UT/Texas Tribune Statewide Poll
February 2011
Crosstabs

[This page intentionally left blank]

Political interest * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	21	31	34	61	48	86	100	381
		% within Libcon scale	65.6%	62.0%	43.0%	28.2%	41.7%	50.9%	78.1%	48.3%
	Somewhat interested	Count	10	18	35	97	59	77	25	321
		% within Libcon scale	31.3%	36.0%	44.3%	44.9%	51.3%	45.6%	19.5%	40.7%
	Not very interested	Count	0	1	9	44	8	2	2	66
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	11.4%	20.4%	7.0%	1.2%	1.6%	8.4%
	Not at all interested	Count	1	0	1	14	0	4	1	21
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	.0%	1.3%	6.5%	.0%	2.4%	.8%	2.7%
Total		Count	32	50	79	216	115	169	128	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	81	24	25	40	67	24	115	1	377
		% within 7 point Party ID	49.4%	26.4%	41.7%	50.6%	63.2%	32.4%	58.4%	7.1%	48.0%
	Somewhat interested	Count	69	53	27	23	35	35	75	2	319

5

	% within 7 point Party ID	42.1%	58.2%	45.0%	29.1%	33.0%	47.3%	38.1%	14.3%	40.6%
Not very interested	Count	11	12	6	13	3	10	6	6	67
	% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	13.2%	10.0%	16.5%	2.8%	13.5%	3.0%	42.9%	8.5%
Not at all interested	Count	3	2	2	3	1	5	1	5	22
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	2.2%	3.3%	3.8%	.9%	6.8%	.5%	35.7%	2.8%
Total	Count	164	91	60	79	106	74	197	14	785
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	32	93	181	77	383
		% within age	26.2%	38.9%	56.0%	67.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	67	104	120	33	324
		% within age	54.9%	43.5%	37.2%	28.7%	40.6%
	Not very interested	Count	20	30	16	3	69
		% within age	16.4%	12.6%	5.0%	2.6%	8.6%
	Not at all interested	Count	3	12	6	2	23
		% within age	2.5%	5.0%	1.9%	1.7%	2.9%
Total		Count	122	239	323	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	14	113	135	32	58	32	384
		% within Education	48.3%	37.0%	50.6%	65.3%	54.7%	74.4%	48.1%
	Somewhat interested	Count	11	133	114	14	41	10	323
		% within Education	37.9%	43.6%	42.7%	28.6%	38.7%	23.3%	40.4%
	Not very interested	Count	3	46	10	3	6	1	69
		% within Education	10.3%	15.1%	3.7%	6.1%	5.7%	2.3%	8.6%
	Not at all interested	Count	1	13	8	0	1	0	23
		% within Education	3.4%	4.3%	3.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	2.9%
Total		Count	29	305	267	49	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	65	66	60	90	101	382
		% within Church attendance	49.2%	45.2%	55.6%	47.4%	45.5%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	57	62	39	83	82	323

7

		% within Church attendance	43.2%	42.5%	36.1%	43.7%	36.9%	40.5%
	Not very interested	Count	3	17	7	13	30	70
		% within Church attendance	2.3%	11.6%	6.5%	6.8%	13.5%	8.8%
	Not at all interested	Count	7	1	2	4	9	23
		% within Church attendance	5.3%	.7%	1.9%	2.1%	4.1%	2.9%
Total		Count	132	146	108	190	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	265	34	49	7	3	4	21	0	383
		% within Race	51.1%	33.7%	39.5%	50.0%	100.0%	40.0%	80.8%	.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	205	50	54	6	0	5	5	0	325
		% within Race	39.5%	49.5%	43.5%	42.9%	.0%	50.0%	19.2%	.0%	40.7%
	Not very interested	Count	34	14	17	1	0	0	0	2	68
		% within Race	6.6%	13.9%	13.7%	7.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	8.5%

8

Not at all interested	Count	15	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	23
	% within Race	2.9%	3.0%	3.2%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	2.9%
Total	Count	519	101	124	14	3	10	26	2	799
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	255	5	46	16	51	10	383
		% within Marital Status	52.5%	41.7%	47.9%	53.3%	35.9%	33.3%	48.1%
	Somewhat interested	Count	190	5	38	12	58	17	320
		% within Marital Status	39.1%	41.7%	39.6%	40.0%	40.8%	56.7%	40.2%
	Not very interested	Count	33	2	7	1	24	3	70
		% within Marital Status	6.8%	16.7%	7.3%	3.3%	16.9%	10.0%	8.8%
	Not at all interested	Count	8	0	5	1	9	0	23
		% within Marital Status	1.6%	.0%	5.2%	3.3%	6.3%	.0%	2.9%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	142	30	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Gender Crosstabulation

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	

Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	215	168	383
		% within Gender	57.5%	39.5%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	139	185	324
		% within Gender	37.2%	43.5%	40.6%
	Not very interested	Count	18	51	69
		% within Gender	4.8%	12.0%	8.6%
	Not at all interested	Count	2	21	23
		% within Gender	.5%	4.9%	2.9%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	104	185	93	382
		% within Urban/Rural	43.3%	48.7%	52.2%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	104	151	68	323
		% within Urban/Rural	43.3%	39.7%	38.2%	40.5%
	Not very interested	Count	23	35	12	70
		% within Urban/Rural	9.6%	9.2%	6.7%	8.8%
	Not at all interested	Count	9	9	5	23
		% within Urban/Rural	3.8%	2.4%	2.8%	2.9%
Total		Count	240	380	178	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					Total
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	84	109	41	39	109	382
		% within Metropolitan areas	49.7%	49.3%	57.7%	44.8%	43.8%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	75	85	19	41	103	323
		% within Metropolitan areas	44.4%	38.5%	26.8%	47.1%	41.4%	40.5%
	Not very interested	Count	7	23	7	6	26	69
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.1%	10.4%	9.9%	6.9%	10.4%	8.7%
	Not at all interested	Count	3	4	4	1	11	23
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	1.8%	5.6%	1.1%	4.4%	2.9%
Total		Count	169	221	71	87	249	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	79	61	58	69	54	60	381
		% within AP Region	49.1%	46.2%	48.3%	43.7%	52.4%	49.6%	47.9%
	Somewhat interested	Count	68	49	54	72	38	43	324

		% within AP Region	42.2%	37.1%	45.0%	45.6%	36.9%	35.5%	40.8%
	Not very interested	Count	10	18	5	14	8	13	68
		% within AP Region	6.2%	13.6%	4.2%	8.9%	7.8%	10.7%	8.6%
	Not at all interested	Count	4	4	3	3	3	5	22
		% within AP Region	2.5%	3.0%	2.5%	1.9%	2.9%	4.1%	2.8%
Total		Count	161	132	120	158	103	121	795
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	9	7	4	15	13	20	27	95
		% within Libcon scale	27.3%	14.3%	5.1%	6.9%	11.4%	11.8%	21.3%	12.1%
	Somewhat closely	Count	11	22	31	78	59	94	69	364
		% within Libcon scale	33.3%	44.9%	39.7%	35.9%	51.8%	55.6%	54.3%	46.3%
	Not that closely	Count	8	15	33	75	31	48	26	236
		% within Libcon scale	24.2%	30.6%	42.3%	34.6%	27.2%	28.4%	20.5%	30.0%
	Not at all	Count	5	4	10	47	11	7	5	89
		% within Libcon scale	15.2%	8.2%	12.8%	21.7%	9.6%	4.1%	3.9%	11.3%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	33	49	78	217	114	169	127	787
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	22	7	8	12	11	6	26	1	93
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.5%	7.9%	13.3%	15.0%	10.4%	8.1%	13.2%	6.3%	11.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	67	34	20	35	62	30	113	1	362
		% within 7 point Party ID	41.1%	38.2%	33.3%	43.8%	58.5%	40.5%	57.4%	6.3%	46.1%
	Not that closely	Count	54	32	20	22	29	21	50	6	234
		% within 7 point Party ID	33.1%	36.0%	33.3%	27.5%	27.4%	28.4%	25.4%	37.5%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	20	15	12	11	4	17	8	8	95
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.3%	16.9%	20.0%	13.8%	3.8%	23.0%	4.1%	50.0%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	163	89	60	80	106	74	197	16	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	8	18	52	19	97
		% within age	6.6%	7.5%	16.1%	16.5%	12.2%

13

Somewhat closely	Count	39	107	153	67	366	
	% within age	32.2%	44.6%	47.5%	58.3%	45.9%	
Not that closely	Count	44	70	96	27	237	
	% within age	36.4%	29.2%	29.8%	23.5%	29.7%	
Not at all	Count	27	45	21	2	95	
	% within age	22.3%	18.8%	6.5%	1.7%	11.9%	
Don't know	Count	3	0	0	0	3	
	% within age	2.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	
Total	Count	121	240	322	115	798	
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Following Texas legislative session * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	2	22	31	4	24	12	95
		% within Education	6.9%	7.2%	11.6%	8.2%	22.6%	27.9%	11.9%
	Somewhat closely	Count	11	129	137	25	44	21	367
		% within Education	37.9%	42.3%	51.3%	51.0%	41.5%	48.8%	45.9%
	Not that closely	Count	13	102	72	18	26	8	239
		% within Education	44.8%	33.4%	27.0%	36.7%	24.5%	18.6%	29.9%
	Not at all	Count	3	50	27	2	11	2	95
		% within Education	10.3%	16.4%	10.1%	4.1%	10.4%	4.7%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	0	0	1	0	3

			.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.4%
		% within Education							
Total		Count	29	305	267	49	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	24	16	12	21	21	94
		% within Church attendance	18.5%	11.0%	11.1%	11.1%	9.5%	11.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	56	73	60	89	89	367
		% within Church attendance	43.1%	50.3%	55.6%	47.1%	40.1%	46.2%
	Not that closely	Count	38	39	26	62	72	237
		% within Church attendance	29.2%	26.9%	24.1%	32.8%	32.4%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	12	17	8	17	39	93
		% within Church attendance	9.2%	11.7%	7.4%	9.0%	17.6%	11.7%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3
		% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.5%	.4%
Total		Count	130	145	108	189	222	794
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	64	8	12	3	2	1	6	0	96
		% within Race	12.4%	7.9%	9.8%	20.0%	66.7%	9.1%	24.0%	.0%	12.0%
	Somewhat closely	Count	250	35	55	7	1	3	15	0	366
		% within Race	48.3%	34.7%	45.1%	46.7%	33.3%	27.3%	60.0%	.0%	45.9%
	Not that closely	Count	148	37	41	4	0	3	4	0	237
		% within Race	28.6%	36.6%	33.6%	26.7%	.0%	27.3%	16.0%	.0%	29.7%
	Not at all	Count	55	21	14	1	0	4	0	0	95
		% within Race	10.6%	20.8%	11.5%	6.7%	.0%	36.4%	.0%	.0%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
		% within Race	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.4%
Total		Count	518	101	122	15	3	11	25	2	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	62	1	12	3	16	2	96
		% within Marital Status	12.8%	8.3%	12.6%	10.3%	11.3%	6.5%	12.1%
	Somewhat closely	Count	241	5	41	14	49	13	363
		% within Marital Status	49.6%	41.7%	43.2%	48.3%	34.8%	41.9%	45.7%

16

	Not that closely	Count	142	3	31	11	38	12	237
		% within Marital Status	29.2%	25.0%	32.6%	37.9%	27.0%	38.7%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	41	3	11	1	37	2	95
		% within Marital Status	8.4%	25.0%	11.6%	3.4%	26.2%	6.5%	12.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
		% within Marital Status	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	6.5%	.4%
Total		Count	486	12	95	29	141	31	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	60	37	97
		% within Gender	16.0%	8.7%	12.1%
	Somewhat closely	Count	190	177	367
		% within Gender	50.5%	41.7%	45.9%
	Not that closely	Count	107	131	238
		% within Gender	28.5%	30.9%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	17	78	95
		% within Gender	4.5%	18.4%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	2	1	3
		% within Gender	.5%	.2%	.4%
Total		Count	376	424	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	28	48	20	96
		% within Urban/Rural	11.6%	12.7%	11.3%	12.0%
	Somewhat closely	Count	97	183	87	367
		% within Urban/Rural	40.1%	48.3%	49.2%	46.0%
	Not that closely	Count	85	99	54	238
		% within Urban/Rural	35.1%	26.1%	30.5%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	29	49	16	94
		% within Urban/Rural	12.0%	12.9%	9.0%	11.8%
	Don't know	Count	3	0	0	3
		% within Urban/Rural	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	21	24	10	14	27	96

18

gsession								
		% within Metropolitan areas	12.4%	10.9%	13.9%	16.3%	10.8%	12.0%
	Somewhat closely	Count	74	110	40	36	106	366
		% within Metropolitan areas	43.5%	50.0%	55.6%	41.9%	42.2%	45.8%
	Not that closely	Count	59	57	14	28	81	239
		% within Metropolitan areas	34.7%	25.9%	19.4%	32.6%	32.3%	29.9%
	Not at all	Count	16	29	6	8	36	95
		% within Metropolitan areas	9.4%	13.2%	8.3%	9.3%	14.3%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3
		% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.4%	.4%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	251	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Following Texas legislative session	Extremely closely	Count	16	14	18	18	15	14	95
		% within AP Region	9.9%	10.6%	15.0%	11.4%	14.6%	11.5%	11.9%
	Somewhat closely	Count	75	65	51	68	46	63	368

		% within AP Region	46.3%	49.2%	42.5%	43.0%	44.7%	51.6%	46.2%
	Not that closely	Count	54	31	37	51	30	34	237
		% within AP Region	33.3%	23.5%	30.8%	32.3%	29.1%	27.9%	29.7%
	Not at all	Count	17	22	14	21	12	8	94
		% within AP Region	10.5%	16.7%	11.7%	13.3%	11.7%	6.6%	11.8%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
		% within AP Region	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	.4%
Total		Count	162	132	120	158	103	122	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	14	27	39	68	30	15	14	207
		% within Libcon scale	43.8%	54.0%	49.4%	31.2%	26.1%	9.0%	10.9%	26.2%
	Wrong track	Count	13	11	29	102	66	140	105	466
		% within Libcon scale	40.6%	22.0%	36.7%	46.8%	57.4%	83.8%	82.0%	59.1%
	Don't know	Count	5	12	11	48	19	12	9	116
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	24.0%	13.9%	22.0%	16.5%	7.2%	7.0%	14.7%
Total		Count	32	50	79	218	115	167	128	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	95	39	27	13	3	10	22	0	209
		% within 7 point Party ID	57.9%	43.3%	44.3%	16.5%	2.8%	13.5%	11.1%	.0%	26.5%
	Wrong track	Count	42	40	20	51	92	52	159	4	460
		% within 7 point Party ID	25.6%	44.4%	32.8%	64.6%	86.0%	70.3%	80.3%	26.7%	58.4%
	Don't know	Count	27	11	14	15	12	12	17	11	119
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.5%	12.2%	23.0%	19.0%	11.2%	16.2%	8.6%	73.3%	15.1%
Total		Count	164	90	61	79	107	74	198	15	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Country direction	Right direction	Count	44	74	70	20	208
		% within age	36.1%	30.7%	21.8%	17.4%	26.0%
	Wrong track	Count	49	128	212	82	471
		% within age	40.2%	53.1%	66.0%	71.3%	58.9%
	Don't know	Count	29	39	39	13	120
		% within age	23.8%	16.2%	12.1%	11.3%	15.0%
Total		Count	122	241	321	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

21

Country direction * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	5	78	69	16	32	9	209
		% within Education	17.9%	25.5%	25.9%	32.7%	30.2%	20.9%	26.2%
	Wrong track	Count	18	184	153	28	58	29	470
		% within Education	64.3%	60.1%	57.5%	57.1%	54.7%	67.4%	58.9%
	Don't know	Count	5	44	44	5	16	5	119
		% within Education	17.9%	14.4%	16.5%	10.2%	15.1%	11.6%	14.9%
Total		Count	28	306	266	49	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	24	40	38	51	55	208
		% within Church attendance	18.3%	27.4%	35.2%	26.7%	24.9%	26.1%
	Wrong track	Count	88	92	57	112	121	470
		% within Church attendance	67.2%	63.0%	52.8%	58.6%	54.8%	59.0%

Don't know	Count		19	14	13	28	45	119
	% within Church attendance		14.5%	9.6%	12.0%	14.7%	20.4%	14.9%
Total	Count		131	146	108	191	221	797
	% within Church attendance		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	91	61	42	8	2	1	3	0	208
		% within Race	17.5%	60.4%	33.9%	53.3%	66.7%	9.1%	12.0%	.0%	26.0%
	Wrong track	Count	348	24	63	6	1	8	21	0	471
		% within Race	67.1%	23.8%	50.8%	40.0%	33.3%	72.7%	84.0%	.0%	58.9%
	Don't know	Count	80	16	19	1	0	2	1	2	121
		% within Race	15.4%	15.8%	15.3%	6.7%	.0%	18.2%	4.0%	100.0%	15.1%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	3	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

23

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
								Marital Status	
Country direction	Right direction	Count	109	2	25	7	51	10	204
		% within Marital Status	22.5%	16.7%	26.3%	23.3%	35.7%	33.3%	25.7%
	Wrong track	Count	316	10	55	19	57	14	471
		% within Marital Status	65.2%	83.3%	57.9%	63.3%	39.9%	46.7%	59.2%
	Don't know	Count	60	0	15	4	35	6	120
		% within Marital Status	12.4%	.0%	15.8%	13.3%	24.5%	20.0%	15.1%
Total		Count	485	12	95	30	143	30	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Gender Crosstabulation

			Male	Female	Total
				Gender	
Country direction	Right direction	Count	103	105	208
		% within Gender	27.5%	24.8%	26.0%
	Wrong track	Count	239	231	470
		% within Gender	63.7%	54.5%	58.8%
	Don't know	Count	33	88	121
		% within Gender	8.8%	20.8%	15.1%
Total		Count	375	424	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

24

Country direction * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	87	96	25	208
		% within Urban/Rural	36.1%	25.3%	14.1%	26.1%
	Wrong track	Count	110	234	125	469
		% within Urban/Rural	45.6%	61.7%	70.6%	58.8%
	Don't know	Count	44	49	27	120
		% within Urban/Rural	18.3%	12.9%	15.3%	15.1%
Total		Count	241	379	177	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	60	62	17	24	44	207
		% within Metropolitan areas	35.3%	28.2%	23.3%	27.9%	17.6%	25.9%
	Wrong track	Count	88	132	42	49	160	471
		% within Metropolitan areas	51.8%	60.0%	57.5%	57.0%	64.0%	58.9%
	Don't know	Count	22	26	14	13	46	121

25

			12.9%	11.8%	19.2%	15.1%	18.4%	15.1%
Total		Count	170	220	73	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The first row label reads: % within Metropolitan areas

Country direction * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Country direction	Right direction	Count	40	37	43	42	19	27	208
		% within AP Region	24.7%	28.0%	35.8%	26.6%	18.4%	22.3%	26.1%
	Wrong track	Count	98	77	61	93	70	70	469
		% within AP Region	60.5%	58.3%	50.8%	58.9%	68.0%	57.9%	58.9%
	Don't know	Count	24	18	16	23	14	24	119
		% within AP Region	14.8%	13.6%	13.3%	14.6%	13.6%	19.8%	14.9%
Total		Count	162	132	120	158	103	121	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	6	5	9	66	52	107	78	323

26

		% within Libcon scale	18.2%	10.0%	11.5%	30.6%	44.8%	64.1%	60.9%	41.0%
	Wrong track	Count	25	38	56	103	43	32	28	325
		% within Libcon scale	75.8%	76.0%	71.8%	47.7%	37.1%	19.2%	21.9%	41.2%
	Don't know	Count	2	7	13	47	21	28	22	140
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	14.0%	16.7%	21.8%	18.1%	16.8%	17.2%	17.8%
Total		Count	33	50	78	216	116	167	128	788
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	29	30	13	17	62	36	131	0	318
		% within 7 point Party ID	17.7%	33.3%	21.7%	21.3%	59.0%	48.6%	66.5%	.0%	40.5%
	Wrong track	Count	111	41	38	42	28	25	38	4	327
		% within 7 point Party ID	67.7%	45.6%	63.3%	52.5%	26.7%	33.8%	19.3%	26.7%	41.7%
	Don't know	Count	24	19	9	21	15	13	28	11	140
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.6%	21.1%	15.0%	26.3%	14.3%	17.6%	14.2%	73.3%	17.8%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	105	74	197	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * age Crosstabulation

27

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	50	86	128	60	324
		% within age	41.0%	35.8%	39.8%	53.1%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	39	110	141	39	329
		% within age	32.0%	45.8%	43.8%	34.5%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	33	44	53	14	144
		% within age	27.0%	18.3%	16.5%	12.4%	18.1%
Total		Count	122	240	322	113	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	8	131	107	23	39	17	325
		% within Education	28.6%	42.8%	40.4%	46.0%	36.8%	38.6%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	13	102	114	25	51	24	329
		% within Education	46.4%	33.3%	43.0%	50.0%	48.1%	54.5%	41.2%
	Don't know	Count	7	73	44	2	16	3	145
		% within Education	25.0%	23.9%	16.6%	4.0%	15.1%	6.8%	18.1%
Total		Count	28	306	265	50	106	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

28

Texas direction * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	72	76	41	70	64	323
		% within Church attendance	55.0%	52.4%	38.0%	36.8%	29.0%	40.6%
	Wrong track	Count	36	48	55	80	109	328
		% within Church attendance	27.5%	33.1%	50.9%	42.1%	49.3%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	23	21	12	40	48	144
		% within Church attendance	17.6%	14.5%	11.1%	21.1%	21.7%	18.1%
Total		Count	131	145	108	190	221	795
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Race Crosstabulation

		Race								
		White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total

29

Texas direction	Right direction	Count	229	22	53	2	1	4	14	0	325
		% within Race	44.3%	21.8%	42.7%	14.3%	25.0%	33.3%	56.0%	.0%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	197	56	50	9	3	6	8	0	329
		% within Race	38.1%	55.4%	40.3%	64.3%	75.0%	50.0%	32.0%	.0%	41.2%
	Don't know	Count	91	23	21	3	0	2	3	2	145
		% within Race	17.6%	22.8%	16.9%	21.4%	.0%	16.7%	12.0%	100.0%	18.1%
Total		Count	517	101	124	14	4	12	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	229	1	26	12	43	9	320
		% within Marital Status	47.1%	9.1%	27.4%	41.4%	30.1%	29.0%	40.3%
	Wrong track	Count	176	9	52	13	63	17	330
		% within Marital Status	36.2%	81.8%	54.7%	44.8%	44.1%	54.8%	41.5%
	Don't know	Count	81	1	17	4	37	5	145
		% within Marital Status	16.7%	9.1%	17.9%	13.8%	25.9%	16.1%	18.2%
Total		Count	486	11	95	29	143	31	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Gender Crosstabulation

30

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	172	152	324
		% within Gender	46.1%	35.8%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	156	173	329
		% within Gender	41.8%	40.8%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	45	99	144
		% within Gender	12.1%	23.3%	18.1%
Total		Count	373	424	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	80	161	83	324
		% within Urban/Rural	33.1%	42.7%	46.9%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	108	160	61	329
		% within Urban/Rural	44.6%	42.4%	34.5%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	54	56	33	143
		% within Urban/Rural	22.3%	14.9%	18.6%	18.0%
Total		Count	242	377	177	796
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	65	91	29	32	106	323
		% within Metropolitan areas	38.7%	41.6%	40.3%	37.2%	42.4%	40.6%
	Wrong track	Count	72	97	30	43	86	328
		% within Metropolitan areas	42.9%	44.3%	41.7%	50.0%	34.4%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	31	31	13	11	58	144
		% within Metropolitan areas	18.5%	14.2%	18.1%	12.8%	23.2%	18.1%
Total		Count	168	219	72	86	250	795
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	66	44	49	67	55	43	324
		% within AP Region	40.7%	33.6%	40.5%	42.7%	53.4%	35.0%	40.7%
	Wrong track	Count	57	69	49	68	33	53	329

		% within AP Region	35.2%	52.7%	40.5%	43.3%	32.0%	43.1%	41.3%
	Don't know	Count	39	18	23	22	15	27	144
		% within AP Region	24.1%	13.7%	19.0%	14.0%	14.6%	22.0%	18.1%
Total		Count	162	131	121	157	103	123	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	6	7	26	55	23	35	21	173
		% within Libcon scale	19.4%	14.0%	32.9%	25.6%	19.8%	20.8%	16.4%	22.0%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	9	18	17	39	17	13	11	124
		% within Libcon scale	29.0%	36.0%	21.5%	18.1%	14.7%	7.7%	8.6%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	1	5	2	27	30	50	38	153
		% within Libcon scale	3.2%	10.0%	2.5%	12.6%	25.9%	29.8%	29.7%	19.4%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	3	2	4	17	11	20	20	77
		% within Libcon scale	9.7%	4.0%	5.1%	7.9%	9.5%	11.9%	15.6%	9.8%
	Health care	Count	2	2	11	9	6	9	1	40
		% within Libcon scale	6.5%	4.0%	13.9%	4.2%	5.2%	5.4%	.8%	5.1%
	Moral decline	Count	0	0	5	5	3	7	7	27
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	6.3%	2.3%	2.6%	4.2%	5.5%	3.4%
	National security/terrorism	Count	1	0	0	2	1	6	5	15
		% within Libcon scale	3.2%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.9%	3.6%	3.9%	1.9%

Immigration	Count	1	1	0	10	6	8	6	32
	% within Libcon scale	3.2%	2.0%	.0%	4.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.7%	4.1%
Taxes	Count	0	1	0	2	1	6	1	11
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.9%	.9%	3.6%	.8%	1.4%
Gas prices	Count	0	0	2	11	1	1	3	18
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	2.5%	5.1%	.9%	.6%	2.3%	2.3%
Energy	Count	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	6
	% within Libcon scale	3.2%	.0%	1.3%	.5%	.0%	1.8%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.8%	.3%
Education	Count	2	6	7	12	6	1	1	35
	% within Libcon scale	6.5%	12.0%	8.9%	5.6%	5.2%	.6%	.8%	4.4%
Social welfare programs	Count	0	0	0	3	2	2	5	12
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	3.9%	1.5%
Environment	Count	4	2	1	6	0	0	0	13
	% within Libcon scale	12.9%	4.0%	1.3%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.7%
The media	Count	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	4
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Abortion	Count	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.4%
Crime and drugs	Count	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	6
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.8%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	6
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	4.0%	.0%	1.4%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Housing	Count	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

			.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	4.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
		% within Libcon scale	3.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.4%
	Border security	Count	0	0	3	8	1	3	5	20
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	3.8%	3.7%	.9%	1.8%	3.9%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.8%	.3%
Total		Count	31	50	79	215	116	168	128	787
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	47	23	21	12	8	20	38	3	172
		% within 7 point Party ID	28.7%	25.6%	35.6%	15.4%	7.5%	27.4%	19.3%	18.8%	22.0%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	44	21	12	11	7	10	15	6	126
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.8%	23.3%	20.3%	14.1%	6.6%	13.7%	7.6%	37.5%	16.1%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	7	7	2	19	39	14	57	2	147
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	7.8%	3.4%	24.4%	36.8%	19.2%	28.9%	12.5%	18.8%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	7	6	2	12	18	9	22	0	76
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	6.7%	3.4%	15.4%	17.0%	12.3%	11.2%	.0%	9.7%

Health care	Count	11	5	6	4	3	1	10	0	40
	% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	5.6%	10.2%	5.1%	2.8%	1.4%	5.1%	.0%	5.1%
Moral decline	Count	5	3	2	0	5	2	10	0	27
	% within 7 point Party ID	3.0%	3.3%	3.4%	.0%	4.7%	2.7%	5.1%	.0%	3.4%
National security/terrorism	Count	3	1	0	1	3	0	6	0	14
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	1.1%	.0%	1.3%	2.8%	.0%	3.0%	.0%	1.8%
Immigration	Count	4	1	0	6	5	2	14	0	32
	% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	1.1%	.0%	7.7%	4.7%	2.7%	7.1%	.0%	4.1%
Taxes	Count	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	10
	% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	3.0%	.0%	1.3%
Gas prices	Count	7	3	1	1	0	3	1	2	18
	% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	3.3%	1.7%	1.3%	.0%	4.1%	.5%	12.5%	2.3%
Energy	Count	1	2	0	1	0	0	3	0	7
	% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	2.2%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	.9%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	10	5	6	6	1	5	2	2	37
	% within 7 point Party ID	6.1%	5.6%	10.2%	7.7%	.9%	6.8%	1.0%	12.5%	4.7%
Social welfare programs	Count	2	5	0	0	3	1	1	1	13
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	5.6%	.0%	.0%	2.8%	1.4%	.5%	6.3%	1.7%
Environment	Count	8	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	14
	% within 7 point Party ID	4.9%	1.1%	6.8%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.8%
The media	Count	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4
	% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Abortion	Count	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3

		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.9%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.4%
	Crime and drugs	Count	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	5
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	1.1%	.0%	1.3%	.9%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.6%
	Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	5
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	3.4%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.6%
	Housing	Count	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.3%
	Border security	Count	1	4	0	1	9	1	4	0	20
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	4.4%	.0%	1.3%	8.5%	1.4%	2.0%	.0%	2.6%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	4
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	2.7%	.5%	.0%	.5%
Total		Count	164	90	59	78	106	73	197	16	783
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Country problem	The economy	Count	33	59	66	18	176
		% within age	26.8%	24.4%	20.8%	15.7%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	21	39	51	16	127

37

	% within age	17.1%	16.1%	16.0%	13.9%	15.9%
Federal spending/national debt	Count	13	44	66	31	154
	% within age	10.6%	18.2%	20.8%	27.0%	19.3%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	6	16	36	17	75
	% within age	4.9%	6.6%	11.3%	14.8%	9.4%
Health care	Count	10	7	19	4	40
	% within age	8.1%	2.9%	6.0%	3.5%	5.0%
Moral decline	Count	1	8	13	6	28
	% within age	.8%	3.3%	4.1%	5.2%	3.5%
National security/terrorism	Count	0	6	6	3	15
	% within age	.0%	2.5%	1.9%	2.6%	1.9%
Immigration	Count	7	8	12	7	34
	% within age	5.7%	3.3%	3.8%	6.1%	4.3%
Taxes	Count	1	4	5	1	11
	% within age	.8%	1.7%	1.6%	.9%	1.4%
Gas prices	Count	6	7	5	0	18
	% within age	4.9%	2.9%	1.6%	.0%	2.3%
Energy	Count	0	4	3	0	7
	% within age	.0%	1.7%	.9%	.0%	.9%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	1	1	2
	% within age	.0%	.0%	.3%	.9%	.3%
Education	Count	10	16	8	2	36
	% within age	8.1%	6.6%	2.5%	1.7%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	0	4	7	1	12
	% within age	.0%	1.7%	2.2%	.9%	1.5%

	Environment	Count	5	5	2	1	13
		% within age	4.1%	2.1%	.6%	.9%	1.6%
	The media	Count	0	1	1	1	3
		% within age	.0%	.4%	.3%	.9%	.4%
	Abortion	Count	0	1	1	1	3
		% within age	.0%	.4%	.3%	.9%	.4%
	Crime and drugs	Count	1	1	2	1	5
		% within age	.8%	.4%	.6%	.9%	.6%
	Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	2	1	3	0	6
		% within age	1.6%	.4%	.9%	.0%	.8%
	Housing	Count	0	2	0	0	2
		% within age	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	0	2	0	1	3
		% within age	.0%	.8%	.0%	.9%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	0	2	2	0	4
		% within age	.0%	.8%	.6%	.0%	.5%
	Border security	Count	3	5	8	3	19
		% within age	2.4%	2.1%	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	4	0	1	0	5
		% within age	3.3%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.6%
Total		Count	123	242	318	115	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Education Crosstabulation

39

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Country problem	The economy	Count	3	58	68	8	27	12	176
		% within Education	11.1%	19.0%	25.6%	16.7%	25.0%	27.9%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	6	38	46	11	18	7	126
		% within Education	22.2%	12.4%	17.3%	22.9%	16.7%	16.3%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	2	64	51	7	21	9	154
		% within Education	7.4%	20.9%	19.2%	14.6%	19.4%	20.9%	19.3%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	2	34	24	5	8	2	75
		% within Education	7.4%	11.1%	9.0%	10.4%	7.4%	4.7%	9.4%
	Health care	Count	0	23	10	0	5	2	40
		% within Education	.0%	7.5%	3.8%	.0%	4.6%	4.7%	5.0%
	Moral decline	Count	2	13	8	0	3	2	28
		% within Education	7.4%	4.2%	3.0%	.0%	2.8%	4.7%	3.5%
	National security/terrorism	Count	0	5	4	3	1	1	14
		% within Education	.0%	1.6%	1.5%	6.3%	.9%	2.3%	1.8%
	Immigration	Count	1	17	11	2	3	0	34
		% within Education	3.7%	5.6%	4.1%	4.2%	2.8%	.0%	4.3%
	Taxes	Count	0	4	4	1	0	1	10
		% within Education	.0%	1.3%	1.5%	2.1%	.0%	2.3%	1.3%
	Gas prices	Count	3	5	6	2	2	0	18
		% within Education	11.1%	1.6%	2.3%	4.2%	1.9%	.0%	2.3%
	Energy	Count	0	0	4	0	1	2	7
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	.9%	4.7%	.9%
	Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

40

	% within Education	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	2	7	12	3	10	2	36
	% within Education	7.4%	2.3%	4.5%	6.3%	9.3%	4.7%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	5	1	4	1	1	1	13
	% within Education	18.5%	.3%	1.5%	2.1%	.9%	2.3%	1.6%
Environment	Count	0	8	4	1	1	0	14
	% within Education	.0%	2.6%	1.5%	2.1%	.9%	.0%	1.8%
The media	Count	0	3	0	0	1	0	4
	% within Education	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.5%
Abortion	Count	0	3	0	1	0	0	4
	% within Education	.0%	1.0%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Crime and drugs	Count	0	3	1	1	0	0	5
	% within Education	.0%	1.0%	.4%	2.1%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	0	2	1	0	1	1	5
	% within Education	.0%	.7%	.4%	.0%	.9%	2.3%	.6%
Housing	Count	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
	% within Education	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Iraq	Count	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
	% within Education	.0%	.3%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Foreign trade	Count	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
	% within Education	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.4%
Border security	Count	0	12	4	2	2	1	21
	% within Education	.0%	3.9%	1.5%	4.2%	1.9%	2.3%	2.6%
Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
	% within Education	3.7%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%

Total		Count	27	306	266	48	108	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	28	24	34	35	55	176
		% within Church attendance	21.5%	16.4%	31.2%	18.4%	24.9%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	12	19	16	35	45	127
		% within Church attendance	9.2%	13.0%	14.7%	18.4%	20.4%	16.0%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	32	32	21	32	37	154
		% within Church attendance	24.6%	21.9%	19.3%	16.8%	16.7%	19.3%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	21	15	12	18	9	75
		% within Church attendance	16.2%	10.3%	11.0%	9.5%	4.1%	9.4%
	Health care	Count	0	12	11	10	7	40
		% within Church attendance	.0%	8.2%	10.1%	5.3%	3.2%	5.0%
	Moral decline	Count	14	7	2	2	4	29
		% within Church attendance	10.8%	4.8%	1.8%	1.1%	1.8%	3.6%
	National security/terrorism	Count	5	3	3	2	1	14
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	2.1%	2.8%	1.1%	.5%	1.8%
	Immigration	Count	4	5	5	10	10	34
		% within Church attendance	3.1%	3.4%	4.6%	5.3%	4.5%	4.3%
	Taxes	Count	2	2	0	5	1	10

42

	% within Church attendance	1.5%	1.4%	.0%	2.6%	.5%	1.3%
Gas prices	Count	1	4	0	10	2	17
	% within Church attendance	.8%	2.7%	.0%	5.3%	.9%	2.1%
Energy	Count	1	1	0	1	3	6
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.7%	.0%	.5%	1.4%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	1	0	0	1	0	2
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	3	7	2	10	14	36
	% within Church attendance	2.3%	4.8%	1.8%	5.3%	6.3%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	1	1	0	2	9	13
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.7%	.0%	1.1%	4.1%	1.6%
Environment	Count	0	0	0	4	9	13
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.1%	4.1%	1.6%
The media	Count	0	0	0	1	3	4
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	1.4%	.5%
Abortion	Count	2	0	0	0	1	3
	% within Church attendance	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.4%
Crime and drugs	Count	1	1	1	1	1	5
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.7%	.9%	.5%	.5%	.6%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	0	2	1	1	2	6
	% within Church attendance	.0%	1.4%	.9%	.5%	.9%	.8%
Housing	Count	0	2	0	0	0	2
	% within Church attendance	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Iraq	Count	0	1	0	0	2	3
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.4%

43

	Foreign trade	Count	0	0	1	1	1	3
		% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.9%	.5%	.5%	.4%
	Border security	Count	0	8	0	7	5	20
		% within Church attendance	.0%	5.5%	.0%	3.7%	2.3%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	2	0	0	2	0	4
		% within Church attendance	1.5%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.5%
Total		Count	130	146	109	190	221	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Country problem	The economy	Count	99	30	34	5	1	2	3	2	176
		% within Race	19.1%	29.7%	27.6%	33.3%	33.3%	20.0%	12.0%	100.0%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	73	21	21	6	0	3	2	0	126
		% within Race	14.1%	20.8%	17.1%	40.0%	.0%	30.0%	8.0%	.0%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	126	5	15	0	0	0	6	0	152
		% within Race	24.3%	5.0%	12.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	24.0%	.0%	19.1%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	50	6	11	0	1	2	6	0	76
		% within Race	9.7%	5.9%	8.9%	.0%	33.3%	20.0%	24.0%	.0%	9.5%
	Health care	Count	24	9	6	0	0	0	1	0	40
		% within Race	4.6%	8.9%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	5.0%

44

Moral decline	Count	17	6	4	1	0	0	1	0	29
	% within Race	3.3%	5.9%	3.3%	6.7%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	3.6%
National security/terrorism	Count	10	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	15
	% within Race	1.9%	2.0%	.0%	6.7%	33.3%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	1.9%
Immigration	Count	26	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	33
	% within Race	5.0%	1.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	8.0%	.0%	4.1%
Taxes	Count	6	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	11
	% within Race	1.2%	1.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.0%	.0%	1.4%
Gas prices	Count	11	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	18
	% within Race	2.1%	1.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%
Energy	Count	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
	% within Race	.8%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% within Race	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	24	4	8	1	0	0	0	0	37
	% within Race	4.6%	4.0%	6.5%	6.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
	% within Race	1.2%	4.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
Environment	Count	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	13
	% within Race	1.4%	4.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
The media	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	% within Race	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Abortion	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	% within Race	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Crime and drugs	Count	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5

		% within Race	.2%	1.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
	Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
		% within Race	.2%	.0%	3.3%	6.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Housing	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		% within Race	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		% within Race	.4%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		% within Race	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	Border security	Count	13	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	20
		% within Race	2.5%	4.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Race	.6%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Total		Count	518	101	123	15	3	10	25	2	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Country problem	The economy	Count	93	3	23	8	38	11	176
		% within Marital Status	19.1%	25.0%	24.5%	28.6%	27.1%	35.5%	22.3%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	65	2	15	6	32	6	126
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	16.7%	16.0%	21.4%	22.9%	19.4%	15.9%

Federal spending/national debt	Count	104	1	12	5	26	4	152
	% within Marital Status	21.4%	8.3%	12.8%	17.9%	18.6%	12.9%	19.2%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	51	1	10	3	9	2	76
	% within Marital Status	10.5%	8.3%	10.6%	10.7%	6.4%	6.5%	9.6%
Health care	Count	20	0	8	2	4	1	35
	% within Marital Status	4.1%	.0%	8.5%	7.1%	2.9%	3.2%	4.4%
Moral decline	Count	23	1	4	1	0	0	29
	% within Marital Status	4.7%	8.3%	4.3%	3.6%	.0%	.0%	3.7%
National security/terrorism	Count	12	1	1	0	1	0	15
	% within Marital Status	2.5%	8.3%	1.1%	.0%	.7%	.0%	1.9%
Immigration	Count	20	1	5	1	4	2	33
	% within Marital Status	4.1%	8.3%	5.3%	3.6%	2.9%	6.5%	4.2%
Taxes	Count	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
	% within Marital Status	2.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
Gas prices	Count	12	0	4	0	1	1	18
	% within Marital Status	2.5%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	.7%	3.2%	2.3%
Energy	Count	3	0	1	0	2	0	6
	% within Marital Status	.6%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	18	1	6	1	10	1	37
	% within Marital Status	3.7%	8.3%	6.4%	3.6%	7.1%	3.2%	4.7%
Social welfare programs	Count	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
	% within Marital Status	2.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
Environment	Count	4	1	1	0	7	0	13

		% within Marital Status	.8%	8.3%	1.1%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	1.6%
	The media	Count	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
		% within Marital Status	.6%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	Abortion	Count	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.4%
	Crime and drugs	Count	4	0	0	0	0	1	5
		% within Marital Status	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.2%	.6%
	Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	5	0	1	0	0	0	6
		% within Marital Status	1.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Housing	Count	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
		% within Marital Status	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.5%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.4%
	Border security	Count	14	0	2	1	3	0	20
		% within Marital Status	2.9%	.0%	2.1%	3.6%	2.1%	.0%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
		% within Marital Status	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Total		Count	486	12	94	28	140	31	791
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Gender Crosstabulation

	Gender	Total

48

			Male	Female	
Country problem	The economy	Count	81	95	176
		% within Gender	21.7%	22.5%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	54	72	126
		% within Gender	14.4%	17.0%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	84	69	153
		% within Gender	22.5%	16.3%	19.2%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	45	31	76
		% within Gender	12.0%	7.3%	9.5%
	Health care	Count	16	23	39
		% within Gender	4.3%	5.4%	4.9%
	Moral decline	Count	6	22	28
		% within Gender	1.6%	5.2%	3.5%
	National security/terrorism	Count	7	7	14
		% within Gender	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%
	Immigration	Count	20	14	34
		% within Gender	5.3%	3.3%	4.3%
	Taxes	Count	5	5	10
		% within Gender	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%
	Gas prices	Count	5	13	18
		% within Gender	1.3%	3.1%	2.3%
	Energy	Count	5	2	7
		% within Gender	1.3%	.5%	.9%
	Gay marriage	Count	1	1	2
		% within Gender	.3%	.2%	.3%

49

	Education	Count	15	22	37
		% within Gender	4.0%	5.2%	4.6%
	Social welfare programs	Count	3	9	12
		% within Gender	.8%	2.1%	1.5%
	Environment	Count	2	12	14
		% within Gender	.5%	2.8%	1.8%
	The media	Count	3	1	4
		% within Gender	.8%	.2%	.5%
	Abortion	Count	1	2	3
		% within Gender	.3%	.5%	.4%
	Crime and drugs	Count	1	4	5
		% within Gender	.3%	.9%	.6%
	Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	4	2	6
		% within Gender	1.1%	.5%	.8%
	Housing	Count	2	0	2
		% within Gender	.5%	.0%	.3%
	Iraq	Count	1	2	3
		% within Gender	.3%	.5%	.4%
	Foreign trade	Count	2	2	4
		% within Gender	.5%	.5%	.5%
	Border security	Count	10	10	20
		% within Gender	2.7%	2.4%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	1	3	4
		% within Gender	.3%	.7%	.5%
Total		Count	374	423	797

50

			% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	70	74	32	176
		% within Urban/Rural	29.2%	19.5%	18.3%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	41	66	19	126
		% within Urban/Rural	17.1%	17.4%	10.9%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	33	78	42	153
		% within Urban/Rural	13.8%	20.5%	24.0%	19.2%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	19	30	27	76
		% within Urban/Rural	7.9%	7.9%	15.4%	9.6%
	Health care	Count	13	18	9	40
		% within Urban/Rural	5.4%	4.7%	5.1%	5.0%
	Moral decline	Count	7	10	11	28
		% within Urban/Rural	2.9%	2.6%	6.3%	3.5%
	National security/terrorism	Count	5	5	5	15
		% within Urban/Rural	2.1%	1.3%	2.9%	1.9%
	Immigration	Count	8	17	9	34
		% within Urban/Rural	3.3%	4.5%	5.1%	4.3%
	Taxes	Count	1	8	1	10
		% within Urban/Rural	.4%	2.1%	.6%	1.3%
	Gas prices	Count	5	8	4	17

51

	% within Urban/Rural	2.1%	2.1%	2.3%	2.1%
Energy	Count	1	2	3	6
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.5%	1.7%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within Urban/Rural	.8%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	15	19	2	36
	% within Urban/Rural	6.3%	5.0%	1.1%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	4	6	2	12
	% within Urban/Rural	1.7%	1.6%	1.1%	1.5%
Environment	Count	1	10	2	13
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	2.6%	1.1%	1.6%
The media	Count	1	3	0	4
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.8%	.0%	.5%
Abortion	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.5%	.6%	.4%
Crime and drugs	Count	1	4	0	5
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	1.1%	.0%	.6%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	1	5	0	6
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	1.3%	.0%	.8%
Housing	Count	0	2	0	2
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.5%	.0%	.3%
Iraq	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.3%	.6%	.4%
Foreign trade	Count	2	2	0	4
	% within Urban/Rural	.8%	.5%	.0%	.5%

