Press Release: April 6, 2016 Center for the Study of Local Issues Anne Arundel Community College 101 College Parkway, Arnold MD, 21012-1895 Contact: Dan Nataf 410-777-2733

County Survey Finds Rise in Crime and Drugs as Most Important Problem

A survey of 566 Anne Arundel County residents conducted March 25-April 1 by the Center for the Study of Local Issues (CSLI) at Anne Arundel Community College asked respondents about a variety of issues including the benchmark question, "What is the most important problem facing residents of Anne Arundel County at the present time?"

While in the past issues like the economy, high taxes or growth and development predominated, the spring 2016 survey found that concern about drugs (i.e., "use or sale of illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, or use of prescription pain killers for non-medical purposes") topped the list, cited by 14 percent of residents. Combined with other kinds of crime – cited by 6 percent – the total focus on crime/drugs hit 20 percent, the highest score in at least a decade.

Other than the most important problem, the survey included questions about presidential primary races, a variety of policy choices such as a version of the "Death with Dignity" concept, the timing for felons to receive the right to vote and a series of questions about the schools – school board, nominating commission, start date for the school year and state mandated testing.

The survey also asked a range of questions about the local economy and its impact upon residents.

A detailed review of these issues as well as other results follows the summary of findings. The actual questionnaire and percentages can be found in Appendix A at the end of the press release.

Summary of Main Findings

Most important problem facing county residents: Crime/drugs (20 percent) was cited the most, followed by taxes (12 percent) the economy and growth/development – both 11 percent. (See p. 4.)

Right direction/wrong direction: The percentage of those saying that the **county** was moving in the right direction was 55 percent, up four points from last fall. Following a dramatic increase observed in the percentage of those saying that the **state** was going in the right direction in spring 2015 - 47 percent and up 20 points from fall 2014 – the trend has stabilized as this spring saw only a one-point increase over last fall - to 52 percent. The percentage applicable to the **country** was also stable at 22, up one point. (See pp. 6-7.)

Perceptions of the economy: The survey found that 65 percent viewed the county's economy as excellent or good – up somewhat from last fall when it was 64 percent; 53 percent said the same for Maryland's economy (an increase of 8 points) and 24 percent favorably rated the national economy, up 3 points. (See pp. 7-10.)

Economic conditions experienced by individuals: Starting in March 2008 a variety of items were added to the semi-annual survey to evaluate respondents' economic experiences and perceptions. The

spring 2016 survey found that most economic indicators saw little change, with a few more down than up, but generally stable. (See pp. 11-14.) An analysis showed that those with household incomes under \$75,000 generally were more likely to cite a specific negative economic condition as applicable to themselves or their households. Another analysis of the relationship between economic conditions and voting preferences for president highlighted some differences among supporters of different candidates. (See pp. 14-16.)

Consumer confidence: There was some retreat in consumer confidence measures this spring, with lower percentages expressing optimism towards growth, unemployment, inflation and personal finances. (See pp. 17-18.)

Major Issues Facing the State and County: Large majorities agreed with the ideas of maintaining the ban on roadside panhandling (71 percent), providing body cameras to local police (69 percent) and starting the school year after Labor Day (65 percent). Smaller majorities favored a reduced focus on state-mandated testing for students (59 percent), replacement of the school board nominating commission with an elected school board (57 percent) and having President Obama and the Senate taking action on the Supreme Court vacancy (57 percent). Fifty percent favored both a law that makes it easier for severely ill persons to terminate their life and the reduction of the significance of state-required student testing as a part of teacher evaluations. Pluralities favored increases in the minimum wage, federal support for free tuition to community colleges and public universities, and the inclusion of at least one African-American on the county's school board. A large majority opposed a law allowing felons to vote before finishing with probation or parole. An analysis of partisan differences about these proposals showed that some issues such as having President Obama and the Senate deal with the Supreme Court vacancy or raising the minimum wage to \$15 had very strong partisan divides, while others – such as providing body cameras or the start of the school year – did not. (See pp. 19-22.)

Media Use and Trust in Media Types and Sources: The survey asked how individuals get information about state and local news. Television, radio and newspapers were most commonly cited. Those between 18-29 were much more likely to cite social media as a source than were older groupings. (See pp. 23-24.) The most trusted media types were television and newspapers. Younger respondents were again much more likely to cite social media as a trusted source of information. (See pp. 25-26.) When asked to name specific programming – newspapers, broadcasts, Web sites – names that came up frequently included FOX news, CNN, NBC, BBC, MSNBC, NPR, the Washington Post, Capital-Gazette and New York Times. (See p. 27.)

Officeholders' job approval: Job approval for Governor Larry Hogan rose a bit from last fall, rising two points to 73 percent. President Obama saw his job approval percentage move up to 46 percent – an eight-point jump. County Executive Steve Schuh's job approval percentage has been stable over the last year, moving up a point to 44 percent, still reflecting a very large "no answer" percentage (37 percent). (See pp. 28-30.) Analysis of presidential job approval by party registration and ideology was also included (pp. 30-32).

Which party do you trust? The percentage favoring Democrats rose somewhat from 33 to 37 percent since last fall. The Republican percentage dropped from 33 to 28 percent, continuing a decline that began in fall 2014 when its percentage was 39 percent, with the percentage saying "neither" rising from

26 to 28 percent. An analysis of trust in parties by party registration and ideology focused on which groups were expressing more or less trust in specific parties. (See pp. 33-34.)

Presidential Candidate Preferences: The survey asked respondents to indicate their choice for president. The frontrunners were Hillary Clinton (25 percent of all respondents who were registered voters, 47 percent of all Democrats) vs. Bernie Sanders (17 and 28 percent) and Donald Trump (19 and 34 percent). (See p. 35-36.) A hypothetical Clinton vs. Trump match-up showed Clinton ahead 46 to 35 percent, with 14 percent saying they wouldn't vote for either (or vote for a third party candidate) and another 5 percent offering no answer (pp. 37-38). A detailed examination of the relationship between a host of demographic variables and presidential voting choices follows, focusing on age, gender, race, income, religion, education and marital status (pp. 38-44). An open-ended question about "the most important reason for favoring" a candidate showed a variety of distinctions among the candidates, with Sanders being the most likely to be supported due to policy positions, while John Kasich most supported by virtue of personal traits (pp. 45-46).

Presidential Candidate Preferences and Personality Traits: The final section dealing with candidate preferences incorporated an assessment of personality traits thought to be predictive of political participation, ideological inclinations and partisanship. In this case, 11 traits were evaluated to note whether a predictable pattern might emerge. Some traits seemed predictive, with the trait duality "tolerance/intolerance" providing the best separation between Democratic and Republican candidates. Other traits either showed a "frontrunner" affinity – with Clinton and Trump leading among those with a similar trait score – or strange amalgams such as instances when Cruz and Clinton supporters shared some traits. (See pp. 47-51.)

Methodology: The survey polled a random sample of 566 county residents who were at least 18 years old, primarily using a database of listed and unlisted landline numbers along with cell phone numbers. Telephone interviewing was conducted March 25-April 1 during evening hours. In addition, members of a CSLI Web panel were also asked to participate in an online version of the survey. There was about a 4 percent statistical margin of error for the combined sample; the error rate was higher for subgroups such as "Democrats" or "men." The dataset was weighted by gender, political party and education to better represent the general population. College students were trained and used as telephone interviewers.

Contact Dan Nataf, Ph.D., center director, for additional comments or questions at 410-777-2733 and <u>ddnataf@aacc.edu</u>. Check the CSLI website for results for information and press releases for this and previous surveys: <u>www2.aacc.edu/csli</u>.

Detailed Review of Survey Findings

The Most Important Problem Facing Residents – Focus on Crime/Drugs and Growth/Development with Decreasing Focus on the Economy

The last few years have seen CSLI surveys show high levels of concern about the state of the economy in answer to the question, "What is the most important problem facing the residents of Anne Arundel County at the present time?" However, the more recent surveys have shown a stabilization of concern at less than a quarter of the percentage found in fall 2011: 11-12 percent.

In part, a declining propensity to single out economic issues was compensated by concern about high taxes, with 28 percent citing this as the most important problem in fall 2014. This value dropped significantly last fall (when 14 percent cited it, down from 25 percent); the spring 2016 percentage was slightly less (12 percent)

Among the items showing the largest recent jump was "growth and development" that rose from a period in the low single digits to 11 percent this spring (up one point from fall 2015). This was accompanied by a steady number citing the "environment" (6 percent) and "transportation" (7 percent) – for a combined 24 percent citing some development/quality of life factor. As mentioned on the first page, the recent rise of crime and especially the sale and use of drugs has drawn the focus of the public away from economic issues to some extent. (See the entire frequency distribution in Appendix A.)

While crime/drugs seemed to rise in salience, education was relatively unaffected by the decline of concern about the economy. Education remained nearly unchanged from last fall at 8 percent. Graph 1 shows the long term trend, while Graph 1a focuses more narrowly on the last two years, highlighting the expansion of concern with growth/development and crime/drugs.

Tuble 10 10050 important 11051em 1 acmg Restaction Spring 2000 to Spring 2010																	
	Sp '08	Fa '08	Sp '09	Fa '09	Sp '10	Fa '10	Sp '11	Fa '11	Sp '12	Fa '12	Sp '13	Fa '13	Sp '14	Fa '14	Sp '15	Fa '15	Sp '16
Taxes – too high	16	12	10	12	11	13	11	9	17	17	19	19	22	28	25	14	12
Crime / drugs*	6	4	6	8	6	6	6	8	4	7	5	9	8	6	13	15	20
Economy	23	38	48	33	36	36	35	48	30	27	23	16	16	18	12	12	11
Education / school problems	12	10	8	7	8	9	10	5	7	8	8	6	12	11	9	9	8
Traffic congestion/ problems	7	6	4	5	6	6	3	5	5	6	5	4	4	5	8	9	7
Growth / development	12	9	5	5	5	2	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	2	10	11
Unsure/no answer	9	7	8	10	10	8	12	8	9	9	10	12	11	12	10	6	8
Other answer	15	14	11	21	17	21	19	13	24	23	29	30	23	19	21	25	24
Total	100	100	100	101	99	101	100	100	100	100	101	100	100	101	100	100	101

 Table 1: "Most Important Problem Facing Residents" – Spring 2008 to Spring 2016¹

Note: In this and other tables, totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding. Unless otherwise noted, all numeric values included in tables and graphs are percentages.

