Trends in National Spending Priorities, 1973-2010

Tom W. Smith

General Social Survey National Opinion Research Center University of Chicago

February, 2011

Facing soaring deficits and disagreements over the mix of taxes and spending in the stimulus program, the President and the Congress may wish to consider what the American people think governmental spending priorities should be and how their preferences have changed over the last four decades.

Since 1973 the General Social Surveys (GSSs) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago have asked people whether government spending in various areas from health to foreign aid is too much, too little, or about right. Table 1 presents the spending preferences of the American public for all areas across all years. (The question wording is given in Table 1 and details on the GSSs appear in the Technical Appendix.) Eleven spending topics have been covered in the 27 GSSs between 1973 and 2010, 20 spending areas from 1984-1998, 21 in 2000, and 22 in 2002-2010.

To help distill this crunch of numbers, public support for spending is summarized in net spending scores. Net spending is the % saying that "too little" is being spent minus the % saying "too much" is being spent. For example, in 2010 60.2% said that "too little" was spent on the environment and 11.7% said "too much" was spent for a net spending score of +48.5 (i.e. 60.2% - 11.7 = +48.5 percentage points). If everyone favored more spending for an area, the maximum net spending score would be +100.0 and if everyone wanted less spending, the net spending score would -100.0. Positive scores indicate that more people want to increase spending than to decrease it and negative scores mean that the cutters outnumber the adders.

Current Priorities:

Education had generally led spending priorities in recent years, topping the list in 1996-2002 and 2006-2010. In absolute terms support for educational spending has been very high and changed little since 1989 (with net spending scores ranging from +65.8 to +71.5).<sup>1</sup>

After a first place rank in 2004 Health finished second in 2006-2010 with scores of +64.9 to +68.1.

Together Health and Education distinguish themselves from the other areas as regularly being among the most favored programs during the last decade. In ten surveys since 1990 Health topped the list twice and Education finished first eight times. Moreover, they both are consistently ahead of the next group of spending areas.

Next, in 2010 comes six closely grouped areas, Assistance to the Poor third at +57.6, Halting Crime fourth at +51.2, Social Security fifth at +48.9, the Environment 6th at +48.5, Dealing with Drug Addiction 7th at +46.0, and Assistance for Childcare 8th at

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Table 2 shows the rank and net spending scores for the eleven areas consistently covered from 1973 to 2010, Table 3 shows the same for the areas covered in 1984-2010, and Table 4 for the areas covered in 2002-2010. The current (2010) rankings mentioned in this section are from Table 4.

+43.8. These spending areas are not only close in absolute terms, but have frequently switched relative positions in recent years.

Now in 3<sup>rd</sup> place at +57.6, Assistance to the Poor has strongly rebounded from a 10th place showing in 1996. It showed its top relative finish ever in 2002-2010 and had its best ever absolute score (+63.5) in 2004.

Halting Crime was the perennial top choice from 1974 to 1988 and even regained first place in 1993 and 1994. But since 1994 net spending has dropped from +71.4 to +50.6 in 2002, the lowest support for Halting Crime ever recorded. Its fourth place finish in 2010 is its best rank since 1998, but its absolute score of +51.2 is marginally lower than in recent years.

Social Security has gained major ground in recent years rising from 10th place in 1993 and 1994 to 9th in 1996, 5th in 1998, 4th in 2000-2004, and 5th in 2006-2010. Its net spending score of +60.5 in 2004 in was the highest it has ever achieved. Since then it has remained in  $5^{\text{th}}$  place, but its absolute score has slipped to 48.9 in 2010.

Support for environmental spending rose from +35.8 in 1980 to +70.4 and a first-place rank in 1989. But then backing of the Environment declined to +51.3 and a 7th place position in 1993. Then the Environment nudged upwards in both its net spending score and its relative rank, reaching 4th place in both 2006 and 2008, but it then declined to 6<sup>th</sup> position in 2010 with a score of +48.5.

Dealing with Drug Addiction hit its record high of +66.8 and ranked 2nd in 1988, but slid back to a 7th place position with +57.7 by 1990. In 2006, both its rank (6th place) and net spending (+54.8) showed gains over recent years. But in 2010 it slipped to 7<sup>th</sup> place at +46.0.

Assistance for Childcare is 8th with a score of +43.8 in 2010. Since first included in 2000, support for more spending for childcare has weakened somewhat.

Drug Rehabilitation comes in 9th place in 2010 with a score of +39.1. Support for spending on Drug Rehabilitation has almost always been lower than support for Dealing with Drug Addiction.

Law Enforcement is in 10th place with a score of +36.4 in 2010. Support for spending on Law Enforcement has always trailed support for Halting Crime because people are attracted to the results-oriented action promised in the latter area.

In 11th place come Highways and Bridges with a score of +32.9 in 2010. Its 2010 position is the highest it ever achieved and well above its 16<sup>th</sup> place rank in 2004.

Mass Transportation is at 12th place in 2010 with a score of +31.9. While higher than in the early 2000s, support slipped from its all-time best  $10^{th}$  place finish in 2008 with a score of +40.8.

Supporting Scientific Research is 13th in 2010 with a score of +27.9. Since first included in 2002, support first grew, but then fell back a bit in 2008-2010.

Parks and Recreation is in 14th place with a score of +27.5 in 2010. Parks and Recreation has stayed around the same position over the years and its net spending score has changed little.

In 15th place in 2010 comes Solving the Problems of Big Cities

with a score of +22.9. In both rank and absolute score, support for Solving the Problems of Big Cities is at an all-time low in 2010.

In 16th and 17th places in 2010 are two items on government programs for African Americans. Support for Improving the Condition of Blacks is at +19.4 and for the less results-promising Assistance to Blacks support stands at +5.9.

Defense is in 18th place in 2010 with a net spending score of -9.2. It is the first topic on the list to show a negative, net spending score meaning that more people want to make cuts than to increase funding. While low on the priority list, support rose appreciably from a low of -33.4 in 1993 to a recent high of +7.8 in 2002 in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Support for more spending then was down in 2006-2010, shifting back into negative scores.

In 19th place comes Assistance to Big Cities at -19.2 in 2010. It finishes much worse than Solving the Problems of Big Cities because it does not promise positive results. It has shown little change in its rank or absolute score over the years. It is one of only four areas that has always had negative scores.

Welfare in 20th place in 2010 with a score of -19.2 has regained considerable ground from a near record low of -49.3 in 1994. (Its low point was -49.6 in 1977). However, support for Welfare did not rise in 2010 despite the economic downturn. Welfare has always been favored much less than Assistance to the Poor. People like the idea of the government helping those with lowincomes, but many consider Welfare a failed program. Part of the rise in support for Welfare reflects a positive response to the welfare reforms of the mid-1990s.