	Border security	Count	8	8	4	20
		% within Urban/Rural	3.3%	2.1%	2.3%	2.5%
	Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	1	2	1	4
		% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.5%	.6%	.5%
Total		Count	240	380	175	795
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	35	46	20	15	60	176
		% within Metropolitan areas	20.7%	20.9%	27.8%	17.2%	24.3%	22.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	28	43	10	15	30	126
		% within Metropolitan areas	16.6%	19.5%	13.9%	17.2%	12.1%	15.8%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	34	42	12	20	45	153
		% within Metropolitan areas	20.1%	19.1%	16.7%	23.0%	18.2%	19.2%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	18	17	4	5	32	76
		% within Metropolitan areas	10.7%	7.7%	5.6%	5.7%	13.0%	9.6%
	Health care	Count	5	17	2	4	12	40
		% within Metropolitan areas	3.0%	7.7%	2.8%	4.6%	4.9%	5.0%
	Moral decline	Count	6	5	4	1	13	29
		% within Metropolitan areas	3.6%	2.3%	5.6%	1.1%	5.3%	3.6%
	National security/terrorism	Count	1	4	3	1	6	15

53

	% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	1.8%	4.2%	1.1%	2.4%	1.9%
Immigration	Count	8	6	1	5	14	34
	% within Metropolitan areas	4.7%	2.7%	1.4%	5.7%	5.7%	4.3%
Taxes	Count	5	3	2	0	0	10
	% within Metropolitan areas	3.0%	1.4%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
Gas prices	Count	3	3	5	0	7	18
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	1.4%	6.9%	.0%	2.8%	2.3%
Energy	Count	3	2	0	1	0	6
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	.9%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	1	2
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.3%
Education	Count	6	12	5	7	6	36
	% within Metropolitan areas	3.6%	5.5%	6.9%	8.0%	2.4%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	3	1	1	4	3	12
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	.5%	1.4%	4.6%	1.2%	1.5%
Environment	Count	3	7	0	3	1	14
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	3.2%	.0%	3.4%	.4%	1.8%
The media	Count	1	1	0	0	1	3
	% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.4%
Abortion	Count	0	1	0	0	2	3
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.4%
Crime and drugs	Count	2	2	0	1	0	5
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.2%	.9%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.6%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count	1	0	0	1	3	5
	% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	1.2%	.6%

							Total
Housing	Count	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	.0%	.3%
Iraq	Count	1	0	1	1	0	3
	% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	.0%	1.4%	1.1%	.0%	.4%
Foreign trade	Count	0	3	0	0	0	3
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Border security	Count	6	3	2	1	8	20
	% within Metropolitan areas	3.6%	1.4%	2.8%	1.1%	3.2%	2.5%
Iran/nuclear weapons	Count	0	1	0	0	3	4
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.5%
Total	Count	169	220	72	87	247	795
	% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country problem * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Country problem	The economy	Count	37	28	27	35	17	32	176
		% within AP Region	23.1%	21.1%	22.1%	22.2%	16.7%	25.8%	22.0%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	21	28	23	17	10	26	125
		% within AP Region	13.1%	21.1%	18.9%	10.8%	9.8%	21.0%	15.6%
	Federal spending/national debt	Count	28	24	27	35	22	17	153
		% within AP Region	17.5%	18.0%	22.1%	22.2%	21.6%	13.7%	19.1%
	Political	Count	17	8	11	13	18	9	76

corruption/leadership	% within AP Region	10.6%	6.0%	9.0%	8.2%	17.6%	7.3%	9.5%
Health care	Count	11	11	5	7	4	3	41
	% within AP Region	6.9%	8.3%	4.1%	4.4%	3.9%	2.4%	5.1%
Moral decline	Count	11	3	2	4	3	5	28
	% within AP Region	6.9%	2.3%	1.6%	2.5%	2.9%	4.0%	3.5%
National security/terrorism	Count	4	2	0	2	3	4	15
	% within AP Region	2.5%	1.5%	.0%	1.3%	2.9%	3.2%	1.9%
Immigration	Count	7	4	3	11	4	6	35
	% within AP Region	4.4%	3.0%	2.5%	7.0%	3.9%	4.8%	4.4%
Taxes	Count	4	0	3	1	0	2	10
	% within AP Region	2.5%	.0%	2.5%	.6%	.0%	1.6%	1.3%
Gas prices	Count	3	2	2	0	6	5	18
	% within AP Region	1.9%	1.5%	1.6%	.0%	5.9%	4.0%	2.3%
Energy	Count	1	1	3	1	0	0	6
	% within AP Region	.6%	.8%	2.5%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
	% within AP Region	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.3%
Education	Count	5	10	4	9	1	7	36
	% within AP Region	3.1%	7.5%	3.3%	5.7%	1.0%	5.6%	4.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	2	0	1	6	1	2	12
	% within AP Region	1.3%	.0%	.8%	3.8%	1.0%	1.6%	1.5%
Environment	Count	1	4	2	4	2	1	14
	% within AP Region	.6%	3.0%	1.6%	2.5%	2.0%	.8%	1.8%
The media	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	.8%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.4%

			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Abortion	Count		2	1	0	0	0	0		3
	% within AP Region		1.3%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%		.4%
Crime and drugs	Count		1	2	1	1	0	1		6
	% within AP Region		.6%	1.5%	.8%	.6%	.0%	.8%		.8%
Afghanistan/Pakistan	Count		0	0	1	2	0	3		6
	% within AP Region		.0%	.0%	.8%	1.3%	.0%	2.4%		.8%
Housing	Count		0	0	0	2	0	0		2
	% within AP Region		.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%		.3%
Iraq	Count		1	0	0	1	1	0		3
	% within AP Region		.6%	.0%	.0%	.6%	1.0%	.0%		.4%
Foreign trade	Count		0	3	0	0	0	0		3
	% within AP Region		.0%	2.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%		.4%
Border security	Count		3	1	6	7	3	1		21
	% within AP Region		1.9%	.8%	4.9%	4.4%	2.9%	.8%		2.6%
Iran/nuclear weapons	Count		0	0	0	0	5	0		5
	% within AP Region		.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%	.0%		.6%
Total	Count		160	133	122	158	102	124		799
	% within AP Region		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Texas problem * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	2	3	4	18	14	41	41	123

	% within Libcon scale	6.3%	5.9%	5.1%	8.3%	12.2%	24.6%	31.8%	15.6%
The economy	Count	2	3	7	36	11	8	7	74
	% within Libcon scale	6.3%	5.9%	9.0%	16.7%	9.6%	4.8%	5.4%	9.4%
Unemployment/jobs	Count	1	5	9	36	17	18	9	95
	% within Libcon scale	3.1%	9.8%	11.5%	16.7%	14.8%	10.8%	7.0%	12.1%
Border security	Count	0	0	5	18	17	42	34	116
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	6.4%	8.3%	14.8%	25.1%	26.4%	14.7%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	9	9	15	12	7	4	4	60
	% within Libcon scale	28.1%	17.6%	19.2%	5.6%	6.1%	2.4%	3.1%	7.6%
Health care	Count	0	2	4	5	3	1	0	15
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	3.9%	5.1%	2.3%	2.6%	.6%	.0%	1.9%
Gas prices	Count	0	0	3	11	2	3	2	21
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	3.8%	5.1%	1.7%	1.8%	1.6%	2.7%
Crime and drugs	Count	0	2	5	4	0	3	1	15
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	3.9%	6.4%	1.9%	.0%	1.8%	.8%	1.9%
Education	Count	5	9	7	18	11	7	2	59
	% within Libcon scale	15.6%	17.6%	9.0%	8.3%	9.6%	4.2%	1.6%	7.5%
State government spending	Count	1	3	2	10	7	9	6	38
	% within Libcon scale	3.1%	5.9%	2.6%	4.6%	6.1%	5.4%	4.7%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	0	0	1	1	0	4	3	9
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.5%	.0%	2.4%	2.3%	1.1%
Taxes	Count	2	1	0	3	5	1	1	13
	% within Libcon scale	6.3%	2.0%	.0%	1.4%	4.3%	.6%	.8%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	0	1	1	4	2	5	3	16
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	1.3%	1.9%	1.7%	3.0%	2.3%	2.0%

Insurance rates	Count	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.6%
Water supply	Count	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	3.9%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	9
	% within Libcon scale	6.3%	3.9%	1.3%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	5
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.9%	.9%	.6%	.0%	.6%
Abortion	Count	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	4
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	3.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.8%	.4%
Voting system	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	7	6	12	23	15	12	12	87
	% within Libcon scale	21.9%	11.8%	15.4%	10.6%	13.0%	7.2%	9.3%	11.0%
Utility rates	Count	1	0	0	2	0	3	1	7

			3.1%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.8%	.8%	.9%
	Electoral fraud	Count	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	32	51	78	216	115	167	129	788
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	7	5	2	17	17	11	62	1	122
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	5.6%	3.4%	22.4%	16.0%	15.3%	31.6%	6.7%	15.7%
	The economy	Count	19	10	7	7	6	6	13	4	72
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.6%	11.1%	11.9%	9.2%	5.7%	8.3%	6.6%	26.7%	9.3%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	31	19	7	4	4	12	16	2	95
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.9%	21.1%	11.9%	5.3%	3.8%	16.7%	8.2%	13.3%	12.2%
	Border security	Count	4	5	2	8	35	9	49	1	113
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	5.6%	3.4%	10.5%	33.0%	12.5%	25.0%	6.7%	14.5%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	20	11	7	6	8	5	1	1	59
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.2%	12.2%	11.9%	7.9%	7.5%	6.9%	.5%	6.7%	7.6%
	Health care	Count	6	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	14
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.7%	1.1%	1.7%	2.6%	1.9%	1.4%	.5%	.0%	1.8%
	Gas prices	Count	4	3	2	3	0	1	3	1	17
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	3.3%	3.4%	3.9%	.0%	1.4%	1.5%	6.7%	2.2%

Crime and drugs	Count	7	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	14
	% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	4.4%	1.7%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.5%	.0%	1.8%
Education	Count	18	8	9	7	5	7	8	0	62
	% within 7 point Party ID	11.0%	8.9%	15.3%	9.2%	4.7%	9.7%	4.1%	.0%	8.0%
State government spending	Count	9	4	2	2	6	8	7	1	39
	% within 7 point Party ID	5.5%	4.4%	3.4%	2.6%	5.7%	11.1%	3.6%	6.7%	5.0%
Moral decline	Count	0	0	2	0	3	2	3	0	10
	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	3.4%	.0%	2.8%	2.8%	1.5%	.0%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	3	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	13
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	3.3%	3.4%	1.3%	1.9%	1.4%	.0%	6.7%	1.7%
Social welfare programs	Count	3	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	15
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	1.1%	.0%	2.6%	.9%	4.2%	2.6%	.0%	1.9%
Insurance rates	Count	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	2.0%	.0%	.6%
Water supply	Count	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
	% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	.0%	3.4%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	2	9
	% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	2.2%	5.1%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.3%	1.2%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	5
	% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	2.6%	.9%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.6%
Abortion	Count	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4

			.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.5%
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.5%
	Housing	Count	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	State courts	Count	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	The media	Count	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	Voting system	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	State budget shortfall	Count	22	11	9	9	14	4	16	1	86
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.4%	12.2%	15.3%	11.8%	13.2%	5.6%	8.2%	6.7%	11.1%
	Utility rates	Count	2	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	7
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	1.1%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	.9%
	Electoral fraud	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	164	90	59	76	106	72	196	15	778
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	22	29	56	17	124
		% within age	18.2%	12.0%	17.3%	15.0%	15.5%
	The economy	Count	6	35	22	10	73

62

	% within age	5.0%	14.5%	6.8%	8.8%	9.1%
Unemployment/jobs	Count	19	32	34	13	98
	% within age	15.7%	13.3%	10.5%	11.5%	12.3%
Border security	Count	10	28	61	21	120
	% within age	8.3%	11.6%	18.8%	18.6%	15.0%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	6	19	21	13	59
	% within age	5.0%	7.9%	6.5%	11.5%	7.4%
Health care	Count	0	6	8	1	15
	% within age	.0%	2.5%	2.5%	.9%	1.9%
Gas prices	Count	2	7	9	1	19
	% within age	1.7%	2.9%	2.8%	.9%	2.4%
Crime and drugs	Count	3	4	5	2	14
	% within age	2.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.8%	1.8%
Education	Count	14	26	16	7	63
	% within age	11.6%	10.8%	4.9%	6.2%	7.9%
State government spending	Count	4	12	15	7	38
	% within age	3.3%	5.0%	4.6%	6.2%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	1	4	5	1	11
	% within age	.8%	1.7%	1.5%	.9%	1.4%
Taxes	Count	3	6	4	0	13
	% within age	2.5%	2.5%	1.2%	.0%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	1	2	7	6	16
	% within age	.8%	.8%	2.2%	5.3%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count	4	0	1	0	5
	% within age	3.3%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.6%

Water supply	Count	5	1	0	0	6
	% within age	4.1%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	0	1	0	1
	% within age	.0%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	1	0	0	1
	% within age	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	7	1	2	0	10
	% within age	5.8%	.4%	.6%	.0%	1.3%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	2	1	2	0	5
	% within age	1.7%	.4%	.6%	.0%	.6%
Abortion	Count	3	0	0	1	4
	% within age	2.5%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	3	0	0	3
	% within age	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	2	0	0	0	2
	% within age	1.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	0	1	1	1	3
	% within age	.0%	.4%	.3%	.9%	.4%
Voting system	Count	0	0	0	1	1
	% within age	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	6	20	50	11	87
	% within age	5.0%	8.3%	15.4%	9.7%	10.9%
Utility rates	Count	1	2	4	0	7
	% within age	.8%	.8%	1.2%	.0%	.9%
Electoral fraud	Count	0	1	0	0	1

			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
		% within age	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%			.1%
Total		Count	121	241	324	113			799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%

Texas problem * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	8	49	38	7	17	5	124
		% within Education	29.6%	16.0%	14.3%	14.3%	16.0%	12.2%	15.6%
	The economy	Count	2	35	19	4	6	6	72
		% within Education	7.4%	11.4%	7.1%	8.2%	5.7%	14.6%	9.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	4	46	32	9	5	2	98
		% within Education	14.8%	15.0%	12.0%	18.4%	4.7%	4.9%	12.3%
	Border security	Count	1	48	51	5	8	6	119
		% within Education	3.7%	15.7%	19.2%	10.2%	7.5%	14.6%	15.0%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	1	11	24	7	10	6	59
		% within Education	3.7%	3.6%	9.0%	14.3%	9.4%	14.6%	7.4%
	Health care	Count	0	9	3	0	1	1	14
		% within Education	.0%	2.9%	1.1%	.0%	.9%	2.4%	1.8%
	Gas prices	Count	1	13	3	1	3	0	21
		% within Education	3.7%	4.2%	1.1%	2.0%	2.8%	.0%	2.6%
	Crime and drugs	Count	0	9	3	0	2	0	14
		% within Education	.0%	2.9%	1.1%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	1.8%

Education	Count	1	11	20	4	23	3	62
	% within Education	3.7%	3.6%	7.5%	8.2%	21.7%	7.3%	7.8%
State government spending	Count	0	11	18	1	7	2	39
	% within Education	.0%	3.6%	6.8%	2.0%	6.6%	4.9%	4.9%
Moral decline	Count	0	3	4	0	3	0	10
	% within Education	.0%	1.0%	1.5%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	1	7	4	0	0	1	13
	% within Education	3.7%	2.3%	1.5%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	3	7	3	2	1	0	16
	% within Education	11.1%	2.3%	1.1%	4.1%	.9%	.0%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count	1	4	0	0	0	0	5
	% within Education	3.7%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Water supply	Count	0	5	1	0	0	0	6
	% within Education	.0%	1.6%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Education	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% within Education	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	2	2	2	0	2	0	8
	% within Education	7.4%	.7%	.8%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	1.0%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	0	2	1	2	0	0	5
	% within Education	.0%	.7%	.4%	4.1%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Abortion	Count	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
	% within Education	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

		% within Education	.0%	.3%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	State courts	Count	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	The media	Count	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
		% within Education	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.4%
	Voting system	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.1%
	State budget shortfall	Count	2	22	33	7	14	9	87
		% within Education	7.4%	7.2%	12.4%	14.3%	13.2%	22.0%	10.9%
	Utility rates	Count	0	6	1	0	0	0	7
		% within Education	.0%	2.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%
	Electoral fraud	Count	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	27	306	266	49	106	41	795
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	23	16	23	31	31	124
		% within Church attendance	17.3%	11.1%	21.1%	16.3%	14.1%	15.6%
	The economy	Count	10	15	8	18	23	74

67

	% within Church attendance	7.5%	10.4%	7.3%	9.5%	10.5%	9.3%
Unemployment/jobs	Count	11	18	15	19	35	98
	% within Church attendance	8.3%	12.5%	13.8%	10.0%	15.9%	12.3%
Border security	Count	25	26	16	30	21	118
	% within Church attendance	18.8%	18.1%	14.7%	15.8%	9.5%	14.8%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	3	9	6	19	23	60
	% within Church attendance	2.3%	6.3%	5.5%	10.0%	10.5%	7.5%
Health care	Count	1	2	5	3	4	15
	% within Church attendance	.8%	1.4%	4.6%	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%
Gas prices	Count	6	4	1	5	4	20
	% within Church attendance	4.5%	2.8%	.9%	2.6%	1.8%	2.5%
Crime and drugs	Count	7	1	2	3	2	15
	% within Church attendance	5.3%	.7%	1.8%	1.6%	.9%	1.9%
Education	Count	6	12	7	17	19	61
	% within Church attendance	4.5%	8.3%	6.4%	8.9%	8.6%	7.7%
State government spending	Count	3	11	5	10	8	37
	% within Church attendance	2.3%	7.6%	4.6%	5.3%	3.6%	4.6%

Moral decline	Count	5	3	0	1	1	10
	% within Church attendance	3.8%	2.1%	.0%	.5%	.5%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	5	4	0	0	3	12
	% within Church attendance	3.8%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	1.5%
Social welfare programs	Count	4	4	2	7	0	17
	% within Church attendance	3.0%	2.8%	1.8%	3.7%	.0%	2.1%
Insurance rates	Count	0	4	0	0	1	5
	% within Church attendance	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.6%
Water supply	Count	2	0	0	3	1	6
	% within Church attendance	1.5%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.5%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	0	0	0	1	8	9
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	3.6%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffi	Count	0	0	1	1	3	5

c	% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.9%	.5%	1.4%	.6%
Abortion	Count	1	0	3	0	0	4
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	1	2	0	0	3
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.7%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	1	0	0	1	1	3
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.5%	.4%
Voting system	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	17	10	12	17	32	88
	% within Church attendance	12.8%	6.9%	11.0%	8.9%	14.5%	11.1%
Utility rates	Count	2	1	1	2	0	6
	% within Church attendance	1.5%	.7%	.9%	1.1%	.0%	.8%
Electoral fraud	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Church attendance	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%

Total		Count	133	144	109	190	220	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	96	8	10	0	0	2	8	0	124
		% within Race	18.6%	7.8%	8.1%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	30.8%	.0%	15.6%
	The economy	Count	35	15	19	2	0	2	1	0	74
		% within Race	6.8%	14.6%	15.4%	15.4%	.0%	18.2%	3.8%	.0%	9.3%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	44	33	15	4	0	0	0	2	98
		% within Race	8.5%	32.0%	12.2%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	12.3%
	Border security	Count	98	2	11	0	1	2	6	0	120
		% within Race	19.0%	1.9%	8.9%	.0%	33.3%	18.2%	23.1%	.0%	15.1%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	43	2	5	1	1	0	7	0	59
		% within Race	8.3%	1.9%	4.1%	7.7%	33.3%	.0%	26.9%	.0%	7.4%
	Health care	Count	7	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	15
		% within Race	1.4%	4.9%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
	Gas prices	Count	9	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	19
		% within Race	1.7%	1.0%	6.5%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%

71

Crime and drugs	Count	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
	% within Race	1.0%	4.9%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
Education	Count	40	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	62
	% within Race	7.8%	10.7%	8.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.8%
State government spending	Count	27	2	8	0	0	0	1	0	38
	% within Race	5.2%	1.9%	6.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
	% within Race	1.0%	1.9%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	5	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	13
	% within Race	1.0%	1.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	12	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	17
	% within Race	2.3%	1.9%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	.0%	2.1%
Insurance rates	Count	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	% within Race	.2%	3.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Water supply	Count	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6
	% within Race	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Race	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Race	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
	% within Race	1.2%	.0%	1.6%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
	% within Race	.4%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
Abortion	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

		% within Race	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	Housing	Count	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		% within Race	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	State courts	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		% within Race	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	The media	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Race	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	.4%
	Voting system	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		% within Race	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
	State budget shortfall	Count	60	9	12	3	1	1	1	0	87
		% within Race	11.6%	8.7%	9.8%	23.1%	33.3%	9.1%	3.8%	.0%	10.9%
	Utility rates	Count	4	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	7
		% within Race	.8%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	.0%	.9%
	Electoral fraud	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		% within Race	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	516	103	123	13	3	11	26	2	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	94	0	14	3	11	2	124
		% within Marital Status	19.4%	.0%	14.4%	10.0%	7.8%	6.7%	15.6%

The economy	Count	39	1	7	3	20	3	73
	% within Marital Status	8.1%	8.3%	7.2%	10.0%	14.2%	10.0%	9.2%
Unemployment/jobs	Count	41	2	16	5	29	5	98
	% within Marital Status	8.5%	16.7%	16.5%	16.7%	20.6%	16.7%	12.3%
Border security	Count	84	1	11	4	14	4	118
	% within Marital Status	17.4%	8.3%	11.3%	13.3%	9.9%	13.3%	14.9%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	37	1	7	3	10	2	60
	% within Marital Status	7.6%	8.3%	7.2%	10.0%	7.1%	6.7%	7.6%
Health care	Count	5	0	6	0	2	1	14
	% within Marital Status	1.0%	.0%	6.2%	.0%	1.4%	3.3%	1.8%
Gas prices	Count	10	1	3	1	6	0	21
	% within Marital Status	2.1%	8.3%	3.1%	3.3%	4.3%	.0%	2.6%
Crime and drugs	Count	9	0	1	0	3	0	13
	% within Marital Status	1.9%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	1.6%
Education	Count	34	1	11	1	12	3	62
	% within Marital Status	7.0%	8.3%	11.3%	3.3%	8.5%	10.0%	7.8%
State government spending	Count	27	1	2	4	2	3	39
	% within Marital Status	5.6%	8.3%	2.1%	13.3%	1.4%	10.0%	4.9%
Moral decline	Count	8	1	0	1	1	0	11
	% within Marital Status	1.7%	8.3%	.0%	3.3%	.7%	.0%	1.4%
Taxes	Count	7	1	0	0	4	2	14
	% within Marital Status	1.4%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	2.8%	6.7%	1.8%
Social welfare programs	Count	12	1	1	0	2	0	16
	% within Marital Status	2.5%	8.3%	1.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Water supply	Count	3	0	0	0	2	1	6
	% within Marital Status	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	3.3%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	4	0	0	0	5	0	9
	% within Marital Status	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.5%	.0%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
	% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.7%	.5%
Abortion	Count	1	0	0	0	3	0	4
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	% within Marital Status	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% within Marital Status	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.4%
Voting system	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	57	1	13	4	11	2	88
	% within Marital Status	11.8%	8.3%	13.4%	13.3%	7.8%	6.7%	11.1%
Utility rates	Count	1	0	4	1	1	0	7
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	4.1%	3.3%	.7%	.0%	.9%

Electoral fraud	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within Marital Status	.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total	Count	484	12	97	30	141	30	794
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	61	62	123
		% within Gender	16.2%	14.7%	15.4%
	The economy	Count	26	47	73
		% within Gender	6.9%	11.2%	9.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	44	55	99
		% within Gender	11.7%	13.1%	12.4%
	Border security	Count	61	58	119
		% within Gender	16.2%	13.8%	14.9%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	36	23	59
		% within Gender	9.5%	5.5%	7.4%
	Health care	Count	4	11	15
		% within Gender	1.1%	2.6%	1.9%
	Gas prices	Count	6	14	20
		% within Gender	1.6%	3.3%	2.5%
	Crime and drugs	Count	7	7	14
		% within Gender	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%

Education	Count		18	44	62
	% within Gender		4.8%	10.5%	7.8%
State government spending	Count		23	15	38
	% within Gender		6.1%	3.6%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count		2	8	10
	% within Gender		.5%	1.9%	1.3%
Taxes	Count		12	1	13
	% within Gender		3.2%	.2%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count		5	11	16
	% within Gender		1.3%	2.6%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count		6	0	6
	% within Gender		1.6%	.0%	.8%
Water supply	Count		2	5	7
	% within Gender		.5%	1.2%	.9%
Gay marriage	Count		0	1	1
	% within Gender		.0%	.2%	.1%
Energy	Count		1	0	1
	% within Gender		.3%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count		2	7	9
	% within Gender		.5%	1.7%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count		2	3	5
	% within Gender		.5%	.7%	.6%
Abortion	Count		4	0	4
	% within Gender		1.1%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count		0	3	3

		% within Gender	.0%	.7%	.4%
	State courts	Count	0	2	2
		% within Gender	.0%	.5%	.3%
	The media	Count	2	1	3
		% within Gender	.5%	.2%	.4%
	Voting system	Count	1	0	1
		% within Gender	.3%	.0%	.1%
	State budget shortfall	Count	51	36	87
		% within Gender	13.5%	8.6%	10.9%
	Utility rates	Count	1	6	7
		% within Gender	.3%	1.4%	.9%
	Electoral fraud	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	.0%	.2%	.1%
Total		Count	377	421	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	24	71	28	123
		% within Urban/Rural	9.9%	18.8%	16.1%	15.5%
	The economy	Count	24	35	14	73
		% within Urban/Rural	9.9%	9.3%	8.0%	9.2%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	49	29	20	98

	% within Urban/Rural	20.2%	7.7%	11.5%	12.4%
Border security	Count	28	54	37	119
	% within Urban/Rural	11.6%	14.3%	21.3%	15.0%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	19	30	10	59
	% within Urban/Rural	7.9%	8.0%	5.7%	7.4%
Health care	Count	3	7	4	14
	% within Urban/Rural	1.2%	1.9%	2.3%	1.8%
Gas prices	Count	10	7	3	20
	% within Urban/Rural	4.1%	1.9%	1.7%	2.5%
Crime and drugs	Count	4	5	5	14
	% within Urban/Rural	1.7%	1.3%	2.9%	1.8%
Education	Count	21	37	3	61
	% within Urban/Rural	8.7%	9.8%	1.7%	7.7%
State government spending	Count	5	24	9	38
	% within Urban/Rural	2.1%	6.4%	5.2%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	5	3	2	10
	% within Urban/Rural	2.1%	.8%	1.1%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	3	6	4	13
	% within Urban/Rural	1.2%	1.6%	2.3%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	0	9	7	16
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	2.4%	4.0%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count	4	1	0	5
	% within Urban/Rural	1.7%	.3%	.0%	.6%
Water supply	Count	3	3	0	6
	% within Urban/Rural	1.2%	.8%	.0%	.8%

Gay marriage	Count	1	0	0	1
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.3%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	3	4	2	9
	% within Urban/Rural	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	2	1	2	5
	% within Urban/Rural	.8%	.3%	1.1%	.6%
Abortion	Count	0	1	3	4
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.3%	1.7%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	2	1	3
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.5%	.6%	.4%
State courts	Count	2	0	0	2
	% within Urban/Rural	.8%	.0%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	1	1	1	3
	% within Urban/Rural	.4%	.3%	.6%	.4%
Voting system	Count	0	1	0	1
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.3%	.0%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	27	43	17	87
	% within Urban/Rural	11.2%	11.4%	9.8%	11.0%
Utility rates	Count	4	2	1	7
	% within Urban/Rural	1.7%	.5%	.6%	.9%
Electoral fraud	Count	0	0	1	1
	% within Urban/Rural	.0%	.0%	.6%	.1%
Total	Count	242	377	174	793

Texas problem * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	30	28	8	13	45	124
		% within Metropolitan areas	17.6%	12.7%	11.1%	14.8%	18.0%	15.5%
	The economy	Count	8	19	11	7	28	73
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.7%	8.6%	15.3%	8.0%	11.2%	9.1%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	23	24	7	8	36	98
		% within Metropolitan areas	13.5%	10.9%	9.7%	9.1%	14.4%	12.3%
	Border security	Count	25	34	14	6	41	120
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.7%	15.5%	19.4%	6.8%	16.4%	15.0%
	Political corruption/leadership	Count	15	19	4	8	13	59
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.8%	8.6%	5.6%	9.1%	5.2%	7.4%
	Health care	Count	3	6	0	1	5	15
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	2.7%	.0%	1.1%	2.0%	1.9%
	Gas prices	Count	3	2	2	0	13	20
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	.9%	2.8%	.0%	5.2%	2.5%
	Crime and drugs	Count	7	3	1	1	2	14
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.1%	1.4%	1.4%	1.1%	.8%	1.8%
	Education	Count	14	23	5	12	8	62
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.2%	10.5%	6.9%	13.6%	3.2%	7.8%

State government spending	Count	10	9	1	8	10	38
	% within Metropolitan areas	5.9%	4.1%	1.4%	9.1%	4.0%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	3	0	2	0	5	10
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	2.0%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	4	3	1	3	3	14
	% within Metropolitan areas	2.4%	1.4%	1.4%	3.4%	1.2%	1.8%
Social welfare programs	Count	2	3	1	3	8	17
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.2%	1.4%	1.4%	3.4%	3.2%	2.1%
Insurance rates	Count	0	6	0	0	0	6
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	2.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Water supply	Count	2	1	0	0	3	6
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.2%	.5%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	2	5	0	2	1	10
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.2%	2.3%	.0%	2.3%	.4%	1.3%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	0	1	0	1	3	5
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	1.1%	1.2%	.6%
Abortion	Count	0	0	0	3	1	4
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.4%	.4%	.5%
Housing	Count	0	2	0	1	0	3
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2

		% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.3%
	The media	Count	1	0	0	0	2	3
		% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.4%
	Voting system	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
	State budget shortfall	Count	17	26	14	11	19	87
		% within Metropolitan areas	10.0%	11.8%	19.4%	12.5%	7.6%	10.9%
	Utility rates	Count	1	3	1	0	1	6
		% within Metropolitan areas	.6%	1.4%	1.4%	.0%	.4%	.8%
	Electoral fraud	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.1%
Total		Count	170	220	72	88	250	800
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas problem * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Texas problem	Immigration	Count	23	21	21	26	19	14	124
		% within AP Region	14.4%	16.0%	17.6%	16.5%	18.6%	11.5%	15.7%
	The economy	Count	11	13	8	16	7	18	73
		% within AP Region	6.9%	9.9%	6.7%	10.1%	6.9%	14.8%	9.2%
	Unemployment/jobs	Count	19	12	21	18	10	18	98
		% within AP Region	11.9%	9.2%	17.6%	11.4%	9.8%	14.8%	12.4%

Border security	Count	21	17	18	14	26	21	117
	% within AP Region	13.1%	13.0%	15.1%	8.9%	25.5%	17.2%	14.8%
Political corruption/leadership	Count	15	8	9	14	5	7	58
	% within AP Region	9.4%	6.1%	7.6%	8.9%	4.9%	5.7%	7.3%
Health care	Count	3	6	1	3	1	1	15
	% within AP Region	1.9%	4.6%	.8%	1.9%	1.0%	.8%	1.9%
Gas prices	Count	6	2	0	3	3	6	20
	% within AP Region	3.8%	1.5%	.0%	1.9%	2.9%	4.9%	2.5%
Crime and drugs	Count	5	2	3	1	0	3	14
	% within AP Region	3.1%	1.5%	2.5%	.6%	.0%	2.5%	1.8%
Education	Count	12	15	10	14	2	8	61
	% within AP Region	7.5%	11.5%	8.4%	8.9%	2.0%	6.6%	7.7%
State government spending	Count	9	3	4	14	4	4	38
	% within AP Region	5.6%	2.3%	3.4%	8.9%	3.9%	3.3%	4.8%
Moral decline	Count	1	0	3	2	2	2	10
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	2.5%	1.3%	2.0%	1.6%	1.3%
Taxes	Count	1	0	3	4	3	2	13
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	2.5%	2.5%	2.9%	1.6%	1.6%
Social welfare programs	Count	5	3	1	4	2	1	16
	% within AP Region	3.1%	2.3%	.8%	2.5%	2.0%	.8%	2.0%
Insurance rates	Count	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
	% within AP Region	.0%	4.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
Water supply	Count	0	1	2	0	3	0	6
	% within AP Region	.0%	.8%	1.7%	.0%	2.9%	.0%	.8%
Gay marriage	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

	% within AP Region	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Energy	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Environment	Count	0	2	2	2	2	1	9
	% within AP Region	.0%	1.5%	1.7%	1.3%	2.0%	.8%	1.1%
Transportation/roads/traffic	Count	2	0	0	1	1	1	5
	% within AP Region	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.6%	1.0%	.8%	.6%
Abortion	Count	1	0	0	3	0	0	4
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Housing	Count	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
	% within AP Region	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.4%
State courts	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% within AP Region	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
The media	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	.8%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.4%
Voting system	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% within AP Region	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
State budget shortfall	Count	19	15	11	18	10	14	87
	% within AP Region	11.9%	11.5%	9.2%	11.4%	9.8%	11.5%	11.0%
Utility rates	Count	0	3	1	0	1	1	6
	% within AP Region	.0%	2.3%	.8%	.0%	1.0%	.8%	.8%
Electoral fraud	Count	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% within AP Region	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total	Count	160	131	119	158	102	122	792
	% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	5	3	6	8	3	0	2	27
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	5.9%	7.6%	3.7%	2.6%	.0%	1.6%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	11	26	31	63	33	13	17	194
		% within Libcon scale	34.4%	51.0%	39.2%	29.0%	28.7%	7.7%	13.2%	24.5%
	About the same	Count	6	11	21	80	29	60	26	233
		% within Libcon scale	18.8%	21.6%	26.6%	36.9%	25.2%	35.7%	20.2%	29.5%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	4	6	15	42	26	52	44	189
		% within Libcon scale	12.5%	11.8%	19.0%	19.4%	22.6%	31.0%	34.1%	23.9%
	A lot worse off	Count	6	0	6	17	23	43	40	135
		% within Libcon scale	18.8%	.0%	7.6%	7.8%	20.0%	25.6%	31.0%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	5	0	7	1	0	0	13
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	9.8%	.0%	3.2%	.9%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
Total		Count	32	51	79	217	115	168	129	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID	Total

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	11	3	5	5	1	2	0	0	27
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	3.3%	8.3%	6.3%	.9%	2.7%	.0%	.0%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	90	22	24	12	11	11	22	1	193
		% within 7 point Party ID	54.5%	24.4%	40.0%	15.2%	10.4%	14.9%	11.2%	7.1%	24.6%
	About the same	Count	40	25	18	30	23	18	68	7	229
		% within 7 point Party ID	24.2%	27.8%	30.0%	38.0%	21.7%	24.3%	34.5%	50.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	16	31	9	10	29	31	59	1	186
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.7%	34.4%	15.0%	12.7%	27.4%	41.9%	29.9%	7.1%	23.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	5	5	4	22	40	10	48	0	134
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.0%	5.6%	6.7%	27.8%	37.7%	13.5%	24.4%	.0%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	3	4	0	0	2	2	0	5	16
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	4.4%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	2.7%	.0%	35.7%	2.0%
Total		Count	165	90	60	79	106	74	197	14	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	7	10	8	2	27
		% within age	5.7%	4.1%	2.5%	1.7%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	36	71	69	18	194
		% within age	29.5%	29.3%	21.4%	15.7%	24.2%

	About the same	Count	44	77	86	31	238
		% within age	36.1%	31.8%	26.6%	27.0%	29.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	19	53	85	33	190
		% within age	15.6%	21.9%	26.3%	28.7%	23.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	9	26	72	30	137
		% within age	7.4%	10.7%	22.3%	26.1%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	7	5	3	1	16
		% within age	5.7%	2.1%	.9%	.9%	2.0%
Total		Count	122	242	323	115	802
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	1	4	8	6	6	2	27
		% within Education	3.4%	1.3%	3.0%	12.2%	5.6%	4.5%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	4	68	70	8	31	13	194
		% within Education	13.8%	22.2%	26.5%	16.3%	29.0%	29.5%	24.3%
	About the same	Count	5	98	69	15	38	12	237
		% within Education	17.2%	32.0%	26.1%	30.6%	35.5%	27.3%	29.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	11	83	60	10	16	10	190
		% within Education	37.9%	27.1%	22.7%	20.4%	15.0%	22.7%	23.8%
	A lot worse off	Count	6	47	52	9	15	7	136

			20.7%	15.4%	19.7%	18.4%	14.0%	15.9%	17.0%
	% within Education								
	Don't know	Count	2	6	5	1	1	0	15
		% within Education	6.9%	2.0%	1.9%	2.0%	.9%	.0%	1.9%
Total		Count	29	306	264	49	107	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	10	2	4	6	6	28
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	1.4%	3.7%	3.1%	2.7%	3.5%
	Somewhat better off	Count	18	37	39	45	54	193
		% within Church attendance	13.7%	25.5%	36.1%	23.6%	24.4%	24.2%
	About the same	Count	40	46	34	56	60	236
		% within Church attendance	30.5%	31.7%	31.5%	29.3%	27.1%	29.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	34	33	22	42	56	187
		% within Church attendance	26.0%	22.8%	20.4%	22.0%	25.3%	23.5%
	A lot worse off	Count	28	25	9	38	36	136
		% within Church attendance	21.4%	17.2%	8.3%	19.9%	16.3%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	2	0	4	9	16
		% within Church attendance	.8%	1.4%	.0%	2.1%	4.1%	2.0%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	221	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Race Crosstabulation

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
							Race				
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	10	8	4	1	1	1	1	0	26
		% within Race	1.9%	7.9%	3.3%	6.7%	33.3%	9.1%	3.8%	.0%	3.3%
	Somewhat better off	Count	94	53	33	7	0	3	3	0	193
		% within Race	18.2%	52.5%	26.8%	46.7%	.0%	27.3%	11.5%	.0%	24.2%
	About the same	Count	162	22	41	5	0	2	2	2	236
		% within Race	31.3%	21.8%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	18.2%	7.7%	100.0%	29.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	135	15	28	1	1	2	8	0	190
		% within Race	26.1%	14.9%	22.8%	6.7%	33.3%	18.2%	30.8%	.0%	23.8%
	A lot worse off	Count	104	2	14	1	1	3	12	0	137
		% within Race	20.1%	2.0%	11.4%	6.7%	33.3%	27.3%	46.2%	.0%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	16
		% within Race	2.3%	1.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%
Total		Count	517	101	123	15	3	11	26	2	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Marital Status Crosstabulation

90

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
								Marital Status	
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	16	0	3	1	7	0	27
		% within Marital Status	3.3%	.0%	3.1%	3.3%	4.9%	.0%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	103	5	27	3	41	16	195
		% within Marital Status	21.2%	41.7%	27.8%	10.0%	28.7%	51.6%	24.4%
	About the same	Count	146	2	23	11	47	5	234
		% within Marital Status	30.0%	16.7%	23.7%	36.7%	32.9%	16.1%	29.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	120	4	25	10	23	7	189
		% within Marital Status	24.7%	33.3%	25.8%	33.3%	16.1%	22.6%	23.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	94	1	18	5	16	3	137
		% within Marital Status	19.3%	8.3%	18.6%	16.7%	11.2%	9.7%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	7	0	1	0	9	0	17
		% within Marital Status	1.4%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	6.3%	.0%	2.1%
Total		Count	486	12	97	30	143	31	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Gender Crosstabulation

			Male	Female	Total
			Gender		
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	19	7	26
		% within Gender	5.1%	1.7%	3.3%
	Somewhat better off	Count	95	98	193

		% within Gender	25.4%	23.2%	24.2%
	About the same	Count	101	136	237
		% within Gender	27.0%	32.2%	29.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	91	98	189
		% within Gender	24.3%	23.2%	23.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	67	69	136
		% within Gender	17.9%	16.3%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	15	16
		% within Gender	.3%	3.5%	2.0%
Total		Count	374	423	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	15	7	5	27
		% within Urban/Rural	6.2%	1.8%	2.8%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	63	104	26	193
		% within Urban/Rural	26.0%	27.4%	14.7%	24.2%
	About the same	Count	74	113	48	235
		% within Urban/Rural	30.6%	29.8%	27.1%	29.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	61	76	53	190
		% within Urban/Rural	25.2%	20.1%	29.9%	23.8%
	A lot worse off	Count	23	71	43	137

			9.5%	18.7%	24.3%	17.2%
		% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	18.7%	24.3%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	6	8	2	16
		% within Urban/Rural	2.5%	2.1%	1.1%	2.0%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	8	14	2	1	2	27
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.7%	6.4%	2.8%	1.2%	.8%	3.4%
	Somewhat better off	Count	43	59	18	31	42	193
		% within Metropolitan areas	25.3%	26.8%	25.0%	36.0%	16.9%	24.2%
	About the same	Count	58	69	19	21	69	236
		% within Metropolitan areas	34.1%	31.4%	26.4%	24.4%	27.7%	29.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	33	43	15	23	75	189
		% within Metropolitan areas	19.4%	19.5%	20.8%	26.7%	30.1%	23.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	26	33	13	9	55	136

		% within Metropolitan areas	15.3%	15.0%	18.1%	10.5%	22.1%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	2	2	5	1	6	16
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.2%	.9%	6.9%	1.2%	2.4%	2.0%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	249	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country Economy Retrospective * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Country Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	7	9	5	1	2	2	26
		% within AP Region	4.4%	6.9%	4.2%	.6%	1.9%	1.6%	3.3%
	Somewhat better off	Count	36	37	30	43	19	28	193
		% within AP Region	22.5%	28.5%	25.0%	27.4%	18.4%	22.8%	24.3%
	About the same	Count	45	39	41	42	35	33	235
		% within AP Region	28.1%	30.0%	34.2%	26.8%	34.0%	26.8%	29.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	44	23	24	41	25	30	187
		% within AP Region	27.5%	17.7%	20.0%	26.1%	24.3%	24.4%	23.6%
	A lot worse off	Count	26	20	18	27	22	23	136
		% within AP Region	16.3%	15.4%	15.0%	17.2%	21.4%	18.7%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	2	2	2	3	0	7	16
		% within AP Region	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	.0%	5.7%	2.0%

Total		Count	160	130	120	157	103	123	793
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	1	3	3	6	3	1	3	20
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	6.0%	3.8%	2.8%	2.6%	.6%	2.4%	2.5%
	Somewhat better off	Count	9	11	21	35	13	27	14	130
		% within Libcon scale	27.3%	22.0%	26.9%	16.3%	11.4%	16.1%	11.0%	16.6%
	About the same	Count	11	27	30	97	47	86	53	351
		% within Libcon scale	33.3%	54.0%	38.5%	45.1%	41.2%	51.2%	41.7%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	8	4	16	54	32	40	37	191
		% within Libcon scale	24.2%	8.0%	20.5%	25.1%	28.1%	23.8%	29.1%	24.3%
	A lot worse off	Count	4	4	8	16	19	14	20	85
		% within Libcon scale	12.1%	8.0%	10.3%	7.4%	16.7%	8.3%	15.7%	10.8%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	2.0%	.0%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	33	50	78	215	114	168	127	785
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

95

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	9	4	2	2	1	2	2	0	22
		% within 7 point Party ID	5.5%	4.5%	3.3%	2.5%	.9%	2.7%	1.0%	.0%	2.8%
	Somewhat better off	Count	42	12	17	9	10	10	32	1	133
		% within 7 point Party ID	25.5%	13.5%	28.3%	11.3%	9.4%	13.7%	16.2%	6.7%	16.9%
	About the same	Count	74	37	27	35	39	32	100	6	350
		% within 7 point Party ID	44.8%	41.6%	45.0%	43.8%	36.8%	43.8%	50.5%	40.0%	44.5%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	30	28	7	26	32	22	42	3	190
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.2%	31.5%	11.7%	32.5%	30.2%	30.1%	21.2%	20.0%	24.2%
	A lot worse off	Count	10	6	7	8	23	7	22	0	83
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.1%	6.7%	11.7%	10.0%	21.7%	9.6%	11.1%	.0%	10.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	8
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	1.0%
Total		Count	165	89	60	80	106	73	198	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	7	10	3	0	20
		% within age	5.7%	4.1%	.9%	.0%	2.5%
	Somewhat better off	Count	21	62	44	7	134

