

A Study of 2011 Ohio Ballot Measures:

Issues 2 and 3

[October 28, 2011]

Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics

University of Akron

Executive Summary

An in-depth study of the 2011 Ohio ballot measures finds that registered voters oppose Issue 2 (on public employee collective bargaining) by a double-digit margin (37.1% to 25.3%). At the same time, voters favor Issue 3 (on the national health care law) by a double-digit margin as well (33.8% to 18.3%).

However, voter opinion on these issues is fluid and changeable, with a large number of voters lacking firm views—nearly two-fifths on Issue 2 and almost one-half on Issue 3.

Thus there is room for the rival campaigns to persuade voters in their favor in the final days of the campaign. In this regard, the opponents of Issue 2 and Issue 3 have had an advantage in the volume of campaign information.

Registered voters report that Issues 2 and 3 are a strong motivation to cast a ballot. A standard model of turnout reveals the possibility of a close contest for Issue 2, but other models suggest Issue 2 may be defeated by a wider margin. Issue 3 appears likely to pass.

Regardless of their views on Issues 2 and 3, Ohioans overwhelmingly regard ballot measures as a legitimate way to make political decisions.

The Survey

This report is based on the 2011 Fall Akron Buckeye Poll, a telephone survey of a random sample of registered voters in Ohio, with a cell phone component. The survey was conducted between October 11 and October 23, 2011 by the Center for Marketing and Opinion Research, LLC of Canton, Ohio. The number of respondents was 602 and the overall margin of error is plus or minus 4 percentage points. Smaller subsamples have higher margins of error. The data are weighted by demography to reflect 2010 U.S. Census data in Ohio; the unweighted results are very similar to weighted results.

Key Findings:

*In the 2011 ballot contests, the opponents of Issue 2 have a double-digit lead (11.8 percentage points) over the supporters among registered voters. Meanwhile, the supporters of Issue 3 also have a double-digit advantage over the opponents (15.5 percentage points).

*However, the views of registered voters are fluid and changeable, with nearly two-fifths of voters lacking a firm view on Issue 2 and nearly one-half of voters lacking a firm view on Issue 3.

*Registered voters are divided on the major arguments for and against Issue 2, with the most popular argument about collective bargaining. There is potential support for Issue 2 among undecided voters.

*Registered voters are less divided on the major arguments for and against Issue 3, with the most popular arguments being about freedom to buy or not buy health insurance. There is potential support for Issue 3 among undecided voters.

*In the effort to change opinion of registered voters, the volume of campaign information strongly favors the opponents of Issue 2; to a lesser extent it also favors the opponents of Issue 3.

*In the effort to increase turnout, both issues motivate registered voters to cast a ballot. But Issue 2 is a stronger motivator than Issue 3.

*A standard model of turnout suggests that the contest for Issue 2 may be very close. Other models of turnout suggest that Issue 2 may be defeated by a wider margin. Issue 3 appears likely to pass.

*Registered voters overwhelmingly support the legitimacy of ballot measures as a way to make political decisions in Ohio.

Detailed Findings

Views on Issue 2

Table 1 reports the responses of Ohioans to the following question, designed to probe the attitudes of registered voters toward Issue 2 (the referendum on the collective bargaining law, Senate Bill 5):

Given what you have heard so far, will you vote yes on Issue 2, to keep the law, or vote no on issue 2, to repeal the law, or haven't you made up your mind yet?

This question found that 25.3% of voters say they will vote “yes” on Issue 2, 37.1% say they will vote “no,” and 37.6% have not yet made up their minds.

Thus there is an 11.8% gap in favor of the “no” position on Issue 2 among registered voters. If the undecided are excluded from the calculation, the “no” position leads 59% to 41%.

Table 1 Views on Issue 2

Yes	25.3
Undecided	37.6
No	37.1
Total	100.0

These figures include a small percentage of voters who say they had already cast a ballot (7%). These ballots were overwhelmingly “no” on Issue 2 (76% to 12%; the remaining 12% may have skipped voting for Issue 2). Another small group of voters says they plan to vote before Election Day (14%), and they oppose Issue 2 by a smaller margin (49% to 24%). Voters who say they will cast a ballot on Election Day also oppose Issue 2, but by an even smaller margin (41% to 31%). These findings suggest that about one-fifth of voters will cast an early ballot in 2011.