In 21st place is Space Exploration with a score of -21.0. Space has always finished close to the bottom. While its absolute score is up from -44.5 in 1993, its rank is unchanged.

In last place in this and every year comes Foreign Aid with a score of -55.1 in 2010. This is a fairly strong score for Foreign Aid, up from -70 to -72 in the early and mid-1990s, but this still leaves it solidly in 22nd place.

Overall Spending Trends:

Support for overall spending (i.e. the average net spending across areas) has always been positive with more people favoring increases than cuts (Table 5). Looking at the 11 items that can be tracked from 1973 to 2010, support declined in the early 1970s to low points in 1976-78 (+11). The public then generally increased its overall support for spending over the next dozen years to highs of +24/25 in 1988-90. Then overall spending once again slipped to a moderate level of +16.8 in 1994 before rising again to a near record high of +23.7 in 2006, but then declined to +19.7 in 2010.

Support for domestic social spending (average net spending for Health, Education, Welfare, Solving the Problems of Big Cities, and Improving the Condition of Blacks) has also always been in the pluses. It fell from an early high of +29.2 in 1974 to a low of +13/14 in 1977-78. Support then generally moved up to a record high of +39.9 in 1990. Support then slipped to +26.4 in 1994, then rose to +36.7 in 2008 (its second highest) before slipping back to +31.3 in 2010.

#### Conclusion:

Despite a dislike of taxes (e.g. in 2010 52% said their own federal income tax was too high, 46% about right, and 2% too low), more people have always favored increases in spending than cuts. In 2010, as in most years since the 1970s, people have backed more spending in about three-quarters of the areas and less spending in only the bottom quarter. Moreover, the number of areas with positive net spending scores not only outnumbered areas with negative scores, but are also larger. In 2010, the largest negative score (-55.1 for Foreign Aid) was bested by the top three positive scores (Education +68.6, Health +64.9, Assistance for the Poor +57.6).

The level of support has however waxed and waned over the decades. Support for both overall spending and domestic social spending declined from the early 1970s to the early 1980s before rebounding to a peak in 1990. Then support again fell off to lows in 1994-1996. After that support again picked up with highest over overall spending in 2006 and for domestic social spending in 2008. Both scales then decreased in 2010.

Currently Education and Health are clearly the public's top two spending priorities with very high scores (+65 to +69) that are consistently above even other very popular areas like Assistance to the Poor, the Environment, Social Security, Halting Crime, Assistance for Childcare, and Dealing with Drug Addiction (+44 to +58).

#### Table 1

#### Trends in National Spending Priorities, 1973-2010

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount. First, (READ ITEM A)... are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on (ITEM)?

- A. Space Exploration Program/Space Exploration<sup>a</sup>
- B. Improving and Protecting the Environment/The Environment
- C. Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health/Health
- D1. Solving the Problems of the Big Cities
- D2. Assistance to Big Cities
- E1. Halting the Rising Crime Rate
- E2. Law Enforcement
- F1. Dealing with Drug Addiction
- F2. Drug Rehabilitation
- G. Improving the Nation's Education System/Education
- H1. Improving the Condition of Blacks
- H2. Assistance to Blacks
- I. The Military, Armaments, and Defense/National Defense
- J. Foreign Aid/Assistance to Other Countries
- K1. Welfare
- K2. Assistance to the Poor
- L. Highways and Bridges
- M. Social Security
- N. Mass Transportation
- O. Parks and Recreation
- P. Assistance for Childcare
- Q. Supporting Scientific Research

<sup>a</sup>For explanation of the dual headings see Technical Appendix.

## A. Space Exploration Program/Space Exploration

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	31.1	29.2	32.2	29.4	37.3	37.9	37.7	44.5
Net (TL - TM)	-53.9	-55.0	-51.8	-51.8	-41.1	-37.7	-22.9	-28.3
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	43.1	43.8	45.7	48.3	43.5	42.6	46.3	11.4 46.8 41.8
Net (TL - TM)	-27.3	-32.1	-31.3	-30.1	-22.7	-16.8	-21.6	-30.4
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	48.3	39.7	41.6	44.6	46.9	14.1 42.3 43.6	49.7	45.5
Net (TL - TM)	-25.9	-44.5	-39.4	-30.0	-30.1	-29.5	-25.6	-25.7
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	14.7 47.9 37.4	46.8	16.4 48.2 37.4					
Net (TL - TM)	-22.7	-24.3	-21.0					

			5		•	-	-	
	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much								
Net (TL - TM)	+56.9	+55.4	+48.0	+49.2	+40.5	+44.7	+35.8	+42.2
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	32.5	32.4	29.6	31.3	27.4	27.4	20.4	21.2
Net (TL - TM)	+48.7	+53.3	+54.4	+56.1	+60.4	+63.5	+70.4	+71.2
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right	71.8	60.5	62.7	62.0	64.7	64.3	61.9	64.9
Too much	5.0	9.2	28.2	10.3	27.5 7.8	27.7 8.0	29.8 8.2	6.8
Too much Net (TL - TM)	5.0	9.2	9.0	10.3	7.8	8.0	8.2	6.8
Too much	5.0	9.2 +51.3	9.0	10.3	7.8	8.0	8.2	6.8
Too much	5.0 +66.8 2006 68.9 24.1	9.2 +51.3 2008 67.4 23.9	9.0 +53.7 2010 60.2 28.1	10.3 +51.7	7.8	8.0	8.2	6.8

## B. Improving and Protecting the Environment/The Environment

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	31.8	28.8	29.1	32.4	34.0	35.9	34.3	33.8
Net (TL - TM)	+58.6	+62.6	+60.2	+58.4	+52.4	+50.3	+50.1	+52.4
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	34.7	33.4	34.5	34.1	25.3	25.5	25.0	24.1
Net (TL - TM)	+52.6	+53.0	+50.0	+52.9	+63.0	+64.1	+65.8	+68.5
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right			66.0	65.6	69.6	71.9	73.7	78.3 15.8
Too much				9.4				
Net (TL - TM)	3.3	10.7	11.0	9.4	6.9	5.0	5.5	5.9
	3.3	10.7 +62.5	11.0	9.4	6.9	5.0	5.5	5.9
	3.3 +67.4 2006 73.5 19.4	10.7 +62.5 2008 76.2 15.7	11.0 +55.0 2010 72.8 19.3	9.4	6.9	5.0	5.5	5.9