	% within age	17.2%	25.7%	13.7%	6.1%	16.8%
About the same	Count	54	108	146	48	356
	% within age	44.3%	44.8%	45.3%	42.1%	44.6%
Somewhat worse off	Count	24	37	85	47	193
	% within age	19.7%	15.4%	26.4%	41.2%	24.2%
A lot worse off	Count	12	20	43	12	87
	% within age	9.8%	8.3%	13.4%	10.5%	10.9%
Don't know	Count	4	4	1	0	9
	% within age	3.3%	1.7%	.3%	.0%	1.1%
Total	Count	122	241	322	114	799
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	0	1	8	7	4	2	22
		% within Education	.0%	.3%	3.0%	14.3%	3.7%	4.7%	2.8%
	Somewhat better off	Count	2	38	44	7	31	11	133
		% within Education	7.4%	12.5%	16.5%	14.3%	29.0%	25.6%	16.7%
	About the same	Count	10	137	127	16	46	20	356
		% within Education	37.0%	45.1%	47.7%	32.7%	43.0%	46.5%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	5	89	60	14	16	7	191
		% within Education	18.5%	29.3%	22.6%	28.6%	15.0%	16.3%	24.0%

								Total
A lot worse off	Count	8	34	27	5	9	3	86
	% within Education	29.6%	11.2%	10.2%	10.2%	8.4%	7.0%	10.8%
Don't know	Count	2	5	0	0	1	0	8
	% within Education	7.4%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.0%
Total	Count	27	304	266	49	107	43	796
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	5	1	5	7	3	21
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	.7%	4.6%	3.7%	1.3%	2.6%
	Somewhat better off	Count	29	21	17	29	38	134
		% within Church attendance	22.1%	14.4%	15.7%	15.2%	17.0%	16.8%
	About the same	Count	55	76	51	82	91	355
		% within Church attendance	42.0%	52.1%	47.2%	42.9%	40.8%	44.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	27	38	21	53	53	192
		% within Church attendance	20.6%	26.0%	19.4%	27.7%	23.8%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	14	9	14	20	31	88
		% within Church attendance	10.7%	6.2%	13.0%	10.5%	13.9%	11.0%
	Don't know	Count	1	1	0	0	7	9
		% within Church attendance	.8%	.7%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	1.1%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	223	799

Family Economy Retrospective * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
					Church attendance			
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	5	1	5	7	3	21
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	.7%	4.6%	3.7%	1.3%	2.6%
	Somewhat better off	Count	29	21	17	29	38	134
		% within Church attendance	22.1%	14.4%	15.7%	15.2%	17.0%	16.8%
	About the same	Count	55	76	51	82	91	355
		% within Church attendance	42.0%	52.1%	47.2%	42.9%	40.8%	44.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	27	38	21	53	53	192
		% within Church attendance	20.6%	26.0%	19.4%	27.7%	23.8%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	14	9	14	20	31	88
		% within Church attendance	10.7%	6.2%	13.0%	10.5%	13.9%	11.0%
	Don't know	Count	1	1	0	0	7	9
		% within Church attendance	.8%	.7%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	1.1%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	223	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	9	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	21
		% within Race	1.7%	3.0%	4.0%	26.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.6%
	Somewhat better off	Count	82	26	18	4	1	0	2	0	133
		% within Race	15.8%	26.0%	14.5%	26.7%	33.3%	.0%	8.0%	.0%	16.6%
	About the same	Count	234	50	54	5	0	4	8	2	357
		% within Race	45.0%	50.0%	43.5%	33.3%	.0%	36.4%	32.0%	100.0%	44.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	133	12	36	2	1	3	5	0	192
		% within Race	25.6%	12.0%	29.0%	13.3%	33.3%	27.3%	20.0%	.0%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	56	9	8	0	1	4	10	0	88
		% within Race	10.8%	9.0%	6.5%	.0%	33.3%	36.4%	40.0%	.0%	11.0%
	Don't know	Count	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
		% within Race	1.2%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
Total		Count	520	100	124	15	3	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Family Economy	A lot better off	Count	13	0	1	0	8	0	22

Retrospective									
		% within Marital Status	2.7%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	5.6%	.0%	2.8%
	Somewhat better off	Count	94	2	12	2	16	8	134
		% within Marital Status	19.4%	16.7%	12.4%	6.7%	11.2%	26.7%	16.8%
	About the same	Count	211	4	39	13	68	18	353
		% within Marital Status	43.6%	33.3%	40.2%	43.3%	47.6%	60.0%	44.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	114	5	34	11	25	2	191
		% within Marital Status	23.6%	41.7%	35.1%	36.7%	17.5%	6.7%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	50	1	10	4	20	2	87
		% within Marital Status	10.3%	8.3%	10.3%	13.3%	14.0%	6.7%	10.9%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	1	0	6	0	9
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	4.2%	.0%	1.1%
Total		Count	484	12	97	30	143	30	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	14	7	21
		% within Gender	3.7%	1.7%	2.6%
	Somewhat better off	Count	50	83	133
		% within Gender	13.4%	19.6%	16.7%
	About the same	Count	187	169	356
		% within Gender	50.0%	40.0%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	84	108	192

101

		% within Gender	22.5%	25.5%	24.1%
	A lot worse off	Count	38	49	87
		% within Gender	10.2%	11.6%	10.9%
	Don't know	Count	1	7	8
		% within Gender	.3%	1.7%	1.0%
Total		Count	374	423	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	14	6	0	20
		% within Urban/Rural	5.8%	1.6%	.0%	2.5%
	Somewhat better off	Count	37	65	31	133
		% within Urban/Rural	15.3%	17.3%	17.6%	16.8%
	About the same	Count	114	168	73	355
		% within Urban/Rural	47.1%	44.7%	41.5%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	56	90	46	192
		% within Urban/Rural	23.1%	23.9%	26.1%	24.2%
	A lot worse off	Count	20	41	25	86
		% within Urban/Rural	8.3%	10.9%	14.2%	10.8%
	Don't know	Count	1	6	1	8
		% within Urban/Rural	.4%	1.6%	.6%	1.0%
Total		Count	242	376	176	794

Family Economy Retrospective * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Family Economy Retrospective	A lot better off	Count	14	6	0	20
		% within Urban/Rural	5.8%	1.6%	.0%	2.5%
	Somewhat better off	Count	37	65	31	133
		% within Urban/Rural	15.3%	17.3%	17.6%	16.8%
	About the same	Count	114	168	73	355
		% within Urban/Rural	47.1%	44.7%	41.5%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	56	90	46	192
		% within Urban/Rural	23.1%	23.9%	26.1%	24.2%
	A lot worse off	Count	20	41	25	86
		% within Urban/Rural	8.3%	10.9%	14.2%	10.8%
	Don't know	Count	1	6	1	8
		% within Urban/Rural	.4%	1.6%	.6%	1.0%
Total		Count	242	376	176	794
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Family Economy	A lot better off	Count	7	5	1	2	5	20

		East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Retrospective	% within Metropolitan areas	4.2%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	2.0%		2.5%
Somewhat better off	Count	37	31	15	24	27		134
	% within Metropolitan areas	22.0%	14.1%	21.1%	27.3%	10.8%		16.8%
About the same	Count	66	104	30	44	111		355
	% within Metropolitan areas	39.3%	47.3%	42.3%	50.0%	44.4%		44.5%
Somewhat worse off	Count	42	54	15	12	70		193
	% within Metropolitan areas	25.0%	24.5%	21.1%	13.6%	28.0%		24.2%
A lot worse off	Count	16	24	8	5	34		87
	% within Metropolitan areas	9.5%	10.9%	11.3%	5.7%	13.6%		10.9%
Don't know	Count	0	2	2	1	3		8
	% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	.9%	2.8%	1.1%	1.2%		1.0%
Total	Count	168	220	71	88	250		797
	% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Family Economy Retrospective * AP Region Crosstabulation

	AP Region						
	East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total

Family Economy	A lot better off	Count	2	4	6	4	1	4	21
Retrospective		% within AP Region	1.2%	3.1%	5.0%	2.5%	1.0%	3.2%	2.6%
	Somewhat better off	Count	22	21	23	36	14	17	133
		% within AP Region	13.7%	16.0%	19.3%	22.9%	13.5%	13.7%	16.7%
	About the same	Count	73	59	50	67	59	48	356
		% within AP Region	45.3%	45.0%	42.0%	42.7%	56.7%	38.7%	44.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	45	29	28	37	18	34	191
		% within AP Region	28.0%	22.1%	23.5%	23.6%	17.3%	27.4%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	19	16	12	11	12	17	87
		% within AP Region	11.8%	12.2%	10.1%	7.0%	11.5%	13.7%	10.9%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	0	2	0	4	8
		% within AP Region	.0%	1.5%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	3.2%	1.0%
Total		Count	161	131	119	157	104	124	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	13	24	25	41	9	1	8	121
		% within Libcon scale	39.4%	48.0%	32.1%	18.9%	7.8%	.6%	6.2%	15.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	12	19	34	68	21	11	1	166
		% within Libcon scale	36.4%	38.0%	43.6%	31.3%	18.3%	6.5%	.8%	21.0%
	Neither approve nor	Count	1	3	7	40	9	1	7	68

105

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican		Total
	disapprove	% within Libcon scale	3.0%	6.0%	9.0%	18.4%	7.8%	.6%	5.4%		8.6%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	2	4	6	23	19	13	6		73
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	8.0%	7.7%	10.6%	16.5%	7.7%	4.7%		9.2%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	5	0	6	43	57	140	107		358
		% within Libcon scale	15.2%	.0%	7.7%	19.8%	49.6%	82.8%	82.9%		45.3%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	2	0	3	0		5
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.8%	.0%		.6%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	169	129		791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Obama approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	86	16	14	7	0	0	0	1	124
		% within 7 point Party ID	52.1%	17.6%	23.3%	8.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.7%	15.8%
	Approve somewhat	Count	53	39	32	19	6	6	6	3	164
		% within 7 point Party ID	32.1%	42.9%	53.3%	23.8%	5.7%	8.2%	3.0%	20.0%	20.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	16	12	7	14	4	7	3	4	67
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.7%	13.2%	11.7%	17.5%	3.8%	9.6%	1.5%	26.7%	8.5%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	8	11	2	11	13	9	18	3	75
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.8%	12.1%	3.3%	13.8%	12.3%	12.3%	9.1%	20.0%	9.5%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	1	13	5	29	83	51	168	2	352
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	14.3%	8.3%	36.3%	78.3%	69.9%	85.3%	13.3%	44.7%

Don't know	Count		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5
	% within 7 point Party ID		.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	13.3%	.6%
Total	Count		165	91	60	80	106	73	197	15	787
	% within 7 point Party ID		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	15	48	49	12	124
		% within age	12.3%	19.8%	15.2%	10.4%	15.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	43	56	50	18	167
		% within age	35.2%	23.1%	15.5%	15.7%	20.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	15	27	22	2	66
		% within age	12.3%	11.2%	6.8%	1.7%	8.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	21	30	6	76
		% within age	15.6%	8.7%	9.3%	5.2%	9.5%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	30	87	170	77	364
		% within age	24.6%	36.0%	52.6%	67.0%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	3	2	0	5
		% within age	.0%	1.2%	.6%	.0%	.6%
Total		Count	122	242	323	115	802
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

107

Obama approval * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	4	36	44	10	21	8	123
		% within Education	14.3%	11.8%	16.5%	20.0%	19.6%	18.6%	15.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	4	65	51	11	26	10	167
		% within Education	14.3%	21.2%	19.1%	22.0%	24.3%	23.3%	20.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	6	31	19	4	5	2	67
		% within Education	21.4%	10.1%	7.1%	8.0%	4.7%	4.7%	8.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	1	37	19	4	10	4	75
		% within Education	3.6%	12.1%	7.1%	8.0%	9.3%	9.3%	9.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	13	133	133	21	44	19	363
		% within Education	46.4%	43.5%	49.8%	42.0%	41.1%	44.2%	45.3%
	Don't know	Count	0	4	1	0	1	0	6
		% within Education	.0%	1.3%	.4%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.7%
Total		Count	28	306	267	50	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	19	18	23	32	30	122
		% within Church attendance	14.5%	12.4%	21.5%	16.8%	13.6%	15.3%

Approve somewhat	Count	13	29	22	32	71	167
	% within Church attendance	9.9%	20.0%	20.6%	16.8%	32.1%	21.0%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	5	8	10	25	17	65
	% within Church attendance	3.8%	5.5%	9.3%	13.1%	7.7%	8.2%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	11	15	8	23	17	74
	% within Church attendance	8.4%	10.3%	7.5%	12.0%	7.7%	9.3%
Disapprove strongly	Count	82	75	44	77	84	362
	% within Church attendance	62.6%	51.7%	41.1%	40.3%	38.0%	45.5%
Don't know	Count	1	0	0	2	2	5
	% within Church attendance	.8%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.9%	.6%
Total	Count	131	145	107	191	221	795
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	47	50	17	7	2	1	1	0	125
		% within Race	9.1%	49.0%	13.8%	46.7%	50.0%	9.1%	3.8%	.0%	15.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	78	38	38	5	0	3	2	2	166
		% within Race	15.0%	37.3%	30.9%	33.3%	.0%	27.3%	7.7%	100.0%	20.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	34	11	19	1	0	3	0	0	68

109

disapprove	% within Race	6.6%	10.8%	15.4%	6.7%	.0%	27.3%	.0%	.0%	8.5%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	47	2	21	1	0	1	2	0	74
	% within Race	9.1%	2.0%	17.1%	6.7%	.0%	9.1%	7.7%	.0%	9.2%
Disapprove strongly	Count	309	1	28	1	2	3	20	0	364
	% within Race	59.5%	1.0%	22.8%	6.7%	50.0%	27.3%	76.9%	.0%	45.4%
Don't know	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
	% within Race	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	.6%
Total	Count	519	102	123	15	4	11	26	2	802
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	66	1	13	5	32	5	122
		% within Marital Status	13.6%	9.1%	13.7%	16.7%	22.5%	16.1%	15.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	76	1	31	2	43	9	162
		% within Marital Status	15.6%	9.1%	32.6%	6.7%	30.3%	29.0%	20.4%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	26	4	10	2	22	3	67
		% within Marital Status	5.3%	36.4%	10.5%	6.7%	15.5%	9.7%	8.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	42	3	7	6	13	4	75
		% within Marital Status	8.6%	27.3%	7.4%	20.0%	9.2%	12.9%	9.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	273	2	34	15	30	10	364
		% within Marital Status	56.2%	18.2%	35.8%	50.0%	21.1%	32.3%	45.8%

110

Don't know	Count	3	0	0	0	2	0	5
	% within Marital Status	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.6%
Total	Count	486	11	95	30	142	31	795
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	63	60	123
		% within Gender	16.8%	14.1%	15.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	69	98	167
		% within Gender	18.4%	23.1%	20.9%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	24	43	67
		% within Gender	6.4%	10.1%	8.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	39	36	75
		% within Gender	10.4%	8.5%	9.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	179	184	363
		% within Gender	47.7%	43.3%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	1	4	5
		% within Gender	.3%	.9%	.6%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

111

Obama approval * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	45	62	16	123
		% within Urban/Rural	18.6%	16.4%	9.0%	15.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	72	80	15	167
		% within Urban/Rural	29.8%	21.1%	8.4%	20.9%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	28	21	16	65
		% within Urban/Rural	11.6%	5.5%	9.0%	8.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	30	33	11	74
		% within Urban/Rural	12.4%	8.7%	6.2%	9.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	67	179	119	365
		% within Urban/Rural	27.7%	47.2%	66.9%	45.7%
	Don't know	Count	0	4	1	5
		% within Urban/Rural	.0%	1.1%	.6%	.6%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	35	42	9	14	22	122

112

		% within Metropolitan areas	20.5%	19.1%	12.5%	16.3%	8.8%	15.3%
Approve somewhat	Count		41	52	12	20	41	166
	% within Metropolitan areas		24.0%	23.6%	16.7%	23.3%	16.4%	20.8%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count		8	13	8	15	23	67
	% within Metropolitan areas		4.7%	5.9%	11.1%	17.4%	9.2%	8.4%
Disapprove somewhat	Count		17	17	10	7	24	75
	% within Metropolitan areas		9.9%	7.7%	13.9%	8.1%	9.6%	9.4%
Disapprove strongly	Count		70	95	31	30	138	364
	% within Metropolitan areas		40.9%	43.2%	43.1%	34.9%	55.2%	45.6%
Don't know	Count		0	1	2	0	2	5
	% within Metropolitan areas		.0%	.5%	2.8%	.0%	.8%	.6%
Total	Count		171	220	72	86	250	799
	% within Metropolitan areas		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Obama approval * AP Region Crosstabulation

	AP Region						
	East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total

113

Obama approval									
Obama approval	Approve strongly	Count	33	27	21	20	6	17	124
		% within AP Region	20.4%	20.3%	17.4%	12.7%	5.8%	13.8%	15.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	21	39	34	37	9	27	167
		% within AP Region	13.0%	29.3%	28.1%	23.4%	8.7%	22.0%	20.9%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	11	8	6	19	9	13	66
		% within AP Region	6.8%	6.0%	5.0%	12.0%	8.7%	10.6%	8.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	12	10	13	10	10	20	75
		% within AP Region	7.4%	7.5%	10.7%	6.3%	9.7%	16.3%	9.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	85	48	47	72	68	43	363
		% within AP Region	52.5%	36.1%	38.8%	45.6%	66.0%	35.0%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	0	1	3	5
		% within AP Region	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	2.4%	.6%
Total		Count	162	133	121	158	103	123	800
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	2	1	1	2	1	1	4	12
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	2.0%	1.3%	.9%	.9%	.6%	3.1%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	10	10	19	41	8	28	19	135
		% within Libcon scale	31.3%	19.6%	24.4%	18.9%	7.0%	16.7%	14.6%	17.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	4	12	18	60	24	21	11	150

	disapprove	% within Libcon scale	12.5%	23.5%	23.1%	27.6%	20.9%	12.5%	8.5%	19.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	3	11	22	54	30	50	38	208
		% within Libcon scale	9.4%	21.6%	28.2%	24.9%	26.1%	29.8%	29.2%	26.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	12	13	18	47	47	65	54	256
		% within Libcon scale	37.5%	25.5%	23.1%	21.7%	40.9%	38.7%	41.5%	32.4%
	Don't know	Count	1	4	0	13	5	3	4	30
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	7.8%	.0%	6.0%	4.3%	1.8%	3.1%	3.8%
Total		Count	32	51	78	217	115	168	130	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	7	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	12
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.2%	.0%	3.4%	2.5%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	52	24	5	3	7	9	30	0	130
		% within 7 point Party ID	31.5%	26.7%	8.5%	3.8%	6.6%	12.3%	15.2%	.0%	16.6%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	34	17	16	23	15	16	22	8	151
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.6%	18.9%	27.1%	28.7%	14.2%	21.9%	11.2%	57.1%	19.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	32	21	20	18	27	15	72	1	206
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.4%	23.3%	33.9%	22.5%	25.5%	20.5%	36.5%	7.1%	26.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	34	23	13	34	55	25	67	2	253
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.6%	25.6%	22.0%	42.5%	51.9%	34.2%	34.0%	14.3%	32.3%

Don't know	Count	6	5	3	0	1	8	6	3	32
	% within 7 point Party ID	3.6%	5.6%	5.1%	.0%	.9%	11.0%	3.0%	21.4%	4.1%
Total	Count	165	90	59	80	106	73	197	14	784
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	4	5	3	0	12
		% within age	3.3%	2.1%	.9%	.0%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	25	49	47	14	135
		% within age	20.3%	20.3%	14.6%	12.3%	16.9%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	40	56	45	12	153
		% within age	32.5%	23.2%	13.9%	10.5%	19.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	32	61	81	34	208
		% within age	26.0%	25.3%	25.1%	29.8%	26.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	13	58	136	54	261
		% within age	10.6%	24.1%	42.1%	47.4%	32.6%
	Don't know	Count	9	12	11	0	32
		% within age	7.3%	5.0%	3.4%	.0%	4.0%
Total		Count	123	241	323	114	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	0	5	3	2	3	0	13
		% within Education	.0%	1.6%	1.1%	4.1%	2.8%	.0%	1.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	10	55	39	8	18	4	134
		% within Education	34.5%	18.0%	14.6%	16.3%	16.8%	9.5%	16.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	7	59	49	6	23	8	152
		% within Education	24.1%	19.3%	18.4%	12.2%	21.5%	19.0%	19.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	6	82	68	11	28	13	208
		% within Education	20.7%	26.8%	25.5%	22.4%	26.2%	31.0%	26.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	5	88	98	22	32	16	261
		% within Education	17.2%	28.8%	36.7%	44.9%	29.9%	38.1%	32.6%
	Don't know	Count	1	17	10	0	3	1	32
		% within Education	3.4%	5.6%	3.7%	.0%	2.8%	2.4%	4.0%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	42	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	5	2	2	1	2	12
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	1.4%	1.9%	.5%	.9%	1.5%

								Total
Approve somewhat	Count	17	26	37	23	31		134
	% within Church attendance	13.0%	17.7%	34.3%	12.0%	14.0%		16.8%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	18	20	14	50	51		153
	% within Church attendance	13.7%	13.6%	13.0%	26.0%	23.0%		19.1%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	47	38	26	42	55		208
	% within Church attendance	35.9%	25.9%	24.1%	21.9%	24.8%		26.0%
Disapprove strongly	Count	41	52	26	68	73		260
	% within Church attendance	31.3%	35.4%	24.1%	35.4%	32.9%		32.5%
Don't know	Count	3	9	3	8	10		33
	% within Church attendance	2.3%	6.1%	2.8%	4.2%	4.5%		4.1%
Total	Count	131	147	108	192	222		800
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Congress approval * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	1	3	6	1	1	0	0	0	12
		% within Race	.2%	2.9%	4.8%	6.7%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	64	39	24	2	1	1	3	2	136
		% within Race	12.3%	38.2%	19.2%	13.3%	25.0%	8.3%	11.5%	100.0%	16.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	98	20	29	3	0	0	3	0	153

118

										Total
disapprove	% within Race	18.9%	19.6%	23.2%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	11.5%	.0%	19.0%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	132	24	37	6	0	4	8	0	211
	% within Race	25.4%	23.5%	29.6%	40.0%	.0%	33.3%	30.8%	.0%	26.2%
Disapprove strongly	Count	202	13	25	3	2	4	11	0	260
	% within Race	38.9%	12.7%	20.0%	20.0%	50.0%	33.3%	42.3%	.0%	32.3%
Don't know	Count	22	3	4	0	0	3	1	0	33
	% within Race	4.2%	2.9%	3.2%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	3.8%	.0%	4.1%
Total	Count	519	102	125	15	4	12	26	2	805
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	8	0	0	0	4	0	12
		% within Marital Status	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	76	3	13	4	24	9	129
		% within Marital Status	15.6%	25.0%	13.5%	13.8%	16.9%	30.0%	16.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	80	2	19	4	40	8	153
		% within Marital Status	16.5%	16.7%	19.8%	13.8%	28.2%	26.7%	19.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	136	1	26	9	32	6	210
		% within Marital Status	28.0%	8.3%	27.1%	31.0%	22.5%	20.0%	26.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	164	6	37	11	34	7	259
		% within Marital Status	33.7%	50.0%	38.5%	37.9%	23.9%	23.3%	32.6%

Don't know	Count	22	0	1	1	8	0	32
	% within Marital Status	4.5%	.0%	1.0%	3.4%	5.6%	.0%	4.0%
Total	Count	486	12	96	29	142	30	795
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	8	4	12
		% within Gender	2.1%	.9%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	57	77	134
		% within Gender	15.2%	18.1%	16.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	49	104	153
		% within Gender	13.1%	24.5%	19.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	107	102	209
		% within Gender	28.5%	24.0%	26.1%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	151	109	260
		% within Gender	40.3%	25.6%	32.5%
	Don't know	Count	3	29	32
		% within Gender	.8%	6.8%	4.0%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

120

Congress approval * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	6	5	1	12
		% within Urban/Rural	2.5%	1.3%	.6%	1.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	46	68	20	134
		% within Urban/Rural	19.1%	18.0%	11.2%	16.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	47	74	32	153
		% within Urban/Rural	19.5%	19.6%	18.0%	19.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	69	100	39	208
		% within Urban/Rural	28.6%	26.5%	21.9%	26.1%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	64	116	78	258
		% within Urban/Rural	26.6%	30.7%	43.8%	32.4%
	Don't know	Count	9	15	8	32
		% within Urban/Rural	3.7%	4.0%	4.5%	4.0%
Total		Count	241	378	178	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	4	2	2	0	4	12

		East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
	% within Metropolitan areas	2.4%	.9%	2.8%	.0%	1.6%		1.5%
Approve somewhat	Count	40	32	17	15	30		134
	% within Metropolitan areas	23.7%	14.5%	23.6%	17.4%	12.0%		16.8%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	29	54	6	15	49		153
	% within Metropolitan areas	17.2%	24.5%	8.3%	17.4%	19.6%		19.2%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	44	53	21	21	69		208
	% within Metropolitan areas	26.0%	24.1%	29.2%	24.4%	27.6%		26.1%
Disapprove strongly	Count	47	76	20	28	88		259
	% within Metropolitan areas	27.8%	34.5%	27.8%	32.6%	35.2%		32.5%
Don't know	Count	5	3	6	7	10		31
	% within Metropolitan areas	3.0%	1.4%	8.3%	8.1%	4.0%		3.9%
Total	Count	169	220	72	86	250		797
	% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Congress approval * AP Region Crosstabulation

		AP Region						Total
		East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	

Congress approval									Total
Approve strongly	Count		2	2	3	0	1	4	12
	% within AP Region		1.2%	1.5%	2.5%	.0%	1.0%	3.3%	1.5%
Approve somewhat	Count		28	16	30	23	11	26	134
	% within AP Region		17.4%	12.0%	24.8%	14.5%	10.7%	21.1%	16.8%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count		39	31	17	28	21	17	153
	% within AP Region		24.2%	23.3%	14.0%	17.6%	20.4%	13.8%	19.1%
Disapprove somewhat	Count		32	39	37	40	26	34	208
	% within AP Region		19.9%	29.3%	30.6%	25.2%	25.2%	27.6%	26.0%
Disapprove strongly	Count		56	43	29	59	39	35	261
	% within AP Region		34.8%	32.3%	24.0%	37.1%	37.9%	28.5%	32.6%
Don't know	Count		4	2	5	9	5	7	32
	% within AP Region		2.5%	1.5%	4.1%	5.7%	4.9%	5.7%	4.0%
Total	Count		161	133	121	159	103	123	800
	% within AP Region		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	2	0	0	8	9	28	40	87
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	.0%	.0%	3.7%	7.9%	16.6%	31.3%	11.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	1	2	4	40	33	91	54	225
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	3.9%	5.2%	18.4%	28.9%	53.8%	42.2%	28.6%
	Neither approve nor	Count	1	2	13	58	27	21	14	136

disapprove	% within Libcon scale	3.1%	3.9%	16.9%	26.7%	23.7%	12.4%	10.9%	17.3%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	0	8	15	40	23	21	10	117
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	15.7%	19.5%	18.4%	20.2%	12.4%	7.8%	14.8%
Disapprove strongly	Count	28	36	42	56	21	7	10	200
	% within Libcon scale	87.5%	70.6%	54.5%	25.8%	18.4%	4.1%	7.8%	25.4%
Don't know	Count	0	3	3	15	1	1	0	23
	% within Libcon scale	.0%	5.9%	3.9%	6.9%	.9%	.6%	.0%	2.9%
Total	Count	32	51	77	217	114	169	128	788
	% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	2	0	5	11	11	57	0	89
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	2.2%	.0%	6.3%	10.4%	14.9%	28.9%	.0%	11.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	13	17	7	11	46	25	101	1	221
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.9%	18.7%	11.7%	13.9%	43.4%	33.8%	51.3%	6.7%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	27	21	9	16	18	17	21	4	133
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.4%	23.1%	15.0%	20.3%	17.0%	23.0%	10.7%	26.7%	16.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	22	17	8	23	23	9	13	3	118
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.3%	18.7%	13.3%	29.1%	21.7%	12.2%	6.6%	20.0%	15.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	94	29	35	21	7	8	4	2	200
		% within 7 point Party ID	57.0%	31.9%	58.3%	26.6%	6.6%	10.8%	2.0%	13.3%	25.4%

		6	5	1	3	1	4	1	5	26
Don't know	Count	6	5	1	3	1	4	1	5	26
	% within 7 point Party ID	3.6%	5.5%	1.7%	3.8%	.9%	5.4%	.5%	33.3%	3.3%
Total	Count	165	91	60	79	106	74	197	15	787
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	18	47	20	88
		% within age	2.5%	7.5%	14.6%	17.4%	11.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	35	63	87	41	226
		% within age	28.9%	26.4%	26.9%	35.7%	28.3%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	27	51	47	13	138
		% within age	22.3%	21.3%	14.6%	11.3%	17.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	34	53	13	119
		% within age	15.7%	14.2%	16.4%	11.3%	14.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	24	67	84	27	202
		% within age	19.8%	28.0%	26.0%	23.5%	25.3%
	Don't know	Count	13	6	5	1	25
		% within age	10.7%	2.5%	1.5%	.9%	3.1%
Total		Count	121	239	323	115	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	40	25	7	10	3	88
		% within Education	10.7%	13.2%	9.3%	14.3%	9.4%	7.0%	11.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	8	88	78	13	26	12	225
		% within Education	28.6%	28.9%	29.1%	26.5%	24.5%	27.9%	28.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	3	67	42	8	15	3	138
		% within Education	10.7%	22.0%	15.7%	16.3%	14.2%	7.0%	17.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	4	47	35	5	19	9	119
		% within Education	14.3%	15.5%	13.1%	10.2%	17.9%	20.9%	14.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	8	50	79	15	34	16	202
		% within Education	28.6%	16.4%	29.5%	30.6%	32.1%	37.2%	25.3%
	Don't know	Count	2	12	9	1	2	0	26
		% within Education	7.1%	3.9%	3.4%	2.0%	1.9%	.0%	3.3%
Total		Count	28	304	268	49	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	14	23	12	21	16	86
		% within Church attendance	10.7%	15.9%	11.2%	11.1%	7.3%	10.9%

Approve somewhat	Count	55	47	36	50	37	225
	% within Church attendance	42.0%	32.4%	33.6%	26.5%	16.8%	28.4%
Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	23	32	15	30	37	137
	% within Church attendance	17.6%	22.1%	14.0%	15.9%	16.8%	17.3%
Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	18	14	30	37	118
	% within Church attendance	14.5%	12.4%	13.1%	15.9%	16.8%	14.9%
Disapprove strongly	Count	20	23	28	51	79	201
	% within Church attendance	15.3%	15.9%	26.2%	27.0%	35.9%	25.4%
Don't know	Count	0	2	2	7	14	25
	% within Church attendance	.0%	1.4%	1.9%	3.7%	6.4%	3.2%
Total	Count	131	145	107	189	220	792
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	71	2	11	1	1	0	3	0	89
		% within Race	13.7%	2.0%	8.9%	7.1%	25.0%	.0%	12.0%	.0%	11.1%
	Approve somewhat	Count	171	14	27	2	0	4	8	0	226
		% within Race	33.0%	13.7%	21.8%	14.3%	.0%	36.4%	32.0%	.0%	28.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	76	25	31	1	0	0	3	2	138
		% within Race	14.7%	24.5%	25.0%	7.1%	.0%	.0%	12.0%	100.0%	17.3%

127

										Total
Disapprove somewhat	Count	73	12	24	4	1	1	3	0	118
	% within Race	14.1%	11.8%	19.4%	28.6%	25.0%	9.1%	12.0%	.0%	14.8%
Disapprove strongly	Count	112	44	26	6	2	6	7	0	203
	% within Race	21.6%	43.1%	21.0%	42.9%	50.0%	54.5%	28.0%	.0%	25.4%
Don't know	Count	15	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	26
	% within Race	2.9%	4.9%	4.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	3.3%
Total	Count	518	102	124	14	4	11	25	2	800
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	65	1	8	8	4	3	89
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	8.3%	8.4%	27.6%	2.8%	9.7%	11.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	156	1	22	8	25	9	221
		% within Marital Status	32.2%	8.3%	23.2%	27.6%	17.7%	29.0%	27.9%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	80	2	13	3	34	6	138
		% within Marital Status	16.5%	16.7%	13.7%	10.3%	24.1%	19.4%	17.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	77	4	13	1	20	3	118
		% within Marital Status	15.9%	33.3%	13.7%	3.4%	14.2%	9.7%	14.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	94	4	36	9	49	10	202
		% within Marital Status	19.4%	33.3%	37.9%	31.0%	34.8%	32.3%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	13	0	3	0	9	0	25

128

	% within Marital Status	2.7%	.0%	3.2%	.0%	6.4%	.0%	3.2%
Total	Count	485	12	95	29	141	31	793
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	45	44	89
		% within Gender	12.0%	10.4%	11.1%
	Approve somewhat	Count	115	111	226
		% within Gender	30.6%	26.1%	28.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	59	79	138
		% within Gender	15.7%	18.6%	17.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	49	70	119
		% within Gender	13.0%	16.5%	14.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	103	100	203
		% within Gender	27.4%	23.5%	25.3%
	Don't know	Count	5	21	26
		% within Gender	1.3%	4.9%	3.2%
Total		Count	376	425	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	23	36	29	88
		% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	9.5%	16.5%	11.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	49	118	58	225
		% within Urban/Rural	20.2%	31.1%	33.0%	28.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	51	58	29	138
		% within Urban/Rural	21.1%	15.3%	16.5%	17.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	37	55	26	118
		% within Urban/Rural	15.3%	14.5%	14.8%	14.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	74	97	31	202
		% within Urban/Rural	30.6%	25.6%	17.6%	25.3%
	Don't know	Count	8	15	3	26
		% within Urban/Rural	3.3%	4.0%	1.7%	3.3%
Total		Count	242	379	176	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perry approval * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	15	20	11	8	34	88
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.8%	9.2%	15.5%	9.4%	13.5%	11.1%

130

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
	Approve somewhat	Count	40	56	20	23	86		225
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.5%	25.7%	28.2%	27.1%	34.3%		28.3%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	32	37	13	12	43		137
		% within Metropolitan areas	18.8%	17.0%	18.3%	14.1%	17.1%		17.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	31	35	8	8	36		118
		% within Metropolitan areas	18.2%	16.1%	11.3%	9.4%	14.3%		14.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	47	67	15	30	43		202
		% within Metropolitan areas	27.6%	30.7%	21.1%	35.3%	17.1%		25.4%
	Don't know	Count	5	3	4	4	9		25
		% within Metropolitan areas	2.9%	1.4%	5.6%	4.7%	3.6%		3.1%
Total		Count	170	218	71	85	251		795
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Perry approval * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Perry approval	Approve strongly	Count	17	7	11	15	25	10	85
		% within AP Region	10.5%	5.3%	9.2%	9.6%	24.3%	8.2%	10.7%

131

			54	29	31	42	35	36	227
	Approve somewhat	Count	54	29	31	42	35	36	227
		% within AP Region	33.3%	22.0%	25.8%	26.8%	34.0%	29.5%	28.5%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	25	20	20	31	17	25	138
		% within AP Region	15.4%	15.2%	16.7%	19.7%	16.5%	20.5%	17.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	28	27	18	19	6	20	118
		% within AP Region	17.3%	20.5%	15.0%	12.1%	5.8%	16.4%	14.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	33	46	36	45	17	26	203
		% within AP Region	20.4%	34.8%	30.0%	28.7%	16.5%	21.3%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	5	3	4	5	3	5	25
		% within AP Region	3.1%	2.3%	3.3%	3.2%	2.9%	4.1%	3.1%
Total		Count	162	132	120	157	103	122	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	1	0	3	2	5	11	22	44
		% within Libcon scale	3.2%	.0%	3.8%	.9%	4.4%	6.7%	17.3%	5.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	1	0	4	34	23	91	56	209
		% within Libcon scale	3.2%	.0%	5.0%	15.7%	20.2%	55.8%	44.1%	26.8%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	2	8	24	77	51	30	22	214
		% within Libcon scale	6.5%	16.3%	30.0%	35.5%	44.7%	18.4%	17.3%	27.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	7	16	16	53	21	25	16	154

132

		% within Libcon scale	22.6%	32.7%	20.0%	24.4%	18.4%	15.3%	12.6%	19.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	18	19	30	30	11	2	9	119
		% within Libcon scale	58.1%	38.8%	37.5%	13.8%	9.6%	1.2%	7.1%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	2	6	3	21	3	4	2	41
		% within Libcon scale	6.5%	12.2%	3.8%	9.7%	2.6%	2.5%	1.6%	5.2%
Total		Count	31	49	80	217	114	163	127	781
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	4	1	0	4	4	4	28	0	45
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.5%	1.1%	.0%	5.0%	3.8%	5.5%	14.7%	.0%	5.8%
	Approve somewhat	Count	7	14	6	8	50	25	94	0	204
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.3%	15.4%	9.8%	10.0%	47.2%	34.2%	49.2%	.0%	26.2%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	40	36	15	24	28	18	43	7	211
		% within 7 point Party ID	24.5%	39.6%	24.6%	30.0%	26.4%	24.7%	22.5%	46.7%	27.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	43	15	21	24	17	13	19	2	154
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.4%	16.5%	34.4%	30.0%	16.0%	17.8%	9.9%	13.3%	19.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	56	18	19	15	4	3	4	1	120
		% within 7 point Party ID	34.4%	19.8%	31.1%	18.8%	3.8%	4.1%	2.1%	6.7%	15.4%
	Don't know	Count	13	7	0	5	3	10	3	5	46
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.0%	7.7%	.0%	6.3%	2.8%	13.7%	1.6%	33.3%	5.9%

133

Total	Count	163	91	61	80	106	73	191	15	780
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	6	17	15	7	45
		% within age	5.2%	7.1%	4.7%	6.1%	5.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	25	47	96	42	210
		% within age	21.6%	19.6%	29.8%	36.8%	26.5%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	43	70	80	23	216
		% within age	37.1%	29.2%	24.8%	20.2%	27.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	15	54	63	23	155
		% within age	12.9%	22.5%	19.6%	20.2%	19.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	12	36	55	17	120
		% within age	10.3%	15.0%	17.1%	14.9%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	15	16	13	2	46
		% within age	12.9%	6.7%	4.0%	1.8%	5.8%
Total		Count	116	240	322	114	792
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Education Crosstabulation

	Education	Total

134

Texas legislature job approval			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	1	22	14	2	4	2	45
		% within Education	3.4%	7.3%	5.3%	4.2%	3.8%	4.5%	5.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	7	73	75	14	28	12	209
		% within Education	24.1%	24.3%	28.2%	29.2%	26.4%	27.3%	26.4%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	9	103	60	12	26	6	216
		% within Education	31.0%	34.3%	22.6%	25.0%	24.5%	13.6%	27.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	2	57	56	6	21	13	155
		% within Education	6.9%	19.0%	21.1%	12.5%	19.8%	29.5%	19.5%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	6	26	46	14	19	10	121
		% within Education	20.7%	8.7%	17.3%	29.2%	17.9%	22.7%	15.3%
	Don't know	Count	4	19	15	0	8	1	47
		% within Education	13.8%	6.3%	5.6%	.0%	7.5%	2.3%	5.9%
Total		Count	29	300	266	48	106	44	793
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Church attendance Crosstabulation

Texas legislature job approval			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	10	4	11	11	7	43
		% within Church attendance	7.7%	2.9%	10.2%	5.8%	3.2%	5.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	52	46	30	49	31	208

		% within Church attendance	40.0%	32.9%	27.8%	25.8%	14.0%	26.4%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	30	47	28	48	63	216
		% within Church attendance	23.1%	33.6%	25.9%	25.3%	28.5%	27.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	27	24	19	38	47	155
		% within Church attendance	20.8%	17.1%	17.6%	20.0%	21.3%	19.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	9	11	16	33	52	121
		% within Church attendance	6.9%	7.9%	14.8%	17.4%	23.5%	15.3%
	Don't know	Count	2	8	4	11	21	46
		% within Church attendance	1.5%	5.7%	3.7%	5.8%	9.5%	5.8%
Total		Count	130	140	108	190	221	789
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Race Crosstabulation

	Race								Total
	White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	

Texas legislature job approval											Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	32	1	7	1	1	0	3	0	45
		% within Race	6.2%	1.0%	5.7%	7.1%	33.3%	.0%	12.0%	.0%	5.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	163	6	29	1	0	3	7	0	209
		% within Race	31.6%	6.3%	23.6%	7.1%	.0%	30.0%	28.0%	.0%	26.5%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	124	38	38	3	0	3	7	2	215
		% within Race	24.0%	39.6%	30.9%	21.4%	.0%	30.0%	28.0%	100.0%	27.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	86	26	30	6	1	3	2	0	154
		% within Race	16.7%	27.1%	24.4%	42.9%	33.3%	30.0%	8.0%	.0%	19.5%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	77	17	16	3	1	1	5	0	120
		% within Race	14.9%	17.7%	13.0%	21.4%	33.3%	10.0%	20.0%	.0%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	34	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	46
		% within Race	6.6%	8.3%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	5.8%
Total		Count	516	96	123	14	3	10	25	2	789
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	33	0	4	2	3	3	45
		% within Marital Status	6.8%	.0%	4.2%	6.9%	2.1%	9.7%	5.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	151	1	19	10	21	8	210
		% within Marital Status	31.3%	8.3%	20.0%	34.5%	14.8%	25.8%	26.5%
	Neither approve nor	Count	116	4	24	8	53	10	215

137

	disapprove	% within Marital Status	24.0%	33.3%	25.3%	27.6%	37.3%	32.3%	27.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	95	4	22	4	27	3	155
		% within Marital Status	19.7%	33.3%	23.2%	13.8%	19.0%	9.7%	19.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	57	3	23	5	26	7	121
		% within Marital Status	11.8%	25.0%	24.2%	17.2%	18.3%	22.6%	15.3%
	Don't know	Count	31	0	3	0	12	0	46
		% within Marital Status	6.4%	.0%	3.2%	.0%	8.5%	.0%	5.8%
Total		Count	483	12	95	29	142	31	792
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	23	21	44
		% within Gender	6.2%	5.0%	5.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	104	105	209
		% within Gender	28.1%	24.9%	26.4%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	94	122	216
		% within Gender	25.4%	28.9%	27.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	68	88	156
		% within Gender	18.4%	20.9%	19.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	74	47	121
		% within Gender	20.0%	11.1%	15.3%
	Don't know	Count	7	39	46

			Urban	Suburban	Rural
		% within Gender	1.9%	9.2%	5.8%
Total		Count	370	422	792
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	11	22	11	44
		% within Urban/Rural	4.6%	5.8%	6.2%	5.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	39	109	62	210
		% within Urban/Rural	16.4%	28.8%	35.0%	26.5%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	84	91	41	216
		% within Urban/Rural	35.3%	24.1%	23.2%	27.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	54	69	31	154
		% within Urban/Rural	22.7%	18.3%	17.5%	19.4%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	42	56	24	122
		% within Urban/Rural	17.6%	14.8%	13.6%	15.4%
	Don't know	Count	8	31	8	47
		% within Urban/Rural	3.4%	8.2%	4.5%	5.9%
Total		Count	238	378	177	793
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

139

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	14	9	1	2	19	45
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.2%	4.2%	1.4%	2.3%	7.6%	5.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	50	49	18	16	77	210
		% within Metropolitan areas	29.4%	22.7%	25.0%	18.4%	30.8%	26.4%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	36	66	24	20	70	216
		% within Metropolitan areas	21.2%	30.6%	33.3%	23.0%	28.0%	27.2%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	36	45	15	21	39	156
		% within Metropolitan areas	21.2%	20.8%	20.8%	24.1%	15.6%	19.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	25	39	9	18	30	121
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.7%	18.1%	12.5%	20.7%	12.0%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	9	8	5	10	15	47
		% within Metropolitan areas	5.3%	3.7%	6.9%	11.5%	6.0%	5.9%
Total		Count	170	216	72	87	250	795
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	10	2	11	5	12	2	42
		% within AP Region	6.2%	1.6%	9.0%	3.2%	11.7%	1.7%	5.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	49	23	34	36	35	33	210
		% within AP Region	30.4%	18.1%	27.9%	22.9%	34.0%	27.5%	26.6%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	43	38	26	44	26	39	216
		% within AP Region	26.7%	29.9%	21.3%	28.0%	25.2%	32.5%	27.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	27	34	28	32	13	22	156
		% within AP Region	16.8%	26.8%	23.0%	20.4%	12.6%	18.3%	19.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	23	25	15	26	13	18	120
		% within AP Region	14.3%	19.7%	12.3%	16.6%	12.6%	15.0%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	9	5	8	14	4	6	46
		% within AP Region	5.6%	3.9%	6.6%	8.9%	3.9%	5.0%	5.8%
Total		Count	161	127	122	157	103	120	790
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	3	2	3	46	57	141	107	359

		% within Libcon scale	9.1%	4.0%	3.8%	21.2%	49.6%	83.9%	82.9%	45.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	26	38	59	106	34	15	15	293
		% within Libcon scale	78.8%	76.0%	75.6%	48.8%	29.6%	8.9%	11.6%	37.1%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	4	10	16	65	24	12	7	138
		% within Libcon scale	12.1%	20.0%	20.5%	30.0%	20.9%	7.1%	5.4%	17.5%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	0	7	4	23	79	54	185	1	353
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	7.7%	6.7%	28.7%	74.5%	74.0%	93.4%	6.7%	44.9%
	Democratic Primary	Count	152	73	37	18	4	2	8	1	295
		% within 7 point Party ID	93.3%	80.2%	61.7%	22.5%	3.8%	2.7%	4.0%	6.7%	37.5%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	11	11	19	39	23	17	5	13	138
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	12.1%	31.7%	48.8%	21.7%	23.3%	2.5%	86.7%	17.6%
Total		Count	163	91	60	80	106	73	198	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