Registered voters who support or oppose Issue 2 appear to be firm in their views: 88% of the “yes” voters say they are “very sure” of their position on Issue 2, while 87% of the “no” voters are “very

sure” of their position. However, the undecided voters are much less firm in their views: just 11% say they are “very sure” and 66.7% say they are “not very sure” of their position on Issue 2.

Reasons for Supporting and Opposing Issue 2. Table 2 reports voter attitudes on four common arguments about Issue 2, two for and two against.

The most popular of these arguments is against Issue 2, concerning the right of public employees to bargain collectively, with 49% of all voters agreeing/strongly agreeing, and 38% disagreeing/strongly disagreeing. A large majority of “yes” voters disagree with this argument (76%) and a large majority of “no” voters agree with the argument (81%). Undecided voters are more divided on this argument, with disagreement having an edge over agreement in favor of Issue 2 (38% to 29%).

Some 44% of all voters agree/strongly agree with an argument for Issue 2 about increasing the contributions of public employees to their health insurance and retirement; 42% disagree/strongly disagree. Here, too, a large majority of the “yes” votes agree with this argument (83%) and a large majority of the “no” voters disagree (71%). The undecided voters on balance agree with this argument in favor of Issue 2 (52% to 27%).

In addition, 44% of all voters agree/strongly agree with an argument against Issue 2 that the measure will hurt the quality of public services; 46% disagree/strongly disagree with this argument. “Yes” voters largely disagree with this argument (88%) and “no” voters largely agree (75%). The undecided voters on balance favor Issue 2, disagreeing with this argument (44% to 32%).

Finally, 43% of all voters agree/strongly agree with the argument for Issue 2 that it will restrain the costs of government; 45% disagree/strongly disagree with this argument. Here, the “yes” and “no” voters have nearly opposite views, with the “yes” voters agreeing (86%) and the “no” voters disagreeing (83%). The undecided on balance favor Issue 2, agreeing with the argument (50% to 22%).

Table 2 Voter Views of Arguments For and Against Issue 2

Issue 2 should fail because it will undermine the right of public employees to collective bargaining.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
ALL	23%	26%	13%	24%	14%	100%
Yes	8%	11%	5%	42%	34%	100%
Undecided	3%	26%	33%	30%	8%	100%
No	45%	36%	4%	10%	5%	100%

Issue 2 should pass because it will require public employees to contribute 15 percent of their wages for health insurance and 10 percent of their wages for retirement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
ALL	15%	29%	14%	25%	17%	100%
Yes	40%	43%	6%	8%	3%	100%
Undecided	7%	45%	21%	21%	6%	100%
No	6%	9%	14%	37%	34%	100%

Issue 2 should fail because it will hurt the quality of public services, such as public safety and education.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
ALL	24%	20%	10%	28%	18%	100%
Yes	4%	5%	3%	40%	48%	100%
Undecided	11%	21%	24%	39%	5%	100%
No	46%	29%	3%	13%	9%	100%

Issue 2 should pass because it will reduce the cost of government and keep taxes from increasing.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
ALL	16%	27%	12%	25%	20%	100%
Yes	37%	49%	6%	5%	3%	100%
Undecided	13%	37%	28%	20%	2%	100%
No	5%	6%	6%	41%	42%	100%

Apportioning the Undecided Issue 2 Voters. Table 3 uses the attitudes on the arguments for and against Issue 2 to apportion the undecided voters into “Leaning Yes,” “Leaning No,” and “Fully Undecided” categories. Voters who were not “very sure” about their “yes” or “no” position were also placed in the “leaning” categories, creating “Firm Yes” and “Firm No” categories on Issue 2.

