

## **THE UNH POLL\***

By: Andrew E. Smith, Ph.D.  
UNH Survey Center  
(603) 862-4367

**FOR RELEASE**  
December 13, 1999

### **LITTLE SUPPORT FOR CURRENT LAW, NO CONSENSUS ON LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS FOR FUNDING EDUCATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE**

DURHAM, NH—New Hampshire residents are divided in their support of recent education funding legislation and there is no consensus over long-term funding options for education.

These findings are based on the latest **UNH POLL**, conducted by the University of New Hampshire Survey Center.

#### **NO END IN SIGHT**

The New Hampshire Supreme Court's decision in the Claremont case forced New Hampshire to change the way primary and secondary education is funded. Although the New Hampshire House, Senate, and Governor Shaheen finally agreed on a plan to fund education in May, the debate over a long-term funding solution is far from over. The education funding law was passed after months of heated negotiations and debate. A court challenge resulted in additional legislation addressing problems with the earlier bill.

"The contentious nature of the legislative debate and continued legal challenges reflect the divided opinions New Hampshire residents" says the Director of the UNH Survey Center, Andy Smith. In the latest UNH Poll, only 45% of New Hampshire residents say they support the education funding law, 45% oppose the law and 10% are unsure.

Residents opposing the current education funding law are more intense in their opinions than are supporters -- 28% of New Hampshire residents say they "strongly oppose" the current law and 17% say they "moderately oppose" it. Conversely, only 14% of New Hampshire residents say they "strongly support" the current law and 31% "moderately support" the law.

Opposition to the new law is stronger among registered -- 51% either moderately or strongly oppose the law, 42% either moderately or strongly support it, and 8% are unsure.

#### **DONOR TOWNS VS. RECEIVER TOWNS**

One of the major criticisms of the current education funding law is that its reliance on a property tax unfairly targets towns with high property values. Several "donor towns", towns who must pay additional property taxes because of the education funding law, are discussing ways of legally challenging the law. Residents of donor towns are more opposed to the current funding law than are residents of "receiver towns", towns who will receive more money from the state in education funding than they pay in additional property taxes. Sixty-one percent of donor town residents oppose the current law while only 43% of receiver town residents oppose the current law.

"State legislators are left in the difficult position of defending a law which is not particularly popular among receiver towns and which has strong, organized opposition from donor towns" says Smith. "This will likely result in further legal challenges to the current law and to new legislation proposing alternate ways of dealing with the problem of education funding."

## LONG TERM FUNDING SOLUTIONS

The current education funding law relies on a state-wide property tax of \$6.60 per \$1,000 valuation for much of its revenue. This tax will expire in 2003. Legislators must find a long-term funding mechanism for education and will have to address concerns about the fairness of using a property-tax.

In order to gauge the political impact of several proposed alternatives to the current education funding law, survey respondents were asked if they would be more likely to vote for or against their state Senator if he or she supported a particular education funding alternative. The alternatives presented to respondents included an income tax, a sales tax, a state-wide property tax, using revenues from legalized gambling, or a constitutional amendment reversing the Claremont decision and making towns responsible for their own schools. None of these proposals was supported by majority of state residents. The lack of consensus among state residents is a major reason why this issue has not yet been settled.

### Income Tax

Many state residents, particularly those from the Seacoast and from donor towns, have criticized Governor Shaheen for refusing to support an income tax to fund education. However, there is little general support for an income tax. Statewide, only 32% say they would be more likely to vote **for** their state Senator if he or she supported an income tax, 50% said they would be more likely to vote **against** their Senator if they supported an income tax, 14% said it would make little difference in their vote and 3% don't know.

Among registered voters, 36% say they would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported an income tax, 50% would be more likely to vote against, 11% said it will make little difference in their vote and 3% don't know.

And although many leaders of donor towns have supported an income tax, there is little difference between donor and receiver towns in their view of an income tax to fund education. Among donor town residents, only 36% say they would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported an income tax, 51% would be more likely to vote against, 9% say it will make little difference in their vote, and 4% don't know. In receiver towns, 32% say they would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported an income tax, 50% would be more likely to vote against, 15% say it will make little difference, and 3% don't know.

