

THE MASSACHUSETTS SPECIAL ELECTION: WHAT HAPPENED, AND WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA IN 2010

“...I would be the forty-first vote. I would actually stop it and ask for them to go back to the drawing board, because everyone is entitled to some form of insurance. But why do we need a one-size-fits-all? I don’t understand.” U.S. Senate Candidate Scott Brown, January 8, 2010

“In dealing with terrorists, our tax dollars should pay for weapons to stop them, not lawyers to defend them.” U.S. Senate Candidate Scott Brown, January 17, 2010

The Massachusetts Special Election last week upended “conventional wisdom” about “who can/might/should/will win” and called into question just how “blue” – politically—Massachusetts, and the seat held by the late Ted Kennedy – really are.

The outcome showed that campaigns and candidates matter, but that issues carry the day. Voters were both informed and engaged about the positions of Republican Scott Brown and Democrat Martha Coakley, and have distinct opinions about what the nation’s leaders should do to fix the economy, stimulate entrepreneurship, shore up national security, and the major issue du jour, reform healthcare.

Independent Women’s Voice commissioned the polling company, inc./WomanTrend to conduct a statewide survey of 411 Massachusetts voters who participated in the January 19, 2010 Special Election; the key findings cross-tabs and methodology are outlined on the following pages.

ELECTION 2010: SPOTLIGHT ON INDEPENDENT WOMEN & THE ISSUES

Two-thirds of Independent women bucked their gender and supported Scott Brown for U.S. Senate. What motivated them? These women were nearly twice as likely as the average to say that “jobs and unemployment” were most important when they voted on Tuesday (24% vs. 13%). Thirty percent of Independent women said “healthcare” was most important compared to 51% of Democratic women and 38% of Republican women.

When asked whether *“increased federal government spending will speed up or slow down the country’s economic recovery,”* 54% of self-identified Independent women felt it would impede mending while 20% thought it would hasten it.

Conversely, 78% of self-identified Independent women believed, *“providing tax cuts to small businesses for job creation”* will speed up the pace of economic recovery; 4% thought it would slow it down.

Given the option of *“reducing taxes and regulations on small businesses”* or *“increasing government spending on projects like road repair, school construction, or other infrastructure developments”*, 51% of Independent women preferred tax cuts while 30% chose infrastructure.

Two opposing opinions were presented to respondents for their reactions:

*Person 1 believes that **Congress should continue to spend money on current and new programs at its current rate, even if it means the country goes into deeper debt than it is now.***

*Person 2 believes **Congress should stop spending at its current rate and should instead focus on reducing the country's debt, even if it means the federal government cannot create new programs or has to make cuts to existing programs.***

- Overall, 49% of women and 64% of men agreed with the opinion of Person 2 – that Congress should turn its energies to debt reduction.
- However, a considerable schism emerged across political lines: Whereas just 29% of self-identified Democratic women aligned with this view, 61% of self-identified Independent women and 85% of Republican women did so.

By a 22-point margin, self-identified Independent women oppose the “current proposals or legislation being debated in Washington to change the way healthcare is covered and delivered here in the United States” (33% Support vs. 55% Oppose, including 44% Strongly Opposed).

Independent women are open to a number of changes to improve the current debate about healthcare:

- Open negotiations for public observation (53%);
- Start all over (45%); and
- Remove special treatment provisions for certain states (29%).

Independent women also favor:

- Allowing small businesses to form groups to buy healthcare coverage at lower rates (67%); and
- Enacting provisions that make it more affordable for people to buy health insurance on their own, instead of through their jobs, in the same way people buy homeowners’ and life insurance (56%).

Sixty-eight percent of Independent women said that Scott Brown’s remark that “In dealing with terrorists, our tax dollars should pay for weapons to stop them, not lawyers to defend them,” was **very or somewhat important to their voting decisions.**

Some 86% of Independent women indicated that Brown’s declaration that he will be the “41st vote against healthcare” was **very (62%) or somewhat (24%) important to how they voted.**

ELECTION 2010: ON THE ISSUES

Healthcare Plays the Heaviest Hand in Massachusetts: Nearly two-in-five (38%) actual voters said they had healthcare on the brain when voting; of those, 57% said in a later question that they support current efforts being undertaken in Washington. Other issues of importance were, like healthcare, fiscal in nature: the economy (16%), jobs and unemployment (13%), government spending (7%), and taxes (3%).

