per hour and average interview time
- Searching, subsetting and modification of sample by characteristics
- Built-in checking of area codes for time zones

WinCati actually consists of two products. Ci3 is the questionnaire authoring software and WinCati is the sample management software. Ci3 is designed to be used both with a CATI system and for face-to-face interviewing—that is, Ci3 is a separate product. WinCati is only a sample management program and provides no facility for programming questionnaires or outputting data. WinCati is designed to evaluate the history of the telephone sample and invoke Ci3 when a respondent is contacted.

There are two companies associated with this package: Sawtooth Software, which maintains Ci3, and Sawtooth Technologies, which maintains WinCati. Both companies have an agreement to share their software with each other. After more than a year of use this arrangement has not been a problem.

One big advantage that a product like WinCati has over other packages is that it operates in client-server mode. This means that there is a database engine, in this case Sybase, that is dedicated to the management of sample records on the server. Under this system, interviewer stations (clients) access this database and make requests to modify records on the server. This is in sharp contrast to shared systems such as CASES. Under a shared system, records are stored on a database on the server, but the modification of the record takes place at the station. Information about the record, such as the telephone number and call history, are copied to the interviewer station and the record is locked from use on the server by other users. This system works well in smaller labs without many stations. But beyond 20 stations the increased traffic may put stress on the system and cause it to fail. Most new systems, possibly even the new version of CASES, will be based on client-server technology.

Another Experience with Windows-Based CATI Systems

Perhaps the biggest advantage of WinCati over previous products is the wealth of reporting modules that have been built in. The programmers at Sawtooth have anticipated many of the needs of the typical telephone center manager. These can be run at any time and yield current results. With CASES we had to program nearly all of our reports in SAS and it was necessary to make a copy of the data file prior to running SAS on them.

WinCati appears to be capable of handling very large surveys. We recently completed a survey of nearly 26,000 completed interviews which was running concurrently with other surveys of various sizes. At one point we were concerned when the database exceeded 250 megabytes. At this time the database for all the surveys we are running is about 1.5 gigabytes, and WinCati has not failed yet.

Our system administrators do have some critiques of WinCati. One is the installation process. When installing client-server software there are often several "protocol" options one can use. In the case of WinCati, it suggests that three are available: IPX, TCP/IP and NetBEUI. In fact, the only one that seems to work on our NT server is TCP/IP. From a system administrator's standpoint this is less than ideal, as TCP/IP requires considerably more system maintenance than a protocol such as NetBEUI.

Another area where Sawtooth's WinCati is lacking is in lab management capability. To my knowledge, most other packages lack these tools as well. The integration of time management and pay rate information into the CATI software would be a significant addition. Over the years we have experimented with various systems, from a simple sign-in sheet to a time clock with personalized badges. Currently we are using a shareware product called Powerclock that is very versatile. One problem is that it does not work directly with WinCati, so an interviewer can be signed on under

one survey task in Powerclock but actually be working on a different survey task in WinCati.

Ci3 could also use some improvement. Although Ci3 does provide several formats for exporting data, we have found that with complex surveys that use lists and rosters the export format specifications (field lengths) change from one export event to another. We see no reason why this step could not be more streamlined for the user.

Over the years, I have come to appreciate the complexity of CATI software programming. As all of you know, a survey lab is a dynamic environment where many things are happening at once. I assume it must be a monumental task to accommodate all that can happen in a survey lab as well as the specific needs of different types of users. No CATI product will be perfect. For us, however, WinCati is a solid product that provides a lot of value for the cost of purchase. It is an excellent choice for a university survey lab. ♣

Christopher McCarty, Ph.D., is director of the Survey Program of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Florida.

M E E T *t h e* N N S P

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY *Social Research Laboratory*

"One SRL project that has received national and international attention in an NSF-funded study on the impact of Internet voting. In collaboration with the NAU Political Science department, we're examining whether there is a relationship between Internet voting and voter turnout, how Internet voting might affect election outcomes, which populations are most likely to actually vote via the Internet, and whether there is any evidence of fraud in Internet voting."

Fred Solop, Ph.D., Director

The Social Research Laboratory (SRL) is a full-service research and teaching facility within Northern Arizona University's College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The SRL conducts quality research while providing graduate and undergraduate students with applied research instruction and experience. It exemplifies the College's commitment to using the knowledge and tools of social science to better understand the world. The SRL, which regularly collaborates and shares expertise with NAU faculty members, specializes in public opinion studies, needs assessments, program evaluations, and demographic and social issue analyses.

Former SRL students are now working throughout the country in professional public- and private-sector research positions. Three former SRL students work in Washington, D.C., at the U.S. Census Bureau, while others are conducting research at RAND Institute and Pacific Research in California, Westat in Maryland, and the Domain Group in Seattle. Other students have gone on to serve the local community, including one NAU doctoral graduate now working as a planning specialist for the Northern Arizona Council of Governments' Head Start program.

The SRL has conducted election polling in Arizona since 1992; the current presidential election season is especially interesting because the state's March 2000 Democratic primary was the first binding Internet election ever held, and because leading Republican presidential candidate John McCain hailed from Arizona. Another project underway is a comprehensive "Study of the American Public" for the National Park Service. In this project, the SRL will conduct 3,500 telephone surveys—500 in each of the seven National Park Service regions—to provide a reliable analysis of national opinions and at the same time allow for regional analyses. At the end of the project, the data will be combined for a portrait of American attitudes toward the nation's system of national parks, monuments, and historic and cultural areas. A full report will be issued to Congress, the President, National Park Service directors, and the American public.

The Social Research Laboratory serves the local community with an annual Flagstaff-area Omnibus survey. By regularly surveying the area population, the impact of yearly changes in growth patterns, income distribution, and economic development for the region can be assessed. This survey allows organizations and agencies to add questions to a larger survey instrument for a nominal price. In recent years, the SRL has worked with the Flagstaff City Council, Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce, Grand Canyon Trust, and Flagstaff 2020 Visioning Task Force. 🍌

The SRL Website is located at <<http://www.nau.edu/~srl>>

A version of this article was first published in the *Flagstaff Daily Sun* on February 17, 2000.

NNSP HEADQUARTERS TO MOVE

This fall, the NNSP Executive Council will select the future headquarters of the National Network of State Polls. Several organizations have submitted letters of intent to apply for the headquarters position. Proposals are due September 1, and a new headquarters is expected to be named before the end of the year.

The NNSP headquarters has been located at the Odum Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, since 1991. Chairperson Bev Wiggins is proud of the Network's accomplishments during the Odum Institute's tenure as headquarters. "The Institute's most important contribution, I think, is the establishment and maintenance of the NNSP Data Archive, which now is the world's largest collection of state-level data. Development of the archive was a long-time goal of the NNSP that was never realized until the Institute made it a priority," Wiggins noted. The Institute provides data cataloging and web-based distribution, as well as study-level and item-level search capabilities for NNSP datasets archived as part of its data library. The ability to run on-line crosstabulations on the data in the archive has recently been added. Neither depositors nor users of the data are charged for these services. The Institute's new director, Dr. Kenneth Bollen, recognizes the importance of the work that NNSP member organizations and the Institute together have invested in the archive. Bollen has indicated a willingness to maintain the NNSP Data Archive at the Odum Institute, if that is the wish of the Executive Council. "Few organizations in the country are equipped to take on the task of data archiving at no cost to depositors or users," Bollen said. "We are happy to continue to maintain the NNSP data archive as a service to both NNSP depositors and the many others who use these data." The archive URL is http://www.irss.unc.edu/data_archive/.

