



Public Attitudes Toward the Clean Elections Initiative

Monitoring Study of the 2007 New Jersey Clean Elections Pilot Project

Peter Woolley, Ph.D., Tim Vercellotti, Ph.D.¹

Nov. 27, 2007

Introduction

This report summarizes the results of a series of voter surveys conducted in New Jersey during the fall 2007 campaign. The surveys were designed to measure public attitudes about campaign finance reform in general and the Clean Elections legislation in particular. It also compares the 2007 survey results to findings from a similar series conducted in the autumn of 2005 when the Clean Elections legislation was first implemented.

Fairleigh Dickinson University's PublicMind Poll conducted two statewide surveys of likely voters each year in 2007 and 2005, one in late September and a second in late October. The statewide surveys were designed to measure attitudes about trust in government, concerns about undue influence of private money on the legislative process, the idea of public financing for legislative campaigns, awareness of the Clean Elections program and any changes in the public's attitudes through the fall campaign season. (See Appendix II for survey questionnaires.)

In addition, in 2007 Rutgers University's Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling surveyed voters in the state's 14th, 24th, and 37th legislative districts, the three districts in which the state's experimental Clean Elections legislation applied. In 2005, Rutgers' Eagleton Center polled voters in the 6th and 13th legislative districts, the two districts in which the experimental campaign finance rules were first used.²

The district surveys were designed to measure whether awareness of the Clean Elections pilot project was higher in the targeted districts than in the rest of the state and

¹ Peter Woolley is director of Fairleigh Dickinson University's PublicMind and Professor of Comparative Politics. Tim Vercellotti is Director of Polling at Rutgers University's Eagleton Institute of Politics and Assistant Research Professor.

² For the 2005 report on survey findings see: "The Well-Kept Secret of Clean Elections" at <http://www.eagleton.rutgers.edu/News-Research/CEReport.pdf> or <http://publicmind.fdu.edu/secretclean/index.html>

whether voter attitudes about trust in government, the influence of private money and public financing of legislative campaigns, as well as awareness of the Clean Elections legislation, differed in those districts compared to each other and compared to the rest of the state.

All surveys were conducted by telephone in between late September and early November. Statewide surveys employed random-digit dialing (RDD) while district surveys used registered voter lists (RVL). Question wording and question order for all populations in both years were nearly identical. (See Appendix I for a detailed statement on survey methods and Appendix II for exact wording and question order.)

The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce and the Fund for New Jersey generously supported the costs of the surveys.

Results

September Statewide Survey

The first survey of likely voters in 2007 was undertaken statewide from Sept. 17 through Sept. 23, dates essentially similar to those of the first statewide survey in 2005. In fact, survey results for September 2007 were also essentially similar to those in September 2005 and, so, the baseline did not move. Topline results for the September 2007 survey showed:

- Four of five (80%) likely voters said you can “trust the state legislature to do what is right” only some of the time or none of the time, while just 16% said you can trust it most or all of the time. These responses were essentially unchanged from September 2005 when three of four (75%) said they trust the state legislature to do what is right only some or none of the time and only 22% said they trust the state legislature to do what is right most or all of the time.
- Only 10% said they were “not at all concerned” that “people who give money to campaigns might also influence the legislature after the election,” while 87% said they were somewhat or very concerned that campaign donors influence legislation. Voters were more concerned in September 2007 than in 2005 about the undue influence of campaign monies: 56% said they were “very concerned” compared to 49% in September 2005.
- Four of five (79%) likely voters reported they had heard little or nothing at all about the state’s Clean Elections legislation. In September of 2005 four of five (82%) likely voters also reported they heard little or nothing at all about this legislation and in November 2005 four of five (80%) still reported they heard little or nothing. However, the percentage who said they had heard “nothing at all” declined to 49% from 56% compared to the September 2005 poll.
- Voters split on the question of whether public financing can reduce large donors’ influence over the political process: 38% said they were not at all confident that public financing will work while 42% said they were “somewhat” confident that

public financing can work. But only 9% said they were “very” confident public financing can work, while another 11% said they were unsure. Republicans were more likely than Democrats to say they think it will not work. The results were very similar to 2005.