- Voters who cast ballots for Coakley were nearly twice as likely as Brown supporters to note healthcare as the most important issue (52% vs. 27%). Brown voters were notably more inclined to cite jobs and unemployment as the single most important issue (16% of Brown supporters vs. 8% of Coakley supporters) and government spending (13% of Brown supporters vs. 0% of Coakley supporters).
- The majority (55%) of liberals as well as pluralities of moderates (33%) and conservatives (26%) said healthcare mattered most. However, moderates were more likely than most to emphasize the economy while conservatives stood out above the average as more focused on government spending and national security.
- Similarly, pluralities of self-identified Democrats (48%), Independents (27%), and Republicans (34%) noted how healthcare was important. Again, though, middle-of-the-road Independents stood out as more interested in jobs and unemployment while self-identified Republicans were notably more apt than the average to focus on government spending and national security.

In a separate question, 86% of voters in Massachusetts said healthcare was either the top issue (29%) or one of the top three issues (57%) they considered when participating in the 2010 Special Election for U.S. Senate last week.

- Majorities of all major demographic and political groups placed the healthcare among their top three concerns.
- Identical percentages of Brown and Coakley voters – 29% each – said that healthcare was the top issue influencing how they voted.

Among respondents who said that healthcare was their top concern, the majority (51%) said it was because they *oppose* the current legislation being considered in Washington, D.C., 46% because they *support* it. When asked specifically to explain the source(s) of their disagreement, voters in Massachusetts cited the following:

And what elements, specifically, of the legislation do you oppose? (N=60)

52%	THE CUTS TO MEDICARE
51%	HOW IT WILL AFFECT THE QUALITY OF MY HEALTHCARE OR INSURANCE
51%	CONGRESS'S CLOSED-DOOR NEGOTIATIONS
45%	THE COSTS OF THE LEGISLATION
45%	HOW IT WILL INCREASE THE FEDERAL DEBT AND BUDGET DEFICIT
41%	THE LACK OF BIPARTISANSHIP
41%	HOW IT WILL REDUCE THE CHOICES I HAVE IN HEALTHCARE OR INSURANCE
35%	THE LOSS OF PRIVACY OF MEDICAL RECORDS

Voter Recommendations for What's Next on Healthcare: Support and opposition to “current proposals or legislation being debated in Washington to change the way healthcare is covered and delivered here in the United States” were tied within the margin of error: 47%-44%. However, intensity rested in the opposition, where 34% strongly rejected what is being discussed inside the Beltway on healthcare.

- Those splits were reflected in candidate support: 83% of Coakley voters said they support the current healthcare legislation, while 78% of Brown backers said they oppose it.
- The gender gap was significant: women favored the bill 53%-35% while men opposed it 53%-39%. **Self-identified Independent women rejected the bill 55%-33% while moderate women embraced it 57%-26%.** Independent men opposed by a 57%-35% margin.
- Among respondents who earlier said “healthcare” was their most important issue, they endorsed the legislation 57%-35% while those who said “government spending” or “taxes” were most important opposed it by an eye-popping 90%-8%. Voters who fingered “the economy” generally as most pressing split 43% support vs. 43% oppose.

Massachusetts Voters Think Congress Needs a Course Correction: When asked how Congress should handle current healthcare legislation being considered in Washington, only 16% of respondents believed that Congress should “keep going as is.” Conversely, 36% thought that Washington’s 535 should “start all over.” Among other recommendations voters offered:

- Open negotiations for the public to observe (47%); and
- Remove special treatment provisions for certain states (28%).

Among the greatest surprises in the data was the tri-partisan agreement that the status quo on healthcare in Washington has been a failure: just 29% of self-identified Democrats, 8% of self-identified Republicans, and 5% of self-identified Independents recommend Congress proceed full steam ahead and as-is.

Additionally, pluralities of self-identified Democrats (47%) and Republicans (44%), as well as the majority of self-identified Independents (52%) thought one of the best ways for President Obama and the Democrats in Congress to change the way healthcare legislation is being developed is to unbolt the secret door and allow sunshine in on the negotiations.

