

THE THIRD ANNUAL PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY OF KANSAS

POLICY ANALYSIS DIVISION
INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND BUSINESS RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66045
913/864-3701

STEVEN MAYNARD-MOODY
DIRECTOR, POLICY ANALYSIS

REPORT #119
FEBRUARY 1987

ANTHONY REDWOOD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SURVEY STAFF

Director:

Steven Maynard-Moody, Director of the Policy Analysis Division of the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research and Assistant Professor of Public Administration.

Supervisors:

Jerry Mitchell, Research Assistant in the Policy Analysis Division of the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research and Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Political Science.

David Steven Owen, Doctoral Student in the Department of Political Science.

Data Keypuncher:

Nancy Morales, senior political science major.

Telephone Interviewers:

Hedi Hood, Karen Keim, Jacqueline Seery, Charles Shirley, Ann Szemplenski, and Kirste Thomson; all students at the University of Kansas.

POLICY ANALYSIS DIVISION
INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND BUSINESS RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The University of Kansas Institute for Public Policy and Business Research (IPPBR) performs applied and scholarly research in the areas of business, economics, public policy, and community development. IPPBR publishes the Policy Studies Journal, Kansas Business Review, and Kansas Statistical Abstract. IPPBR also disseminates a variety of technical reports and research monographs and holds annual conferences on city management and economic development.

The IPPBR Policy Analysis Division performs applied policy evaluations and conducts surveys for government and business. The Policy Analysis Division has recently conducted surveys for the Kansas Committee for the Humanities, the Kansas Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and the City Council of Bonner Springs, Kansas. To maintain up-to-date survey information, IPPBR is a member of the National Network of State Polls and the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
2. INTRODUCTION.....	3
A. BACKGROUND OF SURVEY	
B. METHODOLOGY	
3. KANSAS CHARACTERISTICS.....	6
A. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS	
B. KANSAS AS A PLACE TO LIVE	
4. SOCIAL ISSUES.....	8
A. INTRODUCTION	
B. SMOKING IN THE WORKPLACE	
C. DRUG TESTING	
D. DEATH PENALTY	
E. DISABILITY POLICY	
5. ECONOMIC ISSUES.....	12
A. INTRODUCTION	
B. CONDITION OF THE KANSAS ECONOMY	
C. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	
D. TAX INCREASES	
E. SPENDING CUTS	
F. TAX WINDFALL	
6. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.....	17
A. INTRODUCTION	
B. RADIOACTIVE WASTE	
C. CHEMICAL PESTICIDES	
7. SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS.....	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a summary of major findings in the 1987 poll of Kansas public opinion.

1. Over 80% of Kansans view the state as a good or excellent place to live.

2. Kansans support a prohibition on the smoking of cigarettes in the workplace.

3. Most Kansans support drug testing for state employees whose work involves public safety.

4. A majority of Kansans support the death penalty -- 69% in support, 24% in opposition, and 7% neutral.

5. Kansans are split over whether cost should be a consideration in the adoption of the death penalty -- 44% said cost should be a consideration and 56% said it should not.

6. Only 14% of those in favor of the death penalty thought it was a deterrent to murder. Another 33% giving a reason for their support said the punishment should fit the crime.

7. Most Kansans want the State to take actions to improve employment conditions for persons with disabilities. Most think rehabilitation should be the focus of government action.

8. A little less than half (42%) of the respondents said the condition of the Kansas economy was getting worse.

9. Kansas support bold, new actions in the economic development area.

10. Asked about state budget priorities, 50% said spending for education should be cut last, and 33% said prison spending should be trimmed first.

11. Education was the first priority for spending of the federal income tax windfall. Only 1.1% ranked education last. Another 29% said the windfall should be returned to the taxpayers.

12. Kansans support a ban on the burial of radioactive waste in the state. They also support increased control over the manufacture and application of chemical pesticides.

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Survey

In the past three years, the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research (IPPBR) has conducted surveys of public opinion in Kansas. IPPBR has conducted these surveys with the expectation that objective and independent public opinion surveys are useful to both citizens and state officials.