### Sales Tax

A second means of funding education is with a state sales tax. This is only marginally more popular than an income tax – 35% of state residents are more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported a sales tax to fund education, 47% are more likely to vote against, 16% say it will make little difference in their vote, and 2% don't know.

Among registered voters, 39% would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported a sales tax, 46% would be more likely to vote against, 13% said it will make little difference in their vote, and 2% don't know.

### State-wide Property Tax

Despite the fact that most state residents will see a reduction in their property taxes as a result of the current education funding law, a state-wide property tax is the least popular method for funding education. Only 19% of state residents are more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported a state-wide property tax to fund education, 56% are more likely to vote against, 21% say it will make little difference in their vote, and 3% don't know.

Among registered voters, 20% would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported a state-wide property tax, 57% would be more likely to vote against, 20% said it will make little difference in their vote, and 3% don't know.

### Legalized Gambling

Several legislators and political commentators have proposed legalizing casino gambling in selected locations in New Hampshire and using revenues from these casinos to fund education. Thirty-six percent of New Hampshire residents say they would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they favored legalizing gambling and using revenues from gambling to fund education, 44% are more likely to vote against, 18% say it will make little difference in their vote, and 3% don't know.

Among registered voters, 33% would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported legalized gambling to fund education, 49% would be more likely to vote against, 17% said it will make little difference in their vote, and 2% don't know.

### Reverse the Claremont Decision

Another proposed response to the education funding problem in New Hampshire is to reverse the Supreme Court's decision in Claremont through a constitutional amendment, and return the responsibility of funding education to the towns. There is less opposition to this proposal than the others, but there is still more opposition than support – 34% say they would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they favored a constitutional amendment overturning the Claremont decision, 42% are more likely to vote against, 19% say it will make little difference in their vote, and 5% don't know.

Among registered voters, 36% would be more likely to vote for their state Senator if they supported a constitutional amendment reversing Claremont, 43% would be more likely to vote against, 16% said it will make little difference in their vote, and 4% don't know.

### **NO CONSENSUS**

Survey respondents were next asked which of these options is closest to their opinion of what should be done about education funding in New Hampshire. Again, there is no consensus. Twenty-two percent of state residents favor an income tax, 22% favor legalizing gambling and using revenues from casinos to fund education, 21% favor a state sales tax, 16% favor a constitutional amendment overturning the Claremont decision and making towns responsible for funding their own schools, 8% favor the current law, 7% favor a state-wide property tax, 1% favor some combination of options, and 3% don't know.

Among registered voters there is also no consensus -- 27% favor an income tax, 22% favor a sales tax, 18% favor legalized gambling, 16% favor a constitutional amendment overturning Claremont, 7% favor a state-wide property tax, 6% favor the current system, 1% favor some combination, and 3% don't know.

### **SUB-GROUP ANALYSIS**

Younger adults (under 30), liberals, renters, and people who have never married are the strongest supporters of the current education funding law. Republicans, older residents (65 and older), and residents of donor towns are most likely to oppose the current funding law.

While a majority of no demographic group says they are more likely to vote for their state Senator if they favored an income tax to fund education, residents with post-graduate educations, Democrats, liberals, older residents (65 and older), and those with annual incomes between \$60,000 and \$100,000 are most likely to say they would. Conservatives, Republicans, upper income residents, and those with incomes between \$20,000 and \$40,000 are most likely to say they would vote against their state Senator if they favored an income tax.

Young adults (under 30) and those who have never married are most likely to say they would vote against their state Senator if they favored a state sales tax.

Upper income residents (\$100,000 or more) are most likely to say they would vote for their state Senator if they favored an legalizing gambling and using the revenues to fund education. Democrats, Protestants, and those with post-graduate educations are most likely to say they would vote against their state Senator if they favored an legalizing gambling.