According to Wiggins, the Institute has also received good feedback on the quarterly newsletter and website it produces. This August 2000 issue of the *NNSP Newsletter* will be the last one produced by the Institute. "I hope the new headquarters will continue all of these services to the Network," Wiggins said. "After nearly a decade at the Odum Institute, it makes sense to change the headquarters so that new ideas for the NNSP can be tried. The Institute's major challenge as headquarters was to establish the data archive. The new headquarters will have the opportunity to explore other ways to make the NNSP a useful organization to both members and others." ♣

CURRENT RESEARCH

INDIANA

Center for Survey Research
Indiana University
1022 E Third St
Bloomington, IN 47405
phone: 812-855-2573
fax: 812-855-2818
email: csr@indiana.edu
<http://www.indiana.edu/~csr/>

The **Indiana Health Insurance Coverage Survey** was sponsored by the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration to assess health insurance coverage of Indiana residents under age 65. The CSR collaborated with the University of Florida's Survey Program of the Bureau of Economics and Business Research to conduct 10,137 interviews using a stratified, RDD sample. Health Management Associates of Lansing, MI was the contractor.

Principle Investigator: Rebecca Martling

CSR Project Director: John Kennedy

Project Managers: April Henry and Kevin Tharp

Between February and June 2000, the **POLIS Clergy Survey** was conducted with 250 Marion County clergy.

The study, which was sponsored by the Lilly Endowment and conducted for the Polis Center at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, asked about the religious and community involvement of congregations and their pastors. The respondents were selected from a list of Christian churches in Marion County, Indiana, in three categories: all Roman Catholic, all Mainline Protestant, and a randomly drawn sample of Independent Christian.

Principle Investigator: William Mirola

Project Director: John Kennedy

Project Manager: April Henry

The **Work Assistance Survey**, sponsored by the Joyce Foundation, was the first year of a three-year telephone survey of 800 directors of private, public, for-profit, and not-for-profit Indiana workforce development agencies. The study seeks to determine the strategies such organizations are using to reduce barriers to employment, particularly to low-income clients. Interviewing for phase 1 began in May 2000 and was to conclude by the end of June 2000.

Principle Investigator: Kenneth Bickers

Project Director: John Kennedy

Project Manager: Stacy Scherr ♣

SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

CALIFORNIA

The *Los Angeles Times* Poll interviewed 4,106 open primary voters as they left 75 polling places across California during voting hours on March 7, 2000. The sample included 1,707 Democrats and 1,468 Republicans. The overall margin of error was $\pm 2\%$. The survey was a self-administered confidential questionnaire and was offered in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Copyright *Los Angeles Times*. <<http://www.latimes.com/news/timespoll/>>

Primary Turnout

Statewide, turnout for the March primary was 48.4%, although it was expected to reach 52% or more once absentees were counted. At 43.1%, turnout in heavily Democratic Los Angeles County lagged behind the statewide average, and in San Francisco, the state's most consistently liberal city, turnout was 40.2%. Latinos made up 7% of the March 2000 electorate, down from 12% in the 1998 primary, while whites increased from 74% of the voters in the 1998 primary to 81% in 2000. Not counting absentees, turnout among registered Republicans rose 10 points between the 1996 and 2000 presidential primaries—from 44% to 54%. By contrast, the 48% turnout among Democrats in 2000 was up only slightly over four years ago, even though the Democratic nomination was uncontested in 1996. Of the GOP voters in 2000, 25% identified themselves as evangelical Christians, up from 18% in the 1996 primary.

President's Most Important Quality

By a 75% to 20% margin, more respondents said they supported their presidential candidate because they liked him and his policies than because he was "the best of a bad lot," while 5% said they made their choice

to send a protest message. Among Democrats, 73% said they liked the candidate and his policies, 21% said he was the best of a bad lot, and 6% wanted to send a protest message. Among Republicans, 82% said they liked the candidate and his policies, 15% said he was the best of a bad lot, and 3% wanted to send a protest message. Asked to name up to two qualities they like most about their choice for president, 33% of all respondents cited the candidate's honesty and integrity, 26% said his experience, 22% said his strong leadership, 16% said that "he cares about people like me," 10% said that he can win in November, 9% that he is more liberal than the other candidates, 9% that he is a true conservative, 9% that he is not associated with Bill Clinton, 7% that he has new ideas, 7% that he can bring needed change, and 6% that he is not a typical politician.

Prop. 1A: Gambling on Tribal Lands

Proposition 1A, which would legalize and expand Nevada-style casino gambling on Indian reservations, passed by a 65% to 35% overall margin. The lowest-income group, people in households with incomes of \$20,000 a year or less, were the strongest supporters of the gambling measure, at 73%, while only 61% of respondents with household incomes of \$60,000 a year or more backed it. Democrats supported the proposition 72% to 28%, independents supported it 67% to 33%, and Republicans supported it 54% to 46%. Fully 83% of African Americans supported it, as did 74% of Latino voters. Among respondents intending to vote for Gore, the proposition was supported by a 76% to 24% margin. Among respondents intending to vote for Bush, support was split 50% to 50%.

Proposition 22: Limit on Marriages

Proposition 22, the initiative to prohibit California from recognizing gay marriages, passed by a 61% to 39%

margin overall. Republicans backed it 80% to 20% and Democrats opposed it 57% to 43%. Among conservatives, 84% supported it, while 71% of liberals opposed it. Latinos backed it 65% to 35%. Among respondents intending to vote for Gore, the proposition was opposed by a 58% to 42% margin. Among respondents intending to vote for Bush, the proposition was supported by a 90% to 10% margin.

Proposition 26: School Bond Vote

Proposition 26, which would have reduced the vote required for the approval of local school construction bonds from a two-thirds majority to a simple majority, was defeated 51% to 49%. Democrats supported Proposition 26 by a 67% to 33% margin, but Republicans opposed it by a 70% to 30% margin, and independents opposed it by a 52% to 48% margin. Among respondents intending to vote for Gore, the proposition was supported by a 71% to 29% margin. Among respondents intending to vote for Bush, the proposition was opposed by a 73% to 27% margin. Respondents in households with incomes of \$60,000 or more opposed it 55% to 45%. ✪

D.C.