- Three of four likely voters (74%) reported they had heard or read “just a little” or “nothing at all” about the Assembly or Senate race in their district. Only 6% said they had heard “quite a lot.” This was slightly improved from 2005, when in September four of five likely voters (80%) reported they had heard or read little or nothing about the Assembly race in their district. In addition, the percent reporting they had heard “nothing at all” declined by 15 percentage points, to 35% from 50% two years ago. Note that in 2007 there was no governor’s race to overshadow the legislative races. Also, in 2007 members of the State Senate as well as the Assembly members were standing for election, whereas in 2005 only the Assembly candidates were running.
- Most voters reported in late September that they had received no campaign advertisements by mail for their legislative race (76%), heard no radio or TV ads (77%), saw no ads on the internet (90%), nor read any articles about the race in the newspaper (58%). The results were all but identical to September 2005.
- Asked whether their local campaigns for state Assembly and Senate were focused more on personality or more on issues, more than a third (37%) could not offer an opinion while 25% said the races focused more on issues and 38% said the races focused more on the personal characteristics of the candidates.

October Pre-Election Statewide Survey

A final, pre-election survey was conducted from Oct. 22 through Oct. 28, ending just eight days before the November 6 election day. Results of the late October survey differed little or not at all from the September survey despite respondents reporting that they had been exposed to some campaign information.

- Voters’ natural cynicism about government persisted: 83% said they could trust the legislature only some or none of the time to do what is right. This was little changed from 80% in September and was identical to the October survey two years ago. Only 14% said you can trust the legislature most or all of the time.
- Voters continue to be concerned about the influence of money on political decisions. Almost 9 in 10 voters (88%) said they were somewhat or very concerned that large campaign donors influence legislation, unchanged from September and unchanged from two years ago.
- By late October, four of five likely voters (78%) reported they heard little or nothing at all about the new, experimental campaign finance rules, unchanged from September (79%) and essentially similar to results two years ago.
- As to whether they thought public financing of campaigns might reduce the influence of large donors over legislation, voters were divided: 39% said they were not confident at all that public financing was the solution, unchanged from September and unchanged from two years ago; 38% said they were somewhat

confident; only 12% said they were very confident. Another 11% said they had no opinion.

- Likely voters at this late stage of the campaign had heard little about the legislative races: 62% reported they had heard “just a little” or “nothing at all” about the race in their district; 37% said they had heard “some” or “quite a lot.” This was improved 12 percentage points: from 74% who heard or read little or nothing the month before and 25% who said they had heard some or a lot. The November results were little different from two years ago, though two years ago the change from September to October was more pronounced, showing a swing of 18 percentage points.
- A majority – 57% of likely voters – said they heard no radio or TV ads for the legislative races in their district, while 86% said they had seen nothing about the races on a Web site. But a majority (56%) said they had seen an article in the newspaper and half (49%) said they had received campaign mail.
- Asked whether their local legislative campaigns focused more on the personality of the candidates or on the issues, three in ten could not say (29%). One in four (25%) said the campaigns addressed issue positions more than personalities. A plurality of 45% said the campaigns were mainly about personality. Again, these perceptions did not differ from 2005.

October - November Survey in the Clean Elections Districts

The district-level surveys were conducted by telephone Oct. 29 through Nov. 5, the day before the election. The sample, drawn from lists of registered voters in each of the three districts, yielded interviews with 759 registered voters and 441 likely voters. The three districts were: the 14th District (parts of Mercer and Middlesex counties), the 24th District (parts of Hunterdon and Morris counties and all of Sussex County) and the 37th District (parts of Bergen County).

The data show a number of interesting differences between 2007 and 2005.