*Crime and drugs are presented here as a combined category but have recently been coded independently. The drug percentage for spring 2016 was 14 percent; crime was only 6 percent.

¹ From spring 2007 to spring 2010, surveys' answer categories for "most important problem" included "lack of affordable housing" for interviewers to check off. Previously, that answer to the open-ended question would have been categorized under "economy" a practice which was resumed in fall 2010. The running totals in Table 1 combine both answers into the single "Economy" category.





County – Right or Wrong Direction?

The survey included a CSLI benchmark question whose results are seen on Table 2 and Graph 2: "Overall, would you say that the county is headed in the right direction or in the wrong direction?" After peaking at 58 percent "right direction" in spring 2015, the percentage has been wavering between 51 and 55 percent – rising four points to 55 percent this spring.

Response	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Average										
	'09	'10	'10	'11	'11	'12	'12	'13	'13	'14	'14	' 15	'15	'16	
Right direction	52	52	49	50	47	43	50	49	50	50	49	58	51	55	50
Wrong direction	27	28	28	28	32	41	36	33	35	33	38	25	22	21	31
Unsure/NA	21	20	23	22	22	16	14	18	16	17	13	17	27	24	19
Right- wrong	25	24	21	22	15	2	14	16	15	17	11	33	29	34	20
Total	100	100	100	100	101	100	100	100	101	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2: Anne Arundel County - Right vs. Wrong Direction Fall 2009 to Spring 2016



The survey also asked individuals to indicate right/wrong views about the state and the nation. Table 3 shows those results along with those for the county.

Graph 3 shows the trend for the last eight CSLI surveys at each level of government. The county percentage indicating "right direction" has historically remained around 50 percent, with the spring ascent to 55 percent being the anomaly. By contrast, the "Hogan honeymoon" which began in spring 2015 has mostly continued with the state right direction percentage rising slightly from 51 to 52 percent

Those who approved of Governor Hogan's performance in office were statistically significantly more likely (p<.01) to say that the state was moving in the right direction: 60 percent (for those who approve) vs. 40 percent for those who disapprove.

	Right	Wrong	Unsure/ Don't know	Total
County	55	21	24	100
State	52	27	21	100
Nation	21	65	15	101

Table 3: Right/Wrong Direction for County, State and Nation, Spring 2016



Graph 3: Right Direction Percentage for County, State and Nation, Fall 2012-Spring 2016

Rating Economic Conditions – Anne Arundel County

Since March 2002, the CSLI semi-annual survey has asked a benchmark question about the economy: "How would you rate economic conditions in Anne Arundel County – 'excellent,' 'good,' 'only fair' or 'poor'?"

As shown on Table 4, since March 2007 the county's historical average saying that the economy was a combined "excellent" or "good" was 52 percent. As shown on Graph 4, since falling from historic highs in 2007, from fall 2008 to fall 2014 the percentage oscillated up and down within a relatively narrow band of 44 percent on the low side, to 53 percent on the high side. Starting spring 2015, the combined percentage rose to 57 percent; the upswing continued as the percentage rose further to 64

percent last fall and 65 percent this spring. This trend would seem to confirm the findings mentioned earlier when discussing the "most important problem" suggesting that the perception of economic crisis has dissipated, favoring a return to a quality of life focus.

	Sp '07	Fa '07	Sp '08	Fa '08	Sp '09	Fa '09	Sp '10	Fa '10	Sp '11	Fa '11	Sp '12	Fa '12	Sp '13	Fa '13	Sp '14	Fa '14	Sp '15	Fa '15	Sp '16	Average
Excellent+ Good	71	69	55	49	46	48	44	45	49	48	51	48	49	53	50	44	57	64	65	52
Excellent	12	10	6	6	2	4	3	3	3	4	2	5	3	6	8	4	5	7	8	5
Good	59	59	49	43	44	44	41	42	46	44	49	43	46	47	42	40	52	57	57	48
Fair	22	25	36	37	43	38	41	45	38	40	37	39	38	35	40	41	33	27	27	36
Poor	4	5	8	12	10	11	13	8	12	11	11	12	11	10	9	12	7	6	5	9
Don't know	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	4	3	4	2
Total	100	101	101	100	101	100	100	100	101	101	100	101	101	101	101	99	101	100	100	101

Table 4: Perceptions of County Economic Conditions – Spring 2007 to Spring 2016



Rating Economic Conditions – Maryland and the National Economy

Since spring 2009, the question about rating economic conditions has been extended to the state of Maryland and the country overall.

Regarding the state economy, Table 5 shows that the average "excellent+good" percentage is 35 percent. The low (27 percent) over that period was in the depths of the Great Recession (spring 2009) while the high was obtained this spring (53 percent).

As illustrated in Graph 5, in fall 2014 the percentage (28 percent) nearly equaled the historic low – foreshadowing an electoral loss for the incumbent Democrats in the November 2014 race for governor. In spring 2015, the percentage essentially returned to a level found in spring 2014 – around 40 percent (41 percent), only a slight improvement of the score previously attained under the O'Malley/Brown administration. However, this spring, the upward trend continued, reaching a new high of 53 percent.

Surprisingly, among those approving of the job performed by Governor Larry Hogan, the excellent+good score was only 51 percent; by contrast, those who *disapproved* of Hogan's job performance were more inclined to favorably rate the state's economy: 59 percent gave an answer of good or excellent. Democrats were more positive about the state's economy than Republicans (68 vs. 63 percent). Thus, the favorable appraisal of the state economy is not necessarily part of the "Hogan honeymoon."

											0		- ·	0	-	
	Sp '09	Fa '09	Sp '10	Fa '10	Sp '11	Fa '11	Sp '12	Fa '12	Sp '13	Fa '13	Sp '14	Fa '14	Sp '15	Fa '15	Sp '16	Avg.
Excellent+ good	27	30	31	32	35	33	38	33	30	40	40	28	41	45	53	35
Excellent	1	2	2	1	3	1	4	3	1	4	4	1	3	2	5	2
Good	26	28	29	31	32	32	34	30	29	36	36	27	38	43	48	32
Fair	49	45	46	47	43	41	40	42	41	36	40	40	39	41	36	42
Poor	22	21	21	19	21	24	21	23	24	21	18	30	16	11	9	21
Don't know	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	4	3	3	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	101	100	99	101	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 5: Perceptions of State Economic Conditions – Spring 2009 to Spring 2016

Rating Economic Conditions – The National Economy

As shown on Graph 5, economic appraisal of the national economy has always lagged significantly behind both the county and state. In spring 2016, the combined indicator for the country rose somewhat along with the measures for the county and state, increasing from 21 to 24 percent saying good or excellent.

The partisan dimension of national economic perceptions was very sharp: Among those approving of President Obama's job, 40 percent felt that the economy was excellent or good; among those disapproving, the value was just 8 percent. Among those trusting Democrats to do a better job handling issues, positive scores were 43 percent, while those trusting Republicans as well as those saying "neither" were both 13 percent.



The national mood as measured by the Gallup polling organization was identical – 24 percent saying excellent or good.² The Gallup data show that the national trend has been stuck around this percentage for the last few months.

	Sp '09	Fa '09	Sp '10	Fa '10	Sp '11	Fa '11	Sp '12	Fa '12	Sp '13	Fa '13	Sp '14	Fa '14	Sp '15	Fa '15	Sp '16	Ave.
Excellent+Good	5	11	11	11	11	9	13	16	12	14	21	16	27	21	24	14
Excellent	0	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
Good	5	10	10	9	9	7	12	14	10	13	20	15	24	20	23	13
Fair	30	39	42	41	43	28	47	37	38	31	41	42	32	40	40	38
Poor	63	48	46	47	45	62	39	46	47	55	37	40	37	36	34	46
Unsure/NA	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	4	3	2	2
Total	99	100	101	100	101	101	101	100	100	101	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 6: Perceptio	ns of National Eco	nomic Conditions	s– Spring 2009	to Spring 2016
	no or r actoriar 1200	nonne contantion.		to oping acto

² See <u>http://www.gallup.com/poll/151127/economic-conditions-weekly.aspx</u> for Gallup's running totals for this question.

This Gallup national percentage was for the period March 21-27, 2016.

Economic Conditions Applying to Respondents

Respondents were asked: "Thinking about your personal circumstances, please tell me whether any of these economic conditions apply to you or your household."

Table 7 shows the results for recent CSLI surveys. The fall 2014 survey significantly modified the list of items included – two new items were added ("Hard to afford the cost of education" and "Hard to afford the cost of food and groceries"), while several previous items were dropped. Other modifications have occurred over the years, such as the inclusion of questions asking about a "salary increase or other increase in income recently" and whether the respondent had "found a new or better job recently" – these items were introduced in fall 2011.

Table 7 is ordered by the highest percentage of respondents saying a condition applied in spring 2016. If there is a movement away from economic concerns, the expectation would be that most of the negative indicators would go down in the percentage cited, while the two positive indicators would go up.

In fact, this expectation was only partly confirmed. As shown on Graph 6, there were decreases in the percentages saying that taxes were too high; the percentage citing a fear of unemployment also went down. However, there was an increase in the percentage of those saying that wages had not kept up with inflation, it was hard to afford the cost of food/groceries, and that health insurance was unavailable, too expensive or inadequate. While the negative indicators were mixed, the positive indicators were both down: there was a smaller percentage saying that they had "found a new or better job recently" or had "received a salary increase or other increase in income." All of the changes were small – between 2 and 5 points.