# C. Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health/Health

## D1. Solving the Problems of the Big Cities

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	55.4 31.0 13.7	58.6 29.0 12.3	56.5 29.5 14.0	48.0 29.9 22.0	47.7 29.6 22.7	45.0 33.6 21.5	45.9 29.5 24.6	49.8 26.9 23.4
Net (TL - TM)	+41.7	+46.3	+42.5	+26.0	+25.0	+23.5	+21.3	+26.4
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
About right	47.3 34.5 18.3	33.3	38.0	49.2 33.3 17.5	39.2	34.4	53.1 34.0 12.9	30.4
Net (TL - TM)	+29.0	+37.2	+24.5	+31.7	+28.0	+43.8	+40.2	+48.3
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	33.5	25.3	25.0		34.5	35.8	40.6	42.5
Net (TL - TM)	+38.6	+49.6	+46.7	+44.2	+37.7	+39.6	+30.0	+29.1
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	48.1 39.1 12.9	48.6 38.5 12.9	42.8 37.3 19.9					
Net (TL - TM)	+35.2	+35.7	+22.9					
D2. Assistance	e to Bi	ig Cit	Les					
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
About right	42.0	37.4	43.4	22.5 43.1 34.4	40.3	40.1	44.7	39.5
Net (TL - TM)	-19.6	-21.6	-22.4	-11.9	-9.1	-15.3	-5.5	-12.1
	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Too little About right Too much		38.0	37.9	22.0 44.8 33.2	42.3	17.2 47.2 35.6	48.7	42.1
Net (TL - TM)	-9.7	-7.7	-10.9	-11.2	-3.9	-18.4	-13.9	-14.5

Table 1 (continued)

# D2. Assistance to Big Cities

	2008	2010
Too little About right Too much	21.9 45.2 33.0	42.4

Net (TL - TM) -11.1 -19.2

## ${\tt E1}\,.$ Halting the Rising Crime Rate

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much		24.4	25.1	21.8	23.4	25.9	21.7	18.9
Net (TL - TM)	+63.5	+65.5	+63.5	+61.8	+64.5	+61.3	+66.1	+70.7
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	68.8 25.8 5.4	71.3 23.8 4.9	65.1 29.0 5.9	66.4 29.1 4.5	72.2 22.5 5.3	72.4 23.4 4.2	74.9 20.1 4.9	70.9 24.8 4.3
Net (TL - TM)	+63.4	+66.4	+59.2	+61.9	+66.9	+68.2	+70.0	+66.9
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	26.7	21.1	16.3		28.9	33.6	35.6	
Net (TL - TM)	+62.9	+68.6	+71.4	+61.7	+56.3	+55.2	+50.6	+52.4
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	32.1	31.4	32.2					
Net (TL - TM)	+54.6	+55.0	+51.2					
E2. Law Enford	cement							
Too little About right Too much	1984 57.7 35.3 6.9	58 1	1986 52.8 40.5 6.6	53 7	56 4	62 3	58 0	56 9
Net (TL - TM)	+50.8	+52.4	+46.2	+47.2	+50.9	+55.5	+52.3	+50.8
	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
About right			59.1 32.1 8.8			41.3		55.3 35.2 9.5
Net (TL - TM)	+54.2	+58.3	+50.3	+48.5	+43.9	+37.7	+45.1	+45.8

## E2. Law Enforcement

	2008	2010
Too little About right Too much	37.0	48.3 39.7 11.9

Net (TL - TM) +44.8 +36.4

## F1. Dealing with Drug Addiction

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much		29.4	32.3	28.5	31.9	32.7	27.3	29.6
Net (TL - TM)	+63.7	+56.6	+50.8	+55.7	+50.8	+48.3	+57.0	+51.9
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
About right	62.0 32.2 5.8	27.7	29.6	33.8	28.1	70.9 25.0 4.1	20.7	
Net (TL - TM)	+56.2	+60.1	+59.2	+54.0	+60.9	+66.8	+66.7	+57.7
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	31.8	28.7	27.6	27.8	29.5		31.8	35.0
Net (TL - TM)	+52.4	+55.2	+54.0	+48.7	+51.1	+53.1	+47.4	+45.6
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	30.6	32.6	56.4 33.2 10.4					
Net (TL - TM)	+54.8	+47.2	+46.0					
F2. Drug Rehal	bilita	tion						
Too little About right Too much	1984 50.7 39.2 10.1	57.8	34.4	60.8 31.2	61.3	62.5	66.7 25.1	61.4
Net (TL - TM)	+40.6	+49.5	+45.6	+52.8	+53.1	+53.2	+58.5	+53.6
	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Too little About right Too much	57.9 31.4 10.7	55.5 32.6 11.9	57.2 30.7 12.1	56.0 31.6 12.4	54.8 34.0 11.2	54.7 32.6 12.7	52.4 36.3 11.2	54.9 33.5 11.6

Net (TL - TM) +47.2 +43.6 +45.1 +43.6 +43.6 +42.0 +41.2 +43.3

## F2. Drug Rehabilitation

	2008	2010
Too little About right Too much	37.5	51.6 35.8 12.5

Net (TL - TM) +36.7 +39.1

# G. Improving the Nation's Education System/Education

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	39.4	38.3	36.5	52.6 38.1 9.3	39.8	34.9	34.3	33.8
Net (TL - TM)	+42.0	+45.3	+40.1	+43.3	+40.6	+41.5	+46.0	+48.2
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	32.2	20.6	28.8	30.4	29.3	27.7	25.5	22.5
Net (TL - TM)	+55.6	+59.4	+58.7	+60.3	+59.5	+64.7	+67.9	+71.5
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	24.8	23.0	21.5	21.5	20.5	21.8	19.0	19.1
Net (TL - TM)	+66.2	+65.8	+67.5	+67.5	+66.3	+68.4	+70.8	+71.1
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	20.4	20.8	20.8					
Net (TL - TM)	+68.7	+68.4	+68.6					

## H1. Improving the Condition of Blacks

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	35.3 41.9 22.8	33.4 44.5 22.0	29.4 44.4 26.3	29.6 42.7 27.6	27.5 46.2 26.3	26.3 46.9 26.8	26.7 47.8 25.5	30.2 48.0 21.8
Net (TL - TM)	+12.5	+11.4	+3.1	+2.0	+1.2	-0.5	+1.2	+8.4
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
About right	31.7 47.2 21.1	46.0	32.1 46.3 21.6		46.3	38.0 45.3 16.6	46.1	
Net (TL - TM)	+10.6	+21.0	+10.5	+20.6	+21.1	+21.4	+21.2	+25.2
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	39.0 45.3 15.6	43.6	43.9	35.4 43.2 21.4	45.2	45.4	48.8	50.1
Net (TL - TM)	+23.4	+22.4	+11.9	+14.0	+19.0	+21.3	+14.7	+19.5
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	37.0 47.1 15.9	38.2 47.7 14.0	35.6 48.2 16.2					
Net (TL - TM)	+21.1	+24.2	+19.4					
H2. Assistance	e to Bl	lacks						
Too little About right Too much	1984 26.5 45.9 27.6	28.8 44.8	23.5 47.8	1987 28.2 47.6 24.2	29.0 46.2	44.7	31.1 45.7	34.5
Net (TL - TM)								
	-1.1	+2.4	-5.3			+7.3		+14.4
	-1.1 1993	+2.4 1994	-5.3 1996	+4.0				
Too little About right Too much	1993 27.2	1994 26.5 44.1	1996 25.4 46.4	+4.0 1998 29.3 45.6	+4.2 2000 33.4 42.5	+7.3 2002	+7.9 2004 27.9 51.6	2006 27.7 46.5