- Awareness of the Clean Elections legislation was higher, with 44% of likely voters having heard quite a lot or some about the legislation, compared to 29% in 2005. (See Table 3B in Appendix III) Breaking out the districts, awareness was highest in the 14th District, with 49% of likely voters saying they had heard quite a lot or some about the legislation. (Table 3C) The greater level of awareness in the 14th District probably stems from the district’s status as the politically competitive district for the Clean Elections experiment, with the 24th and 37th districts serving as safe districts for the Republicans and Democrats respectively at the designation of the State Legislature. The 14th District also featured an outside organization airing political ads targeting Assemblywoman Linda Greenstein, a Democrat, which triggered the release of an additional \$100,000 in Clean Elections “rescue funds” to Greenstein for use in rebutting the ads. In all, the greater level of competition and the additional information in the 14th District

probably were factors in raising voter awareness of the Clean Elections legislation.

- Voters also were more likely to answer correctly that they were in a Clean Elections district in 2007 compared to 2005 (49% in District 14, 28% in District 24, and 28% in District 37, compared to 23% in District 6 and 18% in District 13 in 2005). (Table 4)
- Voters were more likely to have heard or read quite a lot or some about the races in 2007 compared to 2005 (70% in 2007, compared to 40% in 2005). (Table 6B) The highest level of awareness, not surprisingly, was in the 14th District, where 81% said they had heard or read quite a lot or some about the races. (Table 6C)
- Likely voters were evenly split over whether the campaigns for seats in the State Legislature focused on candidates' issue positions or personal characteristics (41% to 42%) in 2007. But the data still reflected improvement over 2005, when 45% of likely voters in Clean Elections districts said the campaign focused on personal characteristics, and only 22% pointed to issue positions. (Table 8B) In 2007, this was most pronounced in the 24th District compared to the 14th and 37th districts. (Table 8C)
- Reception of information about the campaigns was higher in 2007 compared to 2005 for direct mail and newspapers, with a smaller increase for radio and no change for the Internet. Twenty-eight percent of likely voters said they received Clean Elections information from the state. (Table 7B) All of the numbers were higher for the 14th District than the other districts, with the exception of the Internet. (Table 7C)
- Other data were consistent from year to year. Trust in government did not vary, with 78% of likely voters in the districts saying they could trust the State Legislature to do what is right some or none of the time, compared to 77% in the Clean Elections districts in 2005. (Table 1B) Concern about donors influencing the legislature also was roughly the same. Ninety-two percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts said they were very or somewhat concerned, compared to 89% in 2005. (Table 2B) Confidence that public financing will reduce the influence of large donors also was consistent, with 54% of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts saying they are very or somewhat confident, compared to 52% in 2005. (Table 5B)

Comparing Statewide and District Results

In general, likely voters in the Clean Elections districts were more knowledgeable than their counterparts elsewhere in the state late in the campaign.

- Twice as many likely voters in the Clean Elections districts had heard quite a lot or some about the Clean Elections legislation compared to the state as a whole (44% to 22%).
- The same was true regarding awareness of the legislative races in their districts, with 70% of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts saying they had heard quite a lot or some about the races, compared to 37% of likely voters statewide.
- Voters in the Clean Elections districts also reported having received more information than voters in the rest of the state. Eighty-two percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections Districts reported receiving campaign ads in the mail, compared to 49% statewide. Seventy-four percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts said they had gotten information about the legislative races from an article or articles in the newspaper, compared to 56% statewide.

Voters in the Clean Elections districts also were more likely than voters statewide to say the legislative campaigns had focused on issue positions as opposed to candidates' personal characteristics.

- While likely voters in the Clean Elections districts were evenly divided over whether the campaigns emphasized issue positions (41%) or personal characteristics (42%), the split was lopsided statewide, with 45% of likely voters pointing to personal characteristics and 25% indicating issue positions.

The differences were much smaller, however, when it came to attitudes regarding trust in government and concern about the role of campaign donations in influencing politics and policy.

- Seventy-eight percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts said they could trust the State Legislature to do what is right some or none of the time, compared to 83% of voters statewide.
- Ninety-two percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts said they were very or somewhat concerned that campaign donors might influence the State Legislature after the election, compared to 88% of likely voters statewide.
- Fifty-four percent of likely voters in the Clean Elections districts said they were very or somewhat confident that public financing of campaigns would reduce the influence of larger donors on the political process, compared to 50 percent of likely voters statewide.

