

## **The 2005 Ohio Ballot Initiatives: Public Opinion on Issues 1-5**

Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics  
University of Akron

### **Executive Summary**

A survey of Ohio citizens finds mixed results for the 2005 ballot issues, all proposed amendments to the Ohio constitution. Issues 1 (Bond Issue) and Issue 2 (Early Voting) had considerable support and appear likely to pass if present conditions hold. Although Issue 3 (Campaign Finance) is evenly divided among citizens who are aware of it, the measure enjoys a reservoir of public support. Although Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission) and Issue 5 (State Elections Board) are ahead among aware citizens, they appear to lack deep public support. In addition, there is strong backing for a Tax Expenditure Limitation measure not on the 2005 ballot but that may be on the ballot in 2006. Each measure had its own pattern of support in the public.

### **The Study**

This report is based on a survey of a random sample of the Ohio citizens interviewed by telephone between September 28 and October 20, 2005 at the University of Akron Survey Research Center. The number of respondents was 1,076 and the margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. This survey is part of a broader study of ballot initiatives in Ohio politics.

### **Introduction**

Ballot initiatives have long been an important part of Ohio politics, especially amendments to the state constitution. However, the five constitutional amendments on the ballot in the 2005 off-year election is unusual.

One such measure, Issue 1, entitled “Jobs for Ohio,” was placed on the ballot by the state legislature. It would authorize the issuance of \$2 billion dollars in general obligation bonds for the purpose of constructing roads and bridges; investment in research and development; and the preparation of local industrial sites.

The remaining four measures were sponsored by “Reform Ohio Now” and put on the ballot by petition. These measures include Issue 2 (allowing early voting); Issue 3 (revising the campaign finance laws); Issue 4 (establishing a new redistricting commission); and Issue 5 (replacing the secretary of state as chief elections officer with a state elections board).

A sixth proposed measure, a Tax Expenditure Limitation measure, would have qualified for the 2005 ballot by petition, but was withdrawn by its sponsor, Citizens for Tax Reform. It may appear on the 2006 general election ballot.

### **Findings**

This survey contained two measures of public attitudes for each of the ballot measures. First, respondents were asked if they had “heard or read anything” about each of the issues. Respondents that reported being aware of the measure were asked if they favored or opposed the measure. Second, all respondents were presented with two statements about each ballot measure, one an argument in favor and one an argument against, and asked to choose the statement that best reflected their own views.

Table 1 presents the answers to the first type of question (the opinion of citizens who were aware of the measure) in the first column, and then reports answers to the second question (all citizens’ choice of arguments) in the third column.

In essence, the first column in Table 1 reports what the election results would be if only the aware citizens voted, while the third column in Table 1 reports what the results would be if all the citizens voted. Both these assumptions about turnout are likely to be wrong.

A more realistic answer is offered in the second column in Table 1: the opinion of likely voters. “Likely Voters” were determined on the basis of past voting behavior as well as interest and knowledge of the 2005 campaign. These data assume a turnout rate of 38%, the average turnout in the last four off-year elections (2003, 2001, 1999 and 1997).

Taken together the three columns in Table 1 provide a sense of the 2005 campaign two weeks in advance of the election. The “Aware Citizens” column provides a sense of effect of the campaign right before the final push to Election Day. The “Likely Voters” column provides a historical based line for the campaign’s results. The “All Citizens” column reports the underlying opinion on the measures.

**Table 1. 2005 Ballot Measures: Range of Likely Election Results**

		<i>Aware Citizens</i>	<i>Likely Voters</i>	<i>All Citizens</i>
<b>Issue 1 (Bond Issue)</b>	<i>Favor</i>	66.7	61.8	66.6
	<i>Oppose</i>	33.3	38.2	33.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Issue 2 (Early Voting)</b>	<i>Favor</i>	66.7	63.8	64.0
	<i>Oppose</i>	33.3	36.2	36.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Issue 3 (Campaign Finance)</b>	<i>Favor</i>	50.8	61.2	59.0
	<i>Oppose</i>	49.2	38.8	41.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission)</b>	<i>Favor</i>	56.1	43.5	39.6
	<i>Oppose</i>	43.9	56.5	60.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Issue 5 (State Election Board)</b>	<i>Favor</i>	52.7	42.5	42.1
	<i>Oppose</i>	47.3	57.5	57.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Legend:**

“*Aware Citizens*”: Respondents who reported hearing or reading about the measure and who had an opinion for or against;

“*Likely Voters*”: Respondents who are like to vote based on past voting behavior, interest and knowledge of the 2005 campaign;

“*All Citizens*”: All respondents who expressed an opinion when offered arguments for and against the measure.