Massachusetts Voters Put Their Stamps of Approval on “Alternatives” to Healthcare Reform

Those who actually cast a ballot in the January 19th special are not “just saying no” to healthcare altogether. In fact, considerable numbers of them were open to incorporating free market principles into whatever types of reform are presented in the future, including:

- Allowing small businesses to form groups to buy healthcare coverage at lower rates (57%);
- Enacting provisions that make it more affordable for people to buy health insurance on their own, instead of through their jobs, in the same way people buy homeowners’ and life insurance (50%);
- Including medical malpractice reform to bring down the costs of physicians defending against malpractice lawsuits (46%); and
- Adding provisions that allow people to purchase health insurance across state lines (36%).

Women were notably more supportive than men of allowing small businesses to band together (63% vs. 51%). Interestingly, 69% of self-identified Democratic women and 67% of their self-identified Independent counterparts favored this, compared to 47% of Republican women.

Even Coakley supporters embraced these tenets, which had been omitted from the legislation that actually passed in Washington. Nearly three-in-five of Coakley's backers also lent their voice to the idea of permitting small businesses to join for lower health insurance rates (59%). An additional 47% of her supporters favored provisions for more affordable insurance while 45% backed medical malpractice caps. One-in-three (33%) favored laws to allow for interstate purchase of health insurance.

The “Politics” of Healthcare Mattered, Too: Voters were reminded that Scott Brown famously said he would be the “41st vote” against the current of healthcare legislation and asked the importance of this statement to their ballot box decisions. **Eighty-six percent of respondents said that it was “very” or “somewhat” important to know that Scott Brown would be the 41st vote.**

- Eighty-five percent of those who voted for Brown said it was important, but so too did 87% who voted for Coakley, demonstrating that both sides had a lot to gain or a lot to lose from this race. In fact, of those who said it was “very important,” 52% cast ballots for Coakley.
- Equal percentages of men and women deemed this important (86% each). However, women were five points more likely than men to say it was “very” critical.
- The majority (56%) of self-identified Independents said it was “very important” and 29% “somewhat important” knowing that Scott Brown said this; 72% of self-identified Democrats and Republicans alike deemed it “very important.”

A PRESCRIPTION FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Voters also went to the polls thinking about jobs and the economy; 18% of respondents said that they were the “top issues” when deciding which candidate to support, and an additional 62% placed them in the top three.

- **80% of men and 79% of women said “jobs and the economy” were the top or top three matters of greatest concern to them.**
- Majorities of voters in all age, ideological, political party, and regional subgroups said that these issues ranked in at least the top three, if not the top, spots.

A series of four questions were posed about how the country can improve its economic future.

Mild Consensus: More Federal Spending Isn't the Cure: Forty-six percent of Massachusetts voters believed “increased federal government spending will **slow down** the country's economic recovery,” while 32% believed it would “**speed up**” recovery.

- The majority (51%) of men and plurality (40%) of women felt that more spending would hurt, not help, the country recover. This was notably true among Independent women (54%), Republican women (70%), Independent men (61%), and Republican men (76%). Conversely, the plurality of Democratic women (47%) and majority of Democratic men (58%) believed that increased government spending would impel improvement.

- Unsurprisingly, 56% of Coakley voters believed more government spending would lead to faster growth, 75% of Brown supporters felt it would impede it.

Four-in-Five Agree: Tax Credits for Small Business Will Stimulate Economic Resurgence: Eighty-two percent predicted that “providing tax cuts to small businesses for job creation will **speed up** the economic recovery,” while only 5% thought it would “**slow down**” revitalization.

- Majorities of men, women, voters of all ages, ideologies, political parties, and regions believed that small business tax cuts would hasten economic recovery.
- Though they may have voted for different candidates, 86% of Brown supporters and 78% of Coakley voters also noted the power of tax cuts to small businesses. Furthermore, even 79% of those who said they in the past voted for Ted Kennedy “always” or “often” believed that small businesses will drive the economic recovery if empowered with the necessary tools to do so.

Tax Credits over Cash for Clunkers or Caulkers: By a margin of 49%-32% actual voters in Massachusetts favored “reducing taxes and regulations on small businesses” over “increasing government spending on projects like road repair, school construction, or other infrastructure developments” as the “best way to stimulate the economy and increase the number of jobs.”