Conclusions

Statewide surveys show a remarkable stability in voter attitudes, whether the question is trust in the State Legislature, money in politics, or campaign finance:

- voter trust in their elected legislature is low;
- they are wary of the influence of money on the political process; and
- they are not sure of the merits or demerits of public financing as a solution.

Statewide surveys also show remarkable similarity of voters' perceptions of the legislative campaigns:

- that they hear little about the races in their district;
- there is some but not dramatic change in the amount of information they receive by late October compared to September;
- what they do hear suggests the focus of the campaign is on personality more than issues;
- that direct mail is far more in their line of vision than Internet advertisements;
- and they heard little about experimental campaign finance reform.

Compared to statewide voters, voters in the Clean Elections districts were just as likely to say they:

- trust the legislature only some or none of the time to do what is right;
- are concerned that campaign money influences legislators after the election;
- are not confident that public financing of campaigns will reduce the influence of large donors in the political process.

The surveys in the Clean Elections districts, however, reveal higher levels of political awareness and information than the statewide surveys. Voters in those districts were more likely to have heard or read information about the legislative races in their district compared to voters statewide. They also were more likely to have heard of the Clean Elections experiment. In addition, voters in the Clean Elections districts were evenly split over whether the legislative campaigns had stressed issue positions or the candidates' personal characteristics, while voters statewide were more likely to cite candidate characteristics.

The higher levels of awareness about the legislative races and the Clean Elections experiment may be due in part to publicity surrounding the contested races and the involvement of an outside organization in targeting Assemblywoman Linda Greenstein in the 14th legislative district. But awareness and access to information also were higher in the 24th and 37th districts compared to the statewide data.

The district surveys also revealed differences from two years ago, when the state first attempted the Clean Elections experiment in the 6th District (parts of Camden County) and the 13th District (parts of Middlesex and Monmouth counties). Knowledge of the Clean Elections experiment and the legislative races in general were higher this time

around. Voters also were more likely to cite candidates' issue positions, as opposed to personal characteristics, as the focus of the campaigns.

Several factors may help to explain these differences. In 2005, only one of five pairs of candidates qualified for the Clean Election funding, which may have influenced publicity surrounding the experiment. The legislative offices on the ballot in 2005 – the 80 seats in the Assembly – may have been overshadowed by the race for governor. In 2007, on the other hand, voters elected the State Senate as well as the Assembly, and the governor's office was not on the ballot. In addition, the state expanded the experiment from two to three districts in 2007, and included a competitive district for the first time. Publicity surrounding the experiment also may have been greater for several reasons. In addition to expanding to three districts, the experiment in 2007 featured state-sponsored literature on Clean Elections mailed to voters in the districts, and candidates qualified for the funding in all three districts. Also, the attention surrounding the Assembly races in the 14th District may have raised voter awareness.

To the extent that voters in the Clean Elections districts were more aware of the races and the financing experiment than their counterparts statewide in 2007 and voters in the Clean Elections districts in 2005, this year's program had positive results. A greater challenge remains, however. While voters in the Clean Elections districts appeared to be more knowledgeable, their levels of trust in government and concern over the effects of large campaign donations on the political process were on a par with voters across the state. To the extent that the Clean Elections initiative is designed to foster confidence in elections and governance through the use of publicly financed campaigns, much more work remains to be done.

Appendix I Methodological Notes

All interviews were conducted by telephone by professionally trained interviewers using a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing system). Respondents in statewide surveys were identified by random digit dialing (RDD). Respondents in Clean Elections legislative districts were identified through registered voter lists (RVL). Likely voters in all populations were identified by standard screening questions.