Republicans and upper income residents are most likely to say they would vote for their state Senator if they favored an constitutional amendment reversing the Claremont decision and returning education funding to towns. Liberals, union members, and residents with post-graduate educations are most likely to say they would vote against their state Senator if they favored a constitutional amendment reversing Claremont.

Democrats, liberals, older residents (65 and older), and those with post-graduate educations are most likely to favor an income tax as the best option for long term funding of education. Young adults (under 30), those who have never married, renters, and those not registered to vote are most likely to favor legalized gambling. Republicans, conservatives, and residents of donor towns are most likely to favor a constitutional amendment reversing the Claremont decision

## UNH Poll Methodology

These findings are based on the most recent UNH Poll conducted by the University of New Hampshire Survey Center from November 16 to November 30, 1999.

A random sample of 712 adults from throughout New Hampshire was interviewed by telephone. In 95 of 100 cases, statewide estimates will be accurate to plus or minus 3.7 percent. Results reported for subgroups have potential for somewhat larger variation than those for the entire population.

In addition to sampling error, all surveys have other potential sources of non-sampling error including question order effects, question wording effects, and non-response.

Respondents to the UNH Poll were asked:

- "As you may know, the New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled in the Claremont decision, that the method of funding public education was unconstitutional. How closely have you followed the State Supreme Court's decision in the Claremont lawsuit and the current debate over how to solve the education funding issue ... very closely ... moderately closely ...only somewhat closely ... or not closely?"
- "The most recent education funding bill includes a \$6.60 property-tax which is set to expire in 2003, hikes in business taxes, a hike in the cigarette tax, and use of tobacco settlement funds. Based on what you have heard or read, do you support or oppose the latest plan to fund education?" IF SUPPORT: "Do you strongly support this proposal or only moderately support it?" IF OPPOSE: "Do you strongly oppose this proposal or only moderately oppose it?"

"Many people think that in the long run, a different means of funding education in New Hampshire will have to be found. There have been several proposals made by state legislators to fund education in New Hampshire and these proposals rely on different sources of revenue. As I read each plan for education, please tell me if you would be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Senator if they favored that position, or if it would make little difference in your vote. First ..." ROTATE

- "Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Senator if they favored a state INCOME TAX to fund education, or would that make little difference in your vote?"
- "Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Senator if they favored a state SALES TAX to fund education, or would that make little difference in your vote?"
- "Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Senator if they favored a state-wide PROPERTY TAX to fund education, or would that make little difference in your vote?"
- "Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Senator if they favored legalizing gambling and using money from gambling to fund education, or would that make little difference in your vote?"
- "Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for your state Representative or Senator if they favored a constitutional amendment which would reverse the Claremont decision and make towns and communities, not the state, responsible for funding their own schools, or would that make little difference in your vote?"
- "Which of these options is closest to your opinion of what should be done about education funding in New Hampshire ... an income tax ... a sales tax ... a state-wide property tax ... revenues from legalized gambling ... or a constitutional amendment overturning the Claremont decision?"

**How Closely Following Education Funding Issue?**

	All Respondents	Likely Voters	
	November <u>1999</u>	Nov. <u>1999</u>	May <u>1999</u>
Very Closely	20%	29%	20%
Moderately Closely	30	32	30
Somewhat Closely	23	23	23
Not Closely, Don't know	27	16	25
	(N=706)	(N=434)	(N=665)

**Support or Oppose Current Funding Law?**

	All <u>Respondents</u>	Donor <u>Towns</u>	Receiver <u>Towns</u>
Strongly Support	14%	5%	15%
Moderately Support	31	22	32
Moderately Oppose	17	23	16
Strongly Oppose	28	38	27
Don't know	10	12	10
	(N=704)	(N=92)	(N=612)

**Vote for or Against State Senator who Favored ...**

	More Likely <u>to Vote For</u>	No <u>Difference</u>	More Likely <u>to Vote Against</u>	Don't <u>Know</u>	(N)
Revenue from Gambling	36%	18%	44%	2%	(N=698)
Sales Tax	35	16	47	2	(N=697)
Reverse Claremont	34	19	42	5	(N=694)
Income Tax	32	14	50	3	(N=694)
State-wide Property Tax	19	21	56	3	(N=693)

