

**Views Of Connecticut Voters On
Public Financing Legislation**

Submitted to:

Common Cause
Connecticut Citizen Action Group

Submitted by:

Zogby International
John Zogby, President and CEO
John Bruce, Vice President and Systems Administrator
Rebecca Wittman, Vice President and Managing Editor

May 2005

Table Of Contents

Subject	Page
I. Methodology and Sample Characteristics (Parts 1 and 2)	2
II. Narrative Analysis – Part 1	4
III. Narrative Analysis – Part 2	9
Appendix – Script (Parts 1 and 2)	13

I. Methodology and Sample Characteristics

Survey Methodology – Connecticut Likely Voters: 5/12/05 thru 5/14/05

This is a statewide telephone survey of likely voters conducted by Zogby International. The target sample is 500 interviews with approximately 42 questions asked. Samples are randomly drawn from telephone cd's of national listed sample. Zogby International surveys employ sampling strategies in which selection probabilities are proportional to population size within area codes and exchanges. As many as six calls are made to reach a sampled phone number. Cooperation rates are calculated using one of AAPOR's approved methodologies¹ and are comparable to other professional public-opinion surveys conducted using similar sampling strategies.² Weighting by *party, age, race, gender* is used to adjust for non-response. Margin of error is +/- 4.5 percentage points.

Zogby International's sampling and weighting procedures also have been validated through its political polling: more than 95% of the firm's polls have come within 1% of actual election-day outcomes.

Sample Characteristics	Frequency	Valid Percent*
Sample size	500	100
Southwest	247	49
Other part of state	253	51
Very likely to vote	410	82
Somewhat likely to vote	90	18
Democrat	185	37
Republican	150	30
Independent/Minor party	162	33
18-29	77	16
30-49	202	42
50-64	135	28
65+	67	14
18-24	33	7
25-34	77	16
35-54	208	43

¹ See COOP4 (p.38) in *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates of Surveys*. The American Association for Public Opinion Research, (2000).

² *Cooperation Tracking Study: April 2003 Update*, Jane M. Sheppard and Shelly Haas. The Council for Marketing & Opinion Research (CMOR). Cincinnati, Ohio (2003).

Sample Characteristics (continued)

55-69	112	23
70+	52	11
Did not answer age	18	--
Less than high school	13	3
High school graduate	66	13
Some college	117	24
College graduate+	303	61
White	456	93
Hispanic	10	2
African American	7	2
Asian/Pacific	4	1
Other/mixed	15	3
Did not answer race	7	--
Less than \$15,000	27	6
\$15,000-\$24,999	26	6
\$25,000-\$34,999	31	7
\$35,000-\$49,999	44	10
\$50,000-\$74,999	105	25
\$75,000 or more	191	45
Did not answer income	77	--
Male	241	48
Female	259	52

* Numbers have been rounded to the nearest percent and might not total 100.

II. Narrative Analysis (Part 1)

Connecticut, following a corruption scandal in the state’s highest office, would seem a fertile ground for campaign finance reform efforts. A solid majority (54%) of likely voters in the Constitution State say that “major” changes are needed in the way election campaigns are financed—far more than the one-in-four (24%) who favor minor changes and the 12% who favor no changes at all to the current system.

This favorable opinion regarding campaign finance reform is centered on the belief of two-thirds (62%) of voters that elected officials in their home state are more concerned with the needs of those who pay for their campaigns than the needs of everyone. And more than four-in-ten (44%) voters believe that the problem of money’s influence in Connecticut’s politics is getting worse—more than four times the 10% who believe things are getting better.

In fact, the issue of campaign finance reform resonates strongly in Connecticut. More than eight-in-ten (82%) believe that limiting the influence of money on politics is essential to improving the lives of citizens—and nearly three-in-five (57%) hold this position strongly. These levels of support hold even when the issue shifts to specific legislation, with three-quarters (78%) favoring passage of a new campaign-finance law that would allow candidates to opt for voluntary public funding of their political campaigns.

