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### Part 1: Tables

**Table A1: Counterbalancing Order for Each of Twenty Research Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Group</th>
<th>Challenger (attacker)</th>
<th>Incumbent (responder)</th>
<th>Response type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>counterattack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>counterattack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>counterattack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>counterattack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>counterimaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>counterimaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>counterimaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>counterimaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>mudslinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>mudslinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R – Hall</td>
<td>D – Stanley</td>
<td>mudslinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>R – Stanley</td>
<td>D – Hall</td>
<td>mudslinging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Hall is always the female candidate, Stanley is always the male candidate.*
Part 2: Experimental Manipulations

Candidate Biographies: Female Republican Incumbent

KATHERINE HALL (Republican), incumbent
Age: 46
Family: married since 1991 to Andrew (dean of student affairs at local community college), four children aged between 7 and 18
Born, raised, and continues to live in your local area
Education: B.A. (political science major) and J.D. (law degree) from a major state university
Military service: eight years active duty with U.S. Army, primarily as a criminal prosecutor in the Judge Advocate General’s (JAG) office
Profession: attorney specializing in family law
Civic: Public library (advisory board), United Way (local board of directors), Big Brothers/Sisters
Political: served one term (4 years) as member of County Commission, two terms (4 years) in the state House of Representatives; seeking third term as member of the U.S. House

MICHAEL STANLEY (Democrat), challenger
Age: 47
Family: married since 1990 to Rebecca (office manager for local advertising firm), two children aged 12 and 19
Born, raised, and continues to live in your local area
Education: B.S. (marketing major) and M.S. (finance/real estate) from a major state university
Military Service: U.S. Army Reserves (6 years); deployment to Afghanistan as intelligence officer in the late 1990s
Profession: commercial property management
Civic: Ronald McDonald House, Pet Rescue (local advisory board), volunteer coach for youth sports leagues
Political: served one term (4 years) as member of City Council, one term (2 years) in the state House of Representatives; currently in first term (3rd year) as member of the state Senate
Imagine that it is the fall of 2012, and the general election campaign is under way. One of the races on your ballot is for U.S. House of Representatives, where incumbent Michael Stanley (R) is being challenged by state senator Katherine Hall (D). Please read the following short biographical sketches of these candidates, and then answer the questions that immediately follow.

**MICHAEL STANLEY (Republican), incumbent**

Age: 47  
Family: married since 1990 to Rebecca (office manager for local advertising firm), two children aged 12 and 19  
Born, raised, and continues to live in your local area  
Education: B.S. (marketing major) and M.S. (finance/real estate) from a major state university  
Military Service: U.S. Army Reserves (6 years); deployment to Afghanistan as intelligence officer in the late 1990s  
Profession: commercial property management  
Civic: Ronald McDonald House, Pet Rescue (local advisory board), volunteer coach for youth sports leagues  
Political: served one term (4 years) as member of County Commission, two terms (4 years) in the state House of Representatives; seeking third term as member of the U.S. House

**KATHERINE HALL (Democrat), challenger**

Age: 46  
Family: married since 1991 to Andrew (dean of student affairs at local community college), four children aged between 7 and 18  
Born, raised, and continues to live in your local area  
Education: B.A. (political science major) and J.D. (law degree) from a major state university  
Military service: eight years active duty with U.S. Army, primarily as a criminal prosecutor in the Judge Advocate General’s (JAG) office  
Profession: attorney specializing in family law  
Civic: Public library (advisory board), United Way (local board of directors), Big Brothers/Sisters  
Political: served one term (4 years) as member of City Council, one term (2 years) in the state House of Representatives; currently in first term (3rd year) as member of the state Senate
Katherine Hall is a millionaire, and there’s nothing wrong with that — so long as she plays by the same rules as everyone else. But despite her wealth, Hall has a habit of helping herself to other people’s money. For example:

**VOTED HERSELF PAY RAISES**
As both county commissioner and state legislator, she voted herself a pay raise shortly after taking office.

