

THE PEOPLE, THE PRESS & POLITICS
OCTOBER PRE-ELECTION TYPOLOGY SURVEY

Conducted for
TIMES MIRROR
by
The Gallup Organization, Inc.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Donald S. Kellermann
213-237-3847

October 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Summary and Conclusions	2
III. Findings	
A. The Standing of the Candidates	7
B. Public Awareness of the Campaign	22
C. The Campaigns and the Media	31
D. Issues for the New Administration	42
IV. Technical Appendix	46
V. The Questionnaire	59

INTRODUCTION

This is the sixth in a series of national surveys commissioned by Times Mirror to assess the American electorate. The People, The Press, and Politics series employs a unique voter classification scheme developed by Gallup for Times Mirror in 1987. The overall purpose of these surveys is to provide a better understanding of how voters decide about candidates and issues. The voter typology used in this survey is briefly described in the Technical Appendix and more fully described in previous reports available from Times Mirror.

The October pre-election survey deals with the voter's assessments of the Bush - Dukakis race near the end of the 1988 presidential campaign. It utilizes the Times Mirror typology to gauge opinions of the candidates, important issues facing the nation, and the role of the media and news organizations in the campaign.

For this survey, telephone interviews were administered to a nationally representative sample of 2,006 registered voters during the period from October 23-26, 1988. Over the course of the past eighteen months, three major surveys involving face-to-face personal interviewing in the home were conducted, as well as two telephone surveys in August and September. The first of the face-to-face interview studies was fielded April 25 - May 10, 1987 with a national sample of 4,244 adults. This was followed by a survey of 2,109 Americans, conducted January 8-17, 1988, and a survey of 3,021 adults conducted from May 13-22, 1988. The telephone surveys involved interviews with 1,000 registered voters conducted between August 24-25, 1988 and interviews with 2,001 registered voters fielded September 9-14, 1988.

For a more detailed description of the sample design for this survey and the composition of the groups, please refer to the Technical Appendix.

Summary and Conclusions

The latest Times Mirror\Gallup survey shows no change in voter preferences when compared to the most recent Gallup Polls. In fact, over the past six weeks there has been no significant change in candidate preferences and little change in the individual favorability evaluations accorded Bush and Dukakis. Currently, Bush leads Dukakis by eight percentage points among all registered voters and by 11 points when the sample is narrowed to those most likely to cast ballots on November eighth. Neither measure is significantly different from previous Gallup Polls showing ten and six point margins among all registered voters and 12 to 13 percentage point margins among likely voters.

On a bottom line basis this contest has changed very little over the past eight weeks. If Bush goes on to win it, the trend suggests that he won it in the first blush of the campaign, in early September. Since that time the campaign has done little to change voter preferences overall.

On balance, voter preference for each candidate is about as soft as we found it in September and there has been only a modest decline in the percentage of swing voters - those who support a candidate but say they might switch, plus the undecideds - 29% currently, down from 34% in the previous Times Mirror survey. Neither candidate has an edge in strong support, 24% for Bush and 20% for Dukakis and both show the same percentage of supporters saying they might defect to the opponent.

The prognostication problem in this campaign is: What's more important the fluidity of choice as measured by strength of support and prospects for change questions or the stability of the trend in preferences over the past nine weeks?

Some light is shed on that question by examining the trend in preferences by the Typology groups. From this analysis it is clear that the stability apparent in the overall national trends belies a fair degree of offsetting change within voter groups. More specifically, the Democratically oriented groups show considerable volatility in comparison to the Republicans. Enterprisers, Moralists and Upbeats support Bush at the same high levels observed in September. Disaffecteds who had been the most equivocal of all voters show no change in support. As in September they prefer Bush over Dukakis by a 60% to 26% margin. Analysis of campaign awareness indicators suggests that

the Bush crime themes may be especially critical to this group's continuing support of his candidacy.

The important dynamic on the Republican side is that within each group, but especially among Disaffecteds and Upbeats, there has been a major increase in the proportion saying they are unlikely to switch to Dukakis. Since September, that feeling rose from 36 to 51% among Disaffecteds and from 59 to 67% among Upbeats. These key swing Republican oriented groups not only support Bush at the same levels as recorded in September they appear to be doing it with more resolve.

In contrast, on the Democratic side, defections to George Bush have doubled among Seculars and significantly increased among the Partisan Poor. Offsetting these gains, Dukakis has regained the support of many New Dealers and picked up support among Followers. The shift toward Bush among Seculars and the Partisan Poor is a consequence of an improved personal image of Bush and a somewhat less favorable view of Dukakis. Among New Dealers, opinion of Dukakis has not changed, but Bush's favorability rating declined by 17% points. Older, socially conservative New Dealers have also expressed the most discontent with negative campaigning.

The increase in Bush's support among Seculars is coincident with an increase in the Vice President's support among middle aged people that has been observed since the second Presidential Debate. None of the campaign awareness measures suggest that Seculars have moved toward Bush and away from Dukakis on the basis of campaign themes. The debate may have played an important role in the changed opinions of these voters.

The slight drift toward Bush among the Partisan Poor is indicative of the problems that the Dukakis campaign has had in achieving enthusiastic support from some traditional Democratic constituencies. A seventeen percent defection rate among the Partisan poor and among blacks, as this survey also shows, is a measure of the Dukakis campaign's inability to fully achieve its potential among core supporters.

The only signs of a sustained growth in enthusiasm for Dukakis is found among the most consistently liberal group, 60's Democrats - strong support has climbed from 17% in May to 36% in September to 51% in October.

In effect, the overall stability in voter preferences is a consequence of stability among the Republican core groups and static volatility among Democrats. The most sophisticated and least affluent Democrats are defecting at greater rates, while there is renewed loyalty among older, more traditional Democrats.

The action appears to be on the Democratic side but with the groups who mostly don't fit the image of the "Reagan Democrats". If Dukakis is to catch up it must come from a turn around among Seculars and the Partisan Poor. He must also make further inroads among New Dealers. This is important because the other major swing group, Disaffecteds appears to be more solidly behind Bush than they once were.

Our measures of awareness of specific campaign themes and rhetoric find that relatively few American voters are aware specific campaign figures and phrases, but that large majorities of voters know which candidate is associated with which position on such issues as the death penalty and abortion. In contrast, only slightly more than half of the respondents (53%) could identify General Manuel Noriega, the Panamanian military leader who has been indicted on drug charges; and only one in five (24%) recognized the name of Willie Horton, the Massachusetts convict who escaped while on furlough. For all the controversy about the pledge, less than a majority (41%) identified Dukakis as the candidate who vetoed the bill requiring teachers to lead students in the pledge.

Two campaign phrases have reached a majority of voters: "read my lips... No new taxes" - 59% had heard of it and associated it with Bush. and "You're no Jack Kennedy" - 60% associated it with Bentsen. Dukakis' most memorable slogan "good jobs at good wages" was identified by 49%. However, this phrase appears to be one that make the most difference to voters in the direction of Michael Dukakis. We calculated the size of the voter preference lead among the sub samples of voters that could recall various slogans, campaign facts and positions and we found that among those aware of this theme there was a 12% point shift in the direction of Dukakis. Of the 12 items tested this was the only one that yielded a greater Dukakis margin. The campaign elements that made the most difference in the direction of Bush were the pledge and awareness of the candidate's positions on the death penalty.

One measure of the greater skill of the Bush campaign is found in the fact that the two themes that resonate most for Bush have been emphasized consistently, while Dukakis' best theme has not played that central a role in his campaign.

Looking at the relative appeal of these key campaign themes by voter groups may give some indication of why there has been gridlock with regard to voter preferences:

- * Knowledge of the pledge veto hurts Dukakis among the New Dealers, but it helps him among Seculars.

- * Knowledge of Dukakis's opposition to capital punishment helps Bush among the Disaffecteds but hurts among the Seculars.

- * The charge that Michael Dukakis is a "card-carrying member of the ACLU" has helped Bush among the core Republicans but there has been a backlash among members of Democratic-oriented groups.

- * Knowledge of Dukakis's pro-choice position on abortion helps him a little among all Democratic groups, especially among the Partisan Poor.

Since September there has been increased concern about the critical tone of this year's presidential campaigns, more so about Bush's personal criticism of Dukakis than the other way around. Half of those surveyed (52%) feel that Bush has been too personally critical of Dukakis, while 43% feel he has not been. The ratio is reversed for perceptions of Dukakis criticisms of Bush - 45% feel he has been too personally critical and 50% feel he has not been.

There is a strong partisan undertone to attitudes about how critical each candidate has been. But members of Democratic groups are more concerned about Bush's criticism of Dukakis than members of Republican-oriented groups are about the Dukakis criticisms of Bush.

Evaluations of the quality of the campaign coverage have declined since they were first measured in a Times Mirror survey in May. At that time, only 22% indicated they were doing either a "poor" job or "only fair." In August, that proportion had grown to 35%, and in the latest survey it stands at 38%. In general, the public does not find the coverage too personally critical of either candidate; but a majority of those interviewed in the latest survey (58%) think

that news organizations have "too much influence" on which candidate becomes president,

As it was at the outset of the campaign, the public is divided about whether advertising consultants and pollsters have too much influence on which candidate becomes president (43%) or have about the right amount of influence (44%). Despite this division of opinion, pluralities of the respondents reported that they believed that polls do not improve election coverage and that reporting the horse race is a bad thing for the country.

Much has been written about discontent with the campaign and the candidates. Clearly, this survey shows a high level of frustration with negativism and campaign practices; but the favorability ratings of the candidates when put into the historical perspective do not justify a conclusion that the electorate is expressing mass dissatisfaction with the candidates. More specifically, George Bush gets favorability ratings that are about average for Presidential candidates, and in fact, equal to what Reagan achieved four and eight years ago . However, Dukakis' ratings are significantly below those of most Presidential candidates.

PERCENT FAVORABLE*

Bush	58	48	Dukakis
Reagan	62	58	Mondale
Reagan	58	62	Carter
Ford	68	70	Carter
Nixon	68	53	Mc Govern
Nixon	70	63	Humphrey
Goldwater	51	76	Johnson
Nixon	74	68	Kennedy

* Candidate ratings from previous elections were based on a slightly different question wording. We adjusted these measure through a statistical technique, so that they would be comparable to our current ratings.

The impression that voters are exceptionally displeased is based on polling measures that speak to a more general level of alienation about American politics, than opinions about these candidates specifically. Put another way, there hasn't been an election in recent memory when respondents would have expressed satisfaction with the candidates. For example in 1980 Gallup found a majority of voters saying that they would likely vote "none of the above" if they had the choice. The climate of opinion in 1988 isn't much different.

THE STANDING OF THE CANDIDATES

This survey assessed the strength of the presidential candidates in two ways - by obtaining a head-to-head trial heat measure pitting Michael Dukakis against George Bush and by looking at each candidate's overall favorability ratings, as well as those of their respective running mates, Lloyd Bentsen and Dan Quayle.

Both of these measures show that in the aggregate, support for Bush and Dukakis has stabilized in the last six weeks, among registered voters as well as among those most likely to go to the polls on Election Day.

-George Bush continues to hold a lead of 8 percentage points over Michael Dukakis on the question which measures candidate preference, by a 50% to 42% margin among registered voters. This is no different than his lead of 50% to 44% in the Times Mirror survey conducted in early September.

-Among likely voters, the Bush margin increases to 11 percentage points (52% to 41%), similar to the most recent Gallup Poll, conducted from October 21 to 23, 1988, in which it was 53% to 39%.

-George Bush's favorability ratings are 10 percentage points higher than Michael Dukakis's, similar to what they were when last measured in the September Times Mirror survey. In the current survey, 58% of registered voters rate Bush favorably, while 37% give him an unfavorable evaluation. At the same time, 48% give Michael Dukakis a favorable rating, while 46% give him an unfavorable one.

There is no significant change in the support for either Bush or Dukakis among registered voters or among those who are most likely to go to the polls. Bush has maintained his lead over Dukakis through the formation of a coalition based upon overwhelming support among members of the core Republican groups and solid support among members of independent groups which lean Republican. Bush is the beneficiary of substantial defections among some Democratic-oriented groups, although the levels are not as high as those received by Ronald Reagan in his landslide victory in the 1984 election. For Dukakis, on the other hand, his support is not as strong among his own partisans; and he is receiving virtually no defections from members of core Republican groups.

-Bush is the choice of more than nine out of ten Enterprisers (96%) and Moralists (93%).

-Eight in ten of the young, optimistic Upbeats (83%) prefer Bush. This is the group of Republican-leaning independents who have come of political age during the Reagan years.

-The Disaffecteds now prefer Bush over Dukakis by a better than two-to-one margin, 60% to 26%.

-Dukakis receives equivalent support from two groups of Democratic-leaning independents, the Seculars (61%) and the Followers (60%).

-Among members of the core Democratic groups, however, Dukakis receives no better support than 84% of the 60's Democrats, a politically sophisticated group with high levels of social tolerance. He is being supported by only seven in ten of the older, more conservative Democrats known as the New Dealers (72%) and the most loyal Democrats, the Partisan Poor (74%), who strongly supported the Reverend Jesse Jackson earlier in the campaign.

-Only six in ten of the God & Country Democrats (62%) are supporting Dukakis, while one-quarter (25%) have defected to Bush.

