

**GOVERNOR DEVAL PATRICK'S PROPOSAL FOR
THREE DESTINATION RESORT CASINOS IN
MASSACHUSETTS**

**A PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY OF
MASSACHUSETTS RESIDENTS**

Prepared by the



CENTER FOR POLICY ANALYSIS
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
DARTMOUTH

September 2007

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH CENTER FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

The University of Massachusetts Dartmouth Center for Policy Analysis is a multidisciplinary research unit that promotes economic, social, and political development by providing research and technical assistance to client organizations. The Center for Policy Analysis offers custom designed research and technical analysis in the areas of economic development, public management, program evaluation and polling research for government agencies, non-profit organizations, private businesses, and educational institutions. The Center for Policy Analysis strives to erode the walls between research and teaching by training students in the techniques of applied social science and by conducting university and community based educational programs. The Center for Policy Analysis does not pursue a predetermined research agenda, but is a flexible research organization responding on a timely basis to the problems and issues identified by client agencies.

Clyde W. Barrow, Ph.D., Political Science
Director

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Philip Melanson, Ph.D., Political Science
Chairman of the Board & Senior Research Associate

David Borges, M.P.A., Public Administration
Senior Research Associate

Chris Eisenhart, Ph.D., English
Senior Research Associate

John Fobanjong, Ph.D., Political Science
Senior Research Associate

William Hogan, Ph.D., Economics
Senior Research Associate

Toby Huff, Ph.D., Sociology
Senior Research Associate

Susan Krumholz, J.D., Ph.D., Sociology
Senior Research Associate

Spencer Ladd, M.F.A., Design
Senior Research Associate

Robin Robinson, Psy.D, Ph.D, Social Welfare
Senior Research Associate

Gail Russell, M.S., Ed.D., Nursing
Senior Research Associate

Shawna E. Sweeney, Ph.D., Political Science
Senior Research Associate

Jeffrey Robinson, M.P.A., Public Administration
Adjunct Research Associate

Paul Vigeant, M.A., Public Administration
Adjunct Research Associate

Luther Wallin, M.R.P., Regional Planning
Senior Research Associate

EXECUTIVE STAFF

David Borges, M.P.A., Public Administration
Senior Research Associate

Megan Gauthier
Research Assistant

Andrea Davis, Sociology
Assistant to the Director

ADJUNCT RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Jeffrey Robinson, M.P.A., Public Administration
UMass Dartmouth Controller

Paul Vigeant, M.A., Public Administration
SouthCoast Development Partnership

Authors: Clyde W. Barrow, David R. Borges, and Nina Galipeau

Correspondence and inquiries should be addressed to: Center for Policy Analysis, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, 285 Old Westport Road, North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747-2300 (telephone: 508-990-9660; fax: 508-999-8374).

Copyright © Center for Policy Analysis. All rights reserved. This document may not be reproduced in any form without prior written permission from the Center for Policy Analysis except by the Sponsor.

Website URL: www.umassd.edu/cfpa

The analysis and recommendations in this report do not represent an official statement or view of the University of Massachusetts.

Polling and Program Evaluation Series No. 56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
1.00 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT	1
2.00 METHODOLOGY.....	1
2.10 Survey Instrument	1
3.00 RESULTS	3
3.10 Do you support or oppose Governor Deval Patrick’s plan to authorize three destination resort casinos in Southeastern Massachusetts, Western Massachusetts and Greater Boston?.....	3
3.20 Support by Casino Visitation in Past 12 Months.....	3
3.30 Support by Age	4
3.40 Support by Gender	4
3.50 Support by Education.....	5
3.60 Support by Voter Registration	5
3.70 Support by Income.....	6
3.80 Support by Region	7
3.90 Support by City/Town	7
APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT	8
APPENDIX B - TABLES	10

[This page left blank intentionally]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Center for Policy Analysis at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth conducted a random sample telephone survey of Massachusetts residents that asked:

“Do you support or oppose Governor Deval Patrick’s plan to authorize three destination resort casinos in Southeastern Massachusetts, Western Massachusetts and Greater Boston?”

The survey also asked respondents if they have visited a casino in the last twelve months along with several demographic questions, including age, income and educational attainment. The survey was conducted from September 19, 2007 to September 29, 2007 using a survey instrument developed by the Center for Policy Analysis. A total of 1,190 telephone interviews were conducted for a +/- 2.8 percent margin of error at the 95 percent confidence level.