**Preferred Plan for Funding Education**

	All <u>Respondents</u>	Registered <u>Voters</u>	Not <u>Registered</u>
Income Tax	22%	27%	10%
Revenue from Gambling	22	18	33
Sales Tax	21	22	17
Reverse Claremont	16	16	15
Current law	8	6	14
State-wide Property Tax	7	7	6
Combination	1	1	1
Don't Know	3	3	3
	(N=686)	(N=477)	(N=196)

**Attention to Claremont Debate**

<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b><u>Very Closely</u> 20%</b>	<b><u>Moderately Closely</u> 30%</b>	<b><u>Only Somewhat</u> 23%</b>	<b><u>Not Closely</u> 25%</b>	<b><u>Don't Know</u> 2%</b>	<b><u>(N)</u> 705</b>
Reg. Democrat	30	29	17	23	2	118
Reg. Independent	13	29	24	31	2	388
Reg. Republican	30	33	24	12	1	177
Registered to vote	27	32	24	16	1	482
Not registered	4	27	21	44	4	201
Liberal	22	32	16	29	2	123
Moderate	20	35	23	21	1	293
Conservative	23	24	28	24	2	209
1st District	21	28	22	26	2	388
2nd District	18	33	23	23	2	317
Donor town	35	23	24	19	0	92
Receiver town	18	31	23	26	3	612
Union household	32	35	18	16	0	80
Non-union household	19	29	24	26	2	588
18 to 29	2	23	28	42	5	98
30 to 45	16	37	22	24	2	247
46 to 64	29	29	21	20	1	201
65 and over	29	25	22	24	1	106
Male	23	32	20	23	2	336
Female	17	28	26	26	2	370
High school or less	12	27	21	37	3	224
Some college	19	26	29	26	0	188
College graduate	27	36	20	16	2	170
Post-graduate	34	38	20	9	0	86
Less than \$20,000	14	17	23	44	1	58
\$20,000 to \$39,999	14	28	28	29	1	109
\$40,000 to \$59,999	20	35	24	18	3	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	30	30	20	17	3	129
\$100,000 or more	24	47	17	12	0	55
Married	26	33	20	19	2	443
Widowed	17	21	31	29	1	41
Divorced	14	32	29	25	1	73
Never Married	5	22	25	44	3	115
Own home	25	33	20	21	1	499
Rent home	10	20	30	37	3	148
Protestant	24	36	17	22	2	215
Catholic	20	28	27	23	2	257

**Support or Oppose Current Funding Law**

<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b><u>Strongly Support</u></b> <b>14%</b>	<b><u>Moderately Support</u></b> <b>31%</b>	<b><u>Moderately Oppose</u></b> <b>17%</b>	<b><u>Strongly Oppose</u></b> <b>28%</b>	<b><u>Don't Know</u></b> <b>10%</b>	<b><u>(N)</u></b> <b>704</b>
Reg. Democrat	14	35	17	23	10	118
Reg. Independent	14	33	17	25	11	388
Reg. Republican	11	25	18	39	7	177
Registered to vote	13	29	18	33	8	482
Not registered	16	38	15	18	14	201
Liberal	20	36	11	24	8	123
Moderate	13	31	18	30	8	292
Conservative	12	28	18	31	10	209
1st District	14	32	17	27	10	386
2nd District	13	29	17	30	10	317
Donor town	5	22	23	38	12	92
Receiver town	15	32	16	27	10	612
Union household	15	33	18	25	9	80
Non-union household	13	31	17	29	9	588
18 to 29	21	39	9	18	13	98
30 to 45	15	34	17	25	10	247
46 to 64	11	30	18	34	6	201
65 and over	11	21	18	38	12	106
Male	13	32	14	33	8	334
Female	15	30	19	24	12	370
High school or less	14	31	17	25	14	224
Some college	14	26	14	35	10	188
College graduate	11	39	16	29	5	170
Post-graduate	16	31	23	24	6	86
Less than \$20,000	17	30	22	19	12	58
\$20,000 to \$39,999	16	25	17	33	10	109
\$40,000 to \$59,999	12	33	15	25	14	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	14	38	17	28	3	129
\$100,000 or more	16	39	13	28	5	55
Married	13	29	18	31	9	442
Widowed	11	28	19	28	14	41
Divorced	12	35	15	34	5	74
Never Married	18	38	13	17	13	115
Own home	10	31	17	33	10	499
Rent home	26	31	18	18	7	148
Protestant	11	31	19	30	9	215
Catholic	16	33	18	26	7	257

