

1995 Vermonter Poll - Vermonters Rate the Contract with America, and Political Figures

Almost one-half of Vermont's registered voters do not support the Republican Contract with America, according to the results of the 1995 Vermonter Poll. In December of 1995, the Center for Rural Studies at the University of Vermont surveyed by telephone 705 registered voters around the state.

Survey respondents were asked whether they supported or opposed the "national political initiative known as the Contract with America." According to 1995 Vermonter Poll results, almost one-half of Vermonters surveyed (48.2%) opposed the Contract, 23.6% supported it, and 26.4% indicated they did not know whether or not they supported it (Table 1). State-level survey results had a margin of error of +/-5% with a statistical confidence of 95%.

Similar trends were discovered when analyzing responses from the Chittenden County and Northeast Kingdom regions where the Contract was opposed by 49.5% and 45.8% of respondents, respectively (Table 1). Regional results had a margin of error of +/-5% with a statistical confidence of 90%.

Table 1. Support for Contract with America: Statewide and Regionally (All figures are in percentages)

Support/Oppose Contract with America	Vermont (N=705)	Chittenden County (N=281)	Northeast Kingdom (N=118)
Support	23.6	26.3	27.1
Oppose	48.2	49.5	45.8
Don't Know	26.4	22.4	26.3
Refused	1.7	1.8	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Registered voters also were asked to gauge their favorability toward national and state-level political figures and candidates. In general, Vermont's state and national leadership received high favorability marks by survey respondents. Both Senators Patrick Leahy (D-VT) and James Jeffords (R-VT) were viewed favorably by 65.4% and 64.3% of respondents, respectively. Representative Bernard Sanders (I-VT) also was considered favorably by 58.1% of respondents.

At the state level, Governor Howard Dean received relatively high marks with 63.4% of respondents viewing him favorably, 24.3% unfavorably, and 11.0% undecided. Lt. Governor Barbara Snelling (R), who has announced her candidacy for governor, was viewed favorably by 44.4% of respondents, while 35.6% viewed her unfavorably and 16.8% were undecided (Table 2).

According to poll results, U.S. House of Representatives candidate, Susan Sweetser (R), was not recognized by 25.8% of the registered voters surveyed. Approximately 27 percent of survey respondents viewed her favorably, 14.4% were unfavorable, and 31.7% were undecided. Candidates for Lt. Governor, Douglas Racine (D) and John Carroll (R), also were not recognized by relatively large percentages of respondents, 25.8% and 17.4%, respectively. Racine was viewed favorably by 23.1% of the respondents, unfavorably by 13.8%, and 36.2% were undecided. Carroll was considered favorably by 21.7% of those surveyed, unfavorably by 28.8%, and 31.1% were undecided (Table 2).

When asked about national political figures, more than half of the Vermonters surveyed (55.0%) were favorable toward President Bill Clinton, while 34.3% were unfavorable, and 9.7% undecided. The nation's First Lady, Hillary Clinton, was viewed favorably by 49.6% of poll respondents, unfavorably by 36.8%, and 11.4% were undecided on how they favored the president's spouse. Both leaders of the nation's Senate and House of Representatives were viewed less favorably by respondents. One-third of Vermonters polled indicated they viewed Senator Bob Dole (R) favorably, while nearly one-half (49.5%) viewed him unfavorably. House Speaker Rep. Newt Gingrich (R) received the lowest favorability rating of all political figures in question with 13.2% of respondents reporting favorably toward him, 75.6% unfavorably, and 8.5% undecided (Table 2).

Table 2.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures: Statewide Sample
(All numbers are percents)

Political Figure	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	Refuse
Patrick Leahy	65.4	20.2	12.9	0.7	0.8
James Jeffords	64.3	19.1	14.6	1.0	1.0
Bernard Sanders	58.1	31.5	8.1	1.0	1.2
Howard Dean	63.4	24.3	11.0	0.5	0.8
Barbara Snelling	44.4	35.6	16.8	1.9	1.3
Susan Sweetser	27.3	14.4	31.7	25.8	0.8
Doug Racine	23.1	13.8	36.2	25.8	1.2
John Carroll	21.7	28.8	31.1	17.4	1.0
Bill Clinton	55.0	34.3	9.7	0.0	1.0
Hillary Clinton	49.6	36.8	11.4	0.0	2.1
Bob Dole	33.0	49.5	15.8	0.6	1.1
Newt Gingrich	13.2	75.6	8.5	1.8	0.9