#### H2. Assistance to Blacks

	2008	2010
Too little About right Too much	31.1 46.7 22.2	49.4
Net (TL - TM)	+ 8.9	+5.9

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	47.4	48.5	17.8 49.3 32.9	45.0	25.7 49.4 24.8	47.4	27.1	37.2
Net (TL - TM)	-28.4	-15.7	-15.1	-2.6	+0.9	+6.9	+48.9	+0.4
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	40.2	43.0	42.5	44.3		42.6	15.8 42.9 41.3	
Net (TL - TM)	-8.8	-21.3	-26.5	-21.6	-22.8	-21.6	-25.5	-33.5
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	59.1	44.2	17.3 49.3 33.4	48.9	49.2	48.2	33.8 45.2 26.0	39.1
Net (TL - TM)	-12.6	-33.4	-16.1	-14.7	-13.2	-0.2	+7.8	+7.1
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much		35.0	25.7 39.4 34.9					
Net (TL - TM)	-12.6	-14.4	-9.2					

## ${\tt I}\,.$ The Military, Armaments, and Defense/National Defense

## J. Foreign Aid/Assistance to Other Countries

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982
Too little About right Too much	21.9	18.3	17.8	18.5	25.5	25.3	21.5	19.0
Net (TL - TM)	-68.3	-75.3	-71.1	-75.7	-67.1	-66.1	-67.4	-69.7
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Too little About right Too much	17.7	19.3	23.6	19.3	21.1	22.3	22.4	23.4
Net (TL - TM)	-73.5	-71.9	-61.2	-70.3	-66.3	-67.9	-66.5	-64.2
	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
Too little About right Too much	3.7 21.0 75.2	4.5 20.9 74.6	4.6 19.8 75.6	4.2 20.7 75.1	6.8 25.3 67.9	8.5 28.0 63.4	7.8 24.5 67.7	9.4 24,1 66.6
Net (TL - TM)	-71.5	-70.1	-71.0	-70.9	-61.1	-54.9	-59.9	-57.2
	2006	2008	2010					
Too little About right Too much	10.8 24.7	11.0 25.8	7.8 29.3					

#### K1. Welfare 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1980 1982 Too little 20.9 23.8 24.6 14.1 13.1 13.5 14.3 20.4 About right 25.0 32.8 30.0 22.7 24.2 24.9 26.5 28.4 54.1 43.4 45.4 63.2 62.7 61.6 Too much 59.2 51.2 Net (TL - TM) -33.2 -19.6 -20.8 -49.1 -49.6 -48.1 -44.9 -30.8 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 Too little 22.1 24.4 18.9 23.4 21.5 24.7 24.2 24.4 About right 34.5 32.6 32.5 28.7 35.9 34.7 32.7 37.1 49.2 39.8 46.4 42.1 45.9 42.8 43.1 38.4 Too much Net (TL - TM) -27.1 -15.4 -27.5 -18.7 -24.4 -18.1 -18.9 -14.0 1991 1993 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 15.3 16.0 20.8 Too little 24.0 17.1 13.1 20.9 23.6 About right 36.7 25.6 24.6 26.6 37.7 39.8 37.8 35.0 Too much 39.3 57.3 62.4 58.1 46.3 39.3 41.3 41.4 Net (TL - TM) -15.3 -40.2 -49.3 -42.8 -30.3 -18.5 -20.4 -17.8 2006 2008 2010 Too little 25.1 25.4 23.2 About right 36.5 36.4 34.5 Too much 38.3 38.2 42.4 Net (TL - TM) -13.2 -12.8 -19.2 K2. Assistance to the Poor 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 Too little 63.2 65.8 63.2 67.3 70.2 68.1 68.7 66.4 About right 25.6 24.3 28.1 23.3 22.8 23.4 24.5 24.5 Too much 11.3 9.9 8.7 9.4 6.9 8.5 6.7 9.2 Net (TL - TM) +51.9 +55.9 +54.5 +57.9 +63.3 +59.6 +62.0 +57.2 1993 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 Too little 64.4 59.3 55.1 62.8 64.3 67.3 69.9 69.8 About right 25.2 26.3 25.8 24.2 24.5 23.0 23.7 22.4 12.6 15.5 18.6 11.4 11.5 Too much 8.2 6.4 7.8 Net (TL - TM) +51.8 +43.8 +36.5 +51.4 +52.8 +59.1 +63.5 +62.0

#### K2. Assistance to the Poor

	2008	2010
Too little About right Too Much	21.7	67.5 22.5 9.9
Net (TL - TM)	+62.1	+57.6