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=1076)  
(Margin of error plus or minus 3 percentage points)*

**Issue 1 (Bond Issue).** The results for Issue 1 are based on the following questions:

1. One proposed amendment authorizes \$2 billion dollars in general obligation bonds to improve roads and bridges, fund research and development programs, such as at state universities, and prepare local sites for commercial development.

Have you read or heard anything about this bond amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed bond amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*The new bonds are a good idea because they will create jobs in Ohio.*

*The new bonds are a bad idea because they will create long-term debt for Ohioans.*

The Aware Citizens backed the issue 66.7 to 33.3, a position almost identical to the views of All Citizens. Interestingly, the Likely Voters were a little less supportive, with a 62% majority. Unless there is a significant change in public opinion or an unusual pattern of turnout, Issue 1 is appears likely to pass.

**Issue 2 (Early Voting).** The results for Issue 2 are based on the following questions:

1. Another proposed constitutional amendment would allow registered voters to cast an absentee ballot up to 35 days before Election Day by mail or in person, for any reason they wish.

Have you read or heard anything about this early voting amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed early voting amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*Early voting is a good idea because it will make voting more convenient.*

*Early voting is a bad idea because it will increase voter fraud.*

Here, too, the Aware Citizens backed the measure two-to-one. Support from All Citizens and Likely Voters is only slightly less at about 64%. Banning a significant change in opinion or an unusual turnout pattern, Issue 2 seems likely to pass.

**Issue 3 (Campaign Finance).** The results for Issue 3 are based on the following questions:

1. Another proposed amendment would change the campaign contribution rules in Ohio. For example, it would reduce the maximum contribution one person could make to a state-wide candidate from \$10,000 dollars to \$2,000 dollars, and allow labor unions to use members' dues to influence state elections.

Have you read or heard anything about this campaign finance amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed campaign finance amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*The new campaign contribution rules are a good idea because they will reduce corruption.*

*The new contribution rules are a bad idea because they will make elections less competitive.*

A different pattern holds for Issue 3. A tiny majority favored the measure among the Aware Citizens (50.8%), but All Citizens backed the measure by a substantial 59% majority. Likely Voters had even stronger support, at better than three-fifths. Thus there is a reservoir of public support for this measure.

**Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission).** The results for Issue 4 are based on the following questions:

1. Still another proposed amendment would create a new five-member non-partisan commission appointed with the help of judges to redraw the lines for congressional and state legislative districts. The commission would be required to make competitive elections a primary factor in drawing new district lines.

Have you read or heard anything about this redistricting commission amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed redistricting commission amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*The redistricting commission is a good idea because legislative elections will become more competitive.*

*The redistricting commission is a bad idea because the commission won't be accountable to the voters.*

On this measure, the Aware Citizens showed a solid majority in favor (56%). However, All Citizens were opposed to it, with only about two-fifths support; Likely Voters were only a little more supportive. These data suggest that the proponents have persuaded citizens who are aware of the measure and that the measure could succeed if this pattern were extended more broadly. However, the lack of deep public support, at least as measured by these questions, poses a major challenge.

**Issue 5 (State Election Board).** The results for Issue 5 are based on the following questions:

1. Yet another proposed amendment would replace the Secretary of State as the chief election administrator with an appointed bi-partisan state election board with nine members each serving for nine years.

Have you read or heard anything about this state elections board amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed state elections board amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*A state election board is a good idea because it will make election administration bipartisan.*

*A state election board is a bad idea because it takes away the voters' right to vote for the chief election administrator.*

The results for this measure resembled Issue 4. The Aware Citizens backed the issue with a slim majority (52%), but All Citizens supported the measure at a lower 42% level; the Likely Voters had about the same level of support. As with Issue 4, this pattern suggests that, on balance, citizens who are aware of the measure have been persuaded to support it. However, the underlying opinion presents a challenge to extend this persuasion more broadly.