				~ - -F		8 **								•• ~	8		
Condition	Fa '08	Sp '09	Fa '09	Sp '10	Fa '10	Sp '11	Fa '11	Sp '12	Fa '12	Sp '13	Fa '13	Sp '14	Fa '14	Sp '15	Fa '15	Sp '16	Ave.
Taxes are too high in relation to the govt. services provided	58	59	59	63	60	63	58	63	63	62	66	65	74	66	62	59	63
Wages or salaries are not rising as fast as the cost of living	59	55	55	56	56	63	59	66	59	59	60	57	63	57	54	58	59
Hard to afford the cost of education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	45	41	39	39	42
Health care insurance is unavailable, too expensive or inadequate	30	29	33	32	34	35	32	32	27	32	29	26	40	38	33	38	32
Received a salary increase or other increase in income recently	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	26	35	31	34	29	36	33	37	34	32	33
Hard to afford the cost of food and groceries	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	33	31	28	30	31
Found a new or better job recently	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	14	16	11	14	16	14	12	11	13	10	13
Facing the possibility of unemployment	15	24	24	19	21	20	21	17	14	19	17	16	17	12	12	9	18
Significant losses in your stock or retirement accounts	71	75	70	56	60	52	60	44	38	32	32	26	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	51
Delay in making a major purchase such as a home or car	n.a.	51	46	47	44	47	51	45	38	42	38	43	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	45
Hard to afford cost of utilities such as electricity or gas	50	53	42	44	43	46	39	39	32	31	29	37	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	40
Hard to afford cost of transportation	32	21	17	21	24	41	30	36	30	27	24	24	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	27
Unable to find affordable housing	11	12	13	15	10	14	11	15	9	12	14	10	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	12
Facing the possibility of house foreclosure or loss	4	6	8	7	7	9	8	8	4	7	7	4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	7

 Table 7: Economic Conditions Applying to Personal Circumstances – Fall 2008 to Spring 2016

Economic Conditions Applying to Individuals/Households – Socio-economic and Political Factors

Table 8 shows the impact of income on the indicators of economic conditions applying to personal circumstances. Dividing the sample of respondents into those earning \$75,000 or less into one group and those earning over \$75,000 into a second group, it is clear that almost all desirable outcomes favor the higher income group.

Over twice as many lower income respondents mentioned that it was hard to afford the cost of food and groceries. The cost of education, problems with health care insurance, concerns about high taxes were all more frequently cited by the lower income group. The latter was half as likely to have received a salary increase or other increase in income recently.

A later section reports on general findings relevant to the upcoming presidential primary elections in Maryland. For this section, only one political question will be associated with these measures of economic conditions: the choice for president.

Tuble of meenie Groups and Leonor	mie maie		
Condition	Under \$75,000	\$75,000+	Under \$75k- Over 75K
Hard to afford cost of food and groceries*	47	20	27
Health care insurance is unavailable, too expensive or inadequate*	47	33	14
Hard to afford the cost of education*	43	35	8
Taxes are too high in relation to the government services provided*	62	54	8
Wages or salaries are not rising as fast as the cost of living	61	56	5
Facing the possibility of unemployment	8	9	-1
Found a new or better job recently*	6	12	-6
Received a salary increase or other increase in income recently*	20	40	-20

Table 8: Income Groups and Economic Indicators

Note: Desirable outcomes are bolded. *=p<.01

				5		
Condition	Clinton	Sanders	Cruz	Kasich	Trump	Average
					•	0
Hard to afford cost of food and groceries	22	20	45	13	51	30
Health care insurance is unavailable, too expensive or inadequate	28	38	36	36	57	39
Hard to afford the cost of education	29	57	38	33	38	39
Taxes are too high in relation to the government services provided	44	37	75	65	70	58
Wages or salaries are not rising as fast as the cost of living	49	64	65	51	69	60
Facing the possibility of unemployment	7	17	8	17	6	11
Found a new or better job recently	10	12	15	10	6	11
Received a salary increase or other increase in income recently	29	45	38	41	23	35

Table 9: Presidential Choice and Economic Indicators

Note: All were statistically significant: p<.01 Bolded values show highest value in the row.

Looking first at the Republican side, Graph 7 shows the differences between Donald Trump's divergence from the average (for example, his "hard to afford cost of food and groceries score is 21 points higher than average) and the equivalent score for Ted Cruz and John Kasich. Positive scores indicate disproportionate numbers of Trump voters; negative scores show lower numbers of Trump supporters.



Comparing Trump with Kasich, some divergences are clear: Kasich's supporters were much less likely to be economically strapped. They were much less likely to think that it is "hard to afford the cost of food and groceries" or that health care insurance is too expensive. They were also less likely to say that wages aren't keeping up with inflation. They are more likely to have received an increase in income recently. Trump's followers were less likely to cite unemployment – but that is the only major factor for which they economically better off than Kasich followers.

Comparing Trump with Cruz, the differences were less acute. Cruz supporters were closer to Trump's with regards to the affordability of groceries, the cost of education, salaries keeping up with inflation, and unemployment. All three groups of supporters were similar with regarding to their view of taxes.

Graph 8 permits a similar analysis for Clinton and Sanders. Sanders' supporters were more likely to express concern for health care insurance, the cost of education, the cost of living, and the fear of unemployment. They were a bit less likely to have concerns about taxes. Sanders supporters had a greater likelihood of experiencing a salary increase or finding a new job – perhaps due to his attraction of younger voters with greater propensity to change jobs for slightly higher pay. It seems that Sanders' followers resonated with some of the key elements of his platform: free college and "Medicare for all" and had less concern about the possibility of rising taxes to pay for it.



Graph 9 compares Clinton, Sanders and Trump. Both Clinton and Sanders supporters are distinct from Trump's along these lines: they were less likely to say that it is hard to afford food and to worry about high taxes (negative numbers). Trump supporters were also more likely than either Clinton or Sanders supporters to be concerned about the cost of health care insurance.

Sanders' supporters were much more likely to be concerned with the cost of education – and on this issue Clinton's differences with Trump were much smaller. Sanders' followers were more like Trumps' regarding wages keeping up with inflation, but were more likely to say that they have received a salary increase than Trump supporters. Sanders' group was also more likely to say that they were facing the possibility of unemployment than either Clinton or Trump followers.

In summary, among Republicans, Kasich stood out as more distinct than either Cruz or Trump who appear closer together. Among Democrats, Clinton and Sanders diverge along programmatic lines. While both Democrats have important distinctions with Trump supporters on issues like high taxes, Trump supporters were more likely to cite core economic challenges regarding affordability of basic goods, inflation and health care insurance cost/access.



Consumer Confidence

A section of the survey asked respondents to think about the next 12 months and the county's economy and say whether a given economic condition will be better, the same or worse.

As previously mentioned, two measures of economic performance suggested rising public optimism about the economy: the general decline in percentages citing the economy as the most important problem and the improved ratings of the state, county and national economies. The gradual improvement in perceptions of the economy should have also been reflected in four measures of consumer confidence as respondents were asked to ponder the county's economy over the next 12 months and say whether growth, inflation, unemployment and their personal financial situation would be the same, better or worse.

Table 10 shows the results just for spring 2016; Graph 10 shows the results since fall 2011, calculated by subtracting the value of "worse" from the value of "better" (with a higher number indicating greater economic optimism in all cases except for inflation, in which case a smaller negative number indicates the growth of optimism).

	Better	Same	Worse	Unsure/NA	Total
Economic growth	28	50	13	10	101
Unemployment	24	46	20	10	100
Inflation	7	43	43	8	101
Your personal financial situation	6	17	63	14	100

Table 10: Economic Conditions over the Next 12 Months, Spring 2016

Spring 2015 was a relative highpoint for many of the indicators: Growth, unemployment and inflation especially. By contrast, fall 2015 was not as positive, with positive net scores in each case being less than in spring. This trend continued for spring 2016 – all the measures were still in positive numbers, but had lower values (the negative number for inflation grew as well). While these results seem somewhat distinct from the diminishing concern for the economy found in the "most important problem" question – the pattern was mostly indicating a somewhat more cautious optimism.



Major Issues Facing the State and County

The spring 2016 survey asked respondents whether they agreed, partly agreed or disagreed with a variety of statements and proposals with public policy implications. Table 11 shows the results ranked by the percentage saying "agree."

The greatest agreement was found regarding the idea that the "current ban" on roadside panhandling be maintained. The House of Delegates passed a measure that would "allow fire companies, charitable groups and religious, fraternal, civic and war veterans' organizations to request a permit from the county to collect money along the side of the road for up to seven days a year." According to the *Capital* newspaper, "Panhandling has been illegal in the county since 2007. Former County Executive and state delegate John Leopold, a Republican, made it his mission to get rid of the practice, which he said causes safety issues and is a nuisance to motorists."³ While this question did not mention which groups might be allowed to resume such panhandling, the strong desire to "maintain the ban" indicates that the public was not inclined to look favorably on such legislation.

	Agree	Partly	Disagree	Can't	No
	Agree	Agree	Disagice	decide	answer
Maintain the current ban on roadside panhandling by all nonprofit groups	71	10	12	5	3
Provide body cameras to all local police.	69	16	12	3	1
Start the school year after Labor Day rather than before.	65	9	15	8	3
Reduce the time devoted to state-required testing of students in public schools.	59	14	17	7	2
Replace the school board nominating commission by an elected school board.	57	13	12	13	4
President Obama and the Senate should take action now to fill the vacancy on the US Supreme Court, rather than wait until next year.	57	6	31	5	2
A law making it possible for severely ill individuals to get a doctor's prescription that can help end their lives.	50	19	23	7	2
Reduce the significance of state-required test results as a part of teacher evaluations.	50	19	23	6	2
Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 over the next few years.	47	13	38	2	1
Federal support providing free tuition for community college and public universities.	45	16	37	2	1
Always include at least one African-American on the county's school board.	39	17	34	8	2
A law allowing felons to vote <u>before</u> finishing with probation or parole rather than after.	18	8	68	5	1

Table 11: Statements and Proposals – Agree/Partly Agree or Disagree

Body cameras on local police have been cited as a means for providing a video record of police contacts with the public, especially worthwhile when there is a dispute over the facts relevant to an incident. As recently as March 25, the Capital newspaper ran an editorial in favor of such an approach.⁴ The public appeared to agree as 69 percent fully agreed, with another 16 percent partly agreeing.

³ http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/general_assembly/ph-ac-cn-panhandling-house-vote-0317-20160316-4-story.html

⁴ http://www.capitalgazette.com/opinion/our_say/ph-ac-ce-our-say-0325-20160325-story.html

The start time for the school year has been a continuing issue, with some such as Comptroller Peter Franchot advocating a delay in the start of the school year until after Labor Day.⁵ With about two-thirds of the public agreeing with this idea, Franchot seems to have a strong case.

State mandated testing of public school students gained attention with the No Child Left Behind Act that dramatically expanded "the role of standardized testing in American public education, requiring that students in grades 3 through 8 be tested every year in reading and math."⁶ With Congressional passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the focus on testing and its incorporation into teacher evaluations for promotion was diminished.⁷ When asked about reducing the time devoted to "state-required testing of students," the public was favorable (59 percent agreed). They were also generally agreeable to the idea of reducing "the significance of state-required test results as a part of teacher evaluations" with 50 percent agreeing and another 19 percent partly agreeing.