The results reported herein also represent IPPBR's contribution to the data collection efforts of the National Network of State Polls. Through this network, comparisons can be made about the opinions of citizens living in different states.

B. Methodology

The IPPBR survey was conducted January 24, 1987 to January 29, 1987. The survey was by telephone and a total of 561 interviews were completed with persons 18 years of age or older. The response rate for the survey was 73%. This means for every four persons called, three responded to the survey.

Questions in the survey were derived from interviews with state officials, newspaper articles concerning legislative issues, and the National Network of State Polls. Readers should consult the section of this report on the

survey instrument for a full text of the questions and responses because many have been summarized for discussion within the report.

The sample was designed to proportionately represent each of Kansas's 105 counties and an equal number of men and women. The two area codes in Kansas and three digit telephone exchanges were used to match telephone numbers and geographical areas. This method ensures a random selection of listed and unlisted numbers throughout the state.

The percentages obtained in the sample are estimates of the entire population of Kansas. Sampling theory suggests when an adequate random sample is obtained within a population, the sample will accurately reflect the responses that would be given if the entire population were surveyed. The margin of error in a survey is the probable difference between interviewing everyone in a given population and a sample drawn from the population. The margin of error for the 1987 survey is less than 4.0% at a 95% level of confidence. Given this margin of error, chances are that in about 19 cases out of 20, if all households in Kansas with telephones had been surveyed with the same questionnaire, the results would differ from the poll findings by no more than 4% in either direction. In other words, an issue with 50% support might have as little as 46% support or as much as 54% support.

Although great care was taken in composing questions and drawing a sample, certain caution should be exercised in the interpretation of telephone survey results. Responses generally represent immediate reactions to questions and respondents are limited to the answer categories provided. Nevertheless, telephone surveys are by far the best form of public opinion polling to obtain random and representative samples in a short time span.

KANSAS CHARACTERISTICS

A. Respondent Characteristics

The 1987 survey asked a number of questions to highlight the characteristics of Kansans. The survey found most Kansans are homeowners (76%) with family incomes of \$15,000 to \$40,000 dollars (53%). The survey respondents were divided between those who have high school educations (43%) and those who have college educations (48%). The mean age for the sample was 45. Most Kansans do not have a physical disability (90%). In terms of gender, 38% were male and 62% were female. Finally, 37% live in urban areas and 63% reside in rural areas.

B. Kansas as a Place to Live

This year's survey repeats a question asked in last year's survey about the perception of Kansas as a place to live. Table 1 shows Kansans continue to see the state as either an excellent or good place to live. In 1986 and 1987, 35% of the respondents were of the opinion that Kansas is an excellent place to live. A recent poll in Maryland also found 35% of its residents were positive about their state. Even with negative perceptions of the Kansas economy (to be discussed later), Kansans continue to view the state in a positive manner.

=====

TABLE 1:
KANSAS AS A PLACE TO LIVE

<u>Response Categories</u>	<u>1986 Survey</u>	<u>1987 Survey</u>
Excellent	35%	35%
Good	49%	50%
Fair	14%	12%
Poor	2%	3%
	-----	-----
Totals	100%	100%
Number	(622)	(560)

=====

SOCIAL ISSUES

A. Introduction

The 1987 survey asked a number of questions of a social nature. Table 3 provides a summary of the support and opposition to the social issues addressed by the survey.

=====

TABLE 3:
SUMMARY OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION TO SOCIAL ISSUES

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Neutral</u>
Prohibiting Smoking in Workplace	61%	30%	9%
Drug Testing for State Employees whose Work Involves Life or Safety	87%	9%	4%
Drug Testing for Intercollegiate Athletes	79%	15%	6%
Death Penalty	69%	24%	7%

=====

B. Smoking In The Workplace

Kansans support a prohibition on the smoking of cigarettes in the workplace (61% to 30%). This support was consistent across all subsets of the sample, with the exception of an age split. Younger respondents (18 to 30 years of age) were more opposed to smoking controls than were older respondents (over 60).