OCTOBER PREFERENCES FOR BUSH AND DUKAKIS, BY GROUP

	AMONG REGISTERED VOTERS		AMONG LIKELY VOTERS	
	<u>Bush</u>	<u>Dukakis</u>	<u>Bush</u>	<u>Dukakis</u>
Total Sample	50%	42 (2006)	52%	41 (1505)
Enterprisers	96%	2 (242)	96%	2 (196)
Moralists	93%	3 (249)	93%	3 (211)
Upbeats	83%	12 (271)	84%	12 (211)
Disaffecteds	60%	26 (228)	62%	28 (175)
Followers	28%	60 (121)	28%	62 (74)
Seculars	33%	61 (159)	30%	63 (118)
60's Democrats	10%	84 (215)	10%	85 (173)
New Dealers	15%	72 (174)	16%	72 (135)
God & Country Democrats	25%	62 (137)	20%	66 (95)
Partisan Poor	18%	74 (167)	21%	71 (114)

Candidate Favorability

Despite this picture of a static race, there have been important shifts in how the public evaluates the two candidates - individually and in relation to each other. George Bush's favorability ratings remain relatively high, while Michael Dukakis's continue their slow erosion. As a result, there has been a slight but steady growth in the difference in their favorability ratings since the nominating conventions.

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATINGS OF BUSH AND DUKAKIS

<u>Survey Date</u>	<u>Bush</u>	<u>Dukakis</u>	<u>Difference in percentage points</u>
April/May, 1987	68%	--	--
May 13-22, 1988	50%	68%	-18
June 10-12, 1988*	53%	70%	-17
July 8-10, 1988*	52%	57%	- 5
August 18-19, 1988**	60%	55%	5
August 24-25, 1988	65%	59%	6
September 9-14, 1988	59%	51%	8
October 23-26, 1988	58%	48%	10

*Gallup/Conus

**Newsweek

George Bush continues to receive very favorable evaluations from members of the two core Republican groups - the Enterprisers (98%) and the Moralists (95%). He is now more likely to be seen favorably by members of one Democratic-oriented group - the Seculars (39% in the current survey compared to 32% in September) - but he is less likely to be seen favorably by members of another core Democratic group - the New Dealers (25% in the current survey compared to 42% in September).

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATING FOR GEORGE BUSH, IN PERCENT

	<u>TOTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
<u>GEORGE BUSH</u>											
April/May, 1987	67	85	88	86	72	61	52	50	54	63	52
May, 1988	50	84	85	84	53	38	32	20	32	46	24
September, 1988	59	94	94	92	70	47	32	29	42	37	23
October, 1988	58	98	95	88	67	44	39	26	25	36	27
Difference (from Sept. to Oct.)	-1	+4	+1	-4	-3	-3	+7	-3	-17	-1	+4

Michael Dukakis's favorability ratings have remained consistently low among the two core Republican groups, and they have declined among the Disaffecteds. More significantly, they have declined among two important Democratic-oriented groups. One is the Partisan Poor (76% of whom now view Dukakis favorably compared to 87% in September), a group which strongly supported the candidacy of the Reverend Jesse Jackson. Dukakis's favorability ratings have also declined among the Seculars, from 79% to 71%.

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATINGS FOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS, IN PERCENT

	TOTL	ENTP	MORA LIST	UP- BTS	DIS AFF	FOL LOW	SECU LARS	60'S DEMS	NEW DEAL	GOD/ CTRY	PART POOR
<u>MICHAEL DUKAKIS</u>											
May, 1988	68	55	43	52	59	68	82	84	86	74	84
September, 1988	51	11	15	25	36	57	79	84	72	74	87
October, 1988	48	8	9	27	30	64	71	85	75	68	76
Difference (from Sept. to Oct.)	-3	-3	-4	+2	-6	+7	-8	+1	+3	-6	-11

The trends in favorability ratings of the vice-presidential candidates continue to diverge, as Lloyd Bentsen is viewed more favorably and Dan Quayle less favorably with the passage of time. The debate between the two candidates is a significant intervening event which has occurred since the last survey in September. Bentsen now has a favorability rating as high as George Bush's (58%), while Quayle's remains the same as in September (43%). However, as the proportion of those who can't rate Quayle declines, the proportion who rate him unfavorably increases, from 32% in September to 45% in the latest survey.

Lloyd Bentsen's favorability ratings are just as high as Michael Dukakis's among members of Democratic-oriented groups, and they are much higher than his running mate's among members of Republican-oriented groups.

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATING FOR LLOYD BENTSEN, IN PERCENT

	TOTL	ENTP	MORA LIST	UP- BTS	DIS AFF	FOL LOW	SECU LARS	60'S DEMS	NEW DEAL	GOD/ CTRY	PART POOR
<u>LLOYD BENTSEN</u>											
September, 1988	50	44	31	41	44	42	72	63	59	59	55
October, 1988	58	43	34	46	40	62	78	87	74	68	74
Difference (from Sept. to Oct.)	+8	-1	+3	+5	-4	+20	+6	+24	+15	+9	+19

Dan Quayle's favorability ratings are consistently lower than George Bush's. Despite the fact that they have gone up since September among most Republican-oriented groups, they average 20 percentage points lower than Bush's. They are also much lower than Bush's among members of Democratic-oriented groups, with the exception of two groups which give Bush and Quayle equally low favorability ratings: the New Dealers (25% for Bush and 23% for Quayle) and the Partisan Poor (27% for Bush and 26% for Quayle).

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATING FOR DAN QUAYLE, IN PERCENT

	TOTL	ENTP	MORA LIST	UP- BTS	DIS AFF	FOL LOW	SECU LARS	60'S DEMS	NEW DEAL	GOD/ CTRY	PART POOR
<u>DAN QUAYLE</u>											
September, 1988	40	68	70	65	41	23	14	18	24	27	23
October, 1988	43	75	76	65	46	29	15	14	23	28	26
Difference (from Sept. to Oct.)	+3	+7	+6	0	+5	+6	+1	-4	-1	+1	+3

Candidate Preference

Trial heat measurements taken across the last six weeks show a net stability in the race, although there have been important underlying shifts in group support for each candidate. Half the registered voters in this survey say they would vote for George Bush if the election were held today, while 42% say they would vote for Dukakis. Among "likely voters" the Bush lead increases to 11 percentage points, 52% to 41%.

TREND IN TRIAL HEAT MEASURES

	Registered Voters								Likely Voters
	June 24-26	July 8-10	July 22-24	Aug. 5-7	Aug. 19-21	Sept. 9-14	Oct. 21-23	Oct. 23-26	Oct. 23-26
Bush/Quayle	41%	41%	37%	42%	48%	50%	50%	50%	52%
Dukakis/Bentsen	46	47	54	49	44	44	40	42	41
Other/Undecided/ No Answer	13	12	9	9	8	6	10	8	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sample Size	(1210)	(1001)	(1001)	(1004)	(1000)	(2001)	(1232)	(2006)	(1505)

A comparison of the data from the September and October surveys shows how Bush has consolidated his support among the Republican-oriented groups and continues to win defections from members of Democratic-oriented groups. Among the registered voters:

-There is no change in the strong levels of support Bush receives from Enterprisers, Moralists, or Disaffecteds.

-Bush's support has increased by 16 percentage points among the Seculars, 9 percentage points among the Partisan Poor, and 5 percentage points among the God & Country Democrats.

-At the same time, his support has declined by 11 percentage points among the Followers and 8 percentage points among the New Dealers.

For Dukakis across the same period, his strength has increased among the New Dealers by 9 percentage points and the Followers by 7 percentage points.

-But his support has dropped by 16 percentage points among the Seculars, 11 percentage points among the Partisan Poor, and 8 percentage points among the God & Country Democrats.

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER TREND IN TRIAL HEAT DATA

	<u>Prefer Bush</u>		<u>Prefer Dukakis</u>		<u>Bush October Difference</u>	<u>Dukakis October Difference</u>
	<u>9/88</u>	<u>10/88</u>	<u>9/88</u>	<u>10/88</u>		
Total Sample	50	50	44	42	0	-2
Enterprisers	95	96	3	2	+1	-1
Moralists	94	93	4	3	-1	-1
Upbeats	85	83	10	12	-2	-2
Disaffecteds	61	60	27	26	-1	-1
Followers	39	28	53	60	-11	+7
Seculars	17	33	77	61	+16	-16
60's Democrats	15	10	82	84	-5	+2
New Dealers	23	15	63	72	-8	+9
God & Country Democrats	20	25	70	62	+5	-8
Partisan Poor	9	18	85	74	+9	-11

Overall, then, the composition of each candidate's support among registered voters - and the changes in it - can be summarized as follows:

-The groups' contribution to Bush's support increased by one net percentage point among the Upbeats, Seculars, and the Partisan Poor. It declined by the same amount among Enterprisers, Moralists, and the 60's Democrats.

-Dukakis, meanwhile, has gained one net percentage point each from the Upbeats, the Followers, and the New Dealers. But he has lost 2 percentage points each from the Seculars and the Partisan Poor and one from the God & Country Democrats.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE SHIFTING SUPPORT FOR BUSH AND DUKAKIS

BY TYPOLOGY GROUP, SEPTEMBER TO OCTOBER 1988

	<u>SUPPORT FOR BUSH</u>			<u>SUPPORT FOR DUKAKIS</u>		
	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>Oct.</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>Oct.</u>	<u>Change</u>
Enterprisers	11%	10%	- 1	*	*	0%
Moralists	12	11	- 1	1	1	0
Upbeats	10	11	+ 1	1	2	+ 1
Disaffecteds	7	7	0	3	3	0
Followers	2	2	0	3	4	+ 1
Seculars	1	2	+ 1	6	4	- 2
60's Democrats	2	1	- 1	9	9	0
New Dealers	2	2	0	6	7	+ 1
God & Country Democrats	2	2	0	6	5	- 1
Partisan Poor	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>+ 1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>- 2</u>
TOTAL	50%	50%	0	44%	42%	- 2

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Overall, Bush's lead increases to 11 percentage points among likely voters, to a 52% to 41% advantage. This is due in part to the greater propensity for members of Republican-oriented groups to go to the polls. But it also comes from higher levels of support for Bush among the Republican-oriented groups than Dukakis receives among the Democratic-oriented groups. And Bush remains the beneficiary of Democratic defections at a much higher rate than Dukakis is attracting Republican defections.

OCTOBER TRIAL HEAT DATA, AMONG LIKELY VOTERS

	<u>Prefer Bush</u>	<u>Prefer Dukakis</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Total Sample	52%	41	11
Enterprisers	96%	2	94
Moralists	93%	3	90
Upbeats	84%	12	72
Disaffecteds	62%	28	34
Followers	28%	62	-34
Seculars	30%	63	-33
60's Democrats	10%	85	-75
New Dealers	16%	72	-56
God & Country Democrats	20%	66	-46
Partisan Poor	21%	71	-50

Strength of Support and Voter Volatility

In the latest survey, approximately half of those who preferred each candidate indicated "strong" support, while the remainder said they supported their choice "only moderately." Republicans support George Bush more strongly than Democrats support Michael Dukakis. Overall better than nine in ten of the members of the two core Republican groups support the Bush/Quayle ticket, and they are at least twice as likely to support them "strongly" as "only moderately." Among the four core Democratic groups, however, between 62% and 84% support the Dukakis/Bentsen ticket. And only among the 60's Democrats do a bare majority (51%) support the Democratic candidates "strongly." These same patterns are found among the "likely voters" as well.

Two out of three Bush supporters say their support is pro-Bush, compared to one-third who say it is anti-Dukakis. Support for Dukakis is only slightly less positive. But among the Seculars who still support Dukakis - and this is the Democratic-oriented group which now has the highest defection rate to Bush - are those least likely to say their vote is pro-Dukakis.

Ten percentage points of the support each candidate receives is subject to some chance of switching by election day. But this represents almost one-quarter of Dukakis's support and only about one-fifth of Bush's. And one-seventh (15%) of the registered voters surveyed said they preferred the other candidate at some earlier point in the campaign.

George Bush has more strong supporters in the Republican-oriented groups than Dukakis has among the Democratic-oriented groups.