- Men and women were equally as likely to prefer tax credits (49% each) over government spending (33% of men vs. 31% of women). However, there was more variation across the political spectrum: 37% of self-identified Democratic women, 51% of self-identified Independent women, but 75% of self-identified Republican women favored tax cuts.
- Coakley’s supporters favored more government spending over tax cuts by a 50%-23% margin, but Brown voters were more definitive: they favored tax cuts by a 71%-17% margin.
- Voters who identified “the economy” and “jobs and unemployment” as their most important issues felt the best way to repair the country’s financial situation is to reduce taxes and regulations over more government spending by almost 2-to-1 (53% vs. 27%).

Freeze the Country Credit Card, Voters Say: Respondents were asked to align with one of two opposing opinions on Congress’s spending habits.

*Person 1 believes that **Congress should continue to spend money** on current and new programs at its current rate, even if it means the country goes into deeper debt than it is now.*

*Person 2 believes **Congress should stop spending at its current rate** and should instead focus on reducing the country’s debt, even if it means the federal government cannot create new programs or has to make cuts to existing programs.*

- Pluralities, if not majorities, of men, women, and respondents of all ages and regions said agreed with the opinion offered by Person 2, that Congress needs to cease its spending. Those in greatest agreement with this position included men (64%), 35-44 year olds (75%), conservatives (83%), self-identified Republicans (90%), Brown voters (86%), and those who said “government spending” or “taxes” mattered most to them on Election Day (96%).

- Groups of voters more likely than most to agree with the opinion offered by Person 1 and advocate for additional spending included liberals (65%), self-identified Democrats (60%), Coakley supporters (65%), past frequent Kennedy voters (50%), and those who said “healthcare” was important to them on Election Day (54%).

Majority of Massachusetts Voters Want Tax Cuts To Be Reauthorized, Not to Expire: As outlined in the adjacent textbox, 56% of Massachusetts voters believe that tax cuts on capital gains, dividends, estates, and investments should be continued by Congress; one-third (33%) say let them expire.

- Support for reauthorizing the tax cuts spanned both genders (59% of men and 53% of women), and in every age cohort, excluding 18-34 year olds.
- Whereas ideological moderates tend to align more with liberals than with conservatives, 56% of moderates preferred reauthorization compared to 35% of liberals and 77% of conservatives.
- Within political party self-identification, 40% of Democrats, 60% of Independents, and 79% of Republicans favored extending the tax cuts. Forty-seven percent of Democrats, 29% of Independents, and 17% of Republicans favored allowing them to expire.
- Fifty-two percent of Coakley voters wanted the cuts to expire, 37% wanted them preserved. Among Brown voters, the reverse was true: 74% hoped they would be reauthorized while 17% preferred to let them finish.
- The plurality of union households (46%) and majority of non-union household (58%) also backed extension of the tax cuts.

As you might be aware, a number of tax cuts are set to expire next year. If Congress does not reauthorize them, taxes will increase on capital gains, dividends, estates, and investments. While some argue that most Americans will not be impacted directly, others say that the overall American economy will be negatively impacted if the tax cuts are not reauthorized because businesses will not have access to capital that allows for job creation. In your opinion, should Congress (ROTATED) allow the tax cuts to expire or reauthorize the tax cuts? (PROBED: And would that be DEFINITELY or PROBABLY ALLOW/REAUTHORIZE?)

33%	TOTAL ALLOW TAX CUTS TO EXPIRE (NET)
20%	DEFINITELY ALLOW THE TAX CUTS TO EXPIRE
13%	PROBABLY ALLOW THE TAX CUTS TO EXPIRE
56%	TOTAL REAUTHORIZE TAX CUTS (NET)
21%	PROBABLY REAUTHORIZE THE TAX CUTS
35%	DEFINITELY REAUTHORIZE THE TAX CUTS
10%	DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
1%	REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

NATIONAL SECURITY: ADVANTAGE: BROWN

On Christmas Day 2009, the United States came close to experiencing a terrorist attack on its own soil when a man aboard a Detroit-bound flight failed to properly ignite his underwear laced with explosives.