**More Likely to Vote FOR or Against Senator who Favors Income Tax**

	<b><u>More Likely Vote FOR</u></b> 32%	<b><u>No Difference</u></b> 14%	<b><u>More Likely Vote AGAINST</u></b> 50%	<b><u>Don't Know</u></b> 3%	<b><u>(N)</u></b> 694
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
Reg. Democrat	47	13	37	2	118
Reg. Independent	27	16	53	4	385
Reg. Republican	31	9	57	2	176
Registered to vote	36	11	50	3	480
Not registered	21	19	55	5	199
Liberal	47	15	36	2	123
Moderate	33	13	50	4	290
Conservative	22	15	60	2	208
1st District	28	13	56	3	383
2nd District	38	16	43	3	311
Donor town	36	9	51	4	90
Receiver town	32	15	50	3	604
Union household	41	6	49	4	79
Non-union household	31	15	51	3	585
18 to 29	16	31	49	3	98
30 to 45	35	11	51	3	246
46 to 64	31	11	55	3	199
65 and over	42	12	43	3	105
Male	28	12	57	2	332
Female	36	16	44	4	362
High school or less	27	17	51	5	224
Some college	27	12	58	3	186
College graduate	36	16	47	1	167
Post-graduate	50	3	44	4	86
Less than \$20,000	28	23	45	4	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	24	12	62	3	108
\$40,000 to \$59,999	33	19	46	1	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	44	11	45	0	128
\$100,000 or more	26	15	58	1	55
Married	37	11	49	3	439
Widowed	26	13	58	3	40
Divorced	29	15	52	4	73
Never Married	20	23	53	4	115
Own home	36	11	50	3	495
Rent home	23	19	54	4	148
Protestant	34	13	51	2	211
Catholic	31	13	53	3	257

**More Likely to Vote FOR or Against Senator who Favors Sales Tax**

	<u>More Likely Vote FOR</u> 35%	<u>No Difference</u> 16%	<u>More Likely Vote AGAINST</u> 47%	<u>Don't Know</u> 2%	<u>(N)</u> 697
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
Reg. Democrat	41	17	42	0	118
Reg. Independent	32	17	48	3	387
Reg. Republican	38	11	48	2	177
Registered to vote	39	13	46	2	482
Not registered	27	21	49	4	200
Liberal	37	16	46	2	123
Moderate	38	15	44	2	293
Conservative	32	15	53	1	209
1st District	36	16	46	2	384
2nd District	34	16	48	2	312
Donor town	40	12	44	3	90
Receiver town	34	16	47	2	606
Union household	37	22	41	0	80
Non-union household	35	15	48	2	587
18 to 29	12	21	67	0	98
30 to 45	41	15	40	4	247
46 to 64	36	12	51	1	200
65 and over	41	20	36	3	106
Male	33	14	51	1	333
Female	37	17	43	3	363
High school or less	29	20	48	2	224
Some college	38	14	46	2	188
College graduate	36	11	53	1	169
Post-graduate	42	14	40	3	86
Less than \$20,000	26	25	49	0	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	36	14	49	1	109
\$40,000 to \$59,999	30	20	46	4	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	39	15	46	0	129
\$100,000 or more	33	17	50	0	55
Married	38	14	46	2	443
Widowed	39	21	35	5	40
Divorced	35	12	50	3	73
Never Married	24	20	56	1	115
Own home	38	14	46	2	498
Rent home	26	19	54	1	148
Protestant	38	12	47	2	215
Catholic	31	19	49	2	257