Table 3: Issue 2 Opinion, Leaners Apportioned

Firm Yes	23.0
Leaning Yes	20.5
Fully Undecided	7.2
Leaning No	12.6
Firm No	36.7
Total	100.0

By this measure, 23.0% of registered voters are in the “Firm Yes” category and 20.5% in the “Leaning Yes” category. In contrast, 36.7% are in the “Firm No” category and 12.6% in the “Leaning No” category. The “Fully Undecided” makes up 7.2% of voters.

Thus by this measure, the “no” position leads the “yes” position on Issue 2 49.3% to 43.5%; if the “Fully Undecided” are excluded from the calculation, the “no” position leads 53% to 47%.

Issue 2 voters display a strong political divide. For example, 63% of Firm Yes voters describe themselves as “conservative,” compared to just 18% of the Firm No voters. Meanwhile, just 30% of Firm Yes voters describe themselves as “moderates” and 55% of the Firm No voters do.

There are also differences on race (with non-whites backing Issue 2), income (with higher income voters favoring Issue 2), and gender (with women favoring Issue 2 and also common among the leaning and undecided groups). However, there are no significant differences by education: Firm Yes and Firm No voters are just as likely to have college degrees. Also, there are no significant differences by region, with the Firm Yes and Firm No voters common in all parts of the state.

The Effort to Change Opinion on Issue 2. Taken together, these findings suggest that voter opinion can be changed in favor or opposed to Issue 2 during the final days of the campaign. Table 4 reports the impact of these campaign efforts to date.

Overall, 85% of the registered voters say they have heard or read something about Issue 2. On this measure, nearly all of the Firm Yes and Firm No voters had heard about Issue 2, but note that markedly fewer members of the other three categories have heard about Issue 2, especially the Leaning Yes and Fully Undecided.

Table 4. Issue 2: Information and Importance

	Heard About?	Heard more from:			Issue 2:
	Yes	<i>Supporters</i>	<i>Same for each</i>	<i>Opponents</i>	Very important
Firm Yes	96%	23%	23%	55%	75%
Leaning Yes	63%	29%	21%	51%	26%
Fully Undecided	62%	17%	33%	50%	18%
Leaning No	77%	23%	26%	51%	35%
Firm No	96%	17%	30%	53%	83%
ALL	85%	21%	26%	53%	59%

However, there was a consensus across all the voter categories when asked which side of the Issue 2 campaign they had heard more from: about one-half say they have heard more from the opponents of Issue 2 and less from the supporters. The margin is about two-to-one in favor of the opponents in all the categories. One-third of the Fully Undecided say they heard the same amount from both sides, the highest of all the categories.

There are also differences in the importance of Issue 2 to registered voters. Overall, 59% of voters say that Issue 2 is “very important” to them compared to other issues. The Firm No voters score the highest (83%), followed by the Firm Yes voters (75%). However, Issue 2 is much less important to Leaning Yes (35%), Fully Undecided (18%), and Leaning No (26%) voters.

Thus there is room for both campaigns to inform and persuade registered voters on Issue 2 in the last part of the campaign. But so far, the opposition to Issue 2 appears to have a large advantage in the volume of messages.

Views of Issue 3

Table 5 reports the responses of registered voters to the following question, designed to probe the attitudes of registered voters toward Issue 3 (the measure to block individual mandate in the national health insurance law):

Given what you have heard so far, will you vote yes on Issue 3, to block the individual health care mandate, or vote no on issue 3, to accept the health care mandate, or haven't you made up your mind yet?

This question found that 33.8% of registered voters say they will vote “yes” on Issue 3, 18.3% say they will vote “no,” and 47.9% are undecided.

Thus there is a 15.5 percentage-point gap in favor of Issue 3. If the undecided are excluded from the calculation, supporters of Issue 3 lead 65% to 35%.

Table 5: Issue 3 Opinion, October 2011

Yes	33.8
Undecided	47.9
No	18.3
Total	100.0

Respondents who say they have already cast a ballot favor Issue 3, but three-quarters of these voters may have skipped Issue 3 when they cast their ballot. Voters who say they plan to cast an early ballot favor Issue 3 (38% to 26%), as do Election Day voters (40% to 20%).