**TOOK HER FAMILY TO EUROPE...ON ANOTHER’S CREDIT CARD**
She used a political party credit card to take her husband and kids on a two-week vacation to Europe. She also spent party money on such “essentials” as expensive dinners, luxury hotels, and handcrafted chairs for her legislative office.
Source: *Washington Post* (September 18, 2009)

**FUNNELED MONEY TO HER BROTHER**
She funneled money from her campaign account to rent office space (at inflated prices) in an office complex owned by her brother.
Source: *New York Times* (October 9, 2010)

Katherine Hall has also benefited personally from her shady actions as both a private citizen and a member of the state legislature:

**OVERBILLED FOR SERVICES**
In an outrageous attempt to fatten her wallet at taxpayer expense, she billed the local city government $175,000 for legal services that were worth only $20,000.
Source: *National Journal* (June 12, 2006)

**NO BID CONTRACTS TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS**
She is being investigated by the state Attorney General for supporting three separate million-dollar state contracts that were awarded — without competitive bidding — to either campaign contributors or family members.
Source: *Newsweek* (April 11, 2008)

Katherine Hall deserves to be in jail more than she deserves to be in Congress. Words like “corrupt” and “immoral” are not too strong to describe her actions as an attorney, as a candidate, and as a so-called public servant. The plain truth is, Katherine Hall does not serve the public at all — instead, she serves herself, her family, and her political friends.

The people in this congressional district deserve better.

**PAID FOR BY MICHAEL STANLEY FOR CONGRESS**
Michael Stanley will say whatever it takes to get elected . . . even if it’s not true!

STANLEY SAID: “As both county commissioner and state legislator, Katherine Hall voted herself a pay raise.”
THE TRUTH: Each of these pay raises was enacted before Hall took office.

STANLEY SAID: “She used a political party credit card to take her husband and kids on a two-week vacation to Europe.”
THE TRUTH: Hall used her own personal money to pay for this vacation, which occurred after she attended a conference on trade policy at the London School of Economics.

STANLEY SAID: “She funneled money from her campaign account to rent office space (at inflated prices) in an office complex owned by her brother.”
THE TRUTH: Her district office is located in a building complex once owned by her brother, but which was sold to another firm (having no connection to the Hall family) more than a year before Katherine was even elected to Congress.

STANLEY SAID: “She billed the local city government $175,000 for legal services that were worth only $20,000.”
THE TRUTH: This was a simple clerical error that was quickly corrected. The actual billing was just $17,500.

STANLEY SAID: “She is being investigated by the state Attorney General for supporting three separate million-dollar state contracts that were awarded — without competitive bidding — to either campaign contributors or family members.”
THE TRUTH: This investigation was concluded eight months ago, and it exonerated Katherine Hall on all counts.

You would think that someone running for Congress would at least take the time to get his facts straight.

Katherine Hall is as sick as you are of the games many politicians play, constantly attacking one another with charges that are either half-truths or outright lies — this isn’t what public service is supposed to be about. If you want a congressperson who will promise to always shoot straight with you, and always put the people’s interests ahead of her own, then Hall is your only choice. Unlike her opponent, she is not just another politician!

Re-elect Katherine Hall to the U.S. House.

PAID FOR BY KATHERINE HALL FOR CONGRESS
Michael Stanley says that voters should look at the character of the candidates in this election.

Well, Michael . . . be careful what you wish for!

Stanley accuses Katherine Hall of “corrupt” and “dishonest” behavior. Not only are his charges untrue, but consider the following:

FAILED TO PAY TAXES
A federal audit investigation found that Michael Stanley filed a false tax return three years ago, claiming business losses of over $200,000 when in fact his firm made a profit of over $3 million. He was fined and ordered to pay over a quarter million dollars in back taxes.

ILLEGAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
After his last campaign, Michael Stanley was fined by the state Elections Commission for accepting contributions from sixteen different corporate donors that exceeded the legal limit.
Source: Action News at 6 (local CBS affiliate) (February 3, 2011)

MISAPPROPRIATED STATE MONEY
While serving in the legislature, Michael Stanley has steered over $50 million in state contracts to business clients and campaign contributors — including one indicted developer who hired Stanley’s sister and even gave her a brand-new Acura.
Source: CNN.com (July 27, 2010)

OPPOSES ETHICS REFORM
On seven different occasions, Michael Stanley voted against bills that would have increased the punishment for government officials who violate state ethics laws.
Source: Late News at 11 (local Fox affiliate) (December 2, 2010)

Our country today faces some difficult challenges — high gas prices, too many people out of work, huge budget deficits, and a world that seems to get more dangerous every day. What is Michael Stanley’s solution? To attack his opponent with false charges, in a desperate effort to hide the fact that he has nothing to say about the things voters care most about.

If the issue is character, Katherine Hall is your only choice.

Her record as your representative is one that reflects common sense values, innovative ideas, and a tireless determination to see that the voice of the people is heard in Washington. Katherine Hall is making a difference for the people in this state — and for you!

Re-elect Katherine Hall to the U.S. House.

PAID FOR BY KATHERINE HALL FOR CONGRESS
Response (Counterimaging): Female Republican Incumbent

Born to a working-class family, Katherine Hall has come to embody the American dream.

WORKED TO SUPPORT FAMILY
After her father died suddenly when she was just sixteen, Katherine and her brothers worked a succession of jobs—first to help support their family, then later to put themselves through college.

AWARDED SCHOLARSHIP
A political science major in college, Katherine’s strong performance earned her a scholarship that allowed her to go on to law school and attain her J.D. degree.

A SELF-MADE WOMAN
After law school, she spent several years as a prosecutor with the U.S. Army’s JAG office before re-entering civilian life and establishing her own successful business as a family law attorney whose firm has created dozens of new jobs for local residents.

No one ever gave Katherine Hall anything that she didn’t earn. Along with her husband Andrew, she has worked hard to provide her family with a level of financial security that she simply did not have growing up.

What’s more, Katherine knows how to give back:

TO HER COUNTRY
She served in the U.S. Army JAG office for 8 years.

TO HER COMMUNITY
She has done volunteer work on behalf of the public library, United Way charities, and Big Brothers/Sisters.

TO THOSE LESS FORTUNATE
She has created an endowed scholarship fund for high-school graduates who could not otherwise afford to attend college.

TO HER CHURCH
She has engaged in a variety of charitable activities on its behalf over the years, including missions to Central America and Africa.

Katherine Hall is a woman of character and exactly the kind of person we want representing us in Washington. She is honest, hardworking, she cares about other people—and she is someone we can trust to make the right decisions, for the right reasons, on the important issues facing our country. Don’t let anyone try to tell you differently!

Re-elect Katherine Hall to the U.S. House.

PAID FOR BY KATHERINE HALL
FOR CONGRESS
Michael Stanley doesn't always see things the way they really happen.

STANLEY SAID: “As both county commissioner and state legislator, Katherine Hall voted herself a pay raise.”

THE FACTS: The salary for these offices had not changed in over ten years and, besides, the raise only applied to future commissioners and legislators — not to anyone currently serving, including Hall.

STANLEY SAID: “She used a political party credit card to take her husband and kids on a two-week vacation to Europe.”

THE FACTS: Several years ago, the state party sent Hall and two other legislators to attend official meetings with European business leaders in an effort to bring trade and clean industry to this state. Although Hall’s husband accompanied her on this trip, and on a short vacation taken after the trade meetings ended, the party was later reimbursed for all personal expenses.

STANLEY SAID: “She funneled money from her campaign account to rent office space (at inflated prices) in an office complex owned by her brother.”

THE FACTS: When first elected to Congress, Hall established a district office in exactly the same location as her predecessor — and the rent she pays has not risen one penny since then. Further, she and her brother have a signed contract stating that future rent increases will not exceed the rate of inflation so long as Katherine Hall is the tenant.

STANLEY SAID: “She billed the local city government $175,000 for legal services that were worth only $20,000.”

THE FACTS: The services in question were worth considerably more than $20,000. Although city auditors initially objected, it ultimately was agreed by all sides that the final bill would be for $142,500.