Sampling error at the 95% level of confidence (MoE) as well as the interview dates and sample sizes for the various populations included in this report are as follows:

Interview Dates:	Population	Sample size	MoE
Oct. 22-28, 2007	likely voters – statewide	519	+/- 4
Oct. 29- Nov. 5, 2007	RVL, likely voters – Clean Elections districts	441	+/- 5
Oct. 29- Nov. 5, 2007	RVL, registered voters – Clean Elections districts	759	+/- 4
Sep. 17-23, 2007	RDD, likely voters, statewide	701	+/- 4
Oct. 20-26, 2005	RDD, likely voters, statewide	355	+/- 5
Oct. 24-31, 2005	RVL, likely voters – Clean Elections districts	347	+/- 5
Oct. 24-31, 2005	RVL, registered voters, Clean Elections districts	500	+/- 4
Sep. 21-26, 2005	RDD, likely voters, statewide,	596	+/- 4

But survey results are also subject to non-sampling error. This kind of error, which cannot be measured, arises from many factors including, but not limited to, non-response (eligible individuals refusing to be interviewed), question wording, the order in which questions are asked, and variations in the technique and demeanor of interviewers.

Appendix II Questionnaires

The wording and order of the questions for 2007 are as below and are the same as all 2005 surveys except for minor alterations where noted. The statewide question series was preceded by a number of standard voter screening questions as well as standard questions about the direction of the nation and the state, name recognition of selected state officials and evaluations of the governor.

Questionnaire for Statewide Survey

Trust in the political process

CE1. How much of the time do you think you can trust the state legislature in Trenton to do what is right?

1. Just about always
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

CE2. How concerned are you that people who give money to campaigns might influence the state legislature after the election? Are you...

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not concerned at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

The November election / Clean Election

CE3. AS YOU MAY OR MAY NOT KNOW, the state is applying new, experimental campaign finance rules to elections in three legislative districts. How much have you heard or read about this Clean Elections legislation...?

1. Quite a lot
2. Some
3. Just a little or
4. Nothing at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

CE4. How confident are you that public financing of campaigns will reduce the influence of large donors in the political process? Are you...

1. Very confident
2. Somewhat confident
3. Not confident at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

Legislative races in respondent's district

CE5. And what about the races for State Legislature... How much have you heard or read so far about the races for State Legislature in the district where you live...?

1. Quite a lot
2. Some
3. Just a little or
4. Nothing at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

In the past month, have you received information about the state legislative races in your district in any of the following ways:

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know (Vol)
9. Refused (Vol)

CE6. Campaign ads in the mail

CE7. Radio or TV ads

CE8. News or advertising on an Internet web site

CE9. An article or articles in the newspaper

CE10. In general, would you say that the campaigns for the state legislature where you live have focused more on [ROTATE RESPONSES 1 and 2]

1. The candidates' issue positions
2. The personal characteristics of the candidates
9. Don't Know/Refused (vol)

Questionnaire for District Surveys

Clean Elections: Trust in the political process

CE1. We would like to ask you some questions about the New Jersey Legislature. How much of the time do you think you can trust the state legislature in Trenton to do what is right?

1. Just about always
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

CE2. How concerned are you that people who give money to campaigns might influence the state legislature after the election? Are you...

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not concerned at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

The November election / Clean Election

CE3. As you may or may not know, the state is applying new, experimental campaign finance rules to elections in three legislative districts. How much have you heard or read about this Clean Elections legislation...?

1. Quite a lot
2. Some
3. Just a little or
4. Nothing at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

CE4. How confident are you that public financing of campaigns will reduce the influence of large donors in the political process? Are you...

1. Very confident
2. Somewhat confident
3. Not confident at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

State legislative races in respondent's district

CE5. And what about the races for State Legislature... How much have you heard or read so far about the races for the State Legislature in the district where you live...?

1. Quite a lot
2. Some
3. Just a little or
4. Nothing at all
9. Don't Know/Refused (Vol)

CE6. Is your district one of the districts in which the new campaign finance rules are being applied?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know (Vol)
9. Refused (Vol)

In the past month, have you received information about the legislative races in your district in any of the following ways:

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know (Vol)
9. Refused (Vol)

CE7. Campaign ads in the mail

CE8. Radio or TV ads

CE9. News or advertising on an Internet web site

CE10. An article or articles in the newspaper

CE11. Literature on Clean Elections from the state

CE12. In general, would you say that the campaigns for state legislature where you live have focused more on [ROTATE RESPONSES 1 and 2]