The evidence in Table 1 must be viewed with caution. After all, survey data represents a snap shot of opinion at a particular point in time. It may be that the last two weeks of the campaign will dramatically change public opinion or

produce an unusual pattern of turnout. Many of these measures are complex and it is possible that arguments other than presented in the survey will become important. Nonetheless, these results are a useful description of the conditions in the final weeks of the 2005 campaign.

**Public Interest in the 2005 Ballot Measures.** The evidence in Table 2 lends some credence to the numbers in Table 1. The first entry assesses the extent to which support or opposition to the ballot measures will motivate respondents to turnout on Election Day. Here 37.8% of respondents said the ballot measures were “very motivating.” This figure is nearly equal to the average turnout for past off-year elections used in the Likely Voters estimate.

**Table 2. Ballot Measures as a Motivation to Vote in 2005, Interest in 2005 Ballot Measures, and General Views of Ballot Measures**

		<i>All Citizens</i>
<b>How much is support or opposition to the ballot measures a motivation to vote in 2005?</b>	<i>Very motivating</i>	37.8
	<i>Somewhat motivating</i>	34.8
	<i>A little motivating</i>	13.5
	<i>Not at all motivating</i>	13.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Interest level in 2005 ballot measures</b>	<i>Very interested</i>	33.8
	<i>Fairly interested</i>	46.8
	<i>Not too interested</i>	13.0
	<i>Not at all interested</i>	6.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Views on voting for ballot measures in general</b>	<i>Amendments are a good idea because voters should have a voice in these questions</i>	82.8
	<i>Amendments are a bad idea because voters lack knowledge to decide these questions</i>	17.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=1076)  
(Margin of error plus or minus 3 percentage points)*

The second entry in Table 2 reports the level of interest in the 2005 ballot measures. Here 33.8% of the respondents said they were “very interested” in the campaign to date, a figure of roughly the same size as the “very motivated” respondents.

Finally, it is worth noting that Ohioans strongly approve of voting on ballot measures, especially constitutional amendments: more than two-fifths agreed that “Amendments are a good idea because voters should have a voice in these questions.”

**Tax Expenditure Limitation Measure.** Table 3 presents evidence for the Tax Expenditure Limitation measure, which is not on the 2005 ballot. These results were based on the following question:

1. Now I would like to ask you about a proposed constitutional amendment that may be on the ballot NEXT YEAR in 2006. It would limit the increase in state government spending in any year to the rate of inflation plus population increase or 3.5 percent, whichever is higher, unless a majority of the voters authorize a larger increase.

Have you read or heard anything about this proposed state spending limitation amendment?

Given what you have heard so far do you favor or oppose the proposed state spending limitation amendment, or have you not made up your mind?

2. Which of the following statements comes CLOSEST to your view?

*A state spending limitation is a good idea because it will keep taxes from going up.*

*A state spending limitation is a bad idea because it will require cuts in public services.*

Among the Aware Citizens, 64% supported this measure, a figure a bit lower than the 68% among All Citizens and the 66.6% among Likely Voters. These data suggest that, at least in the abstract, this measure is popular with the public. It is hard to tell if such numbers would hold up in an actual campaign, however.

**Table 3. Views of Proposed Tax Expenditure Limitation Measure (Not on the Ballot in 2005)**

		<i>Aware Citizens</i>	<i>Likely Voters</i>	<i>All Citizens</i>
<b>Proposed Tax Expenditure Limitation Measure</b>	<i>Favor</i>	64.2	66.6	68.1
	<i>Oppose</i>	35.8	33.4	31.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Legend:**

*“Aware Citizens”*: Respondents who reported hearing or reading about the measure and who had an opinion for or against;

*“Likely Voters”*: Respondents who are like to vote based on past voting behavior, interest and knowledge of the 2005 campaign;

*“All Citizens”*: All respondents who expressed an opinion when offered arguments for and against the measure.

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=1076)  
(Margin of error plus or minus 3 percentage points)*

**Level of Awareness of the 2005 Ballot Issues.** One of the challenges facing issue campaigns in off-year elections is making citizens aware of the ballot measures. Table 4 reveals that the level of awareness was low and varied from measure to measure.