School board appointment approaches gained attention recently when County Executive Steve Schuh presented the idea of rotating a statutory seat among various local chambers of commerce, along with various voting rule changes within the school board nominating commission. The school board selection issue was further highlighted "when [Governor] Hogan did not reappoint its only African-American member, Solon Webb, replacing him and former member Debbie Ritchie with a white man and a Hispanic woman."⁸ Thus, the spring survey asked various related questions. While the Maryland General Assembly passed a bill to revamp the nominating commission, the general question of whether a commission – however fashioned – would be more well received than an elected school board inspired the question: "Replace the school board nominating commission by an elected school board." The public broadly supported the use of an election process for selecting the school board since 57 percent agreed with the proposal.

CSLI last asked about this issue in spring 2007. At that time, it asked, "There has been some discussion lately of changing the method for selecting the Anne Arundel County school board. How familiar are you with this general issue – very, somewhat or not very familiar?"⁹ Only 37 percent were very or somewhat familiar. That survey also asked whether the county should continue using the school board nominating convention system then in place: only 20 percent agreed. Among the 64 percent favoring "some other system" an elected school board was chosen by 42 percent, with 40 percent favoring "a school board selected by citizens representing elected officials and other groups in our county such as teachers' unions and the chamber of commerce." In 1999, CSLI asked the public to comment upon the idea of having the school "board members elected by citizens, but without any independent control over taxes and school spending." This was supported by 49 percent. Overall, it seems that the public would probably support an elected school board, but that its understanding of the issues associated with the school board selection process may not be very high.

Regarding the idea of having an African-American individual included on the school board, the public was divided as only 39 percent agreed with the statement, "Always include at least one African-American on the county's school board." Adding the 17 percent who "partly agreed" would create a majority of 56 percent, but it was one of the least supported statements. This statement cut sharply along

⁵ See http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/government/ph-ac-cn-labor-day-0116-20150116-story.html.

⁶ http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/schools/nochild/nclb.html

⁷ According to a publication by the National Educational Association, "Not only does the Every Student Succeeds Act take steps to reduce the amount of standardized testing, it decouples testing and high-stakes decision making..." https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/ESSA Testing 120715 (to Donna).pdf.

⁸ http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/general_assembly/ph-ac-cn-sbnc-debate-0330-20160331-story.html#

⁹ http://www2.aacc.edu/csli/NewHP/Index/schools.htm#q56

political lines, with 55 percent of Democrats agreeing (not including partly agreeing), but only 22 percent of Republicans.¹⁰

Another issue considered but rejected by the Maryland General Assembly was a bill making it possible for a terminally ill patient to obtain a prescription that would hasten death. Once called "Death with Dignity," in 2016 the issue came up as the End of Life Option Act and included numerous complex provisions to ensure that patients weren't coerced into accepting a medically induced early death.¹¹ While the General Assembly didn't pass the bill, the public appeared generally receptive to the overall idea as 50 percent agreed with "A law making it possible for severely ill individuals to get a doctor's prescription that can help end their lives" and another 19 percent partly agreed.

The Maryland General Assembly gained enough support to override a veto by Governor Hogan of a bill that would create "a new state law...that allows people with felony convictions to register to vote as soon as they are released from prison. Before that, they had to finish probation or parole."¹² This proposal was not popular with Anne Arundel residents as only 18 percent agreed with "A law allowing felons to vote <u>before</u> finishing with probation or parole rather than after."

Three national questions were included in the survey. The one gaining the most support stated, "President Obama and the Senate should take action now to fill the vacancy on the US Supreme Court, rather than wait until next year." A large majority (57 percent) agreed (and another 6 percent partly agreed). Unsurprisingly, partisan differences were acute on this issue as 83 percent of Democrats but only 29 percent of Republicans agreed. Unaffiliated voters sided with the Democrats as 56 percent agreed.

Another federal question focused on the minimum wage. With the Sanders campaign making an issue of a \$15 minimum wage and states like California passing plans to raise their minimum wages to that level, the CSLI spring survey asked local residents about it. Two years ago, CSLI had asked about "An increase in the state minimum wage to \$10.10 by 2016" and found that 60 percent favored it.¹³ This spring the question was "Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 over the next few years." Only 47 percent "agreed" with the proposal, but another 13 percent "partly agreed" – thus replicating the 60 percent who said "support" in spring 2014.

The last federal question dealt with "federal support providing free tuition for community college and public universities." The issue of student debt has been in the news as "seven in 10 seniors (69%) who graduated from public and nonprofit colleges in 2014 had student loan debt, with an average of \$28,950 per borrower. Over the last decade—from 2004 to 2014—the share of graduates with debt rose modestly (from 65% to 69%) while average debt at graduation rose at more than twice the rate of inflation."¹⁴ The question of college affordability has been a key feature of Bernie Sanders' campaign and was even mentioned recently during a recent candidate forum at Anne Arundel Community College where both Democrats and some Republicans agreed that college affordability was increasingly important to the success of students in a world where college degrees have become a key pathway to employment and career advancement.¹⁵

¹⁰ Apparently this issue was taken to heart by Governor Hogan who appointed Davidsonville African-American Eric Gannon to the school board. See http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/schools/ph-ac-cn-grannon-profile-0403-20160403-story.html

¹¹ See http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/annapolis/ph-ac-cn-deathwithdignity-returns-1209-20151209-story.html ¹² http://www.capitalgazette.com/news/elections/bs-md-voter-signup-20160331-story.html

¹³ <u>http://www2.aacc.edu/CSLI/csli/surveys/2014/Spring/CSLI_Press_Release_Spring_2014_Final.pdf</u> Respondents were only given the choice "support" or "oppose." In spring 2016, they had three choices – agree, partly agree and disagree. ¹⁴ http://ticas.org/posd/home

¹⁵ <u>https://youtu.be/hjXWO-NBTS4?t=13m15s</u> for a full video of this forum that featured candidates running for Maryland's fourth congressional district on March 23, 2016.

The public was again divided on this issue with 45 percent "agreeing" and another 16 percent "partly agreeing." Partisan division was acute as Democrats favored the proposal by 63 percent who agreed compared to only 25 percent of Republicans (unaffiliated voters were somewhere in the middle at 43 percent). While this issue doesn't have a broad immediate consensus, the majority of 61 percent who agree at least partly suggests that it might be tailored to gain broad support.¹⁶

Table 12 provides the partisan breakdown of all these statements/proposals. Five issues clearly distinguish the two groups of partisans, with very large differences in agreement scores: Filling the Supreme Court vacancy, raising the minimum wage, federal support for free colleges, the inclusion of an African-American on the school board and the idea of allowing felons to vote once released from jail.

Five issues don't have such significant partian divisions (ten points or less): the ban on roadside panhandling, starting the school year after Labor Day, body cameras, reducing state-required student testing and replacing the school board nominating commission with an elected school board.

	Democrat	Republican	Dem- Rep	Unaffiliated
President Obama and the Senate should take action now to fill the vacancy on the US Supreme Court, rather than wait until next year.	85	37	48	66
Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 over the next few years.	84	37	47	57
Federal support providing free tuition for community college and public universities.	81	37	47	61
Always include at least one African-American on the county's school board.	71	34	37	47
A law allowing felons to vote <u>before</u> finishing with probation or parole rather than after.	44	8	36	24
A law making it possible for severely ill individuals to get a doctor's prescription that can help end their lives.	76	61	15	71
Reduce the significance of state-required test results as a part of teacher evaluations.	74	63	11	75
Replace the school board nominating commission by an elected school board.	69	75	6	58
Reduce the time devoted to state-required testing of students in public schools.	75	70	5	82
Provide body cameras to all local police.	87	83	4	85
Start the school year after Labor Day rather than before.	72	80	-8	69
Maintain the current ban on roadside panhandling by all nonprofit groups	78	89	-9	79

 Table 12: Partisan Differences about Public Policy Proposals (% Agreeing and Partly Agreeing)

¹⁶ Sanders' supporters were the most enthusiastic about this proposal with 92 percent at least partly agreeing. A lower percent of Clinton's supporter (78 percent) were also favorable. Among Republicans, Cruz supporters were least favorable (23 percent at least partly support) while Kasich and Trump supporters were about even in their support (38, 40 percent).

Media Use and Trust in Media Types and Sources

The spring survey devoted some time to an exploration of "how you get information about state and local news" by asking respondents to specify whether they relied a lot, somewhat or not much upon the following information sources: newspapers or news magazines, television programming or nightly news, radio broadcasts, social media like Facebook and Twitter, or "other online sources."

	A lot +	A lot	Somewhat	Not much	No
	Somewhat			or none	answer
Television programming or nightly news	82	50	32	18	0
Radio broadcasts or news	71	32	36	32	1
Newspapers or news magazines either print or online	69	42	27	29	1
Other online sources	52	21	31	42	6
Social media like Facebook or Twitter	42	20	22	57	2

Table 13: How Respondents Get Their State and Local News

As shown on Table 13, television programming or nightly news dominated as the key source of information for state and local news, with 82 percent saying that they relied on it at least somewhat. Radio featured a larger share saying "somewhat" (36 percent) compared to television (32 percent) or newspapers (27 percent), with the latter having a much higher "a lot" score (42 vs. 32 percent). Social media was the least likely source of state and local news.

Age is often an important predictor of how individuals obtain information. The Pew Research Center discovered that "about six-in-ten online Millennials (61%) report getting political news on Facebook in a given week, a much larger percentage than turn to any other news source." According to their research, "This stands in stark contrast to internet-using Baby Boomers, for whom local TV tops the list of sources for political news at nearly the same reach (60%)."¹⁷

Table 14 uses a breakdown of age groups and compares the frequency with which each group claimed to use each media source "a lot." Graph 11 illustrates the results as well.

Media source/Age Group	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
Television programming or nightly news	31	46	40	47	57	58
Radio broadcasts or news	24	29	38	45	35	18
Newspapers or news magazines either print or online	21	39	33	33	52	57
Other online sources	31	20	18	23	21	15
Social media like Facebook or Twitter	55	28	19	20	12	11

Table 14: Media Source Use and Age Groups

¹⁷ http://www.journalism.org/2015/06/01/millennials-political-news/



Graph 11 suggests the following generalizations:

- The youngest age cohort (18-29) is twice as likely to use social media. It is almost more likely to go online for news. It is the least likely to view television programming, newspapers/news magazine and radio broadcasts (although those 70 and above are even less likely to use radio).
- Those between 30 and 60 often group together with middling use of television, newspapers, and online sources. Those between 30 and 39 are a bit more likely than others within this large group to use social media.
- Those who are 60 or more tend to group together with similar levels of television viewing, newspaper, social media and online usage. The only large difference within this group is that those between 60 and 69 are twice as likely to listen to the radio, perhaps due to greater commuting and vehicle use than those 70 or more.

