

June 28, 2011

To: Interested Parties

Fr: Anzalone Liszt Research

Re: Findings and Political Implications for Paid Sick Day Legislation

Paid sick days victories in Philadelphia and Connecticut confirms recent polling results: there is deep and unwavering geographic and key demographic group support for legislation that guarantees all citizens the opportunity to earn paid sick days from their employers (See appendix A for polling methodology). Polling conducted by Anzalone Liszt Research among voters in Philadelphia, Connecticut and Denver demonstrate that voters understand that ensuring workers have paid sick days will promote public health, as well as make healthier more economically secure families and stronger businesses. Further, voters are more willing to support public officials who back this legislation, indicating its potential to help candidates who incorporate this issue in their campaigns. Below, we detail the collective findings from the surveys conducted by Anzalone Liszt Research in Philadelphia, Connecticut and Denver.

Key Findings

1. Voters readily offer deep and abiding support for this type of policy. The paid sick day legislation is popular everywhere we've polled, and strong support extends across demographic lines. In all three areas we polled, voters offered better than 2:1 support for the bill, even prior to learning any information about it. In Connecticut, support begins at 64% favor - 29% opposed. In Denver, support starts at 56% - 15%, and Philadelphia voters come out in the strongest initial support for it, 77% support – 17% opposed. Support cuts across party lines, as a majority of Democrats, Independents and Republicans all back it (see Appendix C for partisan breakdown by region). As Table 1 demonstrates, in each place, support either holds or expands after hearing a short, informative description of the bill, without any message or persuasion, indicating that voters will back the actual legislation, not just the idea in theory. See Appendix B for language of the bills tested in all three places.

Table 1: Uninformed to Short Description Vote

	Uninformed Vote (favor – oppose)	Short Description Vote (favor – oppose)
Connecticut	64% - 29%	73% - 24%
Philadelphia	77% - 17%	71% - 24%
Denver	56% - 15%	65% - 30%

2. Support is especially strong among key electoral targets for the 2012 presidential campaign. Initial support is strong across nearly every demographic. However, strongest levels of support come from unmarried women, moms, Hispanics, and Independent women, all of whom offer strong support that either holds or intensifies as additional information is provided.

Table 2: Support among key electoral targets

	2012 Target group (post-description vote)
Independents (total)	62% - 32%
Independent women	71% - 25%
Unmarried women	78% - 18%
Moms	80% - 16%
Hispanics	73% - 22%

3. Voters are inclined to use an official’s position on this issue to inform their voting decisions. Voters fundamentally see paid sick day legislation as a sensible, good-policy measure, and want to see public officials support it. A strong majority of voters in Philadelphia and Connecticut (the only places we tested this question) said that an official’s support for this policy would make them more likely to support them (64% more likely – 23% less likely and 58% more – 28% less respectively). This is especially true among unmarried women, seniors, African American women, moms, and Hispanics.
 - *Supporters are likely to reward officials who get behind this, and opponents will not punish them.* While supporters are likely to use an official’s position on this to inform their voting decisions, opponents are not. Only 49% of opponents to this legislation in both locations say they are less likely to support an official if they back this, while 80% of supporters are more likely to do so. Among key swing voter blocs, this is even more pronounced. Among Independents, 56% are more likely to support a candidate who supports this, only 32% are less likely.
4. Voters recognize the positive impact this will have on public health and families, and they reject opponents’ arguments about this legislation being bad for business and local economies. In all three areas, our positive message highlighting the impact this legislation will have on public health and families overcomes our opponents’ message threatening a weakened economy and job losses. Pairing these messages against each other, support in all three places holds at better than 2:1 support (see table 2), and strong support increases. See full language tested in Appendix D.

Table 3: Informed Vote with Proponents' and Opponents' messages

	Informed Vote (Favor – Oppose)
Philadelphia	78% - 17%
Connecticut	68% - 30%
Denver	63% - 33%

- *Voters strongly believe this legislation is good for business. The business community's arguments do not sway voters. In Connecticut and Philadelphia, voters believe that the legislation is good for area businesses by a double-digit margin. In Connecticut, 55% of voters agree with the statement *this proposal is good for Connecticut's businesses* while only 39% agree with the statement *this proposal is bad for Connecticut's businesses*. By an even wider margin voters in Philadelphia agree that it will be good for Philly businesses (64% - 26%). Minority voters are especially likely to feel this way, with 68% of African Americans and 70% of Hispanics believing it will be good for businesses in their respective localities.*

Appendix A: Methodology

Anzalone Liszt Research conducted three polls among voters. In Connecticut and Philadelphia, the polling was conducted PRIOR to the legislative victories.