Gonzales/Arscott Research & Communications interviewed 636 registered voters in Washington, D.C., June 15-18, 2000. A cross-section of calls was made to reflect voter registration and turnout patterns in the city's eight council wards. The overall margin of error was $\pm 4\%$ ($\pm 5\%$ for the subgroup of 407 likely or definite voters in the June 27 special election). Copyright, Gonzales/Arscott Research & Communications, Inc. <<http://www.garesearch.com/>>

School Governance Amendment Vote

Overall, 43% of voters favored the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 (which would

change the make-up and powers of the Board of Education), while 41% opposed it, and 16% were undecided. Whites (62%) favored the amendment at nearly twice the rate of African Americans (33%). Registered Democrats were split 42% for and 42% against, while Republicans favored the amendment 80% to 10%. Independents opposed the amendment 51% to 30%. Fully 81% of voters ages 18 to 34 favored the amendment, while voters ages 55 and older opposed the amendment 44% to 40%, and voters ages 35 to 54 were split 41% to 42%. By a 47% to 40% margin, men tended to oppose the amendment while 45% of women supported it and 36% opposed it. Respondents who definitely planned to vote in the June 27 election opposed the amendment 49% to 35%, while likely voters favored it by a 60% to 24% margin.

Most Important Issue in Wash., D.C.

Nearly one third (32%) of District of Columbia residents named education as the most important issue facing Washington today. Drugs and crime was viewed as the second most important issue (19%), followed by home rule or, in its recent formulation, "taxation without representation" (14%). Combined with another 4% who cited statehood specifically, nearly one-fifth of Washington, D.C., voters named a problem unique to

SAPOR 2000 Conference Oct. 5 & 6, Raleigh, NC <http://www.irss.unc.edu/sapor>

Details about the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research conference and a list of Raleigh-area attractions are available at the SAPOR website: <<http://www.irss.unc.edu/sapor/2000Conference.htm>>.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact Conference Chair Michael Link (Link@rti.org; 919-485-7785). To be added to the mailing list, contact Jennifer Drolet (jdrolet@irss.unc.edu; 919-962-3062).

their city as its most important issue. Single-digit concerns were: urban revitalization (7%), taxes (5%), traffic and transportation issues (3%), city services (3%), jobs and the economy (2%), low-income housing (2%), and health care (1%). The remaining 8% of respondents offered no answer.

Job Approval & Name Recognition

Washington, D.C., Mayor Tony Williams was viewed favorably by 71% of respondents, unfavorably by 8%, and neutrally by 20%. Council member-at-large and former mayoral candidate Carol Schwartz was viewed favorably by 57%, unfavorably by 7%, neutrally by 29%, and was unknown to 7%. Former mayor and possible council candidate Marion Barry was viewed favorably by 41% of District voters, unfavorably by 44%, and neutrally by 15%. Council member-at-large and possible Barry target Harold Brazil was recognized favorably by 40% of city voters, unfavorably by 18%, neutrally by 37%, while the remaining 5% did not recognize his name. Fully 77% of respondents approved of the job Williams was doing as mayor, 8% disapproved, and 15% had no opinion. If the 2002 election for mayor were held today, 66% of respondents said they would vote to re-elect Williams, 25% said they would consider another candidate, and 9% said they would vote to replace him. Williams' 68% support among African Americans was somewhat stronger than his 62% among whites. When asked whether they thought former mayor Barry should run for elective office in D.C. again, 56% of respondents said they would prefer than he didn't, 38% thought that he should, and 6% expressed no opinion. Barry's possible re-entry was particularly opposed by Republicans (86%), whites (79%), men (63%), and voters ages 18 to 34 (62%).

D.C. License Tag Slogan: "Taxation Without Representation"

Fully 78% of District voters approved of changing the slogan on D.C. auto license tags from "Celebrate and Discover" to "Taxation

Without Representation," while 15% opposed it and 7% offered no opinion. Most enthusiastic about the change were Republicans (90%, vs. 77% of Democrats and 75% of independents), whites (86%, vs. 74% of African Americans), and voters ages 35 to 54 (85%, vs. 76% of respondents 55 and older and 63% of 18- to 34-year olds). ♪

GEORGIA

The Spring 2000 Georgia State Poll was conducted April 16 through May 15, 2000, with 792 adult residents of Georgia. The margin of error was ±3.5%. Copyright, Georgia State University. <<http://cspweb.gsu.edu/>>

Approval Ratings

Overall, 55% of April/May 2000 respondents approved of the way Bill Clinton was handling his job as president, down from 60% in January/February. Georgia Governor Roy Barnes's approval rating dropped by a similar percentage, from 87% in the winter poll to 80% in the spring poll.

2000 Presidential Election

Among registered voters, 46% said they would vote for George W. Bush if the presidential election were held today, 29% said they would vote for Al Gore, 16% would vote for another candidate, 7% didn't know, and 2% said they would not vote.

Most Important Problem in Georgia

Asked to name the most important problem facing the state, the top response was education (37%), followed by drugs and crime (18%), the budget and taxes (9.6%) and social issues such as abortion and the breakdown of the family (9.6%).

Increase in Gasoline Prices

Asked whether they had changed any specific activities in response to the increase in gasoline prices over the past several months, 56% of respondents said they had made no changes, 23% said they were limiting their driving, and 6% said they were combining trips. ♪

MARYLAND

On February 23-27, 2000, Gonzales/Arscott Research & Communications, Inc. interviewed 807 registered Maryland voters, including 393 likely Democratic and 346 likely Republican presidential primary voters. A cross-section of calls was made into each jurisdiction within the state to reflect general election voting patterns. The overall margin of error was $\pm 3.5\%$ ($\pm 5\%$ for the Democratic and $\pm 5.5\%$ for the Republican primary subsample). Copyright, Gonzales/Arscott Research & Communications, Inc. <<http://www.garesearch.com/>>

2000 Pres. Election & Primaries

In the February 2000 poll, Al Gore led George W. Bush 54% to 37% among Maryland voters, with 9% undecided. Gore was rated favorably by 48% of respondents and unfavorably by 34%. Bush was rated favorably by 42% of respondents and unfavorably by 33%. For the primary, Gore led Bill Bradley 63% to 24%, with 13% undecided. Gore led Bradley among men 58% to 27%; among women 68% to 21%; among African Americans 81% to 11%; and among whites 54% to 31%. Bush led John McCain 47% to 37%, with 12% undecided. Among Republicans, Bush led 54% to 30%, while McCain led Bush 77% to 8% among independents. Fully 96% of independents approved of the Maryland Republican party's decision to open up its primary to them; 49% of registered Republicans approved and 46% disapproved. Among Democrats, 69% thought that the Democratic primary should be opened to independents, while 23% did not.

Most Important Pres. Campaign Issue

In response to an open-ended question about the most important issue in the presidential election, saving Social Security/Medicare was cited by 33% of all respondents, including supporters of each of the four then-candidates (49% of Gore voters; 43% of Bradley voters; 25% of McCain voters; and 23% of Bush voters). Education was next at 14% overall, including 18% of Bradley voters and

16% of Gore voters. The character of the candidate ranked third overall at 10%, including 22% of McCain voters and 18% of Bush voters. Paying down the national debt tied for fourth place overall with cutting taxes, at 8% each. Both of these concerns placed high with voters for the Republicans candidates, with cutting taxes the second most important issue for Bush voters (19%) and paying down the debt the third most important issue for McCain voters (13%). Maintaining current economic conditions was a priority for just 6% of voters overall, but the issue placed third with both Gore (10%) and Bradley (9%) voters.