STRENGTH OF CANDIDATE PREFERENCE

PREFERENCE	TTL	ENTP	MORA LIST	UP- BTS	DIS AFF	FOL LOW	SECU LARS	60'S DEMS	NEW DEAL	GOD/ CTRY	PART POOR
BUSH/QUAYLE	50%	96%	93%	83%	60%	28%	33%	10%	15%	25%	18%
STRONGLY	24	71	61	41	15	6	8	2	3	9	3
ONLY	26	25	32	42	45	22	25	8	12	16	15
MODERATELY											
DUKAKIS/BENTSEN	42	2	3	12	26	60	61	84	72	62	74
STRONGLY	20	0	1	3	7	19	30	51	34	39	32
ONLY	22	2	2	9	19	41	31	33	38	23	42
MODERATELY											
OTHER/UNDECIDED	8	1	4	5	14	11	6	6	12	13	8
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

CANDIDATE PREFERENCES: BUSH VS. DUKAKIS

	<u>May 13-22</u>	<u>Sept. 9-14</u>	<u>Oct. 23-26</u>
<u>Strength</u>			
Bush	40%	50%	50%
Strongly	12	26	24
Only Moderately	28	24	26
Dukakis	53%	44%	42%
Strongly	14	19	20
Only Moderately	38	25	22
<u>Direction</u>			
Bush	40%	50%	50%
Pro-Bush	26	31	31
Anti-Dukakis	11	15	16
Undecided	3	4	3
Dukakis	53%	44%	42%
Pro-Dukakis	23	21	23
Anti-Bush	26	19	15
Undecided	4	4	4
<u>Prior Support</u>			
Bush	40%	50%	50%
Preferred Opponent	NA	9	9
Never Preferred Opponent	NA	39	40
Don't Know	NA	2	1
Dukakis	53%	44%	42%
Preferred Opponent	NA	6	6
Never Preferred Opponent	NA	37	35
Don't Know	NA	1	1
<u>Switching</u>			
Bush	40%	50%	50%
Good Chance	4	3	4
Some Chance	11	10	6
No Chance Whatsoever	23	35	40
Don't Know	2	2	*
Dukakis	53%	44%	42%
Good Chance	5	2	4
Some Chance	10	10	6
No Chance Whatsoever	35	31	31
Don't Know	3	1	1
Sample Size	(2416)	(2001)	(2006)

Bush's strong support has increased among Enterprisers, Seculars, and God & Country Democrats. But it has declined among New Dealers, Disaffecteds, and Followers. Dukakis's strong support has increased substantially among 60's Democrats and less so among God & Country Democrats, New Dealers, Followers, Disaffecteds, and Upbeats. But his strong support has declined significantly among the Partisan Poor and the Seculars.

**SHIFTS IN STRONG SUPPORT FOR BUSH AND DUKAKIS BY GROUP
(PERCENT DESCRIBING THEIR SUPPORT AS "STRONG")**

	BUSH				DUKAKIS			
	Strong Support				Strong Support			
	May 1988	Sept. 1988	Oct. 1988		May 1988	Sept. 1988	Oct. 1988	
Registered Voters	12	26	24	-2	14	19	20	+1
Enterprisers	24	68	71	+3	2	*	0	0
Moralists	37	60	61	+1	1	1	1	0
Upbeats	24	48	41	-7	2	*	3	+3
Disaffecteds	5	19	15	-4	8	5	7	+2
Followers	8	9	6	-3	14	16	19	+3
Seculars	4	2	8	+6	20	38	30	-8
60's Democrats	2	2	2	0	17	36	51	+15
New Dealers	2	10	3	-7	26	31	34	+3
God & Country Democrats	9	5	9	+4	22	33	39	+6
Partisan Poor	3	2	3	+1	33	44	32	-12

Among the Bush supporters, the greatest chance of losses due to switching lies among the Upbeats, where 16% of those supporting him indicate there is a possibility. But one-fifth of the Followers supporting Dukakis (22% in total), the 60's Democrats (18%), the Partisan Poor (16% in total), and the New Dealers (15% in total) indicate a chance of switching.

CHANCE OF SWITCHING VOTE

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP-BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
<u>SWITCHING</u>											
BUSH/QUAYLE	50%	96%	93%	83%	60%	28%	33%	10%	15%	25%	18%
GOOD CHANCE	4	5	6	6	2	8	*	1	2	4	5
SOME CHANCE	6	6	4	10	7	6	9	4	2	8	3
NO CHANCE	40	85	83	67	51	14	24	5	11	13	8
WHATSOEVER											
DON'T KNOW	*	*	0	*	1	*	0	0	0	0	2
DUKAKIS/BENTSEN	42	2	3	12	26	60	61	84	72	62	74
GOOD CHANCE	4	0	0	1	2	9	5	9	6	6	6
SOME CHANCE	6	1	1	4	7	13	4	9	9	7	10
NO CHANCE	31	1	1	6	16	36	52	65	56	48	57
WHATSOEVER											
DON'T KNOW	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1
OTHER/UNDECIDED	8	1	4	5	14	11	6	6	12	13	8
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

While the aggregate data for all registered voters show that the chances of voters switching their preferences by Election Day has declined slightly, there are important differences in this potential by candidate by typology group.

-There has been a sharp drop in the proportion of Disaffecteds now supporting Bush who say they might switch (15 percentage points), as well as among the Upbeats (8 percentage points).

-For Dukakis, the prospects of losses have increased in one group - the Followers (by 7 percentage points). But Seculars who support him are now much less likely to switch (13 percentage point decline) as are the God & Country Democrats (7 percentage point decline).

**TREND IN POTENTIAL SWITCHING OF VOTES,
BY CANDIDATE AND GROUP**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
Potential Switching											
Bush											
September	13	13	14	24	23	16	9	6	8	10	5
October	10	11	10	16	8	14	9	5	4	12	8
Difference	-3	-2	-4	-8	-15	-2	0	-1	-4	+2	+3
Dukakis											
September	12	*	1	6	10	15	22	17	15	20	18
October	10	1	1	5	9	22	9	18	15	13	16
Difference	-2	+1	0	-1	-1	+7	-13	+1	0	-7	-2

The strong support for each candidate has not changed significantly in the last six weeks, and there are still three in ten respondents who can be classified as "swing voters" -- those who say there is some chance they might switch or are currently undecided about their preference. The proportion of "swing voters" among the Upbeats, Disaffecteds, Seculars, and New Dealers has declined since the last survey, while the proportion among the Followers has increased to almost half (47%).

TREND IN PROPORTION OF SWING VOTERS BY TYPOLOGY GROUP

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
Swing Vote											
September	32%	15%	18%	35%	44%	39%	36%	27%	37%	40%	30%
October	29%	13%	16%	26%	31%	47%	24%	30%	32%	38%	33%
Difference	-3	-2	-2	-9	-13	+8	-12	-3	-5	-2	+3

The Demographic Profile of Candidate Support

The general pattern of each candidate's support in the electorate is very similar, in demographic terms, to the last survey.

- A significant gender gap still exists. The overall Bush lead can be attributed to his greater support among men, as women remain evenly divided in their preferences.

- Bush's support among whites is unchanged, but it has increased among blacks.

- There is now a clear relationship between age and support for Bush. Although he holds a lead in all age groups, his support declines with the age of respondents.

- In regional terms, the race is even in the East; but Bush holds substantial leads in the South and Midwest, and he is now ahead in the West.

- Dukakis holds a lead over Bush only among those with the lowest levels of education and income, while Bush is supported by majorities of those of higher socioeconomic status.

- Bush receives much more solid support from Republicans than Dukakis does from Democrats. And he holds a 13 percentage point lead among self-described Independents.

- Bush is losing nearly one in five of those who reported voting for Ronald Reagan in 1984, as many Democrats are returning home to support Dukakis. The Democratic candidate has retained the support of most Mondale voters. Previous nonvoters are divided in their preferences.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CANDIDATE SUPPORT

	<u>Bush</u>	<u>Dukakis</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>
All Voters	50%	42	(2006)
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	55%	38	(1004)
Female	46%	44	(1002)
<u>Race</u>			
White	55%	37	(1811)
Black	17%	71	(127)
<u>Age</u>			
Under 30	57%	39	(407)
30-39	50%	42	(495)
40-49	48%	44	(389)
50-59	48%	42	(258)
60 and over	46%	41	(438)
<u>Region</u>			
East	45%	46	(492)
Midwest	51%	40	(605)
South	52%	39	(613)
West	54%	41	(296)
<u>Education</u>			
College Graduate	56%	40	(649)
Some College	56%	39	(402)
High School Graduate	50%	41	(743)
Less than High School	36%	49	(202)
<u>Income</u>			
Under \$10,000	38%	47	(187)
\$10,000 - \$19,999	44%	48	(325)
\$20,000 - \$29,999	51%	41	(396)
\$30,000 - \$39,999	52%	41	(328)
\$40,000 - \$49,999	57%	39	(230)
\$50,000+	60%	37	(403)
<u>Party ID</u>			
Republican	92%	5	(649)
Independent	50%	37	(727)
Democrat	13%	79	(630)
<u>1984 Vote</u>			
Voted Reagan	75%	18	(1159)
Voted Other	6%	85	(539)
Non-Voter	43%	44	(308)

PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE CAMPAIGN

The survey contained several questions which were designed to measure the penetration of campaign rhetoric into the electorate. These items can be classified into two groups - those which reflect the acquisition of political knowledge based upon the candidates' policy positions or specific facts which they have tried to communicate to voters, and those which reflect familiarity with important phrases that have become part of the campaign vernacular, at least to campaign insiders and reporters.

Our measures of awareness of specific campaign themes and rhetoric find that relatively few American voters are aware of specific campaign figures and phrases, but that large majorities of voters know which candidate is associated with which position on such issues as the death penalty and abortion. The campaign elements that test as most effective for Bush were the pledge and awareness of the candidates' positions on the death penalty. The campaign theme "good wages for good jobs" appears to be Dukakis' best appeal.

Political Knowledge

In the area of important people and issues in the campaign, the survey respondents were much more familiar with some of the notable issue positions of the candidates than with the names of political figures who have been used to symbolize other campaign issues.

For example, 71% of the respondents know that Michael Dukakis opposes the death penalty, an issue position which the Bush campaign has gone to great lengths to publicize. At the same time, almost as many respondents (65%) are aware that Michael Dukakis supports a woman's right to choose to have an abortion. But less than half of the respondents (41%) know that Dukakis vetoed a bill requiring public school teachers to lead students in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

In terms of two key personalities whose names have been woven into their campaign rhetoric as symbols of America's problems with crime and drugs, only slightly more than half of the respondents (53%) could identify General Manuel Noriega, the Panamanian military leader who has been indicted on drug charges; and only one in five (24%) recognized the name of Willie Horton, the

Massachusetts convict who escaped while on furlough and committed additional crimes.

The issues of Dukakis's positions on abortion and the death penalty have become widely known in the electorate. But less than half of the respondents (41%) know that Dukakis vetoed a bill requiring public school teachers to lead students in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

In terms of two key personalities whose names have been woven into the candidates' campaign rhetoric as symbols of America's problems with crime and drugs, only slightly more than half of the respondents (53%) could correctly identify General Manuel Noriega, the Panamanian military leader who has been indicted on drug charges; and only one in five (24%) correctly identified the name of Willie Horton, the Massachusetts convict who escaped while on furlough and committed additional crimes.

**POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE
PERCENT GIVING CORRECT ANSWER**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
KNOW DUKAKIS VETOED PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BILL	41	65	41	43	33	25	59	54	34	18	33
KNOW DUKAKIS'S POSITION ON ABORTION	65	79	70	61	56	43	89	82	66	50	59
KNOW DUKAKIS'S POSITION ON DEATH PENALTY	71	88	80	75	67	52	81	80	64	52	70
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 201: Do you happen to know which presidential candidate vetoed a bill requiring teachers to lead students in the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools?

Question 301: Which candidate supports a woman's right to choose to have an abortion?

Question 302: Which candidate opposes the death penalty?

The issues of Dukakis's positions on abortion and the death penalty have been directed by George Bush to conservative elements in both the Democratic and Republican parties. However, the lowest level of knowledge of Dukakis's position can be found among the God & Country Democrats, a core Democratic group, whose members do not represent a well-informed or knowledgeable segment of the party. Both the 60's Democrats and the Seculars have expected high levels of knowledge, while the New Dealers and Partisan Poor - two groups of very loyal Democrats - have significantly lower levels of knowledge.

One issue on which the Bush forces have not been too successful is the Dukakis veto of the bill to require the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag in public schools. This strategy was clearly designed to attract defections from conservative elements of the Democratic party, yet the God & Country Democrats have the lowest levels of knowledge of Dukakis's veto than any other group in the electorate (18%).

The names of two individuals will certainly become part of the folklore of the 1988 presidential campaign because of their use to symbolize important themes on which the candidates have been focusing. General Manuel Noriega, the Panamanian dictator who has been indicted on drug charges in U.S. courts, has been used by Dukakis to symbolize the futility and ineptness of the Reagan administration's war against drugs. Willie Horton is the name of a Massachusetts convict who escaped while on furlough and committed additional crimes, including rape and assault. He is used by the Bush campaign to symbolize how Dukakis is soft on crime.

Neither name has penetrated very deeply into the American electorate; moreover, the penetration has not been among the groups that are most likely to be affected by the issues which these personalities represent. Barely more than half (53%) of those surveyed recognize who Noriega is, but recognition levels among three core Democratic groups, for whom this message is intended, are lower than in the population as a whole - God & Country Democrats (43%), New Dealers (46%), and the Partisan Poor (46%).

Willie Horton is even less well known, as only one in four (24%) could correctly identify who he is. Knowledge of him among the God & Country Democrats is very low (14%), while New Dealers and Partisan Poor are no more likely than the total sample to recognize the name (24% and 20%, respectively).

But knowledge levels are no different among whites and blacks in the sample, suggesting no greater salience of Horton by race.

**POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE
PERCENT IDENTIFYING NAME**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
KNOWS WHO GENERAL MANUEL NORIEGA IS	53	74	52	51	55	31	72	64	46	43	46
KNOWS WHO WILLIE HORTON IS	24	42	21	22	15	14	40	34	24	14	20
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 202: Do you happen to know who General Manuel Noriega is?

Question 203: Do you happen to know who Willie Horton is?