The survey then asked respondents to determine "how much you trust each of those sources of information" by ranking them. Graph 12 shows the percentage ranking each media source as first in trustworthiness. Television programming and newspapers clearly towered over the other media types.





Examining the top ranking of trustworthiness of media types by age (see Graph 13), several observations are possible including:

- Those between 18 and 29 perceive social media as the most highly trusted of any media source.
- Television and newspapers are generally highly ranked, especially by those 30-39.
- Radio is much more likely to be highly ranked by those 30-39.
- Other online sources are highly ranked by most groups under 60; those over 60 treat this category about the same as social media.

Specific Trusted Sources: Websites, Stations, Newspapers

Table 15 shows the number of individuals who cited a particular source of information as most trustworthy – a particular newspaper, online source or broadcast. Since individuals often did not specify whether a source was online, on radio or in print (e.g., CNN, BBC, all newspapers), the source was listed first as a television source or first under "newspapers" rather than in any other grouping. In some cases (e.g., CNN.com) the online version was specified, but to assess total market penetration, it should be added to the primary listing (e.g., under television). It should also be noted that respondents mentioned specific shows as well: Rachel Maddow, Rush Limbaugh, Chris Hayes, Mark Levin, Tom Hartman, Ed Schultz, PBS Newshour, One America and others.

TV	Cases	Radio	Cases	Newpapers	Cases	Social Media	Cases	Online	Cases
FOX	42	NPR	42	WASH. POST	42	TWITTER	2	MSN	5
				CAPITAL/GAZE				ONLINE	
CNN	37	WTOP	8	TTE	39	AAPD	1	GEN.	5
NBC (wbal)	25	680AM	4	NY TIMES	22	FACEBOOK	1	CNN.COM	3
BBC	18	WAMU	2	BALT. SUN	16	SM GEN.	1	HUFF. POST	3
								GOOGLE	
MSNBC	15	WYPR	2	WSJ	13			NEWS	2
NIGHTLY									
NEW/TV				NEWSPAPERS					
GEN.	15	630AM	1	GEN.	8			REDDIT	1
CBS	13	CBS RADIO	1	WASH. TIMES	3				
PBS/MPT	12			NATION	3				
ABC	7			USA TODAY	2				
AL									
JEEZERA	3			AP	2				
CSPAN	2			UPI	2				
CNBC	1			ECONOMIST	2				
				SPVOICE	1				
				DAILY RECORD	1				
				POLITICO	1				
				GUARDIAN	1				
				TIME MAG	1				
				NEWSWEEK	1				
				REUTERS	1				
Total Cases	190		60		161		5		19

 Table 15: Specific Media Sources – Trustworthy (number of cases, not percentages)

Based on the results shown on Table 15, the media types with the greatest outreach to this sample of residents were television and newspapers/news magazines. Within television (or combinations of television/online) were FOX news (42 - this and subsequent numbers are percentages), CNN (all sources, 37+3=40), NBC (might include radio WBAL – 25), BBC (might also include radio – 18), MSNBC (15), CBS (13) and PBS/MPT (12).

Among newspapers and news magazines, two sources predominated: The Washington Post (42) and the Capital/Gazette (39). Others included the New York Times (22), Baltimore Sun (16) and the Wall

Street Journal (13). Again no attempt was made to distinguish between print and online access to these sources.

National Public Radio (NPR) dominated the radio section (42) among sources that did not also have the confusion of a television outlet to muddle classification. Other radio stations were very lightly cited (e.g., WTOP - 8).

Social media was very infrequently mentioned (a total of only 5 cases). Online sources were lightly mentioned as well (total of 19 cases). Naturally, the caveat about redundant listings for television, radio and newspaper sources – in broadcast, cable and online – remains.

Job Approval: County Executive, Governor, President

The survey asked respondents to indicate approval or disapproval of the job performed by the incumbent in an office. Graph 14 shows the percentages saying "approve" for the county executive, the governor and the president. Table 16 shows a complete breakdown of all responses from fall 2014 to spring 2016.



The change in leadership in the governor's office created a meteoric jump in approval values: by spring 2016, Governor Hogan stood 46 points higher than Governor O'Malley in fall 2014. Regarding the county executive's office, there was a gradual diminution in approval values based on the transition from Laura Neuman to Steve Schuh, with the latter's approval rating appearing to stabilize around 43-45 approval range. Schuh had more than twice as much approval than disapproval (44 vs. 18 percent), but remained unknown to a large number of respondents (no answer: 37 percent). Details are shown on Table 16.

Elected official		Approve				Disapprove				Unsure/No answer			
	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	
	' 14	' 15	' 15	' 16	' 14	·15	' 15	' 16	' 14	' 15	' 15	' 16	
County Executive	50	45	43	44	18	13	22	18	33	42	35	37	
Neuman/Schuh													
Governor O'Malley/Hogan	27	56	71	73	63	14	14	10	8	30	15	16	
President Barack Obama	32	37	38	46	58	56	52	47	9	7	10	7	

Table 16: Job Approval for County Executive, Governor, President

Regarding presidential job approval, President Obama experienced a substantial improvement – from 32 percent approval in fall 2014 to 46 percent in spring 2016 (see Table 17).

Since fall 2007 CSLI polls of county residents have generally tracked national presidential job approval trends as indicated by Gallup surveys.¹⁸ For the period closest to that during which CSLI was calling residents, Gallup's presidential job approval surveys conducted March 28-April 1 indicated that 50 percent approved of the president's performance, a figure that brought CSLI's own polling figure of 46 percent closer to the traditional norm of finding President Obama's approval percentage some four percent lower than Gallup's national figure than had recently been the case (see Graph 15 for a comparison of Gallup and CSLI findings).

Issue	Sp	Fa	Sp														
	'08	'08	'09	'09	'10	'10	'11	'11	'12	'12	'13	'13	'14	'14	'15	'15	'16
Approve	28	24	53	47	47	42	47	37	42	44	44	40	39	32	37	38	46
Disapprove	62	69	31	42	45	49	44	56	49	50	51	53	52	58	56	52	47
No answer	10	8	16	11	8	10	9	7	8	6	4	7	9	9	7	10	7
Total	100	101	100	100	100	101	100	100	99	100	99	100	100	99	100	100	100

Table 17: Presidential Job Approval

¹⁸ See <u>http://www.gallup.com/poll/113980/gallup-daily-obama-job-approval.aspx</u> for Obama job approval findings cited here.



As seen on Graph 16, Obama's popularity among Democrats rose somewhat – increasing markedly from last fall's 66 percent to 76 percent this spring. There was also some positive change in support among Republicans (up 5 points to 13 percent) and particularly unaffiliated voters (moving from 36 to 49 percent).



Ideological factors played an especially important part in determining President Obama's level of job approval. Graph 17 shows differences among Democrats, Republicans and unaffiliated voters by ideological self-identification: liberal, moderate conservative. The main gains in job approval were clearly among unaffiliated voters, especially moderate and liberal ones. Obama's approval scores were also up sharply among moderate (up 15 points) and conservative Democrats (up 17 points).



Trust in Political Parties

Since 2008, the CSLI survey has asked which party "do you trust to do a better job in coping with the main problems the nation faces over the next few years." Graph 18 shows that despite some oscillations, Republicans and Democrats have been fairly close most of the time in the percentage choosing one over the other.



Some factors have clearly shaped the more sharply varying fortunes of Republicans: in 2013, the fall survey was taken during the shutdown of the federal government, for which Republicans were apparently blamed. In fall 2015, there was much media attention to the inability of Republicans to choose a candidate for speaker of the House of Representatives – portraying considerable internal dissension. This might account for the steady drop (6 points) from relative heights in fall 2014 to fall 2015. However, this spring Republicans experienced an additional 5-point drop (from 33 to 28 percent), reaching the lowest point value since fall 2013 (when it was 23 percent). What accounts for this continued decline in trust for Republicans?

The data cannot directly provide an answer to this question. Graph 19 does show that trust in the Republican Party declined across the board from spring 2015 to spring 2016. However, Republican registrants were especially likely to convert their "trust" sentiments to "neither" – doing so to a greater

extent than either Democrats or unaffiliated respondents. This might indicate some frustration with the outcome of the Republican nomination process thus far.



The "neither" option (which is volunteered by the respondent without prompting by the interviewer) has shown the greatest amount of change over time (a 20-point range: 37-17). Democrats have been the most stable (range 42-31) with Republicans in between (39-23).

Changes in the "neither" score are clearly related to the presence of an election, during which time voters polarize along their partisan inclinations. Thus, the average "neither" score for election periods (fall 2008, fall 2010, fall 2012, fall 2014) is only 19; outside of election periods it is 27. However, it is also the case that in spring prior to an election, the percentage citing "neither" is stable or declining from the previous fall: this was true in 2010, 2012 and 2014. The change in "neither" percentage from fall 2015 to spring 2016 was positive, moving from 26 to 28 percent. This too might indicate frustration with the current presidential nomination process.

Presidential Candidate Preferences for the 2016 Election

The survey included a section asking respondents to indicate their candidate preference for the 2016 presidential election. In fall 2015, the Democratic race was very close between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. The Republican race featured then frontrunners Donald Trump and Ben Carson, with Marco Rubio a distant third.

Table 18 shows the percentages expressing a preference for each of the major candidates. Candidates with less than one percent are not shown. No likely voter screen was applied. Those who were not registered to vote were excluded.

	Overall	Overall
	Fa '15	Sp '16
Democrats		
Hillary Clinton	18	25
Martin O'Malley	3	
Bernie Sanders	17	17
Republicans		
Ben Carson	18	
Ted Cruz	1	8
Carly Fiorina	4	
John Kasich	4	11
Marco Rubio	6	
Donald Trump	15	19
Others/None	17	20

Table 18: Percentage	s Leaning in	Favor of a	Presidential	Candidate	(Fall 2015 and	I Spring	2016)
					(/

Table 19: Percentages Leaning in Favor of a Presidential Candidate by Party Registratio	n
(Fall 2015 and Spring 2016)	

	Dem	ocrats	Repub	olicans	Unaffiliated		
Democrats	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	
Hillary Clinton	34	47	1	3	15	19	
Bernie Sanders	27	28	3	2	21	26	
Republicans							
Ben Carson	8		32		13		
Ted Cruz	0	2	3	16	2	6	
Carly Fiorina	3		5		8		
John Kasich	4	1	4	22	5	9	
Marco Rubio	1		13		5		
Donald Trump	7	6	21	34	17	13	
Others/None	16	15	18	24	14	26	

On the Democratic side, Table 18 shows that Sanders has not changed in the percentage of the vote captured: 17 percent of all votes. Clinton's vote share has increased from 18 to 25 percent, signaling her consolidation as her party's choice in at least this area. As shown on Table 19, this results in at least a 20-point gap between the two once those supporting other candidates or not expressing a preference are excluded.