142

Primary vote * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	35	91	160	76	362
		% within age	28.9%	37.9%	49.5%	66.1%	45.3%
	Democratic Primary	Count	52	90	123	32	297
		% within age	43.0%	37.5%	38.1%	27.8%	37.2%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	34	59	40	7	140
		% within age	28.1%	24.6%	12.4%	6.1%	17.5%
Total		Count	121	240	323	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	9	135	131	21	46	21	363
		% within Education	31.0%	44.3%	49.2%	42.9%	43.4%	48.8%	45.5%
	Democratic Primary	Count	13	109	98	21	38	17	296
		% within Education	44.8%	35.7%	36.8%	42.9%	35.8%	39.5%	37.1%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	7	61	37	7	22	5	139
		% within Education	24.1%	20.0%	13.9%	14.3%	20.8%	11.6%	17.4%

143

			29	305	266	49	106	43	798
Total		Count	29	305	266	49	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	86	74	48	76	77	361
		% within Church attendance	65.6%	51.0%	44.9%	40.0%	34.7%	45.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	32	55	44	79	85	295
		% within Church attendance	24.4%	37.9%	41.1%	41.6%	38.3%	37.1%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	13	16	15	35	60	139
		% within Church attendance	9.9%	11.0%	14.0%	18.4%	27.0%	17.5%
Total		Count	131	145	107	190	222	795
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total
	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	298	5	37	0	2	3	18	0	363
		% within Race	57.6%	5.0%	29.8%	.0%	50.0%	27.3%	72.0%	.0%	45.5%
	Democratic Primary	Count	126	85	63	8	2	6	6	0	296
		% within Race	24.4%	84.2%	50.8%	57.1%	50.0%	54.5%	24.0%	.0%	37.1%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	93	11	24	6	0	2	1	2	139
		% within Race	18.0%	10.9%	19.4%	42.9%	.0%	18.2%	4.0%	100.0%	17.4%
Total		Count	517	101	124	14	4	11	25	2	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	265	2	33	19	29	14	362
		% within Marital Status	54.8%	16.7%	34.4%	65.5%	20.4%	45.2%	45.6%
	Democratic Primary	Count	149	8	44	8	71	12	292
		% within Marital Status	30.8%	66.7%	45.8%	27.6%	50.0%	38.7%	36.8%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	70	2	19	2	42	5	140
		% within Marital Status	14.5%	16.7%	19.8%	6.9%	29.6%	16.1%	17.6%
Total		Count	484	12	96	29	142	31	794

Primary vote * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	265	2	33	19	29	14	362
		% within Marital Status	54.8%	16.7%	34.4%	65.5%	20.4%	45.2%	45.6%
	Democratic Primary	Count	149	8	44	8	71	12	292
		% within Marital Status	30.8%	66.7%	45.8%	27.6%	50.0%	38.7%	36.8%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	70	2	19	2	42	5	140
		% within Marital Status	14.5%	16.7%	19.8%	6.9%	29.6%	16.1%	17.6%
Total		Count	484	12	96	29	142	31	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	173	189	362
		% within Gender	46.1%	44.6%	45.3%
	Democratic Primary	Count	134	163	297
		% within Gender	35.7%	38.4%	37.2%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	68	72	140
		% within Gender	18.1%	17.0%	17.5%
Total		Count	375	424	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	69	180	114	363
		% within Urban/Rural	28.5%	47.6%	64.0%	45.5%
	Democratic Primary	Count	128	125	43	296
		% within Urban/Rural	52.9%	33.1%	24.2%	37.1%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	45	73	21	139
		% within Urban/Rural	18.6%	19.3%	11.8%	17.4%
Total		Count	242	378	178	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	66	94	36	34	132	362
		% within Metropolitan areas	39.1%	42.7%	50.0%	39.1%	52.8%	45.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	67	87	22	34	85	295
		% within Metropolitan areas	39.6%	39.5%	30.6%	39.1%	34.0%	37.0%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	36	39	14	19	33	141

147

	primaries	% within Metropolitan areas	21.3%	17.7%	19.4%	21.8%	13.2%	17.7%
Total		Count	169	220	72	87	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	81	44	47	72	70	47	361
		% within AP Region	50.0%	33.6%	39.2%	45.9%	68.0%	38.2%	45.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	61	57	47	57	21	53	296
		% within AP Region	37.7%	43.5%	39.2%	36.3%	20.4%	43.1%	37.2%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	20	30	26	28	12	23	139
		% within AP Region	12.3%	22.9%	21.7%	17.8%	11.7%	18.7%	17.5%
Total		Count	162	131	120	157	103	123	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.2%

David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count		1	1	0	7	14	43	32	98
	% within Libcon scale		33.3%	50.0%	.0%	15.2%	24.6%	30.5%	29.9%	27.4%
Michael Williams (Republican)	Count		1	0	0	2	2	5	8	18
	% within Libcon scale		33.3%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	3.5%	3.5%	7.5%	5.0%
Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count		0	0	0	2	1	7	3	13
	% within Libcon scale		.0%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	1.8%	5.0%	2.8%	3.6%
Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count		0	0	0	1	1	6	2	10
	% within Libcon scale		.0%	.0%	.0%	2.2%	1.8%	4.3%	1.9%	2.8%
Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	6
	% within Libcon scale		33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	3.7%	1.7%
Another Republican candidate	Count		0	0	0	1	1	8	6	16
	% within Libcon scale		.0%	.0%	.0%	2.2%	1.8%	5.7%	5.6%	4.5%
Don't Know	Count		0	1	2	33	37	67	49	189
	% within Libcon scale		.0%	50.0%	100.0%	71.7%	64.9%	47.5%	45.8%	52.8%
Total	Count		3	2	2	46	57	141	107	358
	% within Libcon scale		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	7
		% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	2.0%
	David Dewhurst	Count	0	3	0	5	23	8	58	0	97

(Republican)	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	42.9%	.0%	21.7%	28.7%	14.5%	31.5%	.0%	27.3%
Michael Williams	Count	0	0	0	0	6	3	10	0	19
(Republican)	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.5%	5.5%	5.4%	.0%	5.4%
Michael McCaul	Count	0	0	1	2	2	1	7	0	13
(Republican)	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	20.0%	8.7%	2.5%	1.8%	3.8%	.0%	3.7%
Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	0	8
(Republican)	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	.0%	8.7%	1.3%	1.8%	2.2%	.0%	2.3%
Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	9
	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	7.3%	2.2%	.0%	2.5%
Another Republican	Count	0	0	0	1	7	1	8	0	17
candidate	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	8.8%	1.8%	4.3%	.0%	4.8%
Don't Know	Count	0	4	4	13	37	37	89	1	185
	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	57.1%	80.0%	56.5%	46.3%	67.3%	48.4%	100.0%	52.1%
Total	Count	0	7	5	23	80	55	184	1	355
	% within 7 point Party ID	.%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	1	2	3	0	6
		% within age	2.9%	2.2%	1.9%	.0%	1.7%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	5	17	50	27	99
		% within age	14.3%	18.7%	31.3%	35.5%	27.3%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	1	9	6	4	20

150

		% within age	2.9%	9.9%	3.8%	5.3%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	1	2	7	3	13
		% within age	2.9%	2.2%	4.4%	3.9%	3.6%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	0	4	3	2	9
		% within age	.0%	4.4%	1.9%	2.6%	2.5%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	2	1	6	0	9
		% within age	5.7%	1.1%	3.8%	.0%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	0	3	10	3	16
		% within age	.0%	3.3%	6.3%	3.9%	4.4%
	Don't Know	Count	25	53	75	37	190
		% within age	71.4%	58.2%	46.9%	48.7%	52.5%
Total		Count	35	91	160	76	362
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	0	0	2	2	1	1	6
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	1.5%	9.5%	2.2%	5.3%	1.7%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	6	38	34	3	11	7	99
		% within Education	66.7%	27.7%	26.0%	14.3%	24.4%	36.8%	27.3%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	0	8	6	1	4	1	20
		% within Education	.0%	5.8%	4.6%	4.8%	8.9%	5.3%	5.5%

151

									Total
Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	0	5	6	1	0	1	13
	% within Education	.0%	3.6%	4.6%	4.8%	.0%	5.3%	3.6%
Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	0	4	3	1	1	0	9
	% within Education	.0%	2.9%	2.3%	4.8%	2.2%	.0%	2.5%
Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	0	5	3	0	1	0	9
	% within Education	.0%	3.6%	2.3%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	2.5%
Another Republican candidate	Count	0	7	5	2	1	1	16
	% within Education	.0%	5.1%	3.8%	9.5%	2.2%	5.3%	4.4%
Don't Know	Count	3	70	72	11	26	8	190
	% within Education	33.3%	51.1%	55.0%	52.4%	57.8%	42.1%	52.5%
Total	Count	9	137	131	21	45	19	362
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	2	1	4	0	0	7
		% within Church attendance	2.3%	1.3%	8.2%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	24	28	12	16	19	99
		% within Church attendance	27.6%	37.3%	24.5%	21.3%	24.7%	27.3%
	Michael Williams	Count	4	2	3	5	6	20

152

(Republican)	% within Church attendance	4.6%	2.7%	6.1%	6.7%	7.8%	5.5%
Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	4	1	2	2	4	13
	% within Church attendance	4.6%	1.3%	4.1%	2.7%	5.2%	3.6%
Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	3	5	0	0	1	9
	% within Church attendance	3.4%	6.7%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	2.5%
Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	4	2	0	3	0	9
	% within Church attendance	4.6%	2.7%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	2.5%
Another Republican candidate	Count	3	3	2	5	4	17
	% within Church attendance	3.4%	4.0%	4.1%	6.7%	5.2%	4.7%
Don't Know	Count	43	33	26	44	43	189
	% within Church attendance	49.4%	44.0%	53.1%	58.7%	55.8%	52.1%
Total	Count	87	75	49	75	77	363
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Race	2.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	85	0	10	2	0	2	99
		% within Race	28.5%	.0%	26.3%	100.0%	.0%	11.8%	27.3%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	17	1	1	0	0	1	20
		% within Race	5.7%	20.0%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	10	0	4	0	0	0	14
		% within Race	3.4%	.0%	10.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	6	0	1	0	0	1	8
		% within Race	2.0%	.0%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	2.2%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	6	0	3	0	0	0	9
		% within Race	2.0%	.0%	7.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	13	0	2	0	0	2	17
		% within Race	4.4%	.0%	5.3%	.0%	.0%	11.8%	4.7%
	Don't Know	Count	154	4	17	0	3	11	189
		% within Race	51.7%	80.0%	44.7%	.0%	100.0%	64.7%	52.1%
Total		Count	298	5	38	2	3	17	363
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Marital Status	Total

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	5	0	1	1	0	0	7
		% within Marital Status	1.9%	.0%	3.1%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	72	1	11	7	8	0	99
		% within Marital Status	27.2%	33.3%	34.4%	35.0%	26.7%	.0%	27.2%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	13	0	0	0	4	3	20
		% within Marital Status	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.3%	21.4%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	7	0	0	3	3	1	14
		% within Marital Status	2.6%	.0%	.0%	15.0%	10.0%	7.1%	3.8%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	8	0	0	1	0	0	9
		% within Marital Status	3.0%	.0%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
		% within Marital Status	3.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	12	0	2	0	2	0	16
		% within Marital Status	4.5%	.0%	6.3%	.0%	6.7%	.0%	4.4%
	Don't Know	Count	139	2	18	8	13	10	190
		% within Marital Status	52.5%	66.7%	56.3%	40.0%	43.3%	71.4%	52.2%
Total		Count	265	3	32	20	30	14	364
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Gender Crosstabulation

		Gender		
		Male	Female	Total

Republican senate primary					
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	5	2	7
		% within Gender	2.9%	1.1%	1.9%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	48	51	99
		% within Gender	27.6%	26.8%	27.2%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	12	8	20
		% within Gender	6.9%	4.2%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	7	6	13
		% within Gender	4.0%	3.2%	3.6%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	7	3	10
		% within Gender	4.0%	1.6%	2.7%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	2	7	9
		% within Gender	1.1%	3.7%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	10	7	17
		% within Gender	5.7%	3.7%	4.7%
	Don't Know	Count	83	106	189
		% within Gender	47.7%	55.8%	51.9%
Total		Count	174	190	364
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	3	3	2	8
		% within Urban/Rural	4.3%	1.7%	1.8%	2.2%

156

			Count	% within Urban/Rural		
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	19	45	34	98
		% within Urban/Rural	27.1%	25.0%	29.8%	26.9%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	3	8	8	19
		% within Urban/Rural	4.3%	4.4%	7.0%	5.2%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	3	8	3	14
		% within Urban/Rural	4.3%	4.4%	2.6%	3.8%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	3	6	0	9
		% within Urban/Rural	4.3%	3.3%	.0%	2.5%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	2	5	2	9
		% within Urban/Rural	2.9%	2.8%	1.8%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	5	6	6	17
		% within Urban/Rural	7.1%	3.3%	5.3%	4.7%
	Don't Know	Count	32	99	59	190
		% within Urban/Rural	45.7%	55.0%	51.8%	52.2%
Total		Count	70	180	114	364
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	0	4	0	0	3	7
		% within Metropolitan areas	.0%	4.3%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	1.9%

	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	17	30	11	7	34	99
		% within Metropolitan areas	25.4%	32.3%	30.6%	20.6%	25.6%	27.3%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	3	3	0	2	12	20
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.5%	3.2%	.0%	5.9%	9.0%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	7	0	0	4	2	13
		% within Metropolitan areas	10.4%	.0%	.0%	11.8%	1.5%	3.6%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	1	1	3	1	3	9
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.5%	1.1%	8.3%	2.9%	2.3%	2.5%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	1	1	0	2	5	9
		% within Metropolitan areas	1.5%	1.1%	.0%	5.9%	3.8%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	4	5	2	0	5	16
		% within Metropolitan areas	6.0%	5.4%	5.6%	.0%	3.8%	4.4%
	Don't Know	Count	34	49	20	18	69	190
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.7%	52.7%	55.6%	52.9%	51.9%	52.3%
Total		Count	67	93	36	34	133	363
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * AP Region Crosstabulation

					AP Region				
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams (Republican)	Count	0	2	0	0	5	0	7
		% within AP Region	.0%	4.5%	.0%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	1.9%
	David Dewhurst (Republican)	Count	31	12	11	15	20	9	98
		% within AP Region	38.3%	27.3%	23.4%	21.1%	28.6%	18.8%	27.1%
	Michael Williams (Republican)	Count	2	2	3	5	7	1	20
		% within AP Region	2.5%	4.5%	6.4%	7.0%	10.0%	2.1%	5.5%
	Michael McCaul (Republican)	Count	1	0	6	5	0	1	13
		% within AP Region	1.2%	.0%	12.8%	7.0%	.0%	2.1%	3.6%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones (Republican)	Count	2	0	0	1	1	5	9
		% within AP Region	2.5%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	1.4%	10.4%	2.5%
	Ted Cruz (Republican)	Count	0	0	1	3	2	3	9
		% within AP Region	.0%	.0%	2.1%	4.2%	2.9%	6.3%	2.5%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	5	2	1	4	3	2	17
		% within AP Region	6.2%	4.5%	2.1%	5.6%	4.3%	4.2%	4.7%
	Don't Know	Count	40	26	25	38	32	27	188
		% within AP Region	49.4%	59.1%	53.2%	53.5%	45.7%	56.3%	52.1%
Total		Count	81	44	47	71	70	48	361
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	4	9	3	7	6	4	2	35
		% within Libcon scale	16.0%	23.7%	5.2%	6.7%	18.2%	26.7%	13.3%	12.1%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	7	4	10	17	1	3	2	44
		% within Libcon scale	28.0%	10.5%	17.2%	16.2%	3.0%	20.0%	13.3%	15.2%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	1	6	8	10	11	0	0	36
		% within Libcon scale	4.0%	15.8%	13.8%	9.5%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	12.5%
	Don't know	Count	13	19	37	71	15	8	11	174
		% within Libcon scale	52.0%	50.0%	63.8%	67.6%	45.5%	53.3%	73.3%	60.2%
Total		Count	25	38	58	105	33	15	15	289
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	21	8	2	0	0	0	4	0	35
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.9%	11.1%	5.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	57.1%	.0%	12.0%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	23	13	2	4	1	0	3	0	46
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.2%	18.1%	5.4%	23.5%	25.0%	.0%	42.9%	.0%	15.8%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	25	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	37
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.6%	12.5%	8.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.7%
	Don't know	Count	82	42	30	13	3	2	0	1	173

160

	% within 7 point Party ID	54.3%	58.3%	81.1%	76.5%	75.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	59.5%
Total	Count	151	72	37	17	4	2	7	1	291
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	9	13	9	6	37
		% within age	17.3%	14.8%	7.4%	19.4%	12.6%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	7	19	18	1	45
		% within age	13.5%	21.6%	14.8%	3.2%	15.4%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	7	10	15	5	37
		% within age	13.5%	11.4%	12.3%	16.1%	12.6%
	Don't know	Count	29	46	80	19	174
		% within age	55.8%	52.3%	65.6%	61.3%	59.4%
Total		Count	52	88	122	31	293
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	1	13	9	5	5	4	37

		% within Education	7.7%	11.8%	9.4%	22.7%	13.2%	23.5%	12.5%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	0	16	19	4	5	2	46
		% within Education	.0%	14.5%	19.8%	18.2%	13.2%	11.8%	15.5%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	1	15	15	1	5	2	39
		% within Education	7.7%	13.6%	15.6%	4.5%	13.2%	11.8%	13.2%
	Don't know	Count	11	66	53	12	23	9	174
		% within Education	84.6%	60.0%	55.2%	54.5%	60.5%	52.9%	58.8%
Total		Count	13	110	96	22	38	17	296
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	7	8	7	7	7	36
		% within Church attendance	21.2%	14.5%	15.9%	9.0%	8.2%	12.2%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	4	9	9	11	13	46
		% within Church attendance	12.1%	16.4%	20.5%	14.1%	15.3%	15.6%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	5	8	4	13	8	38
		% within Church attendance	15.2%	14.5%	9.1%	16.7%	9.4%	12.9%
	Don't know	Count	17	30	24	47	57	175

	% within Church attendance	51.5%	54.5%	54.5%	60.3%	67.1%	59.3%
Total	Count	33	55	44	78	85	295
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Race Crosstabulation

			Race							Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	12	13	9	2	0	0	0	36
		% within Race	9.6%	15.5%	14.3%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.2%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	23	9	11	1	1	1	0	46
		% within Race	18.4%	10.7%	17.5%	12.5%	100.0%	16.7%	.0%	15.6%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	14	10	8	3	0	0	2	37
		% within Race	11.2%	11.9%	12.7%	37.5%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	12.6%
	Don't know	Count	76	52	35	2	0	5	5	175
		% within Race	60.8%	61.9%	55.6%	25.0%	.0%	83.3%	71.4%	59.5%
Total		Count	125	84	63	8	1	6	7	294
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

163

Democratic senate primary * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	16	1	6	1	8	0	32
		% within Marital Status	10.7%	12.5%	14.0%	11.1%	11.3%	.0%	11.0%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	27	1	3	0	13	2	46
		% within Marital Status	18.1%	12.5%	7.0%	.0%	18.3%	16.7%	15.8%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	17	1	9	1	10	1	39
		% within Marital Status	11.4%	12.5%	20.9%	11.1%	14.1%	8.3%	13.4%
	Don't know	Count	89	5	25	7	40	9	175
		% within Marital Status	59.7%	62.5%	58.1%	77.8%	56.3%	75.0%	59.9%
Total		Count	149	8	43	9	71	12	292
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	27	9	36
		% within Gender	20.3%	5.6%	12.2%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	19	27	46
		% within Gender	14.3%	16.8%	15.6%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	23	15	38
		% within Gender	17.3%	9.3%	12.9%
	Don't know	Count	64	110	174

164

			Urban	Suburban	Rural
		% within Gender	48.1%	68.3%	59.2%
Total		Count	133	161	294
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	24	10	3	37
		% within Urban/Rural	18.8%	8.1%	6.8%	12.5%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	19	20	8	47
		% within Urban/Rural	14.8%	16.1%	18.2%	15.9%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	19	16	3	38
		% within Urban/Rural	14.8%	12.9%	6.8%	12.8%
	Don't know	Count	66	78	30	174
		% within Urban/Rural	51.6%	62.9%	68.2%	58.8%
Total		Count	128	124	44	296
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

		Metropolitan areas					
		Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total

165

Democratic senate primary			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	10	11	3	5	7		36
		% within Metropolitan areas	15.2%	12.5%	13.0%	14.7%	8.2%		12.2%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	19	8	4	1	14		46
		% within Metropolitan areas	28.8%	9.1%	17.4%	2.9%	16.5%		15.5%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	2	15	2	5	15		39
		% within Metropolitan areas	3.0%	17.0%	8.7%	14.7%	17.6%		13.2%
	Don't know	Count	35	54	14	23	49		175
		% within Metropolitan areas	53.0%	61.4%	60.9%	67.6%	57.6%		59.1%
Total		Count	66	88	23	34	85		296
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Democratic senate primary * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp (Democrat)	Count	6	10	8	6	1	5	36
		% within AP Region	10.0%	17.2%	17.0%	10.3%	5.0%	9.6%	12.2%
	Chris Bell (Democrat)	Count	8	3	15	8	2	10	46
		% within AP Region	13.3%	5.2%	31.9%	13.8%	10.0%	19.2%	15.6%
	Chet Edwards (Democrat)	Count	8	8	1	11	3	7	38

166

		% within AP Region	13.3%	13.8%	2.1%	19.0%	15.0%	13.5%	12.9%
	Don't know	Count	38	37	23	33	14	30	175
		% within AP Region	63.3%	63.8%	48.9%	56.9%	70.0%	57.7%	59.3%
Total		Count	60	58	47	58	20	52	295
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	2	2	3	21	24	39	30	121
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	4.0%	3.9%	9.7%	20.9%	23.1%	23.4%	15.4%
	Democratic candidate	Count	28	43	56	94	26	13	10	270
		% within Libcon scale	84.8%	86.0%	73.7%	43.3%	22.6%	7.7%	7.8%	34.3%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	1	0	1	17	31	70	52	172
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	.0%	1.3%	7.8%	27.0%	41.4%	40.6%	21.8%
	Don't know	Count	2	5	16	85	34	47	36	225
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	10.0%	21.1%	39.2%	29.6%	27.8%	28.1%	28.6%
Total		Count	33	50	76	217	115	169	128	788
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID	Total

167

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	0	5	2	3	16	22	74	0	122
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	5.6%	3.3%	3.8%	15.1%	30.1%	37.4%	.0%	15.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	152	57	38	15	0	2	8	1	273
		% within 7 point Party ID	92.7%	64.0%	62.3%	19.0%	.0%	2.7%	4.0%	6.7%	34.8%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	1	4	2	22	52	17	72	0	170
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	4.5%	3.3%	27.8%	49.1%	23.3%	36.4%	.0%	21.7%
	Don't know	Count	11	23	19	39	38	32	44	14	220
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	25.8%	31.1%	49.4%	35.8%	43.8%	22.2%	93.3%	28.0%
Total		Count	164	89	61	79	106	73	198	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	27	30	46	23	126
		% within age	22.3%	12.5%	14.2%	20.2%	15.8%
	Democratic candidate	Count	50	96	100	27	273

168

		% within age	41.3%	40.0%	31.0%	23.7%	34.2%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	8	40	92	32	172
		% within age	6.6%	16.7%	28.5%	28.1%	21.6%
	Don't know	Count	36	74	85	32	227
		% within age	29.8%	30.8%	26.3%	28.1%	28.4%
Total		Count	121	240	323	114	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	4	56	35	5	16	8	124
		% within Education	14.3%	18.3%	13.2%	10.2%	15.1%	18.6%	15.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	7	91	97	20	41	18	274
		% within Education	25.0%	29.7%	36.5%	40.8%	38.7%	41.9%	34.3%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	3	68	62	10	24	6	173
		% within Education	10.7%	22.2%	23.3%	20.4%	22.6%	14.0%	21.7%
	Don't know	Count	14	91	72	14	25	11	227
		% within Education	50.0%	29.7%	27.1%	28.6%	23.6%	25.6%	28.4%
Total		Count	28	306	266	49	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	29	32	21	30	12	124
		% within Church attendance	22.0%	22.1%	19.3%	15.7%	5.5%	15.6%
	Democratic candidate	Count	26	48	40	71	89	274
		% within Church attendance	19.7%	33.1%	36.7%	37.2%	40.5%	34.4%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	37	31	19	39	46	172
		% within Church attendance	28.0%	21.4%	17.4%	20.4%	20.9%	21.6%
	Don't know	Count	40	34	29	51	73	227
		% within Church attendance	30.3%	23.4%	26.6%	26.7%	33.2%	28.5%
Total		Count	132	145	109	191	220	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	98	3	20	0	1	0	4	0	126
		% within Race	18.9%	2.9%	16.3%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	15.4%	.0%	15.8%
	Democratic candidate	Count	118	83	53	9	1	4	6	0	274
		% within Race	22.8%	81.4%	43.1%	64.3%	33.3%	36.4%	23.1%	.0%	34.3%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	143	1	15	0	0	2	12	0	173
		% within Race	27.6%	1.0%	12.2%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	46.2%	.0%	21.7%
	Don't know	Count	159	15	35	5	1	5	4	2	226
		% within Race	30.7%	14.7%	28.5%	35.7%	33.3%	45.5%	15.4%	100.0%	28.3%
Total		Count	518	102	123	14	3	11	26	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	91	1	10	3	17	3	125
		% within Marital Status	18.7%	9.1%	10.5%	10.3%	12.1%	9.7%	15.8%
	Democratic candidate	Count	132	5	39	7	75	11	269
		% within Marital Status	27.2%	45.5%	41.1%	24.1%	53.2%	35.5%	33.9%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	116	1	21	7	18	8	171

171

		% within Marital Status	23.9%	9.1%	22.1%	24.1%	12.8%	25.8%	21.6%
	Don't know	Count	147	4	25	12	31	9	228
		% within Marital Status	30.2%	36.4%	26.3%	41.4%	22.0%	29.0%	28.8%
Total		Count	486	11	95	29	141	31	793
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	55	70	125
		% within Gender	14.7%	16.5%	15.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	127	147	274
		% within Gender	33.9%	34.8%	34.3%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	100	72	172
		% within Gender	26.7%	17.0%	21.6%
	Don't know	Count	93	134	227
		% within Gender	24.8%	31.7%	28.4%
Total		Count	375	423	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

		Urban/Rural			Total
		Urban	Suburban	Rural	

Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	35	52	38	125
		% within Urban/Rural	14.4%	13.8%	21.3%	15.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	114	126	34	274
		% within Urban/Rural	46.9%	33.5%	19.1%	34.4%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	33	86	53	172
		% within Urban/Rural	13.6%	22.9%	29.8%	21.6%
	Don't know	Count	61	112	53	226
		% within Urban/Rural	25.1%	29.8%	29.8%	28.4%
Total		Count	243	376	178	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	19	34	14	13	45	125
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.2%	15.5%	19.7%	14.9%	18.1%	15.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	65	85	21	34	67	272
		% within Metropolitan areas	38.5%	38.6%	29.6%	39.1%	26.9%	34.2%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	39	45	16	14	59	173
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.1%	20.5%	22.5%	16.1%	23.7%	21.7%
	Don't know	Count	46	56	20	26	78	226
		% within Metropolitan areas	27.2%	25.5%	28.2%	29.9%	31.3%	28.4%
Total		Count	169	220	71	87	249	796

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	19	34	14	13	45	125
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.2%	15.5%	19.7%	14.9%	18.1%	15.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	65	85	21	34	67	272
		% within Metropolitan areas	38.5%	38.6%	29.6%	39.1%	26.9%	34.2%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	39	45	16	14	59	173
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.1%	20.5%	22.5%	16.1%	23.7%	21.7%
	Don't know	Count	46	56	20	26	78	226
		% within Metropolitan areas	27.2%	25.5%	28.2%	29.9%	31.3%	28.4%
Total		Count	169	220	71	87	249	796
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Generic Ballot with Tea Party * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Generic Ballot with Tea Party	Republican candidate	Count	28	18	12	21	22	23	124
		% within AP Region	17.5%	13.7%	10.1%	13.4%	21.6%	18.7%	15.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	48	59	46	54	17	49	273
		% within AP Region	30.0%	45.0%	38.7%	34.4%	16.7%	39.8%	34.5%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	37	19	26	35	32	21	170

174

	% within AP Region	23.1%	14.5%	21.8%	22.3%	31.4%	17.1%	21.5%
Don't know	Count	47	35	35	47	31	30	225
	% within AP Region	29.4%	26.7%	29.4%	29.9%	30.4%	24.4%	28.4%
Total	Count	160	131	119	157	102	123	792
	% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	5	8	17	84	66	139	98	417
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	16.3%	21.8%	38.5%	57.9%	82.7%	77.2%	53.1%
	Oppose	Count	25	37	55	99	38	14	26	294
		% within Libcon scale	78.1%	75.5%	70.5%	45.4%	33.3%	8.3%	20.5%	37.4%
	Don't know	Count	2	4	6	35	10	15	3	75
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	8.2%	7.7%	16.1%	8.8%	8.9%	2.4%	9.5%
Total		Count	32	49	78	218	114	168	127	786
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

7 point Party ID	Total

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	45	29	19	37	82	51	149	1	413
		% within 7 point Party ID	27.4%	32.2%	31.7%	46.3%	77.4%	68.9%	76.8%	7.1%	52.8%
	Oppose	Count	101	54	37	32	16	18	31	4	293
		% within 7 point Party ID	61.6%	60.0%	61.7%	40.0%	15.1%	24.3%	16.0%	28.6%	37.5%
	Don't know	Count	18	7	4	11	8	5	14	9	76
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.0%	7.8%	6.7%	13.8%	7.5%	6.8%	7.2%	64.3%	9.7%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	74	194	14	782
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	44	112	181	86	423
		% within age	36.4%	46.3%	56.2%	76.8%	53.1%
	Oppose	Count	67	98	113	19	297
		% within age	55.4%	40.5%	35.1%	17.0%	37.3%
	Don't know	Count	10	32	28	7	77
		% within age	8.3%	13.2%	8.7%	6.3%	9.7%

Total		Count	121	242	322	112	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	11	158	149	27	58	21	424
		% within Education	39.3%	52.0%	55.8%	55.1%	54.7%	48.8%	53.2%
	Oppose	Count	14	112	94	17	40	20	297
		% within Education	50.0%	36.8%	35.2%	34.7%	37.7%	46.5%	37.3%
	Don't know	Count	3	34	24	5	8	2	76
		% within Education	10.7%	11.2%	9.0%	10.2%	7.5%	4.7%	9.5%
Total		Count	28	304	267	49	106	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	86	87	52	95	102	422
		% within Church attendance	65.6%	59.6%	48.1%	49.7%	46.4%	53.0%

	Oppose	Count	35	46	46	74	96	297
		% within Church attendance	26.7%	31.5%	42.6%	38.7%	43.6%	37.3%
	Don't know	Count	10	13	10	22	22	77
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	8.9%	9.3%	11.5%	10.0%	9.7%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	220	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	327	32	42	2	0	3	17	0	423
		% within Race	63.2%	31.7%	33.9%	13.3%	.0%	27.3%	65.4%	.0%	52.9%
	Oppose	Count	137	57	72	13	3	6	9	2	299
		% within Race	26.5%	56.4%	58.1%	86.7%	100.0%	54.5%	34.6%	100.0%	37.4%
	Don't know	Count	53	12	10	0	0	2	0	0	77
		% within Race	10.3%	11.9%	8.1%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	9.6%
Total		Count	517	101	124	15	3	11	26	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

178

Repealing birthright citizenship * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	291	4	47	16	45	16	419
		% within Marital Status	60.1%	36.4%	49.0%	55.2%	31.7%	51.6%	52.8%
	Oppose	Count	151	6	40	9	78	13	297
		% within Marital Status	31.2%	54.5%	41.7%	31.0%	54.9%	41.9%	37.5%
	Don't know	Count	42	1	9	4	19	2	77
		% within Marital Status	8.7%	9.1%	9.4%	13.8%	13.4%	6.5%	9.7%
Total		Count	484	11	96	29	142	31	793
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	223	201	424
		% within Gender	59.5%	47.4%	53.1%
	Oppose	Count	135	163	298
		% within Gender	36.0%	38.4%	37.3%
	Don't know	Count	17	60	77
		% within Gender	4.5%	14.2%	9.6%

Total		Count	375	424	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	101	205	117	423
		% within Urban/Rural	41.9%	54.2%	66.1%	53.1%
	Oppose	Count	115	137	45	297
		% within Urban/Rural	47.7%	36.2%	25.4%	37.3%
	Don't know	Count	25	36	15	76
		% within Urban/Rural	10.4%	9.5%	8.5%	9.5%
Total		Count	241	378	177	796
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	86	119	35	36	147	423
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.9%	53.8%	49.3%	41.4%	59.0%	53.1%
	Oppose	Count	68	85	28	41	76	298

		% within Metropolitan areas	40.2%	38.5%	39.4%	47.1%	30.5%	37.4%
	Don't know	Count	15	17	8	10	26	76
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.9%	7.7%	11.3%	11.5%	10.4%	9.5%
Total		Count	169	221	71	87	249	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Repealing birthright citizenship * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Repealing birthright citizenship	Favor	Count	100	66	54	80	67	54	421
		% within AP Region	62.1%	50.0%	45.0%	51.0%	65.0%	43.9%	52.9%
	Oppose	Count	51	55	51	60	26	55	298
		% within AP Region	31.7%	41.7%	42.5%	38.2%	25.2%	44.7%	37.4%
	Don't know	Count	10	11	15	17	10	14	77
		% within AP Region	6.2%	8.3%	12.5%	10.8%	9.7%	11.4%	9.7%
Total		Count	161	132	120	157	103	123	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

	Libcon scale							Total
	Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants											Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	22	26	36	78	21	21	13		217
		% within Libcon scale	68.8%	52.0%	45.6%	35.9%	18.3%	12.4%	10.1%		27.4%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	6	12	35	104	74	127	108		466
		% within Libcon scale	18.8%	24.0%	44.3%	47.9%	64.3%	75.1%	83.7%		58.9%
	Don't know	Count	4	12	8	35	20	21	8		108
		% within Libcon scale	12.5%	24.0%	10.1%	16.1%	17.4%	12.4%	6.2%		13.7%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	169	129		791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	76	29	29	25	21	12	19	3	214
		% within 7 point Party ID	46.6%	32.2%	48.3%	31.3%	19.8%	16.4%	9.6%	20.0%	27.3%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	64	48	23	44	75	50	154	3	461
		% within 7 point Party ID	39.3%	53.3%	38.3%	55.0%	70.8%	68.5%	78.2%	20.0%	58.8%
	Don't know	Count	23	13	8	11	10	11	24	9	109
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.1%	14.4%	13.3%	13.8%	9.4%	15.1%	12.2%	60.0%	13.9%
Total		Count	163	90	60	80	106	73	197	15	784
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * age Crosstabulation

182

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	51	75	68	23	217
		% within age	42.1%	31.1%	21.1%	20.2%	27.2%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	43	129	223	78	473
		% within age	35.5%	53.5%	69.3%	68.4%	59.3%
	Don't know	Count	27	37	31	13	108
		% within age	22.3%	15.4%	9.6%	11.4%	13.5%
Total		Count	121	241	322	114	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	6	79	71	14	34	14	218
		% within Education	20.7%	25.8%	26.6%	28.6%	32.1%	32.6%	27.3%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	19	183	159	29	58	25	473
		% within Education	65.5%	59.8%	59.6%	59.2%	54.7%	58.1%	59.1%
	Don't know	Count	4	44	37	6	14	4	109
		% within Education	13.8%	14.4%	13.9%	12.2%	13.2%	9.3%	13.6%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	24	33	37	58	65	217
		% within Church attendance	18.5%	22.6%	34.3%	30.4%	29.3%	27.2%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	94	92	58	102	126	472
		% within Church attendance	72.3%	63.0%	53.7%	53.4%	56.8%	59.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	21	13	31	31	108
		% within Church attendance	9.2%	14.4%	12.0%	16.2%	14.0%	13.6%
Total		Count	130	146	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	101	37	57	8	2	7	4	2	218
		% within Race	19.5%	36.3%	46.3%	57.1%	50.0%	63.6%	16.0%	100.0%	27.3%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	343	54	47	5	2	3	19	0	473
		% within Race	66.1%	52.9%	38.2%	35.7%	50.0%	27.3%	76.0%	.0%	59.1%
	Don't know	Count	75	11	19	1	0	1	2	0	109

		14.5%	10.8%	15.4%	7.1%	.0%	9.1%	8.0%	.0%	13.6%
	% within Race									
Total	Count	519	102	123	14	4	11	25	2	800
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	104	5	21	5	59	18	212
		% within Marital Status	21.4%	45.5%	22.1%	17.2%	41.5%	58.1%	26.7%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	331	6	60	18	46	11	472
		% within Marital Status	68.2%	54.5%	63.2%	62.1%	32.4%	35.5%	59.5%
	Don't know	Count	50	0	14	6	37	2	109
		% within Marital Status	10.3%	.0%	14.7%	20.7%	26.1%	6.5%	13.7%
Total		Count	485	11	95	29	142	31	793
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	107	110	217
		% within Gender	28.5%	25.9%	27.1%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	229	245	474

			60.9%	57.6%	59.2%
	Don't know	Count	40	70	110
		% within Gender	10.6%	16.5%	13.7%
Total		Count	376	425	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	81	105	31	217
		% within Urban/Rural	33.5%	27.8%	17.4%	27.2%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	130	222	120	472
		% within Urban/Rural	53.7%	58.7%	67.4%	59.1%
	Don't know	Count	31	51	27	109
		% within Urban/Rural	12.8%	13.5%	15.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	242	378	178	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas					
	Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants								
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	56	67	26	28	40	217
		% within Metropolitan areas	32.9%	30.3%	36.1%	32.6%	16.0%	27.2%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	98	124	39	47	165	473
		% within Metropolitan areas	57.6%	56.1%	54.2%	54.7%	66.0%	59.2%
	Don't know	Count	16	30	7	11	45	109
		% within Metropolitan areas	9.4%	13.6%	9.7%	12.8%	18.0%	13.6%
Total		Count	170	221	72	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants	In-state tuition	Count	42	39	41	41	13	41	217
		% within AP Region	26.1%	29.5%	33.6%	26.1%	12.6%	33.3%	27.2%
	Out-of-state tuition	Count	99	74	68	96	67	67	471
		% within AP Region	61.5%	56.1%	55.7%	61.1%	65.0%	54.5%	59.0%
	Don't know	Count	20	19	13	20	23	15	110
		% within AP Region	12.4%	14.4%	10.7%	12.7%	22.3%	12.2%	13.8%
Total		Count	161	132	122	157	103	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

187

Voter ID * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Voter ID	Agree	Count	12	18	40	151	102	156	112	591
		% within Libcon scale	40.0%	36.0%	51.9%	69.6%	88.7%	92.9%	87.5%	75.3%
	Disagree	Count	17	26	28	33	10	8	9	131
		% within Libcon scale	56.7%	52.0%	36.4%	15.2%	8.7%	4.8%	7.0%	16.7%
	Don't know	Count	1	6	9	33	3	4	7	63
		% within Libcon scale	3.3%	12.0%	11.7%	15.2%	2.6%	2.4%	5.5%	8.0%
Total		Count	30	50	77	217	115	168	128	785
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Voter ID	Agree	Count	88	59	36	55	98	68	180	2	586
		% within 7 point Party ID	54.0%	64.8%	61.0%	69.6%	92.5%	91.9%	90.9%	13.3%	74.6%
	Disagree	Count	61	23	17	15	4	2	8	3	133
		% within 7 point Party ID	37.4%	25.3%	28.8%	19.0%	3.8%	2.7%	4.0%	20.0%	16.9%
	Don't know	Count	14	9	6	9	4	4	10	10	66

	% within 7 point Party ID	8.6%	9.9%	10.2%	11.4%	3.8%	5.4%	5.1%	66.7%	8.4%
Total	Count	163	91	59	79	106	74	198	15	785
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	82	176	244	95	597
		% within age	67.8%	73.6%	75.8%	82.6%	74.9%
	Disagree	Count	22	37	60	14	133
		% within age	18.2%	15.5%	18.6%	12.2%	16.7%
	Don't know	Count	17	26	18	6	67
		% within age	14.0%	10.9%	5.6%	5.2%	8.4%
Total		Count	121	239	322	115	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	17	233	204	35	76	31	596
		% within Education	60.7%	76.6%	77.0%	70.0%	71.0%	72.1%	74.8%
	Disagree	Count	9	42	40	11	21	10	133

			32.1%	13.8%	15.1%	22.0%	19.6%	23.3%	16.7%
		% within Education	32.1%	13.8%	15.1%	22.0%	19.6%	23.3%	16.7%
	Don't know	Count	2	29	21	4	10	2	68
		% within Education	7.1%	9.5%	7.9%	8.0%	9.3%	4.7%	8.5%
Total		Count	28	304	265	50	107	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	104	120	80	140	150	594
		% within Church attendance	81.3%	82.2%	74.1%	73.3%	67.9%	74.8%
	Disagree	Count	19	17	19	27	50	132
		% within Church attendance	14.8%	11.6%	17.6%	14.1%	22.6%	16.6%
	Don't know	Count	5	9	9	24	21	68
		% within Church attendance	3.9%	6.2%	8.3%	12.6%	9.5%	8.6%
Total		Count	128	146	108	191	221	794
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	413	64	84	6	1	9	19	0	596
		% within Race	79.9%	63.4%	67.7%	40.0%	25.0%	90.0%	73.1%	.0%	74.6%
	Disagree	Count	64	28	27	5	3	1	6	0	134
		% within Race	12.4%	27.7%	21.8%	33.3%	75.0%	10.0%	23.1%	.0%	16.8%
	Don't know	Count	40	9	13	4	0	0	1	2	69
		% within Race	7.7%	8.9%	10.5%	26.7%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	100.0%	8.6%
Total		Count	517	101	124	15	4	10	26	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	389	7	69	22	79	25	591
		% within Marital Status	80.0%	58.3%	73.4%	75.9%	56.4%	83.3%	74.7%
	Disagree	Count	65	4	18	6	38	2	133
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	33.3%	19.1%	20.7%	27.1%	6.7%	16.8%
	Don't know	Count	32	1	7	1	23	3	67
		% within Marital Status	6.6%	8.3%	7.4%	3.4%	16.4%	10.0%	8.5%

Total		Count	486	12	94	29	140	30	791
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	279	317	596
		% within Gender	74.6%	74.8%	74.7%
	Disagree	Count	65	69	134
		% within Gender	17.4%	16.3%	16.8%
	Don't know	Count	30	38	68
		% within Gender	8.0%	9.0%	8.5%
Total		Count	374	424	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	174	285	137	596
		% within Urban/Rural	71.9%	75.2%	78.7%	75.0%
	Disagree	Count	45	61	26	132
		% within Urban/Rural	18.6%	16.1%	14.9%	16.6%
	Don't know	Count	23	33	11	67

192

	% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	8.7%	6.3%	8.4%
Total	Count	242	379	174	795
	% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	124	164	52	55	200	595
		% within Metropolitan areas	72.9%	75.2%	72.2%	64.0%	80.3%	74.8%
	Disagree	Count	35	32	15	24	27	133
		% within Metropolitan areas	20.6%	14.7%	20.8%	27.9%	10.8%	16.7%
	Don't know	Count	11	22	5	7	22	67
		% within Metropolitan areas	6.5%	10.1%	6.9%	8.1%	8.8%	8.4%
Total		Count	170	218	72	86	249	795
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Voter ID * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Voter ID	Agree	Count	119	99	88	115	86	88	595