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Comparison of 1995 findings to similar questions asked in the 1993 Vermonter Poll revealed significant declines in favorability toward Gov. Dean (from 72.2% to 63.9%), Lt. Gov. Snelling (from 61.2% to 45.0%), and Mrs. Clinton (from 63.6% to 50.7%). Favorability toward Sen. Leahy also changed significantly from 1993 to 1995. Those Vermonters who viewed him favorably stayed the same at about two-thirds of those polled each year; however, fewer Vermonters were unfavorable toward him in 1995 with an increase in those Vermonters who were undecided (Table 3).

Adapted from web to PDF

Table 3.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures: 1993 and 1995

Political Figure	Year	Favorable Percent	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy	1993	66.2	25.8	7.4	0.6	.00568*
	1995	66.0	20.4	13.0	0.7	
James Jeffords	1993	65.2	20.9	11.3	2.5	.06800
	1995	64.9	19.3	14.8	1.0	
Bernard Sanders	1993	54.5	34.9	9.4	1.2	.51200
	1995	58.8	31.9	8.2	1.0	
Howard Dean	1993	72.2	18.2	8.4	1.2	.00763*
	1995	63.9	24.5	11.1	0.5	
Barbara Snelling	1993	61.2	22.7	15.1	1.0	.00000*
	1995	45.0	36.0	17.1	1.9	
Bill Clinton	1993	59.7	32.1	7.8	0.4	.13917
	1995	55.6	34.7	9.8	0.0	
Hillary Clinton	1993	63.6	28.5	7.1	0.8	.00001*
	1995	50.7	37.6	11.7	0.0	

*Significantly different at the .05 level.

Source: 1993 and 1995 Vermonter Polls, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Looking specifically at the responses of the 1995 Chittenden Co. resident sample, favorability increased for Sen. Leahy (to 70.8%), President Clinton (to 58.4%), and Mrs. Clinton (to 54.8%). Favorability also increased for candidates Sweetser (to 43.1%) and Racine (to 33.8%), with fewer respondents failing to recognize them, 11.0% and 14.2%, respectively. Favorability for Carroll stayed about the same (at 23.1%) despite improved name recognition. Declines in favorability were reported by Chittenden Co. respondents for Sen. Dole (to 28.1%) and House Speaker Gingrich (to 10.3%). Levels of favorability remained similar for Sen. Jeffords (at 63.0%), Rep. Sanders (at 56.9%), Gov. Dean (at 63.0%), and Lt. Gov. Snelling (at 43.8%) (Table 4).

An additional sample was taken of the residents of Vermont's Northeast Kingdom (Caledonia, Essex, and Orleans Counties). Compared to the state-level sample, favorability increased regarding Lt. Gov. Snelling (to 48.7%) and House Speaker Gingrich (to 15.4%). The percentage of respondents undecided toward Gingrich also increased (to 18.8%). Favorability toward Sen. Jeffords remained similar to the statewide sample (at 62.4%). While favorability toward Sen. Leahy declined (to 60.7%), much of the increase in respondents was found among those who were undecided toward him (to 18.8%). Similarly, Rep. Sanders' favorability dropped slightly in the Northeast Kingdom (to 54.7%) with a corresponding increase in the percentage of respondents who were undecided toward him (to 13.7%) (Table 5).

Chittenden Co. respondents were compared to the respondents from Vermont's remaining 13 counties. As shown in Table 6, few significant differences were found between these two groups. Statistically significant differences were discovered regarding favorability toward Snelling, Sweetser, and Racine. While favorability toward Snelling was similar between Chittenden Co. residents (44.4%) and nonresidents (45.1%), a larger percentage of Chittenden Co. residents viewed her unfavorably (42.6%) than did nonresidents (34.1%). County residents also tended to be more undecided about Snelling (18.7%) than nonresidents (11.6%). Sweetser was viewed more favorably by Chittenden Co. respondents (43.5%) than nonresident respondents (22.8%); however, more nonresidents (30.3%) did not recognize her name than Chittenden Co. residents (11.2%). Similarly, the significant difference found between Chittenden Co. respondents and nonresident respondents regarding Racine, was most likely due to more nonresidents indicating they did not recognize his name (29.5%) than did resident respondents (14.5%) (Table 6).