On the Republican side, Donald Trump's percentage of the vote has only increased by 4 percent to 19 percent overall. The departure of many others from the Republican race has generally boosted the electoral fortunes of Ted Cruz (up 7 points) and John Kasich (up 7 points).¹⁹ Table 19 shows that Trump leads comfortably among Republican registrants, with a 12-point gap between him and the Kasich who is currently second. Part of the lost votes from six months ago have gone to "None" which increased from 18 to 24 of Republican voters.

It should also be noted that Maryland's closed primaries make it less likely that the two candidates that benefit the most from support among unaffiliated voters – Sanders and Trump – will be as successful as their "overall" scores predict, since these include the preferences of unaffiliated voters who cannot participate in the primary election for partisan offices.

As was the case with presidential approval, it is possible to combine ideology and party registration to better understand the nature of various candidates' support. Graph 20 shows that Bernie Sanders depends greatly on liberal voters: he comes closest to or leads Clinton among liberal Democrats as well as among liberal unaffiliated respondents. Among moderate Democrats, Clinton has a 22-point lead. Sanders gets nearly no support from conservative Democrats while Clinton gets some along with Trump. Conservative Democrats along with the very few liberal Republicans are the most disaffected judging by their very high "none" scores.

Among Republicans, Kasich appears to be the choice of moderates, while Trump and Cruz split the conservative vote. The main distinction between Trump and Cruz appears to be that Trump does relatively well among moderates (leading Cruz by 21 points) while still beating Cruz by 15 points among conservatives.

Unaffiliated voters who are liberals overwhelmingly support Sanders, while moderates split the vote primarily between Clinton and Sanders, with Kasich in third place. Conservative unaffiliated respondents are concentrated on the Republican side, with Trump beating Cruz by 20 points. This group also has a relatively high "none" score (33 percent).

¹⁹ It might be noted that defecting Democrats have also returned to the fold by backing Clinton over Sanders. Since these defectors had backed a Republican such as Ben Carson, it is not surprising that they would gravitate back to Clinton as the more moderate of the two Democratic candidates.



Trump vs. Clinton – Hypothetical Match-up

After the "most important reason why you currently favor this candidate" question was asked (see the section after the discussion of demographics), the survey concluded the election section by offering a hypothetical match-up: "If the choice of candidates in the general election was Republican Donald Trump and Democrat Hillary Clinton, for whom would you vote?" The percentages in Table 19a exclude those who were not registered to vote.

Table 12a. Trump vs. Chinton Match-up										
	Overall	Democrats	Republicans	Unaffiliated						
Donald Trump	35	11	70	28						
Hillary Clinton	46	76	11	46						
Wouldn't vote for either or would vote third party	14	8	13	21						
No answer	5	5	6	5						
Total	100	100	100	100						

Table 19a: Trump vs. Clinton Match-up

Table 19a clearly shows that Clinton holds a sizable lead over Trump. Several factors account for this: Democrats were more likely to vote for Clinton than Republicans for Trump (76 vs. 70 percent).

Republicans were more likely to say that they wouldn't vote for either rather than vote for Trump (13 vs. 8 percent for Democrats/Clinton). Actual defection rates – those of one party willing to vote for the candidate of the other party – were identical (11 percent), and not a factor in shaping Clinton's lead. The most decisive factor pointed to the unaffiliated: *Clinton had an 18-point lead over Trump among voters in that group*. Another fifth of unaffiliated registrants (21 percent) wouldn't vote for either of the candidates.

Presidential Candidates and Demographic Variables

Age

Graph 21 shows the difference between each candidate's percentage of the total vote attributed to each age group and the overall percentage of that age group as a percentage of the total sample. A positive score indicates a disproportionately high percentage of that age group within the candidate's total; a negative score indicates that the candidate is relatively underrepresented by supporters in that age group. In an age group that seems particularly highlighted by a specific candidate, the candidate's name appears.



As Graph 21 makes apparent, Democratic candidates concentrated their votes at opposite extremes. Sanders making a strong showing among younger voters under 40; Clinton's supporters were concentrated in the 60 plus age group.

Republicans were mostly underrepresented among those under 40. Kasich's support is concentrated among those 50-59; Trump did well in that group but especially among those 70 or more.

Gender

Gender was a relatively simple story: Clinton does disproportionately well among women (64 percent of her supporters) for Democrats, while Kasich does well among Republicans (57 percent). All other candidates either were disproportionately attracting male supporters (both Cruz and Trump at 68, 63 percent male) or split evenly between men and women (Sanders).



Race

Graph 23 shows that there is just one clear conclusion when it comes to race: Clinton was able to do disproportionately well among African-Americans. All other candidates were underrepresented within that group.



Marital Status

Graph 24 shows that especially Sanders and also Clinton did well among single people (61 and 59 percent of their supporters), while the Republicans were especially concentrated among married individuals. Trump (along with Clinton) was somewhat overrepresented among divorcees.



Income

The candidate with the most even distribution of his voting support among income groups was Donald Trump. As shown on Graph 25, only Trump avoided concentrating his supporters among a given income group: Cruz was concentrated among those making \$50-75,000 as well as \$100-150,000; Kasich appealed disproportionately to the highest income group (\$150,000+) where 45 percent of his supporters reside. Clinton received support from those making under \$50,000 (24 percent, compared to only 11 percent for Sanders). Sanders picked up the share he lost to Clinton among the poorer respondents by picking up some extra support among middle income households making between \$75-100,000.



Religion

Hillary Clinton was the least impacted by religion among her supporters as in no single category was she concentrated. Bernie Sanders was clearly the favorite of those choosing "none" for this category; Cruz depended greatly upon Evangelical voters (33 percent of his supporters, but only 11 percent of the sample). Trump excelled among Catholics (where Sanders floundered) as did Kasich among Protestants.



Education

The final demographic category to be examined is education. Among Democrats, Clinton's support was disproportionately concentrated among highly educated voters: 37 percent of her supporters have done some postgraduate work. Sanders was not far behind (33 percent). Also attracting supporters among those with more education was John Kasich whose followers disproportionately had at least a 4-year degree. By contrast, Trump found very little support among those with postgraduate work (10 percent, 26 percent of the sample) but did well among those with a two-year degree or less of formal education. Cruz was somewhere between Kasich and Trump.

Other polling has confirmed Trump's strength among the less educated. According to an article in the Washington Post, "Trump's supporters, for instance, <u>disproportionately</u> lack any college education — a demographic <u>that has suffered badly</u> over the past 20 years in the economy."²⁰ As will be pointed out in the next section, Trump's appeal is primarily economic: supporters mentioned his business experience, the economy and agreement with his plans/policies and vision. If this is true, then the impact of Trump's "bad week" - when he struggled with questions about abortion – might be overstated since his core voters were not intrinsically drawn to him because of his strong stances on social issues like abortion or gay marriage.²¹



 $^{^{20}\} https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/03/22/economic-anxiety-and-racial-anxiety-two-separate-forces-driving-support-for-donald-trump/$

²¹ See E.J. Dionne's "This time it really is the end of Trump. Really." https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/this-time-it-really-is-the-end-of-trump-really/2016/04/03/5dcba99e-f840-11e5-9804-537defcc3cf6_story.html

Presidential Choice – Most Important Reason for Choice of Candidate

As a follow-up to the question about the choice of presidential candidate, respondents were asked about the "most important reason why you currently favor this candidate for president?"

Answers were offered in an open-ended format, so it was necessary to code all the responses – up to two responses were coded per respondent. Table 20 presents those responses that were mostly about the individual – character – and those mostly about issues. Character traits were mentioned twice as frequently as issues, plans, visions or specific policies: 66 percent character, 33 percent policies, plans or visions. Table 21 presents the percentage of supporters mentioning something about issues, plans, visions, or specific policies.

Table 20 has been ranked by the percentage of respondents who cited a character trait: experience/track record was the most frequently cited item (15 percent mentioned it). Two candidates benefited disproportionately from having the apparently appropriate experience: Clinton and Kasich. The latter also led the pack among those saying that the key trait was honesty or trustworthiness; by contrast Clinton was far behind on that trait. Kasich and Clinton were united once again on "electability" although Cruz was just behind. However, the heart of Kasich's competitiveness in this race was his "reasonableness" – his "normal" demeanor, cited by nearly a quarter (23 percent) of his supporters. As long-time "establishment" figures, Clinton and Kasich were more likely to be deemed "qualified"; Kasich was also likely to be perceived as a "problem solver" or "consensus maker."

Bernie Sanders was deemed honest and trustworthy by his followers, but overall his character traits were less important than his policies and vision. About one quarter of his supporters mentioned "agreement with policies/plans/vision" as a major reason for supporting him. In addition, his focus on "Wall St.," inequality and the "billionaire class" also were points of agreement for supporters.

By contrast, Hillary Clinton was not associated with policies to any great degree. Only 7 percent stated "agreement with policies/plans/vision" as a major reason for supporting her." Foreign affairs and women's issues were the two items also mentioned (both 5 percent). Both she and Kasich were primarily engaging as experienced hands in government with the knowledge and intelligence to get things done. Impressively, only *two percent* mentioned agreement with Kasich on plans/policies/vision.

Donald Trump was primarily admired for his character – honesty, independence of the "Washington establishment," frankness and refusal to be "politically correct." Supporters also mentioned his business record, occasionally saying that "government should be run like a business." No one mentioning "experience" as a qualification pointed to Trump in that regard. He was not admired for his knowledge, intelligence nor compassion as well. Trump was a change agent who would focus on business and economics – his leadership would be primarily in that realm.

Cruz was closest to Sanders in terms of a focus on policy rather than character. Nearly as many said "agreement with policies/plans/vision" (20 percent) as mentioned it for Sanders (24 percent). Cruz also was associated with party or "ideology" ("He is a real conservative..."), a "Constitutionalist" who was nearly as "electable" as Kasich (8 vs. 9 percent).

