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INTRODUCTION

The Idaho State Board of Education has designated public affairs as a primary emphasis area for Boise State University. One of the ways BSU fulfills this mission is by conducting timely, high-quality research that addresses the concerns and needs of Idahoans. The Idaho Public Policy Survey is an annual project in the College of Social Sciences and Public Affairs at Boise State University. Conducted by the Social Science Research Center, the survey is designed to examine public opinion on key issues that are the subject of current debate among Idahoans and civic leaders.

METHODOLOGY

A random digit dialing telephone technique was used to conduct this survey. The survey sample was stratified by telephone exchange within counties and region to ensure that every Idaho household with a telephone had a chance to participate. In order to minimize bias in the sample resulting from the known greater likelihood of certain sorts of people to answer phones in households (for example, women and older persons), interviewers asked for the person in the household 18 or older with the most recent birthday.

With measures like those predominantly used in this survey, approximately 600 completed interviews are needed to produce statewide confidence intervals of approximately plus or minus three to four percent for the average, with the most extreme being plus or minus four to five percent. The Center completed 653 interviews.

A small set of core questions that have been asked on Public Policy Surveys over the last five years were retained. A standard set of demographic questions was included in the survey. Professional staff at the Social Science Research Center edited the draft questions provided to produce a polished telephone survey questionnaire. (Details of the survey methodology begin on page 71).

PRESENTATION OF SURVEY RESULTS

The demographic information collected in the survey includes each respondent's age, gender, education, racial/ethnic group, income, length of residence in Idaho, and residence by county and region. The county of residence was used to assign the respondents into one of six regions commonly used for purposes of service delivery and public policy planning (Figure 1). In the discussion of the results, regions are referred to as follows: Region I--Panhandle, Region II--North Central, Region III--Southwest, Region IV--South Central, Region V--Southeast, Region VI--Central Mountain. Obtaining the same findings over multiple years is the best way to make firm conclusions about differences among Idahoans on specific issues.
In subsequent publications, the Center is planning to compare Idahoans' responses to some of the core items that are asked every year in order to provide a better picture of fundamental differences among different types of Idahoans. The order in which the questions appear in this report does not necessarily reflect the order in which they were asked in the survey. Instead, they are grouped thematically to present a variety of perspectives on several core issues. The statewide distribution of responses to each question are presented in a graph, followed by a summary of the analysis of the effects of demographic variables follows each statewide distribution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Item</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I--Panhandle</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II--North Central</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III--Southwest</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV--South Central</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V--Southeast</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI--Central Mountain</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Caucasian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25 Years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 35 Years</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45 Years</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 55 Years</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 65 Years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 86 Years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: Demographic Items**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Item</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo-Tech/Trade School</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (no degree)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional Degree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 or Less</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 to $30,000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or More</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Setting, as Perceived by Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb of a City</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: Demographic Items**

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Item</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation on Economic Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Conservative</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Liberal</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation on Social Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Conservative</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Liberal</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1: Demographic Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Item</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time Living in Idaho</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than One Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 Years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 Years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 + Years</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Reason for Moving to Idaho</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously Resided in Idaho</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: Demographic Items**
QUALITY OF LIFE

The questions in this section have been asked on the annual survey every year. As in previous years, nearly nine out of 10 survey respondents said they were satisfied with their overall quality of life as Idaho residents.

Citizens in the Panhandle were less satisfied with their overall quality of life than citizens in other regions.

Older citizens tended to be more satisfied with the quality of life in Idaho than younger citizens.

Satisfaction with the quality of life was positively related to education.

Citizens with higher incomes were more satisfied than those with lower incomes.

Idahoans who were conservative on economic issues were significantly more satisfied with the quality of life than citizens who described themselves as liberal.

Idahoans who described themselves as conservative on social issues were more satisfied with Idaho quality of life than those who were more liberal.
Will the remainder of the 90s be easier or more difficult? Idahoans were divided.

Will the 90's Get Easier or More Difficult?
Percentage of Respondents in Each Category

- Older citizens were more likely to believe that the remainder of the 90s would become more difficult than younger citizens. This was particularly true with those 66 and older.
- The more educated the respondent, the greater the perception that the remainder of the 90s would become more difficult.
- Idahoans with higher incomes were more optimistic about the remainder of the 90s than lower-income Idahoans.
- Rural citizens were more likely than their urban counterparts to believe that the remainder of the 90s would be difficult.
- A respondent's political liberalism or conservatism on economic and social issues is unrelated to outlook for the remainder of the 90s.
The following figure displays what respondents thought was the greatest issue facing Idaho.

Citizens stated that the four most important issues, in order, were rapid growth, education, the environment, and government spending.

Also important were crime and the economy.

Idahoans were least concerned with homelessness and child abuse, followed closely by a lack of concern over prison spending and abortion.

1. Note: "Other" includes Health Care (1.2%), Moral Decline (1.2%), Water resources (1.1%), Poverty (.8%), Economic Recovery (.5%), Prison Spending (.3%), Abortion (.3%), Child Abuse (.2%), and Homelessness (.2%), as well as many individually mentioned items.
Many regional differences were noted.

- Panhandle residents were significantly more worried about the economy, unemployment, and education than other regions of the state.
- Central Mountain residents were particularly concerned with education.
- Southwest citizens showed high levels of concern with growth.

Younger people were more concerned with the economy and with education.

Senior citizens were particularly concerned with government spending and taxes.

Rural citizens were particularly concerned with the economy and with unemployment.

Growth was a concern to all residents, whether urban, rural, or suburban.

The highest income groups tended to be more concerned with education than other income groups, and were substantially more concerned with growth.