Voters’ views on Issue 3 are less firm than on Issue 2. For example, 76% of Issue 3 “yes” voters say they are “very sure” of their views, and 69% of Issue 3 “no” voters say they are “very sure” of their

views.” However, just 13% of the undecided voters are “very sure” of their views on Issue 3 and 69% are “not very sure.”

The Relationship between Issue 2 and Issue 3 Voters. How are views of Issue 2 and Issue 3 related to each other? Table 6 reports on the relationship of attitudes on Issue 2 and Issue 3.

The top part of Table 6 shows that, 68% of “yes” voters on Issue 2 are also “yes” voters on Issue 3, but only 23% of “no” voters on Issue 2 are “no” voters—about the same number that are “yes” voters on Issue 3. Interestingly, more than one-half of undecided (58%) and “no” voters (55%) on Issue 2 are undecided on Issue 3. A more symmetrical pattern is found at the bottom of Table 6 for Issue 3 voters: 52% of “yes” voters on Issue 3 are also “yes” voters on Issue 2, while 53% of the “no” voters on Issue 3 are also “no” voters on Issue 2. Thus, views on Issue 2 and Issue 3 are related but not identical.

Table 6: Views of Issues 2 and 3

ISSUE 2	ISSUE 3			Total
	Yes	Undecided	No	
Yes	68%	22%	10%	100%
Undecided	22%	58%	20%	100%
No	22%	55%	23%	100%
ALL	34%	48%	18%	100%

ISSUE 3	ISSUE 2			Total
	Yes	Undecided	No	
Yes	52%	20%	28%	100%
Undecided	13%	38%	49%	100%
No	14%	33%	53%	100%
ALL	26%	32%	42%	100%

Reasons for Supporting and Opposing Issue 3. Table 7 reports voter attitudes on four common arguments about Issue 3, two in favor and two opposed.

Overall, the most popular argument for Issue 3 is about personal freedom to buy or not buy health insurance. Among all registered voters, 58% agree/strongly agree and 23% disagree/strongly disagree. A large majority of Issue 3 “yes” voters agree with this argument in favor of Issue 3 and so

does a majority of the undecided (50%). In contrast, a majority of the “no” voters on Issue 3 disagree with the argument (54%).

On another argument for Issue 3—that the national health care mandate is unconstitutional—52% of all registered voters agree/strongly agree, and 30% of all voters disagree/strongly disagree. Here the Issue 3 “yes” voters agree with the argument (83%) and the “no” voters disagree (65%). The undecided voters on balance agree with this argument in favor of Issue 3 (38% to 30%), thus favoring Issue 3.

The arguments against Issue 3 are less popular. For example, 38% of all registered voters agree/strongly agree that Issue 3 is itself unconstitutional, while 40% disagree/strongly disagree. A large majority of the Issue 3 “yes” voters disagree with this argument (64%) and a majority of the Issue 3 “no” voters agree with the argument (58%). On balance, the undecided tend to agree with the argument against Issue 3 (35% to 25%).

Finally, 27% of all registered voters agree/strongly agree with the argument against Issue 3 that it will undermine national health care law and prevent people from getting health insurance; 49% of all voters disagree/strongly disagree with this argument. A large majority of the Issue 3 “yes” voters disagree with this argument (76%); there is more division among the undecided (27% agree, 32% disagree) and Issue 3 “no” voters (45% agree, 43% disagree).

Table 7 Voter Views of Arguments For and Against Issue 3

Issue 3 should pass because it will give people the freedom to buy or not buy health insurance as they see fit.

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	Total
ALL	20%	38%	19%	16%	7%	100%
Yes	41%	40%	6%	10%	3%	100%
Undecided	8%	42%	31%	14%	5%	100%
No	10%	25%	11%	32%	22%	100%

Issue 3 should pass because it is against the U.S. Constitution for the federal government to have so much power.

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	Total
ALL	23%	29%	18%	18%	12%	100%
Yes	49%	34%	5%	8%	4%	100%
Undecided	9%	29%	32%	21%	9%	100%
No	9%	20%	6%	31%	34%	100%

Issue 3 should fail because it against the U.S. Constitution for a state to block a federal law.