	Clinton	Sanders	Cruz	Kasich	Trump	Overall
Experience/track record	35	4	3	15	0	15
Honest, trustworthy	4	14	14	18	12	11
Electable	11	3	8	9	5	8
Reasonable demeanor	6	1	12	23	1	7
qualified	10	0	8	11	4	7
Independent of establishment	0	1	0	0	18	4
Not politically correct,	1	1	0	0	12	3
Problem solver	3	3	0	8	1	3
Business record	0	0	0	0	11	2
Authentic, down to earth	1	2	0	0	6	2
Knowledge	3	2	0	2	0	2
Anti-Trump	2	1	3	2	0	2
Cares about people	1	4	0	0	0	1
Intelligent	3	0	0	0	0	1
Anti-Clinton	0	2	0	2	0	1
Compassion	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	79	39	46	90	70	67

Table 20: Character as Factors Orienting Presidential Candidate Choices

Table 21: Issues as Factors Orienting Presidential Candidate Choices

	Clinton	Sanders	Cruz	Kasich	Trump	Overall
Agree with policies/plans/vision	7	24	20	2	14	13
Party/Ideology Label	2	4	8	5	0	3
Anti-corporate - greed, corruption	0	9	3	0	3	3
Constitutionalist	0	0	18	0	0	2
Economics	1	1	0	0	7	2
Foreign affairs	5	1	3	0	0	2
Middle class helps	1	7	0	0	0	2
Women - gender	5	0	0	0	0	2
Change	0	1	0	0	6	2
Equality	0	4	0	0	0	1
Minimum Wage, college, healthcare	0	4	0	0	0	1
Education	1	1	0	0	0	1
Budget	0	0	0	3	0	0
Environment/CC	0	2	0	0	0	0
Morality	0	1	3	0	0	0
Total	21	61	54	10	30	33

Personality and Politics – Do Personality Traits Affect Voting Choices?

In 2010, political psychologist Jeffrey Mondak published a book focusing on the interaction between personality traits and political participation, ideological inclinations and partisanship. According to his book, "Analyses examining multiple facets of political information, political attitudes, and participation reveal that the Big Five trait dimensions – openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability – produce both direct and indirect effects on a wide range of political phenomena."²² The survey took the ten questions he utilized to measure the "Big Five" traits – and added one more (tolerance/intolerance) – with the simple quest of determining whether these traits were predictive of the vote for president. This was done by reading (or presenting online) two terms to respondents and the instructions to "indicate which term best describes you using a scale of 1 to 5 - a 1 indicates that you strongly view yourself in terms of the first term, a 5 means that you strongly view yourself in terms of the second term. A middle number indicates you are somewhere in between."

Table 22 lists the 11 personality items and lists the percentages who described themselves for each value on the scale. The sample thought of itself as kind (63 percent gave it a "1"), hardworking (62 percent) and to a lesser extent sympathetic (52 percent) and tolerant (47 percent). It was least likely to say that it was relaxed or extroverted (31 percent). Also low were "an intellectual" (39 percent), outgoing (38 percent), calm (38 percent) and philosophical (37 percent). For the simplicity of analysis, the five-point scale will be reduced to two points and compared to voting choices as well as party registration and ideology.

First term	1	2	3	4	5	Second term
Kind	63	25	10	1	1	Unkind
Hardworking	62	25	8	3	2	Lazy
Sympathetic	52	28	13	4	2	Unsympathetic
Tolerant	47	28	18	4	3	Intolerant
Neat	41	28	19	9	3	Sloppy
An intellectual	39	33	19	3	5	Not an intellectual
Outgoing	38	27	20	11	4	Shy
Calm	38	32	20	7	3	Nervous
Philosophical	37	33	23	4	4	Unreflective
Extroverted	31	26	24	11	9	Introverted
Relaxed	31	26	28	11	5	Tense

Table 22: Personality Traits – Respondent Placement on Five-Point Scale

²² Jeffrey Mondak. <u>Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior</u> (Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology) (Kindle Locations 14-17). Cambridge University Press. Kindle Edition, 2010.

Table 23 shows the scores for each candidate and the first term – the percentage choosing a score of "1" being displayed. This table forms the basis for the graphs and discussion below.

First term	Clinton	Sanders	Cruz	Kasich	Trump	Overall	Signif.
Kind	69	56	74	50	55	64	.001
Hardworking	56	46	59	72	66	62	.001
Sympathetic	59	51	41	49	44	54	.001
Tolerant	63	58	25	41	35	48	.001
Neat	38	22	46	49	46	43	.001
An intellectual	36	39	25	49	35	41	.001
Outgoing	40	22	31	35	42	38	.001
Calm	43	32	48	29	33	38	.001
Philosophical	40	38	27	35	34	37	.07
Extroverted	34	19	23	20	44	31	.001
Relaxed	40	28	21	22	29	32	.001

Table 23: Candidate Choice and Percentage Choosing "1" for Personality Trait



Graph 28 shows the first two "Big Five" traits: agreeableness and conscientiousness, operationalized as sympathetic/kind and hardworking/neat. Regarding kindness, two candidates stood out with the highest scores: Clinton and Cruz. The three others had similar lower scores. While these traits suggest an affinity for liberal candidates, clearly this was not the case here.

Regarding sympathetic, another presumed liberal trait, Clinton did rate the highest (59 percent) followed at some distance by Sanders (51 percent) and Kasich (49 percent). This might make sense since Clinton, Sanders (as liberals) and Kasich (as a moderate) might attract voters who are more sympathetic than more conservative candidates such as Cruz (41 percent) or Trump (44 percent).

Moving to the two items measuring conscientiousness, these might be more easily understood as "conservative" elements – hardworking and neatness. Both seem to work as predicted, with the lowest scores for hardworking being attributed to Clinton (56 percent) and especially Sanders (46 percent). By contrast Kasich (72 percent) and Trump (66 percent) had the highest scores. The neatness scores were similar with Clinton (38 percent) and especially Sanders (22 percent) ranking lowest while the Republican candidates were all higher and very similar to one another (46-49 percent).

Graph 29 shows the scores for another trait similar to agreeableness: tolerance. As with sympathetic and kind, it is assumed that tolerance woud be higher for liberal candidates and lower for conservative ones. The liberal/conservative trend for this item is obvious: Sanders and Clinton are very similar (63/58 percent) with the Republican candidates much lower (25-41 percent).



Graph 30 shows the scores for "emotional stability" – calm and relaxed – as well as "openness to experience" – "an intellectual" and "philosophical. Regarding calmness, Clinton and Cruz rated the highest as they did for "kindness." Sanders (32 percent) was nearly identical to Trump (33 percent) on this item – clearly not aligning itself along liberal/conservative lines very well.

Regarding the other aspect of "emotional stability" – relaxed – Clinton's high score (40 percent) compared to all others (22-28) suggests that this might be something relevant to gender rather than politics, but no statistically significant relationship between gender and this variable was found.

Openness to experience might be linked to liberalism, with its presumed greater acceptance of change than conservatism. However, Graph 30 reveals no consistent pattern for "an intellectual" since Kasich rated the highest (49 percent) and Cruz the lowest (25 percent), with Trump (35), Clinton (36) and Sanders (39) all similar. A more evident pattern of liberal/conservative contrast appears regarding "philosophical" with Clinton (40) and Sanders (38) being ahead of Kasich (35), Trump (34) and especially Cruz (27). Cruz seems to have found a special "trait" space since he is closest to Clinton on "calm" and "kind" but noticeably lower than other candidates on "intellectual" and "philosophical."



The final trait to be examined is "extroversion" which was measured by two items – outgoing and extroverted. Graph 31 shows that these items did not correspond clearly to the liberal/conservative distinction. Regarding outgoing, the highest scores were associated with the frontrunners for each party (Clinton, 40 percent, and Trump, 42 percent). The most liberal candidate (Sanders) had the lowest score (22 percent) while the most conservative (Cruz) was second lowest (31 percent).

In terms of the "extroverted/introverted" duality, the same pattern prevailed: frontrunner supporters were the most extroverted – with Trump clearly leading the way (44 percent) over Clinton (34 percent), while the others were far below (19-23 percent).



Thus, the brief examination of the relationship between personality traits and voting choices showed the following:

- Some traits exemplify a liberal/conservative contrast more fully than others. The strongest liberal/conservative appears to be regarding the item "tolerant/intolerant" which was not part of Mondak's original group of items. Others that at least suggest a liberal/conservative contrast include hardworking/neat and "sympathetic."
- Some items showed a frontrunner affinity clearly regards outgoing and extroverted.
- Clinton and Cruz matched up in at least two cases: calm and kind.

Methodology

The survey polled a random sample of 566 county residents who were at least 18 years old, primarily using a database of listed and unlisted landline numbers along with cell phone numbers. Telephone interviewing was conducted March 25-April 1 during evening hours. In addition, members of a CSLI Web panel were also asked to participate in an online version of the survey. There was about a 4 percent statistical margin of error for the combined sample; the error rate was higher for subgroups such as "Democrats" or "men." The dataset was weighted by gender, political party and education to better represent the general population. College students were trained and used as telephone interviewers.

Contact Dan Nataf, Ph.D., center director, for additional comments or questions at 410-777-2733 and <u>ddnataf@aacc.edu</u>. Check the CSLI website for results for information and press releases for this and previous surveys: <u>www2.aacc.edu/csli</u>.

Appendix A:

CSLI Semi-Annual Survey – Spring 2016 with Frequencies (percentages instead of coded values)

1. What do you think is the most important problem facing the residents of Anne Arundel County at the present time? (DON'T READ THE LIST! Have them *volunteer* an answer)

Problem	Choose ONE
Crime (other than drug related – e.g., robbery, burglary, assault)	6
Drugs (use or sale of illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, or use of	14
prescription pain killers for non-medical purposes.)	
Economy – (e.g., no jobs, high cost of living, business closing or losses)	11
Education (problems with schools	8
Environment (e.g., air or water pollution, saving the Bay)	6
Government ethics – corrupt, immoral	3
Government waste – inefficient, spends too much	3
Government lack resources – for roads, schools, services	5
Growth/overpopulation- too much development	11
Healthcare (cost, access)	2
Taxes – too high	12
Transportation problems/traffic congestion	7
Unsure/No Answer	8
Other answer - write in:	5

2. The next questions ask you to say whether things are going in the right or wrong direction. First, would you say that the county is headed in the right direction or in the wrong direction? How about the state of Maryland? How about the nation as a whole?