Those with incomes of 20,000 or less annually tended to be more concerned with crime than other groups.

There was no significant relationship between political conservatism or liberalism on economic issues and what respondents stated was the most important issue facing Idaho.

The following findings pertain to attitudes of Idahoans who were conservative or liberal on social issues.

- Those who were somewhat conservative or moderate on social issues were more likely to be concerned with the economy.
- Growth was of particular concern to those who identified themselves as conservative or moderate.
- The environment was an issue for all groups except the very conservative.
- Concerns over education were evenly distributed across all political groups.
Next, we asked whether respondents thought that, in general terms, Idaho was heading in the right or wrong direction. Nearly 8 of 10 citizens (77.9%) stated that Idaho was heading in the right direction.

**Idaho Headed in the Right Direction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Central Mountain region respondents were the most likely to believe that Idaho was headed in the right direction (86.2%).
- The Panhandle region (26.8%) was significantly more likely to believe that Idaho was headed in the wrong direction. However, 68.8% believed that Idaho was headed in the right direction.
- Caucasian citizens were more likely than minority group members to believe that Idaho was headed in the right direction.
- The youngest (18-25) and the oldest (65 or older) age groups were most likely to agree that Idaho was headed in the right direction. Those between the ages of 36 and 55 were the least likely to agree.
- Idahoans with a Bachelors (4-year) degree were most likely to agree that Idaho was headed in the right direction. Citizens with advanced degrees and those without high school diplomas were the most likely to disagree.
- Respondent's statements about whether Idaho was headed in the right direction were strongly influenced by political predispositions.
  - Economically and socially conservative individuals were most likely to believe that Idaho was headed in the right direction. Only among the very liberal did a majority of the respondents believe that Idaho was headed in the wrong direction.
GOVERNMENT AND TAXES

The first questions in this section are on taxes and spending. We begin with citizens' trust and confidence in government at all levels. The highest levels of trust were in local government, followed by state government. Only 11 percent stated that their greatest trust was in the federal government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Equal</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There was no difference between region and trust in local, state, or federal government. All regions reported more trust in local government by a wide margin than in federal or state government.
- There were no significant differences among ethnic and gender preferences for level of government.
- Those in the lowest income group ($20,000 or below) trusted the federal government to a greater degree than other groups. They were also the most likely to believe that all levels of government are the same.
- The influence of conservative/liberal differences toward economic issues had no impact on trust in government. However, conservative/liberal differences toward social issues did.
  - Support for the federal government was lowest among the very conservative and highest among the very liberal.
  - Support for state government was highest among the very conservative.
  - Support for local government was highest among the more moderate ranks, including conservative and liberal moderates.
Next, we asked which level of government best responded to a citizen's needs. Again, we found that the most frequent choice of respondents was local government.

Findings on this issue are generally unremarkable. Regardless of region, ethnicity, political preference, or gender, respondents believed that the local government was more responsive to their needs. The only exception is mentioned below.

- Higher income respondents were slightly more likely to believe that local and state governments were more responsive to their needs, while lower income respondents were slightly more likely to prefer the federal government.
The figure below shows the level of government respondents thought gave the most for their taxes. Most respondents selected the local government (36.6%), though state government rated a close second (34.6%).

**Government Level Giving Most for Taxes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Males were slightly more likely to select the local government, while females showed a tendency to favor state government.
- Urban respondents were twice as likely to select the federal government as their rural counterparts.
- Rural residents indicated the greatest preference for state government.
- Income, education, and ethnicity were unrelated to level selected by respondents.
- The influence of conservative/liberal differences toward economic issues had no impact on which government level they selected. However, conservative/liberal differences toward social issues did.
- Those who were very liberal were four times as likely to believe that the federal government gave the most for taxes.
We wanted to know what Idaho citizens thought was the least fair tax. Federal income tax was selected most frequently (39.9%), followed closely by local property taxes (35.7%).

The Least Fair Tax

Percentage of Respondents of Each Category

- Minority group members were slightly more likely to view property taxes as the least fair while Caucasians were more likely to view the federal government as the source of the least fair tax.

- Lower income respondents were the most likely to view the state sales tax as the least fair.

- Increases in income were associated with the perception that the federal income tax was unfair.

- Gender, region, age, political views, and education were not associated with differences among citizens perceptions of tax fairness.
PUBLIC PROGRAM SPENDING

The next few questions asked Idahoans whether they believed the level of public spending on a variety of public programs should be increased, maintained at current levels, or decreased. The figure below displays citizen's attitudes about spending on public education, kindergarten through high-school.

Idaho citizens strongly supported increases in spending (68.2%).

Less than 1 in 20 Idahoans supported a decrease (4.4%).

- Women were more likely than men to support an increase in spending for public education. Men are about three times more likely than women to believe that public spending should be decreased.

- The younger a respondent was, the more he or she supported spending for public education. This occurred across all age groups. Senior citizens were the least likely to support spending for education.

- The greater the education of a citizen, the greater the likelihood that she or he supported spending for education. However, those with a 2-year degree supported spending for higher education more than those with a 4-year degree.

- Rural citizens showed the least overall support for education, although even among this group support was strong (59%).

- There was a very strong relationship between differences in economic conservatism/liberalism and support for education. The greater the economic conservatism of a citizen, the lower the support for education. 43% of the very conservative supported an increase for education, while 100% of the very liberal supported an increase for education.
The figure below displays citizen's support for spending for higher education.

Most citizens believed that spending should be increased (46%).

This was followed closely by maintaining spending at the current level (42.8%).