Gonzales/Arscott Research interviewed 826 registered Maryland voters January 7-11, 2000. A cross-section of calls was made in each jurisdiction within the state to reflect general election voting patterns. The overall margin of error was $\pm 3.5\%$. Copyright, Gonzales/Arscott Research & Communications, Inc. <<http://www.garesearch.com/>>

Traffic Conditions in Maryland

Fully 73% of respondents said traffic conditions in their area had worsened in the past five years, 20% thought conditions had stayed the same, 4% felt they had improved, and 3% offered no answer. Worsening traffic conditions were reported by majorities of respondents in every region except Baltimore, where 46% thought conditions had worsened, 41% felt they remained the same, and 7% thought they had improved. In the Washington suburbs, 83% said traffic conditions in their area had declined in the past five years. The local traffic situation was described as at least somewhat of a problem in their daily lives by 65% of voters surveyed statewide, including 18% who called it a major problem (another 23% said that their local traffic situation was not much of a problem, 10% thought it was no problem at all, and 2% offered no answer). African Americans (23%) were more likely than whites (16%) to view their local traffic situation as a major problem,

while Washington-area voters (25%) were more likely than their counterparts across the state to see the problem as a major one in their daily lives.

Spending on New Roads

More than three-quarters (76%) of Maryland voters statewide said they believed that new roads or road improvements were needed to relieve traffic congestion in their area, including 69% of respondents from Baltimore. Just 21% said that new and improved roads were not needed, with the remaining 3% offering no answer. Again, the Washington suburbs led the pack, with 83% believing that relief from their traffic woes required new roads. Among subgroups, Democrats (78%) were slightly more likely to favor new roads than were Republicans (70%). Fully 74% of all respondents said that the congestion problems in their area were significant enough that the General Assembly should act now to fund road improvements, rather than wait three or four years; 22% felt that the General Assembly could wait, and 4% gave no response. Only among Baltimore (64%) and Eastern Shore/Southern Maryland voters (69%) did the majority for acting now drop below 70%.

Spending the Budget Surplus in MD

When asked how they would prefer Maryland's billion dollar surplus be spent, 33% thought that an equal percentage of the funds should be expended on roads, education, and public safety; 4% thought that more should be spent on roads; 49% opted for a higher percentage of the surplus to be spent on education and public safety than on roads; and the remaining 14% offered no answer. Regionally, 43% of voters in the Washington suburbs, 41% of those in Western Maryland, 38% of those in the Baltimore suburbs, and 25% of those in Baltimore City preferred to see at least as high a percentage, if not more, of the state's surplus funds devoted to roads than to education or public safety. ♣

NEW JERSEY

A *Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers* Poll was conducted June 8-13, 2000, with 802 adult New Jersey residents. The overall margin of error was $\pm 3.5\%$. Subgroups included 618 registered voters ($\pm 4\%$ error margin), 441 likely voters ($\pm 5\%$ error margin), and 206 respondents who had used the state's new car inspection system ($\pm 7\%$ error margin). Copyright, *Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers* Poll. <<http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~eaglepol>>

New DMV Inspections

Overall, 67% of respondents had heard or read about problems with the new car inspection system at the NJ Department of Motor Vehicles. Of the 32% who had actually had their cars tested since the new inspection procedures started in December of 1999, 82% had gone to a state inspection center and 17% to a private garage. Of those who had gone to a state inspection center for their check-up since December 1999, 54% thought they got the new test, 21% thought they got the old test, and 25% weren't sure which test they received. Among the 206 respondents who had used a state inspection center since the new procedure was implemented, 85% said the people running the test were courteous, 82% thought the test was fair, 79% were satisfied with the experience, and 67% thought the people running the test were experienced. Only 22% reported a longer wait since the new test's inception; 43% said the wait was shorter, and 27% said it was about the same as when their car was last inspected. Overall, 71% reported waiting no longer than 30 minutes (23% waited 5 minutes or less; 23% waited 6-15 minutes; 25% waited 16-30 minutes), while 8% waited 31-45 minutes, 7% waited 46-60 minutes, and 14% waited more than an hour. The average wait reported was half an hour.

Interest in 2000 Presidential Election

Overall, 48% of registered New Jersey voters said they had given a lot of thought to the upcoming presidential election, 7% said they had given it

some thought, 41% said only a little, and 4% said they had given it no thought. On a similar question, 52% reported having a lot of interest in the upcoming election; 30% said they had some interest, and 16% had either a little or no interest at all in following the 2000 presidential election.

President's Most Important Quality

In an open-ended question, 54% of registered voters listed qualities such as "honesty," "integrity," and "trustworthiness" as the most important characteristic for the next president to have. This included 66% of those intending to vote for Bush, 45% of those intending to vote for Gore, and 53% of those currently undecided. No other specific quality or characteristic was mentioned by more than one person in eight. Among the state's registered voters, 59% were either very (11%) or somewhat (48%) satisfied with their choices among presidential candidates; 26% were not too satisfied, and 13% were not at all satisfied. Among respondents who had indicated whether they intended to vote for Bush or Gore, 34% said they were not satisfied with their choices, indicating a potential for vote switching in the coming months, or perhaps receptiveness to a third-party candidate.

Gore vs. Bush in 2000

Al Gore led George W. Bush by a narrow 44% to 41% margin among likely New Jersey voters in the June poll. Among men, Bush led Gore 46% to 38%, while women preferred Gore by a 50% to 34% margin. Gore received the support of 80% of Democrats and Bush was supported by a slightly higher 86% of Republicans. Among New Jersey's independent voters, Gore led Bush 44% to 38%. Self-identified liberals preferred Gore by a 67% to 20% margin; conservatives favored Bush by a 63% to 28% margin; and moderates were evenly divided at 41% each. Among respondents who approved of the job Clinton was doing as president, Gore led Bush 59% to 25%; among respondents who disapproved

of the job Clinton was doing, Bush led Gore 89% to 2%. Bush led among white New Jerseyans 45% to 40%; Gore led among African Americans and Hispanics 63% to 24%. Favorable opinions about Gore outnumbered unfavorable ones 46% to 28% among all registered voters, with 25% not sure. Fully 73% of Democrats offered favorable assessments, compared to 19% of Republicans. Among independents, more felt positively than negatively about Gore by a 44% to 26% margin, with 29% venturing no opinion. Favorable opinions about Bush outnumbered unfavorable ones by an overall margin of 40% to 30%, with the remaining 30% offering no assessment. Fully 75% of Republicans offered favorable assessments of Bush, compared to 18% of Democrats. Among independents, 36% were favorable, 33% unfavorable, and 30% had no opinion.

