

behavior research center's

Rocky Mountain Poll

NEWS RELEASE RMP 2002-IV-2

Contact: Earl de Berge

Research Director

Jim Haynes Or:

President

GOVERNOR HULL: RADICAL DROP IN HER JOB RATINGS

Phoenix, Arizona, October 12, 2002. Governor Jane Hull's job ratings have been anything but stellar over the past year and now as she approaches the final months of her administration, the public has grown sour toward her to an astonishing degree. Today, only 21 percent rate her job performance favorably. Such a low level of approval for a sitting governor has been seen only twice before; once in July of 1997 when Fife Symington's positive performance ratings fell to 22 percent and once before that when, in October of 1987, Evan Mecham's ratings fell to 23 percent.

What is even more remarkable about the current readings for Governor Hull is the breadth of the negative sentiment toward her. Although not quite as high as was the case for either Symington (46%) or Mecham (50%), her negative readings are remarkably high nonetheless – 38 percent. Fair or no, it appears that the public is blaming the Governor for all the state's recent ills: a struggling economy, the alternative fuels scandal, and the poor state of public education in Arizona.

Another unusual element about the Governor's job ratings is that it is among registered voters and, particularly among voters most likely to go to the polls, that disappointment with her is the most intense. For instance, among likely voters, negative job ratings rise to a stunning 45 percent.

It also appears that Governor Hull, even more so than the legislature, is the recipient of voter dissatisfaction with state government. Thus, while fewer people give the legislature positive ratings (17%) than the Governor (21%), the legislature's negative scores (29%) are noticeably lower than those given the Governor (38%).

- more -

These readings would certainly seem to lend credence to the view that while those in high places may too often get credit for the work of others that they do not deserve, when things go sour, they get the blame as well. In so far as it is arguable that no governor could expect positive ratings in the gloomy economic environment of today, one can only wonder what voters will expect of the next governor. If they remain in a negative mood about the economy, will there be no honeymoon whatever?

The findings outlined in this report are based on a survey of 713 adults across Arizona conducted between October 1st and October 7th, 2002, by the Behavior Research Center of Arizona as part of the Center's independent and non-partisan Rocky Mountain Poll series. The public is welcome to visit www.brcpolls.com to read this and other recent polls.

-30-

EDITOR'S NOTE: This Rocky Mountain Poll Arizona (2002-IV-2) is based on 713 telephone interviews with adults, conducted from October 1st through October 7th, 2002 throughout Arizona. In the overall sample, one may say with 95 percent certainty that the results have a statistical precision of plus or minus 3.7 percent of what they would have been had the entire adult population been surveyed. The Rocky Mountain Poll is conducted by the Behavior Research Center of Arizona and is an independent and non-partisan research program.

This statement conforms to the principles of disclosure of the National Council on Public Polls.

BELOW: Statistical data

For this and other polls. See www.brcpolls.com/results

STATISTICAL DATA

Behavior Research Center Rocky Mountain Poll - Arizona RMP 2002-IV-2

For this and other polls, see www.brcpolls.com/results.

"Next, I'd like to read you the names of some public officials. As I read each one, please just tell me if you think the job they are doing in office is excellent, good, fair, poor or very poor."

		EXCELLENT/ GOOD	FAIR	Poor/Very Poor	(NET POS TO NEG)
Governor Jane	e Hull		17010	TOOK	101120)
October	2002	21%	240/	200/	(47)
July	2002	21% 38	31% 32	38% 24	(- 17) (+ 14)
April	2002	36 37	32 28	29	(+ 14)
January	2002	34	34	22	(+ 6) (+ 12)
October	2002	43	29	20	(+ 12)
July	2001	36	29 29	23	(+ 23)
April	2001	38	28	23 24	(+ 14)
January	2001	36	29	24	(+ 14)
October	2001	47	31	12	(+ 35)
July	2000	51	29	11	(+ 40)
April	2000	41	32	13	(+ 28)
January	2000	50	30	10	(+ 40)
October	1999	55 50	26	8	(+ 47)
July	1999	58	23	7	(+ 51)
April	1999	58	23	5	(+ 53)
January	1999	65	20	4	(+ 61)
October	1998	57 	23	3	(+ 54)
July	1998	55	27	5	(+ 50)
April	1998	57	23	5	(+ 52)
January	1998	56	20	3	(+ 53)
October	1997	45	20	4	(+ 41)
Arizona State	<u>Legislature</u>				
October	2002	17%	35%	29%	(- 12)
October	2001	29	34	16	(+ 13)
April	2001	28	37	17	(+ 11)
January	2001	25	32	25	(-0-)
October	2000	31	35	16	(+ 15)
July	2000	25	37	18	(+ 7)
January	2000	30	36	18	(+ 12)
July	1999	30	32	18	(+ 12)
January	1999	37	33	11	(+ 26)
July	1998	25	38	21	(+ 4)
January	1998	31	35	18	(+ 13)
July	1997	27	39	17	(+ 10)
January	1997	28	40	17	(+ 11)
January	1996	22	46	17	(+ 5)
January	1995	22	41	15	(+ 7)
January	1994	23	39	22	(+ 1)
January	1993	15	39	26	(- 11)
April	1992	14	37	30	(- 16)
January	1991	15	35	30	(- 15)
January	1990	25	41	21	(+ 4)
•					. ,