	% within AP Region	74.8%	75.6%	72.7%	72.8%	82.7%	71.5%	74.7%
Disagree	Count	25	17	26	31	11	24	134
	% within AP Region	15.7%	13.0%	21.5%	19.6%	10.6%	19.5%	16.8%
Don't know	Count	15	15	7	12	7	11	67
	% within AP Region	9.4%	11.5%	5.8%	7.6%	6.7%	8.9%	8.4%
Total	Count	159	131	121	158	104	123	796
	% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	3	0	1	26	7	24	44	105
		% within Libcon scale	9.1%	.0%	1.3%	12.0%	6.1%	14.3%	34.1%	13.3%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	1	3	8	43	45	92	53	245
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	6.0%	10.3%	19.8%	39.1%	54.8%	41.1%	31.0%
	The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	Count	0	5	11	42	18	26	10	112
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	10.0%	14.1%	19.4%	15.7%	15.5%	7.8%	14.2%
	By law, a woman should	Count	27	42	55	92	43	19	15	293

always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	% within Libcon scale	81.8%	84.0%	70.5%	42.4%	37.4%	11.3%	11.6%	37.1%
Don't know	Count	2	0	3	14	2	7	7	35
	% within Libcon scale	6.1%	.0%	3.8%	6.5%	1.7%	4.2%	5.4%	4.4%
Total	Count	33	50	78	217	115	168	129	790
	% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	13	6	3	14	11	4	51	0	102
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.9%	6.6%	5.0%	17.9%	10.4%	5.4%	25.9%	.0%	13.0%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	21	17	15	21	50	28	95	0	247
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.8%	18.7%	25.0%	26.9%	47.2%	37.8%	48.2%	.0%	31.5%
	The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	Count	22	10	9	9	11	16	28	3	108
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.4%	11.0%	15.0%	11.5%	10.4%	21.6%	14.2%	20.0%	13.8%
	By law, a woman should	Count	104	55	33	29	28	23	16	5	293

always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	% within 7 point Party ID	63.4%	60.4%	55.0%	37.2%	26.4%	31.1%	8.1%	33.3%	37.3%
Don't know	Count	4	3	0	5	6	3	7	7	35
	% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	3.3%	.0%	6.4%	5.7%	4.1%	3.6%	46.7%	4.5%
Total	Count	164	91	60	78	106	74	197	15	785
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	12	36	37	20	105
		% within age	9.8%	14.9%	11.5%	17.2%	13.1%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	43	57	106	45	251
		% within age	35.2%	23.7%	32.9%	38.8%	31.3%
	The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	Count	16	27	52	17	112
		% within age	13.1%	11.2%	16.1%	14.7%	14.0%
	By law, a woman should	Count	48	105	113	32	298

196

always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	% within age	39.3%	43.6%	35.1%	27.6%	37.2%
Don't know	Count	3	16	14	2	35
	% within age	2.5%	6.6%	4.3%	1.7%	4.4%
Total	Count	122	241	322	116	801
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	5	46	32	5	13	4	105
		% within Education	17.9%	15.1%	12.0%	10.2%	12.3%	9.5%	13.2%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	11	111	68	14	32	14	250
		% within Education	39.3%	36.4%	25.5%	28.6%	30.2%	33.3%	31.4%
	The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	Count	3	40	44	9	10	6	112
		% within Education	10.7%	13.1%	16.5%	18.4%	9.4%	14.3%	14.1%
	By law, a woman should	Count	8	96	108	21	46	17	296

197

	always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	% within Education	28.6%	31.5%	40.4%	42.9%	43.4%	40.5%	37.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	12	15	0	5	1	34
		% within Education	3.6%	3.9%	5.6%	.0%	4.7%	2.4%	4.3%
Total		Count	28	305	267	49	106	42	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	49	34	15	6	2	106
		% within Church attendance	37.1%	23.3%	13.8%	3.1%	.9%	13.3%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	52	53	38	61	47	251
		% within Church attendance	39.4%	36.3%	34.9%	31.9%	21.3%	31.4%
	The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	Count	10	26	16	31	28	111
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	17.8%	14.7%	16.2%	12.7%	13.9%
	By law, a woman should	Count	18	29	36	82	132	297

always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	% within Church attendance	13.6%	19.9%	33.0%	42.9%	59.7%	37.2%
Don't know	Count	3	4	4	11	12	34
	% within Church attendance	2.3%	2.7%	3.7%	5.8%	5.4%	4.3%
Total	Count	132	146	109	191	221	799
	% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	69	8	23	0	0	0	5	0	105
		% within Race	13.3%	8.1%	18.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	13.2%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	183	17	37	0	1	7	6	0	251
		% within Race	35.3%	17.2%	29.6%	.0%	25.0%	58.3%	24.0%	.0%	31.5%
	The law should permit	Count	70	16	18	2	0	1	4	0	111

199

										Total
abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within Race	13.5%	16.2%	14.4%	15.4%	.0%	8.3%	16.0%	.0%	13.9%
By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	174	55	42	10	3	3	8	2	297
	% within Race	33.6%	55.6%	33.6%	76.9%	75.0%	25.0%	32.0%	100.0%	37.2%
Don't know	Count	22	3	5	1	0	1	2	0	34
	% within Race	4.2%	3.0%	4.0%	7.7%	.0%	8.3%	8.0%	.0%	4.3%
Total	Count	518	99	125	13	4	12	25	2	798
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	73	1	9	5	18	0	106
		% within Marital Status	15.1%	8.3%	9.5%	16.1%	12.7%	.0%	13.3%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	168	5	21	11	30	12	247
		% within Marital Status	34.6%	41.7%	22.1%	35.5%	21.1%	38.7%	31.0%
	The law should permit	Count	71	2	19	3	13	4	112

200

abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within Marital Status	14.6%	16.7%	20.0%	9.7%	9.2%	12.9%	14.1%
By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	157	4	43	11	68	14	297
	% within Marital Status	32.4%	33.3%	45.3%	35.5%	47.9%	45.2%	37.3%
Don't know	Count	16	0	3	1	13	1	34
	% within Marital Status	3.3%	.0%	3.2%	3.2%	9.2%	3.2%	4.3%
Total	Count	485	12	95	31	142	31	796
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	46	59	105
		% within Gender	12.3%	13.9%	13.2%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	131	120	251
		% within Gender	35.0%	28.3%	31.5%
	The law should permit abortion	Count	64	48	112

	for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within Gender	17.1%	11.3%	14.0%
	By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	120	176	296
		% within Gender	32.1%	41.5%	37.1%
	Don't know	Count	13	21	34
		% within Gender	3.5%	5.0%	4.3%
Total		Count	374	424	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	24	53	28	105
		% within Urban/Rural	9.9%	14.0%	15.7%	13.1%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	57	122	72	251
		% within Urban/Rural	23.6%	32.2%	40.4%	31.4%
	The law should permit abortion	Count	34	51	27	112

for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within Urban/Rural	14.0%	13.5%	15.2%	14.0%
By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	117	139	41	297
	% within Urban/Rural	48.3%	36.7%	23.0%	37.2%
Don't know	Count	10	14	10	34
	% within Urban/Rural	4.1%	3.7%	5.6%	4.3%
Total	Count	242	379	178	799
	% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	16	29	10	8	41	104
		% within Metropolitan areas	9.5%	13.1%	14.1%	9.3%	16.4%	13.0%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	54	60	17	19	101	251
		% within Metropolitan areas	32.0%	27.1%	23.9%	22.1%	40.4%	31.5%
	The law should permit	Count	19	35	15	13	29	111

	abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within Metropolitan areas	11.2%	15.8%	21.1%	15.1%	11.6%	13.9%
	By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	73	88	25	44	66	296
		% within Metropolitan areas	43.2%	39.8%	35.2%	51.2%	26.4%	37.1%
	Don't know	Count	7	9	4	2	13	35
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.1%	4.1%	5.6%	2.3%	5.2%	4.4%
Total		Count	169	221	71	86	250	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Abortion (General) * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Abortion	By law, abortion should never be permitted	Count	22	17	12	19	20	16	106
		% within AP Region	13.6%	12.8%	9.9%	12.1%	19.2%	12.9%	13.2%
	The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest or when the woman's life is in danger	Count	56	36	39	45	43	32	251
		% within AP Region	34.6%	27.1%	32.2%	28.7%	41.3%	25.8%	31.3%
	The law should permit	Count	24	15	13	19	14	27	112

204

		col1	col2	col3	col4	col5	col6	Total
abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the ne	% within AP Region	14.8%	11.3%	10.7%	12.1%	13.5%	21.8%	14.0%
By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice	Count	50	60	51	72	24	40	297
	% within AP Region	30.9%	45.1%	42.1%	45.9%	23.1%	32.3%	37.1%
Don't know	Count	10	5	6	2	3	9	35
	% within AP Region	6.2%	3.8%	5.0%	1.3%	2.9%	7.3%	4.4%
Total	Count	162	133	121	157	104	124	801
	% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	5	4	13	61	35	97	84	299
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	8.0%	16.3%	27.9%	30.7%	57.7%	65.6%	37.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	2	2	12	32	27	34	17	126
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	4.0%	15.0%	14.6%	23.7%	20.2%	13.3%	15.9%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	2	3	9	29	19	12	9	83
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	6.0%	11.3%	13.2%	16.7%	7.1%	7.0%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	22	36	37	64	25	13	6	203
		% within Libcon scale	68.8%	72.0%	46.3%	29.2%	21.9%	7.7%	4.7%	25.7%

Don't know	Count	1	5	9	33	8	12	12	80
	% within Libcon scale	3.1%	10.0%	11.3%	15.1%	7.0%	7.1%	9.4%	10.1%
Total	Count	32	50	80	219	114	168	128	791
	% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	29	14	15	31	50	31	129	0	299
		% within 7 point Party ID	17.7%	15.4%	25.0%	38.8%	47.2%	41.3%	65.2%	.0%	37.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	24	16	5	11	23	15	29	3	126
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.6%	17.6%	8.3%	13.8%	21.7%	20.0%	14.6%	21.4%	16.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	16	18	5	10	8	13	11	1	82
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.8%	19.8%	8.3%	12.5%	7.5%	17.3%	5.6%	7.1%	10.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	75	30	29	22	18	11	13	2	200
		% within 7 point Party ID	45.7%	33.0%	48.3%	27.5%	17.0%	14.7%	6.6%	14.3%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	20	13	6	6	7	5	16	8	81
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.2%	14.3%	10.0%	7.5%	6.6%	6.7%	8.1%	57.1%	10.3%

206

| Total | Count | 164 | 91 | 60 | 80 | 106 | 75 | 198 | 14 | 788 |
| | % within 7 point Party ID | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Sonogram Bill * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	52	78	118	53	301
		% within age	43.0%	32.4%	36.6%	46.1%	37.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	23	44	48	15	130
		% within age	19.0%	18.3%	14.9%	13.0%	16.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	13	26	34	11	84
		% within age	10.7%	10.8%	10.6%	9.6%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	24	68	84	27	203
		% within age	19.8%	28.2%	26.1%	23.5%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	9	25	38	9	81
		% within age	7.4%	10.4%	11.8%	7.8%	10.1%
Total		Count	121	241	322	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Education Crosstabulation

	Education	Total

Sonogram Bill			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	10	131	89	20	36	14	300
		% within Education	35.7%	43.0%	33.3%	41.7%	33.6%	32.6%	37.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	5	55	41	9	12	7	129
		% within Education	17.9%	18.0%	15.4%	18.8%	11.2%	16.3%	16.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	5	28	31	5	14	2	85
		% within Education	17.9%	9.2%	11.6%	10.4%	13.1%	4.7%	10.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	1	61	73	9	39	20	203
		% within Education	3.6%	20.0%	27.3%	18.8%	36.4%	46.5%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	7	30	33	5	6	0	81
		% within Education	25.0%	9.8%	12.4%	10.4%	5.6%	.0%	10.2%
Total		Count	28	305	267	48	107	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	91	66	41	59	43	300
		% within Church attendance	69.5%	45.5%	37.6%	30.9%	19.4%	37.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	17	27	15	39	31	129
		% within Church attendance	13.0%	18.6%	13.8%	20.4%	14.0%	16.2%

208

	Somewhat oppose	Count	3	21	16	17	28	85
		% within Church attendance	2.3%	14.5%	14.7%	8.9%	12.6%	10.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	16	21	24	48	94	203
		% within Church attendance	12.2%	14.5%	22.0%	25.1%	42.3%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	4	10	13	28	26	81
		% within Church attendance	3.1%	6.9%	11.9%	14.7%	11.7%	10.2%
Total		Count	131	145	109	191	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	220	17	46	3	0	6	10	0	302
		% within Race	42.5%	16.8%	36.8%	20.0%	.0%	54.5%	38.5%	.0%	37.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	79	17	23	4	1	1	4	0	129
		% within Race	15.3%	16.8%	18.4%	26.7%	25.0%	9.1%	15.4%	.0%	16.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	51	14	14	2	0	0	1	2	84

		% within Race	9.8%	13.9%	11.2%	13.3%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	100.0%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	121	35	28	6	3	3	9	0	205
		% within Race	23.4%	34.7%	22.4%	40.0%	75.0%	27.3%	34.6%	.0%	25.6%
	Don't know	Count	47	18	14	0	0	1	2	0	82
		% within Race	9.1%	17.8%	11.2%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	7.7%	.0%	10.2%
Total		Count	518	101	125	15	4	11	26	2	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	203	5	29	15	41	8	301
		% within Marital Status	41.9%	41.7%	30.2%	50.0%	28.7%	25.8%	37.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	72	3	18	3	25	5	126
		% within Marital Status	14.8%	25.0%	18.8%	10.0%	17.5%	16.1%	15.8%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	54	0	9	3	14	5	85
		% within Marital Status	11.1%	.0%	9.4%	10.0%	9.8%	16.1%	10.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	108	2	32	6	44	11	203
		% within Marital Status	22.3%	16.7%	33.3%	20.0%	30.8%	35.5%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	48	2	8	3	19	2	82
		% within Marital Status	9.9%	16.7%	8.3%	10.0%	13.3%	6.5%	10.3%
Total		Count	485	12	96	30	143	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	137	164	301
		% within Gender	36.7%	38.6%	37.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	70	59	129
		% within Gender	18.8%	13.9%	16.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	43	41	84
		% within Gender	11.5%	9.6%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	86	117	203
		% within Gender	23.1%	27.5%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	37	44	81
		% within Gender	9.9%	10.4%	10.2%
Total		Count	373	425	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	70	146	84	300
		% within Urban/Rural	28.8%	38.5%	47.5%	37.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	46	62	21	129

211

		% within Urban/Rural	18.9%	16.4%	11.9%	16.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	31	36	17	84
		% within Urban/Rural	12.8%	9.5%	9.6%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	76	93	35	204
		% within Urban/Rural	31.3%	24.5%	19.8%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	20	42	20	82
		% within Urban/Rural	8.2%	11.1%	11.3%	10.3%
Total		Count	243	379	177	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	66	66	28	29	113	302
		% within Metropolitan areas	38.6%	29.7%	38.9%	33.3%	45.2%	37.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	24	42	8	7	49	130
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.0%	18.9%	11.1%	8.0%	19.6%	16.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	10	23	10	17	25	85
		% within Metropolitan areas	5.8%	10.4%	13.9%	19.5%	10.0%	10.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	50	63	16	28	45	202

		% within Metropolitan areas	29.2%	28.4%	22.2%	32.2%	18.0%	25.2%
	Don't know	Count	21	28	10	6	18	83
		% within Metropolitan areas	12.3%	12.6%	13.9%	6.9%	7.2%	10.3%
Total		Count	171	222	72	87	250	802
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram Bill * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Sonogram Bill	Strongly support	Count	61	36	50	60	51	42	300
		% within AP Region	37.7%	27.5%	41.7%	38.0%	49.0%	34.1%	37.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	29	28	15	22	17	18	129
		% within AP Region	17.9%	21.4%	12.5%	13.9%	16.3%	14.6%	16.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	19	10	7	21	13	14	84
		% within AP Region	11.7%	7.6%	5.8%	13.3%	12.5%	11.4%	10.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	38	40	33	43	15	34	203
		% within AP Region	23.5%	30.5%	27.5%	27.2%	14.4%	27.6%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	15	17	15	12	8	15	82
		% within AP Region	9.3%	13.0%	12.5%	7.6%	7.7%	12.2%	10.3%
Total		Count	162	131	120	158	104	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	8	13	25	106	69	113	93	427
		% within Libcon scale	25.0%	25.5%	31.3%	48.6%	60.0%	67.3%	72.1%	53.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	5	9	20	55	35	44	24	192
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	17.6%	25.0%	25.2%	30.4%	26.2%	18.6%	24.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	8	13	16	17	5	8	2	69
		% within Libcon scale	25.0%	25.5%	20.0%	7.8%	4.3%	4.8%	1.6%	8.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	9	13	18	13	4	2	6	65
		% within Libcon scale	28.1%	25.5%	22.5%	6.0%	3.5%	1.2%	4.7%	8.2%
	Don't know	Count	2	3	1	27	2	1	4	40
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	5.9%	1.3%	12.4%	1.7%	.6%	3.1%	5.0%
Total		Count	32	51	80	218	115	168	129	793
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	61	45	18	35	74	49	137	3	422

214

		% within 7 point Party ID	37.2%	50.6%	30.5%	43.8%	69.8%	67.1%	69.9%	21.4%	54.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	45	17	16	23	26	16	45	2	190
		% within 7 point Party ID	27.4%	19.1%	27.1%	28.7%	24.5%	21.9%	23.0%	14.3%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	12	14	8	3	0	9	1	69
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.4%	13.5%	23.7%	10.0%	2.8%	.0%	4.6%	7.1%	8.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	30	12	9	7	1	2	2	2	65
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.3%	13.5%	15.3%	8.8%	.9%	2.7%	1.0%	14.3%	8.3%
	Don't know	Count	6	3	2	7	2	6	3	6	35
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.7%	3.4%	3.4%	8.8%	1.9%	8.2%	1.5%	42.9%	4.5%
Total		Count	164	89	59	80	106	73	196	14	781
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	44	123	198	65	430
		% within age	36.1%	51.0%	61.3%	56.5%	53.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	40	61	63	31	195
		% within age	32.8%	25.3%	19.5%	27.0%	24.3%

	Somewhat oppose	Count	16	28	14	10	68
		% within age	13.1%	11.6%	4.3%	8.7%	8.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	14	14	35	6	69
		% within age	11.5%	5.8%	10.8%	5.2%	8.6%
	Don't know	Count	8	15	13	3	39
		% within age	6.6%	6.2%	4.0%	2.6%	4.9%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	14	177	144	30	50	16	431
		% within Education	46.7%	57.8%	53.7%	60.0%	47.2%	37.2%	53.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	6	78	71	3	26	11	195
		% within Education	20.0%	25.5%	26.5%	6.0%	24.5%	25.6%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	0	16	25	6	17	5	69
		% within Education	.0%	5.2%	9.3%	12.0%	16.0%	11.6%	8.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	8	13	22	8	9	10	70
		% within Education	26.7%	4.2%	8.2%	16.0%	8.5%	23.3%	8.7%
	Don't know	Count	2	22	6	3	4	1	38
		% within Education	6.7%	7.2%	2.2%	6.0%	3.8%	2.3%	4.7%
Total		Count	30	306	268	50	106	43	803

216

Capital Punishment * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	14	177	144	30	50	16	431
		% within Education	46.7%	57.8%	53.7%	60.0%	47.2%	37.2%	53.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	6	78	71	3	26	11	195
		% within Education	20.0%	25.5%	26.5%	6.0%	24.5%	25.6%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	0	16	25	6	17	5	69
		% within Education	.0%	5.2%	9.3%	12.0%	16.0%	11.6%	8.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	8	13	22	8	9	10	70
		% within Education	26.7%	4.2%	8.2%	16.0%	8.5%	23.3%	8.7%
	Don't know	Count	2	22	6	3	4	1	38
		% within Education	6.7%	7.2%	2.2%	6.0%	3.8%	2.3%	4.7%
Total		Count	30	306	268	50	106	43	803
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	68	80	57	113	111	429
		% within Church attendance	51.5%	54.8%	52.3%	59.2%	50.0%	53.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	34	46	23	42	50	195

		% within Church attendance	25.8%	31.5%	21.1%	22.0%	22.5%	24.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	10	9	8	16	26	69
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	6.2%	7.3%	8.4%	11.7%	8.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	12	4	14	16	22	68
		% within Church attendance	9.1%	2.7%	12.8%	8.4%	9.9%	8.5%
	Don't know	Count	8	7	7	4	13	39
		% within Church attendance	6.1%	4.8%	6.4%	2.1%	5.9%	4.9%
Total		Count	132	146	109	191	222	800
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	294	41	64	5	2	6	19	0	431
		% within Race	56.6%	40.2%	51.6%	35.7%	66.7%	54.5%	73.1%	.0%	53.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	129	28	32	5	0	0	1	0	195

218

		% within Race	24.9%	27.5%	25.8%	35.7%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	.0%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	43	10	8	1	0	3	3	0	68
		% within Race	8.3%	9.8%	6.5%	7.1%	.0%	27.3%	11.5%	.0%	8.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	32	19	10	3	1	1	2	0	68
		% within Race	6.2%	18.6%	8.1%	21.4%	33.3%	9.1%	7.7%	.0%	8.5%
	Don't know	Count	21	4	10	0	0	1	1	2	39
		% within Race	4.0%	3.9%	8.1%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	3.8%	100.0%	4.9%
Total		Count	519	102	124	14	3	11	26	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	287	4	47	15	60	17	430
		% within Marital Status	59.2%	33.3%	49.0%	50.0%	42.3%	56.7%	54.1%
	Somewhat support	Count	112	4	25	10	33	7	191
		% within Marital Status	23.1%	33.3%	26.0%	33.3%	23.2%	23.3%	24.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	36	2	6	1	22	1	68
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	16.7%	6.3%	3.3%	15.5%	3.3%	8.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	32	2	11	3	17	3	68
		% within Marital Status	6.6%	16.7%	11.5%	10.0%	12.0%	10.0%	8.6%
	Don't know	Count	18	0	7	1	10	2	38
		% within Marital Status	3.7%	.0%	7.3%	3.3%	7.0%	6.7%	4.8%

Total		Count	485	12	96	30	142	30	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	232	198	430
		% within Gender	62.0%	46.7%	53.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	77	117	194
		% within Gender	20.6%	27.6%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	29	39	68
		% within Gender	7.8%	9.2%	8.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	27	41	68
		% within Gender	7.2%	9.7%	8.5%
	Don't know	Count	9	29	38
		% within Gender	2.4%	6.8%	4.8%
Total		Count	374	424	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	121	200	109	430

220

		% within Urban/Rural	50.0%	52.8%	61.6%	53.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	57	96	42	195
		% within Urban/Rural	23.6%	25.3%	23.7%	24.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	23	36	9	68
		% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	9.5%	5.1%	8.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	27	29	11	67
		% within Urban/Rural	11.2%	7.7%	6.2%	8.4%
	Don't know	Count	14	18	6	38
		% within Urban/Rural	5.8%	4.7%	3.4%	4.8%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Capital Punishment * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	94	102	36	37	161	430
		% within Metropolitan areas	55.3%	46.4%	50.0%	43.0%	64.1%	53.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	30	72	16	18	58	194
		% within Metropolitan areas	17.6%	32.7%	22.2%	20.9%	23.1%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	21	15	8	13	11	68
		% within Metropolitan areas	12.4%	6.8%	11.1%	15.1%	4.4%	8.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	19	21	5	11	12	68
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.2%	9.5%	6.9%	12.8%	4.8%	8.5%

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
	Don't know	Count	6	10	7	7	9		39
		% within Metropolitan areas	3.5%	4.5%	9.7%	8.1%	3.6%		4.9%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	251		799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Capital Punishment * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Capital Punishment	Strongly support	Count	93	56	64	88	65	64	430
		% within AP Region	57.4%	42.7%	52.9%	55.7%	61.9%	52.0%	53.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	47	39	20	32	27	29	194
		% within AP Region	29.0%	29.8%	16.5%	20.3%	25.7%	23.6%	24.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	7	12	20	15	4	11	69
		% within AP Region	4.3%	9.2%	16.5%	9.5%	3.8%	8.9%	8.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	11	17	12	13	4	10	67
		% within AP Region	6.8%	13.0%	9.9%	8.2%	3.8%	8.1%	8.4%
	Don't know	Count	4	7	5	10	5	9	40
		% within AP Region	2.5%	5.3%	4.1%	6.3%	4.8%	7.3%	5.0%
Total		Count	162	131	121	158	105	123	800
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

222

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	25	35	52	111	54	60	39	376
		% within Libcon scale	78.1%	70.0%	66.7%	51.2%	47.0%	35.7%	30.2%	47.7%
	Disapprove	Count	5	6	15	67	38	73	72	276
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	12.0%	19.2%	30.9%	33.0%	43.5%	55.8%	35.0%
	Don't know	Count	2	9	11	39	23	35	18	137
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	18.0%	14.1%	18.0%	20.0%	20.8%	14.0%	17.4%
Total		Count	32	50	78	217	115	168	129	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	87	54	40	45	53	30	55	6	370
		% within 7 point Party ID	52.7%	60.0%	66.7%	57.0%	50.0%	40.5%	27.9%	40.0%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	54	23	12	25	32	33	100	2	281
		% within 7 point Party ID	32.7%	25.6%	20.0%	31.6%	30.2%	44.6%	50.8%	13.3%	35.8%
	Don't know	Count	24	13	8	9	21	11	42	7	135
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.5%	14.4%	13.3%	11.4%	19.8%	14.9%	21.3%	46.7%	17.2%
Total		Count	165	90	60	79	106	74	197	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	55	119	158	45	377
		% within age	45.1%	49.4%	48.9%	39.1%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	38	80	115	52	285
		% within age	31.1%	33.2%	35.6%	45.2%	35.6%
	Don't know	Count	29	42	50	18	139
		% within age	23.8%	17.4%	15.5%	15.7%	17.4%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	14	131	131	29	54	19	378
		% within Education	48.3%	42.8%	49.1%	59.2%	50.5%	44.2%	47.2%
	Disapprove	Count	14	114	89	17	34	17	285
		% within Education	48.3%	37.3%	33.3%	34.7%	31.8%	39.5%	35.6%
	Don't know	Count	1	61	47	3	19	7	138
		% within Education	3.4%	19.9%	17.6%	6.1%	17.8%	16.3%	17.2%

224

Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	23	46	52	88	167	376
		% within Church attendance	17.6%	31.7%	48.1%	45.8%	75.2%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	88	68	36	63	28	283
		% within Church attendance	67.2%	46.9%	33.3%	32.8%	12.6%	35.5%
	Don't know	Count	20	31	20	41	27	139
		% within Church attendance	15.3%	21.4%	18.5%	21.4%	12.2%	17.4%
Total		Count	131	145	108	192	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

225

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	246	42	56	9	2	10	11	0	376
		% within Race	47.5%	41.6%	45.5%	60.0%	66.7%	90.9%	44.0%	.0%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	179	44	46	3	1	1	8	2	284
		% within Race	34.6%	43.6%	37.4%	20.0%	33.3%	9.1%	32.0%	100.0%	35.6%
	Don't know	Count	93	15	21	3	0	0	6	0	138
		% within Race	18.0%	14.9%	17.1%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	24.0%	.0%	17.3%
Total		Count	518	101	123	15	3	11	25	2	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	206	6	51	12	80	18	373
		% within Marital Status	42.4%	50.0%	53.1%	41.4%	56.3%	58.1%	46.9%
	Disapprove	Count	186	5	34	13	34	12	284
		% within Marital Status	38.3%	41.7%	35.4%	44.8%	23.9%	38.7%	35.7%
	Don't know	Count	94	1	11	4	28	1	139
		% within Marital Status	19.3%	8.3%	11.5%	13.8%	19.7%	3.2%	17.5%
Total		Count	486	12	96	29	142	31	796

226

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	206	6	51	12	80	18	373
		% within Marital Status	42.4%	50.0%	53.1%	41.4%	56.3%	58.1%	46.9%
	Disapprove	Count	186	5	34	13	34	12	284
		% within Marital Status	38.3%	41.7%	35.4%	44.8%	23.9%	38.7%	35.7%
	Don't know	Count	94	1	11	4	28	1	139
		% within Marital Status	19.3%	8.3%	11.5%	13.8%	19.7%	3.2%	17.5%
Total		Count	486	12	96	29	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	192	184	376
		% within Gender	51.3%	43.4%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	113	171	284
		% within Gender	30.2%	40.3%	35.6%
	Don't know	Count	69	69	138
		% within Gender	18.4%	16.3%	17.3%
Total		Count	374	424	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	123	178	75	376
		% within Urban/Rural	50.8%	47.1%	42.4%	47.2%
	Disapprove	Count	79	132	72	283
		% within Urban/Rural	32.6%	34.9%	40.7%	35.5%
	Don't know	Count	40	68	30	138
		% within Urban/Rural	16.5%	18.0%	16.9%	17.3%
Total		Count	242	378	177	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	78	108	29	52	109	376
		% within Metropolitan areas	45.6%	48.9%	40.8%	60.5%	43.8%	47.1%
	Disapprove	Count	69	68	29	23	95	284
		% within Metropolitan areas	40.4%	30.8%	40.8%	26.7%	38.2%	35.6%
	Don't know	Count	24	45	13	11	45	138

	% within Metropolitan areas	14.0%	20.4%	18.3%	12.8%	18.1%	17.3%
Total	Count	171	221	71	86	249	798
	% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Physician-Assisted Suicide * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Physician-Assisted Suicide	Approve	Count	69	69	54	85	40	59	376
		% within AP Region	42.9%	52.3%	44.6%	53.8%	38.8%	48.4%	47.2%
	Disapprove	Count	56	41	46	52	48	40	283
		% within AP Region	34.8%	31.1%	38.0%	32.9%	46.6%	32.8%	35.5%
	Don't know	Count	36	22	21	21	15	23	138
		% within AP Region	22.4%	16.7%	17.4%	13.3%	14.6%	18.9%	17.3%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	122	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	23	21	29	71	17	9	13	183
		% within Libcon scale	69.7%	42.0%	37.2%	32.6%	14.7%	5.3%	10.2%	23.1%

	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	8	20	40	96	45	51	32	292
		% within Libcon scale	24.2%	40.0%	51.3%	44.0%	38.8%	30.2%	25.2%	36.9%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	1	7	7	33	34	70	45	197
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	14.0%	9.0%	15.1%	29.3%	41.4%	35.4%	24.9%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	1	0	1	9	19	35	33	98
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	.0%	1.3%	4.1%	16.4%	20.7%	26.0%	12.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	1	9	1	4	4	21
		% within Libcon scale	.0%	4.0%	1.3%	4.1%	.9%	2.4%	3.1%	2.7%
Total		Count	33	50	78	218	116	169	127	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	83	36	25	18	1	9	11	3	186
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.6%	40.0%	41.7%	22.8%	.9%	12.2%	5.6%	20.0%	23.7%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	60	40	28	32	37	27	67	2	293
		% within 7 point Party ID	36.6%	44.4%	46.7%	40.5%	34.6%	36.5%	34.2%	13.3%	37.3%
	The government has a	Count	17	12	4	15	42	26	71	4	191

	responsibility to provide FEW social services	% within 7 point Party ID	10.4%	13.3%	6.7%	19.0%	39.3%	35.1%	36.2%	26.7%	24.3%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	1	0	2	12	27	11	41	0	94
		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	.0%	3.3%	15.2%	25.2%	14.9%	20.9%	.0%	12.0%
	Don't know	Count	3	2	1	2	0	1	6	6	21
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	2.2%	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	1.4%	3.1%	40.0%	2.7%
Total		Count	164	90	60	79	107	74	196	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	25	66	78	17	186
		% within age	20.5%	27.4%	24.2%	14.7%	23.2%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	59	74	119	48	300
		% within age	48.4%	30.7%	37.0%	41.4%	37.5%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	23	63	80	31	197
		% within age	18.9%	26.1%	24.8%	26.7%	24.6%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	11	28	39	19	97
		% within age	9.0%	11.6%	12.1%	16.4%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	4	10	6	1	21

231

Government Responsibility for Poor * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	14	69	58	14	20	10	185
		% within Education	48.3%	22.6%	21.7%	28.6%	18.7%	23.3%	23.1%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	7	121	96	16	41	18	299
		% within Education	24.1%	39.7%	36.0%	32.7%	38.3%	41.9%	37.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	6	71	67	13	30	11	198
		% within Education	20.7%	23.3%	25.1%	26.5%	28.0%	25.6%	24.8%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	1	34	40	4	14	4	97
		% within Education	3.4%	11.1%	15.0%	8.2%	13.1%	9.3%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	10	6	2	2	0	21
		% within Education	3.4%	3.3%	2.2%	4.1%	1.9%	.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	29	305	267	49	107	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	24	30	26	46	58	184
		% within Church attendance	18.5%	20.5%	24.1%	24.1%	26.1%	23.1%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	47	56	42	81	72	298
		% within Church attendance	36.2%	38.4%	38.9%	42.4%	32.4%	37.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	28	39	26	38	65	196
		% within Church attendance	21.5%	26.7%	24.1%	19.9%	29.3%	24.6%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	30	16	12	19	20	97
		% within Church attendance	23.1%	11.0%	11.1%	9.9%	9.0%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	1	5	2	7	7	22
		% within Church attendance	.8%	3.4%	1.9%	3.7%	3.2%	2.8%
Total		Count	130	146	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	87	47	39	3	2	4	4	0	186
		% within Race	16.8%	46.5%	31.2%	21.4%	50.0%	36.4%	15.4%	.0%	23.3%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	176	36	63	7	0	6	9	2	299
		% within Race	34.0%	35.6%	50.4%	50.0%	.0%	54.5%	34.6%	100.0%	37.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	156	17	15	3	0	0	6	0	197
		% within Race	30.2%	16.8%	12.0%	21.4%	.0%	.0%	23.1%	.0%	24.6%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	82	0	6	0	2	0	7	0	97
		% within Race	15.9%	.0%	4.8%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	26.9%	.0%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	16	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	21
		% within Race	3.1%	1.0%	1.6%	7.1%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	517	101	125	14	4	11	26	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Marital Status	Total

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	98	2	33	5	42	6	186
		% within Marital Status	20.2%	16.7%	34.4%	16.7%	29.6%	19.4%	23.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	167	7	41	15	51	14	295
		% within Marital Status	34.4%	58.3%	42.7%	50.0%	35.9%	45.2%	37.1%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	130	1	16	6	33	11	197
		% within Marital Status	26.8%	8.3%	16.7%	20.0%	23.2%	35.5%	24.7%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	77	2	4	4	10	0	97
		% within Marital Status	15.9%	16.7%	4.2%	13.3%	7.0%	.0%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	13	0	2	0	6	0	21
		% within Marital Status	2.7%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	4.2%	.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	485	12	96	30	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	83	101	184
		% within Gender	22.2%	23.8%	23.1%
	The government has a	Count	123	176	299

	responsibility to provide SOME social services	% within Gender	32.9%	41.5%	37.5%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	112	85	197
		% within Gender	29.9%	20.0%	24.7%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	51	46	97
		% within Gender	13.6%	10.8%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	5	16	21
		% within Gender	1.3%	3.8%	2.6%
Total		Count	374	424	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	69	84	31	184
		% within Urban/Rural	28.4%	22.3%	17.5%	23.1%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	98	138	62	298
		% within Urban/Rural	40.3%	36.6%	35.0%	37.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	46	98	53	197
		% within Urban/Rural	18.9%	26.0%	29.9%	24.7%
	The government has a	Count	23	50	24	97

	responsibility to provide NO social services	% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	13.3%	13.6%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	7	7	7	21
		% within Urban/Rural	2.9%	1.9%	4.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	243	377	177	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	39	53	12	28	53	185
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.1%	24.2%	16.9%	32.6%	21.1%	23.2%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	63	86	30	33	85	297
		% within Metropolitan areas	37.3%	39.3%	42.3%	38.4%	33.9%	37.3%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	40	55	18	19	65	197
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.7%	25.1%	25.4%	22.1%	25.9%	24.7%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	24	19	7	5	41	96
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.2%	8.7%	9.9%	5.8%	16.3%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	3	6	4	1	7	21

		East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	Total
	% within Metropolitan areas	1.8%	2.7%	5.6%	1.2%	2.8%	2.6%
Total	Count	169	219	71	86	251	796
	% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Government Responsibility for Poor * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Government Responsibility for Poor	The government has a responsibility to provide MANY social services	Count	32	41	29	43	12	28	185
		% within AP Region	19.9%	31.5%	24.0%	27.2%	11.7%	23.0%	23.3%
	The government has a responsibility to provide SOME social services	Count	62	45	44	55	38	53	297
		% within AP Region	38.5%	34.6%	36.4%	34.8%	36.9%	43.4%	37.4%
	The government has a responsibility to provide FEW social services	Count	38	33	28	39	35	24	197
		% within AP Region	23.6%	25.4%	23.1%	24.7%	34.0%	19.7%	24.8%
	The government has a responsibility to provide NO social services	Count	23	10	17	18	15	12	95
		% within AP Region	14.3%	7.7%	14.0%	11.4%	14.6%	9.8%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	6	1	3	3	3	5	21
		% within AP Region	3.7%	.8%	2.5%	1.9%	2.9%	4.1%	2.6%
Total		Count	161	130	121	158	103	122	795
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

238

Redistricting * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	23	27	44	102	54	46	56	352
		% within Libcon scale	71.9%	52.9%	55.7%	47.0%	47.4%	27.5%	44.1%	44.7%
	Oppose	Count	2	5	10	23	27	73	49	189
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	9.8%	12.7%	10.6%	23.7%	43.7%	38.6%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	7	19	25	92	33	48	22	246
		% within Libcon scale	21.9%	37.3%	31.6%	42.4%	28.9%	28.7%	17.3%	31.3%
Total		Count	32	51	79	217	114	167	127	787
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	95	47	37	39	38	30	65	0	351
		% within 7 point Party ID	57.9%	52.2%	61.7%	48.8%	35.8%	41.1%	33.3%	.0%	44.8%
	Oppose	Count	12	15	6	12	44	12	81	0	182
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.3%	16.7%	10.0%	15.0%	41.5%	16.4%	41.5%	.0%	23.2%
	Don't know	Count	57	28	17	29	24	31	49	15	250

	% within 7 point Party ID	34.8%	31.1%	28.3%	36.3%	22.6%	42.5%	25.1%	100.0%	31.9%
Total	Count	164	90	60	80	106	73	195	15	783
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	49	115	140	50	354
		% within age	40.5%	47.7%	43.6%	43.9%	44.4%
	Oppose	Count	19	37	92	40	188
		% within age	15.7%	15.4%	28.7%	35.1%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	53	89	89	24	255
		% within age	43.8%	36.9%	27.7%	21.1%	32.0%
Total		Count	121	241	321	114	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	17	129	112	24	52	18	352
		% within Education	58.6%	42.6%	42.1%	49.0%	49.5%	42.9%	44.3%
	Oppose	Count	3	59	68	15	26	16	187

240

			10.3%	19.5%	25.6%	30.6%	24.8%	38.1%	23.6%
		% within Education	10.3%	19.5%	25.6%	30.6%	24.8%	38.1%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	9	115	86	10	27	8	255
		% within Education	31.0%	38.0%	32.3%	20.4%	25.7%	19.0%	32.1%
Total		Count	29	303	266	49	105	42	794
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	52	66	54	71	111	354
		% within Church attendance	40.3%	45.5%	50.0%	37.4%	50.0%	44.6%
	Oppose	Count	38	37	23	51	36	185
		% within Church attendance	29.5%	25.5%	21.3%	26.8%	16.2%	23.3%
	Don't know	Count	39	42	31	68	75	255
		% within Church attendance	30.2%	29.0%	28.7%	35.8%	33.8%	32.1%
Total		Count	129	145	108	190	222	794
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Race Crosstabulation

241

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	221	49	58	9	3	5	8	0	353
		% within Race	42.8%	48.5%	47.5%	60.0%	75.0%	45.5%	32.0%	.0%	44.3%
	Oppose	Count	141	5	27	1	0	1	12	0	187
		% within Race	27.3%	5.0%	22.1%	6.7%	.0%	9.1%	48.0%	.0%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	154	47	37	5	1	5	5	2	256
		% within Race	29.8%	46.5%	30.3%	33.3%	25.0%	45.5%	20.0%	100.0%	32.2%
Total		Count	516	101	122	15	4	11	25	2	796
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	213	5	43	12	61	16	350
		% within Marital Status	44.1%	45.5%	44.8%	41.4%	43.0%	50.0%	44.1%
	Oppose	Count	127	1	20	10	25	4	187
		% within Marital Status	26.3%	9.1%	20.8%	34.5%	17.6%	12.5%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	143	5	33	7	56	12	256
		% within Marital Status	29.6%	45.5%	34.4%	24.1%	39.4%	37.5%	32.3%

Total		Count	483	11	96	29	142	32	793
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	182	171	353
		% within Gender	48.8%	40.4%	44.3%
	Oppose	Count	115	73	188
		% within Gender	30.8%	17.3%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	76	179	255
		% within Gender	20.4%	42.3%	32.0%
Total		Count	373	423	796
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	126	159	68	353
		% within Urban/Rural	51.9%	42.3%	38.2%	44.3%
	Oppose	Count	37	99	52	188
		% within Urban/Rural	15.2%	26.3%	29.2%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	80	118	58	256

243

	% within Urban/Rural	32.9%	31.4%	32.6%	32.1%	
Total	Count	243	376	178	797	
	% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Redistricting * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	78	110	32	44	88	352
		% within Metropolitan areas	45.9%	50.2%	45.1%	51.2%	35.5%	44.3%
	Oppose	Count	40	50	17	22	58	187
		% within Metropolitan areas	23.5%	22.8%	23.9%	25.6%	23.4%	23.6%
	Don't know	Count	52	59	22	20	102	255
		% within Metropolitan areas	30.6%	26.9%	31.0%	23.3%	41.1%	32.1%
Total		Count	170	219	71	86	248	794
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	68	67	56	66	44	52	353

		% within AP Region	42.2%	51.1%	46.3%	41.8%	42.7%	43.0%	44.4%
	Oppose	Count	36	26	29	40	26	28	185
		% within AP Region	22.4%	19.8%	24.0%	25.3%	25.2%	23.1%	23.3%
	Don't know	Count	57	38	36	52	33	41	257
		% within AP Region	35.4%	29.0%	29.8%	32.9%	32.0%	33.9%	32.3%
Total		Count	161	131	121	158	103	121	795
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	7	5	29	73	63	128	86	391
		% within Libcon scale	22.6%	10.9%	41.4%	38.0%	58.3%	79.0%	72.3%	53.7%
	in between	Count	3	22	21	72	21	17	14	170
		% within Libcon scale	9.7%	47.8%	30.0%	37.5%	19.4%	10.5%	11.8%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	21	19	20	47	24	17	19	167
		% within Libcon scale	67.7%	41.3%	28.6%	24.5%	22.2%	10.5%	16.0%	22.9%
Total		Count	31	46	70	192	108	162	119	728
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID	Total

245

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	30	33	19	36	76	49	142	2	387
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.4%	39.3%	37.3%	48.0%	73.8%	71.0%	76.8%	22.2%	53.5%
	in between	Count	51	26	16	22	14	12	22	6	169
		% within 7 point Party ID	34.7%	31.0%	31.4%	29.3%	13.6%	17.4%	11.9%	66.7%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	66	25	16	17	13	8	21	1	167
		% within 7 point Party ID	44.9%	29.8%	31.4%	22.7%	12.6%	11.6%	11.4%	11.1%	23.1%
Total		Count	147	84	51	75	103	69	185	9	723
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	38	113	173	69	393
		% within age	35.8%	50.0%	58.2%	63.9%	53.3%
	in between	Count	40	57	58	18	173
		% within age	37.7%	25.2%	19.5%	16.7%	23.5%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	28	56	66	21	171
		% within age	26.4%	24.8%	22.2%	19.4%	23.2%
Total		Count	106	226	297	108	737
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	8	147	137	27	53	21	393
		% within Education	32.0%	54.6%	55.2%	58.7%	51.0%	48.8%	53.5%
	in between	Count	6	63	62	8	27	6	172
		% within Education	24.0%	23.4%	25.0%	17.4%	26.0%	14.0%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	11	59	49	11	24	16	170
		% within Education	44.0%	21.9%	19.8%	23.9%	23.1%	37.2%	23.1%
Total		Count	25	269	248	46	104	43	735
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	69	85	48	94	96	392
		% within Church attendance	58.0%	65.4%	48.5%	52.2%	46.6%	53.4%
	in between	Count	27	21	26	48	50	172
		% within Church attendance	22.7%	16.2%	26.3%	26.7%	24.3%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	23	24	25	38	60	170
		% within Church attendance	19.3%	18.5%	25.3%	21.1%	29.1%	23.2%
Total		Count	119	130	99	180	206	734
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Race Crosstabulation

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
							Race			
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	300	25	39	6	2	2	20	394
		% within Race	61.9%	28.7%	35.5%	40.0%	50.0%	18.2%	80.0%	53.5%
	in between	Count	100	27	37	4	0	2	3	173
		% within Race	20.6%	31.0%	33.6%	26.7%	.0%	18.2%	12.0%	23.5%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	85	35	34	5	2	7	2	170
		% within Race	17.5%	40.2%	30.9%	33.3%	50.0%	63.6%	8.0%	23.1%
Total		Count	485	87	110	15	4	11	25	737
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
					Marital Status				
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	272	3	39	18	47	15	394
		% within Marital Status	59.6%	33.3%	47.6%	62.1%	37.3%	53.6%	54.0%
	in between	Count	83	3	26	4	48	7	171

248

			18.2%	33.3%	31.7%	13.8%	38.1%	25.0%	23.4%
	% within Marital Status								
	mostly or entirely through	Count	101	3	17	7	31	6	165
	revenue increases	% within Marital Status	22.1%	33.3%	20.7%	24.1%	24.6%	21.4%	22.6%
Total		Count	456	9	82	29	126	28	730
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	205	188	393
	spending cuts	% within Gender	56.9%	50.1%	53.5%
	in between	Count	72	100	172
		% within Gender	20.0%	26.7%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	83	87	170
	revenue increases	% within Gender	23.1%	23.2%	23.1%
Total		Count	360	375	735
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	95	199	100	394
	spending cuts	% within Urban/Rural	43.4%	55.1%	64.1%	53.5%

	in between	Count	62	73	37	172
		% within Urban/Rural	28.3%	20.2%	23.7%	23.4%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	62	89	19	170
		% within Urban/Rural	28.3%	24.7%	12.2%	23.1%
Total		Count	219	361	156	736
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					Total
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	79	108	37	40	129	393
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.3%	52.2%	61.7%	47.6%	57.1%	53.5%
	in between	Count	40	41	9	21	60	171
		% within Metropolitan areas	25.5%	19.8%	15.0%	25.0%	26.5%	23.3%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	38	58	14	23	37	170
		% within Metropolitan areas	24.2%	28.0%	23.3%	27.4%	16.4%	23.2%
Total		Count	157	207	60	84	226	734
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * AP Region Crosstabulation