13. When it comes to the way we finance election campaigns, do you think we need to make major changes, minor changes or should we not make any changes in the way we finance election campaigns?

Major changes	54%
Minor changes	24
No changes	12
Not sure	11

A vast majority (78%) says that changes need to be made in the way election campaigns are financed, including more than half (54%) who say major changes are needed. More than one in ten says no changes are necessary.

Overall, a plurality or majority in most sub-groups believe that major changes are needed in how campaigns are financed. Equal numbers of voters in southwestern Connecticut and other parts of the state say there should be minor changes in the way campaigns are financed (24% average), while those living in other parts of the state (56%) are more likely than those living in the southwest (51%) to say major changes are in order.

Support for major and minor changes is strong across party lines and received agreement from more than 72 percent of Democrats, Republicans and Independents. Democrats (61%) are the most likely to say Connecticut needs major changes, followed

by independents (56%), and Republicans (42%). While Republicans are most likely to say that no changes are needed (18%), they are still more than twice as likely to say there should be major changes to the system as to say there should be no changes.

Generally, those over 50 are more likely than those under 50 to want major changes. More than half of men (54%) and women (53%) agree equally that major changes are needed, while women (27%) are more likely than men (19%) to believe that minor changes will take care of the problem.

Income has no significant impact on response: For every single income range, more than half (50% or greater) support major changes, and more than seven-in-ten (70%) of every single income bracket favor changes—either major or minor.

14. Right now, would you say elected officials in Connecticut are looking out for the needs of everyone, or are they mostly concerned with the needs of those who pay for their campaigns?

More concerned with those who pay	62%
Looking out for needs of everyone	21
Not sure	17

By about three to one, respondents feel Connecticut’s elected officials are more concerned with those who pay for their campaigns (62%) than in looking out for the needs of everyone (21%). One in six is not sure.

There are just minor differences among sub-groups, with a majority in each saying that elected officials are looking out for the needs of those who pay for their campaigns. Voters throughout the state (64%) are more likely than those living in the southwest corner (60%) to say that elected officials care more about those who finance their campaigns than they care about the needs of everyone.

Independents (67%) are more likely than either Republicans (62%) or Democrats (58%) to think that elected officials care more about the needs of contributors. Men (71%) are much more likely (55%) than women to agree.

15. Do you think the problems with the influence of money on politics in Connecticut are getting worse, staying about the same, or getting better?

Getting worse	44%
Staying the same	39
Getting better	10
Not sure	7

Over two-fifths of respondents (44%) think these problems are getting worse, while only 10% see things getting better. Just under two in five (39%) says things are staying the same.

Voters living in the southwest are closely divided on whether or not they believe that the influence of money is getting worse (39%) or staying the same (41%), while voters living in the rest of the state fall firmly on the side that things are getting worse (48%); 37% think it is staying the same.

Both Republicans (43%) and Democrats (45%) are slightly more likely to say things are staying the same over getting worse (36% Republicans; 43% Democrats), while independents are much more likely to say things are getting worse (51%) than staying the same (31%).

In all the age groups, but one, voters are more likely to believe that things are getting worse than are staying the same. Among 30 to 49 year olds, however, 49% believe that the influence of money in politics is staying the same, while 38% believe it is getting worse.

Men (46%) are more likely than women (41%) to think it is getting worse, while the sexes believe equally that things are staying the same (39% men; 40% women).

16. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement? We need to limit the influence of money on politics. We are never going to improve the lives of Connecticut's citizens as long as the insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, utilities, and industries that pollute the environment keep pouring money into election campaigns.

Strongly agree	57%
Agree	25
Disagree	9
Strongly disagree	5
Not sure	5

Most people (82%) are in agreement with the above statement, including nearly three in five who agree strongly. About one in eight (14%) either disagrees or disagrees strongly.