C. Drug Testing

Kansans support drug testing for state employees with jobs that involve public safety. They also support testing for illegal drugs among intercollegiate athletes. The survey found 67% strongly supported drug testing for Kansas employees and only 6% were strongly opposed. It was furthermore discovered that 55% strongly supported testing for illegal drugs among intercollegiate athletes and 7% were opposed. Older residents, strong republicans, and females were highly supportive of drug testing for both state employees and athletes.

D. Death Penalty

The death penalty was favored by a majority of the sample (69% to 24%). Of those who supported the death penalty, 14% justified their support because of its deterrent effect, 33% because the punishment fits the crime, and 53% for both deterrence and punishment reasons. For those who both supported and opposed the death penalty, 44% thought the cost of implementing it should be a consideration in whether it is adopted or not and 56% said cost should not be a consideration.

The only significant split in support and opposition to capital punishment was along party lines. Among those who identified themselves as Republicans, 87% supported the death penalty. For Democrats, 58% supported capital

punishment.

E. Disability policy

This year's survey examined a relatively unexplored area of public policy, namely, government actions to affect the employment of the handicapped. The results indicate that Kansans want government to be involved. Approximately 54% believed government should take bold, new actions in the disability policy area.

A second set of findings concerned the priorities of Kansans in regard to government involvement. Table 4 presents mean rankings for four types of public sector actions to affect the employment status of disabled persons. The sample ranked rehabilitation first, public awareness activities second, civil rights enforcement third, and income assistance fourth.

Support for rehabilitation and civil rights enforcement was greatest among Democrats, while support for public awareness was higher for Republicans. Other significant differences were not found, and in particular, there were no differences between disabled and non-disabled members of the sample.

=====

TABLE 4:
 PREFERENCES FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION TO
 AFFECT THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISABLED
 (1 = High Priority - 4 = Low Priority)

<u>Types of Actions</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Dev</u>
Rehabilitation	1.82	.88
Public Awareness	2.29	1.06
Civil Rights Enforcement	2.81	1.04
Income Assistance	3.03	1.07

=====

ECONOMIC ISSUES

A. Introduction

A variety of economic and budgetary issues were covered by the 1987 survey. The survey addressed the condition of the Kansas economy, economic development, tax increases, expenditure cuts, and the expected tax windfall.

B. Condition of The Kansas Economy

The perceived condition of the Kansas economy has become more negative since last year's survey. Table 5 indicates a 9% increase, from 33% in 1986 to 42% in 1987, among those who believe the state economy is declining. As in last year's survey, younger persons and rural residents were more likely to think the economy was remaining the same or getting worse.

C. Economic Development

The continuing negative perception of the Kansas economy suggests one reason why Kansans support state action on economic development. In fact, support for economic development has increased since last year. Table 6 shows that Kansans wanting no involvement in economic development dropped from 13% to 7%, while those wanting bold, new actions increased from 50% to 62%. Economic development was favored most by college educated, urban residents.

=====

TABLE 5:
CONDITION OF THE KANSAS ECONOMY

<u>Response Categories</u>	<u>Percent In 1986 Survey</u>	<u>Percent In 1987 Survey</u>
Rapidly Improving	2%	2%
Slowly Improving	13%	11%
Remaining the Same	52%	45%
Slowly Declining	20%	28%
Rapidly Declining	13%	14%
Totals	100%	100%
N	(543)	(602)

=====

=====

TABLE 6:
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

<u>Response Categories</u>	<u>Percent In 1986 Survey</u>	<u>Percent In 1987 Survey</u>
No Involvement	12%	7%
Minimal Involvement	38%	31%
Major Involvement	50%	62%

=====

D. Tax Increases

The current state budget crisis prompted a question about preferences for tax increases. Table 7 presents mean rankings for four different state taxes. The respondents ranked corporate income taxes as their first choice for an increase, sales second, gasoline third, and individual income fourth. Approximately 57% of the sample ranked corporate income taxes as their first preference for an increase and 60% listed personal income taxes as last. There was no significant relationship between lower and higher income households and preferences for tax increases.

