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7. **Survey Details and Demographics**

We contracted with Bovitz Inc. to conduct our survey. The sample is drawn from a panel of respondents who have opted in to complete online surveys. A given sample is drawn using a matching algorithm (based on likely response rates) to ensure that those screened to qualify for the survey constitute a sample that demographically represents the United States.

We conducted the survey in two waves. The first occurred from December 6, 2017 to December, 12, 2017. Respondents were re-contacted 7 days after completing the first wave, and thus the wave 2 data were collected from December 13 to December 20th. Of those contacted to participate in the survey, about 20.5% opted in and completed the wave 1 survey. For wave 2, 83% of those contacted completed the wave 2 survey (2,224/2,784). (Only those who completed wave 1 were contacted for wave 2.)

The experimental items all appeared on wave 2, as did our measure of partisan ambivalence which too experimentally varied the target. The other items—including demographics, partisan social identity, partisan importance, negative partisanship, and the social distance questions (see appendix section 3 on convergent validity)—appeared on wave 1. The separating ensured that asking about partisan identity did not prime subsequent affective evaluations. Also, for all items, respondents were first asked about the other party and then about their own party.

Table A1 below compares our sample to the 2016 American Community Survey, the Census Bureau’s most recent estimate of the characteristics of the U.S. population.[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Our Survey (%) | ACS Benchmark (%) |
| Income $100,000 or more | 20% | 25% |
| Female | 50% | 51% |
| Aged 65+ | 14% | 15% |
| Caucasian | 68% | 73% |
| African-American | 12% | 13% |
| College Graduate or Higher Education | 37% | 31% |

Table A1: Comparison of our survey data to benchmarks from the 2016 American Community Survey

As Table A1 reveals, our data tracks the ACS benchmarks (unsurprising given that Bovitz Inc., our firm, uses them to construct its sample). Our sample diverges from the ACS in only a few ways, most notably in under-representing high-income individuals and over-representing college graduates. But overall, our sample closely matches the U.S. population along most key dimensions.

In Table A2, we compare the partisan distribution of our sample to the 2016 American National Election Studies (ANES) probability sample. While our sample slightly over-represents Strong Democrats and under-represents Strong Republicans, it is generally in-line with the ANES. That is, the skews are not particularly large, and it also is worth noting that the different timing of the samples could contribute to differences.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Our Sample | 2016 American National Election Studies Pre-Election Merged (Web and Face to Face) Weighted Sample |
| Strong Democrat | 25.2%  | 21.1% |
| Not Very Strong Democrat | 12.8%  | 13.7% |
| Independent - Democrat | 10.6%  | 10.8% |
| Independent  | 17.0%  | 14.6% |
| Independent - Republican | 9.6%  | 11.1% |
| Not Very Strong Republican | 12.1%  | 11.7% |
| Strong Republican  | 12.8%  | 16.3% |

Table A2: Comparison of our survey data partisan identification question to the 2016 American National Election Studies pre-election partisan identification question

1. **Correlations By Experimental Condition**

In the paper, we merged experimental conditions when presenting the correlational relationships between affective polarization measures. In Tables A3-A5 we present those correlations separately for each experimental condition. As can be seen, the results are analogous across condition with one exception. That exception is the trait ratings in the “party” condition. This stems from respondents provided notably low in-party trait ratings in that condition. We are not entirely clear on why this is the case.

Correlation Matrix, Out-Party Affect Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.46 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.57 | 0.65 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | -0.19 | -0.21 | -0.25 | 1.0 |

Correlation Matrix, Party Difference (In-Party – Out-Party) Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.60 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.66 | 0.66 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 1.0 |

Table A-3: Correlation Matrix, Measures of Affective Polarization for the Voter Condition

*Note*: Cell entries are the pairwise polychoric correlations between the various measures of affective polarization for the voter experimental condition. The top half of the table presents the correlations between the items measuring affect toward the other party (i.e., Democrats rating of Republicans) (N = 546). The bottom half presents the correlation between the differenced versions of the items (e.g., Democrat’s FT rating of Democrats minus their FT rating of Republicans) (N = 545).