Respondents from the Northeast Kingdom (Caledonia, Essex, and Orleans Counties) were compared to Vermont's remaining 11 counties. As shown in Table 7, statistically significant differences in favorability were discovered regarding Gingrich, Sanders, Racine, and Carroll. While favorability toward Gingrich was similar between NEK respondents (15.5%) and the remainder of the state (13.1%), NEK respondents also were more undecided (19.0%) than non-NEK respondents (7.4%). Favorability toward Sanders also was similar between NEK respondents (55.2%) and non-NEK respondents (59.3%); however, NEK respondents (13.8%) were more undecided than non-NEK respondents (7.6%). For Racine and Carroll, favorability levels were influenced most by larger percentages of NEK respondents being undecided or not recognizing their names (Table 7).

Adapted from web to PDF

Table 4.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures: Chittenden County Sample
(All figures are in percent)

Political Figure	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	Refused
Patrick Leahy	70.8	18.5	9.6	0.0	1.1
James Jeffords	63.0	21.7	13.5	0.7	1.7
Bernard Sanders	56.9	34.5	7.1	0.4	1.1
Howard Dean	63.0	24.2	11.7	0.0	1.1
Barbara Snelling	43.8	42.0	11.4	1.4	1.4
Susan Sweetser	43.1	19.2	25.6	11.0	1.1
Doug Racine	33.8	20.6	29.5	14.2	1.8
John Carroll	23.1	33.1	29.2	12.5	2.1
Bill Clinton	58.4	29.5	11.0	0.0	1.1
Hillary Clinton	54.8	33.1	10.3	0.0	1.8
Bob Dole	28.1	55.9	13.9	0.7	1.4
Newt Gingrich	10.3	80.4	6.4	1.4	1.4

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Table 5.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures: Northeast Kingdom Sample
(All figures are percentages)

Political Figure	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	Refused
Patrick Leahy	60.7	22.2	16.2	0.0	0.9
James Jeffords	62.4	19.7	15.4	1.7	0.9
Bernard Sanders	54.7	28.2	13.7	2.6	0.9
Howard Dean	56.4	29.9	12.0	0.9	0.9
Barbara Snelling	48.7	31.6	16.2	2.6	0.9
Susan Sweetser	17.9	12.0	38.5	30.8	0.9
Doug Racine	12.8	8.5	43.6	34.2	0.9
John Carroll	17.9	15.4	40.2	25.6	0.9

Adapted from web to PDF

Bill Clinton	51.3	38.5	9.4	0.0	0.9
Hillary Clinton	44.9	41.5	11.0	0.0	1.7
Bob Dole	29.1	52.1	17.9	0.0	0.9
Newt Gingrich	15.4	63.2	18.8	1.7	0.9

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Table 6.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures:
Chittenden County v. Remainder of the State

Political Region Figure	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy					
Chittenden Co.	71.6	18.7	9.7	0.0	.08643
Remainder of VT	64.3	20.8	14.0	0.9	
James Jeffords					
Chittenden Co.	63.7	21.9	13.7	0.7	.67842
Remainder of VT	65.3	18.5	15.1	1.1	
Bernard Sanders					
Chittenden Co.	57.6	34.9	7.2	0.4	.45438
Remainder of VT	59.2	31.0	8.5	1.2	
Howard Dean					
Chittenden Co.	63.7	24.5	11.9	0.0	.55470
Remainder of VT	64.0	24.5	10.8	0.7	
Barbara Snelling					
Chittenden Co.	44.4	42.6	11.6	1.4	.03010*
Remainder of VT	45.1	34.1	18.7	2.1	
Susan Sweetser					
Chittenden Co.	43.5	19.4	25.9	11.2	.00000*
Remainder of VT	22.8	13.1	33.7	30.3	
Doug Racine					
Chittenden Co.	34.4	21.0	30.1	14.5	.00000*
Remainder of VT	20.2	11.8	38.5	29.5	