Issue 2 (Early Voting) had the highest awareness level, with 30% of the respondents claiming to have heard or read something about it. Issues 4 (Redistricting Commission) and 3 (Campaign Finance) had lower levels of awareness, at about one-fifth each. Issues 1 (Bond Issues) and 5 (State Election Board) followed, with less than one-fifth of the respondents aware of either.

The Tax Expenditure Limitation had the least public awareness, at just one-tenth of the respondents. Of course, this proposed measure is not actually on the ballot in 2005 and thus subject to much less discussion.

Overall, almost one-half of the respondents were aware of at least one of the 2005 ballot measures.

The levels of public awareness may well increase in the final two weeks of the campaign. However, it is likely that many voters may enter polling places without a clear awareness of these measures and may vote for one or more of the measures based on the ballot language itself.

#### Table 4. Awareness of Ballot Measures, 2005

*Have you read or heard anything about:*

	Percent "Yes"
<b>Issue 1 (Bond Issue)</b>	18.4
<b>Issue 2 (Early Voting)</b>	30.2
<b>Issue 3 (Campaign Finance)</b>	21.9
<b>Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission)</b>	22.0
<b>Issue 5 (State Election Board)</b>	15.6
<b>Proposed Tax Expenditure Limitation Measure</b>	10.2
<b>Heard of at Least One Ballot Measure</b>	49.8

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=1076)  
(Margin of error plus or minus 3 percentage points)*

**Support for Issue 1 (Bond Issue).** Table 5 reports the characteristics of Issue 1 supporters among Likely Voters. (The patterns for Aware Citizens were typically sharper versions of these differences.)

Partisanship and ideology did not differentiate Issue 1 supporters, with Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, reporting about the same level of support. However, respondents who reported feeling "disgusted" with Ohio politics were less supportive.

There were some important demographic differences. Respondents under 35 years of age were more likely to back Issue 1 than respondents over 55 years old (70.8 to 62.5%). Blacks were more supportive than whites (67.6 to 61.8%).

Interestingly, respondents with Post-graduate educations backed Issue 1 (68%) but those with college degrees were less supportive (55%). More affluent respondents also backed Issue 1 at a higher rate than the less affluent (64.8 to 57.5%).

**Table 5. Support for Issue 1 (Bond Issue), Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>ALL</b>		<b>61.8</b>	<b>38.2</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	63.5	36.5
	Independent	59.7	40.3
	Republican	63.6	36.4
Ideology	Liberal	58.5	41.5
	Moderate	65.3	34.7
	Conservative	60.7	39.3
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	56.2	43.8
	In between	65.0	35.0
	Satisfied	62.5	37.5
Gender	Male	63.3	36.7
	Female	60.2	39.8
Age	Less than 35 Years	70.8	29.2
	35 to 54 years	59.2	40.8
	55 years or older	61.8	38.2
Race	White	61.8	38.2
	Black	67.6	32.4
	Other	52.4	47.6
Education	High school or less	62.1	37.9
	Some college	61.3	38.7
	College graduate	55.1	44.9
	Post-graduate	68.4	31.6
Income	Under \$36,000	57.5	42.5
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	65.8	34.2
	Over \$72,000	64.8	35.2
Labor union member		68.1	31.9
Christian conservative group member		64.2	35.8

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

Members of labor unions favored Issue 1 (68%) and members of Christian conservative groups did as well (64%). (White born again Christians had about the same level of support as all Likely Voters, 60.9%).

**Support for Issue 2 (Early Voting).** Table 6 reports the characteristics of Issue 2 supporters among Likely Voters. (The patterns for Aware Citizens were typically sharper versions of these differences.)