- Women showed a slight preference for increased spending for higher education.
- Age was a strong predictor of support for higher education. In the youngest age group (18-25), 58% supported increases for higher education spending and 1% opposed.
- The oldest age group, senior citizens, displayed weaker support for higher education: 34% supported increases for higher education spending and 17% opposed increases, while the majority (52%) preferred that it stay at current levels.
- Educated citizens supported increases in spending for higher education. Those with an advanced degree were twice as likely to support increased spending for colleges and universities than those with only a high school diploma.
- In all categories, those with no college selected spending at existing levels, while those with some college and with any kind of degree supported increasing spending levels.
- There was a strong and positive relationship between income and support for increases in higher education spending.
- Urban and suburban residents showed stronger support for increased higher education spending than their rural counterparts. Rural citizens were twice as likely to oppose increased spending on higher education.
There was a strong relationship between differences in economic conservatism/liberalism and support for higher education spending: the greater the economic conservatism, the lower the support for increases in higher education spending. This is not to say that conservatives are anti-higher education: even among the very conservative, those who supported increases in higher education spending were twice as prevalent as those who opposed increases.

Social conservatives were more likely to maintain current spending, while social liberals are more likely to support funding increases. Social moderates preferred a funding increase over current levels by 48% to 41%.
The following figure shows citizen's attitudes toward spending on environmental protection.

![Pie chart showing spending attitudes](image)

- Nearly half of the respondents supported current spending levels.
- Three in 10 Idahoans wanted an increase in spending, while about 2 in 10 preferred a decrease in spending.

- The Southeast and Central Mountain regions showed the lowest support for environmental protection spending. The highest levels were in the North Central and the South Central.
- Men preferred decreased spending more frequently than women, who tended to prefer spending at current levels.
- Age showed a strong relationship to environmental protection spending. Younger citizens were more likely to select increases in spending than older respondents, while older respondents were more likely to prefer reductions in spending.
  - Citizens between 18 and 25 were four times more likely to favor increased spending over decreased spending for environmental protection.
  - Citizens 65 and older were nearly twice as likely to oppose increased spending over decreased spending on environmental protection.
- Citizens with graduate or professional degrees were more likely to support increased spending on environmental protection than all other categories of education.
- Small towns and suburbs were the strongest supporters of increased spending, consistently showing higher levels of support than city and rural citizens.
- Economic and social conservatives indicated strong support for lowered funding than economic and social liberals.
Over 52% of Idahoans supported increased spending on highways, roads, and bridges.

The North Central region showed the greatest levels of support for increased spending at 68.9%, at twice the level of the Southeast (33.4%). The Southeast was substantially lower than all other regions in support for increased spending.

The Panhandle region ranked second in support for increased spending (63.4%), followed by the Central Mountains (58%).

Older citizens were significantly more likely to support increased spending on highways, roads, and bridges. Younger citizens favored maintaining current levels of spending.

Very conservative citizens were significantly more likely to oppose increases in spending than all other groups.
We next asked about spending for law enforcement. Idahoans most frequently cited maintaining current levels of spending for law enforcement.

![Spending on Law Enforcement](image)

- There was substantial regional variation in support for law enforcement.
  - South Central residents showed the highest support for increases in law enforcement funding, at 63.3%. They were 16% higher than the Southwest, which came in second at 47.3% in favor of increased spending.
  - The lowest support was in the Panhandle, with 34.8% in favor of increased spending and 11.6% in favor of decreased spending.
- Minority respondents were more likely than Caucasians to select decreased spending on law enforcement.
- Women were significantly more in favor of increased spending on law enforcement. Men were significantly more likely to support less spending for law enforcement.
- Urban and suburban respondents were more likely to support increases in law enforcement spending than rural and small town citizens.
- Rural and small town citizens were most likely to support current spending levels, and were twice as likely to select decreased spending for law enforcement than city and suburban residents.
• The more economically conservative a respondent was, the more likely they were to support increases in law enforcement funding.

• Socially conservative citizens were more likely to support law enforcement funding than their more liberal counterparts.

• Those who characterized themselves as very liberal were twice as likely to support reductions rather than increases in law enforcement funding.
The following figure looks at spending on health services for the uninsured. Most citizens preferred maintaining current levels of spending (47.6%).

- Panhandle residents showed the highest support for increases in health care spending (44.2%), while Central Mountain residents indicated the lowest (25.3%).

- A majority of respondents in all regions supported maintaining current levels of spending.

- The older the respondents were, the more likely they were to resist increases in health care spending for the uninsured. Senior citizens supported health care spending the least (24.5% support), over ten percent lower than the next closest group (55-64 years). However, senior citizens were the most likely to support maintaining current levels of spending for the uninsured (64.9%).

- Citizens with vocational-technical or trade degrees were the most likely to support increases in health spending, followed closely by citizens with a high school diploma only. Idahoans with a 4-year college degree were the least likely to support increases in health care spending.
There was a strong relationship between income and support for health services for the uninsured. The greater a respondent's income, the lower the support was for increases in health care spending.

Economically conservative Idahoans are significantly less likely to support increases in health spending than their more liberal counterparts. Very liberal Idahoans were three times more likely to support increases in health spending than those who were very conservative.

Socially more conservative Idahoans were significantly less likely to support increases in health care spending than more liberal respondents.
A majority of Idahoans favored maintaining current levels of economic development.

A majority (55.1%) of respondents wanted to maintain current levels of spending on economic development.

More than 1 in 4 Idahoans wanted to increase spending on economic development.

- Support for increased economic development was highest in the Southeast (35.2%) and South Central (35.1%) regions, and lowest in the Southwest (24.6%). In all regions, respondents preferred maintaining current levels.

- Men were significantly more likely to support increases in economic development spending, while women tended to favor maintaining current levels.