Adapted from web to PDF

John Carroll					
Chittenden Co.	23.6	33.8	29.8	12.7	.08357
Remainder of VT	21.4	27.7	31.9	19.0	
Bill Clinton					
Chittenden Co.	59.0	35.6	11.2	0.0	.21820
Remainder of VT	54.6	36.1	9.4	0.0	
Hillary Clinton					
Chittenden Co.	55.8	33.7	10.5	0.0	.23462
Remainder of VT	49.2	38.8	12.0	0.0	
Bob Dole					
Chittenden Co.	28.5	56.7	14.1	0.7	.16100
Remainder of VT	34.8	48.0	16.6	0.6	
Newt Gingrich					
Chittenden Co.	10.5	81.6	6.5	1.4	.20894
Remainder of VT	14.2	74.7	9.2	2.0	

*Significantly different at the .05 level.

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Table 7.

Favorability of State and National Political Figures:
Northeast Kingdom v. Remainder of the State

Political Region Figure	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy					
NEK	61.2	22.4	16.4	0.0	.46568
Remainder of VT	66.5	20.1	12.6	0.7	
James Jeffords					
NEK	62.9	19.8	15.5	1.7	.86970
Remainder of VT	65.2	19.3	14.7	0.9	

Bernard Sanders

Adapted from web to PDF

	NEK	55.2	28.4	13.8	2.6	.05271*
	Remainder of VT	59.3	32.3	7.6	0.8	
Howard Dean						
	NEK	56.9	30.2	12.1	0.9	.41437
	Remainder of VT	64.7	23.8	10.9	0.5	
Barbara Snelling						
	NEK	49.1	31.9	16.4	2.6	.72103
	Remainder of VT	44.5	36.5	17.1	1.9	
Susan Sweetser						
	NEK	18.1	12.1	38.8	31.0	.05842
	Remainder of VT	28.7	14.9	31.1	25.4	
Doug Racine						
	NEK	12.9	8.6	44.0	34.5	.00399*
	Remainder of VT	24.7	14.5	35.7	25.1	
John Carroll						
	NEK	18.1	15.5	40.5	25.9	.00098*
	Remainder of VT	22.4	30.6	30.4	16.6	
Bill Clinton						
	NEK	51.7	38.8	9.5	0.0	.63140
	Remainder of VT	56.0	34.2	9.8	0.0	
Hillary Clinton						
	NEK	46.1	42.6	11.3	0.0	.52070
	Remainder of VT	51.2	37.0	11.7	0.0	
Bob Dole						
	NEK	29.3	52.6	18.1	0.0	.59803
	Remainder of VT	33.8	49.7	15.8	0.7	
Newt Gingrich						
	NEK	15.5	63.8	19.0	1.7	.00072*
	Remainder of VT	13.1	77.7	7.4	1.9	

*Significantly different at the .05 level.

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Favorability among respondents toward political candidates was also analyzed according to respondent demographic characteristics including gender, age, college attainment, high school attainment, and 1995 household income.

As shown in Table 8, significant differences in favorability according to gender were discovered for Mrs. Clinton, Dole, Gingrich, Jeffords, Sanders, and Dean. Male respondents were significantly more favorable than female respondents toward Dole (41.4% v. 26.5%), Gingrich (20.7% v. 7.0%), Jeffords (69.2% v. 61.3%), and Dean (69.5% v. 59.2%). Female respondents were statistically more favorable toward Mrs. Clinton (54.9% v. 45.7%) and Sanders (56.9% v. 60.5%).

Respondents were dichotomized into two groups: those with less than four years of college and those with a four-year college degree or more in educational attainment. According to Table 9, significant differences in favorability were found for President Clinton, Mrs. Clinton, Gingrich, Sweetser, and Carroll. Respondents with at least a college degree viewed President Clinton (61.9% v. 51.2%) and Mrs. Clinton (56.2% v. 46.8%) more favorably. Respondents with less than a college degree were more undecided about Speaker Gingrich (11.0% v. 5.4%) and viewed him less unfavorably (74.0% v. 79.3%) (Table 9).