Campaign Slogans

Every campaign uses slogans to encapsulate its themes in concise and hopefully memorable messages. Sometimes these slogans represent the presentation of the candidate's own themes, and in other cases they represent points they want to underscore about their opponent.

Respondents were asked whether they had heard each of seven different phrases used during the campaign, three of which were used by the Bush campaign to characterize themselves positively, one used by the Bush campaign to characterize Dukakis negatively, two used by the Dukakis campaign to characterize itself positively, and one used by the Dukakis team to characterize Dan Quayle negatively. In general, these phrases were the most familiar to the best educated and most politically sophisticated segments of the population, as well as the most politically active.

The most memorable of these campaign phrases is one which was not originally part of the regular sloganeering but cropped up in the vice-presidential debate. More than eight in ten (85%) had heard of the phrase "You're no Jack Kennedy," and 60% know it was used by Senator Lloyd Bentsen.

-This phrase was correctly associated with Bentsen by large numbers of Enterprisers (82%), Seculars (76%), and 60's Democrats (73%). But fewer members of three core Democratic groups could link it to the Democratic vice-presidential candidate - one-half of Partisan Poor (51%) and New Dealers (50%) and 43% of God & Country Democrats.

The Bush campaign's use of the phrase "No new taxes...read my lips" has also been successful. Eight in ten of the respondents (78%) have heard it used, and 59% correctly associate it with Bush.

-The Enterprisers are most likely to associate this phrase with Bush (82%). But the New Dealers and God & Country Democrats (57% and 58% respectively) have gotten this message as clearly as the more sophisticated Democratic-oriented groups -- the 60's Democrats and the Seculars (67%).

The Dukakis phrase describing his interest in "Good jobs at good wages" was recognized by almost as many respondents (73%), but fewer could associate it with him (44%). However, all of the Democratic-oriented groups were more likely than the general sample to identify this with Dukakis, suggesting he has been relatively effective in communicating this theme to his most likely supporters.

The only other phrase which was recognized by a majority of respondents (62%) was "My opponent is a card-carrying member of the ACLU," with 49% correctly associating the phrase with Bush.

-This phrase, designed to appeal to conservative Democrats as well as Republicans, has not effectively penetrated the God & Country Democrats (45% familiarity with the phrase and only 29% correctly associate it with Bush).

Only half of those surveyed (48%) recognized the Dukakis phrase "Star Schools, not Star Wars," and only 32% correctly associated it with him.

-Recognition levels of the God & Country Democrats and the Partisan Poor are just as high as those of the Seculars and 60's Democrats. However, they are less likely to associate it correctly with Dukakis than are members of the better educated and more sophisticated Democratic-oriented groups.

George Bush's use of the slogans "1,000 points of light" and a "Flexible freeze" were familiar to only one-third of those surveyed (35% and 31% respectively) and could be associated with him by one-quarter of registered voters or less (27% and 14% respectively). Nonetheless, Enterprisers, Seculars and 60's Democrats could associate these phrases with Bush at greater levels than could the total sample of registered voters.

RECOGNITION OF CAMPAIGN SLOGANS
% CORRECTLY IDENTIFYING SOURCE

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
<u>Slogan</u>											
You're no Jack Kennedy	60	82	65	63	54	40	76	73	50	43	51
No New Taxes.. Read My Lips	59	82	65	51	53	43	67	67	57	58	52
Good Jobs at Good Wages	44	56	37	31	42	30	50	53	53	50	53
My Opponent Is a Card-Carrying Member of the ACLU	49	74	60	42	35	29	70	67	45	29	39
Star Schools, Not Star Wars	32	41	33	38	32	12	45	42	30	28	29
1,000 Points of Light	27	49	26	27	21	11	50	43	19	10	18
Flexible Freeze	14	24	13	13	8	8	23	16	12	13	9
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

The strategic significance of campaign rhetoric is, of course, what difference it makes in voter preferences for the two candidates. This is a difficult issue for analysis as some people will respond to slogans and events because they conform to their prior attitudes and predispositions, while others will be converted to support for a candidate because he uses them. A single survey cannot directly address this question in "cause and effect" terms, but inferences can be made about the effects of campaign rhetoric by looking at the relative margin of Bush over Dukakis among registered voters who are familiar with these policies, personalities, and slogans.

Data are presented in the following table which show the size of the Bush lead over Dukakis, in percentage points, among registered voters in the total sample and for each group, by the group's knowledge of these elements of campaign rhetoric - Dukakis's veto of the Pledge of Allegiance, who Manuel Noriega and Willie Horton are, and Dukakis's positions on abortion and the death penalty. Telling voters about the Pledge veto and Dukakis's opposition to capital punishment has helped George Bush the most, but the data suggest that those who are familiar with Willie Horton are somewhat less likely to support Bush, especially among strongly partisan Democrats.

- Knowledge of the pledge veto hurts Dukakis among the New Dealers, but it helps him among Seculars.

- Knowledge of Dukakis's opposition to capital punishment helps Bush among the Disaffecteds but hurts among the Seculars.

- Knowledge of who Willie Horton is results in a backlash in Dukakis's favor, especially among the Seculars. This suggests they may perceive racial overtones in this Bush appeal.

- Knowledge of who Noriega is helps Dukakis slightly, especially among the New Dealers.

- Knowledge of Dukakis's pro-choice position on abortion helps him a little among all Democratic groups, especially among the Partisan Poor.

BUSH LEAD OVER DUKAKIS, IN PERCENTAGE POINTS

AMONG THOSE WHO KNOW ABOUT:

	<u>Total Sample</u>	<u>Pledge Veto</u>	<u>Know Noriega</u>	<u>Know Horton</u>	<u>Know Abortion</u>	<u>Know Death Penalty</u>
All Registered Voters	8	17	10	5	6	14
Enterprisers	94	98	94	94	94	96
Moralists	90	98	88	93	92	92
Upbeats	71	78	66	69	68	74
Disaffecteds	34	34	37	*	38	43
Followers	-32	-45	*	*	*	-34
Seculars	-28	-34	-25	-51	-32	-37
60's Democrats	-74	-75	-81	-70	-77	-75
New Dealers	-57	-45	-66	*	-63	-58
God & Country Democrats	-37	*	*	*	-44	-39
Partisan Poor	-56	-57	-51	*	-64	-58

* Too few cases for analysis

In terms of campaign slogans, the most telling phrase belongs to Michael Dukakis, although he has not exploited it very effectively to date. Among those who associate the phrase "Good jobs at good wages" with him, he actually holds a small lead over Bush, by 4 percentage points. He does better among all Democratic groups members who recognize this phrase, and he lowers Bush's lead among the Upbeats by 16 percentage points.

-Among those who recognize the phrase "Star schools, not Star Wars," Dukakis does better among Upbeats, but he does worse among New Dealers.

-Among those who correctly associate the phrase "1,000 points of light" with George Bush, he does better with Moralists but worse among Upbeats; and most Democratic-oriented group members who recognize this phrase are more likely to support Dukakis than otherwise.

-The slogan "No New Taxes...Read My Lips" has not had any particular impact on the electorate, even though the latter is widely associated with George Bush.

-The charge that Michael Dukakis is a "card-carrying member of the ACLU" has helped Bush among the core Republicans but there has been a backlash among members of Democratic-oriented groups, particularly the Seculars.

BUSH LEAD OVER DUKAKIS

	AMONG THOSE WHO RECOGNIZE:						
	Total Sample	Star Schools, Not Star Wars	1,000 Points of Light	Good Jobs at Good Wages	No New Taxes	You're No Jack Kennedy	ACLU
All Registered Voters	8	10	8	-4	10	11	8
Enterprisers	94	96	96	97	96	96	96
Moralists	90	92	97	91	91	91	92
Upbeats	71	64	63	55	66	69	68
Disaffecteds	34	*	*	34	40	31	17
Followers	-32	*	*	*	-40	*	*
Seculars	-28	-36	-48	-38	-37	-30	-40
60's Democrats	-74	-71	-82	-81	-78	-81	-73
New Dealers	-57	-45	*	-69	-62	-67	-64
God & Country Democrats	-37	*	*	-52	-39	-24	*
Partisan Poor	-56	*	*	-65	-57	-64	-57

* Too Few cases for analysis

THE CAMPAIGNS AND THE MEDIA

As we near the end of the campaign, increasing coverage is being devoted to the tone of the campaign. Part of this interest is directed toward how the candidates are treating each other, in their speeches and in their advertising. But another element is how the press is treating the candidates, in terms of fairness and the critical tone of their content. And the increased availability of polling data and the constant release of new "trial heat" measurements is also a topic of growing public concern.

The Candidates' Criticisms of Each Other

Large numbers of respondents are concerned about the critical tone of this year's presidential campaigns, more so about Bush's personal criticism of Dukakis than the other way around. And this concern has grown across the campaign. Half of those surveyed (52%) feel that Bush has been too personally critical of Dukakis, while 43% feel he has not been. The ratio is reversed for perceptions of Dukakis's criticisms of Bush - 45% feel he has been too personally critical and 50% feel he has not been.

TREND IN CANDIDATES' CRITICISMS OF EACH OTHER

	Sept. 9-11 <u>1988</u>	Oct. 23-26 <u>1988</u>
<u>Bush:</u>		
Too Personally Critical of Dukakis	44%	52%
Not Too Personally Critical	50	43
Don't Know	$\frac{6}{100\%}$	$\frac{5}{100\%}$
<u>Dukakis:</u>		
Too Personally Critical of Bush	37%	45%
Not Too Personally	56	50
Don't Know	$\frac{7}{100\%}$	$\frac{5}{100\%}$
Sample Size	(1003)	(2006)

Question 312, 313: In the presidential campaign so far, do you think George Bush/Michael Dukakis has been too personally critical of Michael Dukakis/George Bush, or not?

There is a strong partisan undertone to attitudes about how critical each candidate has been. But members of Democratic groups are more concerned about Bush's criticism of Dukakis than members of Republican-oriented groups are about the Dukakis criticisms of Bush.

-Seven in ten of the Partisan Poor (75%), the 60's Democrats (72%), and the New Dealers (70%) feel that Bush has been too personally critical of Dukakis, while two out of three Seculars (66%) feel this way.

-Only slight majorities of most Republican-oriented groups feel that Dukakis has been too personally critical of George Bush, including 55% of the Upbeats, 53% of the Disaffecteds, and 52% of the Moralists. And only four-in-ten Enterprisers feel this way (39%).

As a way of measuring the overall level of concern about the strident tone of campaigning, a Negativity Index was constructed by adding together the proportions in each of the groups who feel that either of the candidates has been too critical of the other. For the total sample, the Negativity Index score was 97, the sum of 45% who felt Dukakis has been too critical of Bush and 52% who feel Bush has been too critical of Dukakis.

-The New Dealers are the most concerned about the negative tone of the campaign, with a score of 119 on the index. This reflects their strong Democratic partisanship, undoubtedly in conjunction with their longer perspective across multiple presidential campaigns. The Bush tone, in particular, may have hurt him with this group.

-The Partisan Poor and the 60's Democrats are also more likely than others to see the campaigns as highly negative, with a score of 112 and 110 on the index.

-Among Independents, the Disaffecteds and the Seculars are more likely than the total sample to see the campaigns as negative, and among Disaffecteds this is due to equivalent perceptions of the tone of both candidates' criticisms.

-The Enterprisers are the least likely to see this as a negative campaign, with a score of 62 on the index.

**CONCERNS ABOUT NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING,
BY CANDIDATE AND IN A COMBINED NEGATIVITY INDEX, BY GROUP**

	<u>Bush Has Been Too Critical</u>	<u>Dukakis Has Been Too Critical</u>	<u>Negativity Index</u>
Total Sample	52%	45%	97
Enterprisers	23%	39%	62
Moralists	28%	52%	80
Upbeats	40%	55%	95
Disaffecteds	51%	53%	104
Followers	59%	38%	97
Seculars	66%	38%	104
60's Democrats	72%	38%	110
New Dealers	70%	49%	119
God & Country Democrats	57%	39%	96
Partisan Poor	75%	37%	112

Assessments of the Quality of Reporting of the Campaign

Americans are paying close attention to news about the presidential campaign, almost as much attention as to the recent flight of the space shuttle. But, their perception of the quality of the campaign coverage has declined since it was measured in a Times Mirror survey in May. In general, the public does not find the coverage too personally critical of either candidate; but they are more likely to think news organizations have been unfair to Dukakis than to Bush.

When asked about how closely they were following each of five major recent news stories, news about the election (43% followed it "very closely" and 44% "fairly closely") ranked just above interest in the coverage of the recent space shuttle flight (50% followed it "very closely" and 35% "fairly closely"). And interest in these two stories outpaced the World Series (31% followed it "very closely" and 21% "fairly closely") and recent problems at nuclear reactor plants (28% followed this "very closely" and 44% "fairly closely"). Very few respondents (14%) have been paying close attention to the pending divorce between Mike Tyson and Robin Givens.

- Large proportions of both the Democratic-oriented groups and the Republican-oriented groups have been paying close attention to news about the campaign. However, Disaffecteds are somewhat less likely to follow election coverage closely.