- The governor’s proposal to site destination resort casinos in three specific regions of the state draws strong support from a majority of respondents; Approximately 55 percent of respondents support the governor’s proposal, while 27 percent are opposed and 18 percent are undecided. Men favor the governor’s proposal by 59-26 percent, while women favor the proposal by a 51-31 percent margin.
- Residents in every region support the governor’s proposal: 63 percent-22 percent in central Massachusetts, 59 percent-27 percent in southeastern Massachusetts, 56 percent-25 percent in western Massachusetts, 55 percent-24 percent in northeastern Massachusetts, and 51 percent-29 percent in greater Boston. Cape and Island residents also support the governor’s proposal by a 49 percent-33 percent plurality.
- Results also show that respondents who have visited a casino during the past 12 months support the governor’s proposal by a 76-13 percent margin. Respondents who did not visit a casino in the past year support the governor’s proposal by a 43 percent-35 percent margin.
- A majority of respondents in the 18-29 (62.7%), 30-39 (56.3%) and 40-49 (56.2%) age groups support the Governor’s proposal for three destination resort casinos. While not a majority, respondents aged 50-59 support the proposal by 49.4 percent-31.4 percent and respondents age 60 and over support the proposal 48.6 percent-33.6 percent.
- Among income groups, all but one expressed majority support for the governor’s proposal. Those who earn less than \$25K a year favor the governor’s proposal by 58 percent-21 percent; \$25K-\$50K, 59 percent-25 percent; \$50K-\$75K, 61 percent-27 percent; \$75K-\$100K, 55 percent-28 percent; and those earning over \$150K annually, 56 percent-28 percent. Those earning between \$100K-\$150K supported the governor’s proposal by a 41 percent-32 percent plurality.
- Residents with less than a high school degree support the governor’s proposal by 64 percent-13 percent; high school graduates by 65 percent-20 percent; those who attended college, 52 percent-27 percent; those with an A.A., 54 percent-28 percent; those holding a B.A., 50 percent-28 percent; and those holding an M.A. or above, 44 percent-39 percent.

[This page left blank intentionally]

1.00 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

On September 24, 2007, Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick announced his plan to license three destination resort casinos in Massachusetts. While the plan does not provide specific locations for the casinos, the target areas are Western Massachusetts, Southeastern Massachusetts and Greater Boston.

To determine support for the Governor's proposal, the Center for Policy Analysis at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth conducted a telephone survey of Massachusetts residents that asked:

"Do you support or oppose Governor Deval Patrick's plan to authorize three destination resort casinos in Southeastern Massachusetts, Western Massachusetts and Greater Boston?"

The survey also asked respondents if they have visited a casino in the last twelve months and several demographic questions, including age, income and educational attainment.¹

2.00 METHODOLOGY

2.10 Survey Instrument

The random sample survey was conducted from September 19, 2007 to September 29, 2007 using a survey instrument developed by the Center for Policy Analysis. A total of 1,190 telephone interviews were conducted for a +/- 2.8 percent margin of error at the 95 percent confidence interval.²

The Center for Policy Analysis uses the Genesys Sampling Systems to generate random telephone numbers. Genesys Sampling Systems is used by many major private and university-based polling and survey organizations. The system uses a list of all possible telephone numbers in the United States to randomly generate a telephone sample for a designated geographic area. The survey was conducted using a random digit dialing (RDD) sample. The RDD sample ensures an equal and known probability of selection for every residential telephone number in the sample geographic frame.

¹ A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A.

² This means that if a question from the survey was asked 100 times, 95 of those times the percentage of people giving a particular answer to the question would be within 2.8 percentage points of the answer given in this poll.

Student research assistants and Center staff were employed as telephone interviewers. These interviewers have conducted numerous telephone polls on behalf of the Center and all have been trained intensively, including practice interviews. Senior-level staff at the Center for Policy Analysis monitored the interviewers at all times to ensure high quality data collection. In addition, interviewers who speak Spanish were available to conduct surveys with respondents who speak that language.

The Center for Policy Analysis conducted interviews between 9:00 am and 8:00 pm on weekdays and from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm on Saturdays. This range of hours provided the interviewers an opportunity to contact hard to reach respondents, a procedure crucial to producing high quality survey data. Callbacks were scheduled at the convenience of the respondents. Households were called up to five times before they were deemed unreachable.