=====

TABLE 7:
PREFERENCES FOR TAX INCREASES
(1 = FIRST CHOICE - 4 = LOWEST CHOICE)

<u>Types of Taxes</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Dev</u>
Corporate Income Tax	1.77	1.01
Sales Taxes	2.41	1.03
Gas Tax	2.48	.89
Individual Income Tax	3.28	.99

=====

E. Spending Cuts

In lieu of tax increases, questions were asked about preferences for spending cuts in the state. Table 8 provides the mean preferences for cuts in spending. Prisons were ranked first for cuts, highways second, economic

development third, human services fourth, higher education fifth, and public education last. About a third of the sample ranked prisons as first for cuts and about half of the sample ranked public education last for cuts. College educated respondents were more likely to rank cuts in highways or prisons as first. Accordingly, educated respondents were more likely to rank cuts in education last. The only other difference within the sample was based on party affiliation. Democrats were less likely to rank cuts in human services high, while Republicans were more likely to rank them at the top of the list.

=====

TABLE 8:
 PREFERENCES FOR SPENDING CUTS
 (1 = HIGH RANKING - 6 = LOW RANKING)

<u>Types of Spending</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Dev</u>
Prisons	2.47	1.47
Highways	2.90	1.41
Economic Development	3.17	1.48
Human Services	3.51	1.81
Higher Education	3.72	1.58
Public Education	4.98	1.34

=====

F. Tax Windfall

The sample preferences for spending of the tax windfall

were reversed from the rankings for cuts in spending. In other words, those who thought prisons should have their spending cut first were also inclined to think prisons should be the last to receive the proceeds of the tax windfall. The respondents thought the tax windfall should be first spent on public education, higher education second, human services third, returned to the taxpayers fourth, highways fifth, economic development sixth, and prisons last. College educated persons ranked spending on education first and spending on prisons last. About 29% of the sample ranked returning the monies to the taxpayer first and 36% ranked a return to the taxpayer as last. Rural residents were more in favor of returning the windfall to taxpayers.

=====

TABLE 9:
 PREFERENCES FOR SPENDING OF TAX WINDFALL
 (1 = HIGH RANKING - 7 = LOW RANKING)

<u>Types of Spending</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Dev</u>
Public Education	2.17	1.46
Higher Education	3.35	1.63
Human Services	3.89	1.85
Taxpayers	4.16	2.57
Highways	4.23	1.61
Economic Development	4.41	1.71
Prisons	5.32	1.57

=====

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

A. Introduction

Two environmental issues were examined in this year's survey. The first dealt with a ban on the storage of radioactive waste in the state and the other concerned the control of chemical pesticides. Table 10 summarizes the support and opposition to these issues.

=====

TABLE 10:
SUMMARY OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION TO ENVIRONMENT ISSUES

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Neutral</u>
Ban on Storage of Radioactive Waste	75%	19%	6%
Control of Pesticides	83%	17%	-

=====

B. Radioactive Wastes

A ban on the storage of radioactive wastes received strong support. About 75% of those interviewed supported such a ban, 19% were opposed and 6% were neutral. No significant differences were found among the sample on this issue.

C. Control Of Chemical Pesticides

Kansans also want the state to increase its efforts to regulate the manufacture and application of chemical pesticides. Over 83% supported such controls, 17% were

opposed. As with the ban on wastes, no significant socio-economic, political, or geographic differences were discovered.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

Q1 First of all, how would you rate Kansas as a place to live - excellent, good, fair, or poor?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Excellent	196	34.9	35.0
Good	277	49.5	84.5
Fair	68	12.1	96.6
Poor	19	3.4	100.0
TOTAL	----- 560	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	1		

Q2 In your opinion, is the economy of Kansas improving, declining, or remaining about the same?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Rapidly Improving	12	2.2	2.2
Slowly Improving	59	10.9	13.1
Remaining the Same	242	44.6	57.6
Slowly Declining	153	28.2	85.8
Rapidly Declining	77	14.2	100.0
TOTAL	----- 543	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	18		

Q3 Which of the following statements best describes your attitude about economic development?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
State and local governments should not get involved.	38	7.1	7.1
State and local governments should have a minimal role in encouraging economic development.	168	31.4	38.5

State and local governments should take bold, new actions to encourage economic development.	329	61.5	100.0
TOTAL	----- 535	----- 100.0	----- -----
MISSING CASES	26		

Q4 If state tax receipts are below what is expected, which of the following tax increases would you favor most and least? I would like for you to rank these taxes from your highest to lowest preference?