NEWS STORIES FOLLOWED CLOSELY

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
<u>FOLLOWED CLOSELY</u>											
PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN	87	95	92	91	78	79	91	95	84	81	86
RECENT SPACE SHUTTLE FLIGHT	85	92	86	92	87	74	84	91	76	82	79
NUCLEAR REACTOR PLANT PROBLEMS	72	74	71	73	74	54	85	81	76	62	71
WORLD SERIES	52	58	53	62	49	44	53	49	52	60	40
MIKE TYSON- ROBIN GIVENS DIVORCE	36	32	30	38	31	40	34	40	32	45	45
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 601: Next, I will read a list of some stories covered by news organizations this past year. As I read each item, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely.

Among those who have been following news about the presidential campaign "very closely" or "fairly closely," their evaluations of the job news organizations have been doing has declined since May. At that time, only 22% evaluated the job they were doing either as either "poor" or "only fair." In August, that proportion had grown to 35%; in the latest survey it stands at 39%.

TREND IN RATING OF NEWS ORGANIZATIONS ON CAMPAIGN COVERAGE

	<u>May 1988</u>	<u>August 1988</u>	<u>October 1988</u>
<u>Job Done Was</u>			
Excellent	14%	20%	14%
Good	57	43	46
Only Fair	19	23	30
Poor	3	12	9
Don't Know	7	2	1
Sample Size	2416	1000	2006

-Among those who followed the news closely, Enterprisers (50%), and Seculars (48%), and to a lesser extent the God & Country Democrats (44%) and Disaffecteds (45%) have the lowest regard for the quality of coverage.

-The Upbeats are the most likely to give news organizations good evaluations for the job they have been doing (72% rate their efforts "excellent" or "good" compared to 60% in the total sample).

ASSESSMENTS OF THE NEWS COVERAGE OF THE CAMPAIGN
BASED ON THOSE VOTERS WHO FOLLOWED THIS STORY CLOSELY

<u>JOB DONE WAS</u>	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
EXCELLENT	14%	8%	10%	19%	9%	17%	8%	20%	14%	20%	16%
GOOD	46	42	47	53	45	50	43	48	46	34	53
ONLY FAIR	30	35	32	20	31	24	36	26	34	34	24
POOR	9	15	10	7	14	8	12	5	6	10	5
DON'T KNOW	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SAMPLE SIZE	1759	228	228	248	176	97	147	207	150	113	145

Question 602: In general, how would you rate the job news organizations have done in covering news about the presidential campaign in 1988: excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

About one in three of the survey respondents thinks news organizations have been too personally critical of each of the candidates. Constructing a Negativity Index for press coverage of the candidates, there are fewer differences between the groups than were found in their views of how the candidates are treating each other. Overall, the Negativity Index for press coverage was 70 among all registered voters, compared to 97 for assessments of how the candidates have been treating each other.

-The Moralists and the New Dealers (84 and 76 on the Negativity Scale) stand out as the groups that are most concerned about the negative tenor of the campaign and who perceive an imbalanced, critical coverage of their party's candidate.

-The Upbeats have an equivalent score on the Negativity Index (74), but they see each candidate as equally disadvantaged.

-The Seculars are the least likely to see critical coverage (Index score of 45), although they also see Dukakis as relatively disadvantaged.

**CONCERNS ABOUT CRITICAL CAMPAIGN COVERAGE,
BY CANDIDATE AND IN A COMBINED NEGATIVITY INDEX, BY GROUP**

News Organizations Have Been Too Critical Of:

	<u>George Bush</u>	<u>Michael Dukakis</u>	<u>Negativity Index</u>
Total Sample	33%	37%	70
Enterprisers	41%	28%	69
Moralists	50%	34%	84
Upbeats	36%	38%	74
Disaffecteds	37%	36%	73
Followers	31%	45%	76
Seculars	18%	27%	45
60's Democrats	24%	37%	61
New Dealers	31%	45%	76
God & Country Democrats	28%	34%	62
Partisan Poor	25%	45%	70

Question 605, 606: In the presidential campaign so far, do you think news organizations have been too personally critical of George Bush/Michael Dukakis, or not?

Organizational Influences on the Campaign

A number of non-candidate factors have been criticized for their role in the current campaign, including news organizations and advertising consultants and pollsters. The increased use of polls by news organizations as an integral part of their reporting has also come under attack, particularly because of the variation in results presented by a larger number of media organizations sponsoring polls. The public remains more concerned about the influence of news organizations than they are about the "handlers" who manage the candidates' campaigns. And pluralities think that reporting of who is ahead in the polls does not improve the quality of press coverage of the election and is a bad thing for the country.

A majority of those interviewed in the latest survey (58%) think that news organizations have "too much influence" on which candidate becomes president, reflecting no change from the August survey in which 54% felt this way, or with similar questions asked in the January and May surveys about their influence on which candidates become their party's presidential nomination (52% and 49% respectively).

-Members of two of the most politically sophisticated groups - the Seculars (72%) and the Enterprisers (68%) are most likely to be concerned about undue influence, as are the Disaffecteds. God & Country Democrats (35%) and Followers (40%) are least concerned.

**ASSESSMENTS OF THE INFLUENCE OF NEWS ORGANIZATIONS
ON WHICH CANDIDATE BECOMES PRESIDENT**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA</u> <u>LIST</u>	<u>UP-</u> <u>BTS</u>	<u>DIS</u> <u>AFF</u>	<u>FOL</u> <u>LOW</u>	<u>SECU</u> <u>LARS</u>	<u>60'S</u> <u>DEMS</u>	<u>NEW</u> <u>DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/</u> <u>CTRY</u>	<u>PART</u> <u>POOR</u>
NEWS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE											
TOO MUCH INFLUENCE	58%	68%	63%	59%	70%	40%	72%	56%	58%	35%	51%
TOO LITTLE INFLUENCE	3	1	2	1	3	6	3	3	3	7	1
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT	36	30	30	37	22	49	25	40	35	53	45
DON'T KNOW	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 603: How much influence do you feel news organizations have on which candidate becomes president: too much influence, too little influence, or about the right amount?

The survey respondents were divided about whether advertising consultants and pollsters have too much influence on which candidate becomes president (43%) or have about the right amount of influence (44%).

-Again it is members of the most politically sophisticated groups, in particular the Seculars, who are the most likely to be concerned about their influence (70%). Followers (31%) are least likely to feel this way. Other groups that are somewhat less likely to be concerned include the Upbeats (34%), the Moralists (35%), and the God & Country Democrats (35%).

**ASSESSMENTS OF THE INFLUENCE OF ADVERTISING CONSULTANTS
AND POLLSTERS ON WHICH CANDIDATE BECOMES PRESIDENT**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
<u>AD CONSULTANTS/ POLLSTERS HAVE</u>											
TOO MUCH INFLUENCE	43%	48%	35%	34%	49%	31%	70%	50%	42%	35%	40%
TOO LITTLE INFLUENCE	8	5	8	7	9	12	4	4	10	10	7
ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT	44	44	49	55	35	46	24	45	42	48	47
DON'T KNOW	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 604: And how about advertising consultants and pollsters? How much influence do you feel advertising consultants and pollsters have on which candidate becomes President? Would you say they have too much influence, too little influence, or about the right amount?

Nearly one-half of the respondents hold the opinion that the reporting of who is ahead in the polls does not improve the coverage of the election (47%), compared to less than four-in-ten who feel it does improve coverage (38%). Only 7% volunteered that it has no effect.

-Disaffecteds and 60's Democrats (by 55% to 32% and 56% to 33% margins respectively) are most likely to feel that the "horse race" treatment of polls does not improve press coverage of the election. They are closely followed by the Seculars, who hold this view by a 52% to 36% margin.

-Three groups are about equally divided in their assessment of its contribution. New Dealers feel it improves coverage by a 43% to 41% margin, while God & Country Democrats (by a 42% to 38% margin) and the Partisan Poor (by a 43% to 42% margin) feel it does not improve coverage.

EFFECTS OF REPORTING WHO IS AHEAD IN THE POLLS ON PRESS COVERAGE

REPORTING WHO'S AHEAD	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
IMPROVES PRESS COVERAGE	38%	37%	36%	42%	32%	35%	36%	33%	43%	38%	42%
DOES NOT IMPROVE PRESS COVERAGE	47	46	41	49	55	48	52	56	41	42	43
HAS NO EFFECT	7	10	8	7	8	7	7	5	8	9	5
DON'T KNOW	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 607: In your opinion, does the reporting of who is ahead in the polls improve the press coverage of the election, or not?

By a slight plurality of 45% to 38%, more Americans believe the reporting of who is ahead in the polls is a bad thing for the country.

-Majorities of the Seculars (58%), 60's Democrats (57%), New Dealers (54%), and the Disaffecteds (53%), think the reporting of who is ahead in the polls is a "bad thing" for the country.

-There is a majority in only one group - 50% of the Upbeats - who feel such reporting is a "good thing" for the country.

IS REPORTING WHO IS AHEAD A GOOD THING OR A BAD THING FOR THE COUNTRY?

REPORTING WHO'S AHEAD	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
GOOD THING FOR THE COUNTRY	38	47	43	50	29	40	28	30	31	36	39
BAD THING FOR THE COUNTRY	45	39	38	34	53	41	58	57	54	43	43
NEITHER A GOOD THING OR A BAD THING	12	12	14	12	13	9	10	9	8	12	15
DON'T KNOW	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

SAMPLE SIZE 2006 242 249 271 228 121 159 215 174 137 167

Question 608: In your opinion, is the reporting of who is ahead in the polls a good thing or a bad thing for the country?

ISSUES FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Respondents were asked to assess a list of nine issues in terms of the amount of attention they should be given by the new President, whoever he is. Some of these issues have already been discussed by the candidates during the campaign, either as a difference with the opponent or as a common interest. Others have not been addressed by either candidate.

Three of the issues were seen by at least six in ten of those surveyed as very important and a top priority for the new administration - reducing the federal deficit (76%), proposing laws to increase protection of the environment (64%), and negotiating further arms reductions with the Soviet Union (63%). Four other issues are seen by approximately four in ten respondents as having the same level of importance - proposing laws to create a national health insurance program (44%), developing a program to make it easier for people to buy their first home (40%), and proposing a program to provide care for children while their parents are at work (39%).

For two other issues - restoring diplomatic relations with Iran and delaying cost of living increases in Social Security for one year in order to reduce the federal budget deficit - only one in five respondents feel they should be a top priority (17% and 24% respectively) and four in ten think they should not be considered at all (35% and 40% respectively).

**SUMMARY TABLE OF ISSUES THAT ARE VERY IMPORTANT AND
SHOULD BE A TOP PRIORITY FOR THE NEXT ADMINISTRATION**

	<u>TTL</u>	<u>ENTP</u>	<u>MORA LIST</u>	<u>UP- BTS</u>	<u>DIS AFF</u>	<u>FOL LOW</u>	<u>SECU LARS</u>	<u>60'S DEMS</u>	<u>NEW DEAL</u>	<u>GOD/ CTRY</u>	<u>PART POOR</u>
VERY IMPORTANT/TOP PRIORITY ISSUES											
REDUCING DEFICIT	76	82	74	73	77	66	79	84	73	73	79
PROPOSING LAWS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT	64	55	59	62	63	61	76	81	64	61	65
NEGOTIATING ARMS REDUCTIONS WITH SOVIETS	63	73	62	66	56	43	69	78	59	61	59
PROPOSING LAWS FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE	44	13	29	31	45	55	49	55	52	62	58
DEVELOP PROGRAM FOR 1ST TIME HOME BUYERS	40	22	29	31	39	43	34	38	53	63	52
PROPOSING CHILD CARE PROGRAM	39	16	24	36	31	52	43	52	41	52	58
INCREASING TARIFFS ON JAPANESE IMPORTS	35	26	37	34	53	18	24	30	52	42	34
DELAYING COLAs FOR SOCIAL SECURITY FOR ONE YEAR TO REDUCE DEFICIT	24	24	21	19	24	29	17	20	23	40	22
RESTORING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH IRAN	17	14	18	21	16	21	17	9	14	21	25 13
SAMPLE SIZE	2006	242	249	271	228	121	159	215	174	137	167

Question 310: Regardless of who is elected in November, there are a number of important issues the next president will face. I'm going to read you a list of issues, and for each one please tell me whether you think it is very important and should be a top priority for the next administration, it's important but not a top priority, or whether it should not be considered at all.

Specific ways to reduce the federal deficit have not been discussed in detail by either candidate, yet this is the issue most likely to be seen as very important.

-The 60's Democrats (84%) and Enterprisers (82%) are most likely to attach significance to this issue, but at least seven in ten of all other voter groups also feel it is very important.

-Both candidates have spoken of their concern about the environment, and it has been an important topic in their advertising. This issue is particularly important to the 60's Democrats and the Seculars (81% and 76%, respectively, say it is a very important issue). Enterprisers are least likely to say this is a top priority (55%).

-Both Bush and Dukakis have spoken of the need to negotiate further arms reductions with the Soviet Union. The Enterprisers (73%) and the 60's Democrats (78%) are more likely than the total sample to feel this is a very important issue. But this issue does not have as much appeal to the Disaffecteds (56%) and the Followers (43%).

-Michael Dukakis has proposed creating a national health insurance plan, while Bush has labeled this proposal "socialized medicine." This issue is very important to at least half the membership of all the Democratic-oriented groups, especially the God & Country Democrats (62%) and the Partisan Poor (58%). But it is seen this way by only 13% of the Enterprisers and three in ten of the Moralists (29%) and the Upbeats (31%).