Corzine vs. Franks for 2000 Senate

In the New Jersey race for retiring U.S. Senator Frank Lautenberg's seat, Democrat Jon Corzine led Republican Bob Franks by a 43% to 33% margin among registered voters in June, with 23% undecided. Among likely voters, the margin was a narrower 43% to 36%, with 20% undecided. Overall, 23% said they were very sure they would vote for Corzine in November, and 19% were very sure of voting for Franks. Although 49% of registered voters said they knew a lot or some about Corzine, only 28% said they knew that much about Franks. Conversely, 50% knew just a little or nothing at all about Corzine, as did 72% about Franks. Among all registered voters, favorable opinions for Corzine outnumbered unfavorable ones by a margin of 36% to 20%, with 44% offering no opinion. The favorable to unfavorable margin among Democrats was 45% to 14%; among independents it was 38% to 18%; and among Republicans it was 27% to 30%. Franks received a 26% to 6% favorable to unfavorable margin among all registered voters; fully 68% had no opinion of him. The fa-

avorable to unfavorable margin among Republicans was 42% to 6%; among independents it was 26% to 5%; and among Democrats it was 13% to 9%, with the remainder having no opinion. Asked who they would vote for if the election for Senate were held today, 68% of Republicans said Franks, 17% said Corzine, and 15% were undecided. Among Democrats, 69% said they would vote for Corzine, 12% for Franks, and 18% were undecided. Among independents, 43% planned to vote for Corzine, 27% for Franks, and 30% were undecided. Among whites, 39% planned to vote for Corzine, 38% for Franks, and 23% were undecided. Among African Americans and Hispanics, 61% planned to vote for Corzine, 14% for Franks, and 26% were undecided. Among men, 40% planned to vote for Corzine and 39% for Franks, but among women, 46% planned to vote for Corzine and 27% for Franks. Corzine led Franks 47% to 26% among 18- to 29-year olds; 42% to 30% among 30- to 49-year olds; 46% to 36% among 50- to 64-year olds; and 44% to 39% among voters 65 and older.

Spending in the NJ Senate Primary

Corzine is estimated to have spent about \$34 million in his primary election contest against former Gov. Jim Florio, about 20 times what Franks spent in winning the Republican nomination. Respondents were asked how important they thought money was in determining who wins and loses elections: 25% said it was the most important factor, 42% said it was one of many important factors, and 30% thought money was not as important as other factors. Twice as many respondents said they were more concerned with *who* contributes money (54%) than with *how much* a candidate spends (25%). The remaining 21% included those concerned about both (5%), those concerned about neither (8%), and those who didn't know (8%). In a randomized series of questions, respondents were asked which of a pair of statements "comes closer to your views, even if neither one captures

exactly how you feel." Overall, 50% thought that "As a political newcomer, Corzine had to spend heavily to get known," while 42% thought that "Corzine spent more than he had to, giving him an unfair advantage." While 56% agreed with the statement "I am not bothered by a candidate spending as much as Corzine did since it is his own money and he is not beholden to special interest contributors," 41% said that "the idea of one candidate spending that much money bothers me no matter where the money comes from." Just over one-third (36%) thought that "Jon Corzine *bought* the Democratic senate nomination—it was because of the money," while 53% identified more closely with the statement that "While Corzine may have spent more than his opponent, he communicated what he wanted to do to voters of his party and they responded to those ideas." Fully 75% of registered voters reported having seen a TV commercial for one of the candidates; of those, 71% had seen an ad for Corzine, 66% for Florio, 38% for Bill Gormley, 36% for Franks, 14% for Murray Sabrin, and 12% for Jim Treffinger. Asked whether they had been mailed any campaign literature by a Senate candidate, 52% of registered voters said yes and 48% said no. Of registered voters who had received mail, 41% received campaign literature from Corzine, 33% from Florio, 22% from Gormley, 22% from Franks, 14% from Treffinger, and 10% from Sabrin.

Impact of Corzine's Spending

Overall, 52% of registered voters said the fact that Corzine spent more than \$30 million on the Democratic senate nomination did not bother them at all; 4% were bothered a little, 12% were bothered some, and 31% were bothered a lot. Respondents who were bothered a lot by Corzine's spending included 9% of those under age 30, 25% of those ages 30 to 49, 37% of those ages 50 to 64, and 49% of those 65 or older. Women (36%) were more likely to be bothered a lot than were men (26%); whites (35%) were more likely to be bothered a lot

than were African Americans or Hispanics (18%). Further, 42% of those who planned to vote for Corzine's Republican opponent Bob Franks were bothered a lot, compared to 23% of those intending to vote for Corzine, and 30% of those who had not yet decided. Among those bothered either a lot or some, unfavorable opinions of Corzine outnumbered favorable ones by a margin of 34% to 26%, with the remaining 40% expressing no opinion. Franks had a 42% to 36% lead among this group, with 22% undecided. Among those either not bothered or bothered just a little, favorable opinions of Corzine outnumbered unfavorable ones by 40% to 8%, with 52% voicing no opinion. Corzine led Franks by 48% to 26% among this smaller group, with the remaining 26% undecided. Despite the fact that a majority of registered voters were not bothered by Corzine's level of spending, a significant portion of all groups (44% of Democrats, 46% of Republicans, and 47% of independents) reported being bothered at least somewhat by Corzine's primary spending. ✪

OHIO

From April 5-22, 2000, the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Cincinnati interviewed 857 Ohio adults. The overall margin of error was $\pm 3.3\%$ ($\pm 4.3\%$ for the 531 likely voters). Copyright, the Ohio Poll. <<http://www.ipr.uc.edu/>>

Most Important Problem in Ohio

Asked to identify the most important problem facing Ohio, 39% of respondents cited education, including education funding (13%) and education quality (11%). Other responses were crime (7%), the economy (6%), taxes (4%), drug and alcohol abuse (3%), road conditions (3%) and health care (3%).

Gov. Taft Approval Ratings

Fully 69% of respondents approved of the way Bob Taft was handling his job, while 11% disapproved and 21% weren't sure. The most frequent reason for approving of Taft was that he

was “doing a good job” (23%); respondents most frequently disapproved because Taft was “not improving education” in Ohio (2%) or because of Taft’s political ideology (2%). As was the case in the October 1999 Ohio Poll, large majorities of both Democrats (67%) and Republicans (80%) approved of the way Taft was handling his job as governor, and 67% of all registered voters approved. A comparison of Taft’s rating to those earned by his two predecessors, George Voinovich and Richard Celeste, finds that Taft’s 69% approval rating tied Voinovich’s highest approval marks (69%, in October 1997 and January 1998) and exceeded Celeste’s highest rating (63%, in October/November 1986).

Sens. Voinovich & DeWine Approval

Regarding U.S. Senator George Voinovich, 51% of respondents in the April 2000 poll approved of his job performance, 12% disapproved, and 37% neither approved nor disapproved, virtually unchanged since October 1999. In ratings unchanged since October 1999, 42% approved of U.S. Senator Mike DeWine, his job performance, 9% disapproved and 49% neither approved nor disapproved. The April 2000 poll also found that 48% of Ohioans likely to vote in the November election approved of DeWine’s job performance, 11% disapproved, and 41% neither approved nor disapproved.