- Senior citizens were the least likely age group to support economic development, followed by citizens between the ages of 56 and 65.
The next figure examines aid to low-income families. Fifty four percent of the respondents preferred maintaining current levels.

- Female respondents were significantly more likely than males to support increased spending for low-income families.
- Those who were more economically liberal were three times more likely to support aid to low-income families than economic conservatives.
- Social conservatives were less likely to support aid to low-income families than their more liberal and moderate counterparts. However, all groups preferred maintaining current levels of spending.
The following figure looks at spending for senior citizen programs. Over half of Idahoans selected maintaining current levels of spending on programs for senior citizens. Nearly four in ten Idahoans preferred increased spending.

![Pie chart showing spending preferences for senior citizen programs]

- The South Central region indicated the greatest support for increased spending (46.4%). Support for spending was lowest in the Central Mountains (32.3%) and Southeast region (32.4%).

- Minority group members were significantly more likely to support increased spending for senior citizen programs (60%) than Caucasians (39.2%). Caucasian citizens were most likely to prefer maintaining current levels.

- Younger citizens were significantly more likely than older Idahoans to support increasing funding for senior citizen programs. Seniors 66 and older were the least likely of all groups to support increased senior citizen program funding and the most likely to support maintaining current levels of funding.

- Graduates of vocational-technical and trade schools were the most likely to support senior citizen funding programs, followed by Idahoans with high school diplomas. Increases in education were marked by sharp declines in support for senior citizen programs, while respondents with graduate degrees were the least supportive of senior citizen program funding.

- Idahoans with incomes of $50,000 or greater were less likely to support increases in senior citizen program funding than all other income groups.

- Economically and socially conservative Idahoans were the least likely to support increases in senior citizen program funding, with support increasing for moderate and liberal respondents.
A majority of Idahoans supported increased spending on child protective services.

- Women were significantly more likely than men to support increased child protective services funding. Men were twice as likely to support decreased funding.
- Older citizens were slightly less likely to support increases in child protective services funding than younger age groups.
- Idahoans with less than a high school diploma were substantially more likely to support child protective services funding (73.3%) than those with higher levels of education.
- Idahoans with a 2-year degree were most likely to support maintaining existing levels of funding.
- **Economic** conservatives were significantly less likely to support child protective services funding than more centrist and liberal respondents. This is also true for **social** conservatives. Very liberal Idahoans were twice as likely as very conservative citizens to support funding for child protective services.
Idahoan’s attitudes toward spending on jails and prisons are presented in the following figure. Most respondents supported current levels of spending. For those citizens who wanted to change spending levels, a slightly greater number supported decreased spending over increased spending.

We found no significant differences among the many demographic variables. This means that attitudes regarding spending on jails and prisons are relatively stable. Attitudes toward jail and prison spending were unaffected by differences in income, gender, urban-rural status, political outlook, region, or any of the other variables we assessed.
STATEWIDE INITIATIVES

There has been considerable discussion in Idaho about the growing number of statewide initiatives that are circulated and often appear on the general election ballot. The following three questions ask about initiatives.

Idahoans were first asked if the number of initiatives should be limited. Most stated that current levels were about right (44.6%). About 29% stated that there were too many, while almost 1 in 5 stated that there weren't enough.

Citizens from the Panhandle were most likely to believe that there were too many initiatives (37.5%), followed closely by South Central citizens (35%).

Respondents from the Central Mountains were the most likely to believe that there were too few initiatives (27.7%).

Idahoans with less than a high school education were significantly more likely to believe that there were too many initiatives, at a rate nearly double that of other citizens.
We asked citizens if they were aware of changes making it more difficult to put initiatives on the general election ballot. Only 3 in 10 respondents (29.6%) indicated that they were aware of the changes (see figure below).

Finally, we wondered if Idahoans supported recent changes to the state initiative process. As the figure below shows, a slim majority supported changes (32.3% in favor vs. 26.6% opposed).
STATE COMPARISONS

In the following four questions, we compared Idahoan's perceptions of taxes in Idaho to their perceptions of taxes in other states. How do other states compare with us?

First, we asked about overall level of per capita state and local taxes.

28.2% of the respondents stated that overall taxes were lower in Idaho than in other states.

Half stated that they were about the same.

Next, we asked about Idaho property taxes.

Slightly over 1 in 4 respondents stated that Idaho's property taxes were lower than other states.

About 1 in 5 (20.4%) stated that they were higher than average.

Nearly 37% of the respondents stated that they were about average.
Third, we asked how Idaho’s sales tax compared to that of other states.

Almost 65 percent stated that the sales tax was about average.

Less than 1 in 2 stated that Idaho’s sales tax was higher than average.

Fourth, Idahoans noted their perceptions about Idaho’s personal income tax.

Six of 10 Idahoans responded that the state income tax was about average.

Nearly 14 percent observed that Idaho’s state income tax was lower than average.
STATE GENERAL FUND

The following four questions were asked of Idahoans about the state general fund revenue and expenditure.

First, we asked what respondents thought is the largest revenue source for the state general fund. The figure below provides a description of their responses.

- The most frequently selected answer was the income tax, selected by nearly 1/3 of the respondents.
- Sales tax was the second most frequently selected answer, followed closely by property tax.
We asked Idahoans what they thought the largest state general fund expenditure was.

The answer most frequently selected was education, by almost 29% of the respondents.

Health and Welfare was the second most frequently identified.

The category titled "Others" included a wide range of responses. The single most frequently identified "other" was alcohol and tobacco. Many responded "none specifically." Still others noted "special interest," "state tax," "out-of-town taxes," and "property tax."
Idaho citizens were asked to identify the most acceptable fund raiser, if the level of taxes and/or fees were to be increased.