The Center's senior staff continually monitored the progress of interview outcomes and each block of telephone numbers to prevent problem cases that could interfere with the integrity of survey procedures. The survey procedures used by the Center for Policy Analysis adhere to the highest quality academic and government research standards.

3.00 RESULTS

3.10 Do you support or oppose Governor Deval Patrick's plan to authorize three destination resort casinos in Southeastern Massachusetts, Western Massachusetts and Greater Boston?

A majority of respondents (54.7%) support the governor's proposal for three destination resort casinos in greater Boston, western and southeastern Massachusetts, while 27.1 percent of respondents are opposed and 18.2 percent are undecided (see Table 1).³

Table 1

	Percent	N
Support	54.7%	651
Do Not Support	27.1%	322
Undecided	18.2%	216

3.20 Support by Casino Visitation in Past 12 Months

More than three-in-four respondents (76.3%) who have visited a casino during the past 12 months support the governor's plan for three destination resort casinos, while 13.0 percent do not support the plan and 10.7 percent are undecided. In addition, respondents who did not visit a casino in the past 12 months support the governor's proposal by a 42.5 percent to 31.5 percent margin, with 22.4 percent undecided (see Table 2).

Table 2

	Has Visited	Has not Visited
Support	76.3%	42.5%
Do Not Support	13.0%	35.1%
Undecided	10.7%	22.4%

³ Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding.

3.30 Support by Age

A majority of respondents in the 18-29 (62.7%), 30-39 (56.3%) and 40-49 (56.2%) age groups support the Governor's proposal for three destination resort casinos. While not a majority, respondents aged 50-59 support the proposal by 49.4 percent-31.4 percent and respondents age 60 and over support the proposal 48.6 percent-33.6 percent. The percentage of respondents who are undecided about the proposal is fairly consistent between age groups (see Table 3).

Table 3

	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Support	62.7%	56.3%	56.2%	49.4%	48.6%
Do not support	19.9%	27.1%	23.4%	31.4%	33.6%
Undecided	17.4%	16.7%	20.4%	19.2%	17.8%

3.40 Support by Gender

A higher percentage of men (59.1%) favor the Governor's proposal for three destination resort casinos in comparison to women (51.0%), although a majority of both sexes favor the plan (see Table 4).

Table 4

	Men	Women
Support	59.1%	51.0%
Do Not Support	25.5%	28.5%
Undecided	15.4%	20.5%

3.50 Support by Education

Residents with less than a high school degree support the governor's proposal by 64.1 percent-12.8 percent; high school graduates by 65.2 percent-19.6 percent; those who attended college, 51.8 percent-26.7 percent; those with an Associate's degree, 53.5 percent-28.3 percent; those holding a Bachelor's degree, 50.9 percent-28.8 percent; and those holding a Master's degree or above, 43.7 percent-39.1 percent. Opposition to the plan increases as the level of the respondent's education rises; opposition is lowest among respondents with less than a high school diploma (12.8%) and highest among respondents with Master's degrees (39.1%) (see Table 5).

Table 5

	< HS	High School	Some College	Assoc.	Bachelor's	Master's +
Support	64.1%	65.2%	51.8%	53.5%	50.9%	43.7%
Do not support	12.8%	19.6%	26.7%	28.3%	28.8%	39.1%
Undecided	23.1%	15.2%	21.5%	18.2%	20.3%	17.2%

3.60 Support by Voter Registration

A majority of both registered (53.7%) and not registered voters (60.9%) support the governor's plan for three destination resort casinos, while 28.8 percent of registered voters and 16.0 percent of non registered voters do not support the plan. In addition, a higher percentage of voters who are not registered are undecided about the plan (23.1%) in comparison to registered voters (17.5%) (see Table 6).

Table 6

	Registered	Not Registered
Support	53.7%	60.9%
Do Not Support	28.8%	16.0%
Undecided	17.5%	23.1%

3.70 Support by Income

Among income groups, all but one expressed majority support for the governor's proposal. Respondents who earn less than \$25K a year favor the governor's proposal by 58 percent-21 percent; \$25K-\$50K, 59 percent-25 percent; \$50K-\$75K, 61 percent-27 percent; \$75K-\$100K, 55 percent-28 percent; and those earning over \$150K annually, 56 percent-28 percent. Those earning between \$100K-\$150K supported the governor's proposal by a 41 percent-32 percent plurality.