The vast majority of voters in each sub-group agree that there needs to be a limit on the influence of money in politics, including a majority in nearly every sub-group who strongly agrees.

Regionally, those living in parts of the state other than the southwestern corner are more likely (84%) to agree than are those living in the southwest (80%). Democrats (86%) and independents (88%) are more likely to agree than are Republicans (72%).

Among the age groups, 50 to 64 year olds are the most likely to agree (83%), while voters 65 and older (74%) are the least likely to agree. Women (88%) are more likely to agree than are men (75%) that limits are needed.

32. There is a proposal before the state legislature to reform the way campaigns are funded. Under this proposal, candidates for governor and other state offices could agree to no longer raise money from private sources. Instead, each candidate would receive a set amount of money from a publicly financed election fund and spending by candidates would be limited to the amount they receive from the fund. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this proposal?

Strongly favor	49.5%		
Somewhat favor	26.5	Favor	76%
Somewhat oppose	7		
Strongly oppose	10	Oppose	17
Not sure	7		

More than three in four respondents (76%) either *strongly* or *somewhat* favor the specific proposal to reform campaigns with public financing. The question was asked twice—once before a list of arguments for and against public financing, and once afterwards. Support remained virtually consistent with 76% supporting it the second time and 78% the first time. Opposition also remained consistent, (18% previously vs. 17% this round), while those saying “not sure” increased from 4 percent to 7 percent.

Again, a majority in every sub-group favors a proposal that would reform the way campaigns are funded, by providing each candidate with money from a publicly-financed election fund and disallowing private fund raising for campaigns.

Seventy-eight percent of voters living in other parts of the state favor this proposal, while 74% of those in the southwest are also in favor.

The specific proposal for public financing garnered high levels of support regardless of party ID, with more than two-thirds of every political identity group in favor: independents (76%), Republicans (68%) and Democrats (83%).

This proposal seems popular regardless of age, with 73% or more of every single age group favoring the proposal, including more than 80% of seniors.

Support for these changes remained strong throughout the income spectrum: Support among \$15-25K income earners was 92 percent and 74 percent among those earning more than \$75K.

37. Another reform proposal would place strict limits on political action committees and lobbyists campaign contributions. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this proposal?

Strongly agree	55%		
Somewhat agree	24	Agree	80%
Somewhat disagree	9		
Strongly disagree	6	Disagree	15
Not sure	6		

Support for this proposal is even greater than the previous one, as 80% agree with a proposal placing strict limits on political action committees and lobbyists campaign contributions. More than half are in strong agreement.

About one in seven (15%) disagrees with this reform proposal.

A significant majority of voters in the southwestern corner of Connecticut (75%) agree that there should be strict limits placed on PAC and lobbyists campaign contributions, with voters in the rest of the state even more in agreement (84%).

Democrats and independents agree equally (81% each) that there should be strict limits on such contributions, with 75% of Republicans also agreeing.

III. Narrative Analysis (Part 2)

Governor Rell draws much of her popularity from an image of incorruptibility. When asked the best thing about the governor, more than one in four emphasized a perception of honesty or integrity. But when the subject turns to Governor Rell's negatives, we find that no more than 4% of the population can identify any single negative, and a majority (57%) either are not sure or specify that there is nothing they dislike about the governor.

Given Governor Rell's favorable stature in the public mind, it is relevant that a majority (56%) say they would view her less favorably were she to veto any campaign finance reform measure that included public financing and/or limits. Just one-in-four (24%) Connecticut voters would view her *more* favorably in such a circumstance.

Public sentiment is on the side of campaign finance reform and against public officials who avoid the issue. A full one-third (32%) of the public becomes more favorable to such reform when they know that the bill before the legislature "is similar to the bill requiring public financing that was passed by the legislature in 2000 but vetoed by Governor Rowland."