-Dukakis has also proposed a program to facilitate first-time home ownership, and this is seen as an important issue by members of three of the four core Democratic groups - a majority of the God & Country Democrats (63%), the New Dealers (53%), and the Partisan Poor (52%). But members of the two core Republican groups are the least likely to view it this way (only 22% of Enterprisers and 29% of the Moralists), as are the Upbeats (31%).

-Both candidates have described programs to increase child care, although they differ on the role the federal government should play in such efforts. A majority of nearly all Democratic-oriented groups see this as very important - 58% of the Partisan Poor and 52% of the God & Country Democrats, the 60's Democrats, and the Followers. But only 16% of the Enterprisers and 24% of the Moralists feel the same way.

-Neither candidate can be labelled a "protectionist" nor has either advocated increased tariffs on Japanese imports. But a majority of the Disaffecteds (53%) and the New Dealers (52%) feel this should be a top priority of the new Administration. At least one-quarter of Followers (29%), Seculars (28%), and Enterpriser (25%) feel it should not be considered at all.

-Michael Dukakis has charged that George Bush plans to use Social Security funds to reduce the federal deficit, and George Bush has denied this. The God & Country Democrats are the only group in which as many as four in ten of the respondents think this should be a top priority of the new administration, while only one in six of the Upbeats (19%) and the Seculars (17%) feel this way.

-Neither candidate has discussed the restoration of diplomatic relations with Iran. This is an unpopular proposal with no more than one in four members of any group - the God & Country Democrats (25%) - believing this should be a top priority. The lowest level of support for this issue comes from the Seculars (9%).

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

THE COMPOSITION OF THE TYPOLOGY

For more than a year, the Gallup Organization has been conducting extensive interviews with Americans in order to learn more about the basic values and orientations that structure their political thinking. The overriding purpose of this effort was to develop a more meaningful way of describing the American electorate than the traditional concepts of "liberal" and "conservative", "Democrat" and "Republican." Although party affiliation remains the single best indicator of voters' candidate preferences as well as the best individual measure of political behavior, this research has found that political preference and opinions on issues are more fully understood when an individual's values and personal orientations are also taken into account.

Through extensive research and from analysis of the findings of a nationwide survey of over 4000 personal interviews, Gallup identified nine dimensions that animate public opinion. Three of these dimensions are basic personal orientations while six are values:

Personal Orientations

Religious Faith: a measure of belief in God.

Alienation: the degree of powerlessness, hopelessness, and the lack of trust in government people feel.

Financial Pressure: the degree of personal financial concern.

Values

Tolerance/Intolerance: the degree to which people value civil liberties and free speech and the extent to which they accept others who choose a different life style.

Social Justice: beliefs about social welfare, social class standing, and the role of the federal government in providing for the needy.

Militant Anti-Communism: perceptions about the threat of communism, militarism, ethnocentrism, and the use of force to further American interests.

Attitudes toward Government: beliefs about the size and effectiveness of government.

American Exceptionalism: a belief in America that combines patriotism with the view that the United States has a boundless ability to solve its problems.

Attitudes toward Business Corporations: beliefs about American "big business."

The Times Mirror typology was constructed by classifying people according to these nine basic values and orientations, by their party affiliation and by their degree of political involvement. A statistical technique called "cluster analysis" was used to identify these distinct groups of American voters. Two groups are solidly Republican, four are Democratic, and five are independent with two of them leaning Republican and two leaning Democratic.

The typology, then, consists of the following 11 groups:

CORE REPUBLICAN GROUPS

Enterprisers: Affluent, well-educated, and predominantly male. This classic Republican group is mainly characterized by its pro-business and anti-government attitudes. Enterprisers are moderate on questions of personal freedom, but oppose increased spending on most social programs.

Moralists: Middle-aged and middle-income, this core Republican group is militantly anti communist, and restrictive on personal freedom issues.

REPUBLICAN-LEANING GROUPS

Upbeats: Young and optimistic, the members of this group are firm believers in America and in the country's government. Upbeats are moderate in their political attitudes but strongly pro-Reagan.

Disaffecteds: Alienated, pessimistic, and financially pressured, this group leans toward the GOP camp, but it has had historic ties to the Democratic party. Disaffecteds are skeptical of both big government and big business, but are pro-military.

LOW INVOLVEMENT GROUP

Bystanders: The members of this group are young, predominantly white and poorly educated. They neither participate in politics nor show any interest in current affairs.

DEMOCRATIC-LEANING GROUPS

Followers: Young, poorly educated and disproportionately black. This group shows little interest in politics and is very persuadable and unpredictable. Although they are not critical of government or big business, Followers do not have much faith in America.

Seculars: This group is uniquely characterized by its lack of religious belief. In addition, Seculars are strongly committed to personal freedom and are dovish on defense issues. Their level of participation in politics, however, is not as high as one might expect given their education and their political sophistication.

CORE DEMOCRATIC GROUPS

60's Democrats: This well-educated, heavily female group has a strong belief in social justice, as well as a very low militancy level. These mainstream Democrats are highly tolerant of views and lifestyles they do not share and favor most forms of social spending.

New Dealers: Older, blue collar and religious. The roots of this aging group of traditional Democrats can be traced back to the New Deal. Although supportive of many social spending measures, New Dealers are intolerant on social issues and somewhat hawkish on defense.

God & Country Democrats: This group is older, poor, and disproportionately black, with high numbers concentrated in the South. The Passive Poor have a strong faith in America and are uncritical of its institutions. They favor social spending and are moderately anti-communist.

Partisan Poor: Very low income, relatively high proportions of blacks and poorly educated, this loyal Democratic group has a strong faith in its party's ability to achieve social justice. The Partisan Poor firmly support all forms of social spending, yet they are conservative on some social issues.

TYPOLGY DISTRIBUTION

	<u>January</u> <u>1988</u>	<u>May</u> <u>1988</u>	<u>September</u> <u>1988</u>	<u>October</u> <u>1988</u>
Enterprisers	10%	10%	12%	10%
Moralists	12	12	12	12
Upbeats	10	8	11	13
Disaffecteds	10	11	12	11
Bystanders	3	3	2	3
Followers	6	6	6	7
Seculars	7	8	8	7
60's Democrats	9	11	10	10
New Dealers	14	13	9	10
God & Country Democrats	8	8	8	8
Partisan Poor	11	10	10	9
Sample Size	(1688)	(2416)	(2001)	(2006)

SAMPLE SIZE OF THE TYPOLOGY GROUPS

	Registered Voters				
	April/May 1987	Jan. 1988	May 1988	Sept. 1988	Oct. 1988
Enterprisers	394	195	244	276	242
Moralists	397	224	319	249	249
Upbeats	289	164	208	243	271
Disaffecteds	282	182	266	230	228
Bystanders	89	31	65	30	43
Followers	223	84	119	105	121
Seculars	290	135	193	166	159
60's Democrats	365	165	258	222	215
New Dealers	439	218	325	166	174
God & Country Democrats	270	127	189	134	137
Partisan Poor	367	163	229	180	167
Total	(3405)	(1688)	(2416)	(2001)	(2006)

RDD TELEPHONE SAMPLE

For this survey, The Gallup Organization used a standard unclustered random digit dial (RDD) telephone sample. Gallup purchases these samples, which are based on a proportionate stratified sampling design, from Survey Sampling, Incorporated.

Because the interviewing was conducted on the telephone, this survey employed a shortened form of the battery of questions used to construct the voter typology. The combination of the difference between samples of telephone households and samples of all households and the difference between the long and short forms of the typology questionnaire may lead to differences in the size and composition of the resulting groups. Continuous methodological research and testing has been devoted to this issue in order to minimize these differences.

The random digit aspect of the sample is used to avoid "listing" bias. According to the most recent estimates from the Bureau of the Census, there are 87.5 million households in the United States, and just over 92% of them contain one or more telephones. Telephone directories only list about 74% of such "telephone households," and numerous studies have shown that households with unlisted telephone numbers are different in several important ways from listed households. Moreover, nearly 15% of listed telephone numbers are "discontinued" due to household mobility and directory publishing lag, and it is reasonable to assume that a roughly equal number are working residential numbers too new to be found in published directories.

In order to avoid these various sources of bias, a random digit procedure designed to provide representation of both listed and unlisted (including not-yet-listed) numbers is used. The design of the sample ensures this representation by random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange (the first three digits of a seven digit telephone number), and bank number (the fourth and fifth digits).

The selection procedure produces a sample that is superior to random selection from a frame of listed telephone households, and the superiority is greater to the degree that the assignment of telephone numbers to households is made independently of their publication status in the directory. That is, if unlisted numbers tend to be found in the same telephone banks as listed numbers and if, in general, banks containing relatively few listed numbers also contain relatively few unlisted numbers, then the sample that results from the procedure described below will represent unlisted telephone households fully as well as it represents listed households. Random number selection within banks ensures that all numbers within a particular bank (whether listed or unlisted) have the same likelihood of inclusion in the sample, and that the sample so generated will represent listed and unlisted telephone households in the appropriate proportions.

The first eight digits of the sample telephone numbers (area code, telephone exchange, and bank number) are selected after geographic pre-stratification of a database of listed telephone numbers, so that state, county, and telephone exchange within county are all represented in their appropriate proportions. That is, the number of telephone numbers randomly sampled from within a given exchange is proportional to that exchange's share of listed telephone households in the set of exchanges from which the sample is drawn.

Only working banks of numbers are selected. A working bank is defined as 100 contiguous telephone numbers containing three or more residential telephone listings. By eliminating non-working banks of numbers from the sample, the likelihood that any sampled telephone number will be associated with a residence increases from only 20% (where all banks of numbers are sampled) to between 60% and 70%.

The sample of telephone numbers produced by this method is thus designed to produce an unbiased random sampling of telephone households in the continental United States.

TELEPHONE PROCEDURES AND WEIGHTING

Interviewers were instructed to make up to three calls to each telephone number in order to attempt to complete an interview in that household.

Interviewers used a systematic selection method designed to provide a sample of respondents that conforms closely to Census Bureau information about the age and gender characteristics of the adult population of the Continental United States.

Interviewers screened selected respondents to ascertain whether they were registered to vote, and only attempted to complete the entire interview with those who answered in the affirmative. For those who claimed not to be registered, or not to know whether they were registered, interviewers were instructed to ask a short series of demographic questions, to be used in weighting the final dataset.

The assignment of weights to individual respondents was undertaken to minimize the effects of possible sample biases in the analysis of data. In order to achieve this goal, the demographic characteristics of the total sample including registrants and non-registrants were compared to the most recently available demographic parameters for the adult population living in households with access to a telephone in the Continental United States. These parameters are drawn from the Census Bureau's March 1987 Current Population Survey. In particular, age, gender, race, education, and region of the country were examined, and weights were assigned to individual respondents to ensure a close match to the Census distributions for these variables. Once this weighting was accomplished, the registered voters were extracted for analysis.

This procedure is designed to correct for demographic biases in the cross-section data (i.e., the data that includes the demographics of both registrants and non-registrants) that may result from both random error (i.e., sampling error) and systematic error (i.e., non-response bias). The procedure is designed to ensure that when the sample of registered voters is extracted from this more inclusive cross-section, they will be weighted to represent the demographic characteristics of the sub-population of registered voters.

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE FOR THE PRINCIPAL SURVEY

	Weighted Percentage	Number of Interviews
<u>Sex</u>	47.5	(1004)
Male	52.5	(1002)
Female	100.0	
<u>Race</u>	87.5	(1811)
White	9.5	(127)
Black	2.6	(57)
Other	.4	(11)
Undesignated	100.0	
<u>Age</u>	22.7	(407)
18-29 years	39.3	(884)
30-49 years	37.1	(696)
50 years and older	.9	(9)
Undesignated	100.0	
<u>Education</u>	23.5	(649)
College graduate	21.1	(402)
Other college	37.7	(743)
High school graduate	17.2	(202)
Less than high school graduate	.5	(10)
Undesignated	100.0	
<u>Region</u>		
East: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	24.3	(492)
Midwest: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri	26.0	(605)
South: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana	29.7	(613)
West: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, California, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Hawaii	20.0 100.0	(296)

SAMPLING TOLERANCES

In interpreting survey results, it should be borne in mind that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the extent to which the results may differ from what would be obtained if the whole population had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews.

The following tables may be used in estimating the sampling error of any percentage in this report. The computed allowances have taken into account the effect of the sample design upon sampling error. They may be interpreted as indicating the range (plus or minus the figure shown) within which the results of repeated samplings in the same time period could be expected to vary, 95 percent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedures, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

The first table shows how much allowance should be made for the sampling error of a percentage:

	Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of a Percentage								
	In Percentage Points								
	(at 95 in 100 confidence level) ¹								
	Sample Size								
	2000	1750	1500	1250	1000	750	500	250	100
Percentages near 10	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	6
Percentages near 20	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	5	9
Percentages near 30	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	6	10
Percentages near 40	2	3	3	3	3	4	5	7	11
Percentages near 50	2	3	3	3	3	4	5	7	11
Percentages near 60	2	3	3	3	3	4	5	7	11
Percentages near 70	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	6	10
Percentages near 80	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	5	9
Percentages near 90	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	6

¹The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as, for example, men and women, the question arises as to how large a difference must be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference. The tables below indicate the number of points which must be allowed for such comparisons.