STANLEY SAID: “She is being investigated by the state Attorney General for supporting three separate million-dollar state contracts that were awarded — without competitive bidding — to either campaign contributors or family members.”

THE FACTS: The recipients of these contracts were not family members. And while they did include a few campaign donors, most of these were individuals who actually gave money to both Hall and her opponent during Hall’s last state House campaign.

When candidates attack their opponent, they should be fair and tell the whole story — not just part of it. Katherine Hall has worked hard to earn your trust, first in the state legislature and then in Washington, and she will continue working hard to keep it. She brings clear vision and honest leadership to Congress. Aren’t those qualities we could use a lot more of in politics?

Re-elect Katherine Hall to the U.S. House.

PAID FOR BY KATHERINE HALL FOR CONGRESS
Response (Mudslinging): Female Republican Incumbent

Michael Stanley is insulting your intelligence.

Instead of dealing with the things that people truly care about, Stanley insists on waging a campaign of personal attacks, lies, innuendo, and mudslinging against Congresswoman Katherine Hall. We have a question for candidate Stanley . . .

Are your leadership qualities so weak, and your ideas so out of touch with the concerns of voters, that it’s easier to sling mud at your opponent than to talk about the positive things you’d like to do if elected?

Instead of being so relentlessly negative, why don’t you tell people how YOU would deal with important problems? What about CREATING MORE JOBS? LOWERING GAS PRICES? IMPROVING PUBLIC SCHOOLS? REDUCING BUDGET DEFICITS? PROTECTING CITIZENS FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES? Do you have nothing to say about these issues at all?

Michael Stanley just doesn’t seem to get it.

• Never mind that voters say they’re sick and tired of all the mudslinging in politics today.
• Never mind that negative campaigns breed pessimism about the ability of elected leaders to deal with pressing issues.
• Never mind that negativity leads many people to give up and just stay home on Election Day.

None of this matters to Michael Stanley and his attack machine.

Desperate people do desperate things, and Stanley wants to win the election so badly that he will do almost anything—anything, that is, except talk about things that really matter. It’s time for voters to let candidates like Stanley know that they’re not going to put up with the politics of negativity any longer.

If you’re looking for someone who is willing to tackle the tough issues, and who will continue representing this district with class and integrity, Katherine Hall is the only choice.

Re-elect Katherine Hall to the U.S. House.

PAID FOR BY KATHERINE HALL FOR CONGRESS
Part 3: Background Questionnaire

Note: The following questions were answered by respondents in our voter sample prior to the introduction of any experimental stimuli. The student questionnaire was shorter, e.g., it contained fewer demographics, lacked measures of political knowledge, and posed just one of the two regime-based external efficacy items – but was otherwise identical to the voter questionnaire in all respects relevant to this paper.

Answer the following questions. In each case, indicate the number that comes closest to describing how you feel. If you have no opinion, do indicate any number.

1. Some people seem to follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there’s an election going on or not. Others aren’t that interested. How closely would you say that you follow what’s going on in government and public affairs?

   1  Most of the time
   2  Some of the time
   3  Only now and then
   4  Hardly at all

2. We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. On a scale of one through seven, where “1” is very liberal and “7” is very conservative, where would you place yourself on this scale or haven’t you thought much about it?

   1  Very liberal
   2  Liberal
   3  Slightly liberal
   4  Moderate, middle of the road
   5  Slightly conservative
   6  Conservative
   7  Very conservative
   8  Other
   9  Haven’t thought much about it

3. Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about it?

   1  Very liberal
   2  Liberal
   3  Slightly liberal
   4  Moderate, middle of the road
   5  Slightly conservative
   6  Conservative
   7  Very conservative
   8  Other
   9  Haven’t thought much about it
4. Where would you place the Republican Party on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about it?