**Table 6. Support for Issue 2 (Early Voting), Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>All</b>		<b>63.7</b>	<b>36.3</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	69.0	31.0
	Independent	66.4	33.6
	Republican	53.5	46.5
Ideology	Liberal	73.8	26.2
	Moderate	68.5	31.5
	Conservative	48.8	51.2
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	66.2	33.8
	In between	64.4	35.6
	Satisfied	51.5	48.5
Gender	Male	61.0	39.0
	Female	66.8	33.2
Age	Less than 35 Years	67.3	32.7
	35 to 54 years	65.9	34.1
	55 years or older	60.5	39.5
Race	White	63.8	36.2
	Black	62.5	37.5
	Other	65.2	34.8
Education	High school or less	63.4	36.6
	Some college	58.8	41.2
	College graduate	67.1	32.9
	Post-graduate	68.7	31.3
Income	Under \$36,000	57.4	42.6
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	61.7	38.3
	Over \$72,000	71.4	28.6
Labor union member		58.3	41.7
Christian conservative group member		62.7	37.3

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

Partisanship and ideology were important factors with regard to Issue 1, with Democrats (69%) favoring the measure more than Republicans (53.5%). Respondents “disgusted” with Ohio politics (66.2%) favored more than those who reported being “satisfied” (51.5%).

Women supported Issue 2 (66.8%), and younger respondents were more supportive than older ones (67.3 to 60.5%). Better educated respondents also favored Issue 2 more than the less well educated (for example, 68.7% of those with post-graduate education compared to just 58.8% of those with some college.) The affluent also backed Issue 2 more than the less affluent (71.4 to 57.4%).

Interestingly, labor union members were less supportive than Likely Voters as a whole (58.3%).

**Support for Issue 3 (Campaign Finance).** Table 7 reports the characteristics of Issue 3 supporters among Likely Voters. (The patterns for Aware Citizens were typically sharper versions of these differences.)

Backing for Issue 3 was sharply divided along party lines (Democrats 72%, Republicans 42.5%) and by ideology (Liberals 75.9% and Conservatives 42.1%). A similar difference appeared between those “disgusted” with Ohio politics (68.6% for) and those that were “satisfied” (37.5%).

Women were far more supportive of Issue 3 than men (65.9 to 56.8%) and blacks more than whites (70.3 to 60.9%). And there was a sharp difference between those with post-graduate and college educations (65.4 to 50%).

Labor Union members strongly backed Issue 3 (78.7%), while members of Christian conservative groups were less supportive (52.8%).

**Table 7. Support for Issue 3 (Campaign Finance), Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>All</b>		<b>61.4</b>	<b>38.6</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	72.0	28.0
	Independent	65.0	35.0
	Republican	42.5	57.5
Ideology	Liberal	75.9	24.1
	Moderate	66.1	33.9
	Conservative	42.1	57.9
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	68.6	31.4
	In between	60.7	39.3
	Satisfied	37.5	62.5
Gender	Male	56.8	43.2
	Female	65.9	34.1
Age	Less than 35 Years	60.4	39.6
	35 to 54 years	62.7	37.3
	55 years or older	59.4	40.6
Race	White	60.9	39.1
	Black	70.3	29.7
	Other	50.0	50.0
Education	High school or less	60.4	39.6
	Some college	65.6	34.4
	College graduate	50.0	50.0
	Post-graduate	65.4	34.6
Income	Under \$36,000	61.9	38.1
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	61.8	38.2
	Over \$72,000	60.2	39.8
Labor union member		78.7	21.3
Christian conservative group member		52.8	47.2

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

**Support for Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission).** Table 8 reports the characteristics of Issue 4 supporters among Likely Voters. (The patterns for Aware Citizens were typically sharper versions of these differences.)

**Table 8. Support for Issue 4 (Redistricting Commission), Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>All</b>		<b>43.7</b>	<b>56.3</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	55.8	44.2
	Independent	48.3	51.7
	Republican	21.7	78.3
Ideology	Liberal	60.7	39.3
	Moderate	48.5	51.5
	Conservative	23.7	76.3
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	50.0	50.0
	In between	41.2	58.8
	Satisfied	35.5	64.5
Gender	Male	42.6	57.4
	Female	44.5	55.5
Age	Less than 35 Years	59.1	40.9
	35 to 54 years	43.1	56.9
	55 years or older	40.4	59.6
Race	White	43.9	56.1
	Black	52.8	47.2
	Other	22.7	77.3
Education	High school or less	35.8	64.2
	Some college	42.4	57.6
	College graduate	43.6	56.4
	Post-graduate	55.1	44.9
Income	Under \$36,000	34.8	65.2
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	48.4	51.6
	Over \$72,000	50.9	49.1
Labor union member		56.3	43.8
Christian conservative group member		20.0	80.0

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

A partisan and ideological gap appears in the support for Issue 4, but with lower levels of backing compared to Issue 3: 55.8% of Democrats supported the measure compared to 21.7% of Republicans; 60.7% of liberals did as well compared to 23.7% of conservatives. A similar pattern was obtained for those “disgusted” with Ohio politics (50%) and “satisfied” (35.5%).