A) Gas Tax

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	73	14.5	14.5
Second Preference	178	35.4	49.9
Third Preference	190	37.8	87.7
Fourth Preference	62	12.3	100.0
TOTAL	----- 503	----- 100.0	----- -----
MISSING CASES	58		

B) Sales Tax

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	119	23.6	23.6
Second Preference	154	30.5	54.1
Third Preference	140	27.7	81.8
Fourth Preference	92	18.2	100.0
TOTAL	----- 505	----- 100.0	----- -----
MISSING CASES	56		

C) Individual Income Tax

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	35	7.0	7.0
Second Preference	90	17.9	24.9
Third Preference	76	15.1	40.0
Fourth Preference	302	60.0	100.0
TOTAL	----- 503	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	58		

D) Corporate Income Tax

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	294	57.3	57.3
Second Preference	84	16.4	73.7
Third Preference	93	18.1	91.8
Fourth Preference	42	8.2	100.0
TOTAL	----- 513	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	48		

Q5 An alternative to tax increases is a reduction in spending in state programs. Please rank your preferences for cuts in the following state programs?

A) Public education

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	13	2.9	2.9
Second Preference	20	4.5	7.4
Third Preference	34	7.6	15.1
Fourth Preference	52	11.7	26.7
Fifth Preference	102	22.9	49.7
Sixth Preference	224	50.3	100.0
TOTAL	----- 445	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	116		

B) Higher education

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	58	13.0	13.0
Second Preference	59	13.2	26.2
Third Preference	68	15.2	41.5
Fourth Preference	67	15.0	56.5
Fifth Preference	152	34.1	90.6
Sixth Preference	42	9.4	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	446	100.0	
MISSING CASES	115		

C) Highways

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	99	22.3	22.3
Second Preference	91	20.5	42.9
Third Preference	107	24.2	67.0
Fourth Preference	78	17.6	84.7
Fifth Preference	38	8.6	93.2
Sixth Preference	30	6.8	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	443	100.0	
MISSING CASES	118		

D) Economic development

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	70	15.9	15.9
Second Preference	91	20.7	36.6
Third Preference	95	21.6	58.2
Fourth Preference	92	20.9	79.1
Fifth Preference	62	14.1	93.2
Sixth Preference	30	6.8	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	440	100.0	
MISSING CASES	121		

E) Prisons

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	148	33.1	33.1
Second Preference	121	27.1	60.2
Third Preference	75	16.8	77.0
Fourth Preference	47	10.5	87.5
Fifth Preference	35	7.8	95.3
Sixth Preference	21	4.7	100.0
TOTAL	447	100.0	
MISSING CASES	114		

F) Human services

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	85	19.1	19.1
Second Preference	68	15.3	34.5
Third Preference	54	12.2	46.6
Fourth Preference	88	19.8	66.4
Fifth Preference	48	10.8	77.3
Sixth Preference	101	22.7	100.0
TOTAL	444	100.0	
MISSING CASES	117		

Q6 You may have heard that changes in the federal income tax may increase the amount Kansas state government will collect in state income tax. I would like for you to rank whether the state should spend it on.....