- The state sales tax was most frequently selected (35%).
- A development impact fee was the second most frequently selected, and was chosen by 14 percent of the respondents.
Paying for public services is a perennial issue in Idaho. We asked Idahoans "Regarding paying for services such as education, corrections, transportation, public safety, welfare, etc., what should be done?"

Almost 6 of 10 respondents wanted to keep paying at the current levels, only redistributing current service funding.

Only 16 percent wanted to change current levels of taxes and fees by increasing or decreasing them.
We asked respondents what they thought the monthly pay of state legislators was.

Citizen's Perceptions of State Legislators Monthly Pay

- Most respondents stated that they did not know.
- For those who selected a sum, the most frequent response was $3,000 monthly (19%), followed closely by $5,000 or more (18.2%).
- 13.8 percent of the respondents stated that legislators made $1,000 or less.
FAIR SHARE

Idahoans were asked to respond if they thought that various groups were paying their fair share of Idaho state and local taxes. Respondents were asked to state whether the groups were paying too much, about right, or too little. Findings are presented in the following figures.

Lower-Income People

Over half of respondents stated that lower income people were paying their fair share.

Nearly 1 in 4 stated that lower income people were paying more than their fair share.

Middle-Income People

Half of our respondents stated that middle-income people were paying their fair share.

Nearly as many (44.6%) stated they were paying more than their fair share.

Only 3.4 percent stated that middle-income people were paying less than their fair share.
Upper-Income People

Slightly more than 1 in 5 Idahoans (21.1 percent) stated that upper-income people were paying their fair share.

Seven in 10 Idahoans stated that upper-income people were paying less than their fair share.

Large Businesses

Slightly less than 1/3 of Idahoans thought that big business was paying its fair share.

Six in 10 respondents stated that big business was paying less than its fair share.
Small Business

Over half (56.2%) stated that small business was paying its fair share.

A large minority of Idahoans stated that small business was paying more than its fair share.

Only 1 in 20 Idahoans stated that small business was paying less than its fair share.

Retirees

Nearly 6 in 10 Idahoans thought that retirees were paying their fair share.

Less than 1 in 20 respondents stated that retirees were paying less than their fair share.
CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

In the following items, we asked Idahoans about their level of confidence in people running state institutions of government. Did they have a great deal of confidence, only some, or hardly any?

People running the State Supreme Court?

87.3% of Idahoans had some or a great deal of confidence in the people running the state supreme court.

Less than one in 10 (7.8%) had hardly any confidence in the people running the state supreme court.

People who are running the Idaho legislature?

83% had some or a great deal of confidence in the people who are running the state legislature.

Only a small minority (14.9%) had hardly any confidence in the people who are running the state legislature.
Your State Senator?

More than 4 of 5 Idahoans had either a great deal or some confidence in their state senator.

Only 13 percent had hardly any confidence in their state senator.

Your state representative?

A large majority of Idahoans (84.4%) had either a great deal or some confidence in their state representative.

Only 12.1% of the respondents had no confidence in their state legislators.
Governor Batt?

84.3% of the respondents had either some or a great deal of confidence in Governor Batt. No other representative or group received as high marks as did the Governor.

Only 13% of respondents had hardly any confidence in Governor Batt.

State Government Employees?

83.4 percent of the respondents had a great deal or some confidence in state government employees.

About 1 in 8 respondents had hardly any confidence in government employees.
TERM LIMITS

The term limit law in Idaho virtually limits all state, city, county and school district officials to either six or eight years in office. The following three questions assess Idahoan's perceptions of term limits.

First, we asked Idahoans about state officials such as the governor, secretary of state, and superintendent of public education. Did Idahoans think the law should be changed or retained?

![Term Limits: State Officials](image)

- Six of 10 Idahoans wanted to keep limits at current levels.
- One of 5 (19.4%) wanted to remove term limits.

We asked the same question about state legislators. Should the law be changed or retained?

![Term Limits: State Legislators](image)

- Again, 6 of 10 wanted to maintain existing limits.
- About the same percentage (roughly 1 in 5) wanted to either take the limits off or impose higher limits.
We asked Idahoans about term limits for local officials such as county clerks, mayors, and school board members.

The majority of Idahoans wanted to keep limits at the current levels (58.5%). Idahoans wanting no limits slightly outnumbered those wanting stricter limits.

- The Panhandle and the Southwest regions had the highest support for increasing current term limits for all government officials.

- Males were more likely than females to prefer the removal of term limits.

- In general, there was a slight tendency for more educated respondents to support the removal of term limits. However, in all educational categories, respondents preferred to keep limits at current levels.
  - Citizens without a high school diploma showed the greatest support for stricter term limits.
  - Citizens with a Bachelors degree were the most likely group to support the removal of term limits, at a rate slightly over 3 of 10.

- There was a strong relationship between income and term limits for all types: lower income categories support stricter term limits, while higher income groups are more likely to support the removal of term limits. However, in all categories of income Idahoans wanted to keep current levels of term limits.

- Differences in economic and social conservatism/liberalism were unrelated to term limit preference.
GAMING

The following two questions were asked of Idahoans about gaming issues.

Recently, there has been a lot of news about the addition of new games in tribal casinos. We asked Idahoans about their opinions on tribal gaming. Should tribes be allowed to operate casinos with these games?

![New Games in Tribal Casinos](image)

Nearly 6 in 10 respondents (58.8%) stated that they should be allowed to operate new games in casinos.

About 4 in 10 stated that they should not operate the new games.