	AP Region	Total

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through spending cuts	Count	74	62	59	82	60	55	392
		% within AP Region	52.9%	50.0%	50.4%	54.3%	65.2%	50.5%	53.5%
	in between	Count	37	23	32	33	21	25	171
		% within AP Region	26.4%	18.5%	27.4%	21.9%	22.8%	22.9%	23.3%
	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count	29	39	26	36	11	29	170
		% within AP Region	20.7%	31.5%	22.2%	23.8%	12.0%	26.6%	23.2%
Total		Count	140	124	117	151	92	109	733
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	1	2	4	20	24	45	46	142
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	4.0%	5.1%	9.2%	20.9%	26.8%	35.7%	18.0%
	No	Count	31	48	75	197	91	123	83	648
		% within Libcon scale	96.9%	96.0%	94.9%	90.8%	79.1%	73.2%	64.3%	82.0%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

251

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	11	5	4	16	36	16	47	1	136
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.7%	5.6%	6.7%	20.3%	34.0%	21.6%	23.9%	6.7%	17.3%
	No	Count	153	85	56	63	70	58	150	14	649
		% within 7 point Party ID	93.3%	94.4%	93.3%	79.7%	66.0%	78.4%	76.1%	93.3%	82.7%
Total		Count	164	90	60	79	106	74	197	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	9	36	68	28	141
		% within age	7.4%	14.9%	21.1%	24.6%	17.6%
	No	Count	112	205	255	86	658
		% within age	92.6%	85.1%	78.9%	75.4%	82.4%
Total		Count	121	241	323	114	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Education Crosstabulation

	Education	Total

			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	2	47	53	9	19	11	141
		% within Education	7.1%	15.4%	19.9%	18.0%	17.9%	25.6%	17.6%
	No	Count	26	258	214	41	87	32	658
		% within Education	92.9%	84.6%	80.1%	82.0%	82.1%	74.4%	82.4%
Total		Count	28	305	267	50	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	34	24	13	33	38	142
		% within Church attendance	26.0%	16.4%	12.0%	17.3%	17.1%	17.8%
	No	Count	97	122	95	158	184	656
		% within Church attendance	74.0%	83.6%	88.0%	82.7%	82.9%	82.2%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Race Crosstabulation

253

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	112	8	10	3	0	0	7	2	142
		% within Race	21.6%	7.9%	8.1%	21.4%	.0%	.0%	26.9%	100.0%	17.8%
	No	Count	407	93	114	11	3	11	19	0	658
		% within Race	78.4%	92.1%	91.9%	78.6%	100.0%	100.0%	73.1%	.0%	82.3%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	26	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	105	0	14	4	14	6	143
		% within Marital Status	21.6%	.0%	14.6%	13.3%	9.8%	20.0%	17.9%
	No	Count	381	12	82	26	129	24	654
		% within Marital Status	78.4%	100.0%	85.4%	86.7%	90.2%	80.0%	82.1%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	143	30	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

254

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	99	43	142
		% within Gender	26.5%	10.1%	17.8%
	No	Count	275	383	658
		% within Gender	73.5%	89.9%	82.3%
Total		Count	374	426	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	33	72	36	141
		% within Urban/Rural	13.6%	19.0%	20.3%	17.7%
	No	Count	209	307	141	657
		% within Urban/Rural	86.4%	81.0%	79.7%	82.3%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	29	39	16	17	40	141
		% within Metropolitan areas	17.1%	17.7%	22.5%	19.5%	16.0%	17.7%
	No	Count	141	181	55	70	210	657
		% within Metropolitan areas	82.9%	82.3%	77.5%	80.5%	84.0%	82.3%
Total		Count	170	220	71	87	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state public education funding * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - cut state public education funding	Yes	Count	24	20	20	40	20	18	142
		% within AP Region	14.8%	15.2%	16.5%	25.3%	19.4%	14.6%	17.8%
	No	Count	138	112	101	118	83	105	657
		% within AP Region	85.2%	84.8%	83.5%	74.7%	80.6%	85.4%	82.2%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	103	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	4	7	18	51	48	98	75	301
		% within Libcon scale	12.1%	14.0%	23.1%	23.4%	41.7%	58.0%	58.6%	38.1%
	No	Count	29	43	60	167	67	71	53	490
		% within Libcon scale	87.9%	86.0%	76.9%	76.6%	58.3%	42.0%	41.4%	61.9%
Total		Count	33	50	78	218	115	169	128	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	26	14	15	27	68	34	113	1	298
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.8%	15.6%	25.0%	33.8%	64.2%	46.6%	57.1%	6.7%	37.9%
	No	Count	139	76	45	53	38	39	85	14	489
		% within 7 point Party ID	84.2%	84.4%	75.0%	66.3%	35.8%	53.4%	42.9%	93.3%	62.1%
Total		Count	165	90	60	80	106	73	198	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * age Crosstabulation

257

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	33	70	139	60	302
		% within age	27.3%	29.0%	43.0%	52.2%	37.8%
	No	Count	88	171	184	55	498
		% within age	72.7%	71.0%	57.0%	47.8%	62.3%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	8	112	98	24	42	18	302
		% within Education	28.6%	36.6%	36.7%	49.0%	39.3%	41.9%	37.8%
	No	Count	20	194	169	25	65	25	498
		% within Education	71.4%	63.4%	63.3%	51.0%	60.7%	58.1%	62.3%
Total		Count	28	306	267	49	107	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	62	57	37	71	75	302
		% within Church attendance	47.0%	39.0%	34.3%	37.2%	33.8%	37.8%
	No	Count	70	89	71	120	147	497
		% within Church attendance	53.0%	61.0%	65.7%	62.8%	66.2%	62.2%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	222	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	234	19	29	4	1	0	15	0	302
		% within Race	45.1%	18.8%	23.6%	26.7%	25.0%	.0%	60.0%	.0%	37.8%
	No	Count	285	82	94	11	3	11	10	2	498
		% within Race	54.9%	81.2%	76.4%	73.3%	75.0%	100.0%	40.0%	100.0%	62.3%
Total		Count	519	101	123	15	4	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	212	1	28	16	34	7	298
		% within Marital Status	43.6%	9.1%	29.2%	53.3%	23.9%	22.6%	37.4%
	No	Count	274	10	68	14	108	24	498
		% within Marital Status	56.4%	90.9%	70.8%	46.7%	76.1%	77.4%	62.6%
Total		Count	486	11	96	30	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	159	144	303
		% within Gender	42.4%	33.8%	37.8%
	No	Count	216	282	498
		% within Gender	57.6%	66.2%	62.2%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

260

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	72	156	74	302
		% within Urban/Rural	29.8%	41.2%	41.6%	37.8%
	No	Count	170	223	104	497
		% within Urban/Rural	70.2%	58.8%	58.4%	62.2%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	68	85	18	29	102	302
		% within Metropolitan areas	40.0%	38.5%	25.4%	33.7%	40.8%	37.8%
	No	Count	102	136	53	57	148	496
		% within Metropolitan areas	60.0%	61.5%	74.6%	66.3%	59.2%	62.2%
Total		Count	170	221	71	86	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - end funding for pre-k	Yes	Count	57	49	48	68	47	32	301
		% within AP Region	35.4%	37.1%	40.0%	43.0%	45.6%	26.0%	37.8%
	No	Count	104	83	72	90	56	91	496
		% within AP Region	64.6%	62.9%	60.0%	57.0%	54.4%	74.0%	62.2%
Total		Count	161	132	120	158	103	123	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	2	4	10	36	29	73	58	212
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	8.0%	12.8%	16.6%	25.2%	43.5%	45.3%	26.9%
	No	Count	31	46	68	181	86	95	70	577
		% within Libcon scale	93.9%	92.0%	87.2%	83.4%	74.8%	56.5%	54.7%	73.1%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	168	128	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	14	15	6	12	50	21	83	2	203
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.5%	16.5%	10.0%	15.2%	47.2%	28.4%	42.1%	13.3%	25.8%
	No	Count	150	76	54	67	56	53	114	13	583
		% within 7 point Party ID	91.5%	83.5%	90.0%	84.8%	52.8%	71.6%	57.9%	86.7%	74.2%
Total		Count	164	91	60	79	106	74	197	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	26	43	95	49	213
		% within age	21.5%	17.8%	29.4%	42.6%	26.6%
	No	Count	95	198	228	66	587
		% within age	78.5%	82.2%	70.6%	57.4%	73.4%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Education Crosstabulation

263

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	5	77	72	10	36	13	213
		% within Education	17.2%	25.2%	27.0%	20.4%	33.6%	31.0%	26.6%
	No	Count	24	229	195	39	71	29	587
		% within Education	82.8%	74.8%	73.0%	79.6%	66.4%	69.0%	73.4%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	42	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	41	50	27	51	44	213
		% within Church attendance	31.3%	34.2%	24.8%	26.7%	19.9%	26.7%
	No	Count	90	96	82	140	177	585
		% within Church attendance	68.7%	65.8%	75.2%	73.3%	80.1%	73.3%
Total		Count	131	146	109	191	221	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	170	8	17	3	1	1	13	0	213
		% within Race	32.8%	7.9%	13.7%	21.4%	25.0%	9.1%	52.0%	.0%	26.6%
	No	Count	349	93	107	11	3	10	12	2	587
		% within Race	67.2%	92.1%	86.3%	78.6%	75.0%	90.9%	48.0%	100.0%	73.4%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	4	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	150	3	16	13	20	7	209
		% within Marital Status	30.9%	25.0%	16.7%	44.8%	14.1%	22.6%	26.3%
	No	Count	336	9	80	16	122	24	587
		% within Marital Status	69.1%	75.0%	83.3%	55.2%	85.9%	77.4%	73.7%
Total		Count	486	12	96	29	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	136	77	213
		% within Gender	36.3%	18.1%	26.6%
	No	Count	239	348	587
		% within Gender	63.7%	81.9%	73.4%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	62	95	56	213
		% within Urban/Rural	25.5%	25.1%	31.5%	26.6%
	No	Count	181	284	122	587
		% within Urban/Rural	74.5%	74.9%	68.5%	73.4%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	46	62	18	16	71	213
		% within Metropolitan areas	27.1%	28.2%	25.0%	18.6%	28.3%	26.7%
	No	Count	124	158	54	70	180	586
		% within Metropolitan areas	72.9%	71.8%	75.0%	81.4%	71.7%	73.3%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	251	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - reduce grants to college students	Yes	Count	46	33	34	40	34	27	214
		% within AP Region	28.4%	25.0%	28.1%	25.3%	32.7%	22.0%	26.8%
	No	Count	116	99	87	118	70	96	586
		% within AP Region	71.6%	75.0%	71.9%	74.7%	67.3%	78.0%	73.3%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	104	123	800
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	3	5	9	42	51	74	65	249
		% within Libcon scale	9.4%	10.0%	11.4%	19.4%	44.3%	44.0%	50.4%	31.5%
	No	Count	29	45	70	175	64	94	64	541
		% within Libcon scale	90.6%	90.0%	88.6%	80.6%	55.7%	56.0%	49.6%	68.5%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	19	19	11	19	57	34	88	1	248
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.6%	21.1%	18.3%	24.1%	53.3%	45.9%	44.4%	6.7%	31.5%
	No	Count	145	71	49	60	50	40	110	14	539
		% within 7 point Party ID	88.4%	78.9%	81.7%	75.9%	46.7%	54.1%	55.6%	93.3%	68.5%
Total		Count	164	90	60	79	107	74	198	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * age Crosstabulation

268

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	25	64	115	48	252
		% within age	20.5%	26.6%	35.7%	41.7%	31.5%
	No	Count	97	177	207	67	548
		% within age	79.5%	73.4%	64.3%	58.3%	68.5%
Total		Count	122	241	322	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	7	95	90	13	33	14	252
		% within Education	24.1%	31.0%	33.7%	26.5%	31.1%	32.6%	31.5%
	No	Count	22	211	177	36	73	29	548
		% within Education	75.9%	69.0%	66.3%	73.5%	68.9%	67.4%	68.5%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	42	51	35	55	68	251
		% within Church attendance	32.1%	35.2%	32.4%	28.9%	30.6%	31.5%
	No	Count	89	94	73	135	154	545
		% within Church attendance	67.9%	64.8%	67.6%	71.1%	69.4%	68.5%
Total		Count	131	145	108	190	222	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	196	9	30	3	0	4	10	0	252
		% within Race	37.8%	8.9%	24.2%	21.4%	.0%	36.4%	38.5%	.0%	31.5%
	No	Count	323	92	94	11	3	7	16	2	548
		% within Race	62.2%	91.1%	75.8%	78.6%	100.0%	63.6%	61.5%	100.0%	68.5%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	26	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	179	4	19	10	28	11	251
		% within Marital Status	36.8%	36.4%	19.8%	34.5%	19.7%	35.5%	31.6%
	No	Count	307	7	77	19	114	20	544
		% within Marital Status	63.2%	63.6%	80.2%	65.5%	80.3%	64.5%	68.4%
Total		Count	486	11	96	29	142	31	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	152	100	252
		% within Gender	40.5%	23.5%	31.5%
	No	Count	223	325	548
		% within Gender	59.5%	76.5%	68.5%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

271

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	57	133	61	251
		% within Urban/Rural	23.6%	35.2%	34.5%	31.5%
	No	Count	185	245	116	546
		% within Urban/Rural	76.4%	64.8%	65.5%	68.5%
Total		Count	242	378	177	797
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	50	74	25	27	76	252
		% within Metropolitan areas	29.4%	33.5%	35.2%	31.4%	30.3%	31.5%
	No	Count	120	147	46	59	175	547
		% within Metropolitan areas	70.6%	66.5%	64.8%	68.6%	69.7%	68.5%
Total		Count	170	221	71	86	251	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - reduce contributions to retirement programs	Yes	Count	57	36	34	56	33	35	251
		% within AP Region	35.4%	27.3%	28.3%	35.4%	32.0%	28.7%	31.5%
	No	Count	104	96	86	102	70	87	545
		% within AP Region	64.6%	72.7%	71.7%	64.6%	68.0%	71.3%	68.5%
Total		Count	161	132	120	158	103	122	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	2	0	4	11	14	36	36	103
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	.0%	5.1%	5.1%	12.2%	21.3%	28.1%	13.0%
	No	Count	31	50	75	206	101	133	92	688
		% within Libcon scale	93.9%	100.0%	94.9%	94.9%	87.8%	78.7%	71.9%	87.0%
Total		Count	33	50	79	217	115	169	128	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

273

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	3	2	5	12	21	9	45	1	98
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	2.2%	8.3%	15.2%	19.8%	12.3%	22.7%	6.7%	12.5%
	No	Count	161	88	55	67	85	64	153	14	687
		% within 7 point Party ID	98.2%	97.8%	91.7%	84.8%	80.2%	87.7%	77.3%	93.3%	87.5%
Total		Count	164	90	60	79	106	73	198	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	8	35	48	12	103
		% within age	6.6%	14.5%	14.9%	10.4%	12.9%
	No	Count	114	206	275	103	698
		% within age	93.4%	85.5%	85.1%	89.6%	87.1%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	2	27	43	7	20	4	103
		% within Education	6.9%	8.8%	16.1%	14.3%	18.9%	9.3%	12.9%
	No	Count	27	279	224	42	86	39	697
		% within Education	93.1%	91.2%	83.9%	85.7%	81.1%	90.7%	87.1%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	23	16	14	24	27	104
		% within Church attendance	17.4%	11.0%	13.0%	12.6%	12.2%	13.0%
	No	Count	109	130	94	167	195	695
		% within Church attendance	82.6%	89.0%	87.0%	87.4%	87.8%	87.0%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	222	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	82	2	9	2	1	1	7	0	104
		% within Race	15.8%	2.0%	7.3%	13.3%	25.0%	9.1%	26.9%	.0%	13.0%
	No	Count	437	99	115	13	3	10	19	2	698
		% within Race	84.2%	98.0%	92.7%	86.7%	75.0%	90.9%	73.1%	100.0%	87.0%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	4	11	26	2	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	83	1	6	4	8	2	104
		% within Marital Status	17.1%	8.3%	6.3%	13.3%	5.6%	6.5%	13.0%
	No	Count	403	11	90	26	134	29	693
		% within Marital Status	82.9%	91.7%	93.8%	86.7%	94.4%	93.5%	87.0%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	142	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

276

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	69	34	103
		% within Gender	18.4%	8.0%	12.9%
	No	Count	305	392	697
		% within Gender	81.6%	92.0%	87.1%
Total		Count	374	426	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	26	59	18	103
		% within Urban/Rural	10.7%	15.6%	10.1%	12.9%
	No	Count	216	320	160	696
		% within Urban/Rural	89.3%	84.4%	89.9%	87.1%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	24	27	9	10	32	102
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.1%	12.3%	12.7%	11.6%	12.8%	12.8%
	No	Count	146	193	62	76	218	695
		% within Metropolitan areas	85.9%	87.7%	87.3%	88.4%	87.2%	87.2%
Total		Count	170	220	71	86	250	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - end funding for children's health insurance	Yes	Count	18	12	16	21	21	14	102
		% within AP Region	11.2%	9.1%	13.3%	13.3%	20.2%	11.4%	12.8%
	No	Count	143	120	104	137	83	109	696
		% within AP Region	88.8%	90.9%	86.7%	86.7%	79.8%	88.6%	87.2%
Total		Count	161	132	120	158	104	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	7	18	25	91	37	64	37	279
		% within Libcon scale	21.9%	36.0%	31.6%	41.9%	32.2%	38.1%	28.7%	35.3%
	No	Count	25	32	54	126	78	104	92	511
		% within Libcon scale	78.1%	64.0%	68.4%	58.1%	67.8%	61.9%	71.3%	64.7%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	59	40	15	31	34	34	62	3	278
		% within 7 point Party ID	36.0%	44.0%	25.0%	39.2%	32.1%	46.6%	31.3%	21.4%	35.4%
	No	Count	105	51	45	48	72	39	136	11	507
		% within 7 point Party ID	64.0%	56.0%	75.0%	60.8%	67.9%	53.4%	68.7%	78.6%	64.6%
Total		Count	164	91	60	79	106	73	198	14	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * age Crosstabulation

279

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	28	96	115	42	281
		% within age	23.0%	39.8%	35.6%	36.8%	35.1%
	No	Count	94	145	208	72	519
		% within age	77.0%	60.2%	64.4%	63.2%	64.9%
Total		Count	122	241	323	114	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	8	111	91	14	44	13	281
		% within Education	27.6%	36.3%	34.1%	28.6%	41.5%	30.2%	35.1%
	No	Count	21	195	176	35	62	30	519
		% within Education	72.4%	63.7%	65.9%	71.4%	58.5%	69.8%	64.9%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	52	64	42	66	57	281
		% within Church attendance	39.4%	43.8%	38.9%	34.7%	25.7%	35.2%
	No	Count	80	82	66	124	165	517
		% within Church attendance	60.6%	56.2%	61.1%	65.3%	74.3%	64.8%
Total		Count	132	146	108	190	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	166	43	53	4	3	3	9	0	281
		% within Race	32.0%	42.6%	42.7%	26.7%	75.0%	27.3%	36.0%	.0%	35.1%
	No	Count	353	58	71	11	1	8	16	2	520
		% within Race	68.0%	57.4%	57.3%	73.3%	25.0%	72.7%	64.0%	100.0%	64.9%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	4	11	25	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	184	5	37	9	36	9	280
		% within Marital Status	37.9%	45.5%	38.5%	31.0%	25.4%	29.0%	35.3%
	No	Count	301	6	59	20	106	22	514
		% within Marital Status	62.1%	54.5%	61.5%	69.0%	74.6%	71.0%	64.7%
Total		Count	485	11	96	29	142	31	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	128	153	281
		% within Gender	34.1%	36.0%	35.1%
	No	Count	247	272	519
		% within Gender	65.9%	64.0%	64.9%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	91	126	63	280
		% within Urban/Rural	37.6%	33.2%	35.4%	35.0%
	No	Count	151	253	115	519
		% within Urban/Rural	62.4%	66.8%	64.6%	65.0%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	62	67	30	28	93	280
		% within Metropolitan areas	36.5%	30.3%	41.7%	32.6%	37.2%	35.0%
	No	Count	108	154	42	58	157	519
		% within Metropolitan areas	63.5%	69.7%	58.3%	67.4%	62.8%	65.0%
Total		Count	170	221	72	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - end state environmental regulation	Yes	Count	55	40	37	62	38	50	282
		% within AP Region	34.0%	30.1%	30.6%	39.2%	36.5%	40.7%	35.2%
	No	Count	107	93	84	96	66	73	519
		% within AP Region	66.0%	69.9%	69.4%	60.8%	63.5%	59.3%	64.8%
Total		Count	162	133	121	158	104	123	801
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	1	4	11	18	22	28	23	107
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	8.0%	13.9%	8.3%	19.1%	16.6%	17.8%	13.5%
	No	Count	31	46	68	199	93	141	106	684
		% within Libcon scale	96.9%	92.0%	86.1%	91.7%	80.9%	83.4%	82.2%	86.5%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	169	129	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	9	8	9	8	25	11	35	1	106
		% within 7 point Party ID	5.5%	8.8%	15.0%	10.1%	23.6%	14.9%	17.8%	7.1%	13.5%
	No	Count	155	83	51	71	81	63	162	13	679
		% within 7 point Party ID	94.5%	91.2%	85.0%	89.9%	76.4%	85.1%	82.2%	92.9%	86.5%
Total		Count	164	91	60	79	106	74	197	14	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	22	34	42	12	110
		% within age	18.0%	14.1%	13.0%	10.4%	13.7%
	No	Count	100	207	281	103	691
		% within age	82.0%	85.9%	87.0%	89.6%	86.3%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	4	31	41	5	23	6	110
		% within Education	13.8%	10.1%	15.4%	10.2%	21.5%	14.0%	13.7%
	No	Count	25	275	226	44	84	37	691
		% within Education	86.2%	89.9%	84.6%	89.8%	78.5%	86.0%	86.3%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	23	13	15	33	26	110
		% within Church attendance	17.4%	8.9%	13.9%	17.3%	11.8%	13.8%
	No	Count	109	133	93	158	195	688
		% within Church attendance	82.6%	91.1%	86.1%	82.7%	88.2%	86.2%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	221	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	75	4	18	4	0	3	5	0	109
		% within Race	14.5%	4.0%	14.5%	28.6%	.0%	27.3%	20.0%	.0%	13.6%
	No	Count	444	97	106	10	3	8	20	2	690
		% within Race	85.5%	96.0%	85.5%	71.4%	100.0%	72.7%	80.0%	100.0%	86.4%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	76	2	8	1	21	2	110
		% within Marital Status	15.6%	16.7%	8.4%	3.3%	14.8%	6.5%	13.8%
	No	Count	410	10	87	29	121	29	686
		% within Marital Status	84.4%	83.3%	91.6%	96.7%	85.2%	93.5%	86.2%
Total		Count	486	12	95	30	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid	Yes	Count	72	37	109
		% within Gender	19.3%	8.7%	13.6%
	No	Count	302	388	690
		% within Gender	80.7%	91.3%	86.4%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	28	60	22	110
		% within Urban/Rural	11.5%	15.8%	12.4%	13.8%
	No	Count	215	319	156	690
		% within Urban/Rural	88.5%	84.2%	87.6%	86.3%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

288

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	25	20	10	15	40	110
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.6%	9.0%	13.9%	17.2%	16.0%	13.7%
	No	Count	146	201	62	72	210	691
		% within Metropolitan areas	85.4%	91.0%	86.1%	82.8%	84.0%	86.3%
Total		Count	171	221	72	87	250	801
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut payments to medicaid providers* AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - cut payments to Medicaid providers	Yes	Count	17	10	18	29	14	22	110
		% within AP Region	10.6%	7.6%	14.9%	18.4%	13.6%	17.9%	13.8%
	No	Count	144	122	103	129	89	101	688
		% within AP Region	89.4%	92.4%	85.1%	81.6%	86.4%	82.1%	86.2%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	1	1	6	11	16	20	22	77
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	2.0%	7.6%	5.1%	13.9%	11.9%	17.1%	9.7%
	No	Count	31	49	73	206	99	148	107	713
		% within Libcon scale	96.9%	98.0%	92.4%	94.9%	86.1%	88.1%	82.9%	90.3%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	4	5	4	11	19	9	23	0	75
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	5.5%	6.7%	13.8%	17.9%	12.2%	11.7%	.0%	9.5%
	No	Count	160	86	56	69	87	65	174	15	712
		% within 7 point Party ID	97.6%	94.5%	93.3%	86.3%	82.1%	87.8%	88.3%	100.0%	90.5%
Total		Count	164	91	60	80	106	74	197	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	11	24	29	13	77
		% within age	9.1%	10.0%	9.0%	11.3%	9.6%
	No	Count	110	217	293	102	722
		% within age	90.9%	90.0%	91.0%	88.7%	90.4%
Total		Count	121	241	322	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	0	16	35	6	13	8	78
		% within Education	.0%	5.2%	13.1%	12.2%	12.1%	18.6%	9.7%
	No	Count	29	290	233	43	94	35	724
		% within Education	100.0%	94.8%	86.9%	87.8%	87.9%	81.4%	90.3%
Total		Count	29	306	268	49	107	43	802
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	14	13	12	20	17	76
		% within Church attendance	10.7%	8.9%	11.1%	10.5%	7.7%	9.5%
	No	Count	117	133	96	170	204	720
		% within Church attendance	89.3%	91.1%	88.9%	89.5%	92.3%	90.5%
Total		Count	131	146	108	190	221	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	60	2	7	3	0	1	4	0	77
		% within Race	11.6%	2.0%	5.6%	20.0%	.0%	9.1%	16.0%	.0%	9.6%
	No	Count	459	99	117	12	3	10	21	2	723
		% within Race	88.4%	98.0%	94.4%	80.0%	100.0%	90.9%	84.0%	100.0%	90.4%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	3	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	58	1	3	2	10	4	78
		% within Marital Status	11.9%	8.3%	3.1%	6.7%	7.0%	12.9%	9.8%
	No	Count	428	11	93	28	132	27	719
		% within Marital Status	88.1%	91.7%	96.9%	93.3%	93.0%	87.1%	90.2%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	142	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	60	17	77
		% within Gender	16.0%	4.0%	9.6%
	No	Count	315	408	723
		% within Gender	84.0%	96.0%	90.4%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

293

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	20	46	11	77
		% within Urban/Rural	8.3%	12.1%	6.2%	9.6%
	No	Count	222	333	167	722
		% within Urban/Rural	91.7%	87.9%	93.8%	90.4%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	20	21	8	10	18	77
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.8%	9.5%	11.1%	11.6%	7.2%	9.6%
	No	Count	150	200	64	76	232	722
		% within Metropolitan areas	88.2%	90.5%	88.9%	88.4%	92.8%	90.4%
Total		Count	170	221	72	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - cut state funding for nursing home care	Yes	Count	9	16	12	22	5	13	77
		% within AP Region	5.6%	12.1%	9.9%	13.9%	4.9%	10.7%	9.7%
	No	Count	152	116	109	136	98	109	720
		% within AP Region	94.4%	87.9%	90.1%	86.1%	95.1%	89.3%	90.3%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	122	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	16	27	37	68	45	46	20	259
		% within Libcon scale	50.0%	54.0%	46.8%	31.2%	39.5%	27.4%	15.5%	32.8%
	No	Count	16	23	42	150	69	122	109	531
		% within Libcon scale	50.0%	46.0%	53.2%	68.8%	60.5%	72.6%	84.5%	67.2%
Total		Count	32	50	79	218	114	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

295

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	70	27	25	30	33	23	45	6	259
		% within 7 point Party ID	42.7%	30.0%	41.7%	37.5%	31.1%	31.5%	22.7%	40.0%	33.0%
	No	Count	94	63	35	50	73	50	153	9	527
		% within 7 point Party ID	57.3%	70.0%	58.3%	62.5%	68.9%	68.5%	77.3%	60.0%	67.0%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	73	198	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	42	71	110	40	263
		% within age	34.7%	29.5%	34.1%	34.8%	32.9%
	No	Count	79	170	213	75	537
		% within age	65.3%	70.5%	65.9%	65.2%	67.1%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Education Crosstabulation

296

				Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	9	88	97	15	35	18	262
		% within Education	31.0%	28.8%	36.3%	30.6%	33.0%	41.9%	32.8%
	No	Count	20	218	170	34	71	25	538
		% within Education	69.0%	71.2%	63.7%	69.4%	67.0%	58.1%	67.3%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Church attendance Crosstabulation

				Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	41	37	36	62	87	263
		% within Church attendance	31.3%	25.3%	33.3%	32.5%	39.2%	33.0%
	No	Count	90	109	72	129	135	535
		% within Church attendance	68.7%	74.7%	66.7%	67.5%	60.8%	67.0%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Race Crosstabulation

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	163	41	36	6	0	6	10	0	262
		% within Race	31.4%	40.6%	29.3%	40.0%	.0%	54.5%	40.0%	.0%	32.8%
	No	Count	356	60	87	9	3	5	15	2	537
		% within Race	68.6%	59.4%	70.7%	60.0%	100.0%	45.5%	60.0%	100.0%	67.2%
Total		Count	519	101	123	15	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	146	6	36	6	54	11	259
		% within Marital Status	30.0%	50.0%	37.5%	20.7%	38.0%	35.5%	32.5%
	No	Count	340	6	60	23	88	20	537
		% within Marital Status	70.0%	50.0%	62.5%	79.3%	62.0%	64.5%	67.5%
Total		Count	486	12	96	29	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	159	103	262
		% within Gender	42.5%	24.2%	32.8%
	No	Count	215	322	537
		% within Gender	57.5%	75.8%	67.2%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	77	134	52	263
		% within Urban/Rural	31.7%	35.4%	29.2%	32.9%
	No	Count	166	245	126	537
		% within Urban/Rural	68.3%	64.6%	70.8%	67.1%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	54	94	19	33	62	262
		% within Metropolitan areas	31.8%	42.5%	26.4%	37.9%	24.8%	32.8%
	No	Count	116	127	53	54	188	538
		% within Metropolitan areas	68.2%	57.5%	73.6%	62.1%	75.2%	67.3%
Total		Count	170	221	72	87	250	800
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for adults * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for adults	Yes	Count	56	58	41	51	22	35	263
		% within AP Region	34.6%	43.9%	33.9%	32.3%	21.4%	28.5%	32.9%
	No	Count	106	74	80	107	81	88	536
		% within AP Region	65.4%	56.1%	66.1%	67.7%	78.6%	71.5%	67.1%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	103	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	18	27	29	71	42	53	22	262
		% within Libcon scale	56.3%	54.0%	37.2%	32.7%	36.5%	31.5%	17.2%	33.2%
	No	Count	14	23	49	146	73	115	106	526
		% within Libcon scale	43.8%	46.0%	62.8%	67.3%	63.5%	68.5%	82.8%	66.8%
Total		Count	32	50	78	217	115	168	128	788
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	64	32	26	32	30	25	44	5	258
		% within 7 point Party ID	39.0%	35.6%	43.3%	40.0%	28.3%	34.2%	22.2%	33.3%	32.8%
	No	Count	100	58	34	48	76	48	154	10	528
		% within 7 point Party ID	61.0%	64.4%	56.7%	60.0%	71.7%	65.8%	77.8%	66.7%	67.2%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	73	198	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * age Crosstabulation

301

			age					Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over		Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	44	71	108	42		265
		% within age	36.4%	29.5%	33.4%	36.5%		33.1%
	No	Count	77	170	215	73		535
		% within age	63.6%	70.5%	66.6%	63.5%		66.9%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115		800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	8	84	101	19	33	20	265
		% within Education	27.6%	27.5%	37.8%	38.8%	30.8%	46.5%	33.1%
	No	Count	21	222	166	30	74	23	536
		% within Education	72.4%	72.5%	62.2%	61.2%	69.2%	53.5%	66.9%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	37	45	33	67	83	265
		% within Church attendance	28.2%	30.8%	30.3%	35.1%	37.4%	33.2%
	No	Count	94	101	76	124	139	534
		% within Church attendance	71.8%	69.2%	69.7%	64.9%	62.6%	66.8%
Total		Count	131	146	109	191	222	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	163	29	47	9	1	6	9	0	264
		% within Race	31.4%	28.7%	37.9%	64.3%	33.3%	54.5%	36.0%	.0%	33.0%
	No	Count	356	72	77	5	2	5	16	2	535
		% within Race	68.6%	71.3%	62.1%	35.7%	66.7%	45.5%	64.0%	100.0%	67.0%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

303

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	159	5	31	8	51	11	265
		% within Marital Status	32.7%	45.5%	32.6%	26.7%	35.7%	35.5%	33.3%
	No	Count	327	6	64	22	92	20	531
		% within Marital Status	67.3%	54.5%	67.4%	73.3%	64.3%	64.5%	66.7%
Total		Count	486	11	95	30	143	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	153	112	265
		% within Gender	40.8%	26.3%	33.1%
	No	Count	222	314	536
		% within Gender	59.2%	73.7%	66.9%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

304

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	85	134	45	264
		% within Urban/Rural	35.1%	35.4%	25.4%	33.1%
	No	Count	157	245	132	534
		% within Urban/Rural	64.9%	64.6%	74.6%	66.9%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	54	83	21	35	72	265
		% within Metropolitan areas	31.8%	37.6%	29.2%	40.2%	28.8%	33.1%
	No	Count	116	138	51	52	178	535
		% within Metropolitan areas	68.2%	62.4%	70.8%	59.8%	71.2%	66.9%
Total		Count	170	221	72	87	250	800
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - close prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	52	44	36	60	28	44	264
		% within AP Region	32.3%	33.1%	29.8%	38.0%	27.2%	35.8%	33.0%
	No	Count	109	89	85	98	75	79	535
		% within AP Region	67.7%	66.9%	70.2%	62.0%	72.8%	64.2%	67.0%
Total		Count	161	133	121	158	103	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	13	19	33	68	46	65	52	296
		% within Libcon scale	39.4%	38.0%	42.3%	31.3%	40.0%	38.7%	40.3%	37.5%
	No	Count	20	31	45	149	69	103	77	494
		% within Libcon scale	60.6%	62.0%	57.7%	68.7%	60.0%	61.3%	59.7%	62.5%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	56	26	27	31	47	28	68	4	287
		% within 7 point Party ID	34.1%	28.9%	45.0%	38.8%	44.3%	38.4%	34.3%	28.6%	36.6%
	No	Count	108	64	33	49	59	45	130	10	498
		% within 7 point Party ID	65.9%	71.1%	55.0%	61.3%	55.7%	61.6%	65.7%	71.4%	63.4%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	73	198	14	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	47	83	125	40	295
		% within age	38.8%	34.4%	38.8%	34.8%	36.9%
	No	Count	74	158	197	75	504
		% within age	61.2%	65.6%	61.2%	65.2%	63.1%
Total		Count	121	241	322	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Education Crosstabulation

307

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	13	96	103	26	38	20	296
		% within Education	46.4%	31.4%	38.6%	53.1%	35.8%	46.5%	37.0%
	No	Count	15	210	164	23	68	23	503
		% within Education	53.6%	68.6%	61.4%	46.9%	64.2%	53.5%	63.0%
Total		Count	28	306	267	49	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	54	61	43	70	67	295
		% within Church attendance	41.2%	42.1%	39.8%	36.6%	30.2%	37.0%
	No	Count	77	84	65	121	155	502
		% within Church attendance	58.8%	57.9%	60.2%	63.4%	69.8%	63.0%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	196	35	41	6	1	7	9	0	295
		% within Race	37.8%	34.7%	33.1%	42.9%	33.3%	63.6%	36.0%	.0%	36.9%
	No	Count	323	66	83	8	2	4	16	2	504
		% within Race	62.2%	65.3%	66.9%	57.1%	66.7%	36.4%	64.0%	100.0%	63.1%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	193	2	35	11	44	11	296
		% within Marital Status	39.7%	18.2%	36.5%	37.9%	30.8%	35.5%	37.2%
	No	Count	293	9	61	18	99	20	500
		% within Marital Status	60.3%	81.8%	63.5%	62.1%	69.2%	64.5%	62.8%
Total		Count	486	11	96	29	143	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	149	147	296
		% within Gender	39.7%	34.6%	37.0%
	No	Count	226	278	504
		% within Gender	60.3%	65.4%	63.0%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	89	146	60	295
		% within Urban/Rural	36.6%	38.5%	33.7%	36.9%
	No	Count	154	233	118	505
		% within Urban/Rural	63.4%	61.5%	66.3%	63.1%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	73	92	21	36	73	295
		% within Metropolitan areas	42.9%	41.6%	29.6%	41.4%	29.2%	36.9%
	No	Count	97	129	50	51	177	504
		% within Metropolitan areas	57.1%	58.4%	70.4%	58.6%	70.8%	63.1%
Total		Count	170	221	71	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for highway construction	Yes	Count	59	55	56	52	35	38	295
		% within AP Region	36.6%	41.7%	46.3%	32.9%	33.7%	31.1%	37.0%
	No	Count	102	77	65	106	69	84	503
		% within AP Region	63.4%	58.3%	53.7%	67.1%	66.3%	68.9%	63.0%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	104	122	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

311

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	21	17	20	34	14	5	9	120
		% within Libcon scale	65.6%	34.0%	25.3%	15.7%	12.2%	3.0%	7.0%	15.2%
	No	Count	11	33	59	183	101	163	120	670
		% within Libcon scale	34.4%	66.0%	74.7%	84.3%	87.8%	97.0%	93.0%	84.8%
Total		Count	32	50	79	217	115	168	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	48	21	21	15	4	4	5	3	121
		% within 7 point Party ID	29.1%	23.1%	35.0%	19.0%	3.8%	5.5%	2.5%	20.0%	15.4%
	No	Count	117	70	39	64	102	69	193	12	666
		% within 7 point Party ID	70.9%	76.9%	65.0%	81.0%	96.2%	94.5%	97.5%	80.0%	84.6%
Total		Count	165	91	60	79	106	73	198	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * age Crosstabulation

312

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	27	39	44	11	121
		% within age	22.3%	16.2%	13.6%	9.6%	15.1%
	No	Count	94	202	279	104	679
		% within age	77.7%	83.8%	86.4%	90.4%	84.9%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	8	34	39	7	23	10	121
		% within Education	27.6%	11.1%	14.6%	14.3%	21.7%	23.3%	15.1%
	No	Count	21	272	228	42	83	33	679
		% within Education	72.4%	88.9%	85.4%	85.7%	78.3%	76.7%	84.9%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

313

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	13	8	16	33	51	121
		% within Church attendance	9.8%	5.5%	14.8%	17.3%	23.0%	15.2%
	No	Count	119	137	92	158	171	677
		% within Church attendance	90.2%	94.5%	85.2%	82.7%	77.0%	84.8%
Total		Count	132	145	108	191	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	57	18	31	8	2	3	2	0	121
		% within Race	11.0%	17.8%	25.0%	57.1%	50.0%	27.3%	8.0%	.0%	15.1%
	No	Count	462	83	93	6	2	8	23	2	679
		% within Race	89.0%	82.2%	75.0%	42.9%	50.0%	72.7%	92.0%	100.0%	84.9%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	4	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

314

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	63	2	14	4	32	6	121
		% within Marital Status	13.0%	16.7%	14.7%	13.3%	22.5%	19.4%	15.2%
	No	Count	423	10	81	26	110	25	675
		% within Marital Status	87.0%	83.3%	85.3%	86.7%	77.5%	80.6%	84.8%
Total		Count	486	12	95	30	142	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	57	64	121
		% within Gender	15.2%	15.1%	15.1%
	No	Count	318	361	679
		% within Gender	84.8%	84.9%	84.9%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	46	61	13	120
		% within Urban/Rural	18.9%	16.1%	7.3%	15.0%
	No	Count	197	318	165	680
		% within Urban/Rural	81.1%	83.9%	92.7%	85.0%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	26	40	12	24	18	120
		% within Metropolitan areas	15.3%	18.2%	16.7%	27.6%	7.2%	15.0%
	No	Count	144	180	60	63	232	679
		% within Metropolitan areas	84.7%	81.8%	83.3%	72.4%	92.8%	85.0%
Total		Count	170	220	72	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Reduce budget - reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	18	28	19	30	9	17	121
		% within AP Region	11.1%	21.2%	15.7%	19.0%	8.7%	13.9%	15.2%
	No	Count	144	104	102	128	94	105	677
		% within AP Region	88.9%	78.8%	84.3%	81.0%	91.3%	86.1%	84.8%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	103	122	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	4	3	7	40	37	44	52	187
		% within Libcon scale	12.5%	6.0%	9.0%	18.9%	32.2%	26.3%	40.3%	23.9%
	No	Count	28	47	71	172	78	123	77	596
		% within Libcon scale	87.5%	94.0%	91.0%	81.1%	67.8%	73.7%	59.7%	76.1%
Total		Count	32	50	78	212	115	167	129	783
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

317

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	19	20	8	19	41	10	61	6	184
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.7%	22.0%	13.6%	24.1%	39.0%	13.7%	31.0%	40.0%	23.6%
	No	Count	143	71	51	60	64	63	136	9	597
		% within 7 point Party ID	88.3%	78.0%	86.4%	75.9%	61.0%	86.3%	69.0%	60.0%	76.4%
Total		Count	162	91	59	79	105	73	197	15	781
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	24	44	85	33	186
		% within age	20.2%	18.3%	26.7%	28.9%	23.5%
	No	Count	95	196	233	81	605
		% within age	79.8%	81.7%	73.3%	71.1%	76.5%
Total		Count	119	240	318	114	791
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Education Crosstabulation

318

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	4	60	71	7	32	12	186
		% within Education	13.8%	19.8%	26.6%	14.9%	30.5%	28.6%	23.5%
	No	Count	25	243	196	40	73	30	607
		% within Education	86.2%	80.2%	73.4%	85.1%	69.5%	71.4%	76.5%
Total		Count	29	303	267	47	105	42	793
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	39	41	15	52	40	187
		% within Church attendance	30.0%	28.3%	14.3%	27.5%	18.0%	23.6%
	No	Count	91	104	90	137	182	604
		% within Church attendance	70.0%	71.7%	85.7%	72.5%	82.0%	76.4%
Total		Count	130	145	105	189	222	791
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	144	13	14	5	0	1	9	0	186
		% within Race	27.7%	12.9%	12.0%	35.7%	.0%	9.1%	34.6%	.0%	23.5%
	No	Count	375	88	103	9	3	10	17	2	607
		% within Race	72.3%	87.1%	88.0%	64.3%	100.0%	90.9%	65.4%	100.0%	76.5%
Total		Count	519	101	117	14	3	11	26	2	793
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	122	2	17	6	33	6	186
		% within Marital Status	25.3%	18.2%	17.9%	20.7%	23.6%	19.4%	23.6%
	No	Count	360	9	78	23	107	25	602
		% within Marital Status	74.7%	81.8%	82.1%	79.3%	76.4%	80.6%	76.4%
Total		Count	482	11	95	29	140	31	788
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	107	80	187
		% within Gender	28.6%	19.0%	23.6%
	No	Count	267	340	607
		% within Gender	71.4%	81.0%	76.4%
Total		Count	374	420	794
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	51	88	48	187
		% within Urban/Rural	21.3%	23.5%	27.0%	23.6%
	No	Count	189	287	130	606
		% within Urban/Rural	78.8%	76.5%	73.0%	76.4%
Total		Count	240	375	178	793
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	38	58	13	14	63	186
		% within Metropolitan areas	22.8%	26.4%	18.3%	16.3%	25.5%	23.5%
	No	Count	129	162	58	72	184	605
		% within Metropolitan areas	77.2%	73.6%	81.7%	83.7%	74.5%	76.5%
Total		Count	167	220	71	86	247	791
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce budget - close four community colleges * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Reduce budget - close four community colleges	Yes	Count	44	34	29	37	20	23	187
		% within AP Region	27.2%	26.0%	24.4%	23.7%	19.4%	19.0%	23.6%
	No	Count	118	97	90	119	83	98	605
		% within AP Region	72.8%	74.0%	75.6%	76.3%	80.6%	81.0%	76.4%
Total		Count	162	131	119	156	103	121	792
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	22	34	57	137	86	91	57	484
		% within Libcon scale	66.7%	68.0%	73.1%	63.1%	74.8%	53.8%	44.2%	61.2%
	No	Count	11	16	21	80	29	78	72	307
		% within Libcon scale	33.3%	32.0%	26.9%	36.9%	25.2%	46.2%	55.8%	38.8%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	169	129	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	112	65	43	50	67	47	94	5	483
		% within 7 point Party ID	68.3%	72.2%	71.7%	62.5%	63.2%	64.4%	47.7%	33.3%	61.5%
	No	Count	52	25	17	30	39	26	103	10	302
		% within 7 point Party ID	31.7%	27.8%	28.3%	37.5%	36.8%	35.6%	52.3%	66.7%	38.5%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	73	197	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * age Crosstabulation