Campaign finance reform in Connecticut is a winning proposition with the public already, even without making the case in terms of message and argument. The key for its proponents is to convince Governor Rell that, given her image as incorruptible and honest, supporting such reform measures is both in keeping with her image and necessary for her continued political viability and standing. Further, highlighting legislative candidates' opposition to reform efforts is critical as well, with 60% saying they would be less likely to vote for a candidate who did not support the proposed reforms. Given these levels of support, politicians can be awakened to the reality that support for reform is very likely in their best interests.

32. [PREVIOUSLY RELEASED, May 19, 2005]

There is a proposal before the state legislature to reform the way campaigns are funded. Under this proposal, candidates for governor and other state offices could agree to no longer raise money from private sources. Instead, each candidate would receive a set amount of money from a publicly financed election fund and spending by candidates would be limited to the amount they receive from the fund. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this proposal?

Strongly favor	49.5%		
Somewhat favor	26.5	Favor	76%
Somewhat oppose	7		
Strongly oppose	10	Oppose	17
Not sure	7		

35. *If you knew that that this bill is similar to the bill requiring public financing that was passed by the legislature in 2000 but vetoed by Governor Rowland, would that make you much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support such a law or would it make no difference?*

Much more likely	21%		
Somewhat more likely	12	More likely	32%
Somewhat less likely	4		
Much less likely	5	Less likely	10
No difference	54		
Not sure	4		

One in three (32%) say they are more likely to support the bill, knowing that Rowland vetoed it, three times the 10 percent who are less likely to do so. On the other hand, more than half (55%) say that knowing that the bill is similar to a bill vetoed by Governor Rowland in 2000 makes no difference in their support.

Women (38%) are noticeably more likely than men (26%) to say they would be more likely to support this new legislation knowing it was similar to the bill vetoed by Rowland. For most sub-groups, however, a majority or plurality say it makes no difference in their support for the law knowing that it is similar to the law passed by the legislature in 2000, but vetoed by Rowland in 2000.

Three in ten in southwestern Connecticut (30%) and one in three (35%) living in the rest of the state say they would be more likely to support the bill knowing it is similar to the 2000 bill. Those living in the southwest are more likely than the rest of the state to say it makes no difference (58% southwest vs. 51% rest of state).

Democrats (36%) and independents (34%) are more likely than Republicans (27%) to say they are more likely to support the law due to its similarity to the 2000 legislation.

36. *Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: Governor Rell needs to enact public financing of elections in order to prevent future scandals like those of former Governor Rowland's administration.*

Strongly agree	43%		
Somewhat agree	27	Agree	70%
Somewhat disagree	12		
Strongly disagree	13	Disagree	25
Not sure	5		

Seven in ten likely voters (70%) agree that Governor Rell needs to enact public financing of elections in order to prevent future scandals like those of the former governor. More than two in five (43%) agree with this position strongly.

In comparison, only one in four (25%) disagrees, with about one in eight (13%) strongly disagreeing.

A majority in each party agrees – 74% Democrats, 61% Republicans, and 74% independents – with nearly half of Democrats (47%) and independents (49%) *strongly agreeing*.

While more than one in three (36%) in southwestern Connecticut *strongly agree* that Governor Rell needs to enact public financing in order to prevent future scandals, nearly half (49%) of those in the rest of the state *strongly agree*. Among age groups, voters fifty and older are more likely to *strongly agree* (50% average) than those under 50.

Women (78%) are more likely than men (62%) to agree overall, with more than half (52%) of women *strongly agreeing* compared to 34% of men who *strongly agree*.

38. Suppose the legislature passed a strong campaign finance measure including both these reforms – public financing and limits -- this year, and Governor Rell vetoed it. Would you feel much more favorably, more favorably, less favorably, or much less favorably about Governor Rell afterwards?