Correlation Matrix, Out-Party Affect Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.57 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.54 | 0.66 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | -0.21 | -0.13 | -0.24 | 1.0 |

Correlation Matrix, Party Difference (In-Party – Out-Party) Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.64 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.62 | 0.70 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 1.0 |

 Table A-4: Correlation Matrix, Measures of Affective Polarization for the Elite Condition

*Note*: Cell entries are the pairwise polychoric correlations between the various measures of affective polarization for the elite experimental condition. The top half of the table presents the correlations between the items measuring affect toward the other party (i.e., Democrats rating of Republicans) (N = 547). The bottom half presents the correlation between the differenced versions of the items (e.g., Democrat’s FT rating of Democrats minus their FT rating of Republicans) (N = 546).

Correlation Matrix, Out-Party Affect Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.52 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.59 | 0.57 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | -0.24 | -0.23 | -0.26 | 1.0 |

Correlation Matrix, Party Difference (In-Party – Out-Party) Items:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feeling Thermometer | Trait Ratings | Trust Ratings | Social Distance Items |
| Feeling Thermometer | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Trait Ratings | 0.18 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Trust Rating | 0.63 | 0.23 | 1.0 |  |
| Social Distance Items  | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.24 | 1.0 |

Table A-5: Correlation Matrix, Measures of Affective Polarization for the Party Condition

*Note*: Cell entries are the pairwise polychoric correlations between the various measures of affective polarization for the party experimental condition. The top half of the table presents the correlations between the items measuring affect toward the other party (i.e., Democrats rating of Republicans) (N = 548). The bottom half presents the correlation between the differenced versions of the items (e.g., Democrat’s FT rating of Democrats minus their FT rating of Republicans) (N = 548).

**3. Convergent Validity Results**

We explored the convergent validity of each affective polarization measures by regressing each on four commonly used predictive variables: partisan importance (Klar 2014), partisan social identity (Huddy et al. 2015), partisan univalence (which indicates a lack of partisan ambivalence; see Lavine et al. 2012), and negative partisanship (Pew Research Center 2016) (all question wordings appear later in the appendix—section 5.)Consistent with the paper, we focus on out-party versions of the measures; we also present individual bi-variate regressions, rather than multiple regressions because collinearity between the predictive variables is severe (e.g., the correlation between party identity importance and partisan social identity is .81). As shows in Tables A6-A9, we find all measures all strongly related to these variables, suggesting that they all meaningfully capture variation in partisan animosity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | Out-Party Feeling Therm. | Trait Ratings of the Other Party | Trust in the Other Party | Social Distance Items |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Partisan Identity | -1.89\*\*\* | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.05\*\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* |
| Importance | (0.46) | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.01) |
| Constant | 31.60\*\*\* | -1.19\*\*\* | 1.98\*\*\* | 1.38\*\*\* |
|  | (1.56) | (0.11) | (0.07) | (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,699 | 1,656 | 1,658 | 2,655 |
| R-squared | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 |

Table A-6: Impact of Partisan Identity Importance

*Note*: Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | Out-Party Feeling Therm. | Trait Ratings of the Other Party | Trust in the Other Party | Social Distance Items |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Partisan Social | -3.93\*\*\* | -0.20\*\*\* | -0.08\*\*\* | 0.15\*\*\* |
| Identity | (0.59) | (0.04) | (0.02) | (0.01) |
| Constant | 38.41\*\*\* | -0.83\*\*\* | 2.07\*\*\* | 1.30\*\*\* |
|  | (2.00) | (0.15) | (0.08) | (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,700 | 1,657 | 1,659 | 2,656 |
| R-squared | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |

Table A-7: Impact of Partisan Social Identity

*Note*: Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | Out-Party Feeling Therm. | Trait Ratings of the Other Party | Trust in the Other Party | Social Distance Items |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Partisan | -15.79\*\*\* | -1.20\*\*\* | -0.66\*\*\* | 0.17\*\*\* |
| Univalence | (0.71) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Constant | 37.69\*\*\* | -0.56\*\*\* | 2.33\*\*\* | 1.70\*\*\* |
|  | (0.74) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,661 | 1,660 | 1,662 | 1,671 |
| R-squared | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.03 |

Table A-8: Impact of Partisan Univalence

*Note*: Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | Out-Party Feeling Therm. | Trait Ratings of the Other Party | Trust in the Other Party | Social Distance Items |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative | -5.97\*\*\* | -0.49\*\*\* | -0.22\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
| Partisanship | (1.16) | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.03) |
| Constant | 33.52\*\*\* | -0.84\*\*\* | 2.11\*\*\* | 1.64\*\*\* |
|  | (1.66) | (0.12) | (0.07) | (0.05) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,662 | 1,619 | 1,621 | 2,284 |
| R-squared | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 |

Table A-9: Impact of Negative Partisanship

*Note*: Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**4. Identity Importance Results**

We asked respondents, on wave 1 of the survey, to rate the importance of six distinct identities on 5 point scales, with higher scores indicating importance. Table A-10 displays the results. The Ns are larger since we include all respondents who participated at wave 1 even if they did not respond at Wave 2. The results reveal that partisan identity ties for last in importance, with class. It also is significantly less important than all other identities apart from class (e.g., comparing partisan identity to racial identity gives *t2590* = 5.80, *p*<.01).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identity** | **Mean (Std. Dev.; N)** |
| American Identity | 4.10 (1.10; 2,662) |
| Gender Identity | 3.93 (1.18; 2.662) |
| Religious Identity | 3.54 (1.28; 2,660) |
| Racial Identity | 3.16 (1.43; 2,593) |
| Partisan Identity | 2.98 (1.25; 2,660) |
| Class Identity | 2.98 (1.22; 2,662) |

Table A-10: Identity Importance Ratings

**5. Question Wordings**

***Wave 1***

1. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?

*Democrat Republican Independent Some other party*

**PROGRAMING INSTRUCTION: IF ANSWERED DEMOCRAT OR REPUBLICAN, ASK, PUTTING IN THE APPROPRIATE PARTY:**

Would you call yourself a strong [**Democrat** / **Republican**] or a not very strong [**Democrat** / **Republican**]?

*Strong Not very strong*

**PROGRAMING INSTRUCTION: IF ANSWERED INDEPENDENT OR SOME OTHER PARTY, ASK:**

If you had to choose, do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

*Closer to Closer to Neither*

*Democratic Party Republican Party*

2. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

*Less than High Some 4 year college Advanced*

*High school school graduate college degree degree*

3. What is your estimate of your family’s annual household income (before taxes)?

*< $30,000 $30,000 - $69,999 $70,000-$99,999 $100,000-$200,000 >$200,000*

4. Which of the following do you consider to be your primary racial or ethnic group? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION – IF CHOOSE “OTHER” OFFER AN OPEN ENDED OPTION TO WRITE IT IN, ASKING “HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR PRIMARY RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUP ?”**

*White African American Asian American Hispanic or Latino Native American Other*

5. Which of the following best describes your gender identity?

*Male Female Transgender None of the categories offered*

6. What is your age?

*Under 18 18-24 25-34 35-50 51-65 Over 65*

7. How important is your identity as a $RELIGION to you? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION -- $RELIGION = THE ANSWER TO RELIGION QUESTION, EDITED IF NECESSARY (E.G., USE “JEW” AND NOT “JEWISH”). IF RESPONDENTS PUT OTHER, THEN USE THEIR ANSWER FROM THE TEXT BOX. IF CHOOSE NON-RELIGIOUS” PUT IN “AS A NON-RELIGIOUS PERSON.” IF DID NOT ANSWER, ASK “HOW IMPORTANT IS YOUR RELIGIOUS IDENTITY TO YOU?”**