Younger respondents favored Issue 4 (59.1%) as did blacks (52.8%) and those with post-graduate training (55.1%) and high incomes (50.9%).

A majority of labor union members supported Issue 4 (56.3%), but few members of Christian conservative groups (20%).

**Support for Issue 5 (State Election Board).** Table 9 reports the characteristics of Issue 5 supporters among Likely Voters.

There were few political differences in the support of Issue 5, with just a mild tendency of Democrats to back the measure more than Republicans. Blacks were more opposed than Likely Voters as a whole (34.2%), while the best educated (51.4%) and the most affluent (49%) were more supportive.

**Table 9. Support for Issue 5 (State election board), Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>All</b>		<b>42.9</b>	<b>57.1</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	44.0	56.0
	Independent	44.7	55.3
	Republican	39.2	60.8
Ideology	Liberal	43.4	56.6
	Moderate	44.6	55.4
	Conservative	40.6	59.4
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	43.1	56.9
	In between	41.0	59.0
	Satisfied	46.4	53.6
Gender	Male	44.4	55.6
	Female	40.5	59.5
Age	Less than 35 Years	42.9	57.1
	35 to 54 years	45.0	55.0
	55 years or older	40.4	59.6
Race	White	44.0	56.0
	Black	34.2	65.8
	Other	35.0	65.0
Education	High school or less	43.3	56.7
	Some college	38.1	61.9
	College graduate	39.4	60.6
	Post-graduate	51.4	48.6
Income	Under \$36,000	40.5	59.5
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	40.2	59.8
	Over \$72,000	49.0	51.0
Labor union member		46.7	53.3
Christian conservative group member		41.2	58.8

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

**Support for the Proposed Tax Expenditure Limitation Measure.** Table 10 reports the characteristics of the Tax Expenditure Limitation measure among Likely Voters. (The patterns for Aware Citizens were typically sharper versions of these differences.)

**Table 10. Support for Proposed Tax Expenditure Limitation, Likely Voters**

		Favor	Oppose
<b>All</b>		<b>66.0</b>	<b>34.0</b>
Partisanship	Democrat	53.1	46.9
	Independent	69.2	30.8
	Republican	79.3	20.7
Ideology	Liberal	48.1	51.9
	Moderate	62.9	37.1
	Conservative	83.1	16.9
View of Ohio Politics	Disgusted	56.7	43.3
	In between	69.3	30.7
	Satisfied	80.6	19.4
Gender	Male	69.7	30.3
	Female	63.1	36.9
Age	Less than 35 Years	60.0	40.0
	35 to 54 years	68.5	31.5
	55 years or older	66.1	33.9
Race	White	67.5	32.5
	Black	59.5	40.5
	Other	65.2	34.8
Education	High school or less	79.2	20.8
	Some college	66.2	33.8
	College graduate	66.7	33.3
	Post-graduate	51.3	48.7
Income	Under \$36,000	70.2	29.8
	\$36,000 to \$72,000	64.8	35.2
	Over \$72,000	67.0	33.0
Labor union member		58.7	41.3
Christian conservative group member		86.0	14.0

*Source: Akron Buckeye Poll, September 28-October 20 (N=409 for Likely Voters; margin of error plus or minus 5 percentage points)*

Support for this proposed measure was sharply drawn on partisan lines, with 79.3 of Republicans in favor and 53.1% of Democrats). An even stronger division occurred between conservatives (83.1%) and liberals (48.1%). Meanwhile, respondents “disgusted” with Ohio politics were much less supportive (56.7%) than those who were “satisfied” (80.6%).

Interestingly, 79.2% of respondents with high school educations or less favored this measure compared to just 51.3% of those with post-graduate educations.

Labor union members were less supportive of this proposed measure than members of Christian conservative groups (58.7 to 86%).