Much more favorably	11%		
More favorably	13	More favorably	24%
Less favorably	36		
Much less favorably	20	Less favorably	56
No difference	12		
Not sure	9		

More than twice as many respondents would feel less favorably than more favorably towards Governor Rell were she to veto a campaign finance measure that had public financing and lobbyist limits. One in five (20%) would feel much less favorably toward Governor Rell, and another 36% would also have a less favorable opinion. One in ten (11%) would feel much more favorably if she vetoed the measure and 13 percent would feel more favorably.. About one in eight (12%) say it would make no difference in their opinion of the governor.

Three in five (60%) Connecticut residents living in parts of the state other than the southwest say they would think less favorably of the governor if she vetoed such a bill, while just over half (51%) of those in the southwest feel the same. Not surprisingly, Democrats (64%) would be more likely to think less favorably of Rell than Republicans,

but nearly half (45%) of Republicans would think less of her. Fifty-six percent of independents would think less favorably of her.

Just under three in five of voters under 64 would think less favorably of Governor Rell in this instance, while 44% of those 65 and older would think less of her.

39. How likely are you to vote for a state legislative candidate who did not support both of these reforms – public financing and limits – much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely?

Much more likely	11%		
Somewhat more likely	10	More likely	21%
Somewhat less likely	30		
Much less likely	30	Less likely	60
No difference	13		
Not sure	6		

By nearly three to one, more people would be less likely (60%) than more likely (21%) to vote for a state legislative candidate who did not support both of these campaign finance reforms.

A majority in each sub-group say they would be less likely to vote for a state legislative candidate who did not support public financing and limits on donations. Nearly three in five southwestern Connecticut residents (59%) would be less likely to vote for such a candidate; 62% of voters in the rest of the state feel the same.

A majority of members in all three parties would be unlikely to vote for a legislative candidate who did not support both measures, including 51% of Republicans. Women (65%) are more likely than men (56%) to say they would be unlikely to support a candidate under these circumstances.

Appendix – Script

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm doing a poll of Connecticut voters for Zogby International. May I ask you some questions? (Do you have a few minutes?)

1. Are you registered to vote in Connecticut?

1. Yes

2. No **(End)**

3. Not sure **(Do not read) (End)**

2. How likely are you to vote in statewide elections?

1. Very likely

2. Somewhat likely

3. Not likely **(End)**

4. Not sure **(Do not read) (End)**

3. In which party are you either registered to vote or do you consider yourself to be a member of – Democratic, Republican, Independent/Minor party, or Libertarian?

1. Democratic

2. Republican

3. Independent/Minor

4. Libertarian

5. Not sure **(Do not read) (End)**

Please tell me if your overall opinion of each of the following people is very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable, or you are not familiar enough to form an opinion?

4. Chris Dodd

5. Joe Lieberman

6. John McCain

7. John Rowland

8. Democrats in the State Legislature

9. Republicans in the State Legislature

10. Jodi Rell

11. What is the best thing about Jodi Rell? **(Do not read choices. Choose only ONE.)**

1. Cares about CT/The people

2. In touch with the people/Accessible

3. She's not Rowland

4. Cleaning house/Ending corruption

5. Restoring faith in government

6. Honesty/Integrity/Straightforward

7. Intelligent/Well informed

8. Good decision maker/Fair

9. Non partisan/Open minded/Works with other politicians

10. She's Republican/Political philosophy

11. Good leader/Strong/Decisive

12. Took over at tough time/Handled Rowland situation well

13. Hard worker/Gets things done

14. Good priorities/Handles what's important
15. Budget/Fiscal responsibility
16. Death penalty/Ross
17. Education(general)
18. Taxes(general)
19. Transportation(general)
20. She's a woman
21. Other (**Please specify**_____)
22. Nothing that I like
23. Not sure