Because the near-attack happened during the campaign, the issue of national security presented itself. During a rally close to Election Day, then-candidate Scott Brown said, “In dealing with terrorists, our tax dollars should pay for weapons to stop them, not lawyers to defend them.” **Sixty-four percent of voters indicated that hearing Scott Brown say this was “very” (42%) or “somewhat” (22%) important when deciding which candidate to support.** Seventy percent of voters who said the statement had importance cast ballots for Brown.

- Three-quarters of Independents – including 68% of Independent women and 80% of Independent men – said it was important to their voting decisions knowing that Scott Brown’s preference is to use tax dollars for fighting terrorists rather than providing legal counsel to them.
- This statement was of greater importance to voters who made their decisions before the eyes of the nation fixated on the race: 69% of those who decided before early December said this was important compared to 55% who made up their minds in early January, 50% who chose a candidate in the last week of the campaign, and 49% who picked someone on Election Day or the Monday before.

ELECTION 2010: THE PLAYERS

Who has clout in Massachusetts? Respondents were asked whether they are mostly positive, mostly negative, or neutral toward three “forces” within Massachusetts. Key highlights:

- Self-identified Independents were equally as “neutral” toward the Republican and Democratic Parties (65% each).
- Whereas 69% of Coakley voters have positive opinions of the Democratic Party, just of 38% of Brown supporters hold affirmative views of the GOP.

The Republican Party: The plurality (43%) of respondents said they are “neutral” toward the GOP while 35% are mostly negative and 20% mostly positive.

- Self-identified Independents: 65% Neutral, 17% Mostly Positive, 16% Mostly Negative
- Seniors: 43% Neutral, 32% Mostly Negative, 23% Mostly Positive
- Women: 43% Neutral, 37% Mostly Negative, 18% Mostly Positive
- Coakley Voters: 66% Mostly Negative, 32% Neutral, 1% Mostly Positive
- Brown Voters: 54% Neutral, 38% Mostly Positive, 6% Mostly Negative

The Democratic Party: Respondents were statistically as likely to say they are “mostly positive” as they were to say they are “neutral” (37% and 36%, respectively); 26% said they are “mostly negative.”

- Self-identified Independents: 65% Neutral, 22% Mostly Negative, 11% Mostly Positive
- Seniors: 37% Neutral, 36% Mostly Positive, 26% Mostly Negative
- Women: 44% Mostly Positive, 37% Neutral, 18% Mostly Negative
- Coakley Voters: 69% Mostly Positive, 28% Neutral, 3% Mostly Negative
- Brown Voters: 48% Mostly Negative, 45% Neutral, 6% Mostly Positive

The Tea Party Movement: Thirty-four percent of actual voters in Massachusetts said they are “neutral” toward the tea partiers, while 29% said they are “mostly negative” and 17% “mostly positive.”

- Self-identified Independents: 38% Neutral, 24% Mostly Negative, 20% Mostly Positive
- Seniors: 33% Mostly Negative, 24% Neutral, 21% Mostly Positive
- Women: 33% Neutral, 28% Mostly Negative, 15% Mostly Positive
- Coakley Voters: 51% Mostly Negative, 23% Neutral, 3% Mostly Positive
- Brown Voters: 45% Neutral, 31% Mostly Positive, 7% Mostly Negative

ELECTION 2010: THE OUTCOME

Women Favored Coakley 53%-45%, But Men Preferred Brown 60%-40%: Majorities of self-identified Republican women (86%) and men (98%) cast votes along party lines for Scott Brown while 82% of self-identified Democratic women and 86% of Democratic men did the same. **However, self-identified Independent men and women handed Republican candidate Scott Brown the victory (67% of Independent women and 72% of Independent men).** Pre-election polling showed much larger gender gap.

Voter engagement:

- **Only 20% of respondents said they had not received a phone call or hear a radio advertisement with a message about healthcare during the recent election.**
- Thirty-two percent of respondents who received a phone call; of those, 53% voted for Coakley and 46% for Brown;
- Ten percent heard a radio advertisement; among those, they preferred Brown 68%-32%; and
- Thirty-two percent received both a phone call **and** heard a radio announcement; they chose Brown over Coakley by a 57%-43% margin.