	Right	Wrong	Unsure	Don't Know
2.1 County	55	21	21	3
2.2 State	52	27	18	3
2.3 Nation	21	65	14	1

3. Next I would like to know how you would rate economic conditions in Anne Arundel County, in Maryland, and in the United States generally. First how would you rate economic conditions in <u>Anne Arundel County</u> -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor? How about the state? How about the nation?

	Excellent	Good	Only fair	Poor	Unsure/Don't
					know
3.1 County	8	57	27	5	4
3.2 State	5	48	36	9	3
3.3 Nation	1	23	40	34	2

4. Thinking now about your personal circumstances, please tell me whether any of these economic conditions apply to you or your household.

	Applies	Doesn't	Don't
		apply	know
4.1 Wages or salaries are not rising as fast as the cost of living	58	40	3
4.2 Received a salary increase or other increase in income recently	32	66	2
4.3 Facing the possibility of unemployment	9	87	4
4.4 Found a new or better job recently	10	89	2
4.5 Hard to afford the cost of food and groceries	30	67	2
4.6 Hard to afford the cost of education	39	59	2
4.7 Taxes are too high in relation to government services provided	59	35	6
4.8 Health insurance is unavailable, too expensive or inadequate	38	60	2

5. Thinking about the next twelve months and the county's economy, please answer the following questions by saying whether a particular condition will be better, the same or worse:

	Better	Same	Worse	Don't Know
5.1 Economic growth	28	50	13	10
5.2 Unemployment	24	46	20	10
5.3 Inflation	7	43	43	8
5.4 Your personal financial situation	17	63	14	6

6. Do you agree, partly agree or disagree with the following statements or proposals:

	Agree	Partly Agree	Disagree	Can't decide	No answer
6.1 A law making it possible for severely ill individuals to get a doctor's prescription that can help end their lives.	50	19	23	7	2
6.2 A law allowing felons to vote <u>before</u> finishing with probation or parole rather than after.	18	8	68	5	1
6.3 Reduce the time devoted to state-required testing of students in public schools.	59	14	17	7	2
6.4 Reduce the significance of state-required test results as a part of teacher evaluations.	50	19	23	6	2
6.5 Start the school year after Labor Day rather than before.	65	9	15	8	3
6.6 Replace the school board nominating commission by an elected school board.	57	13	12	13	4
6.7 Always include at least one African-American on the county's school board.	39	17	34	8	2
6.8 Provide body cameras to all local police.	69	16	12	3	1
6.9 Maintain the current ban on roadside panhandling by all nonprofit groups	71	10	12	5	3
6.10 Federal support providing free tuition for community college and public universities.	45	16	37	2	1
6.11 Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 over the next few years.	47	13	38	2	1
6.12 President Obama and the Senate should take action now to fill the vacancy on the US Supreme Court, rather than wait until next year.	57	6	31	5	2

somewhat of not much upon the following.					
	A lot	Somewhat	Not much	No	Ranking
			or none	answer	
7.1 Newspapers or news magazines either print or	40	27	20	1	(8.01) 30
online	42	27	29	1	
7.2 Television programming or nightly news	50	32	18	0	(8.02)32
7.3 Radio broadcasts or news	32	36	32	1	(8.03)16
7.4 Social media like Facebook or Twitter	20	22	57	2	(8.04)7
7.5 Other online sources	21	31	42	6	(8.05)14

7.0 Thinking about how you get information about <u>state and local</u> news, do you rely a lot, somewhat or not much upon the following:

8.0 Thinking now in terms of how much you trust each of those sources of information, which ranks the highest: => (*Interviewer: Reread the choices if necessary. Put a "1" in the last column in the table above for the source mentioned as ranking highest*)

9.0 Which specific sources - such as a particular newspaper, online source or broadcast - are the most trustworthy:_____See answers in text_____

10.0 Do you approve or disapprove of the way the following elected officials are handling their jobs?							
Elected official	Approve	Disapprove	No answer/DK				
10.1 County Executive Steve Schuh	44	18	37				
10.2 Governor Larry Hogan	73	10	16				
10.3 President Barack Obama	46	47	7				

11. Overall, which party, the Democrats or the Republicans, do you trust to do a better job in coping with the main problems the nation faces over the next few years?

(1) Democrats 37%
(2) Republicans 28%
(3) Neither (*volunteered*) 28%
(4) Other 1%(*volunteered*)
(5) Unsure, no answer 6%

12. With which political party, if any, are you registered?

- (1) Democratic 39%
- (2) Republican 35%
- (3) Unaffiliated (or "independent") 19%
- (4) Other 1%
- (5) None (not registered to vote) 6% (0) No Answer 0%

13. If you think that you are likely to vote during this April's presidential primary election, will you use early voting or just wait until election day on April 26?

- (1) Early voting (if respondent asks for dates say April 14 to April 21) 21%
 - (2) Vote on election day 63%
 - (3) Probably won't vote 7%
 - (0) No answer or unsure 9%

14. Which presidential candidate, if any, are you currently leaning in favor of at this time? (DON'T read the list)

(0) NONE (skip to Q17) (combined with "someone else =20%)

Democrats:

(1) Hillary Clinton 25% (2) Bernie Sanders 17%

Republicans:

(3) Ted Cruz 8% (4) John Kasich 11% (5) Donald Trump 19% (9) Someone else

15. What is the most important reason why you currently favor this candidate for president?

_see analysis in text_____

16. If the choice of candidates in the general election was Republican Donald Trump and Democrat Hillary Clinton, for whom would you vote?

- (1) Donald Trump 35%
- (2) Hillary Clinton 46%
- (3) Wouldn't vote for either or would vote third party 14%
- (0) No answer, no opinion 5%

We are almost done. The last few questions will help us to better understand your responses.

=>17. First, we are going to ask you about some personality traits for an AACC psychology class that is evaluating the relationship between personality and politics.

I will read you a set of words – indicate which word best describes you using a scale of 1 to 5 - a 1 indicates that you strongly view yourself in terms of the first term, a 5 means that you strongly view yourself in terms of the second term. A middle number indicates you are somewhere in between.

First Word	1	2	3	4	5	Second Word
17.1 Philosophical	37	33	23	4	4	Unreflective
17.2 An intellectual	39	33	19	3	5	Not an intellectual
17.3 Hardworking	62	25	8	3	2	Lazy
17.4 Neat	41	28	19	9	3	Sloppy
17.5 Outgoing	38	27	20	11	4	Shy
17.6 Extroverted	31	26	24	11	9	Introverted
17.7 Sympathetic	52	28	13	4	2	Unsympathetic
17.8 Kind	63	25	10	1	1	Unkind
17.9 Relaxed	31	26	28	11	5	Tense
17.10 Calm	38	32	20	7	3	Nervous
17.11 Tolerant	47	28	18	4	3	Intolerant

18. Which of the following best describes your political beliefs: Conservative, Moderate or Liberal?

(1) Conservative 33% (2) Moderate 43% (3) Liberal 18% (4) Unsure, No Answer 7%

19. What is your age?

18-29	11
30-39	5
40-49	13
50-59	22
60-69	26
70+	23
Total	100

20. I am going to read some categories relating to education. Please stop me when I reach the category in which the highest level of your formal education falls.

(1) less than a high school diploma	1%	(5) Completed a 4 year bachelor's degree 18%
(2) a high school diploma	9%	(6) post graduate work 25%
(3) some college	32%	(7) Something else? 0
(4) Completed a 2 year associate co	llege degree 14%	(8) No Answer 0

21. I am going to read some categories relating to income. Please stop me when I reach the category in which your household income falls.

9%		
7%		
15%		
14%		
21%		
15%		
7%	(0) No Answer	14%
	9% 7% 15% 14% 21% 15% 7%	9% 7% 15% 14% 21% 15% 7% (0) No Answer

22. Stop me when I reach the employment category that best describes your situation.

Category	Percentage
Retired	35
Self employed	8
Employed part time	9
Employed for a company in the private sector	16
Employed for government in a non-defense related activity such as	13
education, public works or public safety	
Employed in a defense related activity	4
Employed in a private non-profit organization	3
Student	7
Unemployed and seeking a job	1
Unemployed and not seeking a job	3
No answer	2

23. Regarding race, how would you describe yourself?

(1) White 85%

- (2) Black or African American 7%
- (3) Hispanic or Latino 1%

(4) Asian 1%

(0) Other 4%

(9) No answer 3%

24. What is your religion, if any? (check off category that best describes the answer - DON'T Read)

- (1) None (e.g. atheist, agnostic) 10%
- (2) Non-practicing (e.g. doesn't go to religious places or celebrate religious holidays) 6%
- (3) Evangelical or born again Christian (e.g. possibly Baptist, Pentecostal) 10%
- (4) Catholic
- (5) Protestant (e.g. possibly Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterian, Anglican, Episcopalian) 23%
- (6) Some other Christian (e.g. possibly Mormon) 4%

28%

- (7) Jewish 2%
- (8) A 'spiritual person' not associated with an organized religion 8%
- (0) Something else (e.g. Hindu, Moslem) 4%
- (9) No Answer 1%

25. What is your current marital status?

- (1) Single 17%
- (2) Married 65%
- (3) Separated/divorced 8%
- (4) Widowed 7%
- (5) Living Together 1%
- (6) Other 0%
- (0) No answer 2%

25.1 I have one last request: In an attempt to provide students with more opportunities to survey the public, the Center is asking whether we can contact you occasionally by email to participate in future surveys. Can we count on your help?

(1) Yes 39% (2) No 61% (Go to "That concludes our survey...") 25.2 IF YES: "What email address shall we use to contact you?"

(CLEAR SPELLING/HANDWRITING PLEASE!)

"That concludes our survey, thanks for participating"

Once the respondent hangs up, make sure to enter GENDER and ZIP CODE

26. Gender of respondent to whom you were speaking: (1) Male 49% (2) Female 51%

27. <u>Zipcode</u>

-

None	6.4
20711	.8
20715	.3
20724	.4
20733	.4
20751	.6
20754	.3
20755	.2
20764	.5
20765	.1
20776	.9
20778	.6
20779	.4
210:5	.2
21012	7.0
21032	1.4
21035	2.2
21037	3.6
21043	.1
21054	2.4
21060	4.1
21061	4.1
21076	.9
21077	.1
21090	1.2
21108	5.1
21112	.3
21113	3.0
21114	4.0
21122	14.8
21140	.9
21144	5.8
21146	9.2
21225	.5
21401	5.6
21403	6.4
21404	.2
21405	.6
21409	4.2
21619	.1
	100.0