## L. Highways and Bridges

Too little About right Too much	1984 49.1 44.2 6.8	44.0	36.5 54 8	1987 36.9 54.0 9.2	37.4 54 7	40.1 52 4	47.0 46.6	36.4 52 2
Net (TL - TM)	+42.3	+36.3	+27.9	+27.7	+29.5	+32.6	+40.7	+25.0
	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Too little About right Too much		51.9	52.3	49.4	52.5	35.7 51.7 12.6	56.7	53.0
Net (TL - TM)	+29.4	+32.2	+28.5	+30.4	+22.8	+23.1	+16.9	+24.0
	2008	2010						
Too little About right Too much		44.7						
Net (TL - TM)	+35.5	+32.9						
M. Social Secu	ıritv							
	41 1 C J							
Too little About right Too much	- 1984	1985 54.2 38.5 7.3	1986 57.3 36.2 6.5	1987 57.1 36.1 6.8	1988 55.5 39.4 5.1	1989 57.1 37.9 5.0	1990 52.1 42.2 5.8	1991 55.8 40.2 4.0
	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2	54.2 38.5 7.3	57.3 36.2 6.5	57.1 36.1 6.8	55.5 39.4 5.1	57.1 37.9 5.0	52.1 42.2 5.8	55.8 40.2 4.0
Too little About right Too much	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2	54.2 38.5 7.3 +46.9	57.3 36.2 6.5	57.1 36.1 6.8 +50.3	55.5 39.4 5.1 +50.4	57.1 37.9 5.0 +52.1	52.1 42.2 5.8 +46.3	55.8 40.2 4.0 +51.8
Too little About right Too much Net (TL - TM) Too little About right	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2 +43.7 1993 46.0	54.2 38.5 7.3 +46.9 1994 49.1 43.6	57.3 36.2 6.5 +50.8 1996 51.7 39.6	57.1 36.1 6.8 +50.3 1998 59.8 33.3	55.5 39.4 5.1 +50.4 2000 60.3 34.5	57.1 37.9 5.0 +52.1 2002 61.0 34.3	52.1 42.2 5.8 +46.3 2004 66.0 28.5	55.8 40.2 4.0 +51.8 2006 63.9
Too little About right Too much Net (TL - TM) Too little About right	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2 +43.7 1993 46.0 46.2 7.8	54.2 38.5 7.3 +46.9 1994 49.1 43.6 7.3	57.3 36.2 6.5 +50.8 1996 51.7 39.6 8.7	57.1 36.1 6.8 +50.3 1998 59.8 33.3 6.9	55.5 39.4 5.1 +50.4 2000 60.3 34.5 5.1	57.1 37.9 5.0 +52.1 2002 61.0 34.3 4.7	52.1 42.2 5.8 +46.3 2004 66.0 28.5 5.5	55.8 40.2 4.0 +51.8 2006 63.9 31.4 4.7
Too little About right Too much Net (TL - TM) Too little About right Too much	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2 +43.7 1993 46.0 46.2 7.8	54.2 38.5 7.3 +46.9 1994 49.1 43.6 7.3	57.3 36.2 6.5 +50.8 1996 51.7 39.6 8.7	57.1 36.1 6.8 +50.3 1998 59.8 33.3 6.9	55.5 39.4 5.1 +50.4 2000 60.3 34.5 5.1	57.1 37.9 5.0 +52.1 2002 61.0 34.3 4.7	52.1 42.2 5.8 +46.3 2004 66.0 28.5 5.5	55.8 40.2 4.0 +51.8 2006 63.9 31.4 4.7
Too little About right Too much Net (TL - TM) Too little About right Too much Net (TL - TM) Too little About right	1984 53.9 35.9 10.2 +43.7 1993 46.0 46.2 7.8 +38.2 2008 61.6	54.2 38.5 7.3 +46.9 1994 49.1 43.6 7.3 +41.8 2010 57.3 34.3	57.3 36.2 6.5 +50.8 1996 51.7 39.6 8.7	57.1 36.1 6.8 +50.3 1998 59.8 33.3 6.9	55.5 39.4 5.1 +50.4 2000 60.3 34.5 5.1	57.1 37.9 5.0 +52.1 2002 61.0 34.3 4.7	52.1 42.2 5.8 +46.3 2004 66.0 28.5 5.5	55.8 40.2 4.0 +51.8 2006 63.9 31.4 4.7

#### N. Mass Transportation

1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 32.1 Too little 37.2 30.6 32.2 31.7 33.3 37.1 37.2 About right 50.9 54.2 55.3 53.7 57.2 56.3 53.2 53.0 Too much 11.9 13.7 14.1 14.1 11.1 10.3 9.8 9.8 Net (TL - TM) +25.3 +18.4 +16.5 +18.1 +20.6 +23.0 +27.3 +27.4 1994 1996 1993 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 Too little 38.1 38.2 35.0 34.9 39.8 36.0 36.4 41.0 53.4 54.7 About right 50.9 53.1 51.8 53.3 53.0 49.9 Too much 11.0 8.7 11.6 10.4 8.4 10.7 10.6 10.1 Net (TL - TM) +27.1 +29.5 +23.4 +24.5 +31.4 +25.3 +25.8 +30.9 2008 2010 48.7 42.7 Too little About right 43.3 46.5 Too much 7.9 10.8 Net (TL - TM) +40.8 +31.9

#### O. Parks and Recreation

Too little About right Too much	60.5	31.5 60.7	30.6 63.1	63.2	31.3 63.2	59.7	32.7 61.3	32.1 63.1
Net (TL - TM)	+28.3	+23.7	+24.2	+23.6	+25.8	+29.7	+26.7	+27.3
	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Too little About right Too much	60.6	62.2	60.2	57.4	57.6	59.9	61.1	60.1
Net (TL - TM)	+25.6	+25.0	+27.3	+30.0	+31.0	+28.9	+24.9	+27.1
	2008	2010						
Too little About right Too much	63.3	59.7						
Net (TL - TM) P. <b>Assistance</b>			re					
	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010		

Too Little	64.8	60.0	57.6	55.0	54.4	51.7
About Right	29.5	32.5	35.6	37.4	34.6	40.4
Too Much	5.7	7.5	6.8	7.6	6.8	7.9
Net (TL - TM)	+59.1	+52.5	+50.8	+47.4	+47.6	+43.8

# Q. Supporting Scientific Research

	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
Too Little About Right Too Much	48.9	47.3	43.6 44.3 12.1	48.3	46.6
Net (TL - TM)	+22.3	+27.7	+31.5	+29.3	+27.9

#### Table 2

#### Rank of Net Spending Priorities, 1973-2010

RANK	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982	1983	1984	1985
1	Drugs	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime
	+63.7	+65.5	+63.5	+61.8	+64.5	+61.3	+66.1	+70.7	+63.4	+66.4	+59.2
2	Crime	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Drugs	Health	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs
	+63.5	+62.6	+60.2	+58.4	+52.4	+50.3	+57.0	+52.4	+56.2	+60.1	+59.2
3	Health	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Health	Drugs	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.
	+58.6	+56.6	+50.8	+55.7	+50.8	+48.3	+50.1	+51.9	+55.6	+59.4	+58.7
4	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.	Educ.	Envir.	Defense	Educ.	Health	Envir.	Envir.
	+56.9	+55.4	+48.0	+49.2	+40.6	+44.7	+48.9	+48.2	+52.6	+53.3	+54.4
5	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	Educ.	Envir.	Educ.	Educ.	Envir.	Envir.	Health	Health
	+41.7	+46.3	+42.5	+43.3	+40.5	+41.5	+46.0	+42.2	+48.7	+53.0	+50.0
6	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	Envir.	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity
	+42.0	+45.3	+40.1	+26.0	+25.0	+23.5	+35.8	+26.4	+29.0	+37.2	+24.5
7	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	Defense	SolCity	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks
	+12.5	+11.4	+ 3.1	+ 2.0	+ 1.2	+ 6.9	+21.3	+ 8.4	+10.6	+21.0	+10.5
8	Defense	Defense	Defense	Defense	Defense	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	Defense	Defense	Welfare	Defense
	-28.4	-15.7	-15.1	- 2.6	+ 0.9	- 0.5	+ 1.2	+ 0.4	- 8.8	-15.4	-26.5
9	Welfare	Welfare	Welfare	Welfare	Space	Space	Space	Space	Welfare	Defense	Welfare
	-33.2	-19.6	-20.8	-49.1	-41.1	-37.7	-22.9	-28.3	-27.1	-21.3	-27.5
10	Space -53.9	Space -55.0	Space -51.8	Space -51.8	Welfare -49.6	Welfare -48.1	Welfare -44.9	Welfare -30.8	Space -27.3	Space -32.1	Space -31.3
11	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid
	-68.3	-75.3	-71.1	-75.7	-67.1	-66.1	-67.4	-69.7	-73.5	-71.9	-61.2