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

8. How important is your identity as a $CLASS person to you? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION -- $CLASS = THE ANSWER TO CLASS QUESTION. IF DID NOT ANSWER, ASK “HOW IMPORTANT IS YOUR CLASS IDENTITY TO YOU?”**

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

9. How important is your identity as a $RACE to you? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION -- $RACE = THE ANSWER TO RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUP QUESTION, EDITED WHEN NECESSARY AND SO IF HISPANIC OR LATINO, WRITE “HISPANIC/LATINO”. IF RESPONDENTS PUT OTHER, THEN USE THEIR ANSWER FROM THE TEXT BOX. IF THEY DID NOT ANSWER, ASK “HOW IMPORTANT IS YOUR RACIAL IDENTITY TO YOU?”**

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

10. How important is your identity as a $GENDER to you? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION -- $GENDER = “MAN” IF SELECTED “MALE”; “WOMAN” IF SELECTED “FEMALE” AND “TRANSGENDER PERSON” IF SELECTED “TRANSGENDER.” IF PUT NONE OF THE CATEGORIES OR DID NOT ANSWER, ASK “HOW IMPORTANT IS YOUR GENDER IDENTITY TO YOU?”**

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

11. How important is your identity as an American to you?

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

**PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION FOR NEXT SET OF QUSTIONS. $PARTY = DEMOCRAT IF ANSWERED PARTY QUESTION AS DEMOCRAT OR INDEPENDENT/OTHER CLOSER TO DEMOCRAT; = REPUBLICAN IF ANSWERED REPUBLICAN OR INDEPENDENT/OTHER CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN; = POLITICAL INDEPENDENT IF ANSWERED INDEPENDENT/OTHER AND DID NOT CHOOSE A PARTY CLOSER TO.**

12. How important is your identity as a $PARTY to you?

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

13. How important is being a $PARTY to you?

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*important important important important important*

14. How well does the term $PARTY describe you?

*Not at all Not very Somewhat Very Extremely*

*well well well well well*

15. When talking about $PARTY**s**, how often do you use “we” instead of “they”? **PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION –NOTICE ADD “S” TO PARTY NAME.**

*Never Rarely Some of Most of All of*

 *the time the time the time*

16. To what extent do you think of yourself as being a $PARTY?

*Not at all Not too much Somewhat A good deal A great deal*

**PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTION – FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, $OUTPARTY = REPUBLICANS IF ANSWERED PARTY QUESTION AS DEMOCRAT OR INDEPENDENT/OTHER CLOSER TO DEMOCRAT OR INDEPENDENT/OTHER AND DID NOT CHOOSE A PARTY (WE TREAT PURE INDEPENDNETS AS DEMOCRATS HERE); = DEMOCRATS IF ANSWERED REPUBLICAN OR INDEPENDENT/OTHER CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN (NOTE TERM IS “DEMOCRATIC”). (NOTE TERMS ARE PLURAL WITH “S” ON THE END.)**

17. How comfortable are you having close personal friends who are $OUTPARTY?

*Not at all Not too Somewhat Extremely*

*comfortable comfortable comfortable comfortable*

18. How comfortable are you having neighbors on your street who are $OUTPARTY?

*Not at all Not too Somewhat Extremely*

*comfortable comfortable comfortable comfortable*

19. Suppose a son or daughter of yours was getting married. How would you feel if he or she married a supporter of the $OUTPARTY?

*Not at all Not too Somewhat Extremely*

*upset upset upset upset*

20. Would you say that you are a $PARTY because you are for what the $PARTY represent, or are you more against what the $OUTPARTY represents?