Table 7

	<\$25K	\$25K- \$50K	\$50K- \$75K	\$75K- \$100K	\$100K- \$150K	\$150K+
Support	57.7%	59.3%	60.8%	54.7%	41.3%	55.9%
Do not support	21.1%	24.8%	27.0%	28.1%	31.7%	27.9%
Undecided	21.1%	15.9%	12.2%	17.3%	26.9%	16.2%

3.80 Support by Region

Residents in every region support the governor's proposal: 62.7 percent in central Massachusetts, 58.5 percent in southeastern Massachusetts, 56.1 percent in western Massachusetts, 55.3 percent in northeastern Massachusetts, and 50.0 percent in greater Boston. While not a majority, Cape and Island residents also support the governor's proposal with a 48.3 percent plurality. Nearly one-in-three Cape and Islands respondents (32.8%) do not support the proposal (see Table 8).

Table 8

	Cape & Islands	Greater Boston	Northeast	Southeastern	Western	Central
Support	48.3%	50.0%	55.3%	58.5%	56.1%	62.7%
Do not Support	32.8%	30.0%	23.7%	26.6%	25.2%	22.3%
Undecided	19.0%	20.0%	21.1%	14.9%	18.7%	15.1%

The regions are defined as:

- Cape & Islands: Barnstable County, Dukes County, Nantucket County
- Greater Boston: Middlesex County, Suffolk County, Norfolk County
- Northeastern Massachusetts: Essex County
- Southeastern Massachusetts: Bristol County, Plymouth County
- Western Massachusetts: Berkshire County, Franklin County, Hampshire County, Hampden County
- Central Massachusetts: Worcester County

3.90 Support by City/Town

A higher percentage of respondents who live in cities approve of the Governor's plan in comparison to respondents who live in towns (51.0%), although a majority of both groups support the plan.

Table 9

	City	Town
Support	58.8%	51.0%
Do Not Support	23.2%	30.7%
Undecided	18.1%	18.2%

Appendix A – Survey Instrument

INTRO:

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm calling from UMass Dartmouth. How are you today? We are conducting a short confidential survey on the prospect of casinos in Massachusetts. The survey will take 1 minute. Do you have just one minute to complete the survey?

[IF YES]

Thank you. Before we begin let me assure you that all your responses are strictly confidential. We do not have any information about you but your telephone number. Your telephone number was randomly generated from all households in Massachusetts.

First, I'd like to ask if you are at least 18 years of age.

- Yes
- No

[If yes, proceed to next question. If no, ask if someone over 18 is available. If not, tell the person that you will call back at another time].

And in which town or city do you live? _____ **[Town]**

1. Do you support or oppose Governor Deval Patrick's plan to authorize three destination resort casinos in Southeastern Massachusetts, Western Massachusetts and Greater Boston? **[support]**
 - support
 - do not support
 - undecided
 - don't know
 - refused
2. Have you visited a casino in the last 12 months? **[visited]**
 - yes
 - no
 - don't know
 - refused
3. Do you mind telling me your age? _____ **[age]**
4. Sex **[sex]**
 - male
 - female

*GOVERNOR DEVAL PATRICK'S PROPOSAL FOR THREE DESTINATION
RESORT CASINOS IN MASSACHUSETTS*

5. What is the last grade of school that you completed? [**school**]
- less than high school
 - high school diploma
 - some college
 - Associate's
 - Bachelor's
 - Graduate or higher
 - Don't know
 - refused
6. Are you a registered voter? [**voter**]
- yes
 - no
 - don't know
 - refused
7. Can you please tell me what your family income for the past year is? [**income**]
- Less than \$25,000
 - \$25,000 to \$50,000
 - \$50,000 to \$75,000
 - \$75,000 to 100,000
 - \$100,000 to \$150,000
 - \$150,000 or more
 - don't know
 - refused

These are all the questions that I have. Thank you for your time.