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	Total
ALL	14%	24%	22%	27%	13%	100%
Yes	15%	15%	6%	38%	26%	100%
Undecided	8%	27%	40%	20%	5%	100%
No	26%	32%	13%	23%	6%	100%

Issue 3 should fail because it will undermine the new health care law and prevent people from getting health insurance.

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	Total
ALL	10%	17%	24%	34%	15%	100%
Yes	7%	9%	8%	42%	34%	100%
Undecided	7%	20%	41%	27%	5%	100%
No	22%	23%	12%	36%	7%	100%

Apportioning the Undecided Issue 3 Voters. Table 8 uses the attitudes on these arguments to apportion the undecided voters into “Leaning Yes,” “Leaning No,” and “Fully Undecided” categories. Voters who were not “very sure” about their “yes” or “no” position were also placed in the “leaning” categories, creating “Firm Yes” and “Firm No” categories.

Table 8: Issue 3 Opinion, Leaners Apportioned

Firm Yes	25.7
Leaning Yes	30.8
Fully Undecided	14.2
Leaning No	17.0
Firm No	12.3
Total	100.0

By this measure, 25.7% of voters are in the Firm Yes category and 30.8% in the Leaning Yes category. In contrast, 12.3% are in the Firm No category and 17.0% in the Leaning No category. The Fully Undecided makes up 14.2% of voters.

Thus the “yes” position leads the “no” position on Issue 3, 56.5% to 29.3%. If The “Fully Undecided” are excluded from the calculation, the “yes” position leads 66% to 34%.

There are also strong political divisions among Issue 3 voters. For example, 65% of the Firm Yes voters describe themselves as “conservative” compared to just 10% of Firm No voters. But unlike Issue 2, moderate voters are found in the Leaning and Undecided categories. On Issue 3, there are also differences by gender (with men supporting Issue 3) and region (with Northeast Ohio more opposed to Issue 3). However, there were no significant differences by race, education, or income.

The Effort to Change Opinion on Issue 3. Taken together, these findings suggest that voter opinion can be changed in favor or opposed to Issue 3 during the final weeks of the campaign. Table 9 reports of the impact of these campaign efforts to date.

Overall, 49% of registered voters say they have heard or read something about Issue 3. On this measure, 65% of Firm Yes and 81% of Firm No voters had heard about Issue 3, but note that the figures are markedly lower about the other three groups, especially the Leaning Yes and Fully Undecided.

Table 9: Issue 3: Information and Importance

	Heard About?	Heard more from:			Issue 3:
	Yes	<i>Supporters</i>	<i>Same for each</i>	<i>Opponents</i>	Very important
Firm Yes	65%	29%	39%	32%	65%
Leaning Yes	36%	47%	22%	31%	29%
Fully Undecided	20%	36%	36%	29%	15%
Leaning No	47%	28%	21%	51%	29%
Firm No	81%	20%	39%	41%	54%
ALL	49%	31%	32%	37%	40%

Overall, there was a rough balance of messages from the two sides on Issue 3, with 31% of all voters saying they had heard more from the supporters of Issue 3 and 37% having heard more from the opponents in the debate over Issue 3. However, Firm Yes and Firm No voters say they heard more from the opponents of Issue 3, as did the Leaning No voters. The Leaning Yes and Fully Undecided voters say they heard more from the supporters of Issue 3.

There are also differences in the importance of Issue 3 to voters. Overall, 40% of all voters say that Issue 3 is “very important” to them compared to other issues. The Firm Yes voters score the highest (65%), followed by the Firm No voters at a somewhat lower level (54%). However, Issue 3 is much less important to Leaning Yes (29%), Fully Undecided (15%), and Leaning No (29%) voters.

Thus there is room for both campaigns to persuade registered voters on Issue 3 in the last part of the campaign. This capacity is larger than for Issue 2. But thus far, the opposition to Issue 3 appears to have a modest advantage in the volume of campaign messages.

Motivation to Vote and Interest in 2011 Election

One of the most important questions regarding Issues 2 and 3 is who will actually cast a ballot, before or on Election Day. These results could produce a very close contest or a lopsided victory.