Ohio 2000 U.S. Senate Election

Among likely Ohio voters, incumbent Mike DeWine led challenger Ted Celeste 54% to 31%, with 4% intending to vote for some other candidate and 11% undecided. Among likely independent voters, DeWine led Celeste 40% to 25%, with 25% still undecided. DeWine (97%) also led Celeste (80%) in overall name recognition. Asked in opinion of DeWine, 43% of likely voters were favorable, 13% were unfavorable, 41% knew too little about DeWine to offer an evaluation, and 3% had not heard of him. DeWine’s net favorability rating (the percentage of likely voters with a favorable opinion

of him minus the percent with an unfavorable opinion) was +30%. Asked their opinion of Celeste, 15% of likely voters were favorable, 12% were unfavorable, 53% knew too little about Celeste to offer an evaluation, and 20% had not heard of him. Celeste’s net favorability rating was +3%. Among sub-groups, DeWine led Celeste by 34% among men, but by only 12% among women. DeWine received positive net favorability ratings from Democratic (+11%), Republican (+52%), and independent (+5%) likely voters. Celeste received positive net favorability ratings from Democrats (+11%) and independents (+6%), but a negative net favorability rating (-7%) from Republicans.

Ohio 2000 Presidential Election

George W. Bush led Al Gore 51% to 42% among likely voters in Ohio, while 3% intended to vote for some other candidate, and 4% undecided. A trial heat match-up between Bush, Gore, potential Reform Party candidate Pat Buchanan, and Green Party candidate Ralph Nader resulted in Bush (47%) leading Gore (39%), followed by Nader (4%), Buchanan (3%), some other candidate (2%), and undecideds (5%). While Bush (100%), Gore (99%), Buchanan (97%) and Nader (91%) all showed high name recognition among likely voters, only Nader (+24%) and Bush (+22%) received positive net favorability ratings. Nader was the only candidate on the poll to receive positive net favorability ratings among Democrats (+40%), independents (+20%) and Republicans (+10%). Although Bush had positive net favorability ratings among Republicans (+75%) and independents (+10%), his rating was low among Democrats (-29%). Gore’s net favorability rating was -3%. Gore had positive net favorability ratings among Democrats (+54%) and independents (+10%), but -58% among Republicans. Buchanan’s net favorability rating was -36%. Buchanan was the only candidate to receive negative net favorability ratings among Democrats (-42%), independents (-40%), and Republicans (-30%).

OREGON

The University of Oregon Survey Research Laboratory interviewed 1,696 randomly selected adult residents of Oregon (150 from each of 10 rural regions and one combined urban region) between January and February, 2000. The overall margin of error was ±8%. Copyright, University of Oregon Survey Research Laboratory. <<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl/>>

Computer Ownership & Skills

Overall, 58% of households in the sample reported owning a personal computer. A benchmark question about computer skills (“Do you know how to use a computer to create or edit documents or graphics, or to analyze data?”) showed that 52% of all respondents (and 63% of adults in urban areas) had basic computer skills. The subgroups most likely to own personal computers were younger respondents (66% of those ages 18 to 34 vs. 27% of those ages 55 or older); white (58%, vs. 42% for nonwhites); better-educated (77% of college-educated vs. 26% of those without high school diplomas); employed (67%, vs. 34% of retirees); able to access the Internet at work (75%, vs. 50% of those without work access); and skilled in computers (76%, vs. 68% of those without computer skills). Also more likely to own personal computers were households that had higher incomes (81% of households annually earning \$50,000 or more vs. 27% of those earning \$15,000 or less); had children (71%, vs. 50% of households without children); had home businesses (77%, vs. 54% of households without home businesses); and had multiple telephone lines (78%, vs. 42% of homes with one telephone line).

Home Internet Access

Among households with personal computers, 79% had Internet access. The households most likely to have Internet access were younger (about four-fifths of adults under age 54 vs. two-thirds of adults 55 or older); male (83%, vs. 77% of females); nonwhite (83%, vs. 79% of whites); better-educated (89% of the college-

educated vs. 65% without a high school diploma); employed (81%, vs. 75% others); had Internet access at work (83%, vs. 76% of those without work access); had computer skills (83%, vs. 68% of those not knowing how to use computers); earned more (90% of households annually earning \$75,000 or more vs. 62% of those earning \$15,000 or less); had home businesses (84%, vs. 77% of households without home businesses); had multiple telephone lines (96% of homes with 4 or more telephone numbers vs. 66% of those with only one); and could send a fax (83%, vs. 68% of households that could not send a fax). Regarding type of modem and modem speed, most (42-54%) households in all regions used a 56K telephone dial-up modem, followed by a 28.8K dial-up modem (6-17%), a cable modem (0-8%), a 14.4K dial-up modem (0-8%), and T1DSL (0-3%). However, 20-42% of respondents did not know the type of modem in their home. The modal monthly fee for Internet service was \$16-\$20. Those in rural areas, however, more frequently paid over \$20 per month than those in urban areas.

World Wide Web Use

Overall, 36% of respondents could access the Internet at their work or volunteer site. If they had the ability to access the World Wide Web on public computers, 40% of all respondents said they would be very or somewhat likely to use them for employment-related purposes, such as finding a new job, workforce training, learning job-related skills, or on-the-job training. In addition, 52% said they would use the World Wide Web on public computers to look up other information. Overall, 5% of respondents had used the World Wide Web to buy things, 14% were interested in doing so, and 80% were not interested. Between 42% and 61% of respondents who did not currently use Internet technology for the following purposes said they would like to be able to do so: file taxes, register a vehicle, make reservations, buy tickets, take college classes for credit, learn new job skills, talk with

medical specialists over long distances, or take part in state and local government. Additionally, 29% to 34% expressed interest in using the Internet for entertainment, to check financial information, or to shop for non-necessities.

Television & Phone Access & Use

Over 98% of households had a television. Across all regions, 58% had a hard-wire cable for their TV, 17% had wireless cable, 2% had both, and 22% had no cable. The majority (56%) of households interviewed had one telephone number, but 25% had two numbers, 11% had three, and 7% had four or more. Of households with one telephone number, 12% were planning to add a second. Of households with more than one telephone number, 83% had a wireless cell phone number. Overall, 18% of respondents' households had a telephone line dedicated mainly for computer use, 21% had a telephone line dedicated for home business use, 31% could send a fax from home, 55% had special telephone services, such as caller ID, call waiting, and voice mail (not a telephone answering machine). Overall, 26% of respondents rated their telephone service as excellent, 49% as good, 20% as fair, and 5% as poor. Nearly half of households paid less than \$30 per month for long-distance telephone service, and two-thirds paid less than \$30 per month for local telephone service. ♣

WASHINGTON

The Elway Poll interviewed 400 Washington registered voters by telephone June 19-21, 2000. The overall margin of error was $\pm 5\%$. Copyright, the Elway Poll.

2000 Gubernatorial Race in WA

At the time of the June poll, 43% of respondents said they were inclined to re-elect governor Gary Locke, while 16% planned to vote for Republican John Carlson, 3% for Republican Harold Hochstatter, and 39% were still undecided. Locke led in every area of the state but had

majority support only in Seattle (58%). His lowest totals were in heavily Democratic western Washington outside central Puget Sound (35%). He had 44% support in eastern Washington and 45% in central Puget Sound. Among independent voters, Locke led the two Republican challengers 44% to 16%, with 40% undecided. Among Democrats, Locke had 77% support, with 7% going to Republicans and 17% undecided. Fully 49% of Republicans were undecided and 17% intended to support Democrat Locke.