Respondents were also dichotomized into two groups regarding high school educational attainment: those with a high school degree or less in educational attainment and those with more than a high school degree. Statistically significant differences in favorability between groups were discovered for President Clinton, Mrs. Clinton, Dole, Gingrich, Sweetser, Dean, Racine, and Carroll. Respondents with more than a high school degree viewed more favorably President Clinton (59.8% v. 46.9%), Mrs. Clinton (55.3% v. 41.1%), and Governor Dean (67.4% v. 55.9%). Respondents with more than a high school degree were more unfavorable toward Dole (51.9% v. 46.3%) and less undecided about him (14.3% v. 19.0%). While there was a general tendency to not favor Speaker Gingrich, those with a high school degree were more favorable toward him (15.0% v. 9.5%) and less undecided (6.4% v. 13.3%). For Sweetser, respondents with a high school degree or less were less favorable (21.2% v. 30.2%) and were more likely to not recognize her name (38.5% v. 20.4%) than respondents with more than a high school degree. For both Racine and Carroll, respondents with a high school degree or less were less likely to recognize their names (Table 10).

Respondent's 1995 household income was dichotomized to below and above the state's approximate median household income as reported in the 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing. As shown in Table 11, respondent household income did not significantly affect their favorability toward this group of state and national political figures.

Survey respondents reported a median age of approximately 45 years. Statistically significant differences by respondent age were discovered for Jeffords and Sanders. Respondents who were 45-years-old and older were more favorable than younger respondents toward both political figures. Additionally, younger respondents were more undecided toward Jeffords (18.6% v. 12.3%) (Table 12).

Adapted from web to PDF

Table 8. Favorability of State and National Political Figures: Respondent Gender
 Political Figure
 (All figures are percentages)

Respondent	Gender	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy	Male	64.2	22.1	11.3	0.5	.10968
	Female	67.5	17.2	14.5	0.8	
James Jeffords	Male	69.2	18.3	12.3	0.2	.03877*
	Female	61.3	20.2	16.8	1.7	
Bernard Sanders	Male	56.9	35.8	7.3	0.0	.02014*
	Female	60.5	28.6	9.0	1.9	
Howard Dean	Male	69.5	21.0	8.8	0.7	.03264*
	Female	59.2	27.4	13.0	0.4	
Barbara Snelling	Male	46.0	36.6	16.3	1.2	.52991
	Female	44.1	35.6	17.7	2.6	
Susan Sweetser	Male	26.0	15.5	33.0	25.5	.76165
	Female	28.9	13.7	31.0	26.4	
Doug Racine	Male	24.4	17.3	34.5	23.8	.07122
	Female	22.6	11.0	38.4	28.0	
John Carroll	Male	25.1	28.9	28.3	17.7	.20957
	Female	19.2	29.2	34.1	17.5	
Bill Clinton	Male	55.3	37.2	7.5	0.0	.12046

Adapted from web to PDF

	Female	55.8	32.5	11.7	0.0	
Hillary Clinton						
	Male	45.7	43.9	10.4	0.0	.00744*
	Female	54.9	32.3	12.8	0.0	
Bob Dole						
	Male	41.4	43.2	15.2	0.2	.00027*
	Female	26.5	55.8	16.7	1.0	
Newt Gingrich						
	Male	20.7	71.5	6.6	1.1	.00000*
	Female	7.0	80.3	10.2	2.4	

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Table 9.

Favorability of State and National Political Figures:
Respondent College Educational Attainment

Political Figure	Respondent Education	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy						
	LT College	65.0	20.0	14.6	0.4	.40774
	College Plus	67.1	20.8	11.0	1.0	
James Jeffords						
	LT College	65.0	20.7	13.7	0.6	.34186
	College Plus	64.7	17.4	16.3	1.6	
Bernard Sanders						
	LT College	59.1	31.2	8.8	0.9	.84964
	College Plus	58.3	32.9	7.5	1.3	
Howard Dean						
	LT College	61.1	26.7	11.4	0.8	.28441
	College Plus	67.3	21.7	10.7	0.2	
Barbara Snelling						