323

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	72	140	208	69	489
		% within age	59.0%	58.1%	64.4%	60.5%	61.1%
	No	Count	50	101	115	45	311
		% within age	41.0%	41.9%	35.6%	39.5%	38.9%
Total		Count	122	241	323	114	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	14	187	174	27	64	24	490
		% within Education	48.3%	61.1%	65.2%	55.1%	59.8%	55.8%	61.2%
	No	Count	15	119	93	22	43	19	311
		% within Education	51.7%	38.9%	34.8%	44.9%	40.2%	44.2%	38.8%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

324

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	55	79	65	129	159	487
		% within Church attendance	42.0%	54.1%	60.2%	67.9%	71.9%	61.2%
	No	Count	76	67	43	61	62	309
		% within Church attendance	58.0%	45.9%	39.8%	32.1%	28.1%	38.8%
Total		Count	131	146	108	190	221	796
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	313	65	75	9	3	9	16	0	490
		% within Race	60.3%	64.4%	60.5%	60.0%	100.0%	81.8%	61.5%	.0%	61.2%
	No	Count	206	36	49	6	0	2	10	2	311
		% within Race	39.7%	35.6%	39.5%	40.0%	.0%	18.2%	38.5%	100.0%	38.8%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	3	11	26	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	293	9	58	14	93	23	490
		% within Marital Status	60.3%	75.0%	60.4%	46.7%	65.5%	76.7%	61.6%
	No	Count	193	3	38	16	49	7	306
		% within Marital Status	39.7%	25.0%	39.6%	53.3%	34.5%	23.3%	38.4%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	142	30	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	246	243	489
		% within Gender	65.8%	57.2%	61.2%
	No	Count	128	182	310
		% within Gender	34.2%	42.8%	38.8%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	160	222	107	489
		% within Urban/Rural	65.8%	58.6%	60.1%	61.1%
	No	Count	83	157	71	311
		% within Urban/Rural	34.2%	41.4%	39.9%	38.9%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	107	128	48	46	160	489
		% within Metropolitan areas	62.9%	58.2%	66.7%	52.9%	64.0%	61.2%
	No	Count	63	92	24	41	90	310
		% within Metropolitan areas	37.1%	41.8%	33.3%	47.1%	36.0%	38.8%
Total		Count	170	220	72	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax gambling	Yes	Count	96	82	73	94	60	82	487
		% within AP Region	59.6%	62.1%	60.8%	59.9%	57.7%	67.2%	61.2%
	No	Count	65	50	47	63	44	40	309
		% within AP Region	40.4%	37.9%	39.2%	40.1%	42.3%	32.8%	38.8%
Total		Count	161	132	120	157	104	122	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	19	29	46	120	65	66	61	406
		% within Libcon scale	59.4%	58.0%	59.0%	55.0%	56.5%	39.3%	47.7%	51.5%
	No	Count	13	21	32	98	50	102	67	383
		% within Libcon scale	40.6%	42.0%	41.0%	45.0%	43.5%	60.7%	52.3%	48.5%
Total		Count	32	50	78	218	115	168	128	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

328

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	101	49	39	32	53	42	87	6	409
		% within 7 point Party ID	61.6%	53.8%	63.9%	40.0%	50.0%	57.5%	44.2%	40.0%	52.0%
	No	Count	63	42	22	48	53	31	110	9	378
		% within 7 point Party ID	38.4%	46.2%	36.1%	60.0%	50.0%	42.5%	55.8%	60.0%	48.0%
Total		Count	164	91	61	80	106	73	197	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	69	117	165	62	413
		% within age	56.6%	48.5%	51.1%	53.9%	51.6%
	No	Count	53	124	158	53	388
		% within age	43.4%	51.5%	48.9%	46.1%	48.4%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Education Crosstabulation

329

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	19	165	128	21	57	23	413
		% within Education	65.5%	53.9%	47.9%	42.9%	53.3%	53.5%	51.6%
	No	Count	10	141	139	28	50	20	388
		% within Education	34.5%	46.1%	52.1%	57.1%	46.7%	46.5%	48.4%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	75	81	60	83	111	410
		% within Church attendance	56.8%	55.5%	55.6%	43.7%	50.0%	51.4%
	No	Count	57	65	48	107	111	388
		% within Church attendance	43.2%	44.5%	44.4%	56.3%	50.0%	48.6%
Total		Count	132	146	108	190	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	255	62	69	10	1	6	9	0	412
		% within Race	49.1%	61.4%	55.6%	66.7%	33.3%	54.5%	34.6%	.0%	51.4%
	No	Count	264	39	55	5	2	5	17	2	389
		% within Race	50.9%	38.6%	44.4%	33.3%	66.7%	45.5%	65.4%	100.0%	48.6%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	3	11	26	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	235	8	52	19	78	16	408
		% within Marital Status	48.4%	66.7%	54.2%	65.5%	54.5%	51.6%	51.2%
	No	Count	251	4	44	10	65	15	389
		% within Marital Status	51.6%	33.3%	45.8%	34.5%	45.5%	48.4%	48.8%
Total		Count	486	12	96	29	143	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	189	224	413
		% within Gender	50.4%	52.6%	51.6%
	No	Count	186	202	388
		% within Gender	49.6%	47.4%	48.4%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	122	206	84	412
		% within Urban/Rural	50.2%	54.4%	47.2%	51.5%
	No	Count	121	173	94	388
		% within Urban/Rural	49.8%	45.6%	52.8%	48.5%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	85	127	31	43	125	411
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.0%	57.5%	43.7%	49.4%	50.0%	51.4%
	No	Count	85	94	40	44	125	388
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.0%	42.5%	56.3%	50.6%	50.0%	48.6%
Total		Count	170	221	71	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Raise revenue - increase taxes on alcoholic beverages	Yes	Count	81	80	59	82	49	60	411
		% within AP Region	50.3%	60.6%	48.8%	51.9%	47.1%	49.2%	51.5%
	No	Count	80	52	62	76	55	62	387
		% within AP Region	49.7%	39.4%	51.2%	48.1%	52.9%	50.8%	48.5%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	104	122	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	23	35	41	88	55	42	22	306
		% within Libcon scale	71.9%	70.0%	52.6%	40.6%	48.2%	25.0%	17.1%	38.8%
	No	Count	9	15	37	129	59	126	107	482
		% within Libcon scale	28.1%	30.0%	47.4%	59.4%	51.8%	75.0%	82.9%	61.2%
Total		Count	32	50	78	217	114	168	129	788
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	82	39	39	41	37	27	40	3	308
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.0%	43.3%	63.9%	51.2%	34.6%	36.5%	20.3%	21.4%	39.1%
	No	Count	82	51	22	39	70	47	157	11	479
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.0%	56.7%	36.1%	48.8%	65.4%	63.5%	79.7%	78.6%	60.9%
Total		Count	164	90	61	80	107	74	197	14	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * age Crosstabulation

334

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	61	106	114	29	310
		% within age	50.0%	44.0%	35.4%	25.4%	38.8%
	No	Count	61	135	208	85	489
		% within age	50.0%	56.0%	64.6%	74.6%	61.2%
Total		Count	122	241	322	114	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	10	99	118	25	41	17	310
		% within Education	35.7%	32.4%	44.2%	51.0%	38.7%	39.5%	38.8%
	No	Count	18	207	149	24	65	26	489
		% within Education	64.3%	67.6%	55.8%	49.0%	61.3%	60.5%	61.2%
Total		Count	28	306	267	49	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	23	33	48	85	121	310
		% within Church attendance	17.4%	22.6%	44.4%	44.5%	54.5%	38.8%
	No	Count	109	113	60	106	101	489
		% within Church attendance	82.6%	77.4%	55.6%	55.5%	45.5%	61.2%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	222	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	201	37	40	10	3	9	11	0	311
		% within Race	38.7%	36.6%	32.3%	66.7%	75.0%	81.8%	42.3%	.0%	38.8%
	No	Count	318	64	84	5	1	2	15	2	491
		% within Race	61.3%	63.4%	67.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.2%	57.7%	100.0%	61.2%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	4	11	26	2	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	160	5	47	5	71	17	305
		% within Marital Status	33.0%	41.7%	49.0%	17.2%	50.0%	54.8%	38.4%
	No	Count	325	7	49	24	71	14	490
		% within Marital Status	67.0%	58.3%	51.0%	82.8%	50.0%	45.2%	61.6%
Total		Count	485	12	96	29	142	31	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	165	146	311
		% within Gender	44.0%	34.3%	38.8%
	No	Count	210	280	490
		% within Gender	56.0%	65.7%	61.2%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

337

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	90	166	54	310
		% within Urban/Rural	37.0%	43.8%	30.3%	38.8%
	No	Count	153	213	124	490
		% within Urban/Rural	63.0%	56.2%	69.7%	61.3%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	59	99	23	47	82	310
		% within Metropolitan areas	34.7%	44.8%	31.9%	54.7%	32.8%	38.8%
	No	Count	111	122	49	39	168	489
		% within Metropolitan areas	65.3%	55.2%	68.1%	45.3%	67.2%	61.2%
Total		Count	170	221	72	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Raise revenue - legalize and tax marijuana	Yes	Count	52	68	43	72	28	48	311
		% within AP Region	32.1%	51.5%	35.5%	45.6%	27.2%	39.0%	38.9%
	No	Count	110	64	78	86	75	75	488
		% within AP Region	67.9%	48.5%	64.5%	54.4%	72.8%	61.0%	61.1%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	103	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	21	23	32	49	25	9	5	164
		% within Libcon scale	63.6%	46.0%	40.5%	22.5%	21.7%	5.4%	3.9%	20.7%
	No	Count	12	27	47	169	90	159	124	628
		% within Libcon scale	36.4%	54.0%	59.5%	77.5%	78.3%	94.6%	96.1%	79.3%
Total		Count	33	50	79	218	115	168	129	792
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	49	26	32	21	13	14	7	1	163
		% within 7 point Party ID	29.9%	28.9%	52.5%	26.6%	12.1%	18.9%	3.6%	7.1%	20.7%
	No	Count	115	64	29	58	94	60	190	13	623
		% within 7 point Party ID	70.1%	71.1%	47.5%	73.4%	87.9%	81.1%	96.4%	92.9%	79.3%
Total		Count	164	90	61	79	107	74	197	14	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	30	51	66	17	164
		% within age	24.8%	21.2%	20.4%	14.8%	20.5%
	No	Count	91	190	257	98	636
		% within age	75.2%	78.8%	79.6%	85.2%	79.5%
Total		Count	121	241	323	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Education Crosstabulation

340

				Education					
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	4	46	54	11	34	14	163
		% within Education	13.8%	15.0%	20.2%	22.4%	32.1%	33.3%	20.4%
	No	Count	25	260	213	38	72	28	636
		% within Education	86.2%	85.0%	79.8%	77.6%	67.9%	66.7%	79.6%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	42	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Church attendance Crosstabulation

				Church attendance				
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	14	22	20	47	60	163
		% within Church attendance	10.7%	15.2%	18.5%	24.6%	27.0%	20.5%
	No	Count	117	123	88	144	162	634
		% within Church attendance	89.3%	84.8%	81.5%	75.4%	73.0%	79.5%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	100	20	24	10	2	7	1	0	164
		% within Race	19.3%	19.8%	19.4%	71.4%	50.0%	63.6%	4.0%	.0%	20.5%
	No	Count	419	81	100	4	2	4	24	2	636
		% within Race	80.7%	80.2%	80.6%	28.6%	50.0%	36.4%	96.0%	100.0%	79.5%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	4	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	91	4	21	4	37	7	164
		% within Marital Status	18.7%	33.3%	22.1%	13.3%	25.9%	22.6%	20.6%
	No	Count	395	8	74	26	106	24	633
		% within Marital Status	81.3%	66.7%	77.9%	86.7%	74.1%	77.4%	79.4%
Total		Count	486	12	95	30	143	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	84	80	164
		% within Gender	22.4%	18.8%	20.5%
	No	Count	291	346	637
		% within Gender	77.6%	81.2%	79.5%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	52	93	19	164
		% within Urban/Rural	21.4%	24.5%	10.7%	20.5%
	No	Count	191	286	159	636
		% within Urban/Rural	78.6%	75.5%	89.3%	79.5%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	33	51	11	31	38	164
		% within Metropolitan areas	19.4%	23.1%	15.5%	35.6%	15.2%	20.5%
	No	Count	137	170	60	56	212	635
		% within Metropolitan areas	80.6%	76.9%	84.5%	64.4%	84.8%	79.5%
Total		Count	170	221	71	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Raise revenue - adopt fuel inefficiency surcharge	Yes	Count	26	34	25	45	12	23	165
		% within AP Region	16.0%	25.8%	20.7%	28.5%	11.7%	18.7%	20.7%
	No	Count	136	98	96	113	91	100	634
		% within AP Region	84.0%	74.2%	79.3%	71.5%	88.3%	81.3%	79.3%
Total		Count	162	132	121	158	103	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	21	35	48	116	48	57	43	368
		% within Libcon scale	63.6%	70.0%	61.5%	53.2%	41.7%	33.9%	33.6%	46.6%
	No	Count	12	15	30	102	67	111	85	422
		% within Libcon scale	36.4%	30.0%	38.5%	46.8%	58.3%	66.1%	66.4%	53.4%
Total		Count	33	50	78	218	115	168	128	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	96	55	36	37	37	29	70	7	367
		% within 7 point Party ID	58.5%	61.1%	60.0%	46.3%	34.9%	39.2%	35.4%	46.7%	46.6%
	No	Count	68	35	24	43	69	45	128	8	420
		% within 7 point Party ID	41.5%	38.9%	40.0%	53.8%	65.1%	60.8%	64.6%	53.3%	53.4%
Total		Count	164	90	60	80	106	74	198	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * age Crosstabulation

345

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	52	92	167	60	371
		% within age	42.6%	38.2%	51.9%	52.2%	46.4%
	No	Count	70	149	155	55	429
		% within age	57.4%	61.8%	48.1%	47.8%	53.6%
Total		Count	122	241	322	115	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	16	154	104	23	51	23	371
		% within Education	55.2%	50.3%	39.0%	46.9%	47.7%	53.5%	46.3%
	No	Count	13	152	163	26	56	20	430
		% within Education	44.8%	49.7%	61.0%	53.1%	52.3%	46.5%	53.7%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	54	66	49	89	111	369
		% within Church attendance	40.9%	45.2%	45.4%	46.6%	50.2%	46.2%
	No	Count	78	80	59	102	110	429
		% within Church attendance	59.1%	54.8%	54.6%	53.4%	49.8%	53.8%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	221	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	219	56	67	9	1	7	11	0	370
		% within Race	42.2%	55.4%	54.0%	64.3%	33.3%	63.6%	44.0%	.0%	46.3%
	No	Count	300	45	57	5	2	4	14	2	429
		% within Race	57.8%	44.6%	46.0%	35.7%	66.7%	36.4%	56.0%	100.0%	53.7%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	216	7	53	13	70	13	372
		% within Marital Status	44.4%	58.3%	55.2%	43.3%	49.0%	41.9%	46.6%
	No	Count	270	5	43	17	73	18	426
		% within Marital Status	55.6%	41.7%	44.8%	56.7%	51.0%	58.1%	53.4%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	143	31	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	167	204	371
		% within Gender	44.5%	48.0%	46.4%
	No	Count	208	221	429
		% within Gender	55.5%	52.0%	53.6%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	128	172	71	371
		% within Urban/Rural	52.7%	45.4%	39.9%	46.4%
	No	Count	115	207	107	429
		% within Urban/Rural	47.3%	54.6%	60.1%	53.6%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	85	91	39	36	120	371
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.0%	41.4%	54.2%	41.9%	48.0%	46.5%
	No	Count	85	129	33	50	130	427
		% within Metropolitan areas	50.0%	58.6%	45.8%	58.1%	52.0%	53.5%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Raise revenue - Ban and fine talking on cellphones while driving	Yes	Count	67	63	61	69	48	62	370
		% within AP Region	41.6%	47.7%	50.4%	43.7%	46.6%	50.4%	46.4%
	No	Count	94	69	60	89	55	61	428
		% within AP Region	58.4%	52.3%	49.6%	56.3%	53.4%	49.6%	53.6%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	13	21	24	85	48	67	53	311
		% within Libcon scale	40.6%	42.0%	30.8%	39.2%	41.7%	39.6%	41.4%	39.4%
	No	Count	19	29	54	132	67	102	75	478
		% within Libcon scale	59.4%	58.0%	69.2%	60.8%	58.3%	60.4%	58.6%	60.6%
Total		Count	32	50	78	217	115	169	128	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	56	37	24	33	46	31	83	1	311
		% within 7 point Party ID	33.9%	41.1%	40.0%	41.3%	43.4%	41.9%	42.1%	6.7%	39.5%
	No	Count	109	53	36	47	60	43	114	14	476
		% within 7 point Party ID	66.1%	58.9%	60.0%	58.8%	56.6%	58.1%	57.9%	93.3%	60.5%
Total		Count	165	90	60	80	106	74	197	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	30	97	135	51	313
		% within age	24.8%	40.2%	41.8%	44.7%	39.2%
	No	Count	91	144	188	63	486
		% within age	75.2%	59.8%	58.2%	55.3%	60.8%
Total		Count	121	241	323	114	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Education Crosstabulation

351

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	8	108	108	19	47	22	312
		% within Education	27.6%	35.3%	40.4%	38.8%	44.3%	51.2%	39.0%
	No	Count	21	198	159	30	59	21	488
		% within Education	72.4%	64.7%	59.6%	61.2%	55.7%	48.8%	61.0%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	53	59	33	71	96	312
		% within Church attendance	40.5%	40.7%	30.6%	37.2%	43.2%	39.1%
	No	Count	78	86	75	120	126	485
		% within Church attendance	59.5%	59.3%	69.4%	62.8%	56.8%	60.9%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

352

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	229	25	40	7	1	3	8	0	313
		% within Race	44.1%	24.8%	32.3%	50.0%	25.0%	27.3%	30.8%	.0%	39.1%
	No	Count	290	76	84	7	3	8	18	2	488
		% within Race	55.9%	75.2%	67.7%	50.0%	75.0%	72.7%	69.2%	100.0%	60.9%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	4	11	26	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	209	4	32	17	40	11	313
		% within Marital Status	43.0%	33.3%	33.7%	58.6%	28.2%	35.5%	39.4%
	No	Count	277	8	63	12	102	20	482
		% within Marital Status	57.0%	66.7%	66.3%	41.4%	71.8%	64.5%	60.6%
Total		Count	486	12	95	29	142	31	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

353

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Gender Crosstabulation

| | | | Gender | | Total |
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	156	157	313
		% within Gender	41.6%	36.9%	39.1%
	No	Count	219	269	488
		% within Gender	58.4%	63.1%	60.9%
Total		Count	375	426	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

| | | | Urban/Rural | | | Total |
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	89	150	74	313
		% within Urban/Rural	36.8%	39.6%	41.6%	39.2%
	No	Count	153	229	104	486
		% within Urban/Rural	63.2%	60.4%	58.4%	60.8%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

354

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	65	85	25	41	97	313
		% within Metropolitan areas	38.2%	38.5%	35.2%	47.1%	38.8%	39.2%
	No	Count	105	136	46	46	153	486
		% within Metropolitan areas	61.8%	61.5%	64.8%	52.9%	61.2%	60.8%
Total		Count	170	221	71	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Raise revenue - eliminate the sales tax holiday	Yes	Count	60	47	46	73	41	45	312
		% within AP Region	37.3%	35.6%	38.0%	46.2%	39.8%	36.9%	39.1%
	No	Count	101	85	75	85	62	77	485
		% within AP Region	62.7%	64.4%	62.0%	53.8%	60.2%	63.1%	60.9%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	122	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	9	15	11	26	19	20	13	113
		% within Libcon scale	27.3%	30.0%	14.1%	12.0%	16.5%	11.8%	10.1%	14.3%
	No	Count	24	35	67	191	96	149	116	678
		% within Libcon scale	72.7%	70.0%	85.9%	88.0%	83.5%	88.2%	89.9%	85.7%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	169	129	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	32	12	17	6	8	10	25	1	111
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.5%	13.2%	28.3%	7.6%	7.5%	13.5%	12.7%	6.7%	14.1%
	No	Count	132	79	43	73	98	64	172	14	675
		% within 7 point Party ID	80.5%	86.8%	71.7%	92.4%	92.5%	86.5%	87.3%	93.3%	85.9%
Total		Count	164	91	60	79	106	74	197	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * age Crosstabulation

356

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	21	34	42	16	113
		% within age	17.4%	14.1%	13.0%	14.0%	14.1%
	No	Count	100	207	281	98	686
		% within age	82.6%	85.9%	87.0%	86.0%	85.9%
Total		Count	121	241	323	114	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	4	35	40	5	18	12	114
		% within Education	13.8%	11.4%	15.0%	10.2%	16.8%	27.9%	14.2%
	No	Count	25	271	227	44	89	31	687
		% within Education	86.2%	88.6%	85.0%	89.8%	83.2%	72.1%	85.8%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

357

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	13	19	20	27	34	113
		% within Church attendance	9.9%	13.1%	18.5%	14.1%	15.3%	14.2%
	No	Count	118	126	88	164	188	684
		% within Church attendance	90.1%	86.9%	81.5%	85.9%	84.7%	85.8%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	67	19	17	3	0	6	1	0	113
		% within Race	12.9%	18.8%	13.7%	21.4%	.0%	54.5%	3.8%	.0%	14.1%
	No	Count	452	82	107	11	3	5	25	2	687
		% within Race	87.1%	81.2%	86.3%	78.6%	100.0%	45.5%	96.2%	100.0%	85.9%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	26	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	65	1	12	1	26	5	110
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	8.3%	12.5%	3.4%	18.2%	16.1%	13.8%
	No	Count	420	11	84	28	117	26	686
		% within Marital Status	86.6%	91.7%	87.5%	96.6%	81.8%	83.9%	86.2%
Total		Count	485	12	96	29	143	31	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	76	37	113
		% within Gender	20.3%	8.7%	14.1%
	No	Count	299	388	687
		% within Gender	79.7%	91.3%	85.9%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	42	52	19	113
		% within Urban/Rural	17.4%	13.8%	10.7%	14.2%
	No	Count	200	326	159	685
		% within Urban/Rural	82.6%	86.2%	89.3%	85.8%
Total		Count	242	378	178	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	33	33	10	10	27	113
		% within Metropolitan areas	19.4%	15.0%	13.9%	11.6%	10.8%	14.2%
	No	Count	137	187	62	76	223	685
		% within Metropolitan areas	80.6%	85.0%	86.1%	88.4%	89.2%	85.8%
Total		Count	170	220	72	86	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Raise revenue - increase state sales tax rate	Yes	Count	21	24	26	17	8	17	113
		% within AP Region	13.0%	18.2%	21.5%	10.8%	7.8%	13.8%	14.2%
	No	Count	140	108	95	141	95	106	685
		% within AP Region	87.0%	81.8%	78.5%	89.2%	92.2%	86.2%	85.8%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	103	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	10	8	10	11	5	5	2	51
		% within Libcon scale	31.3%	16.0%	12.8%	5.1%	4.3%	3.0%	1.6%	6.5%
	No	Count	22	42	68	206	110	164	127	739
		% within Libcon scale	68.8%	84.0%	87.2%	94.9%	95.7%	97.0%	98.4%	93.5%
Total		Count	32	50	78	217	115	169	129	790
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	25	7	7	3	0	0	5	1	48
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.2%	7.8%	11.7%	3.8%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	6.7%	6.1%
	No	Count	139	83	53	76	106	74	193	14	738
		% within 7 point Party ID	84.8%	92.2%	88.3%	96.2%	100.0%	100.0%	97.5%	93.3%	93.9%
Total		Count	164	90	60	79	106	74	198	15	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	8	14	23	6	51
		% within age	6.6%	5.8%	7.1%	5.2%	6.4%
	No	Count	114	227	300	109	750
		% within age	93.4%	94.2%	92.9%	94.8%	93.6%
Total		Count	122	241	323	115	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	4	13	13	4	9	7	50
		% within Education	13.8%	4.2%	4.9%	8.2%	8.5%	16.3%	6.3%
	No	Count	25	293	254	45	97	36	750
		% within Education	86.2%	95.8%	95.1%	91.8%	91.5%	83.7%	93.8%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	5	7	5	10	22	49
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	4.8%	4.6%	5.2%	9.9%	6.1%
	No	Count	126	138	103	181	200	748
		% within Church attendance	96.2%	95.2%	95.4%	94.8%	90.1%	93.9%
Total		Count	131	145	108	191	222	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	23	8	12	1	1	2	3	0	50
		% within Race	4.4%	7.9%	9.7%	7.1%	33.3%	18.2%	12.0%	.0%	6.3%
	No	Count	496	93	112	13	2	9	22	2	749
		% within Race	95.6%	92.1%	90.3%	92.9%	66.7%	81.8%	88.0%	100.0%	93.7%
Total		Count	519	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	26	1	5	1	14	3	50
		% within Marital Status	5.3%	9.1%	5.3%	3.3%	9.9%	9.7%	6.3%
	No	Count	460	10	90	29	128	28	745
		% within Marital Status	94.7%	90.9%	94.7%	96.7%	90.1%	90.3%	93.7%
Total		Count	486	11	95	30	142	31	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

364

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	26	24	50
		% within Gender	7.0%	5.6%	6.3%
	No	Count	348	402	750
		% within Gender	93.0%	94.4%	93.8%
Total		Count	374	426	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	14	28	7	49
		% within Urban/Rural	5.8%	7.4%	4.0%	6.1%
	No	Count	228	351	170	749
		% within Urban/Rural	94.2%	92.6%	96.0%	93.9%
Total		Count	242	379	177	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	12	18	2	7	11	50
		% within Metropolitan areas	7.1%	8.1%	2.8%	8.1%	4.4%	6.3%
	No	Count	158	203	69	79	239	748
		% within Metropolitan areas	92.9%	91.9%	97.2%	91.9%	95.6%	93.7%
Total		Count	170	221	71	86	250	798
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - implement state income tax * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Raise revenue - implement state income tax	Yes	Count	6	13	11	10	5	7	52
		% within AP Region	3.7%	9.8%	9.1%	6.3%	4.9%	5.7%	6.5%
	No	Count	156	120	110	148	98	116	748
		% within AP Region	96.3%	90.2%	90.9%	93.7%	95.1%	94.3%	93.5%
Total		Count	162	133	121	158	103	123	800
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	2	0	4	20	6	25	29	86
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	.0%	5.1%	9.2%	5.2%	14.8%	22.5%	10.9%
	No	Count	31	50	74	197	109	144	100	705
		% within Libcon scale	93.9%	100.0%	94.9%	90.8%	94.8%	85.2%	77.5%	89.1%
Total		Count	33	50	78	217	115	169	129	791
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	15	5	3	12	11	3	29	3	81
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.1%	5.6%	4.9%	15.0%	10.4%	4.1%	14.6%	21.4%	10.3%
	No	Count	149	85	58	68	95	70	169	11	705
		% within 7 point Party ID	90.9%	94.4%	95.1%	85.0%	89.6%	95.9%	85.4%	78.6%	89.7%
Total		Count	164	90	61	80	106	73	198	14	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	10	28	37	11	86
		% within age	8.3%	11.6%	11.5%	9.6%	10.8%
	No	Count	111	213	285	104	713
		% within age	91.7%	88.4%	88.5%	90.4%	89.2%
Total		Count	121	241	322	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	6	34	30	6	8	3	87
		% within Education	20.7%	11.1%	11.2%	12.2%	7.5%	7.0%	10.9%
	No	Count	23	272	237	43	99	40	714
		% within Education	79.3%	88.9%	88.8%	87.8%	92.5%	93.0%	89.1%
Total		Count	29	306	267	49	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	22	19	12	19	15	87
		% within Church attendance	16.8%	13.0%	11.1%	9.9%	6.8%	10.9%
	No	Count	109	127	96	172	207	711
		% within Church attendance	83.2%	87.0%	88.9%	90.1%	93.2%	89.1%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	54	12	14	0	0	0	5	2	87
		% within Race	10.4%	11.9%	11.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	100.0%	10.9%
	No	Count	466	89	110	14	3	11	20	0	713
		% within Race	89.6%	88.1%	88.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	.0%	89.1%
Total		Count	520	101	124	14	3	11	25	2	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	61	1	9	3	12	2	88
		% within Marital Status	12.6%	8.3%	9.4%	10.0%	8.4%	6.5%	11.0%
	No	Count	425	11	87	27	131	29	710
		% within Marital Status	87.4%	91.7%	90.6%	90.0%	91.6%	93.5%	89.0%
Total		Count	486	12	96	30	143	31	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	43	44	87
		% within Gender	11.5%	10.4%	10.9%
	No	Count	332	381	713
		% within Gender	88.5%	89.6%	89.1%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

370

Raise revenue - do not support any * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	25	42	20	87
		% within Urban/Rural	10.3%	11.1%	11.2%	10.9%
	No	Count	218	337	158	713
		% within Urban/Rural	89.7%	88.9%	88.8%	89.1%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	17	30	8	8	24	87
		% within Metropolitan areas	10.0%	13.6%	11.1%	9.3%	9.6%	10.9%
	No	Count	153	191	64	78	226	712
		% within Metropolitan areas	90.0%	86.4%	88.9%	90.7%	90.4%	89.1%
Total		Count	170	221	72	86	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Raise revenue - do not support any * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						Total
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Raise revenue - do not support any	Yes	Count	23	13	13	13	12	13	87
		% within AP Region	14.3%	9.8%	10.7%	8.2%	11.5%	10.6%	10.9%
	No	Count	138	119	108	145	92	110	712
		% within AP Region	85.7%	90.2%	89.3%	91.8%	88.5%	89.4%	89.1%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	104	123	799
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	11	6	12	20	9	9	6	73
		% within Libcon scale	34.4%	12.2%	15.4%	9.2%	7.8%	5.4%	4.7%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	5	5	10	38	24	56	48	186
		% within Libcon scale	15.6%	10.2%	12.8%	17.5%	20.9%	33.5%	37.2%	23.6%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	13	33	52	117	75	83	62	435
		% within Libcon scale	40.6%	67.3%	66.7%	53.9%	65.2%	49.7%	48.1%	55.3%
	Don't know	Count	3	5	4	42	7	19	13	93
		% within Libcon scale	9.4%	10.2%	5.1%	19.4%	6.1%	11.4%	10.1%	11.8%

Total		Count	32	49	78	217	115	167	129	787
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	30	7	5	9	8	3	13	0	75
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.2%	7.7%	8.3%	11.3%	7.5%	4.1%	6.6%	.0%	9.5%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	24	10	4	24	42	18	61	2	185
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.5%	11.0%	6.7%	30.0%	39.3%	24.7%	30.8%	13.3%	23.4%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	89	65	47	38	50	39	104	3	435
		% within 7 point Party ID	53.9%	71.4%	78.3%	47.5%	46.7%	53.4%	52.5%	20.0%	55.1%
	Don't know	Count	22	9	4	9	7	13	20	10	94
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.3%	9.9%	6.7%	11.3%	6.5%	17.8%	10.1%	66.7%	11.9%
Total		Count	165	91	60	80	107	73	198	15	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to	Count	14	20	33	7	74

	avoid budget cuts	% within age	11.5%	8.3%	10.2%	6.1%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to	Count	24	46	90	29	189
	avoid budget cuts	% within age	19.7%	19.2%	28.0%	25.4%	23.7%
	Spend some, but not all, of that	Count	60	142	172	65	439
	money to avoid budget cuts	% within age	49.2%	59.2%	53.4%	57.0%	55.0%
	Don't know	Count	24	32	27	13	96
		% within age	19.7%	13.3%	8.4%	11.4%	12.0%
Total		Count	122	240	322	114	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	3	38	17	4	8	4	74
		% within Education	10.3%	12.4%	6.4%	8.2%	7.6%	9.3%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	6	74	62	11	23	13	189
		% within Education	20.7%	24.2%	23.3%	22.4%	21.9%	30.2%	23.7%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	13	151	154	29	68	24	439
		% within Education	44.8%	49.3%	57.9%	59.2%	64.8%	55.8%	55.0%
	Don't know	Count	7	43	33	5	6	2	96
		% within Education	24.1%	14.1%	12.4%	10.2%	5.7%	4.7%	12.0%
Total		Count	29	306	266	49	105	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

374

Rainy day fund * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	10	15	11	17	21	74
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	10.3%	10.2%	8.9%	9.5%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	45	28	29	39	49	190
		% within Church attendance	34.4%	19.2%	26.9%	20.4%	22.2%	23.8%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	64	89	54	108	122	437
		% within Church attendance	48.9%	61.0%	50.0%	56.5%	55.2%	54.8%
	Don't know	Count	12	14	14	27	29	96
		% within Church attendance	9.2%	9.6%	13.0%	14.1%	13.1%	12.0%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	221	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

375

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	43	13	12	1	2	2	1	0	74
		% within Race	8.3%	13.0%	9.7%	7.1%	66.7%	16.7%	3.7%	.0%	9.2%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	137	11	23	3	0	6	10	0	190
		% within Race	26.4%	11.0%	18.5%	21.4%	.0%	50.0%	37.0%	.0%	23.7%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	274	65	73	10	1	2	15	0	440
		% within Race	52.8%	65.0%	58.9%	71.4%	33.3%	16.7%	55.6%	.0%	54.9%
	Don't know	Count	65	11	16	0	0	2	1	2	97
		% within Race	12.5%	11.0%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	3.7%	100.0%	12.1%
Total		Count	519	100	124	14	3	12	27	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	34	3	12	3	17	2	71
		% within Marital Status	7.0%	25.0%	12.5%	10.3%	12.0%	6.5%	8.9%
	Spend none of that money	Count	134	3	14	7	26	4	188

	to avoid budget cuts	% within Marital Status	27.7%	25.0%	14.6%	24.1%	18.3%	12.9%	23.7%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	264	5	58	15	74	23	439
		% within Marital Status	54.5%	41.7%	60.4%	51.7%	52.1%	74.2%	55.3%
	Don't know	Count	52	1	12	4	25	2	96
		% within Marital Status	10.7%	8.3%	12.5%	13.8%	17.6%	6.5%	12.1%
Total		Count	484	12	96	29	142	31	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	37	37	74
		% within Gender	9.9%	8.7%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	100	90	190
		% within Gender	26.7%	21.1%	23.8%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	207	233	440
		% within Gender	55.3%	54.7%	55.0%
	Don't know	Count	30	66	96
		% within Gender	8.0%	15.5%	12.0%
Total		Count	374	426	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

377

Rainy day fund * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	30	29	15	74
		% within Urban/Rural	12.3%	7.7%	8.4%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	43	101	46	190
		% within Urban/Rural	17.7%	26.6%	25.8%	23.8%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	141	208	91	440
		% within Urban/Rural	58.0%	54.9%	51.1%	55.0%
	Don't know	Count	29	41	26	96
		% within Urban/Rural	11.9%	10.8%	14.6%	12.0%
Total		Count	243	379	178	800
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	17	23	6	7	21	74
		% within Metropolitan areas	9.9%	10.5%	8.5%	8.1%	8.4%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	44	50	20	21	55	190
		% within Metropolitan areas	25.7%	22.7%	28.2%	24.4%	21.9%	23.8%
	Spend some, but not all, of	Count	89	126	33	48	144	440

	that money to avoid budget cuts	% within Metropolitan areas	52.0%	57.3%	46.5%	55.8%	57.4%	55.1%
	Don't know	Count	21	21	12	10	31	95
		% within Metropolitan areas	12.3%	9.5%	16.9%	11.6%	12.4%	11.9%
Total		Count	171	220	71	86	251	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend all of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	15	16	13	13	7	10	74
		% within AP Region	9.2%	12.1%	10.7%	8.3%	6.9%	8.1%	9.3%
	Spend none of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	31	32	29	44	25	29	190
		% within AP Region	19.0%	24.2%	24.0%	28.0%	24.5%	23.6%	23.8%
	Spend some, but not all, of that money to avoid budget cuts	Count	98	70	62	84	57	67	438
		% within AP Region	60.1%	53.0%	51.2%	53.5%	55.9%	54.5%	54.9%
	Don't know	Count	19	14	17	16	13	17	96
		% within AP Region	11.7%	10.6%	14.0%	10.2%	12.7%	13.8%	12.0%
Total		Count	163	132	121	157	102	123	798
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	4	1	2	11	4	12	28	62
		% within Libcon scale	12.5%	2.0%	2.5%	5.1%	3.5%	7.1%	21.7%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	2	5	6	16	10	29	17	85
		% within Libcon scale	6.3%	9.8%	7.6%	7.4%	8.8%	17.3%	13.2%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	1	8	14	26	12	17	12	90
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	15.7%	17.7%	12.0%	10.5%	10.1%	9.3%	11.4%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	7	7	2	7	7	10	4	44
		% within Libcon scale	21.9%	13.7%	2.5%	3.2%	6.1%	6.0%	3.1%	5.6%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	17	28	51	127	75	86	59	443
		% within Libcon scale	53.1%	54.9%	64.6%	58.8%	65.8%	51.2%	45.7%	56.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	2	4	29	6	14	9	65
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	3.9%	5.1%	13.4%	5.3%	8.3%	7.0%	8.2%
Total		Count	32	51	79	216	114	168	129	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	5	0	2	13	9	6	28	0	63
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.0%	.0%	3.3%	16.0%	8.6%	8.2%	14.2%	.0%	8.0%

380

Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	18	5	2	5	12	8	35	0	85
	% within 7 point Party ID	11.0%	5.6%	3.3%	6.2%	11.4%	11.0%	17.8%	.0%	10.9%
Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	18	15	12	7	13	5	19	1	90
	% within 7 point Party ID	11.0%	16.9%	20.0%	8.6%	12.4%	6.8%	9.6%	7.1%	11.5%
Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	16	2	7	1	2	4	12	0	44
	% within 7 point Party ID	9.8%	2.2%	11.7%	1.2%	1.9%	5.5%	6.1%	.0%	5.6%
Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	98	56	34	50	62	47	85	4	436
	% within 7 point Party ID	59.8%	62.9%	56.7%	61.7%	59.0%	64.4%	43.1%	28.6%	55.7%
Don't know	Count	9	11	3	5	7	3	18	9	65
	% within 7 point Party ID	5.5%	12.4%	5.0%	6.2%	6.7%	4.1%	9.1%	64.3%	8.3%
Total	Count	164	89	60	81	105	73	197	14	783
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	11	13	21	17	62
		% within age	9.0%	5.4%	6.5%	14.9%	7.8%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	15	28	34	9	86
		% within age	12.3%	11.7%	10.5%	7.9%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	17	29	37	9	92
		% within age	13.9%	12.1%	11.5%	7.9%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only	Count	12	17	10	5	44

381

	to Indian reservations	% within age	9.8%	7.1%	3.1%	4.4%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	55	127	197	68	447
		% within age	45.1%	52.9%	61.0%	59.6%	55.9%
	Don't know	Count	12	26	24	6	68
		% within age	9.8%	10.8%	7.4%	5.3%	8.5%
Total		Count	122	240	323	114	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	1	30	16	3	9	4	63
		% within Education	3.6%	9.8%	6.0%	6.1%	8.6%	9.3%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	1	24	32	5	15	9	86
		% within Education	3.6%	7.8%	11.9%	10.2%	14.3%	20.9%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	2	37	31	4	15	3	92
		% within Education	7.1%	12.1%	11.6%	8.2%	14.3%	7.0%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	2	19	13	2	6	2	44
		% within Education	7.1%	6.2%	4.9%	4.1%	5.7%	4.7%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	14	165	159	30	56	21	445
		% within Education	50.0%	53.9%	59.3%	61.2%	53.3%	48.8%	55.7%
	Don't know	Count	8	31	17	5	4	4	69

		More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
	% within Education	28.6%	10.1%	6.3%	10.2%	3.8%	9.3%	8.6%
Total	Count	28	306	268	49	105	43	799
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Church attendance Crosstabulation

| | | | Church attendance | | | | | |
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	30	14	6	8	5	63
		% within Church attendance	22.9%	9.6%	5.6%	4.2%	2.3%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	23	25	8	22	8	86
		% within Church attendance	17.6%	17.1%	7.4%	11.5%	3.6%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	16	21	12	15	26	90
		% within Church attendance	12.2%	14.4%	11.1%	7.9%	11.8%	11.3%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	8	7	10	10	9	44
		% within Church attendance	6.1%	4.8%	9.3%	5.2%	4.1%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	44	67	60	121	154	446
		% within Church attendance	33.6%	45.9%	55.6%	63.4%	69.7%	56.0%
	Don't know	Count	10	12	12	15	19	68
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	8.2%	11.1%	7.9%	8.6%	8.5%
Total		Count	131	146	108	191	221	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	46	3	9	1	0	1	3	0	63
		% within Race	8.9%	3.0%	7.3%	7.1%	.0%	9.1%	11.5%	.0%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	59	13	8	1	0	0	5	0	86
		% within Race	11.4%	13.0%	6.5%	7.1%	.0%	.0%	19.2%	.0%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	49	15	21	4	0	1	2	0	92
		% within Race	9.4%	15.0%	16.9%	28.6%	.0%	9.1%	7.7%	.0%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	28	5	6	3	0	2	0	0	44
		% within Race	5.4%	5.0%	4.8%	21.4%	.0%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	294	55	67	5	3	7	15	0	446
		% within Race	56.6%	55.0%	54.0%	35.7%	100.0%	63.6%	57.7%	.0%	55.8%
	Don't know	Count	43	9	13	0	0	0	1	2	68
		% within Race	8.3%	9.0%	10.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	100.0%	8.5%
Total		Count	519	100	124	14	3	11	26	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Marital Status	Total

384

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	47	1	4	4	6	1	63
		% within Marital Status	9.7%	7.7%	4.2%	13.3%	4.2%	3.2%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	62	0	8	3	9	0	82
		% within Marital Status	12.8%	.0%	8.4%	10.0%	6.3%	.0%	10.3%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	51	2	14	2	19	4	92
		% within Marital Status	10.5%	15.4%	14.7%	6.7%	13.4%	12.9%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	23	1	3	1	16	1	45
		% within Marital Status	4.7%	7.7%	3.2%	3.3%	11.3%	3.2%	5.6%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	267	8	59	17	74	21	446
		% within Marital Status	54.9%	61.5%	62.1%	56.7%	52.1%	67.7%	56.0%
	Don't know	Count	36	1	7	3	18	4	69
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	7.7%	7.4%	10.0%	12.7%	12.9%	8.7%
Total		Count	486	13	95	30	142	31	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	27	36	63
		% within Gender	7.2%	8.5%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws	Count	40	46	86

	unchanged	% within Gender	10.7%	10.8%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	38	54	92
		% within Gender	10.2%	12.7%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	21	23	44
		% within Gender	5.6%	5.4%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	230	216	446
		% within Gender	61.5%	50.8%	55.8%
	Don't know	Count	18	50	68
		% within Gender	4.8%	11.8%	8.5%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gambling policy * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	13	30	20	63
		% within Urban/Rural	5.3%	7.9%	11.4%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	26	48	12	86
		% within Urban/Rural	10.7%	12.7%	6.8%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	29	47	16	92
		% within Urban/Rural	11.9%	12.4%	9.1%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	14	16	14	44
		% within Urban/Rural	5.8%	4.2%	8.0%	5.5%

386

Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	136	209	100	445	
	% within Urban/Rural	56.0%	55.1%	56.8%	55.8%	
Don't know	Count	25	29	14	68	
	% within Urban/Rural	10.3%	7.7%	8.0%	8.5%	
Total	Count	243	379	176	798	
	% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Gambling policy * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	15	12	3	10	23	63
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.8%	5.5%	4.2%	11.6%	9.2%	7.9%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	20	24	4	9	29	86
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.8%	10.9%	5.6%	10.5%	11.6%	10.8%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	20	32	7	8	25	92
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.8%	14.5%	9.9%	9.3%	10.0%	11.6%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	9	13	3	7	11	43
		% within Metropolitan areas	5.3%	5.9%	4.2%	8.1%	4.4%	5.4%
	Allowing full casino	Count	98	120	46	44	137	445

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
	gambling in Texas	% within Metropolitan areas	57.6%	54.5%	64.8%	51.2%	55.0%		55.9%
	Don't know	Count	8	19	8	8	24		67
		% within Metropolitan areas	4.7%	8.6%	11.3%	9.3%	9.6%		8.4%
Total		Count	170	220	71	86	249		796
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Gambling policy * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Gambling policy	Banning all gambling and gaming in Texas	Count	8	8	14	13	16	5	64
		% within AP Region	5.0%	6.0%	11.6%	8.2%	15.4%	4.1%	8.0%
	Leaving current gambling laws unchanged	Count	20	14	14	18	13	7	86
		% within AP Region	12.4%	10.5%	11.6%	11.3%	12.5%	5.7%	10.7%
	Allowing limited expansion of gambling, but only in existing locations	Count	23	18	13	13	8	17	92
		% within AP Region	14.3%	13.5%	10.7%	8.2%	7.7%	13.8%	11.5%
	Expanding gambling but only to Indian reservations	Count	7	9	7	10	3	8	44
		% within AP Region	4.3%	6.8%	5.8%	6.3%	2.9%	6.5%	5.5%
	Allowing full casino gambling in Texas	Count	95	73	66	89	50	73	446
		% within AP Region	59.0%	54.9%	54.5%	56.0%	48.1%	59.3%	55.7%
	Don't know	Count	8	11	7	16	14	13	69