**More Likely to Vote FOR or Against Senator who Favors State-wide Property Tax**

	<b>More Likely Vote FOR 19%</b>	<b>No Difference 21%</b>	<b>More Likely Vote AGAINST 56%</b>	<b>Don't Know 3%</b>	<b>(N) 693</b>
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
Reg. Democrat	21	20	55	4	118
Reg. Independent	19	22	56	2	384
Reg. Republican	20	18	57	5	177
Registered to vote	20	20	57	3	481
Not registered	21	22	55	3	198
Liberal	21	21	55	3	123
Moderate	19	23	56	3	290
Conservative	20	17	59	4	209
1st District	19	20	58	3	383
2nd District	20	22	54	3	310
Donor town	14	20	62	4	91
Receiver town	20	21	56	3	603
Union household	17	26	54	3	79
Non-union household	20	20	57	3	585
18 to 29	20	26	54	0	98
30 to 45	23	22	51	3	245
46 to 64	17	15	65	3	199
65 and over	14	25	55	6	106
Male	20	20	57	3	333
Female	19	22	56	4	360
High school or less	16	23	59	2	223
Some college	16	22	59	3	186
College graduate	28	19	50	3	169
Post-graduate	22	15	57	6	86
Less than \$20,000	15	30	54	2	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	17	20	59	4	108
\$40,000 to \$59,999	26	14	56	4	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	21	22	54	3	129
\$100,000 or more	17	29	52	2	55
Married	20	21	57	2	439
Widowed	15	21	56	8	40
Divorced	17	16	61	6	73
Never Married	23	23	52	3	115
Own home	18	19	59	4	495
Rent home	21	25	53	1	148
Protestant	19	19	57	5	213
Catholic	21	21	56	3	257

**More Likely to Vote FOR or Against Senator who Favors Legalized Gambling**

	<u>More Likely Vote FOR</u> 36%	<u>No Difference</u> 18%	<u>More Likely Vote AGAINST</u> 44%	<u>Don't Know</u> 2%	<u>(N)</u> 698
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
Reg. Democrat	30	11	58	1	118
Reg. Independent	40	20	38	2	387
Reg. Republican	33	16	49	3	177
Registered to vote	33	17	49	2	482
Not registered	45	19	33	3	200
Liberal	33	18	47	2	123
Moderate	39	19	41	1	293
Conservative	36	14	47	2	209
1st District	41	16	42	2	384
2nd District	31	20	48	2	314
Donor town	32	12	53	3	91
Receiver town	37	19	43	2	607
Union household	39	12	49	0	80
Non-union household	37	18	43	2	587
18 to 29	42	22	36	1	98
30 to 45	33	17	48	2	247
46 to 64	45	13	41	1	200
65 and over	25	23	50	3	106
Male	43	18	38	2	333
Female	30	18	50	2	365
High school or less	38	21	39	2	224
Some college	43	16	40	1	188
College graduate	33	14	52	1	169
Post-graduate	27	17	54	3	86
Less than \$20,000	27	27	45	1	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	41	20	39	1	109
\$40,000 to \$59,999	35	16	48	1	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	40	14	45	1	129
\$100,000 or more	47	19	34	0	55
Married	33	17	48	2	443
Widowed	40	14	43	3	40
Divorced	45	18	34	3	73
Never Married	43	20	36	0	115
Own home	34	17	47	2	498
Rent home	45	17	36	1	148
Protestant	28	14	57	1	215
Catholic	43	19	37	2	257