12. What is the worst thing about Jodi Rell? (**Do not read choices. Choose only ONE.**)

1. Doesn't care/Out of touch with the people
2. She stood by Rowland during the scandal
3. She deserted Rowland during the scandal
4. Was involved in/Knew about Rowland mess
5. Not cleaning house/Handling corruption fast enough
6. Not committed/Flip Flopping/Don't know where she stands
7. She's Republican/Political philosophy
8. Wants it her way/Not open minded
9. Not aggressive enough/Not strong leader
10. Lack of experience
11. Not doing anything/Not accomplishing enough
12. Budget (general)
13. Lack of funding/Cuts in social services
14. Issues with state employees/Unions
15. Death penalty/Ross
16. Economy/Jobs
17. Education(general)
18. Gay issues/Civil unions
19. Taxes (general)
20. Tax - gas tax
21. Tax - cigarette/Liquor tax
22. Transportation(general)
23. Trans - highways/roads
24. Other (**Please specify**_____)
25. Nothing I dislike
26. Not sure

13. When it comes to the way we finance election campaigns, do you think we need to make major changes, minor changes or should we not make any changes in the way we finance election campaigns?

1. Major changes 2. Minor changes 3. No changes 4. Not sure (**Do not read**)

14. Right now, would you say elected officials in Connecticut are looking out for the needs of everyone, or are they mostly concerned with the needs of those who pay for their campaigns?

1. Looking out for all Americans 2. More concerned with those who pay 3. Not sure (**Do not read**)

15. Do you think the problems with the influence of money on politics in Connecticut are getting worse, staying about the same, or getting better?

1. Getting worse 2. Staying the same 3. Getting better 4. Not sure (**Do not read**)

16. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statement? We need to limit the influence of money on politics. We are never going to improve the lives of Connecticut's citizens as long as the insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, utilities, and industries that pollute the environment keep pouring money into election campaigns.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

17. There is a proposal before the state legislature to reform the way campaigns are funded. Under this proposal, candidates for governor and other state offices could agree to no longer raise money from private sources. Instead, each candidate would receive a set amount of money from a publicly financed election fund and spending by candidates would be limited to the amount they receive from the fund. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this proposal?

1. Strongly favor 2. Somewhat favor 3. Somewhat oppose 4. Strongly oppose 5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

Next, I am going to read you some reasons given by **opponents** of the proposed Connecticut public financing legislation. Regardless of your position on the issue, please tell me whether you think that is a very persuasive, somewhat persuasive, somewhat unpersuasive or very unpersuasive reason to oppose the measure.

171. This proposal is just welfare for politicians and we shouldn't be wasting taxpayer money on politicians' campaigns.

172. There are more important things to spend our hard earned tax money on, such as improving public transportation and education.

173. It is wrong for state taxpayers to have their tax dollars used to fund the campaigns of candidates they don't support.

(Systems Note: Q18-23 for half the sample; Q25-30 for other half of sample)

Next, I am going to read you some reasons given by **supporters** of the proposed Connecticut public financing legislation. Regardless of your position on the issue, please tell me whether you think that is a very persuasive, somewhat persuasive, somewhat unpersuasive or very unpersuasive reason to support the measure.

18. This new system would save the people of Connecticut money because it would eliminate pressure to spend state money on projects favored by lobbyists and large campaign donors like state contractors.

19. No question

20. Every candidate would get the same amount of money and a level playing field so elections will be decided by who has the best ideas rather than who has the most money

21. This will help protect our state and allow Connecticut citizens to take back state government from the lobbyists and big money interests

22. No question

23. Voters would benefit because candidates and elected officials can spend more time talking to voters and less time raising money from special interests and the wealthy

24. No question

25. With what we now know after the Rowland scandal, this new system would save the people of Connecticut money because it would eliminate pressure to spend state money on projects favored by lobbyists and large campaign donors like state contractors

26. No question

27. It allows citizens who are not connected to wealthy contributors or big money an equal opportunity to run for office

28. After all the scandals with Governor Rowland, this will help protect our state and allow Connecticut citizens to take back state government from the lobbyists and big money interests

29. No question

30. It is a common sense proposal that has worked well in other states at a cost of less than two dollars per taxpayer

31. No question

All Respondents

32. There is a proposal before the state legislature to reform the way campaigns are funded. Under this proposal, candidates for governor and other state offices could agree to no longer raise money from private sources. Instead, each candidate would receive a set amount of money from a publicly financed election fund and spending by candidates would be limited to the amount they receive from the fund. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this proposal?