388

		% within AP Region	5.0%	8.3%	5.8%	10.1%	13.5%	10.6%	8.6%
Total		Count	161	133	121	159	104	123	801
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	12	14	25	51	20	24	15	161
		% within Libcon scale	37.5%	28.6%	31.6%	23.5%	17.5%	14.5%	12.6%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	9	19	32	92	58	93	59	362
		% within Libcon scale	28.1%	38.8%	40.5%	42.4%	50.9%	56.0%	49.6%	46.6%
	Don't know	Count	11	16	22	74	36	49	45	253
		% within Libcon scale	34.4%	32.7%	27.8%	34.1%	31.6%	29.5%	37.8%	32.6%
Total		Count	32	49	79	217	114	166	119	776
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	59	28	10	8	16	11	31	0	163
		% within 7 point Party ID	37.1%	31.1%	16.7%	10.0%	15.8%	14.9%	15.9%	.0%	21.1%

389

Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	42	37	35	45	58	37	102	3	359
	% within 7 point Party ID	26.4%	41.1%	58.3%	56.3%	57.4%	50.0%	52.3%	20.0%	46.4%
Don't know	Count	58	25	15	27	27	26	62	12	252
	% within 7 point Party ID	36.5%	27.8%	25.0%	33.8%	26.7%	35.1%	31.8%	80.0%	32.6%
Total	Count	159	90	60	80	101	74	195	15	774
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	34	43	65	21	163
		% within age	27.9%	17.8%	20.8%	18.8%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	59	115	134	55	363
		% within age	48.4%	47.7%	42.9%	49.1%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	29	83	113	36	261
		% within age	23.8%	34.4%	36.2%	32.1%	33.2%
Total		Count	122	241	312	112	787
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Education Crosstabulation

	Education						Total
	No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	

390

Immigration priority									
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	9	57	59	13	18	7	163
		% within Education	36.0%	18.9%	22.3%	26.5%	17.0%	16.3%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	7	120	120	23	65	28	363
		% within Education	28.0%	39.9%	45.5%	46.9%	61.3%	65.1%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	9	124	85	13	23	8	262
		% within Education	36.0%	41.2%	32.2%	26.5%	21.7%	18.6%	33.2%
Total		Count	25	301	264	49	106	43	788
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	23	36	24	47	33	163
		% within Church attendance	17.8%	25.0%	23.1%	24.9%	15.1%	20.8%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	60	60	50	79	114	363
		% within Church attendance	46.5%	41.7%	48.1%	41.8%	52.3%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	46	48	30	63	71	258
		% within Church attendance	35.7%	33.3%	28.8%	33.3%	32.6%	32.9%
Total		Count	129	144	104	189	218	784
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Race Crosstabulation

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
						Race					
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	90	25	44	2	1	0	1	0	163
		% within Race	17.6%	26.0%	35.5%	14.3%	25.0%	.0%	4.2%	.0%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	257	32	45	8	2	7	12	0	363
		% within Race	50.2%	33.3%	36.3%	57.1%	50.0%	63.6%	50.0%	.0%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	165	39	35	4	1	4	11	2	261
		% within Race	32.2%	40.6%	28.2%	28.6%	25.0%	36.4%	45.8%	100.0%	33.2%
Total		Count	512	96	124	14	4	11	24	2	787
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
					Marital Status				
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	92	4	20	7	31	4	158
		% within Marital Status	19.4%	33.3%	21.1%	25.0%	21.8%	12.9%	20.2%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	228	2	34	10	69	20	363
		% within Marital Status	48.1%	16.7%	35.8%	35.7%	48.6%	64.5%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	154	6	41	11	42	7	261

392

			32.5%	50.0%	43.2%	39.3%	29.6%	22.6%	33.4%
	% within Marital Status								
Total	Count		474	12	95	28	142	31	782
	% within Marital Status		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	68	95	163
		% within Gender	18.5%	22.6%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	195	168	363
		% within Gender	53.1%	40.0%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	104	157	261
		% within Gender	28.3%	37.4%	33.2%
Total		Count	367	420	787
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	61	70	32	163
		% within Urban/Rural	25.3%	18.9%	18.3%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	100	186	78	364
		% within Urban/Rural	41.5%	50.1%	44.6%	46.3%

393

Don't know	Count	80	115	65	260
	% within Urban/Rural	33.2%	31.0%	37.1%	33.0%
Total	Count	241	371	175	787
	% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	36	57	14	13	43	163
		% within Metropolitan areas	21.6%	26.8%	19.4%	15.1%	17.3%	20.7%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	79	88	32	42	121	362
		% within Metropolitan areas	47.3%	41.3%	44.4%	48.8%	48.8%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	52	68	26	31	84	261
		% within Metropolitan areas	31.1%	31.9%	36.1%	36.0%	33.9%	33.2%
Total		Count	167	213	72	86	248	786
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration priority * AP Region Crosstabulation

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
					AP Region				
Immigration priority	Immigrants with family members living in the U.S.	Count	35	34	26	26	18	25	164
		% within AP Region	22.0%	26.6%	22.0%	16.5%	17.8%	20.3%	20.8%
	Immigrants with useful job skills	Count	70	54	57	78	48	56	363
		% within AP Region	44.0%	42.2%	48.3%	49.4%	47.5%	45.5%	46.1%
	Don't know	Count	54	40	35	54	35	42	260
		% within AP Region	34.0%	31.3%	29.7%	34.2%	34.7%	34.1%	33.0%
Total		Count	159	128	118	158	101	123	787
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
						Libcon scale				
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	18	27	18	39	14	5	12	133
		% within Libcon scale	54.5%	54.0%	23.1%	18.0%	12.1%	3.0%	9.3%	16.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	9	14	31	61	27	27	11	180
		% within Libcon scale	27.3%	28.0%	39.7%	28.1%	23.3%	16.1%	8.5%	22.8%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	1	3	12	28	22	24	11	101
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	6.0%	15.4%	12.9%	19.0%	14.3%	8.5%	12.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	4	2	15	51	48	108	90	318
		% within Libcon scale	12.1%	4.0%	19.2%	23.5%	41.4%	64.3%	69.8%	40.2%
	Don't know	Count	1	4	2	38	5	4	5	59

		Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure
	% within Libcon scale	3.0%	8.0%	2.6%	17.5%	4.3%	2.4%	3.9%	7.5%
Total	Count	33	50	78	217	116	168	129	791
	% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	56	18	19	10	9	11	10	0	133
		% within 7 point Party ID	34.1%	20.0%	31.1%	12.7%	8.5%	14.9%	5.1%	.0%	16.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	46	31	23	24	13	13	30	1	181
		% within 7 point Party ID	28.0%	34.4%	37.7%	30.4%	12.3%	17.6%	15.2%	6.7%	23.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	21	13	6	6	16	10	24	2	98
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.8%	14.4%	9.8%	7.6%	15.1%	13.5%	12.1%	13.3%	12.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	24	23	10	28	67	36	127	2	317
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.6%	25.6%	16.4%	35.4%	63.2%	48.6%	64.1%	13.3%	40.3%
	Don't know	Count	17	5	3	11	1	4	7	10	58
		% within 7 point Party ID	10.4%	5.6%	4.9%	13.9%	.9%	5.4%	3.5%	66.7%	7.4%
Total		Count	164	90	61	79	106	74	198	15	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* age Crosstabulation

	age	Total

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	23	50	49	11	133
		% within age	18.9%	20.7%	15.2%	9.5%	16.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	39	56	65	22	182
		% within age	32.0%	23.2%	20.2%	19.0%	22.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	14	35	41	13	103
		% within age	11.5%	14.5%	12.7%	11.2%	12.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	30	75	152	67	324
		% within age	24.6%	31.1%	47.2%	57.8%	40.4%
	Don't know	Count	16	25	15	3	59
		% within age	13.1%	10.4%	4.7%	2.6%	7.4%
Total		Count	122	241	322	116	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	4	47	47	9	20	6	133
		% within Education	13.8%	15.3%	17.7%	18.0%	18.9%	14.0%	16.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	3	64	60	9	30	14	180
		% within Education	10.3%	20.8%	22.6%	18.0%	28.3%	32.6%	22.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	3	40	35	8	12	6	104
		% within Education	10.3%	13.0%	13.2%	16.0%	11.3%	14.0%	13.0%

									Total
	Strongly oppose	Count	17	121	108	22	41	16	325
		% within Education	58.6%	39.4%	40.6%	44.0%	38.7%	37.2%	40.6%
	Don't know	Count	2	35	16	2	3	1	59
		% within Education	6.9%	11.4%	6.0%	4.0%	2.8%	2.3%	7.4%
Total		Count	29	307	266	50	106	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	17	17	22	34	43	133
		% within Church attendance	13.0%	11.6%	20.2%	17.9%	19.4%	16.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	20	34	25	40	62	181
		% within Church attendance	15.3%	23.3%	22.9%	21.1%	27.9%	22.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	20	19	13	20	30	102
		% within Church attendance	15.3%	13.0%	11.9%	10.5%	13.5%	12.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	67	65	43	79	68	322
		% within Church attendance	51.1%	44.5%	39.4%	41.6%	30.6%	40.4%
	Don't know	Count	7	11	6	17	19	60
		% within Church attendance	5.3%	7.5%	5.5%	8.9%	8.6%	7.5%
Total		Count	131	146	109	190	222	798
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	66	23	34	5	1	4	1	0	134
		% within Race	12.7%	22.8%	27.4%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	3.8%	.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	97	26	42	6	0	2	6	0	179
		% within Race	18.7%	25.7%	33.9%	40.0%	.0%	18.2%	23.1%	.0%	22.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	64	17	19	1	0	1	2	0	104
		% within Race	12.3%	16.8%	15.3%	6.7%	.0%	9.1%	7.7%	.0%	13.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	258	22	21	1	2	3	17	0	324
		% within Race	49.7%	21.8%	16.9%	6.7%	66.7%	27.3%	65.4%	.0%	40.4%
	Don't know	Count	34	13	8	2	0	1	0	2	60
		% within Race	6.6%	12.9%	6.5%	13.3%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	100.0%	7.5%
Total		Count	519	101	124	15	3	11	26	2	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Marital Status Crosstabulation

		Marital Status						
		Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total

399

Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level									Total
Strongly support	Count	66	2	17	5	38	6		134
	% within Marital Status	13.6%	16.7%	17.7%	16.7%	27.0%	19.4%		16.8%
Somewhat support	Count	101	2	18	6	43	7		177
	% within Marital Status	20.8%	16.7%	18.8%	20.0%	30.5%	22.6%		22.2%
Somewhat oppose	Count	65	3	18	5	11	1		103
	% within Marital Status	13.4%	25.0%	18.8%	16.7%	7.8%	3.2%		12.9%
Strongly oppose	Count	228	3	38	14	26	14		323
	% within Marital Status	46.9%	25.0%	39.6%	46.7%	18.4%	45.2%		40.6%
Don't know	Count	26	2	5	0	23	3		59
	% within Marital Status	5.3%	16.7%	5.2%	.0%	16.3%	9.7%		7.4%
Total	Count	486	12	96	30	141	31		796
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	61	72	133
		% within Gender	16.3%	16.9%	16.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	88	93	181
		% within Gender	23.5%	21.9%	22.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	37	65	102
		% within Gender	9.9%	15.3%	12.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	175	149	324
		% within Gender	46.8%	35.1%	40.6%

	Don't know	Count	13	46	59
		% within Gender	3.5%	10.8%	7.4%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	58	57	18	133
		% within Urban/Rural	24.0%	15.0%	10.1%	16.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	65	83	32	180
		% within Urban/Rural	26.9%	21.9%	18.0%	22.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	25	56	22	103
		% within Urban/Rural	10.3%	14.8%	12.4%	12.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	71	159	94	324
		% within Urban/Rural	29.3%	42.0%	52.8%	40.6%
	Don't know	Count	23	24	12	59
		% within Urban/Rural	9.5%	6.3%	6.7%	7.4%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

	Metropolitan areas	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	35	37	15	21	25	133
		% within Metropolitan areas	20.5%	16.8%	21.1%	24.1%	10.0%	16.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	38	54	17	26	46	181
		% within Metropolitan areas	22.2%	24.5%	23.9%	29.9%	18.4%	22.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	34	10	7	30	103
		% within Metropolitan areas	12.9%	15.5%	14.1%	8.0%	12.0%	12.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	62	84	23	32	123	324
		% within Metropolitan areas	36.3%	38.2%	32.4%	36.8%	49.2%	40.6%
	Don't know	Count	14	11	6	1	26	58
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.2%	5.0%	8.5%	1.1%	10.4%	7.3%
Total		Count	171	220	71	87	250	799
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - comprehensive overhaul/pathway to citizenship* AP Region Crosstabulation

	AP Region	Total

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	
Immigration grid - pass comprehensive overhaul at federal level	Strongly support	Count	17	25	29	29	10	23	133
		% within AP Region	10.6%	19.2%	24.0%	18.4%	9.7%	18.9%	16.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	39	34	27	33	16	32	181
		% within AP Region	24.2%	26.2%	22.3%	20.9%	15.5%	26.2%	22.8%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	25	20	12	13	9	23	102
		% within AP Region	15.5%	15.4%	9.9%	8.2%	8.7%	18.9%	12.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	69	44	40	76	58	34	321
		% within AP Region	42.9%	33.8%	33.1%	48.1%	56.3%	27.9%	40.4%
	Don't know	Count	11	7	13	7	10	10	58
		% within AP Region	6.8%	5.4%	10.7%	4.4%	9.7%	8.2%	7.3%
Total		Count	161	130	121	158	103	122	795
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	18	26	49	126	81	137	110	547
		% within Libcon scale	54.5%	52.0%	62.8%	58.6%	71.1%	81.5%	85.9%	69.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	8	13	17	36	17	28	11	130
		% within Libcon scale	24.2%	26.0%	21.8%	16.7%	14.9%	16.7%	8.6%	16.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	4	4	6	22	9	2	5	52
		% within Libcon scale	12.1%	8.0%	7.7%	10.2%	7.9%	1.2%	3.9%	6.6%

403

	Strongly oppose	Count	1	6	2	13	5	1	2	30
		% within Libcon scale	3.0%	12.0%	2.6%	6.0%	4.4%	.6%	1.6%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	2	1	4	18	2	0	0	27
		% within Libcon scale	6.1%	2.0%	5.1%	8.4%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	33	50	78	215	114	168	128	786
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	94	54	32	56	91	57	159	2	545
		% within 7 point Party ID	57.7%	61.4%	53.3%	70.0%	85.0%	77.0%	81.1%	13.3%	69.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	37	18	13	8	8	12	31	2	129
		% within 7 point Party ID	22.7%	20.5%	21.7%	10.0%	7.5%	16.2%	15.8%	13.3%	16.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	14	11	7	7	3	5	2	2	51
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.6%	12.5%	11.7%	8.8%	2.8%	6.8%	1.0%	13.3%	6.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	10	3	6	4	4	0	3	1	31
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.1%	3.4%	10.0%	5.0%	3.7%	.0%	1.5%	6.7%	4.0%
	Don't know	Count	8	2	2	5	1	0	1	8	27
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.9%	2.3%	3.3%	6.3%	.9%	.0%	.5%	53.3%	3.4%
Total		Count	163	88	60	80	107	74	196	15	783
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	62	161	240	89	552
		% within age	51.2%	67.1%	74.5%	78.1%	69.3%
	Somewhat support	Count	25	40	47	20	132
		% within age	20.7%	16.7%	14.6%	17.5%	16.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	13	19	16	4	52
		% within age	10.7%	7.9%	5.0%	3.5%	6.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	10	7	13	1	31
		% within age	8.3%	2.9%	4.0%	.9%	3.9%
	Don't know	Count	11	13	6	0	30
		% within age	9.1%	5.4%	1.9%	.0%	3.8%
Total		Count	121	240	322	114	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	19	211	181	37	76	29	553
		% within Education	65.5%	69.0%	68.3%	77.1%	71.7%	67.4%	69.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	1	53	45	7	18	8	132

405

		% within Education	3.4%	17.3%	17.0%	14.6%	17.0%	18.6%	16.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	6	16	20	0	7	3	52
		% within Education	20.7%	5.2%	7.5%	.0%	6.6%	7.0%	6.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	1	11	15	2	1	1	31
		% within Education	3.4%	3.6%	5.7%	4.2%	.9%	2.3%	3.9%
	Don't know	Count	2	15	4	2	4	2	29
		% within Education	6.9%	4.9%	1.5%	4.2%	3.8%	4.7%	3.6%
Total		Count	29	306	265	48	106	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	103	98	75	133	142	551
		% within Church attendance	78.6%	68.1%	70.1%	70.0%	64.3%	69.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	10	31	13	31	45	130
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	21.5%	12.1%	16.3%	20.4%	16.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	7	7	13	13	13	53
		% within Church attendance	5.3%	4.9%	12.1%	6.8%	5.9%	6.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	6	5	3	8	8	30
		% within Church attendance	4.6%	3.5%	2.8%	4.2%	3.6%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	5	3	3	5	13	29
		% within Church attendance	3.8%	2.1%	2.8%	2.6%	5.9%	3.7%

Total		Count	131	144	107	190	221	793
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	400	62	56	6	3	8	19	0	554
		% within Race	77.1%	63.9%	44.8%	40.0%	75.0%	72.7%	76.0%	.0%	69.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	67	24	33	5	0	1	2	0	132
		% within Race	12.9%	24.7%	26.4%	33.3%	.0%	9.1%	8.0%	.0%	16.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	8	17	3	1	0	2	0	53
		% within Race	4.2%	8.2%	13.6%	20.0%	25.0%	.0%	8.0%	.0%	6.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	14	2	10	0	0	2	2	0	30
		% within Race	2.7%	2.1%	8.0%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	8.0%	.0%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	16	1	9	1	0	0	0	2	29
		% within Race	3.1%	1.0%	7.2%	6.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	3.6%
Total		Count	519	97	125	15	4	11	25	2	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Marital Status Crosstabulation

407

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
									Marital Status
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	358	8	72	22	69	23	552
		% within Marital Status	73.8%	66.7%	75.8%	73.3%	49.3%	74.2%	69.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	75	2	14	6	28	3	128
		% within Marital Status	15.5%	16.7%	14.7%	20.0%	20.0%	9.7%	16.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	28	0	6	1	15	2	52
		% within Marital Status	5.8%	.0%	6.3%	3.3%	10.7%	6.5%	6.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	15	2	1	1	11	1	31
		% within Marital Status	3.1%	16.7%	1.1%	3.3%	7.9%	3.2%	3.9%
	Don't know	Count	9	0	2	0	17	2	30
		% within Marital Status	1.9%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	12.1%	6.5%	3.8%
Total		Count	485	12	95	30	140	31	793
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Gender Crosstabulation

			Male	Female	Total
				Gender	
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	276	277	553
		% within Gender	74.0%	65.5%	69.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	52	80	132
		% within Gender	13.9%	18.9%	16.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	30	52

408

		% within Gender	5.9%	7.1%	6.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	16	14	30
		% within Gender	4.3%	3.3%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	7	22	29
		% within Gender	1.9%	5.2%	3.6%
Total		Count	373	423	796
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	151	270	131	552
		% within Urban/Rural	62.9%	71.2%	74.0%	69.3%
	Somewhat support	Count	52	54	26	132
		% within Urban/Rural	21.7%	14.2%	14.7%	16.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	24	7	53
		% within Urban/Rural	9.2%	6.3%	4.0%	6.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	3	20	7	30
		% within Urban/Rural	1.3%	5.3%	4.0%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	12	11	6	29
		% within Urban/Rural	5.0%	2.9%	3.4%	3.6%
Total		Count	240	379	177	796
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					Total
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	115	162	38	49	189	553
		% within Metropolitan areas	68.5%	73.6%	53.5%	56.3%	75.9%	69.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	28	32	16	17	39	132
		% within Metropolitan areas	16.7%	14.5%	22.5%	19.5%	15.7%	16.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	10	12	7	14	8	51
		% within Metropolitan areas	6.0%	5.5%	9.9%	16.1%	3.2%	6.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	11	9	3	3	5	31
		% within Metropolitan areas	6.5%	4.1%	4.2%	3.4%	2.0%	3.9%
	Don't know	Count	4	5	7	4	8	28
		% within Metropolitan areas	2.4%	2.3%	9.9%	4.6%	3.2%	3.5%
Total		Count	168	220	71	87	249	795
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Immigration grid - require businesses to verify immigration status	Strongly support	Count	122	93	77	104	82	74	552
		% within AP Region	75.8%	70.5%	65.3%	65.8%	79.6%	60.2%	69.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	24	23	21	26	15	24	133
		% within AP Region	14.9%	17.4%	17.8%	16.5%	14.6%	19.5%	16.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	4	8	9	16	2	12	51
		% within AP Region	2.5%	6.1%	7.6%	10.1%	1.9%	9.8%	6.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	7	5	7	6	1	4	30
		% within AP Region	4.3%	3.8%	5.9%	3.8%	1.0%	3.3%	3.8%
	Don't know	Count	4	3	4	6	3	9	29
		% within AP Region	2.5%	2.3%	3.4%	3.8%	2.9%	7.3%	3.6%
Total		Count	161	132	118	158	103	123	795
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	8	12	16	82	63	134	115	430
		% within Libcon scale	25.0%	24.0%	20.8%	38.0%	55.3%	79.3%	89.1%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	3	5	14	50	24	20	5	121
		% within Libcon scale	9.4%	10.0%	18.2%	23.1%	21.1%	11.8%	3.9%	15.4%

411

	Somewhat oppose	Count	1	3	15	24	10	10	2	65
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	6.0%	19.5%	11.1%	8.8%	5.9%	1.6%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	19	26	26	42	10	4	6	133
		% within Libcon scale	59.4%	52.0%	33.8%	19.4%	8.8%	2.4%	4.7%	16.9%
	Don't know	Count	1	4	6	18	7	1	1	38
		% within Libcon scale	3.1%	8.0%	7.8%	8.3%	6.1%	.6%	.8%	4.8%
Total		Count	32	50	77	216	114	169	129	787
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	40	33	13	42	86	52	160	3	429
		% within 7 point Party ID	24.2%	36.7%	22.0%	52.5%	81.1%	71.2%	81.2%	20.0%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	33	20	11	16	10	8	17	4	119
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.0%	22.2%	18.6%	20.0%	9.4%	11.0%	8.6%	26.7%	15.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	15	10	10	7	4	4	14	1	65
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.1%	11.1%	16.9%	8.8%	3.8%	5.5%	7.1%	6.7%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	65	23	22	10	3	7	4	1	135
		% within 7 point Party ID	39.4%	25.6%	37.3%	12.5%	2.8%	9.6%	2.0%	6.7%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	4	3	5	3	2	2	6	37
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.3%	4.4%	5.1%	6.3%	2.8%	2.7%	1.0%	40.0%	4.7%
Total		Count	165	90	59	80	106	73	197	15	785

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	40	33	13	42	86	52	160	3	429
		% within 7 point Party ID	24.2%	36.7%	22.0%	52.5%	81.1%	71.2%	81.2%	20.0%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	33	20	11	16	10	8	17	4	119
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.0%	22.2%	18.6%	20.0%	9.4%	11.0%	8.6%	26.7%	15.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	15	10	10	7	4	4	14	1	65
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.1%	11.1%	16.9%	8.8%	3.8%	5.5%	7.1%	6.7%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	65	23	22	10	3	7	4	1	135
		% within 7 point Party ID	39.4%	25.6%	37.3%	12.5%	2.8%	9.6%	2.0%	6.7%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	4	3	5	3	2	2	6	37
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.3%	4.4%	5.1%	6.3%	2.8%	2.7%	1.0%	40.0%	4.7%
Total		Count	165	90	59	80	106	73	197	15	785
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	39	124	194	79	436
		% within age	32.2%	51.5%	60.4%	69.3%	54.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	19	39	48	16	122
		% within age	15.7%	16.2%	15.0%	14.0%	15.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	24	14	25	3	66

413

		% within age	19.8%	5.8%	7.8%	2.6%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	32	45	44	14	135
		% within age	26.4%	18.7%	13.7%	12.3%	16.9%
	Don't know	Count	7	19	10	2	38
		% within age	5.8%	7.9%	3.1%	1.8%	4.8%
Total		Count	121	241	321	114	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	22	165	143	28	57	22	437
		% within Education	75.9%	53.9%	53.4%	57.1%	53.8%	52.4%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	3	49	46	4	14	5	121
		% within Education	10.3%	16.0%	17.2%	8.2%	13.2%	11.9%	15.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	1	29	19	3	9	6	67
		% within Education	3.4%	9.5%	7.1%	6.1%	8.5%	14.3%	8.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	3	40	51	11	23	9	137
		% within Education	10.3%	13.1%	19.0%	22.4%	21.7%	21.4%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	23	9	3	3	0	38
		% within Education	.0%	7.5%	3.4%	6.1%	2.8%	.0%	4.8%
Total		Count	29	306	268	49	106	42	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

414

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	89	87	56	101	102	435
		% within Church attendance	67.4%	59.6%	51.9%	53.2%	46.2%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	17	24	14	29	36	120
		% within Church attendance	12.9%	16.4%	13.0%	15.3%	16.3%	15.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	14	17	11	12	13	67
		% within Church attendance	10.6%	11.6%	10.2%	6.3%	5.9%	8.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	8	14	20	35	60	137
		% within Church attendance	6.1%	9.6%	18.5%	18.4%	27.1%	17.2%
	Don't know	Count	4	4	7	13	10	38
		% within Church attendance	3.0%	2.7%	6.5%	6.8%	4.5%	4.8%
Total		Count	132	146	108	190	221	797
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

415

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	344	36	29	3	2	3	18	0	435
		% within Race	66.4%	36.4%	23.2%	21.4%	66.7%	27.3%	72.0%	.0%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	66	23	26	0	0	3	4	0	122
		% within Race	12.7%	23.2%	20.8%	.0%	.0%	27.3%	16.0%	.0%	15.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	25	18	18	3	0	2	0	0	66
		% within Race	4.8%	18.2%	14.4%	21.4%	.0%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	60	17	47	7	1	1	3	0	136
		% within Race	11.6%	17.2%	37.6%	50.0%	33.3%	9.1%	12.0%	.0%	17.1%
	Don't know	Count	23	5	5	1	0	2	0	2	38
		% within Race	4.4%	5.1%	4.0%	7.1%	.0%	18.2%	.0%	100.0%	4.8%
Total		Count	518	99	125	14	3	11	25	2	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	304	5	55	20	42	11	437
		% within Marital Status	62.7%	41.7%	56.7%	66.7%	29.6%	34.4%	54.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	62	3	19	5	23	10	122

416

	% within Marital Status	12.8%	25.0%	19.6%	16.7%	16.2%	31.3%	15.3%
Somewhat oppose	Count	41	0	3	1	16	2	63
	% within Marital Status	8.5%	.0%	3.1%	3.3%	11.3%	6.3%	7.9%
Strongly oppose	Count	64	3	19	4	40	7	137
	% within Marital Status	13.2%	25.0%	19.6%	13.3%	28.2%	21.9%	17.2%
Don't know	Count	14	1	1	0	21	2	39
	% within Marital Status	2.9%	8.3%	1.0%	.0%	14.8%	6.3%	4.9%
Total	Count	485	12	97	30	142	32	798
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	210	227	437
		% within Gender	56.1%	53.4%	54.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	48	73	121
		% within Gender	12.8%	17.2%	15.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	32	35	67
		% within Gender	8.6%	8.2%	8.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	70	66	136
		% within Gender	18.7%	15.5%	17.0%
	Don't know	Count	14	24	38
		% within Gender	3.7%	5.6%	4.8%
Total		Count	374	425	799

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	210	227	437
		% within Gender	56.1%	53.4%	54.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	48	73	121
		% within Gender	12.8%	17.2%	15.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	32	35	67
		% within Gender	8.6%	8.2%	8.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	70	66	136
		% within Gender	18.7%	15.5%	17.0%
	Don't know	Count	14	24	38
		% within Gender	3.7%	5.6%	4.8%
Total		Count	374	425	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	105	215	117	437
		% within Urban/Rural	43.6%	56.7%	65.7%	54.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	42	64	15	121
		% within Urban/Rural	17.4%	16.9%	8.4%	15.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	26	24	16	66

		% within Urban/Rural	10.8%	6.3%	9.0%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	50	66	20	136
		% within Urban/Rural	20.7%	17.4%	11.2%	17.0%
	Don't know	Count	18	10	10	38
		% within Urban/Rural	7.5%	2.6%	5.6%	4.8%
Total		Count	241	379	178	798
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	98	115	28	39	156	436
		% within Metropolitan areas	58.0%	52.0%	39.4%	44.8%	62.7%	54.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	15	40	10	14	42	121
		% within Metropolitan areas	8.9%	18.1%	14.1%	16.1%	16.9%	15.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	23	18	6	8	11	66
		% within Metropolitan areas	13.6%	8.1%	8.5%	9.2%	4.4%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	28	42	21	22	24	137
		% within Metropolitan areas	16.6%	19.0%	29.6%	25.3%	9.6%	17.2%

			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
	Don't know	Count	5	6	6	4	16	37	
		% within Metropolitan areas	3.0%	2.7%	8.5%	4.6%	6.4%	4.6%	
Total		Count	169	221	71	87	249	797	
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Immigration grid - require law enforcement to check immigration status* AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Immigration grid - require law enforcement officials	Strongly support	Count	99	62	67	90	74	43	435
		% within AP Region	61.5%	47.0%	55.4%	57.0%	72.5%	35.2%	54.6%
	Somewhat support	Count	28	25	9	22	10	27	121
		% within AP Region	17.4%	18.9%	7.4%	13.9%	9.8%	22.1%	15.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	11	14	17	10	4	10	66
		% within AP Region	6.8%	10.6%	14.0%	6.3%	3.9%	8.2%	8.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	12	29	23	28	9	34	135
		% within AP Region	7.5%	22.0%	19.0%	17.7%	8.8%	27.9%	17.0%
	Don't know	Count	11	2	5	8	5	8	39
		% within AP Region	6.8%	1.5%	4.1%	5.1%	4.9%	6.6%	4.9%
Total		Count	161	132	121	158	102	122	796
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							Total
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	12	8	19	56	44	72	66	277
		% within Libcon scale	37.5%	16.3%	24.1%	25.8%	38.3%	42.9%	51.2%	35.1%
	Somewhat support	Count	3	6	16	41	24	29	15	134
		% within Libcon scale	9.4%	12.2%	20.3%	18.9%	20.9%	17.3%	11.6%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	6	18	16	39	25	33	16	153
		% within Libcon scale	18.8%	36.7%	20.3%	18.0%	21.7%	19.6%	12.4%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	4	7	13	40	14	16	22	116
		% within Libcon scale	12.5%	14.3%	16.5%	18.4%	12.2%	9.5%	17.1%	14.7%
	Don't know	Count	7	10	15	41	8	18	10	109
		% within Libcon scale	21.9%	20.4%	19.0%	18.9%	7.0%	10.7%	7.8%	13.8%
Total		Count	32	49	79	217	115	168	129	789
		% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								Total
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	43	23	16	25	48	26	93	2	276
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.2%	25.8%	26.2%	31.3%	44.9%	35.1%	47.0%	13.3%	35.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	32	14	6	20	13	15	34	1	135

421

		% within 7 point Party ID	19.5%	15.7%	9.8%	25.0%	12.1%	20.3%	17.2%	6.7%	17.1%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	35	22	15	11	18	14	36	2	153
		% within 7 point Party ID	21.3%	24.7%	24.6%	13.8%	16.8%	18.9%	18.2%	13.3%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	32	15	11	12	18	9	20	1	118
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.5%	16.9%	18.0%	15.0%	16.8%	12.2%	10.1%	6.7%	15.0%
	Don't know	Count	22	15	13	12	10	10	15	9	106
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.4%	16.9%	21.3%	15.0%	9.3%	13.5%	7.6%	60.0%	13.5%
Total		Count	164	89	61	80	107	74	198	15	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * age Crosstabulation

			age				Total
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	29	83	122	44	278
		% within age	23.8%	34.4%	38.0%	38.3%	34.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	20	46	57	13	136
		% within age	16.4%	19.1%	17.8%	11.3%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	26	44	52	33	155
		% within age	21.3%	18.3%	16.2%	28.7%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	15	25	65	15	120
		% within age	12.3%	10.4%	20.2%	13.0%	15.0%
	Don't know	Count	32	43	25	10	110
		% within age	26.2%	17.8%	7.8%	8.7%	13.8%
Total		Count	122	241	321	115	799

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	29	83	122	44	278
		% within age	23.8%	34.4%	38.0%	38.3%	34.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	20	46	57	13	136
		% within age	16.4%	19.1%	17.8%	11.3%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	26	44	52	33	155
		% within age	21.3%	18.3%	16.2%	28.7%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	15	25	65	15	120
		% within age	12.3%	10.4%	20.2%	13.0%	15.0%
	Don't know	Count	32	43	25	10	110
		% within age	26.2%	17.8%	7.8%	8.7%	13.8%
Total		Count	122	241	321	115	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	9	112	89	17	36	17	280
		% within Education	31.0%	36.7%	33.3%	34.0%	34.3%	39.5%	35.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	3	55	40	7	23	8	136
		% within Education	10.3%	18.0%	15.0%	14.0%	21.9%	18.6%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	6	58	56	14	12	8	154

		% within Education	20.7%	19.0%	21.0%	28.0%	11.4%	18.6%	19.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	8	34	51	6	17	5	121
		% within Education	27.6%	11.1%	19.1%	12.0%	16.2%	11.6%	15.1%
	Don't know	Count	3	46	31	6	17	5	108
		% within Education	10.3%	15.1%	11.6%	12.0%	16.2%	11.6%	13.5%
Total		Count	29	305	267	50	105	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Church attendance Crosstabulation

			Church attendance					Total
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	41	48	36	74	78	277
		% within Church attendance	31.3%	32.7%	33.0%	38.7%	35.3%	34.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	22	25	19	33	37	136
		% within Church attendance	16.8%	17.0%	17.4%	17.3%	16.7%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	32	28	26	26	44	156
		% within Church attendance	24.4%	19.0%	23.9%	13.6%	19.9%	19.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	20	31	11	27	32	121
		% within Church attendance	15.3%	21.1%	10.1%	14.1%	14.5%	15.1%
	Don't know	Count	16	15	17	31	30	109
		% within Church attendance	12.2%	10.2%	15.6%	16.2%	13.6%	13.6%
Total		Count	131	147	109	191	221	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								Total
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	205	24	29	4	1	4	12	0	279
		% within Race	39.5%	24.0%	23.6%	28.6%	33.3%	36.4%	46.2%	.0%	35.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	80	25	21	1	0	2	6	0	135
		% within Race	15.4%	25.0%	17.1%	7.1%	.0%	18.2%	23.1%	.0%	16.9%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	96	19	32	3	0	2	3	0	155
		% within Race	18.5%	19.0%	26.0%	21.4%	.0%	18.2%	11.5%	.0%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	72	19	21	1	2	0	4	0	119
		% within Race	13.9%	19.0%	17.1%	7.1%	66.7%	.0%	15.4%	.0%	14.9%
	Don't know	Count	66	13	20	5	0	3	1	2	110
		% within Race	12.7%	13.0%	16.3%	35.7%	.0%	27.3%	3.8%	100.0%	13.8%
Total		Count	519	100	123	14	3	11	26	2	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Marital Status	Total

425

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	196	8	29	8	29	9	279
		% within Marital Status	40.5%	61.5%	30.5%	26.7%	20.4%	30.0%	35.1%
	Somewhat support	Count	84	1	16	5	24	5	135
		% within Marital Status	17.4%	7.7%	16.8%	16.7%	16.9%	16.7%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	85	2	16	7	35	6	151
		% within Marital Status	17.6%	15.4%	16.8%	23.3%	24.6%	20.0%	19.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	69	2	24	6	17	3	121
		% within Marital Status	14.3%	15.4%	25.3%	20.0%	12.0%	10.0%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	50	0	10	4	37	7	108
		% within Marital Status	10.3%	.0%	10.5%	13.3%	26.1%	23.3%	13.6%
Total		Count	484	13	95	30	142	30	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	157	122	279
		% within Gender	42.1%	28.8%	35.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	50	85	135
		% within Gender	13.4%	20.0%	16.9%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	75	79	154
		% within Gender	20.1%	18.6%	19.3%

			Count	55	65	120
	Strongly oppose	Count	55	65	120
		% within Gender	14.7%	15.3%	15.1%
	Don't know	Count	36	73	109
		% within Gender	9.7%	17.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	373	424	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	68	148	62	278
		% within Urban/Rural	28.0%	39.2%	34.8%	34.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	41	68	27	136
		% within Urban/Rural	16.9%	18.0%	15.2%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	51	62	42	155
		% within Urban/Rural	21.0%	16.4%	23.6%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	40	58	22	120
		% within Urban/Rural	16.5%	15.3%	12.4%	15.0%
	Don't know	Count	43	42	25	110
		% within Urban/Rural	17.7%	11.1%	14.0%	13.8%
Total		Count	243	378	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					Total
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	74	75	19	28	82	278
		% within Metropolitan areas	44.0%	34.1%	26.4%	32.6%	32.8%	34.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	25	43	12	10	45	135
		% within Metropolitan areas	14.9%	19.5%	16.7%	11.6%	18.0%	17.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	29	50	18	15	43	155
		% within Metropolitan areas	17.3%	22.7%	25.0%	17.4%	17.2%	19.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	20	31	15	17	37	120
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.9%	14.1%	20.8%	19.8%	14.8%	15.1%
	Don't know	Count	20	21	8	16	43	108
		% within Metropolitan areas	11.9%	9.5%	11.1%	18.6%	17.2%	13.6%
Total		Count	168	220	72	86	250	796
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor * AP Region Crosstabulation

428

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Immigration grid - prohibit businesses from soliciting day labor	Strongly support	Count	55	43	53	64	28	35	278
		% within AP Region	34.0%	32.6%	44.5%	40.5%	27.2%	28.5%	34.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	33	29	12	23	18	20	135
		% within AP Region	20.4%	22.0%	10.1%	14.6%	17.5%	16.3%	16.9%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	27	28	23	25	25	27	155
		% within AP Region	16.7%	21.2%	19.3%	15.8%	24.3%	22.0%	19.4%
	Strongly oppose	Count	27	15	15	26	15	23	121
		% within AP Region	16.7%	11.4%	12.6%	16.5%	14.6%	18.7%	15.2%
	Don't know	Count	20	17	16	20	17	18	108
		% within AP Region	12.3%	12.9%	13.4%	12.7%	16.5%	14.6%	13.6%
Total		Count	162	132	119	158	103	123	797
		% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Libcon scale Crosstabulation

			Libcon scale							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	16	19	24	47	12	12	6	136
		% within Libcon scale	50.0%	37.3%	30.4%	21.7%	10.4%	7.1%	4.7%	17.2%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	9	15	35	128	95	149	116	547
		% within Libcon scale	28.1%	29.4%	44.3%	59.0%	82.6%	88.2%	89.9%	69.1%
	Don't know	Count	7	17	20	42	8	8	7	109

		21.9%	33.3%	25.3%	19.4%	7.0%	4.7%	5.4%	13.8%
	% within Libcon scale	21.9%	33.3%	25.3%	19.4%	7.0%	4.7%	5.4%	13.8%
Total	Count	32	51	79	217	115	169	129	792
	% within Libcon scale	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	60	24	14	18	2	6	9	3	136
		% within 7 point Party ID	36.4%	26.4%	23.3%	22.5%	1.9%	8.2%	4.5%	20.0%	17.3%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	69	57	28	50	100	60	172	1	537
		% within 7 point Party ID	41.8%	62.6%	46.7%	62.5%	94.3%	82.2%	86.9%	6.7%	68.1%
	Don't know	Count	36	10	18	12	4	7	17	11	115
		% within 7 point Party ID	21.8%	11.0%	30.0%	15.0%	3.8%	9.6%	8.6%	73.3%	14.6%
Total		Count	165	91	60	80	106	73	198	15	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * age Crosstabulation

			age				
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	35	54	39	9	137
		% within age	28.9%	22.3%	12.1%	7.8%	17.1%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	55	149	246	99	549

	% within age	45.5%	61.6%	76.2%	86.1%	68.5%
Don't know	Count	31	39	38	7	115
	% within age	25.6%	16.1%	11.8%	6.1%	14.4%
Total	Count	121	242	323	115	801
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						Total
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	3	45	49	11	20	8	136
		% within Education	10.3%	14.7%	18.4%	22.4%	18.9%	19.0%	17.0%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	23	209	188	33	66	30	549
		% within Education	79.3%	68.3%	70.7%	67.3%	62.3%	71.4%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	3	52	29	5	20	4	113
		% within Education	10.3%	17.0%	10.9%	10.2%	18.9%	9.5%	14.2%
Total		Count	29	306	266	49	106	42	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Church attendance Crosstabulation

	Church attendance					Total
	More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	

431

Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	10	18	26	33	49	136
		% within Church attendance	7.6%	12.3%	24.1%	17.3%	22.1%	17.0%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	106	110	62	133	138	549
		% within Church attendance	80.3%	75.3%	57.4%	69.6%	62.2%	68.7%
	Don't know	Count	16	18	20	25	35	114
		% within Church attendance	12.1%	12.3%	18.5%	13.1%	15.8%	14.3%
Total		Count	132	146	108	191	222	799
		% within Church attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Race Crosstabulation

			Race								
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indígena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Middle Eastern / Del oriente medio	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	57	21	45	7	2	1	3	0	136
		% within Race	11.0%	21.0%	36.3%	50.0%	50.0%	9.1%	12.0%	.0%	17.0%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	407	57	52	4	2	6	20	2	550
		% within Race	78.4%	57.0%	41.9%	28.6%	50.0%	54.5%	80.0%	100.0%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	55	22	27	3	0	4	2	0	113
		% within Race	10.6%	22.0%	21.8%	21.4%	.0%	36.4%	8.0%	.0%	14.1%
Total		Count	519	100	124	14	4	11	25	2	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

432

Sanctuary cities * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						Total
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	65	3	13	5	41	4	131
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	25.0%	13.7%	17.2%	28.9%	12.9%	16.5%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	362	6	71	22	64	24	549
		% within Marital Status	74.6%	50.0%	74.7%	75.9%	45.1%	77.4%	69.1%
	Don't know	Count	58	3	11	2	37	3	114
		% within Marital Status	12.0%	25.0%	11.6%	6.9%	26.1%	9.7%	14.4%
Total		Count	485	12	95	29	142	31	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	77	59	136
		% within Gender	20.5%	13.9%	17.0%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	269	281	550
		% within Gender	71.7%	66.1%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	29	85	114
		% within Gender	7.7%	20.0%	14.2%
Total		Count	375	425	800

Sanctuary cities * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	77	59	136
		% within Gender	20.5%	13.9%	17.0%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	269	281	550
		% within Gender	71.7%	66.1%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	29	85	114
		% within Gender	7.7%	20.0%	14.2%
Total		Count	375	425	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Urban/Rural Crosstabulation

			Urban/Rural			Total
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	52	65	18	135
		% within Urban/Rural	21.5%	17.2%	10.1%	16.9%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	154	265	131	550
		% within Urban/Rural	63.6%	69.9%	73.6%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	36	49	29	114
		% within Urban/Rural	14.9%	12.9%	16.3%	14.3%
Total		Count	242	379	178	799
		% within Urban/Rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * Metropolitan areas Crosstabulation

			Metropolitan areas					
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	32	40	13	22	28	135
		% within Metropolitan areas	18.7%	18.2%	18.3%	25.6%	11.2%	16.9%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	112	154	41	55	186	548
		% within Metropolitan areas	65.5%	70.0%	57.7%	64.0%	74.7%	68.8%
	Don't know	Count	27	26	17	9	35	114
		% within Metropolitan areas	15.8%	11.8%	23.9%	10.5%	14.1%	14.3%
Total		Count	171	220	71	86	249	797
		% within Metropolitan areas	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sanctuary cities * AP Region Crosstabulation

			AP Region						
			East Texas	Dallas/Ft. Worth	Houston (Harris)	South Central	West	South/Hispanic	Total
Sanctuary cities	Approve of sanctuary cities	Count	17	31	27	26	5	31	137
		% within AP Region	10.6%	23.3%	22.3%	16.4%	4.9%	25.2%	17.1%
	Disapprove of sanctuary cities	Count	117	88	77	113	83	71	549
		% within AP Region	72.7%	66.2%	63.6%	71.1%	80.6%	57.7%	68.6%
	Don't know	Count	27	14	17	20	15	21	114
		% within AP Region	16.8%	10.5%	14.0%	12.6%	14.6%	17.1%	14.2%

Total	Count	161	133	121	159	103	123	800
	% within AP Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%