1  Very liberal
2  Liberal
3  Slightly liberal
4  Moderate, middle of the road
5  Slightly conservative
6  Conservative
7  Very conservative
8  Other
9  Haven’t thought much about it

5. People have different views about how well government works. Depicted below is a scale with scores ranging from 1 to 7, where “1” means that government can almost always be counted on to do the wrong thing, “7” means that government can almost always be counted on to do the right thing, and “4” means that government is right about half of the time and wrong the other half.

a. Where on this scale would you place the national government in Washington?

1  National government can almost always be counted on to do the wrong thing
2  
3  
4  National government is right about half the time and wrong the other half
5  
6  
7  National government can almost always be counted on to do the right thing

b. Where would you place the state government in Tallahassee?

1  State government can almost always be counted on to do the wrong thing
2  
3  
4  State government is right about half the time and wrong the other half
5  
6  
7  State government can almost always be counted on to do the right thing

c. Where would you place the local government in the city or town where you live?

1  Local government can almost always be counted on to do the wrong thing
2  
Local government is right about half the time and wrong the other half

Local government can almost always be counted on to do the right thing

6. Would you say the government, as a whole, is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all the people? [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about this?]

- Government is run by a few big interests (feel strongly)
- Government is run by a few big interests (feel not so strongly)
- Mixed, about half and half
- Government is run for the benefit of all the people (feel not so strongly)
- Government is run for the benefit of all the people (feel strongly)

7. Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or are they mostly just looking out for themselves? [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about this?]

- People mostly try to be helpful (feel strongly)
- People mostly try to be helpful (feel not so strongly)
- Mixed, about half and half
- People mostly look out for themselves (feel not so strongly)
- People mostly look out for themselves (feel strongly)

8. When government leaders make statements to the American people on television or in the newspapers, how often do you think they are telling the truth?

- Just about always
- Most of the time
- Only some of the time
- Almost never

9. Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair? [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about this?]

- Most people would try to take advantage (feel strongly)
- Most people would try to take advantage (feel not so strongly)
- Mixed, about half and half
- Most people would try to be fair (feel not so strongly)
- Most people would try to be fair (feel strongly)

10. Next are a series of paired statements. Although you might agree to some extent with both statements in a given pair, please circle the number next to the one that comes closest to your own opinion.
a. There are many legal ways for citizens to successfully influence what the government does. OR

If public officials are not interested in hearing what the people think, there is really no way to make them listen. [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. Many legal ways to influence (feel strongly)
2. Many legal ways to influence (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. No way to make officials listen (feel not so strongly)
5. No way to make officials listen (feel strongly)

b. In general, political candidates should avoid criticizing their opponents because campaigns have become too negative. OR

Candidates need to criticize their opponents because it is important for voters to know the strengths and weaknesses of all candidates. [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. Candidates should avoid criticizing (feel strongly)
2. Candidates should avoid criticizing (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. Candidates need to criticize (feel not so strongly)
5. Candidates need to criticize (feel strongly)

c. I often don't feel sure of myself when talking with other people about politics and government. OR

I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people. [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. Often don’t feel sure (feel strongly)
2. Often don’t feel sure (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. I am better informed (feel not so strongly)
5. I am better informed (feel strongly)

d. Under our form of government, the people have the final say about how our country is run no matter who is in office. OR

People like me don’t have any say about what the government does. [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. People have the final say (feel strongly)
2. People have the final say (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. Don’t have any say (feel not so strongly)
e. Politics is about compromise, and a good politician will try to find the common ground that brings different groups together. 

OR

A good politician stands on principle and doesn’t like to compromise except as a last resort. 

[Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. Politics is about compromise (feel strongly)
2. Politics is about compromise (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. Good politician stands on principle (feel not so strongly)
5. Good politician stands on principle (feel strongly)

11. Here are two more statements, each of which describes the way some people feel about how much control they have over their personal lives. Please circle the number next to the one that comes closest to your own opinion.

I can do just about anything I really set my mind to. 

OR

I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life. [Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?]

1. I can do just about anything (feel strongly)
2. I can do just about anything (feel not so strongly)
3. Mixed, in-between
4. I often feel helpless (feel not so strongly)
5. I often feel helpless (feel strongly)

12. Generally speaking (setting aside how you might vote in a particular election), which of the following best describes how you think of yourself?