**More Likely to Vote FOR or Against Senator who Favors Constitutional Amendment Reversing Claremont**

	<u>More Likely Vote FOR</u> 34%	<u>No Difference</u> 19%	<u>More Likely Vote AGAINST</u> 42%	<u>Don't Know</u> 5%	<u>(N)</u> 694
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
Reg. Democrat	26	19	51	5	118
Reg. Independent	29	20	44	6	386
Reg. Republican	49	14	32	4	177
Registered to vote	36	16	43	4	482
Not registered	29	23	40	8	198
Liberal	24	16	54	6	123
Moderate	31	20	46	4	292
Conservative	43	18	33	6	209
1st District	37	17	42	4	383
2nd District	30	21	43	7	312
Donor town	52	11	32	6	91
Receiver town	31	20	44	5	604
Union household	32	14	53	1	80
Non-union household	34	20	41	6	585
18 to 29	26	23	45	5	98
30 to 45	30	19	46	5	246
46 to 64	42	12	43	4	200
65 and over	32	32	29	7	106
Male	36	19	41	4	333
Female	32	18	43	6	361
High school or less	30	28	36	6	222
Some college	38	18	39	5	188
College graduate	37	10	47	5	169
Post-graduate	29	11	56	3	86
Less than \$20,000	26	35	33	5	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	33	16	45	5	109
\$40,000 to \$59,999	30	13	49	8	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	40	15	42	3	129
\$100,000 or more	45	18	34	2	55
Married	35	15	45	4	442
Widowed	35	33	23	9	39
Divorced	31	23	40	7	73
Never Married	29	24	40	6	115
Own home	34	17	44	5	497
Rent home	30	23	43	4	147
Protestant	36	18	43	4	215
Catholic	34	20	40	6	257

**Preferred Proposal Regarding Education Funding**

	<u>Income Tax</u> 22%	<u>Sales Tax</u> 21%	<u>Property Tax</u> 7%	<u>Legalized Gambling</u> 22%	<u>Const. Amend.</u> 16%	<u>Current System</u> 8%	<u>Comb- ination</u> 1%	<u>Don't Know</u> 3%	<u>(N)</u> 686
<b>STATEWIDE</b>									
Reg. Democrat	40	20	4	19	9	4	0	4	116
Reg. Independent	17	20	7	28	14	10	2	3	381
Reg. Republican	21	23	9	11	25	6	1	5	177
Registered to vote	27	22	7	18	16	6	1	3	477
Not registered	10	17	6	33	15	14	1	3	196
Liberal	33	22	5	21	9	5	1	6	123
Moderate	25	20	6	25	14	5	1	3	288
Conservative	13	22	7	20	26	10	1	2	207
1st District	17	22	5	25	18	8	1	4	378
2nd District	28	20	9	18	14	7	1	3	308
Donor town	28	21	8	8	30	4	1	0	90
Receiver town	21	21	6	24	14	8	1	4	595
Union household	28	21	4	25	18	2	0	2	80
Non-union household	21	21	7	22	16	8	1	4	578
18 to 29	9	12	5	41	17	12	2	3	98
30 to 45	21	26	9	17	17	9	1	2	244
46 to 64	22	20	6	25	18	5	1	2	197
65 and over	35	18	5	12	14	5	0	11	106
Male	21	19	7	26	19	5	1	2	328
Female	23	22	6	18	13	10	1	5	359
High school or less	15	20	6	28	15	9	1	5	220
Some college	15	23	5	25	19	9	1	3	186
College graduate	28	21	8	21	16	4	0	2	166
Post-graduate	41	19	8	6	17	5	1	3	86
Less than \$20,000	19	15	6	24	13	13	2	8	57
\$20,000 to \$39,999	15	21	4	26	20	8	1	4	106
\$40,000 to \$59,999	17	25	11	27	10	6	0	4	102
\$60,000 to \$99,000	31	19	5	19	20	5	0	1	129
\$100,000 or more	25	20	6	24	20	2	0	2	55
Married	26	21	7	19	17	6	1	2	434
Widowed	18	25	5	18	16	7	0	11	41
Divorced	19	20	5	23	13	12	2	6	72
Never Married	12	17	6	36	15	9	1	4	115
Own home	26	22	7	19	17	6	1	3	490
Rent home	12	19	4	32	14	14	2	4	147
Protestant	25	21	8	14	18	8	0	4	213
Catholic	21	19	5	28	16	7	1	3	253