Abbreviations/Labels Used in Tables 2-4:

AidBlks=Assistance to Blacks AidCity=Assistance to Big Cities Crime=Halting the Rising Crime Rate Defense=The Military, Armaments, and Defense/National Defense Drugs=Dealing with Drug Addiction Educ.=Improving the Nation's Education System/Education Envir.=Improving and Protecting the Environment/The Environment ForAid=Foreign Aid/Assistance to Other Countries Health=Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health/Health ImpBlks=Improving the Condition of Blacks LawEnf=Law Enforcement Parks=Parks and Recreation Poor=Assistance to the Poor Rehab.=Drug Rehabilitation Roads=Highways and Bridges SocSec=Social Security SolCity=Solving the Problems of the Big Cities Space=Space Exploration Program/Space Exploration Trans.=Mass Transportation Welfare=Welfare

#### Table 2 Rank of Net Spending Priorities, 1973-2008 (continued)

RANK	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008
1	Crime	Crime	Crime	Envir.	Educ.	Health	Crime	Crime	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.	Health	Educ.	Educ.
	+61.9	+66.9	+68.2	+70.4	+71.5	+67.4	+68.6	+71.4	+67.5	+66.3	+68.4	+70.8	+72.4	+68.7	+68.4
2	Educ.	Health	Drugs	Crime	Envir.	Envir.	Educ.	Educ.	Crime	Health	Health	Health	Educ.	Health	Health
	+60.3	+63.0	+66.8	+70.0	+71.2	+66.8	+65.8	+67.5	+61.7	+62.7	+66.9	+68.2	+71.1	+66.4	+68.1
3	Envir.	Drugs	Educ.	Educ.	Health	Educ.	Health	Health	Health	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.	Envir.
	+56.1	+60.9	+64.7	+67.9	+68.5	+66.2	+62.5	+55.0	+56.2	+56.9	+56.3	+53.7	+58.1	+61.9	+58.7
4	Drugs	Envir.	Health	Drugs	Crime	Crime	Drugs	Drugs	Envir.	Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Drugs	Crime
	+54.0	+60.4	+64.1	+66.7	+66.9	+62.9	+55.2	+54.0	+51.7	+56.3	+55.2	+50.6	+52.4	+54.8	+55.0
5	Health	Educ.	Envir.	Health	Drugs	Drugs	Envir.	Envir.	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Drugs	Crime	Drugs
	+52.9	+59.5	+63.5	+65.8	+57.7	+52.4	+51.3	+53.7	+48.7	+51.1	+53.1	+42.0	+45.6	+54.6	+47.2
6	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity												
	+31.7	+28.0	+43.8	+40.2	+48.3	+38.6	+49.6	+46.7	+44.2	+37.7	+39.6	+30.0	+29.1	+35.2	+35.7
7	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks												
	+20.6	+21.1	+21.4	+21.2	+25.2	+23.4	+22.4	+11.9	+14.0	+19.0	+21.3	+14.7	+19.5	+21.1	+24.2
8	Welfare	Defense	Space	Welfare	Welfare	Defense	Defense	Welfare							
	-18.7	-22.8	-16.8	-18.9	-14.0	-12.6	-33.4	-16.1	-14.7	-13.2	- 0.2	+ 7.8	+7.1	-12.6	-12.8
9	Defense -21.6	Space -22.7	Welfare -18.1	Space -21.6	Space -30.4	Welfare -15.3	Welfare -40.2	Space -39.4	Space -30.0	Space -30.1	Welfare -18.5	Welfare -20.4	Welfare -17.8	Welfare -13.2	Defense -14.4
10	Space -30.1	Welfare -24.4	Defense -21.6	Defense -25.5	Defense -33.5	Space -25.9	Space -44.5	Welfare -49.3	Welfare -42.8	Welfare -30.3	Space -29.5	Space -25.6	Space -25.7	Space -22.7	Space -24.3
11	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid												
	-70.3	-66.3	-67.9	-66.5	-64.2	-71.5	-70.1	-71.0	-70.9	-61.1	-54.9	-59.9	-57.2	-53.8	-52.3

Table 2 Rank of Net Spendi	g Priorities, 1973-2008	(continued)
----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

RANK	2010
	2010
1	Educ. +68.6
2	Health +64.9
3	Crime +51.2
4	Envir. +48.5
5	Drugs +46.0
6	SolCity +22.9
7	ImpBlks +19.4
8	Defense - 9.2
9	Welfare -19.2
10	Space -21.0
11	For Aid -55.1