Connecticut: From April 13-17, 2011, ALR conducted polling among 600 likely 2012 general election voters. The survey results are subject to a margin of error of 3.9 percentage points.

Philadelphia: From May 18-22, 2011, ALR conducted polling among 500 voters who had voted in the primary elections on May 17. The survey results are subject to a margin of error of 4.4 percentage points.

Denver: From April 26-May 1, 2011, ALR conducted polling among 500 likely 2011 municipal election voters. The survey results are subject to a margin of error of 4.4 percentage points.

Appendix B: Ballot / Legislative Language Read (note polling in Connecticut and Philadelphia was conducted prior to legislative and council passages)

Connecticut

As you may know, the State Legislature is considering a proposal that would require businesses in Connecticut, that have more than fifty employees, to provide at least five paid sick days to their employees to care for themselves or immediate family members and go to doctors' appointments.

Philadelphia

As you may know, the city council is considering a proposal that would require businesses in Philadelphia that have more than ten employees to provide paid sick days to their employees to care for themselves or immediate family members, up to seven days a year. Businesses that have ten or fewer employees would only be required to provide up to four paid sick days a year. From what you know, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

Denver

Shall the voters for the City and County of Denver adopt an ordinance that will provide that employees in Denver shall earn a certain amount of paid sick and safe time to be used for themselves or to care for a family member with the amount of time to be based on the number of hours they work but limited to seventy-two hours a year in the case of large business and forty hours in the case of small businesses with fewer than ten employees?

Appendix C: Support for Paid Sick Day legislation by region and party

	Favor – Oppose
<i>Philadelphia Total*</i>	71% - 24%
Democrats	72% - 23%
Republicans	64% - 29%
<i>Denver Total</i>	67% - 27%
Democrats	73% - 21%
Republicans	58% - 37%
Independents	65% - 33%
<i>Connecticut Total</i>	73% - 24%
Democrats	82% - 14%
Independents	75% - 21%
Republicans	58% - 42%

*Note: The Philadelphia poll was conducted among voters who voted in the closed party primaries on May 17th, therefore no Independent voters were included in the sample.

Appendix D: Balanced Positive and Negative Information

Connecticut

Supporters say that everyone benefits from this proposal. When sick employees do not receive paid sick days, instead of getting the care they need, many times they go to work sick, where they are less productive, risk infecting coworkers and the public, and take longer to get healthy. This proposal also lets people use their sick days to care for a sick family member. This proposal means healthier families and a stronger workforce.

Opponents say that this is bad for Connecticut's economy and businesses can't afford this right now. This proposal would cost businesses thousands of dollars each year and with businesses already struggling, it could cost jobs. It would also make Connecticut less competitive in attracting and keeping businesses because it would be the only state to require such unnecessary regulation and cost.

Philadelphia

Supporters say that this proposal is good for Philadelphia. When sick employees do not receive paid sick days, they have to choose between missing a paycheck or going to work sick, where they are less productive, risk getting others around them sick and take longer themselves to get healthy. This proposal also lets people use their sick days to care for sick family members without being penalized. This proposal means healthier families and a stronger workforce.

Opponents say that this proposal hurts businesses at a time when they cannot afford it. Requiring businesses to pay seven days of sick days per employee adds up to thousands of dollars a year, and in many cases will require businesses to double-pay for a shift by having to pay for the sick employee and their replacement. This unnecessary regulation will cause small businesses to cut jobs and wages for their employees and put some out of business.

Denver

Supporters say that this proposal would improve the health of working families and the strength of our workforce. Nearly forty percent of workers in Denver do not receive paid sick days, which means they lose pay and risk losing their jobs when they're sick. Paid sick days are particularly important for workers who interact with the public, like restaurant workers and child care providers who risk getting others sick if they have to come to work ill. By allowing employees to earn paid sick days, they and their families get healthier faster and are more productive in the workplace, which makes businesses more profitable.

Opponents say that this proposal hurts businesses at a time when they cannot afford it. Requiring businesses to provide nine paid sick days per employee adds up to thousands of dollars a year, and in many cases will require businesses to double-pay for a shift by having to pay for the sick employee and their replacement. It opens the door for abuse by employees who will use the time for personal errands, leaving their employer to cover their shift. This unnecessary regulation will cause small businesses to cut jobs and wages for their employees and put some out of business.