1. The candidates' issue positions
2. The personal characteristics of the candidates
9. Don't Know/Refused (vol)

Appendix III Tables

Table 1A				
How much of the time do you think you can trust the state legislature in Trenton to do what is right?				
	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Just about always	2%	1 %	1%	1%
Most of the time	20%	15 %	15%	13%
Some of the time	61%	68 %	62%	67%
None of the time	14%	15 %	18%	16%
Don't know/Refused	3%	4 %	4%	3%
N =	596	355	701	519

Table 1B				
How much of the time do you think you can trust the State Legislature in Trenton to do what is right?				
	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Just about always	1 %	1%	1%	2%
Most of the time	18 %	17%	19%	17%
Some of the time	65 %	63%	66%	63%
None of the time	12 %	13%	12%	14%
Don't know/Refused	4 %	6%	3%	4%
N=	347	500	441	759

Table 2A				
How concerned are you that people who give money to campaigns might influence the state legislature after the election? Are you...				
	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Very concerned	49%	56%	56%	55%
Somewhat concerned	38%	32%	31%	33%
Not concerned at all	12%	11%	10%	8%
Don't know/Refused	2%	1%	3%	4%
N =	596	355	701	519

	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Very concerned	52%	48%	52%	49%
Somewhat concerned	37%	38%	40%	41%
Not concerned at all	10%	12%	7%	8%
Don't know/Refused	1%	3%	1%	2%
N=	347	500	441	759

	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Quite a lot	4%	7%	4%	7%
Some	14%	13%	16%	15%
Just a little	26%	30%	30%	31%
Nothing at all	56%	50%	49%	47%
Don't know/Refused	1%	1%	1%	1%
N =	596	355	701	519

	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Quite a lot	12 %	10 %	20%	14%
Some	17 %	16 %	24%	22%
Just a little	29 %	27 %	26%	27%
Nothing at all	41 %	45 %	29%	36%
Don't know/ref.	1 %	2 %	1%	1%
N =	347	500	441	759

Table 3C

As you may or may not know, the state is applying new, experimental campaign finance rules to elections in two Assembly districts. How much have you heard or read about this Clean Elections legislation?

	14 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	14 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)
Quite a lot	26%	17%	16%	18%	12%	11%
Some	23%	25%	23%	23%	22%	19%
Just a little	26%	31%	22%	27%	29%	26%
Nothing at all	24%	27%	37%	29%	37%	43%
Don't know/ Refused	1%	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%
N =	152	155	134	256	252	251

Table 4

[Asked only in Clean Elections districts]

Is your district one of the districts in which the new campaign finance rules are being applied?

	14 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	14 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)
Yes	49%	28%	28%	36%	25%	22%
No	12%	16%	14%	12%	13%	11%
Don't know	39%	56%	58%	52%	62%	67%
Refused	0%	0%	9%	1%	0%	0%
N=	152	155	134	256	252	251
	6 th District – Likely voters (10/05)	13 th District – Likely voters (10/05)	6 th District – Registered voters (10/05)	13 th District – Registered voters (10/05)		
Yes	23 %	18 %	20 %	17 %		
No	8 %	14 %	7 %	15 %		
Don't know	69 %	68 %	72 %	68 %		
Refused	1 %	0 %	1 %	0 %		
N=	181	166	250	250		

Table 5A				
[Asked statewide]				
How confident are you that public financing of campaigns will reduce the influence of large donors in the political process? Are you...				
	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Very confident	9%	6%	9%	12%
Somewhat confident	44%	49%	42%	38%
Not confident at all	43%	39%	38%	39%
Don't know/Refused	5%	5%	11%	11%
N =	596	355	701	519

Table 5B				
How confident are you that public financing of campaigns will reduce the influence of large donors in the political process? Are you...				
	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Very confident	8%	7%	8%	8%
Somewhat confident	44%	44%	46%	48%
Not confident at all	42%	41%	41%	40%
Don't know/Ref.	6%	8%	4%	5%
N=	347	500	441	759

Table 6A				
[Asked statewide]				
And what about the [race for state legislature]? How much have you heard or read so far about the [races for state legislature] in the district where you live?*				
	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Quite a lot	5%	15%	6%	11%
Some	13%	21%	19%	26%
Just a little	30%	38%	39%	39%
Nothing at all	50%	25%	35%	23%
Don't know/Refused	2%	1%	2%	1%
N =	596	355	701	519

