



THE GLOVER PARK GROUP

THE TARRANCE GROUP

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Wisconsin Insurance Alliance
FROM: B.J. Martino
David Cantor
DATE: April 6, 2009
RE: Summary Findings from a Bipartisan Survey of Voter Attitudes in Wisconsin

The bipartisan polling team of The Tarrance Group and The Glover Park Group are pleased to present The Wisconsin Insurance Alliance with findings from a survey of N= 500 registered “likely” voters in Wisconsin. The margin of error for the total sample is +/- 4.5% in 19 of 20 cases. The surveys were conducted on March 22-23, 2009.

Joint and Several Liability Proposal

The results of our recent survey indicate that Wisconsin voters have little desire for the joint and several liability proposal. Read a short description, a majority of Wisconsin voters oppose it.

Knowing that “in short, the provision would make each defendant in a civil lawsuit potentially liable for the entire amount of the plaintiff’s damages,” 57% of Wisconsin voters oppose the proposal, with 36% *strongly* opposing. At the same time, just 23% support it¹.

Opposition to joint and several liability holds at a majority among all partisan groups. Independent voters are 53% in opposition, Democrats at 55% oppose, and Republicans at fully 62% oppose.

Furthermore, upon hearing a brief argument from each side of the issue, Wisconsin voters’ opposition to joint and several liability holds fast. A 59% majority agrees with the statement that:

“The provision is unfair because individuals or businesses that are as little as 1% at fault can be made to pay up to 100% of the damages. This could hurt job growth and drive up the cost of goods and services in the state.”

At the same time, only 27% agree with the statement that:

“Right now, some victims are not being treated fairly. This provision is absolutely necessary to protect victims, and will make sure people who are hurt get the money they deserve.”

COMPLETE WORDING FOR THESE QUESTIONS FOLLOWS

¹ Note: complete question wording can be found at the end of this memorandum.



THE GLOVER PARK GROUP

THE TARRANCE GROUP

Now changing subjects slightly. As you may know, Governor Doyle has included in his proposed state budget a provision called "joint and several liability." In short, the provision would make each defendant in a civil lawsuit potentially liable for the entire amount of the plaintiff's damages. Based on what you know:

Do you support or oppose the "joint and several liability" provision to make each defendant in a civil lawsuit liable for the entire amount of the plaintiff's damages?

IF CHOICE IS MADE, ASK:

And do you strongly (Support/Oppose) or somewhat (Support/Oppose)?

- Support/strongly 1
- Support/somewhat 2
- UNSURE (DNR) 3
- Oppose/somewhat 4
- Oppose/strongly 5

(SUPJS1)

Changing subjects slightly, I'd like to read you two viewpoints about the provision called "joint and several liability." Please tell me which one comes closest to your own. **(READ & ROTATE ALTERNATIVES)**

Some people say/

Other people say that right now, some victims are not being treated fairly. This provision is absolutely necessary to protect victims, and will make sure people who are hurt get the money they deserve.

Other people say/

Some people say that the provision is unfair because individuals or businesses that are as little as 1% at fault can be made to pay up to 100% of the damages. This could hurt job growth and drive up the cost of goods and services in the state.

"Which viewpoint comes closest to your own?"

IF CHOICE MADE, ASK:
And do you feel strongly about that?

- provision is absolutely necessary /strongly 1
- provision is absolutely necessary 2
- BOTH EQUALLY (DNR) 3
- NEITHER (DNR) 4
- UNSURE (DNR) 5
- provision is a unfair 6
- provision is a unfair /strongly 7

###