A) Public education

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	200	43.5	43.5
Second Preference	135	29.3	72.8
Third Preference	41	8.9	81.7
Fourth Preference	39	8.5	90.2
Fifth Preference	25	5.4	95.7
Sixth Preference	15	3.3	98.9
Seventh Preference	5	1.1	100.0
TOTAL	460	100.0	
MISSING CASE	101		

B) Higher education

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	33	7.4	7.4
Second Preference	142	32.0	39.4
Third Preference	97	21.8	61.3
Fourth Preference	57	12.8	74.1
Fifth Preference	54	12.2	86.3
Sixth Preference	45	10.1	96.4
Seventh Preference	16	3.6	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	439	100.0	
MISSING CASES	122		

C) Highways

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	23	5.2	5.2
Second Preference	44	10.0	15.3
Third Preference	85	19.4	34.6
Fourth Preference	86	19.6	54.2
Fifth Preference	94	21.4	75.6
Sixth Preference	72	16.4	92.0
Seventh Preference	35	8.0	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	439	100.0	
MISSING CASES	122		

D) Economic development

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	35	8.1	8.1
Second Preference	22	5.1	13.2
Third Preference	72	16.6	29.8
Fourth Preference	86	19.9	49.7
Fifth Preference	88	20.3	70.0
Sixth Preference	81	18.7	88.7
Seventh Preference	49	11.3	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	433	100.0	
MISSING CASES	128		

E) Prisons

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	5	1.2	1.2
Second Preference	20	4.6	5.8
Third Preference	38	8.8	14.5
Fourth Preference	59	13.6	28.1
Fifth Preference	77	17.7	45.9
Sixth Preference	114	26.3	72.1
Seventh Preference	121	27.9	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	434	100.0	
MISSING CASES	127		

F) Human services

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	56	12.8	12.8
Second Preference	61	13.9	26.7
Third Preference	77	17.5	44.2
Fourth Preference	73	16.6	60.8
Fifth Preference	63	14.4	75.2
Sixth Preference	71	16.2	91.3
Seventh Preference	38	8.7	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	439	100.0	
MISSING CASES	122		

G) Taxpayers themselves

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	143	29.1	29.1
Second Preference	40	8.1	37.3
Third Preference	38	7.7	45.0
Fourth Preference	35	7.1	52.1
Fifth Preference	25	5.1	57.2
Sixth Preference	29	5.9	63.1
Seventh Preference	181	36.9	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	491	100.0	
MISSING CASES	70		

I am now going to read you a list of issues that are currently being discussed in Kansas. For the following issues, please indicate whether you support or oppose their implementation.

Q7 A ban on the storage of low-level radioactive waste in the State?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Support	270	50.5	50.5
Moderate Support	130	24.3	74.8
Neutral	31	5.8	80.6
Moderate Opposed	61	11.4	92.0
Strongly Opposed	43	8.0	100.0
TOTAL	535	100.0	
MISSING CASES	26		

Q8 Prohibiting the smoking of cigarettes in the workplace?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Support	237	43.6	43.6
Moderate Support	97	17.8	61.4
Neutral	47	8.6	70.0
Moderate Opposed	66	12.1	82.2
Strongly Opposed	97	17.8	100.0
TOTAL	544	100.0	
MISSING CASES	17		

Q9 Authorizing drug testing for Kansas employees whose work involves public safety? (PRISON GUARDS, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, ETC)

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Support	364	67.3	67.3
Moderate Support	110	20.3	87.6
Neutral	16	3.0	90.6
Moderate Opposed	21	3.9	94.5
Strongly Opposed	30	5.5	100.0
TOTAL	541	100.0	
MISSING CASES	20		

Q10 Authorizing drug testing for intercollegiate athletes?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Support	297	55.0	55.0
Moderate Support	129	23.9	78.9
Neutral	31	5.7	84.6
Moderate Opposed	46	8.5	93.1
Strongly Opposed	37	6.9	100.0
	-----		-----
TOTAL	540	100.0	
MISSING CASES	21		

Q11 The death penalty for certain types of first degree murder?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Support	275	50.9	50.9
Moderate Support	100	18.5	69.4
Neutral	37	6.9	76.3
Moderate Opposed	47	8.7	85.0
Strongly Opposed	81	15.0	100.0
	-----		-----
TOTAL	540	100.0	
MISSING CASES	21		

FOR THOSE ANSWERING SUPPORT TO QUESTION 11, ASK Q12.