*2005 wording was "Assembly race"

Table 6B				
[Asked in Clean Elections districts]				
And what about the [race for state legislature]? How much have you heard or read so far about the [races for state legislature] in the district where you live?*				
	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Quite a lot	16%	14%	34%	26%
Some	24%	23%	36%	34%
Just a little	37%	36%	20%	26%
Nothing at all	21%	25%	8%	12%
Don't know/Ref.	1%	2%	1%	1%
N =	347	500	441	759

*2005 wording was “**Assembly race**”

Table 6C						
[Asked in Clean Elections districts]						
And what about the [race for state legislature]? How much have you heard or read so far about the [races for state legislature] in the district where you live?*						
	14 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	14 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)
Quite a lot	43%	34%	25%	33%	26%	18%
Some	38%	36%	36%	34%	34%	34%
Just a little	13%	23%	24%	20%	28%	30%
Nothing at all	5%	7%	14%	10%	11%	16%
Don't know/ Refused	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%
N=	152	155	134	256	252	251

*2005 wording was “**Assembly race**”

Table 7A [Asked statewide] In the past month, have you received information about [the state legislative races in your district] in any of the following ways:*				
Percent "yes":	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
Campaign ads in the mail	25%	64%	24%	49%
Radio or TV ads	30%	49%	23%	43%
News or advertising on an Internet web site	11%	13%	10%	14%
An article or articles in the newspaper	43%	58%	42%	56%
N =	596	355	701	519

*2005 wording was "your Assembly race"

Table 7B [Asked in the Clean Elections districts] In the past month, have you received information about [the state legislative races in your district] in any of the following ways:*				
	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
Campaign ads in the mail	60 %	61 %	82%	77%
Radio or TV ads	44 %	45 %	55%	51%
News or advertising on an Internet web site	8 %	10 %	12%	12%
An article or articles in the newspaper	58 %	55 %	74%	68%
Clean Elections literature from the state	---	---	28%	24%
N=	347	500	441	759

*2005 wording was "your Assembly race"

	14 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	14 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)
Campaign ads in the mail	91%	81%	73%	85%	76%	70%
Radio or TV ads	74%	55%	32%	67%	50%	34%
News or advertising on an Internet web site	13%	13%	10%	12%	12%	10%
An article or articles in the newspaper	78%	74%	69%	70%	68%	65%
Clean Elections literature from the state	35%	24%	26%	31%	20%	21%
N=	152	155	134	256	252	251

*2005 wording was “**your Assembly race**”

	Statewide Sept. 05	Statewide Oct. 05	Statewide Sept. 07	Statewide Oct. 07
The candidates’ issue positions	31%	29%	25%	25%
The personal characteristics of the candidates	32%	44%	38%	45%
Don’t know/Refused	38%	28%	37%	29%
N =	596	355	701	519

*2005 wording was “**State Assembly**”

Table 8B				
In general, would you say that the campaign for [State Legislature] where you live has focused more on the candidates' issue positions or the personal characteristics of the candidates?*				
	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10/05)	Likely voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)	Registered voters – Clean Elections Districts (10-11/07)
The candidates' issue positions	22 %	24 %	41%	37%
The personal characteristics of the candidates	45 %	43 %	42%	41%
Don't know/Refused	33 %	33 %	17%	21%
N=	347	500	441	759

*2005 wording was "State Assembly"

Table 8C						
In general, would you say that the campaign for [State Legislature] where you live has focused more on the candidates' issue positions or the personal characteristics of the candidates?*						
	14 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Likely voters (10-11/07)	14 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	24 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)	37 th District – Reg. voters (10-11/07)
The candidates' issue positions	38%	52%	31%	34%	46%	32%
The personal characteristics of the candidates	42%	36%	48%	44%	36%	44%
Don't know/Refused	20%	12%	20%	22%	18%	24%
N=	152	155	134	256	252	251

*2005 wording was "State Assembly"