1. Strongly favor 2. Somewhat favor 3. Somewhat oppose 4. Strongly oppose 5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

33. Which one of the following two statements comes closest to your point of view? (**Rotate statements.**)

A: We need to limit the influence of money on politics. Public financing gives voters greater opportunity to hold elected officials accountable. Limiting campaign spending and providing all qualified candidates with an equal amount of money creates a level playing field. This common sense proposition works in other states at a cost of less than \$2 per taxpayer.

B: The taxpayers should not pay for campaigns for candidates. My money might go to support candidates that I strongly disagree with and with the state budget so tight, Connecticut should fund other priority and not pay for campaigns with taxpayer money.

1. A

2. B

3. Not sure (**Do not sure**)

34. The state legislature is looking at proposals to publicly finance campaigns for statewide office such as governor and also campaigns for our state representatives and state senators in Hartford. Is it more important to publicly finance campaigns for statewide offices such as governor or is it more important to publicly finance the campaigns of our state representatives and state senators in Hartford?

1. Statewide offices
2. State representatives/state senators
3. Both/all races (**Do not read**)
4. None/no races (**Do not read**)
5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

35. If you knew that that this bill is similar to the bill requiring public financing that was passed by the legislature in 2000 but vetoed by Governor Rowland, would that make you much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support such a law or would it make no difference?

1. Much more likely 2. Somewhat more likely 3. Somewhat less likely 4. Much less likely 5. No difference 6. Not sure (**Do not read**)

36. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: Governor Rell needs to enact public financing of elections in order to prevent future scandals like those of former Governor Rowland's administration.

1. Strongly agree 2. Somewhat agree 3. Somewhat disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

37. Another reform proposal would place strict limits on political action committees and lobbyists campaign contributions. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this proposal?

1. Strongly agree 2. Somewhat agree 3. Somewhat disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure (**Do not read**)

38. Suppose the legislature passed a strong campaign finance measure including both these reforms – public financing and limits -- this year, and Governor Rell vetoed it. Would you feel much more favorably, more favorably, less favorably, or much less favorably about Governor Rell afterwards?

1. Much more favorably 2. More favorably 3. Less favorably 4. Much less favorably 5. No difference (**Do not read**) 6. Not sure (**Do not read**)

39. How likely are you to vote for a state legislative candidate who did not support both of these reforms – public financing and limits – much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely?

1. Much more likely 2. Somewhat more likely 3. Somewhat less likely 4. Much less likely 5. No difference 6. Not sure (**Do not read**)

40. In your opinion, which of these issues is the **most** important issue facing Connecticut today?
(Read choices)

1. State budget/spending
2. Fixing government corruption
3. Banning cellphone use in cars
4. Tort reform
5. Civil unions & gay marriage
6. Other (**please specify** _____)
7. Not sure/none (**do not read**)

Thanks. We're done. I just need some statistics.

701. What is your age? _____

903. Which of the following best describes your highest educational level?

1. Less than h.s. graduate 2. H.S. graduate 3. Some college 4. College graduate 0. Refuse (**Do not read**)

904. Which of the following best represents your race or ethnic group?

1. White, non-Hispanic
2. Hispanic
3. African American
4. Asian/Pacific
5. Other/mixed
0. Refuse (**Do not read**)

921. Which of the following best represents your household income last year before taxes?

1. Less than \$15,000
2. \$15,000-24,999
3. \$25,000-34,999
4. \$35,000-49,999
5. \$50,000-74,999
6. \$75,000 or more
0. Refuse (**Do not read**)

922. Gender (**Do not ask, simply record.**)

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

Thank you for taking time to complete the survey.