Top Issues for Candidates

Asked to name the most important issues the candidates for state government office should be talking about, 38% of respondents said education, 24% said transportation, 24% said taxes, 16% said social issues, 14% said the environment, 12% said health care, 11% said government, 11% said the economy, 10% said government spending, 8% said crime, and 4% said moral issues. Among respondents planning to vote for Republican legislative candidates in the fall, 35% named education as the issue they most wanted candidates to address, followed by government and spending (34%), taxes (30%), transportation (24%), social issues (13%), the economy (12%), and the environment (11%). Among respondents planning to vote for Democrats in the state legislature, 39% named education as the issue they most wanted candidates to address, followed by transportation (25%), social issues (25%), the environment (20%), taxes (17%), health care (15%), and government and spending (15%). The top issues for respondents who were undecided or who said party was not a factor were education (42%), taxes (23%), transportation (23%), government and spending (19%), the environment (12%), social issues (11%), and crime (11%).

Effect of Special Interest Groups

Respondents were asked whether they would be more or less likely to support a candidate for state legislature who had been endorsed by spe-

cial interest groups. By a 55% to 26% margin, respondents were more likely to vote for a candidate endorsed by the Washington Education Association; by a 49% to 19% margin respondents were more likely to vote for a candidate endorsed by the Washington Medical Association; by a 48% to 18% margin respondents were more likely to vote for a candidate endorsed by the Association of Washington Businesses; and by a 45% to 32% margin respondents were more likely to vote for a candidate endorsed by the Washington Environmental Council. By a 45% to 32% margin, respondents were less likely to support a candidate endorsed by the Christian Conservative Coalition.

Effectiveness of State Government

Overall, 46% of respondents said state government was more likely to spend money on the wrong things and 39% said it was more likely to spend money on the right things, but to spend too much. By a 54% to 37% margin, respondents said they were more concerned with how well state government works than with how much it costs in taxes. Overall, 24% of respondents thought state government was functioning worse than it used to and 15% thought it was working better now. The June 2000 poll also found that 69% of respondents thought people like them were well represented in state government these days, up from 42% in 1996.

Between May 19 and 23, 2000, the Elway Poll interviewed 405 registered voters in Washington state. The overall margin of error was $\pm 5\%$. Copyright, the Elway Poll.

Top Issues for Candidates

Overall, 25% of all respondents said education was the issue they most wanted to hear about from congressional candidates, followed by Social Security (23%), health care (13%), taxes (13%), gun control (11%), Medicare (9%), the environment (8%), crime (5%), the economy (5%), and the budget (4%). Among Democrats, the top issue was Social

Security (29%), followed by education (28%), health care (22%), the environment (16%), gun control (15%), and Medicare (14%). Among Republicans, the top issue was Social Security (22%), followed by taxes (22%), education (17%), health care (9%), and gun control (8%). Among independents, the top issue was education (26%), followed by Social Security (17%), taxes (13%), Medicare (11%), health care (9%), and the economy (9%).

Effect of Special Interest Groups

Respondents were asked whether they would be more or less likely to support a candidate who had been endorsed by particular special interest groups. By a 67% to 14% margin, respondents were more likely to vote for a candidate endorsed by the AARP, and they were more likely by a 46% to 30% margin to vote for a candidate endorsed by organized labor. By a 44% to 27% margin, respondents were less likely to support a candidate endorsed by the Christian Conservative Coalition. Respondents were nearly split over their reaction to an endorsement by the NRA: 42% of respondents would be less likely to support an NRA-endorsed candidate and 41% would be more likely to support one. Among men, 48% would vote for an NRA-endorsed candidate and 36% would vote against one, while among women 48% would vote against and 35% would vote for one. Among respondents earning less than \$25,000 a year, 57% would support an NRA-endorsed candidate, while 50% of respondents earning over \$50,000 annually would oppose one. Among Republicans, 61% said they would support an NRA-endorsed candidate but 61% of Democrats would oppose one.

Voter Categories Based on Domestic Policy Preferences

The poll asked respondents a number of questions designed to develop richer categories to describe electorate groups than the typical "Republican/Democrat" or "liberal/conservative" divisions. On domestic politics,

the following categories were developed: "Populists" (35%) are respondents who think there is too much government control, but who also believe that the government should guarantee everyone food and shelter. Populists included 31% of Republicans, 45% of Democrats, and 42% of independents. They tended to support Gore over Bush by a 35% to 27% margin. "Libertarians" (31%) think there is too much government control and do not think that the government should guarantee food and shelter. Libertarians included 54% of Republicans, 16% of Democrats, and 32% of independents. They supported Bush over Gore 60% to 14%. "Liberals" (18%) do not think there is too much government control, and also believe that the government should guarantee food and shelter to everyone. Fully 75% of Liberals were Democrats, and 69% supported Gore. "Progressives" (5%) do not think the government has too much control, nor do they think it should guarantee food and shelter. Populists included 7% of Republicans, 4% of Democrats, and 8% of independents. They supported Bush over Gore by a 43% to 29% margin.

Voter Categories Based on International Policy Preferences

On foreign policies, the following categories were developed: "Internationalists" (23%) want both free trade and active U.S. involvement in international affairs. Internationalists included 34% of Democrats, 26% of Republicans, and 29% of independents. They supported Gore over Bush 45% to 29%. "Isolationists" (21%) favor staying out of international politics and protecting American industry. Isolationists included 23% of Democrats, 31% of Republicans, and 30% of independents. They supported Bush over Gore 40% to 19%. "Free Traders" (14%) favored free trade but wanted the U.S. to stay out of other countries' problems. Free Traders included 14% of Democrats, 39% of Republicans, and 46% of independents. They favored Bush 46% to 19%. "Fortress Americans" (15%) favored international activism and

protection of U.S. industries. Fortress Americans included 28% of Democrats, 17% of Republicans, and 21% of independents. They supported Gore over Bush 47% to 30%. The remaining 27% of the sample did not fit into any of the four international politics categories.

The Elway Poll interviewed 400 Washington registered voters by telephone April 11-12, 2000. The overall margin of error was $\pm 5\%$. Copyright, the Elway Poll.

Most Important Issue in WA State

Presented with a list of eight categories of issues, 23% of respondents selected education as their most important issue and 19% chose it as their second most important issue. Health care was selected by 18% as their most important issue and as the second most important issue by 13%. Taxes were most important to 14% and second most important to 15%; the economy was most important to 13% and second most important to 12%; government spending was most important to 12% and second most important to 10%; the environment was most important to 8% and second most important to 9%; crime was most important to 5% and second most important to 11%; and transportation was most important to 4% and second most important to 9%. Among subgroups, 28% of Democrats ranked health care as their top concern, followed by education (23%) and the environment (11%). Republicans named taxes (19%) and the economy (19%) as their top concerns, followed by spending (16%) and education (16%). Among independents, 26% ranked education as their top concern, followed by taxes (15%) and the economy (13%).