Tables 10 and 11 offer one gauge of the level turnout: registered voters' report of whether Issues 2 or 3 will provide them with a "great deal" of motivation to cast a ballot.

Table 10 Issue 2 and Motivation to Vote

	Issue 2	Issue 3
	<i>A great deal</i>	<i>A great deal</i>
Issue 2 Voters		
Firm Yes	65%	48%
Leaning Yes	26%	26%
Fully Undecided	16%	26%
Leaning No	25%	27%
Firm No	70%	27%
ALL	50%	32%

Overall, 50% of voters say that Issue 2 will provide "a great deal" of motivation to cast a ballot. This reported motivation is highest among the Issue 2 Firm No voters (70%) and almost as high among Issue 2 Firm Yes voters (65%). The figures are much lower among the other three categories of voters, especially the Fully Undecided. But note that for 48% of Issue 2 Firm Yes voters, Issue 3 provides "a great deal" of motivation to vote as well—a markedly higher number than for the other categories of Issue 2 voters.

Table 11 Issue 3 and Motivation to Vote

	Issue 3	Issue 2
	<i>A great Deal</i>	<i>A great deal</i>
Issue 3 Voters		
Firm Yes	58%	60%
Leaning Yes	19%	41%
Fully Undecided	13%	42%
Leaning No	17%	50%
Firm No	50%	63%
ALL	32%	50%

Table 11 looks at the same kind of information as Table 10, but for Issue 3 voters. Among the Issue 3 Firm Yes voters, 58% say that Issue 3 will provide “a great deal” of motivation to cast a ballot. At the same time, 50% of the Issue 3 Firm No voters have the same view. All the other categories of voters are less motivated to cast a ballot by Issue 3. It is worth noting that Issue 2 provides Issue 3 voters with strong motivation to cast a ballot as well: 63% of the Issue 3 Firm No, 60% of the Firm Yes voters, 50% of the Leaning No voters, 41% of the Leaning Yes voters, and 42% of the Fully Undecided. These findings suggest that both issues motivate registered voters to cast ballots, but that Issue 2 is a much larger draw.

What about general interest in the November 2011 election? Table 12 lists the percentage of highest interest in the election by Issue 2 and Issue 3 voters.

Table 12 Interest in 2011 Election, Issue 2 and 3 Voters

	Issue 2	Issue 3
	<i>Highest Interest</i>	<i>Highest Interest</i>
Firm Yes	59%	57%
Leaning Yes	25%	38%
Undecided	24%	30%
Leaning No	21%	39%
Firm No	56%	51%
ALL	44%	44%

Overall, 44% of registered voters reported the highest level of interest (a “ten” on a one-to-ten scale). By way of comparison, this same question produced 38% highest interest in August 2010. The Firm Yes voters for Issue 2 and Issue 3 show the highest level of interest in the 2011 election (59% and 57%, respectively). The Firm No voters on both issues report the next highest interest (56% and 51%, respectively). The other categories have much lower levels of interest in the 2011 election, with the Issue 3 voters in these categories more interested than the Issue 2 voters.

Table 13 lists the reasons why voters had the highest interest in the 2011 campaign (recoding of verbatim answers). Issue 2 figures prominently among these responses, accounting for 39% of the responses. The second most common reasons listed were economic issues at 27%, including concern over health care. Political consideration (12%), civic duty (12%), and miscellaneous responses (10%) complete the reasons given.

Table 13 Reasons for Interest in 2011 Election

Issue 2	39%
Economic Issues	27%
Political Matters	12%
Civic Duty	12%
Miscellaneous	10%

Estimating Turnout in 2011

Tables 14a, 14b, and 14c present the results of three models of turnout for the 2011 election and the impact of turnout on Issue 2. In each table, the first column lists the estimated turnout for each category of voters, and the second column lists the percentage of the total final vote provided by each category. For purposes of these tables, it is assumed that the level of support or opposition to Issue 2 does not change. But because the assumptions behind these models may not obtain, the results should be viewed with appropriate caution.