- The South Central region showed the greatest resistance to allowing new games, with nearly 5 of 10 respondents opposed.
- The greatest support for allowing new games was in the Panhandle, followed closely by the Southwest region.
- Minority status was unrelated to support for allowing new games.
- Opposition increased with age.
  - Seven of 10 members of the youngest age group (18-25) supported the addition of new games.
  - Among the oldest group (over 65), support for and against new games was evenly split at 48%.
- There was a strong relationship between differences in economic conservatism/liberalism and support for new games.
  - Only about 4 in 10 very conservative Idahoans wanted to allow new games.
  - Two thirds of the moderates (66.7%) supported allowing new games.
Over 9 in 10 economic very liberal citizens (90.9%) supported new games.

When differences in social conservatism/liberalism were considered, the same pattern was observed.

Among very conservative Idahoans, more citizens were opposed to tribal gaming than support it.

Among the moderates, 3 in 10 (29%) did not support tribal gaming, while 66.7% support it.

Among very liberal Idahoans, support was high, at 78%.

Idaho has operated a state lottery under a constitutional amendment passed in 1988.

Should the state continue to operate the lottery?

More than 7 in 10 Idahoans said that the state should continue to operate the lottery.

Slightly over 1 in 4 said that the state should not operate the lottery.

Nearly 4 of 10 citizens of the Central Mountain region (36.2%), did not believe that the state should continue to operate the lottery.

Minority group members were significantly more likely to support the state lottery.

Support for the lottery declined sharply with age.

Among Idahoans aged 18 to 25, more than 8 of 10 supported the lottery.

Among senior citizens (over 65), support declined to about 5 of 10 Idahoans.

There was a tendency for support for the lottery to increase with education, though the highest support was among those with an Associates (2-year) degree.
• When we looked at residential status, we found that the greatest resistance to the lottery was among rural citizens.

• There is a strong relationship between support for the lottery and differences in economic conservatism/liberalism.
  ♦ Very conservative citizens were evenly split on support for the lottery.
  ♦ Four in 5 moderate respondents supported the lottery.
  ♦ Nine in 10 very liberal Idahoans supported the lottery.

• A strong relationship between differences in social conservatism/liberalism and support for the lottery was also noted: more conservative Idahoans were more likely to oppose the lottery.
  ♦ Very liberal respondents were six times more likely to support the lottery than those who said that they were very conservative.
  ♦ Over 50% of the very conservative Idahoans were opposed to the state lottery.
ABORTION

Abortion has again become an issue in Idaho and there may be legislation in the 1998 legislative session. The following two items assess Idahoan's opinions on abortion.

First, we asked Idahoans which of the following represented their views on abortion legislation.

![Diagram of views on abortion legislation]

Most (36%) believed that abortion should be illegal in most cases. This was followed closely by the view that abortion should be legal in most cases (31.4%).

Large regional variations were noted in attitudes toward abortion. No other issue in this survey showed such marked variation across regions.

- Citizens in the Panhandle supported abortion more than all other regions. 63.4% stated that it should be legal in most or all cases.
- The Central Mountains were the least supportive, with 69.2% of the respondents stating that it should be illegal in most or all cases.
- In the following regions, over 50% of the respondents supported abortion in all or most instances: Panhandle (63.4%), North Central (50.8%), South Central (55.5%).
- In the following regions, over 50% of the respondents opposed abortion in all or most instances: Central Mountains (69.2%) and Southeast (61.3%).
- The Southwest region was split, with 49.8% in favor and 49.8% opposed.

Gender was unrelated to abortion preference.

Idahoans with higher education were more likely to support abortion.
• There was a strong relationship between differences in economic conservatism/liberalism and abortion views.
  ◆ Very liberal Idahoans were five times more likely than those who were very conservative to support abortion in all cases.
  ◆ Six of 10 very conservative citizens stated that abortion should be illegal in all or most instances.
  ◆ Slightly over half of the moderates thought that abortion should be legal in some or all instances.
  ◆ Nearly 8 of 10 very liberal citizens stated that abortion ought to be legal in some or all instances.

• The same pattern of findings was noted with regard to differences in social conservatism/liberalism. More socially conservative individuals were more likely to believe that abortion should be illegal and more socially liberal individuals tended to support the legalization of abortion.

*We asked Idahoans if they favored or opposed bans on abortions in a woman's third trimester of pregnancy, also called "partial birth" abortions.*
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Slightly over 6 of 10 said that they would support a ban on partial birth abortions.

One third of respondents said that they would oppose a ban.

• No significant regional differences were noted with regard to partial birth abortions.

• Minority group members were much more likely to oppose a ban on partial birth abortions, with over half (55%) opposing a ban on partial birth abortion.
There was a tendency for economic and social conservatives to support a ban on partial birth abortions to a greater extent than economic and social liberals. There were important exceptions.

- Socially very liberal Idahoans were more likely to support bans on partial birth abortions than somewhat liberal respondents.

- Economically very liberal Idahoans were more likely to support bans on partial birth abortions than both those who were somewhat liberal and moderates, scoring similarly to economic conservatives.
FEDERAL LAND USE

The next eight questions assess Idahoan’s views on the use of federal lands in Idaho. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following possible uses of federal land in Idaho.

Timber harvesting is an appropriate use of a national forest.

Over 3/4 of our respondents agreed that timber harvesting was an appropriate land use.

Less than 1 in 5 (19.7%) disagreed.

Livestock grazing is an appropriate use of the national forests and Bureau of Land Management lands in Idaho.

Four in 5 Idahoans agreed with this use of federal land.

Only 17.6% disagreed.
Idaho currently has enough Congressionally-designated wilderness within the state.
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Over 3/4 of Idahoans stated that there was enough congressionally-designated wilderness.

Less than 1 in 5 stated that there wasn't enough congressionally designated wilderness.