1. Strong Democrat
2. Democrat
3. Independent, leaning toward the Democrats
4. Independent, not leaning toward either party
5. Independent, leaning toward the Republicans
6. Republican
7. Strong Republican
8. Other
9. Don’t know/Not sure

13. We want to know how you feel about the two major political parties in American politics today. Please indicate how positively you feel about each party in the following manner: If you do not have any positive feelings about the party, give it the lowest rating of 1; if you have some positive feelings, rate it a 2; if you have generally positive feelings, rate it a 3; and if you have
extremely positive feelings, rate it a 4. Please rate each party based solely on how positively you feel about it, while ignoring or setting aside for the moment any negative feelings you may also have.

a. the Republican Party

1  no positive feelings
2  some positive feelings
3  generally positive feelings
4  extremely positive feelings

b. the Democratic Party

1  no positive feelings
2  some positive feelings
3  generally positive feelings
4  extremely positive feelings

14. Here are a few questions about the government in Washington. Many people don't know the answers to these questions, so if there are some you don't know just indicate that and move on to the next one.

a. Whose responsibility is it to determine if a law is constitutional or not – is it the president, the Congress or the Supreme Court?

1  President
2  Congress
3  Supreme Court
4  Don’t know

b. Who has the power to nominate judges to the federal courts?

1  President
2  Congress
3  Supreme Court
4  Don’t know

c. How much of a majority is required for the U.S. Senate and House to override a presidential veto?

1  50 percent plus 1
2  Two-thirds
3  Three-quarters
4  A presidential veto cannot be overridden by the Senate or House
5  Don’t know
d. Which party has the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington?

1. Democrats
2. Republicans
3. Don’t know

15. How much of the time do you think you can trust the people who run our government to do what is right?

1. Just about always
2. Most of the time
3. Only some of the time
4. Almost never

16. Going back to your feelings about political parties, we would now like you to indicate how negatively you feel about both the Republicans and the Democrats: If you do not have any negative feelings about the party, give it the lowest rating of 1; if you have some negative feelings, rate it a 2; if you have generally negative feelings, rate it a 3; and if you have extremely negative feelings, rate it a 4. Please rate each party based solely on how negatively you feel about it, while ignoring or setting aside for the moment any positive feelings you may also have.

a. the Republican Party

1. no negative feelings
2. some negative feelings
3. generally negative feelings
4. extremely negative feelings

b. the Democratic Party

1. no negative feelings
2. some negative feelings
3. generally negative feelings
4. extremely negative feelings

17. Some people think it is better when one party controls both the White House and Congress, while others feel that it's better when control is split between the Republicans and the Democrats. What about you . . . When the president is a Republican, do you prefer that the Democrats control Congress or the Republicans control Congress?

1. Democrats
2. Republicans
3. Doesn’t matter

18. When the president is a Democrat, do you prefer that the Democrats control Congress or that the Republicans control Congress?
1  Democrats
2  Republicans
3  Doesn’t matter

19. What is your current age?
1  18-29
2  30-44
3  45-59
4  60-69
5  70 or over

20. How much formal education have you received?
1  less than a high-school degree
2  high-school graduate
3  some college, but did not graduate
4  college graduate
5  some graduate work, but did not receive advanced degree
6  advanced graduate degree

21. What is your gender?
1  Male
2  Female

22. What is your religious affiliation?
1  Protestant
2  Evangelical Protestant
3  Catholic
4  Jewish
5  other affiliation
6  not religious

23. How often do you attend religious services?
1  at least once a week
2  once or twice a month
3  a few times a year
4  never
5  not religious

24. What is your race or ethnic identity?
White (or Caucasian)
African American
Latino
Asian
Native American
other

25. Would you say that your household’s approximate yearly income bracket is . . .

less than $15,000
between $15,000 and $35,000
between $35,000 and $50,000
between $50,000 and $70,000
between $70,000 and $90,000
between $90,000 and $120,000
between $120,000 and $150,000
between $150,000 and $200,000
over $200,000