* For what $PARTY represent
* Against what $OUTPARTY represent

***Wave 2***

1. We’d like you to rate how you feel towards Republican and Democratic Party voters/Republican and Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic and Republican parties on a scale of 0 to 100, which we call a “feeling thermometer.” On this feeling thermometer scale, ratings between 0 and 49 degrees mean that you feel unfavorable and cold (with 0 being the most unfavorable/coldest). Ratings between 51 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm (with 100 being the most favorable/warmest). A rating of 50 means you have no feelings one way or the other. How would you rate your feeling toward Republican and Democratic Party voters/Republican and Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic and Republican parties?**[Use sliders from 0 to 100; SET IT TO HAVE NO DEFAULT IN QUALTRICS SO WOULD NOT BE AT A VALUE:]**

Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party

Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party

2. You might have some favorable thoughts or feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party. Or you might have unfavorable thoughts or feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party. Or you might have some of each. We would like to ask you first about any about any favorable thoughts and feelings you might have about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party. Then, we’ll ask you some separate questions about any unfavorable thoughts and feelings you might have.

Do you have any favorable thoughts or feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party or do you not have any?

*No favorable Yes at least one favorable thought or feeling*

*thoughts or feelings*

***IF AT LEAST ONE, ASK (IF Said no skip the next question):***

How favorable are your favorable thoughts and feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party?

*Slightly Moderately Very Extremely*

*favorable favorable favorable favorable*

Do you have any unfavorable thoughts or feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party, or do you not have any?

*No unfavorable Yes at least one unfavorable thought or feeling*

*thoughts of feelings*

***IF AT LEAST ONE, ASK (IF Said no skip the next question):***

How unfavorable are your unfavorable thoughts and feelings about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party?

*Slightly Moderately Very Extremely*

*Unfavorable Unfavorable Unfavorable Unfavorable*

3. You might have some favorable thoughts or feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party. Or you might have unfavorable thoughts or feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party. Or you might have some of each. We would like to ask you first about any favorable thoughts and feelings you might have about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party. Then, we’ll ask you some separate questions about any unfavorable thoughts and feelings you might have.

Do you have any favorable thoughts or feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party, or do you not have any?

*No favorable Yes at least one favorable thought or feeling*

*thoughts or feelings*

***IF AT LEAST ONE, ASK (IF Said no skip the next question):***

How favorable are your favorable thoughts and feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party?

*Slightly Moderately Very Extremely*

*favorable favorable favorable favorable*

Do you have any unfavorable thoughts or feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party, or do you not have any?

*No unfavorable Yes at least one unfavorable thought or feeling*

*thoughts of feelings*

***IF AT LEAST ONE, ASK (IF Said no skip the next question):***

How unfavorable are your unfavorable thoughts and feelings about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party?

*Slightly Moderately Very Extremely*

*unfavorable unfavorable unfavorable unfavorable*

4. Now we’d like to know more about what you think about Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party. Below, we’ve given a list of words that some people might use to describe them.

For each item, please indicate how well you think it applies to Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party: not at all well; not too well; somewhat well; very well; or extremely well.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not at all well | Not too well | Somewhat well | Very well | Extremely well |
| Patriotic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intelligent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Honest |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open-minded  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generous |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hypocritical |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selfish |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Now we’d like to know more about what you think about Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party. Below, we’ve given a list of words that some people might use to describe them.

For each item, please indicate how well you think it applies to Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party: not at all well; not too well; somewhat well; very well; or extremely well.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not at all well | Not too well | Somewhat well | Very well | Extremely well |
| Patriotic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intelligent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Honest |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open-minded  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generous |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hypocritical |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selfish |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. How much of the time do you think you can trust Republican Party voters/Republican Party candidates and elected officials/the Republican Party to do what is right for the country?

*Almost Once in a About half Most of the Almost*

*never while the time time always*

7. How much of the time do you think you can trust Democratic Party voters/Democratic Party candidates and elected officials/the Democratic Party to do what is right for the country?

*Almost Once in a About half Most of the Almost*

*never while the time time always*
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