#### Table 3 Rank of Net Spending Priorities, 1984-2008

RANK 1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
1 Crim	e Crime	Crime	Crime	Crime	Envir.	Educ.	Health	Crime	Crime	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.	Health	Educ.
+66.4	+59.2	+61.9	+66.9	+68.2	+70.4	+71.5	+67.4	+68.6	+71.4	+67.5	+66.3	+68.4	+70.8	+72.4	+68.7
2 Drug	5 Drugs	Educ.	Health	Drugs	Crime	Envir.	Envir.	Educ.	Educ.	Crime	Health	Health	Health	Educ.	Health
+60.1	+59.2	+60.3	+63.0	+66.8	+70.0	+71.2	+66.8	+65.8	+67.5	+61.7	+62.7	+66.9	+68.2	+71.1	+66.4
3 Educ	Educ.	Envir.	Drugs	Educ.	Educ.	Health	Educ.	Health	LawEnf	Health	Envir.	Envir.	Poor	Poor	Poor
+67.9	+58.7	+56.1	+60.9	+59.4	+67.9	+68.5	+66.2	+62.5	+58.3	+56.2	+56.7	+56.3	+59.1	+63.5	+62.0
4 Envir.	Poor	Poor	Envir.	Health	Drugs	Crime	Crime	Drugs	Health	Envir.	Crime	SocSec	SocSec	SocSec	Envir.
+53.3	+55.9	+54.5	+60.4	+64.1	+66.7	+66.9	+62.9	+55.2	+55.0	+51.7	+56.3	+55.2	+56.3	+60.5	+61.9
5 Heal		Drugs	Educ.	Envir.	Health	Poor	Poor	LawEnf	Drugs	LawEnf	SocSec	Crime	Envir.	Envir.	SocSec
+53.0		+54.0	+59.5	+63.5	+65.8	+62.0	+57.2	+54.2	+54.0	+50.3	+52.9	+55.2	+53.7	+58.1	+59.2
6 Poor	LawEnf	Health	Poor	Poor	Poor	Rehab.	Rehab.	Poor	Envir.	Drugs	Poor	Drugs	Crime	Crime	Drugs
+51.9	+52.4	+52.9	+57.9	+63.3	+59.6	+58.5	+53.6	+51.8	+53.7	+48.7	+51.4	+53.1	+50.6	+52.4	+54.8
7 Lawl	nf Health	SocSec	Rehab.	Rehab.	LawEnf	Drugs	Drugs	Envir.	SolCity	Rehab.	Drugs	Poor	Drugs	Drugs	Crime
+50.3	+50.0	+50.8	+52.8	+53.1	+55.5	+57.7	+52.4	+51.3	+46.7	+45.1	+51.1	+52.8	+47.4	+45.6	+54.6
8 SocS	ec Rehab.	LawEnf	SocSec	LawEnf	Rehab.	LawEnf	SocSec	SolCity	Poor	SolCity	LawEnf	LawEnf	Rehab.	LawEnf	LawEnf
+43.	+49.5	+46.2	+50.3	+50.9	+53.2	+52.3	+51.8	+49.6	+43.8	+44.2	+48.5	+43.9	+42.0	+45.1	+45.8
9 Road		Rehab.	LawEnf	SocSec	SocSec	SolCity	LawEnf	Rehab.	Rehab.	SocSec	Rehab.	Rehab.	LawEnf	Rehab.	Rehab.
+42.2		+45.6	+47.2	+50.4	+52.1	+48.3	+50.8	+47.2	+43.6	+43.0	+43.6	+43.6	+37.7	+41.2	+43.3
10 Reha		SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	SocSec	SolCity	SocSec	SocSec	Poor	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity
+40.0		+31.7	+28.0	+43.8	+40.2	+46.3	+38.6	+38.2	+41.8	+36.5	+37.7	+39.6	+30.0	+29.1	+35.2
11 SolC		Roads	Roads	Roads	Roads	Roads	Trans.	Roads	Roads	Roads	Roads	Trans.	Parks	Trans.	Trans.
+37.2		+27.9	+27.7	+29.5	+32.6	+40.7	+27.4	+29.4	+32.2	+28.5	+30.4	+31.4	+28.9	+25.8	+30.9
12 Park		Parks	Parks	Parks	Parks	Trans.	Parks	Trans.	Trans.	Parks	Parks	Parks	Trans.	Parks	Parks
+28.3		+24.2	+23.6	+25.8	+29.7	+27.3	+27.3	+27.1	+29.5	+27.3	+30.0	+31.0	+25.3	+24.9	+27.1
13 Tran	1	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	Trans.	ImpBlks	Roads	Parks	Parks	Trans.	Trans.	Roads	Roads	ImpBlks	Roads
+25.3		+20.6	+21.1	+21.4	+23.0	+25.2	+25.0	+25.6	+25.0	+23.4	+24.5	+22.8	+23.1	+19.5	+24.0
14 ImpF	lks Trans.	Trans.	Trans.	Trans.	ImpBlks	Parks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	Roads	ImpBlks
+21.0	+18.4	+16.5	+18.1	+20.6	+21.2	+26.7	+23.4	+22.4	+11.9	+14.0	+19.0	+21.3	+14.7	+16.9	+21.1
15 AidE	lks AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	Defense	AidBlks	AidBlks
- 1.1	+ 2.4	- 5.3	+ 4.0	+ 4.2	+ 7.3	+ 7.9	+14.4	- 0.8	- 2.9	- 2.8	+ 4.1	+ 9.3	+ 7.8	+7.4	+2.0
16 Welf	re AidCity	Welfare	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	Defense	AidBlks	Defense	Defense
-15.4	-21.6	-18.7	-11.9	- 9.0	-15.3	- 5.5	-12.1	- 9.7	- 7.7	-10.9	-11.2	- 0.2	- 1.4	+7.1	-12.6
17 AidC	ity Defense	Defense	Defense	Space	Welfare	Welfare	Defense	Defense	Defense	Defense	Defense	AidCity	AidCity	AidCity	Welfare
-19.6	-26.5	-21.6	-22.8	-16.8	-18.9	-14.0	-12.6	-33.4	-16.1	-14.7	-13.2	- 3.9	-18.4	-13.9	-13.2
18 Defe	use Welfare	AidCity	Welfare	Welfare	Space	Space	Welfare	Welfare	Space	Space	Space	Welfare	Welfare	Welfare	AidCity
-21.3	-27.5	-22.4	-24.4	-18.1	-21.6	-30.4	-15.3	-40.2	-39.4	-30.0	-30.1	-18.5	-20.6	-17.8	-14.5
19 Spac -32.1	Space -31.3	Space -30.1	Space -22.7	Defense -21.6	Defense -25.5	Defense -33.5	Space -25.9	Space -44.5	Welfare -49.3	Welfare -42.8	Welfare -30.3	Space -29.5	Space -25.6	Space -25.7	Space -22.7
20 ForA	d ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid
-71.9	-61.2	-70.3	-66.3	-67.9	-66.5	-64.2	-71.5	-70.1	-71.0	-70.9	-61.1	-54.9	-59.9	-57.2	-53.8

Rank	2008	2010
1	Educ. +68.4	Educ. +68.6
2	Health +68.1	Health +64.9
3	Poor +62.1	Poor +57.6
4	Envir. +58.7	Crime +51.2
5	SocSec +55.5	SocSec +48.9
6	Crime +55.0	Envir. +48.5
7	Drugs +47.2	Drugs +46.0
8	LawEnf +44.8	Rehab. +39.1
9	Trans. +40.8	LawEnf +36.4
10	Rehab. +36.7	Roads +32.9
11	SolCity +35.7	Trans +31.9
12	Roads +35.5	Parks +27.5
13	Parks +25.9	SolCity +22.9
14	ImpBlks +24.2	Impblks +19.4
15	AidBlks + 8.9	AidBlks + 5.9
16	AidCity -11.1	Defense - 9.2
17	Welfare -12.8	Welfare -19.2
18	Defense -14.4	Aid City -19.2
19	Space -24.3	Space -21.2
20	ForAid -52.3	ForAid -55.1