Q12 Is your support for the death penalty based on its deterrent effect on criminals or on your belief that the punishment fits the crime, or both?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Deterrence	52	14.1	14.1
Punishment	122	33.2	47.3
Both	194	52.7	100.0
	-----		-----
TOTAL	368	100.0	
MISSING CASES	193		

Q13 Should the cost to the state be a consideration in whether or not Kansas adopts the death penalty?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Yes	231	44.4	44.4
No	289	55.6	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	520	100.0	
MISSING CASES	41		

Q14 Do you think Kansas should increase its efforts to regulate the manufacture and application of chemical pesticides?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Yes	410	83.2	83.2
No	83	16.8	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	493	100.0	
MISSING CASES	68		

Q15 For the following ways government assists the handicapped in the employment area, which do you feel Kansas should have as its highest through its lowest priority?

A) Using education and information to promote positive attitudes about the employability of the disabled

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	145	28.4	28.4
Second Preference	164	32.1	60.5
Third Preference	110	21.5	82.0
Fourth Preference	92	18.0	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	511	100.0	
MISSING CASES	50		

B) Supplying income assistance and health benefits to compensate the disabled for their inability to obtain employment

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	68	13.3	13.3
Second Preference	81	15.9	29.2
Third Preference	129	25.2	54.4
Fourth Preference	233	45.6	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	511	100.0	
MISSING CASES	50		

C) Providing employment training, skills counseling and supported work for the disabled

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	239	46.0	46.0
Second Preference	156	30.0	76.0
Third Preference	106	20.4	96.3
Fourth Preference	19	3.7	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	520	100.0	
MISSING CASES	41		

D) Stopping job discrimination in hiring and accommodations through laws and regulations

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
First Preference	74	14.5	14.5
Second Preference	113	22.2	36.7
Third Preference	161	31.6	68.2
Fourth Preference	162	31.8	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	510	100.0	
MISSING CASES	51		

Q16 Which of the following statements best describes your attitude about government involvement in affecting the employment of the handicapped?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Government should not get involved.	26	4.9	4.9
Government should have a minimal role in affecting the employment of the handicapped.	215	40.9	45.8
Government should take bold, new actions to encourage the employment of the handicapped.	285	54.2	100.0
TOTAL	----- 526	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	35		

Now I would like to ask you a few questions about yourself and we'll be finished.

Q17 Do you own or rent your home?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Own	406	75.6	75.6
Rent	131	24.4	100.0
TOTAL	----- 537	----- 100.0	-----
MISSING CASES	24		

Q18 What level of formal education have you completed?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
High School or Less	232	42.6	42.6
Some College or College Graduate	262	48.1	90.6

Professional or Graduate Degree	51	9.4	100.0
TOTAL	545	100.0	
MISSING CASES	16		

Q19 In which of the following categories would you place your total annual family income? Stop me when I get to the category that fits you.

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Less than 15,000	137	26.8	26.8
15,000 to 40,000	270	52.8	79.6
Over 40,000	104	20.4	100.0
TOTAL	511	100.0	
MISSING CASES	50		

Q20 What is your age?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
18 to 30	143	26.5	26.5
31 to 50	203	37.6	64.1
51 to 70	129	23.9	88.0
Over 70	64	12.0	100.0
TOTAL	539	100.0	
MISSING CASES	22		

Q21 Do you have a physical disability?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Yes	52	9.6	9.6
No	492	90.4	100.0
TOTAL	544	100.0	
MISSING CASES	17		

Q22 Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Strong Republican	82	15.5	15.5
Moderate Republican	124	23.5	39.0
Independent	161	30.5	69.5
Moderate Democrat	75	14.2	83.7
Strong Democrat	86	16.3	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	528	100.0	
MISSING CASES	33		

Q23 Sex of Respondent

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Male	209	37.3	38.5
Female	334	61.5	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	543	100.0	
MISSING CASES	18		

Q24 County Residence **

VALUE LABEL	FREQUENCY	VALID %	CUM %
Urban	207	36.9	36.9
Rural	354	63.1	100.0
	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL	561	100.0	
MISSING CASES	0		

**According to the 1986 Kansas Statistical Abstract, urban counties are Douglas, Sedgwick, Shawnee, Wyandotte, Riley, Leavenworth, and Johnson. All other counties are rural.