Appendix B - Tables

Table A – Crosstabs by Support, Do Not Support, Undecided

	Support	N	Do Not Support	N	Undecided	N	Total N
Gender (Significance .013)							
Male	50.0%	326	43.7%	141	39.4%	85	552
Female	50.0%	326	56.3%	182	60.6%	131	639
Age (Significance .023)							
18 to 29	24.0%	151	15.5%	48	20.1%	42	241
29 to 39	21.5%	135	21.0%	65	19.1%	40	240
40 to 49	21.0%	132	17.8%	55	23.0%	48	235
50 to 59	13.5%	85	17.5%	54	15.8%	33	172
60 +	20.0%	126	28.2%	87	22.0%	46	259
Region (Significance .235)							
Cape & Islands	4.3%	28	5.9%	19	5.1%	11	58
Greater Boston	34.9%	227	42.2%	136	42.1%	91	454
Northeastern MA	9.7%	63	8.4%	27	11.1%	24	114
Southeastern MA	21.7%	141	19.9%	64	16.7%	36	241
Western MA	13.4%	87	12.1%	39	13.4%	29	155
Central MA	16.0%	104	11.5%	37	11.6%	25	166
City/Town (Significance .009)							
City	51.0%	332	40.6%	131	47.2%	102	565
Town	49.0%	319	59.4%	192	52.8%	114	625
Visited a Casino? (Significance .000)							
Has visited casino	50.4%	328	17.3%	56	21.3%	46	430
Has not visited casino	49.6%	323	82.7%	267	78.7%	170	760
Educational Attainment (Significance .000)							
Less than high school	3.8%	25	1.6%	5	4.1%	9	39
High school diploma	36.3%	236	22.2%	71	25.3%	55	362
Some college	15.2%	99	15.9%	51	18.9%	41	191
Associate's	8.2%	53	8.8%	28	8.3%	18	99
Bachelor's	22.0%	143	25.3%	81	26.3%	57	281
Graduate or higher	14.5%	94	26.3%	84	17.1%	37	215
Registered to Vote? (Significance .003)							
Registered Voter	85.3%	551	92.2%	295	83.3%	180	1,026
Not Registered Voter	14.7%	95	7.8%	25	16.7%	36	156
Family Income (Significance .071)							
<\$25,000	18.0%	82	14.0%	30	20.7%	30	142
\$25,000 to \$50,000	27.9%	127	24.6%	53	23.4%	34	214
\$50,000 to \$75,000	19.7%	90	18.7%	40	12.4%	18	148
\$75,000 to \$100,000	16.7%	76	18.2%	39	16.6%	24	139
\$100,000 to \$150,000	9.4%	43	15.4%	33	19.3%	28	104
>\$150,000	8.3%	38	8.9%	19	7.6%	11	68

Table B – Crosstabs by Demographic Variables

Gender (Significance .013)		
	Male	Female
Support	59.1%	51.0%
Do not support	25.5%	28.5%
Undecided	15.4%	20.5%

Age (Significance .023)					
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Support	62.7%	56.3%	56.2%	49.4%	48.6%
Do not support	19.9%	27.1%	23.4%	31.4%	33.6%
Undecided	17.4%	16.7%	20.4%	19.2%	17.8%

Region (Significance .235)							
	Cape & Islands	Greater Boston	Northeast	Southeastern	Western	Central	
Support	48.3%	50.0%	55.3%	58.5%	56.1%	62.7%	
Do not support	32.8%	30.0%	23.7%	26.6%	25.2%	22.3%	
Undecided	19.0%	20.0%	21.1%	14.9%	18.7%	15.1%	

City/Town (Significance .009)		
	City	Town
Support	58.8%	51.0%
Do not support	23.2%	30.7%
Undecided	18.1%	18.2%

Visited a Casino? (Significance: .000)		
	Has Visited	Has not Visited
Support	76.3%	42.5%
Do not support	13.0%	35.1%
Undecided	10.7%	22.4%

Educational Attainment (Significance .000)						
	< HS	High School	Some College	Associate's	Bachelor's	Master's +
Support	64.1%	65.2%	51.8%	53.5%	50.9%	43.7%
Do not support	12.8%	19.6%	26.7%	28.3%	28.8%	39.1%
Undecided	23.1%	15.2%	21.5%	18.2%	20.3%	17.2%

Registered to Vote? (Significance .003)		
	Yes	No
Support	53.7%	60.9%
Do not support	28.8%	16.0%
Undecided	17.5%	23.1%

Family Income (Significance .071)						
	<\$25,000	\$25-\$50	\$50-\$75	\$75-\$100	\$100-\$150	\$150+
Support	57.7%	59.3%	60.8%	54.7%	41.3%	55.9%
Do not support	21.1%	24.8%	27.0%	28.1%	31.7%	27.9%
Undecided	21.1%	15.9%	12.2%	17.3%	26.9%	16.2%