Adapted from web to PDF

LT College	49.0	33.7	15.3	2.0	.11580
College Plus	40.0	38.8	19.4	1.9	
Susan Sweetser					
LT College	26.1	12.5	31.0	30.4	.01474*
College Plus	29.1	17.5	33.3	20.2	
Doug Racine					
LT College	22.3	13.5	34.5	29.7	.09402
College Plus	24.5	14.6	39.7	21.3	
John Carroll					
LT College	22.8	26.0	29.8	21.5	.00732*
College Plus	20.9	33.5	33.1	12.5	
Bill Clinton					
LT College	51.2	39.3	9.5	0.0	.00962*
College Plus	61.9	28.5	9.7	0.0	
Hillary Clinton					
LT College	46.8	40.5	12.7	0.0	.05282*
College Plus	56.2	33.6	10.2	0.0	
Bob Dole					
LT College	33.7	48.5	16.7	1.1	.24543
College Plus	33.0	52.3	14.6	0.0	
Newt Gingrich					
LT College	12.2	74.0	11.0	2.8	.00561*
College Plus	14.8	79.3	5.4	0.5	

*Significantly different at the .05 level.

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Adapted from web to PDF

Table 10.
Favorability of State and National Political Figures:
Respondent High School Educational Attainment

Political Figure	Respondent Education	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy	HS or Less	63.5	18.5	17.2	0.7	.16621
	> HS	67.0	21.2	11.1	0.7	
James Jeffords	HS or Less	66.1	16.6	17.0	0.3	.24210
	> HS	64.3	20.6	13.8	1.4	
Bernard Sanders	HS or Less	58.1	29.8	11.3	0.7	.22221
	> HS	59.1	32.9	6.9	1.2	
Howard Dean	HS or Less	55.9	32.2	10.5	1.4	.00145*
	> HS	67.4	21.0	11.4	0.1	
Barbara Snelling	HS or Less	52.4	30.8	15.1	1.7	.07670
	> HS	41.8	38.2	17.9	2.1	
Susan Sweetser	HS or Less	21.2	9.3	31.0	38.5	.00000*
	> HS	30.2	17.0	32.4	20.4	
Doug Racine	HS or Less	20.3	15.2	30.6	33.9	.00717*
	> HS	24.5	13.4	39.5	22.6	
John Carroll	HS or Less	20.7	24.6	28.1	26.7	.00036*
	> HS	22.6	31.3	32.6	13.5	
Bill Clinton	HS or Less	46.9	42.3	10.8	0.0	.00555*

Adapted from web to PDF

	> HS	59.8	31.2	9.0	0.0	
Hillary Clinton	HS or Less	41.1	42.9	16.0	0.0	.00121*
	> HS	55.3	35.1	9.6	0.0	
Bob Dole	HS or Less	32.6	46.3	19.1	1.9	.00633*
	> HS	33.8	51.9	14.3	0.0	
Newt Gingrich	HS or Less	9.5	74.0	13.3	3.2	.00170*
	> HS	15.0	77.3	6.4	1.2	

* Significantly different at the .05 level.

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

Table 11.

Favorability of State and National Political Figures:
Respondent HH Income

Political Figure	Respondent Income	Favorable	Unfavorable	Undecided	Don't Recognize	CHISQ
Patrick Leahy	\$30,000 or Less	63.8	19.9	15.7	0.6	.29315
	> \$30,000	68.0	20.7	10.6	0.8	
James Jeffords	\$30,000 or Less	66.4	17.5	14.5	1.6	.65230
	> \$30,000	64.8	20.6	13.8	0.8	
Bernard Sanders	\$30,000 or Less	62.6	28.1	8.3	1.0	.50726
	> \$30,000	58.0	33.6	7.2	1.2	
Howard Dean	\$30,000 or Less	61.2	27.0	10.6	1.2	.18376
	> \$30,000	66.1	22.5	11.3	0.2	

Adapted from web to PDF

Barbara Snelling						
\$30,000 or Less	47.8	32.8	17.5	1.9		.31912
> \$30,000	42.2	40.1	15.9	1.8		
Susan Sweetser						
\$30,000 or Less	23.7	12.8	35.4	28.1		.16638
> \$30,000	29.5	15.8	31.6	23.1		
Doug Racine						
\$30,000 or Less	22.5	15.2	38.5	23.8		.44797
> \$30,000	23.4	12.5	35.7	28.4		
John Carroll						
\$30,000 or Less	21.3	27.5	29.8	21.5		.13564
> \$30,000	21.7	30.6	33.3	14.4		
Bill Clinton						
\$30,000 or Less	56.8	34.7	8.5	0.0		.91631
> \$30,000	55.4	35.4	9.2	0.0		
Hillary Clinton						
\$30,000 or Less	53.9	33.7	12.4	0.0		.10056
> \$30,000	49.7	41.4	8.9	0.0		
Bob Dole						
\$30,000 or Less	34.7	49.7	14.4	1.2		.51751
> \$30,000	32.9	51.4	15.4	0.3		
Newt Gingrich						
\$30,000 or Less	12.2	76.1	8.5	3.2		.29837
> \$30,000	13.7	77.0	8.1	1.9		

Source: 1995 Vermonter Poll, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont.