Recreation uses should take preference over resource extraction activities on the federal lands in Idaho.

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents in each category for recreation vs. resource extraction on federal lands.]

Four in 10 Idahoans agreed that recreational uses should take preference over resource extraction activities.

One half of the respondents did not think that recreation uses should take precedence.
There have been a number of discussions and proposals to transfer certain federal lands to the states. We asked Idahoans under what conditions they supported transfer of federal lands to Idaho.

![Support for Transfer of Federal Land to Idaho](image)

Six of 10 respondents supported land transfer only if state management agencies complied with all federal environment law.

Slightly over 1 in 5 supported transfer under no condition. A slightly smaller number, 14.6%, supported transfer under any condition.

- Men were twice as likely as women to unconditionally support the transfer of federal land to the states.
- Younger respondents were less likely to support the unconditional transfer of federal land to the states.
- Increases in the educational level of respondents was associated with support for the transfer of federal land to the states. This relationship did not hold for Idahoans with post-graduate degrees.
- Rural residents were more likely to support the unconditional transfer of Federal land to Idaho than citizens in other residential settings.
- Both economic and social conservatives were much more likely than their liberal counterparts to support the unconditional transfer of federal land to Idaho, with moderates falling midway between these groups.
Do Idahoans support amending the Endangered Species Act to provide incentives to private landowners to protect species on their property?

Most Idahoans (66.2%) supported the provision of incentives to private landowners.

Slightly less than 3 in 10 Idahoans opposed the provision of incentives to private landowners.

The National Park Service should protect park resources even if it means curtailing the number of visitors to national parks. Agree or disagree? (Note that this question refers to national parks in general, not simply those in Idaho.)

Over three-fourths of Idahoans supported the protection of park resources even if the number of visitors were curtailed.

About 1 in 5 respondents didn't support the protection of park resources under these conditions.
Automobile use in national parks such as the Grand Canyon and Zion should be limited. Agree or disagree?

Almost 3 in 4 Idahoans supported limiting automobile use in national parks.

About 1 in 4 Idahoans did not support limiting automobile use.
CRIME AND PUBLIC POLICY

We asked Idahoans if they or anyone in their household had been victimized by a crime in 1997.

Almost 1 in 5 Idahoans reported a victimization to them or to their household in the previous year.

Slightly less than 2% of all victimizations (12 incidents) were for a violent crime.

- Household property crime victimization.
  - Over 1/3 of the property crimes (37%) were repeat victimizations.
  - One in 5 of the households where a property crime occurred was victimized 3 or more times.
  - Fifteen percent of the respondents stated that the property crime wasn't reported to the police. Most of these non-reportees (66%) said they thought the crime wasn't worth reporting.

- Household violent crime victimization.
  - Nearly half of the violent crimes were repeat victimizations.
  - Most of the violent victimizations (80%) were reported to the police.
Respondents were asked to respond to the following question: Do you think that correctional costs should be reduced by removing non-violent offenders from prison after a short period of incarceration and supervising them in the community?

Six in 10 Idahoans agreed that non-violent offenders should be removed after a short period of incarceration.

About 1/3 of the respondents disagreed with the question.

- The North Central region was the most likely to support the removal of non-violent offenders (74% favoring removal), while the Southeast was the most likely to disagree (43% opposing removal of violent offenders).

- Idahoans at the low end of the income scale (less than $20,000) were most likely to disagree with the removal of violent offenders, followed closely by Idahoans at the top end of the income scale (over $50,000).

- Both social and economic conservatives were more likely than more moderate and liberal citizens to disagree with the removal of non-violent offenders from prison after a short stay. However, this relationship was significant only for social conservatives.
Do you support Governor Batt's efforts to reduce the penalties for certain property crimes from felonies to misdemeanors, so that these felons do not have to go to prison?

The majority of the respondents (though slightly less than half) supported Governor Batt's efforts.

Slightly over 4 of 10 respondents did not support Governor Batt's efforts.

- Higher educational levels were associated with support for Governor Batt's efforts. Idahoans with less than a high school diploma were the most likely to oppose Governor Batt's efforts.

- Higher income citizens were the most likely to agree with efforts to decriminalize certain felony crimes. Lower income Idahoans were the most likely to disagree.

- Social liberals were more likely to agree with Batt's efforts than social conservatives. However, there was no significant association between differences in economic conservatism/liberalism and agreement with efforts to decriminalize certain felony crimes.
The following four questions asked Idahoans about their perceptions of minority issues and opportunities in Idaho. They were asked to agree or disagree with the following statements.

"Idaho's Hispanic population is more inclined toward crime and violence than other ethnic groups in the state."

A majority of the respondents disagreed that Hispanic citizens were inclined toward crime than other minorities.

A sizeable minority (41.7%) thought that they were so inclined.

"Minority groups in Idaho do not suffer discrimination in the areas of education, job opportunities, criminal justice administration or political involvement."

By a slim margin (just under 50%), respondents agreed with this statement.

A large percentage of Idahoans thought that minority groups suffered discrimination in Idaho.
"The United States has generally respected the sovereignty of Latin American countries and intervened only when asked."

Slightly less than half of the respondents agreed that the U.S. has intervened in Latin America only when asked.

About 4 of 10 respondents disagreed with this statement.

"Idaho has historically been a region of opportunity."

More than 4 of 5 Idahoans agreed that Idaho is a region of opportunity.

Only 13.5% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.
Finally, we asked Idahoans about their attitudes toward a wide range of public services in Idaho. The final five questions asked Idahoans the extent to which they agree or disagree with different areas of public services.

Idaho should fund social services and programs for children and youth who are at risk of getting into trouble.