2000 Presidential Election

Overall, 39% of Washington voters said they planned to vote for George W. Bush (22% were firm and 17% were leaning) and 38% planned to vote for Al Gore (23% were firm and 15% were leaning). Another 18% of respondents were undecided and 6% planned to vote for neither Bush nor

Gore. Among Republicans, 91% supported Bush (63% firmly), while 76% of Democrats supported Gore (56% firmly). Only 17% of independents were firmly committed to a candidate (10% for Gore and 7% for Bush). One-third of former McCain supporters were firmly committed: 20% to Bush and 13% to Gore, with another 22% leaning toward Bush and 18% toward Gore. Counting respondents both firm and leaning in their decision, Bush led Gore among men 44% to 36%, while Gore led Bush among women 38% to 34%. Gore led Bush 36% to 31% among voters who named education as their most important issue; 61% to 18% among voters who named the environment as their most important issue; 52% to 23% among voters who named health care as their most important issue; and 50% to 25% among voters who named transportation as their most important issue. Bush led Gore 46% to 29% among voters who named the economy as their most important issue; 55% to 24% among voters who named taxes as their most important issue; and 59% to 26% among voters who named government as their most important issue.

Environmental Quality in Washington

Asked whether they thought Washington state's environmental quality had improved or worsened over the last few years, 45% of respondents thought it had stayed the same, 31% thought it had gotten worse, and 25% thought it had gotten better. The top reasons for saying environmental quality had improved were water quality (26%), air quality (21%), more awareness (21%), public involvement (17%), stronger laws (13%), and salmon recovery (8%). The top justifications for saying it had worsened were air quality (17%), salmon (14%), growth/sprawl (14%), water quality (12%), clear cuts (12%), and pollution (12%). In terms of government spending on environmental protection, 43% of respondents thought the amount was about right, 37% thought not enough was being spent, and 22% thought too

much was being spent. In terms of regulations to protect the environment, 36% of respondents thought regulations had not gone far enough, 34% thought they had gone too far, and 29% thought they were about right. Asked whether particular groups had gotten more or less effective at taking care of the environment, 43% thought the government had gotten less effective, 36% said more effective, and 22% said about the same. Fully 56% of respondents thought business had gotten more effective at taking care of the environment, 22% said less effective, and 22% said about the same. The environmental movement was thought to have gotten more effective by 43% of respondents, to have remained about the same by 32%, and to have become less effective by 25%.

Environmental Position vs. Character

Respondents were asked to choose between hypothetical candidates who agreed with them on environmental issues but disagreed on the issue they had named most important earlier in the survey: 61% chose the most important issue over environmental stance and 20% chose environmental position over most important issue. In a second question, respondents were asked their preference if the candidate who agreed with them on the environment was reputed to have less integrity and character than the opponent who disagreed with the respondent's environmental positions. In this case, 65% of respondents preferred the candidate with stronger integrity and character despite their contrary environmental position, while 17% preferred the candidate who agreed on the environment regardless of questionable integrity and character. Asked which statement they agreed with more, 51% of respondents chose "we need to protect the rights of property owners even if some environmentally sensitive areas might be harmed," while 40% chose "we need to protect the environment even if that means restricting what some property owners can do with the property they own." ↵

Four New NNSP Executive Council Members Take Office

Four NNSP representatives have been elected to fill positions on the NNSP Executive Council. The new council members, whose terms began July 1, 2000, and will end June 30, 2002, are Patricia Gwartney, John Kennedy, and Robert Oldendick. In addition, James J. Bason will fill a vacant one-year position ending July 1, 2001. Members of the NNSP Executive Council approve applications for membership and set policy for the Network. This fall, the council will be charged with the important task of choosing a new headquarters for the NNSP.

JIM BASON is Director of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Behavioral Research, at the University of Georgia and Assistant Research Scientist. He is also a Fellow in the Institute for Behavioral Research. Jim completed bachelor's and master's degrees in Political Science at Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina, and a Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of Georgia. He has taught courses in Political Science at Appalachian State University, Young Harris College, and the University of Georgia, and frequently teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in Survey Research Method and Practice. Jim has been affiliated with the Survey Research Center since 1991, and has directly overseen more than 300 research studies of varying scope and size.

PATRICIA GWARTNEY is Founding Director, University of Oregon Survey Research Laboratory (OSRL) since 1992 and a UO Sociology Professor since 1981. She holds an AB from the University of California-Berkeley, an MA from the University of Michigan, and a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. She has conducted all phases of survey research design and analysis for academic, government and private clients for the past 27 years at the University of Oregon, University of Michigan, University of California-Berkeley, and Stanford Research Institute (SRI International). She oversees all aspects of OSRL's projects and organization and mentors UO students' research in survey methodology.

JOHN KENNEDY has directed the Indiana University Center for Survey Research since August 1987. He is also the associate director of the Institute of Social Research and an adjunct associate professor of sociology. John was previously employed as a statistician in the Research and Evaluation Branch of the Housing Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census and as an assistant professor of sociology and director of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Hartford. From 1990-1993, he was a member of the NNSP Executive Council. In 1997, he served as the president of the Society for Applied Sociology. John received his Ph.D. in Sociology from Penn State.

ROBERT OLDENDICK is Director of the University of South Carolina's Survey Research Laboratory and directs the biannual South Carolina State Survey. From 1981 to 1989 he worked on the Ohio Poll at the University of Cincinnati. In journals such as *Public Opinion Quarterly*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Official Statistics*, he has published articles on the effects of question wording, respondent selection in telephone surveys, and the impact of telephone answering machines. A current project examines the effect of declining response rates on the representativeness of telephone survey samples. His book, co-authored with Barbara Bardes, *Public Opinion: Measuring the American Mind*, was published this year. Bob served on the NNSP Executive Council from 1991 to 1997.

The NNSP by-laws call for six executive council members. Each council member serves a two-year term, and the terms are staggered so that the terms of three council members expire in any given year. The council members whose terms will expire in 2001 are Jim Bason (University of Georgia); Ronald Langley (University of Kentucky); and Fred Solop (Northern Arizona University). The three council members whose terms expired on July 1 are John Blydenburgh (Clark University); Samuel Hoff (Delaware State University); and Linda Penalosa (University of Wisconsin Extension). All three have been dependable sources of good advice during their tenure on the council.

ODUM INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCE
CAMPUS BOX #3355
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL NC 27599-3355

UNIV. OF ILLINOIS SRL JOINS NNSP

Please welcome the NNSP's newest member, the University of Illinois Survey Research Laboratory. Diane O'Rourke heads the SRL, which has been in operation for 35 years. Lisa Kelly-Wilson serves as NNSP representative. Contact information: Survey Research Laboratory (MC 036), University of Illinois, 909 West Oregon Street, Suite 300, Urbana, IL 61801; phone: 217-333-7109; fax: 217-244-4408; email: info@srl.uic.edu; <http://www.srl.uic.edu>. ☛