Recommended Allowance for Sampling
Error of the Difference
20% and 80%
In Percentage Points
(at 95 in 100 confidence level)*

[illegible]

Size of Sample	Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of the Difference 50% and 50%								
	In Percentage Points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)*								
	2000	1750	1500	1250	1000	750	500	250	100
2000	3								
1750	4	4							
1500	4	4	4						
1250	4	4	4	4					
1000	4	4	4	5	5				
750	5	5	5	5	5	6			
500	5	5	6	6	6	6	7		
250	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	10	
100	11	11	11	11	11	11	12	13	15

*The chance are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figure shown.

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 percent of men responded a certain way and 40 percent of women respond that way also, for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any assurance that the 10 point difference reflects a real difference between the two groups on the question? Let us consider a sample which contains approximately 500 in each of these groups.

Since the percentages are near 50, we consult Table B, and since the two samples are about 500 persons each, we look for the number in the column headed "500" which is also the row designated "500". We find the number 7 here. This means that the allowance for error should be 7 points, and that in concluding that the percentage among men is somewhere between 3 and 17 points higher than the percentage among women, we should be wrong only about 5 percent of the time. In other words, we can conclude with considerable confidence that a difference exists in the direction observed and that it amounts to at least 2 percentage points.

If, in another case, responses among a group of 500 men amount to 22 percent and 24 percent in a group of 500 women, we consult Table A because these percentages are near 20. We look for the number in the column headed "500" which is also in the row designated "500" and see that the number is 5. Obviously, then, the two-point difference is inconclusive.

TOP LINE RESULTS - FINAL
N = 2006
BASED ON REGISTERED VOTERS

1 Male 2 Female

Interviewer I.D.#

Time Start: _____

Time End: _____

Total Length: _____

G088334

Interviewer Name: _____

Date: _____

Replicate: _____

Page: _____

INTRODUCTION: Hello, I am _____ calling for the Gallup Organization of Princeton, New Jersey. I would like to ask a few questions of the youngest male 18 years of age or older who is now at home. (IF NO MALE IN HOUSEHOLD AVAILABLE, SAY: I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS OF THE OLDEST FEMALE 18 YEARS OR OLDER WHO IS AT HOME).

A. Are you now registered to vote
in your precinct or election
district?

A.

1 Yes

2 No, not sure - NON-VOTER SKIP
AHEAD TO Q.901,
PAGE 21

— SEE NEXT PAGE —

Q.101 If the presidential election were being held today, would you vote for the Republican ticket of George Bush and Dan Quayle or for the Democratic ticket of Michael Dukakis and Lloyd Bentsen?

Q.102 Do you support (INSERT CHOICE FROM Q.101) strongly or only moderately?

Q.103 As of today, do you lean more to Bush and Quayle, the Republicans, or to Dukakis and Bentsen, the Democrats?

Q.104 Would you say your choice is more of a vote for (CHOICE FROM Q.101/103) or more of a vote against (THE OPPONENTS)?

Q.105 How much of a chance is there that you will vote for (THE OPPONENTS) rather than (CHOICE FROM Q.101/103): a good chance, some chance, or no chance whatsoever?

A.101

- 1 Bush/Quayle ☐ - GO TO Q.102
- 2 Dukakis/Bentsen ☐
- 3 Other (VOL.) ☐ - GO TO Q.103
- 0 Undecided/No answer ☐

A.102

- 1 Strongly ☐ - GO TO Q.104
- 2 Only moderately ☐
- 0 Don't know ☐

A.103

- 1 Bush ☐ - GO TO Q.104
- 2 Dukakis ☐
- 0 Undecided/No answer - GO TO Q.107

A.104

- 1 For candidate chosen
- 2 Against other candidate
- 0 Don't know/No answer

A.105

- 1 Good chance
- 2 Some chance
- 3 No chance whatsoever
- 0 Don't know

**TREND IN CANDIDATE SUPPORT
BASED ON REGISTERED VOTERS**

	<u>7/8-10*</u>	<u>7/22-24*</u>	<u>8/5-7*</u>	<u>9/9-11*</u>	<u>9/9-14</u>	<u>10/21-23*</u>	<u>10/23-</u>
Strength of Support							
George Bush	<u>41%</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50%</u>
Strongly	15	15	18	22	26	24	24
Only Moderately	26	22	24	27	24	26	26
Michael Dukakis	<u>47</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>42</u>
Strongly	15	22	18	16	19	18	20
Only Moderately	32	32	31	25	25	24	22
Other/Undecided	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Direction of Support							
George Bush	<u>41%</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50</u>
Pro-Bush	27	23	27	27	31	30	31
Anti-Dukakis	11	11	12	18	15	16	16
Undecided	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
Michael Dukakis	<u>47</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>42</u>
Pro-Dukakis	22	33	26	19	21	20	21
Anti-Bush	22	18	19	19	19	18	18
Undecided	3	3	4	3	4	2	2
Switching							
George Bush	NA	NA	NA	NA	<u>50%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>50</u>
Good chance					3	2	2
Some chance					10	6	6
No chance whatsoever					35	41	40
Undecided					2	1	*
Michael Dukakis					<u>44</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>42</u>
Good chance					2	2	2
Some chance					10	6	6
No chance whatsoever					31	32	31
Undecided					1	*	1
George Bush	NA	NA	NA	NA	<u>50%</u>	NA	<u>50</u>
Preferred Opponent					9		9
Never Preferred Opponent					39		40
Undecided					2		1
Michael Dukakis	NA	NA	NA	NA	<u>44</u>	NA	<u>42</u>
Preferred Opponent					6		6
Never Preferred Opponent					37		35
Undecided					1		1
Number of Interviews	(1001)	(1001)	(1004)	(1003)	(2001)	(1232)	
* Conus Trend							

**TREND IN CANDIDATE SUPPORT
BASED ON LIKELY VOTERS**

	<u>Oct. 7-9*</u>	<u>Oct. 21-23*</u>	<u>Oct. 23-26</u>
Bush/Quayle	52%	53%	52%
Dukakis/Bentsen	41	39	41
Undecided	$\frac{7}{100}$	$\frac{8}{100}$	$\frac{7}{100}$
Sample Size	(748)	(815)	(1505)

* Conus Trend

Q.106 At any point in the campaign had you preferred (THE OTHER TICKET) over (CHOICE FROM Q.101/103)?

A.106

- 1 Yes, preferred other ticket
- 2 No, never preferred other ticket
- 0 Don't know

ASK ALL VOTERS:

Next, I have a few questions about your voting plans. First...

Q.107 Do you happen to know where people who live in your neighborhood go to vote?

A.107

86 1 Yes, any response
14 2 No/Don't know
100

Q.108 Do you, yourself, plan to vote in the election this November, or not?

A.108

98 1 Yes
1 2 No
1 0 Don't know
100

Q.109 I'd like you to rate your chances of voting in the November election on a scale of 10 to 1. If 10 represents a person who definitely will vote and '1' represents a person who definitely will not vote, where on this scale of 10 to 1 would you place yourself? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

A.109

80 6 6 2 2 2 1 * * 1 = 100
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
0 Don't know

Q.110 I'd like your overall opinion of some political figures. First, is your overall opinion of (INSERT ITEM. START AT 'X') very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable or very unfavorable? (CIRCLE RESPONSE) Next, what is your overall opinion of (INSERT NEXT ITEM)?

	Very Favor- able	Mostly Favor- able	Mostly Unfavor- able	Very Unfavor- able	NEVER HEARD OF	CAN'T RATE
a. George Bush	1	2	3	4	5	0
b. Michael Dukakis	1	2	3	4	5	0
c. Dan Quayle	1	2	3	4	5	0
d. Lloyd Bentsen	1	2	3	4	5	0

— SEE NEXT PAGE —

Next, I am going to ask you a series of questions about people and issues that have been in the news recently. First...

Q.201 Do you happen to know which presidential candidate vetoed a bill requiring teachers to lead students in the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools? (IF NECESSARY, PROBE: Who?)

A.201

11 1 Bush
41 2 Dukakis
2 3 Other Answer

460 Don't know
100

Q.202 Do you happen to know who General Manuel Noriega is? (IF NECESSARY, PROBE: Who?)

A.202

53 1 Military leader in Panama
22 2 Other response

250 Don't know
100

Q.203 Do you happen to know who Willie Horton is? (IF NECESSARY, PROBE: Who?)

A.203

24 1 A (Massachusetts) convict who escaped while on leave from prison

10 2 Other response

660 Don't know
100

TREND IN FAVORABILITY RATINGS
BASED ON REGISTERED VOTERS

	<u>Very Favor- able</u>	<u>Mostly Favor- able</u>	<u>Mostly Unfav- orable</u>	<u>Very Unfav- orable</u>	<u>Never Heard of/ Can't Rate</u>
George Bush					
Oct. 23-26, 1988	23	35	20	17	5 = 100
Sept. 9-14,	19	40	20	17	4 = 100
Sept. 9-11*	20	39	22	13	6 = 100
Aug. 24-25	25	40	18	12	5 = 100
Aug. 18-19**	20	40	20	13	7 = 100
July 8-10*	12	40	14	26	8 = 100
May 13-22	11	39	26	18	6 = 100
April/May, 1987	12	56	20	8	4 = 100
Michael Dukakis					
Oct. 23-26, 1988	16	32	25	21	6 = 100
Sept. 9-14,	18	33	23	19	7 = 100
Sept. 9-11*	15	38	25	15	7 = 100
Aug. 24-25	17	42	22	11	8 = 100
Aug. 18-19**	20	35	19	13	13 = 100
July 8-10*	16	41	24	7	12 = 100
May 13-22	13	55	17	5	10 = 100
Ronald Reagan					
Oct. 23-26, 1988			NOT ASKED		
Sept. 9-14,	29	32	17	19	3 = 100
Sept. 9-11*			NOT ASKED		
Aug. 24-25	28	39	17	13	3 = 100
Aug. 18-19**	30	35	14	18	3 = 100
July 8-10*	19	40	16	21	4 = 100
May 13-22	16	40	23	18	3 = 100
Dan Quayle					
Oct. 23-26, 1988	10	33	21	24	12 = 100
Sept. 9-14,	9	32	17	15	27 = 100
Sept. 9-11*	9	37	23	15	16 = 100
Aug. 24-25	12	38	19	9	22 = 100
Aug. 18-19*	11	27	12	7	43 = 100
Lloyd Bentsen					
Oct. 23-26, 1988	19	39	18	11	13 = 100
Sept. 9-14,	11	39	15	7	28 = 100
Sept. 9-11*	13	39	20	5	23 = 100
Aug. 24-25	12	36	13	5	34 = 100
Aug. 18-19**	10	32	15	5	38 = 100
July 21-22*	10	30	11	4	45 = 100

* Gallup/Conus

** Gallup/Newsweek

Next, I am going to ask you some questions on the issue positions of the presidential candidates. First...

Q.301 Which candidate supports a woman's right to choose to have an abortion?

A.301

14 1 Bush

65 2 Dukakis

1 3 Both (VOL.)

* 4 Neither (VOL.)

20 0 Don't know
100

Q.302 Which candidate opposes the death penalty?

A.302

12 1 Bush

71 2 Dukakis

* 3 Both (VOL.)

1 4 Neither (VOL.)

16 0 Don't know
100

Q.303 I am going to read you a short list of phrases that are being used in the campaign by the presidential and vice presidential candidates. For each one, please tell me whether or not you have heard of it. The first phrase is...

Q.303a "Star Schools, not Star Wars"

A.303a

48 1 Heard of

46 2 Haven't heard of

6 0
100

Don't know

- GO TO Q.304a

Q.303b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase?

A.303b

5 1 George Bush

32 1 Michael Dukakis

* 1 Dan Quayle

1 1 Lloyd Bentsen

11 1 Don't know

Q.304a The next phrase is... "1000 Points of Light"
(IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you heard this phrase used in the campaign?)

A.304a

35 1 Heard of

56 2 Haven't heard of

9 0
100

Don't know

- GO TO Q.305a

Q.304b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase?

A.304b

27 1 George Bush

2 1 Michael Dukakis

* 1 Dan Quayle

* 1 Lloyd Bentsen

6 1
100

Don't know

Q.305a The next phrase is... "Good jobs at good wages"
(IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you heard this phrase used in the campaign?)

A.305a

73 1 Heard of
24 2 Haven't heard of
3 0 Don't know
100

- GO TO Q.306a

Q.305b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase?

A.305b

13 1 George Bush
44 1 Michael Dukakis
* 1 Dan Quayle
1 1 Lloyd Bentsen
15 1 Don't know

Q.306a The next phrase is... "Flexible Freeze" (IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you heard this phrase used in the campaign?)

A.306a

31 1 Heard of
59 2 Haven't heard of
10 0 Don't know
100

- GO TO Q.307a

Q.306b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase?

A.306b

14 1 George Bush
7 1 Michael Dukakis
* 1 Dan Quayle
* 1 Lloyd Bentsen
10 1 Don't know

Q.307a The next phrase is... "No new taxes...read my lips" (IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you heard this phrase used in the campaign?)