1995 Vermonter Poll - Introduction and Methodology

January 1996

Introduction:

The 1995 Vermonter Poll is a unique opportunity for researchers, policy makers, social advocates, and citizens to examine changes in public opinion regarding contemporary, and often controversial, issues in the public arena. Since 1990, the Center for Rural Studies at the University of Vermont has conducted four, state-wide polls of registered Vermonters (1990, 1993, 1994, and 1995). Results of these studies help document evolving public attitudes toward a variety of concerns with implications for public policy, programming development, and the allocation of shrinking public resources. Specific issues addressed in the Vermonter Poll Series include: favorability toward political figures; agriculture and the environment; community growth and economic development; satisfaction with community services; property tax reform; and the use of computers and communications technology. Additional questions are added to, or deleted from, the Vermonter Poll as issues become more or less timely.

The first report of the 1995 polling results focuses specifically on Vermonters' support of the "Contract with America" and favorability toward a number of state and national political figures. Political figure favorability responses are first compared to Vermonter's responses to similar questions in the 1993 Vermonter Opinion Poll. Additional comparisons are made according to whether respondents live in Chittenden County or Vermont's Northeast Kingdom. Finally, responses are analyzed according to selected respondent demographics including age, education, income, and gender.

Additional reports will be produced as analysis of the Vermonter Poll data progresses and issues become more timely. Future reports will focus on bovine somatotropin, the quality of Vermont's natural environment, community growth and development, public transportation, and electronic communications--computer use and Internet access.

Methodology

The 1995 Vermonter Poll was conducted and sponsored by the Center for Rural Studies, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, University of Vermont. This is the fourth in a series of state wide polls assessing the attitudes and orientations of voting Vermonters. This survey was conducted from December 4th to 7th, 1995, during the evening hours of 4 p.m. and 9 p.m.. Vermont households were contacted at random and survey respondents were selected randomly within participating households.

The 1995 survey was expanded to include specific survey samples for Chittenden County and the Northeast Kingdom (Caledonia, Essex, and Orleans Counties). While 400 surveys initially were needed to permit a statewide analysis of sufficient statistical confidence and precision (95%, +/-

5%), both Chittenden County and Vermont's Northeast Kingdom (Essex, Orleans, and Caledonia Counties) were over-sampled to allow for separate and comparative analyses of these distinct regions. In total, 702 registered Vermont voters completed the survey. To compensate for over sampling in certain parts of the state, different weights were assigned to data depending on the analysis required (See Table A). Weights were determined using the proportion of Vermont's total households found in these regions during the 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing. The results of the weighting process yielded a representative statewide sample population of 705 cases.

A conservative estimate of the margin of error associated with the statewide analysis is +/- 5.0% with a confidence interval of 95.0%. This means that if the survey were to be redone, 95 percent of the time the results would be the same within +/-5.0 percentage points for each particular question. The margin of error for the Chittenden County and Northeast Kingdom analyses is +/- 5.0% with a confidence interval of 90.0%. The margin of error associated with any given item in the survey increases as the sample size for individual questions are examined in greater detail such as in cross-tabulations.

Adapted from web to PDF

Table A.	Survey weights.		Assigned Weights			
	Region	Households in 1990*	Total Responses (N=702)	Statewide Analysis	Chittenden County Comparison	NEK Comparison
	Chittenden County	48,439	281	0.573016	1.000000	0.531515
	Northeast Kingdom	21,855	118	0.632668	0.488113	1.000000
	Remaining 10 Counties	140,356	303	1.549295	1.195300	1.195300
	Confidence/Precision			95%, +/-5%	90%, +/-5%	90%, +/-5%

* Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1A: Vermont.