Table 14a presents a model of turnout based on reported vote intention: the percentage of registered voters who said that Issue 2 or Issue 3 will motivate them to cast a ballot. This model shows a largely symmetrical pattern across the voter categories, with 73% of Firm Yes and Firm No voters casting a ballot, and about two-fifths of the Leaning categories doing so as well (38% for Leaning Yes and 41% for Leaning No). Just 28% of the Fully Undecided cast ballots in this model.

This turnout model predicts the defeat of Issue 2 by 55% to 41%; the votes of the Fully Undecided would make little difference to the outcome, but could alter the final margin. This model also predicts an overall turnout of 59% of registered voters. This figure would be higher than in recent off-year election ballot contests.

Table 14a Issue 2: Intended Vote Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	73%	28%
Leaning Yes	38%	13%
Fully Undecided	28%	4%
Leaning No	41%	9%
Firm No	73%	46%
ALL	59%	100%

Table 14b offers a model that uses a standard index of likely voters, including reported past voting behavior, present vote intention, the motivating effects of Issues 2 and 3, and interest in the 2011 election. This kind of model has been useful in predicting turnout in past candidate elections. This model shows an asymmetrical turnout, with 63% Firm Yes voters turning out compared to 51% of the Firm No voters. The other three categories show lower levels of turnout.

Table 14b Issue 2: Standard Turnout Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	63%	33%
Leaning Yes	30%	14%
Fully Undecided	21%	3%
Leaning No	29%	8%
Firm No	51%	42%
ALL	45%	100%

This turnout model predicts a very close contest, with the opponents of Issue 2 leading 50% to 47%. Here the votes of the Fully Undecided could be decisive to the outcome. This model also predicts an overall turnout of 45% of registered voters, a figure in line with turnout in recent off-year elections with controversial ballot measures (such as the casino gambling issue in 2009).

Table 14c offers a “momentum” model, which assumes that the turnout pattern of the standard model of turnout is reversed due to the enthusiasm of opponents of Issue 2 (the side leading in the polls) and discouragement among the supporters of Issue 2 (the side behind in the polls). This model predicts a 51% turnout among Firm Yes voters and a 63% turnout among Firm No voters.

This turnout model predicts the defeat of Issue 2 by a large margin, 58% to 39%, and perhaps higher if the Fully Undecided break for the “no” side. This model also predicts overall turnout of 46%.

Table 14c Issue 2: Momentum Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	51	25%
Leaning Yes	29	14%
Fully Undecided	21	3%
Leaning No	30	8%
Firm No	63	50%
ALL	46%	100%

Tables 15a, 15b, and 15c report the same turnout models for Issue 3, with parallel results. In all cases, the models predict the passage of Issue 3. However, because Issue 3 is less known among voters than Issue 2, it is possible that many voters will skip Issue 3 when casting their ballots. For this reason, these results should be viewed with appropriate caution.

Table 15a Issue 3: Intended Vote Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	73%	32%
Leaning Yes	48%	25%
Fully Undecided	47%	12%
Leaning No	53%	15%
Firm No	77%	16%
ALL	59%	100%

Table 15b Issue 3: Standard Turnout Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	66%	38%
Leaning Yes	33%	23%
Fully Undecided	25%	8%
Leaning No	39%	15%
Firm No	59%	16%
ALL	45%	100%

Table 15c Issue 3: Momentum Model

	<i>Turnout</i>	<i>Results</i>
Firm Yes	59%	33%
Leaning Yes	39%	26%
Fully Undecided	25%	8%
Leaning No	33%	12%
Firm No	77%	21%
ALL	46%	100%

Overwhelming Support for Ballot Measures

However Ohioans may feel about Issues 2 and 3, there is overwhelming support for the legitimacy of ballot issues. For example, 92% of registered voters agreed with the first of this pair of statements:

Ballot issues are a good idea because voters should have a voice in these questions.

OR

Ballot issues are a bad idea because voters lack the knowledge to decide these questions.

In addition, 87% agreed with the second of this pair of statements:

Ballot issues are a bad idea because they undermine the power of public officials that the voters elected.

OR

Ballot issues are a good idea because they set limits on the power of public officials that the voters elected.

These results strongly suggest that Ohioans regard ballot measures as a legitimate way to make political decisions.