A.307a

78 1 Heard of
19 2 Haven't heard of
3 0 Don't know
100

- GO TO Q.308a

Q.307b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase?

A.307b

59 1 George Bush
11 1 Michael Dukakis
* 1 Dan Quayle
* 1 Lloyd Bentsen
8 1 Don't know

Q.308a The next phrase is... "You're no Jack Kennedy" (IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you heard this phrase used in the campaign?)

A.308a

85 1 Heard of
13 2 Haven't heard of
2 0 Don't know
100

- GO TO Q.309a

Q.308b Which candidate -- George Bush, Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this phrase to attack his opponent?

A.308b

8 1 George Bush
8 1 Michael Dukakis
3 1 Dan Quayle
60 1 Lloyd Bentsen
6 1 Don't know

Q.309a The next phrase is... "My
opponent is a card-carrying
member of the ACLU" (IF
NECESSARY, PROMPT: Have you
heard this phrase used in the
campaign?)

A.309a

62 1 Heard of
31 2 Haven't heard of
7 0 Don't know - GO TO Q.310
100

Q.309b Which candidate -- George Bush,
Michael Dukakis, Dan Quayle, or
Lloyd Bentsen -- has used this
phrase?

A.309b

49 1 George Bush
5 1 Michael Dukakis
1 1 Dan Quayle
* 1 Lloyd Bentsen
7 1 Don't know

Q.310 Regardless of who is elected in November, there are a number of important issues the next president will face. I'm going to read you a list of issues, and for each one please tell me whether you think it is very important and should be a top priority for the next administration, it's important but not a top priority, or whether it should not be considered at all. The first issue is... (INSERT ITEM. START AT 'X')

	A.310 Very Important, A Top Priority	Important, But Not A Top Priority	Shouldn't Be Considered At All	DK
a. Restoring diplomatic relations with Iran	17	43	35	5 = 100
b. Delaying cost of living increases in Social Security for one year in order to reduce the federal budget deficit	24	33	40	3 = 100
c. Negotiating further arms reductions with the Soviet Union	63	27	8	2 = 100
d. Proposing laws to increase protection of the environment	64	31	3	2 = 100
e. Reducing the federal budget deficit	76	21	1	2 = 100
f. Proposing laws to create a national health insurance plan	44	38	16	2 = 100
g. Increasing tariffs on Japanese imports	35	41	19	5 = 100
h. Developing a program to make it easier for people to buy their first home	40	45	13	2 = 100
i. Proposing a program to provide care for children while their parents are at work	39	42	17	2 = 100

Q.311 Some people feel that reporters should have open access to candidates so that reporters can ask questions that need to be asked. Others feel that by keeping reporters at a distance, candidates can do a better job of telling voters about their positions on the issues. Which view comes closer to your own?

A.311

49 1 Reporters should have open access to candidates so that reporters can ask questions that need to be asked
 45 2 By keeping reporters at a distance candidates can do a better job telling voters what their positions are
6 0 Don't know
 100

Q.312 In the presidential campaign so far, do you think George Bush has been too personally critical of Michael Dukakis, or not?

A.312

52 1 Too personally critical
 43 2 Not too personally critical
5 0 Don't know
 100

9/9-11*
44
 50
6
 100

Q.313 In the presidential campaign so far, do you think Michael Dukakis has been too personally critical of George Bush, or not?

A.313

45 1 Too personally critical
 50 2 Not too personally critical
5 0 Don't know
 100

9/9-11*
37
 56
7
 100

* CONUS TREND

Q.401 In politics, as of today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

A.401

31 1 Republican - GO TO Q.402
 35 2 Democrat - GO TO Q.403
 30 3 Independent
 3 4 No preference - GO TO Q.404
 * 5 Other party
 1 0 Don't know
 100

Q.402 Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

A.402

17 1 Strong - GO TO Q.501
 13 2 Not strong
 1 0 Don't know

Q.403 Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

A.403

18 1 Strong - GO TO Q.501
 16 2 Not strong
 1 0 Don't know

Q.404 Would you say you lean more to the Republican Party or more to the Democratic Party?

A.404

15 1 Republican
 11 2 Democratic
 8 0 Don't know

Republican
and leaner
 46

Democrat
and leaner
 46

Q.501

Now I am going to read you a series of statements that will help us understand how you feel about a number of things. For each statement, please tell me whether you completely agree with it, mostly agree with it, mostly disagree with it or completely disagree with it. The first one is... (INTERVIEWER: CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM.)

	A.501 Com- pletely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Dis- agree	Com- pletely Dis- agree	Don't Know	
a. People like me don't have any say about what the government does	13	31	34	21	1	= 100
b. Generally speaking, elected officials in Washington lose touch with the people pretty quickly	26	48	20	3	3	= 100
c. Most elected officials care what people like me think	9	47	30	11	3	= 100
d. Voting gives people like me some say about how the government runs things	32	48	13	5	2	= 100
e. Hard work offers little guarantee of success	14	23	30	31	2	= 100
f. The strength of this country today is mostly based on the success of American business	27	51	14	4	4	= 100
g. When something is run by the government, it is usually inefficient and wasteful	25	38	27	7	3	= 100
h. The federal government controls too much of our daily lives	23	31	33	10	3	= 100
i. The government is really run for the benefit of all the people	13	45	28	12	2	= 100
j. Business corporations generally strike a fair balance between making profits and serving the public interest	6	36	36	17	5	= 100

CONTINUED....

Q.501 CONTINUED

		A.501 Com- pletely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Dis- agree	Com- pletely Dis- agree	Don't Know	
k.	There is too much power concentrated in the hands of a few big companies	34	43	16	4	3	= 100
l.	Business corporations make too much profit	24	37	26	7	6	= 100
m.	It is time for Washington politicians to step aside and make room for new leaders	24	39	26	6	5	= 100
n.	As Americans we can always find a way to solve our problems and get what we want	20	51	22	5	2	= 100
o.	I don't believe that there are any real limits to growth in this country today	22	41	24	9	4	= 100
p.	Our society should do what is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal <u>opportunity</u> to succeed	53	39	5	2	1	= 100
q.	We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country	15	26	33	24	2	= 100
r.	The government should guarantee every citizen enough to eat and a place to sleep	35	31	22	9	3	= 100
s.	I don't pay attention to whether a candidate calls himself a liberal or a conservative	26	35	22	14	3	= 100
t.	I am very patriotic	60	34	4	1	1	= 100
u.	In the past few years there hasn't been much real improvement in the position of black people in this country	12	26	38	20	4	= 100

CONTINUED...

Q.501 CONTINUED

		A.501 Com- pletely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Dis- agree	Com- pletely Dis- agree	Don't Know
v.	I think it's all right for blacks and whites to date each other	24	32	15	23	6 = 100
w.	We should make every possible effort to improve the position of blacks and other minorities, even if it means giving them preferential treatment	8	19	35	35	3 = 100
x.	It is my belief that we should get even with any country that tries to take advantage of the United States	20	30	31	14	5 = 100
y.	The best way to ensure peace is through military strength	26	35	24	12	3 = 100
z.	American lives are worth more than the lives of people in other countries	9	14	31	43	3 = 100
aa.	We all should be willing to fight for our country, whether it is right or wrong	28	31	23	14	4 = 100
bb.	It's best for the future of our country to be active in world affairs	60	35	3	1	1 = 100
cc.	There is an international communist conspiracy to rule the world	18	26	28	19	9 = 100
dd.	Communist and non-communist countries can learn to live together peacefully	34	46	10	7	3 = 100
ee.	Communists are responsible for a lot of the unrest in the United States today	18	30	32	14	6 = 100

CONTINUED...

Q.501 CONTINUED

		A.501 Com- pletely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Dis- agree	Com- pletely Dis- agree	Don't Know	
ff.	We all will be called before God at the judgment day to answer for our sins	62	22	5	6	5	=100
gg.	Even today miracles are performed by the power of God	54	28	7	6	5	=100
hh.	I am sometimes very conscious of the presence of God	54	31	7	5	3	=100
ii.	I never doubt the existence of God	65	20	7	5	2	=100
jj.	School boards ought to have the right to fire teachers who are known homosexuals	23	20	27	24	6	=100
kk.	Books that contain dangerous ideas should be banned from public school libraries	26	18	21	29	6	=100
ll.	Women should return to their traditional role in society	10	14	26	46	4	=100
mm.	I have old-fashioned values about family and marriage	49	32	12	5	2	=100
nn.	Today it's really true that the rich just get richer while the poor get poorer	31	36	22	9	2	=100
oo.	I can usually tell whether I'll have a lot in common with someone by knowing how much education he or she has	9	26	38	25	2	=100
pp.	I often don't have enough money to make ends meet	22	26	33	18	1	=100
qq.	Money is one of my most important concerns	14	27	36	22	1	=100
rr.	I'm pretty well satisfied with the way things are going for me financially	22	49	18	10	1	=100
ss.	I feel it's my duty as a citizen to always vote	78	19	2	1	*	=100

CONTINUED...

Q.501 CONTINUED

		A.501 <u>Com- pletely Agree</u>	<u>Mostly Agree</u>	<u>Mostly Dis- agree</u>	<u>Com- pletely Dis- agree</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	
tt.	I'm interested in keeping up with national affairs	51	42	5	1	1	=100
uu.	I'm generally bored by what goes on in Washington	13	36	33	16	2	=100
vv.	I'm pretty interested in following <u>local</u> politics	29	51	16	3	1	=100
ww.	Most issues discussed in Washington don't affect me personally	6	27	41	24	2	=100
xx.	I feel guilty when I don't get a chance to vote	42	32	13	6	7	=100
yy.	Sometimes I vote for a candidate without really knowing enough about him or her	15	43	23	17	2	=100

Q.502 Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?

A.502

52 1 Most of the time
33 2 Some of the time
11 3 Only now and then
4 4 Hardly at all
* 0 Don't know
100

Q.503 In the 1984 presidential election did you happen to vote for Reagan or Mondale -- or did things come up that kept you from voting?

A.503

54 1 Reagan
26 2 Mondale
1 3 Other candidate
1 4 Voted, don't remember for which candidate
11 5 Didn't vote
5 6 Too young to vote in '84
2 0 Don't know/No answer
100

Q.504 How often would you say you vote --always, nearly always, part of the time, or seldom?

A.504

51 1 Always
37 2 Nearly always
8 3 Part of the time
3 4 Seldom
* 5 Other _____
1 6 NEVER VOTE (VOL.)
* 0 Don't know
100

Q.601 Next, I will read a list of some stories covered by news organizations this past year. As I read each item, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely. (READ LIST. START AT 'X')

	<u>Very Closely</u>	<u>Fairly Closely</u>	<u>Not Too Closely</u>	<u>Not At All Closely</u>	<u>Can't Say</u>	
a. The recent flight of the space shuttle	50	35	10	4	1	= 100
b. The World Series	31	21	19	28	1	= 100
c. The pending divorce between Mike Tyson and Robin Givens	14	22	28	35	1	= 100
d. The problems at nuclear reactor plants	28	44	18	9	1	= 100
e. News about the presidential campaign in 1988	43	44	11	2	*	= 100

IF ITEM E FOLLOWED "VERY CLOSELY" OR "FAIRLY CLOSELY" IN Q.601 ASK Q.602. ALL OTHERS GO TO Q.603.

Q.602	In general, how would you rate the job news organizations have done in covering news about the presidential campaign in 1988: excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	A.602	<u>5/88</u>	<u>8/88</u>
		14 1 Excellent	14	20
		46 2 Good	57	43
		30 3 Only fair	19	23
		9 4 Poor	3	12
		<u>1 0</u> Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>
		100	100	100

Q.603	How much influence do you feel news organizations have on which candidate becomes president: too much influence, too little influence, or about the right amount?	A.603	<u>188</u>	<u>588</u>	<u>888</u>
		58 1 Too much influence	52	49	54
		3 2 Too little influence	4	4	1
		36 3 About the right amount	36	41	41
		<u>3 0</u> Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
		100	100	100	100

Q.604 And how about advertising consultants and pollsters? (IF NECESSARY, PROMPT: How much influence do you feel advertising consultants and pollsters have on which candidate becomes President? Would you say they have too much influence, too little influence, or about the right amount?)

A.604

43	1	Too much influence	<u>40</u>
8	2	Too little influence	5
44	3	About the right amount	45
<u>5</u>	0	Don't know	<u>10</u>
100			100

Q.605 In the presidential campaign so far, do you think news organizations have been too personally critical of George Bush, or not?

A.605

33	1	Too personally critical
62	2	Not too personally critical
<u>5</u>	0	Don't know
100		

Q.606 In the presidential campaign so far, do you think news organizations have been too personally critical of Michael Dukakis, or not?

A.606

37	1	Too personally critical
58	2	Not too personally critical
<u>5</u>	0	Don't know
100		

Q.607 In your opinion, does the reporting of who is ahead in the polls improve the press coverage of the election, or not?

A.607

38	1	Improves press coverage
47	2	Does not improve press coverage
7	3	Has no effect (VOL.)
<u>8</u>	0	Don't know
100		

Q.608 In your opinion, is the reporting of who is ahead in the polls a good thing or a bad thing for the country?

A.608

38	1	Good thing for the country
45	2	Bad thing for the country
12	3	Neither a good thing or a bad thing (VOL.)
<u>5</u>	0	Don't know
100		