Most Voters Cast Ballots Affirmatively, But Significant Majorities Have the “Bigger Picture” In Mind: Whereas 72% of Brown voters said they cast votes “mostly for” him and 60% of Coakley voters said theirs were also “mostly for” her, voters had not forgotten the consequences of their voting decisions. Consider that 80% of Brown voters said that “all” or “some” of their votes were “to oppose President Obama’s agenda in Washington” and, similarly, 82% of Coakley supporters said that their “all” or “some” of their support was “to advance President Obama’s agenda in Washington.”

In a similar vein of questioning, supporters on both sides of the aisle indicated that their votes were intended to be an enormous billboard for Washington politicians: 39% (the plurality) of Brown supporters hoped their decisions at the ballot box would “send a message to Democrats about their agenda in Washington,” while a sizeable majority of Coakley voters (67%) supported her to “advance the Democrats’ agenda in Washington.”

ELECTION 2010: THE IMPACT

Questions about past and anticipated future voting behavior revealed fascinating insights about the Massachusetts electorate.

The Legacy of Senator Kennedy: Sixty-three percent of respondents could be classified as “frequent” Ted Kennedy voters, having voted for him “always” (41%) or “often” (22%); just 34% could be deemed “infrequent” voters, 9% having voted “rarely” for him and 25% “never.”

- Frequent Kennedy voters favored Coakley 66%-33%; infrequent voters favored Brown 89%-11%.
- Fifty-eight percent of self-identified Independents were “frequent” Kennedy supporters; 29% say they never voted for the “Liberal Lion.”
- Those who had frequently voted for Ted Kennedy in the past had some surprising opinions:
 - 79% of them said providing tax cut to small businesses for job creation will speed up the nation's economic recovery; and
 - 47% say Congress should open healthcare negotiations for the public to observe.

Drop in Anticipated Support for Democrats, No Real Gain for Republicans: When asked which candidates they supported in the past – Democrats or Republicans – for United States Senate and then asked to anticipate how they will vote in the future, there was a seven-point difference between the percentage of voters saying they have always or mostly voted for Democrats and the percentage saying they will do so in the future:

Regardless of how you voted in this week’s election for United States Senator, do you generally... (READ AND ROTATED TOP TO BOTTOM AND BOTTOM TO TOP)	And, thinking about the future, do you think you will... (READ AND ROTATED TOP TO BOTTOM AND BOTTOM TO TOP)
45% TOTAL FOR DEMOCRATS (NET)	38% TOTAL FOR DEMOCRATS (NET)
14% ALWAYS VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS	11% ALWAYS VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS
31% MOSTLY VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS	27% MOSTLY VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS
31% SPLIT VOTES EVENLY BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS	34% SPLIT VOTES EVENLY BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS
20% TOTAL FOR REPUBLICANS (NET)	20% TOTAL FOR REPUBLICANS (NET)
16% MOSTLY VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS	16% MOSTLY VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS
4% ALWAYS VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS	4% ALWAYS VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS
3% DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)	6% DO NOT KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
1% REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)	2% REFUSED (VOLUNTEERED)

	% PAST FOR DEMOCRATS	% FUTURE FOR DEMOCRATS	CHANGE
Women	52%	45%	-7
Men	38%	31%	-7
18-34	55%	58%	+3
Moderates	42%	29%	-13
Self-Identified Independents	20%	17%	-3
Brown Voters	15%	6%	-9
Coakley Voters	77%	73%	-4
Church-Going Catholics	37%	29%	-8
Non-Frequent Church-Going Catholics	48%	33%	-15
Jewish	84%	68%	-16
	% FUTURE SPLIT VOTES	% FUTURE SPLIT VOTES	CHANGE
Women	25%	31%	+6
Men	37%	37%	No Change
18-34	27%	21%	-6
Moderates	44%	53%	+7
Self-Identified Independents	60%	57%	-3
Brown Voters	40%	43%	+3
Coakley Voters	21%	25%	+4
Church-Going Catholics	38%	39%	+1
Non-Frequent Church-Going Catholics	26%	36%	+10
Jewish	12%	28%	+16

	% VOTED FOR KENNEDY FREQUENTLY	% VOTED FOR KENNEDY INFREQUENTLY
Women	67%	28%
Men	58%	40%
18-34	44%	47%
Moderates	66%	29%
Self-Identified Independents	58%	40%
Brown Voters	39%	58%
Coakley Voters	88%	8%
Church-Going Catholics	64%	32%
Non-Frequent Church-Going Catholics	61%	34%
Jewish	84%	16%

ASSESSING MASSACHUSETTS'S HEALTHCARE LAWS

The Massachusetts Model: Reviewing Healthcare At Home: When asked about their “personal experiences with healthcare reform enacted in Massachusetts a few years ago,” 61% reported to be either “very” (22%) or “somewhat” (39%) satisfied; 29% were either “somewhat” (18%) or “very” (11%) unsatisfied.