Eight of 10 Idahoans somewhat or strongly agreed with this statement. Only 13% somewhat or strongly disagreed with this statement.

- All regions tended to agree that Idaho should fund social services and programs for troubled youth, though agreement was lowest in the Southeast, at 70%.
- Women were more likely to agree than men.
- Young Idahoans agreed more frequently than older citizens that social services and programs for troubled youth should be funded. The youngest citizens (18-25) agreed at two times the rate of senior citizens.
- Higher income Idahoans were slightly more inclined to disagree.
- Rural residents were slightly more inclined to disagree than their more urban counterparts.
- Economic conservatives were substantially more likely to disagree than moderate and liberal respondents.
- Those who were economically somewhat liberal were more than twice as likely to strongly agree that services or troubled youth should be funded than those that were somewhat conservative.
- Socially conservative Idahoans were less likely to support funding for troubled youth than their more liberal counterparts. However, a majority in all groups supported funding for troubled youth.
Idaho is becoming an easier place for kids and youth to get into trouble.
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- The South Central region was the most likely to agree, with 40% strongly agreeing that it is easier for kids and youth to get into trouble.

- The North Central region was the most likely region to disagree, with overall disagreement at 35%.

- Idahoans with less education were more likely to agree. Idahoans with no high school education agreed at a rate of 86%, about 20% higher than those with a Bachelors or advanced degree.

- Idahoans with higher incomes were less likely to strongly agree with the statement. Those with incomes over $50,000 were about half as likely to strongly agree as those with incomes under $20,000. However, all income groups were more likely to agree than disagree.

- Agreement was unrelated to differences in either economic or political conservatism/liberalism.
Reforming the welfare system in Idaho should apply to all programs and services, from Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Social Security Insurance to agricultural subsidies and corporate tax breaks.

About 1 in 4 Idahoans strongly agreed, with about 70% agreeing overall.

Sixteen percent of Idahoans somewhat or strongly disagreed.

Juvenile corrections should only fund youth services and programs that are punitive in nature.

Idahoans were more likely to agree than disagree that juvenile corrections should fund only punitive programs. 44.2 percent agreed, while 37.4 percent disagreed.

- Idahoans with less education were more likely to support a punitive corrections system for juveniles than those with greater levels of formal education. Those without a high school education agreed 64% of the time, while those with advanced degrees agreed only 34% of the time.

- Economic conservatives were more likely to agree than economic liberals, with responses ranging from 46% overall agreement for very conservative respondents to 37% overall agreement for very liberal Idahoans.

- Social conservatives were more likely than social liberals to state that juvenile corrections ought to be punitive.
Sex education in our schools should be increased.

35.9% of Idahoans strongly agreed that sex education should be increased.

Slightly less than 3 of 10 respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

- Overall agreement was highest in the Southwest region at 73% (47% strongly agreeing), and lowest in North Central and South Central regions, both showing about 55% agreement.

- Younger Idahoans were slightly more likely to agree than older residents.

- Economic conservatives were substantially less likely to agree than their more centrist and liberal counterparts.
  - Very conservative Idahoans strongly or somewhat agreed 38% of the time.
  - Moderates strongly or somewhat agreed 48% of the time.
  - Very liberal Idahoans strongly or somewhat agreed 100% of the time.

- Social conservatives and liberals showed a similar pattern to economic conservatives and liberals.
  - Very conservative respondents agreed 33% of the time.
  - Moderates agreed 70% of the time
  - Very liberal respondents agreed 90% of the time.
SAMPLE DESIGN

The Social Science Research Center purchases random digit dialing samples from a national sampling company which are well-documented, credible, and have successfully withstood court challenges. The probability samples are stratified proportional to the number of active blocks in each telephone exchange in each county of the test area. A block is a group of 100 telephone numbers in a single exchange. For example, 343-1100 to 343-1199 is one block. There are 100 blocks or 10,000 numbers per exchange. In order for a block to be active, at least one number in the block must be listed in the telephone directory. (The assessment of active blocks is updated every six months by the supplier.) Thus, for example, in the Boise exchange "343" all 100 blocks are active and the sampling frame includes 10,000 numbers. In the town of Deary, Idaho, there are only seven active blocks for the exchange "877," resulting in a total of 700 numbers included in the sampling frame for that exchange.

Once the sample is drawn, the sampling company removes numbers that are identified as business or non-working numbers. However, not all of these numbers can be identified and removed: some must be identified by the Center over the course of the survey. In addition, the Center cannot make contact with all of the valid residential numbers in the sample during the course of the survey. Some numbers will remain unanswered or busy at the end of the survey, and some additional numbers reached will refuse to conduct the interview. The Center attempts each telephone number a maximum of ten times.

The number of calls that result in completed interviews, accounting for no answers, busy signals, businesses, refusals, unqualified households, and so forth, constitute the "response rate." The Center's protocol is designed to ensure a minimum response rate of 60 percent of valid residential numbers.

DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

Once the final draft of the questionnaire was approved by the participants, the Center purchased the sample and began the survey. In order to minimize potential bias in the sample resulting from the known greater likelihood of certain types of people to answer phones in households (for example, women and older persons), interviewers asked for the person in the household 18 or older with the most recent birthday. Although accepted as the industry standard, this method does not perfectly randomize respondent selection, because of the continuing desire of many people to respond to a legitimate public policy survey.

The questionnaire items were entered into the computer-assisted telephone interviewing software which transforms the hard copy questionnaire into computerized data entry screens. The sample telephone numbers were fed through the computer
network to the interviewer work stations. The disposition of every telephone call made as well as the data on all completed interviews were returned through the network to a central computer where the data was prepared for analysis.