			Table 4: Rank of Net Spending Priorities, 2002-2008		
	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
1	Educ.	Health	Educ.	Educ.	Educ.
	+70.8	+72.4	+68.7	+68.4	+68.6
2	<b>TT</b> 1/1	E la c	II 1/1	TT 1/1-	II 14
2	Health	Educ.	Health	Health	Health
	+68.2	+71.1	+66.4	+68.1	+64.9
3	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor
0	+59.1	+63.5	+62.0	+62.1	+57.6
4	SocSec	SocSec	Envir.	Envir.	Crime
	+56.3	+60.5	+61.9	+58.7	+51.2
_		<b>—</b> ·	a a	a a	
5	Envir.	Envir.	SocSec	SocSec	SocSec.
	+53.7	+58.1	+59.2	+55.7	+48.9
6	Child	Crime	Drugs	Crime	Envir.
Ū.	+52.5	+52.4	+54.8	+55.0	+48.5
7	Crime	Child	Crime	Child	Drugs
	+50.6	+50.8	+54.6	+47.6	+46.0
8	Drugs	Drugs	Child	Drugs	Child.
	+47.4	+45.6	+47.4	+47.2	+43.8
_					
9	Rehab.	LawEnf	LawEnf	LawEnf	Rehab.
	+42.0	+45.1	+45.8	+44.8	+39.1
10	LawEnf	Rehab.	Rehab.	Trans.	LawEnf
10	+37.7	+41.2	+43.3	+40.8	+36.4
	+31.1	T <b>H1.2</b>	T <b>H</b> J.J	T <b>40.</b> 0	+50.4
11	SolCity	SolCity	SolCity	Rehab.	Roads
	+30.0	+29.1	+35.2	+36.7	+32.9
12	Parks	Science	Science	SolCity	Trans.
	+28.9	+27.7	+31.5	+35.7	+31.9
13	Trans.	Trans.	Trans.	Roads	Science
	+25.3	+25.8	+30.9	+35.5	+27.9
14	Roads	Parks	Parks	Science	Parks
14	+23.1	+24.9	+27.1	+29.3	+27.5
	123.1	124.9	127.1	127.5	121.5
15	Science	ImpBlks	Roads	Parks	SolCity
	+22.3	+19.5	+24.0	+25.9	+22.9
16	ImpBlks	Roads	ImpBlks	ImpBlks	ImpBlks
	+14.7	+16.9	+21.1	+24.2	+19.4
	5.4				
17	Defense	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks	AidBlks
	+7.8	+7.4	+2.0	+ 8.9	+ 5.9
18	AidBlks	Defense	Defense	AidCity	Defense
10	-1.4	+7.1	-12.6	-11.1	- 9.2
	-1.7	17.1	-12.0	-11.1	- ).2
19	AidCity	AidCity	Welfare	Welfare	AidCity
-	-18.4	-13.9	-13.2	-12.8	-19.2
20	Welfare	Welfare	AidCity	Defense	Welfare
	-20.6	-17.8	-14.5	-14.4	-19.2
21	Space	Space	Space	Space	Space
	-25.6	-25.7	-22.7	-24.3	-21.0
22	E 411	F 4'1	E 4'1	E 4'1	F
22	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid	ForAid
	-59.9	-57.2	-53.8	-52.3	-55.1

#### Table 5

#### Trends in Overall and Domestic Welfare Spending, 1973-2010

	Overall Spending	Domestic Social Spending
1973	+14.1	+24.2
1974	+16.1	+29.2
1975	+13.6	+25.0
1976	+10.7	+16.1
1977	+10.9	+13.9
1978	+11.3	+13.3
1980	+17.4	+14.7
1982	+13.8	+20.9
1983	+16.3	+24.1
1984	+19.1	+31.0
1985	+15.5	+23.2
1986	+17.9	+29.4
1987	+20.3	+29.4
1988	+24.4	+35.2
1989	+24.5	+35.2
1990	+24.3	+39.9
1991	+22.9	+36.1
1993	+17.0	+32.0
1994	+16.8	+26.4
1996	+16.9	+27.8
1998	+19.5	+31.1
2000	+23.4	+35.5
2002	+21.1	+32.7
2004	+23.1	+34.9
2006	+23.7	+35.6
2008	+23.0	+36.7
2010	+19.7	+31.3

Overall Spending = Average Net Spending for all 11 items

Domestic Welfare Spending = Average Net Spending for 5 items (Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health/Health, Solving the Problems of the Big Cities, Improving the Nation's Education System/Education, Improving the Condition of Blacks, Welfare)

#### Technical Appendix

#### General Social Surveys (GSS)

The GSS are conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. James A. Davis, Tom W. Smith, and Peter V. Marsden are the principal investigators. The GSS are fullprobability samples of adults living in households in the United States. Interviews are conducted in-person. Sample size across 1973-2008 in the standard cross-sections totals 50,723 respondents (1973=1504, 1974=1484, 1975=1490, 1976=1499, 1977=1530, 1978=1532, 1980=1468, 1982=1506, 1983=1599, 1984=1473, 1985=1534, 1986=1470, 1987=1466, 1988=1481, 1989=1537, 1990=1372, 1991=1517, 1993=1606, 1994=2992, 1996=2904, 1998=2832, 2000=2817; 2002=2765; 2004=2812; 2006=2992; 2008=2023; 2010=2044). Full technical details on the sample, response rates, and other methodological matters are presented in Tom W. Smith, Peter V. Marsden, and Michael Hout, General Social Surveys, 1972-2010: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: NORC, 2011.

#### National Spending Priority Items

Items covering 11 areas have been asked in every GSS since 1973 (Space Exploration Program, Improving and Protecting the Environment, Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health, Solving the Problems of the Big Cities, Halting the Rising Crime Rate, Dealing with Drug Addiction, Improving the Nation's Education System, Improving the Condition of Blacks, The Military, Armaments, and Defense, Foreign Aid, Welfare). Since 1984 an additional four areas have been included (Highways and Roads, Social Security, Mass Transportation, Parks and Recreation). In 2000 a 16th area (Assistance for Childcare) was added and in 2002 a 17th area (Supporting Scientific Research).

Also since 1984, 11 alternative wordings for the original spending items have been asked on a random sub-sample (Space Exploration, The Environment, Health, Assistance to Big Cities, Law Enforcement, Drug Rehabilitation, Education, Assistance to Blacks, National Defense, Assistance to Other Countries, Assistance to the Poor). When the alternative wordings produced distributions that did not significantly differ from the original wordings they have been combined together (Space Exploration Program/Space Exploration, Improving and Protecting the Environment/The Environment, Improving and Protecting the Nation's Health/Health, Improving the Nation's Education System/Education, The Military, Armaments, and Defense/National Defense, Foreign Aid/Assistance to Other Countries). For the remaining five original spending areas the standard and alternative results are presented separately. Differences between the standard and alternative wordings are examined in Tom W. Smith, "A Preliminary Analysis of Methodological Experiments in the 1984 GSS," GSS Methodological Report No. 30. Chicago: NORC, 1984; Tom W. Smith, "That Which We Call Welfare by Any Other Name Would Smell Sweeter: An Analysis of the Impact of

Question Wording on Response Patterns," <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 51 (Spring, 1987), 75-83; Kenneth A. Rasinski, "The Effect of Question Wording on Public Support for Government Spending," GSS Methodological Report No. 54. Chicago: NORC, 1988; and Tom W. Smith, "Wording Effects on National Spending Priority Items Across Time, 1973-2004," GSS Methodological Report No. 107. Chicago: NORC, 2006.