- Majorities of men, women, and voters above the age of 35 expressed satisfaction with their personal experiences.
- One-half of Brown supporters (50%) and 72% of Coakley voters said they are content with the reform.
- Groups of voters more likely than most to be unsatisfied included conservatives (37%), self-identified Republicans (38%), and Brown voters (39%).

Still, in a separate question, many Massachusetts voters think improvements can be made. When asked to assess a letter grade to “the current laws on mandatory health insurance here in Massachusetts,” 12% of respondents offered “A’s,” 35% rated the laws with “B’s,” while another 31% graded with “C’s”. Nineteen percent offered “D’s” (12%) or “F’s” (7%).

- Ten percent of women and 14% of men graciously awarded “A’s”.
- The plurality (35%) of Independent women afforded the laws “C’s”. Just 7% of Independent women felt compelled to grade with an “A” while 11% failed the laws; 5% of Republican women and 3% of Democratic women gave “F’s” to the program.
- Four percent of Brown’s supporters and 20% of Coakley’s voters passed the program with “A’s”. An additional 26% of Brown’s backers and 45% of Coakley’s cheerleaders gave “B’s.” 3

Massachusetts’ Healthcare Laws Enable Status Quo...At a Higher Price: Seventy-five percent of Massachusetts voters said that their own “quality of healthcare” has “stayed the same since Massachusetts enacted a law requiring everyone to health insurance.” This included majorities of men, women, and respondents of all ages, ideologies, and political party self-identification. Six percent thought their quality of care had “gotten better” while 14% believed it had “gotten worse.”

However, when asked about the consequences to their “healthcare costs,” **the majority (57%) of respondents said their expenses had increased.** Slightly more than one-third (34%) said costs had “stayed the same” while 7% experienced decreases in costs.

- **No more than 10% of men, women, and voters of any age, ideological, or political party cohort said that their costs went down.**
- Men and women were statistically as likely to say that costs had gone up (57% and 56%, respectively).
- Majorities of voters in all age groups (excluding 18-34 year olds) said their costs had increased. Sixty-three percent of 18-34 year olds said their expenses had been stagnant.

- Significant majorities of ideological moderates (59%) and conservatives (66%) said their costs had gone up. The plurality of liberals (45%) said their costs had also increased, but a statistically-similar 44% indicated that expenses had gone unchanged.
- More than two-thirds of Brown supporters (68%) and the plurality of Coakley voters (45%) said that their costs had gone up. It should be noted, however, that 42% of those who cast ballots for Coakley said that their costs had neither increased nor decreased.
- The majority (56%) of those who frequently voted for Ted Kennedy in the past also noted how their healthcare costs have risen following the Romney reforms.

Methodology

On behalf of Independent Women's Voice, **the polling company™, inc./WomanTrend** conducted a statewide survey of 400 registered voters in Massachusetts who participated in the January 19,2010 special election to fill the seat of the late Senator Ted Kennedy.

The survey was in the field January 23-24, 2010 and was conducted at a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) facility using live callers. The sample was drawn using lists of registered voters in Massachusetts. Upon connecting with a potential interviewee, the respondent was screened to ensure a) registration to vote and b) participation in the 2010 election. Sampling controls were used to ensure that a proportional and representative number of people were interviewed from such demographic groups as age, race and ethnicity, and region according to the most recent figures available from the U.S. Census Bureau and voter registration and turnout figures. Slight weighting was applied.

The survey has an overall margin of error of $\pm 4.9\%$ at a 95% confidence interval, meaning that in 19 out of 20 cases, the data obtained would not differ by any more than 4.9 percentage points in either direction had the entire population of actual voters in Massachusetts been surveyed. Margins of error for subgroups are higher.