

Laboratory for Research in Social Relations
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1 August 1960

Dear Friend,

As you no doubt recall, in 1957 and 1958 you very kindly cooperated in our research project on political affiliation and belief. At that time you expressed interest in receiving a brief summary of our findings. We regret that the following report has been so long delayed owing to the large number of respondents and the great variety of data collected.

In June of 1957 our booklets were mailed to the 6,848 available delegates and alternates to the 1956 Democratic and Republican National Conventions. After several reminders, we received a total of 3,193 questionnaires, 3,020 of which were complete and usable in all respects. These booklets included 1,788 from Democratic delegates and 1,232 from Republican delegates. The return was about 45% from each party convention, the greater number of Democrats resulting from the larger number of delegates authorized by the convention rules of that party.

During January 1958, the American Institute of Public Opinion (better known as the Gallup Poll) distributed our questionnaires to two representative nationwide samples. Of the 2,917 people reached, 1,610 responded, of which 1,484 (or about 51% of the total) returned completed booklets. Those who claimed to be Democrats or Independents who favored the Democratic party were grouped to make up our sample of 821 Democratic followers. Republicans and Independents who favored the Republican party were combined into a sample of 623 Republican followers.

Since there is no readily defined body of "political leaders", we cannot say how closely the convention delegates represent the total party leadership. However, our delegates are drawn from every level of political activity, from United States Senator to precinct worker, from every state and every size community, and from party and public office. They represent, we feel, as accurate a sample of "political leaders" as can be obtained without engaging in an even more elaborate and expensive study.

We consider the samples obtained for us by the American Institute of Public Opinion as representing the rank-and-file of the two major parties. These samples closely match the national population on such characteristics as age, sex, and region of the country.

From the following tables comparisons can be made between the leaders of the two parties, the followers of the two parties, or the leaders and followers of the same party.

Tables 1 through 5 present our results on certain characteristics of the samples,—age, education, religion, occupation, and section of the country. Note that among Republicans, both leaders and followers are slightly older than their Democratic counterparts. Republican leaders and followers are somewhat better educated than the corresponding Democrats, but the most striking difference is the far higher educational level of both leader groups compared with the follower samples. The religious differences conform largely to the popular conception in which Catholics and Jews are more Democratic, Protestants more Republican. In table 4 we have grouped the occupations under several broad headings: 'Professional' refers to vocations requiring highly specialized college preparation (lawyers, doctors, etc.), while 'minor professionals' require specialized training but not necessarily on the college level, such as chiropractors, practical nurses, or reporters. 'Upper white collar' includes such occupations as assessors, real estate brokers, and high level salesmen. 'Upper and middle managerial' had to have more than one business establishment and report an annual income of over \$10,000 dollars, while 'lower managerial' had a single business establishment and earned less than \$10,000. The remaining categories follow closely the U.S. Census definition. Note the tendency, once again,

for leaders of both parties to be drawn from the higher occupational groups. As expected, there is a strong tendency for managerial groups to be Republican and for workers to be Democratic.

	Dem. Leaders *N=1788 % 's	Rep. Leaders N=1232 % 's	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 % 's	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 % 's		Dem. Leaders N=1788 % 's	Rep. Leaders N=1232 % 's	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 % 's	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 % 's
1. AGE:					4. OCCUPATION:				
Under 25	0.4	0.2	5.7	7.1	Prof.	36.2	27.4	6.7	6.7
25 - 34	9.7	7.5	23.1	19.4	Minor Prof.				
35 - 44	26.6	20.2	26.8	19.1	U. W. C.	23.9	21.8	10.5	15.2
45 - 54	32.8	31.0	19.5	22.3	U&M Mgr.	14.8	28.2	0.6	2.2
55 - 64	19.3	26.9	11.8	17.5	Low. Mgrs.	9.1	8.0	5.0	7.7
65 and over	10.9	14.0	12.5	14.4	Cler.&Low.				
2. EDUCATION:					White Col.	4.3	3.9	10.8	12.5
Grade School	4.5	2.4	23.1	19.1	Workers	4.3	1.9	48.6	34.3
High School	20.5	18.3	53.7	47.3	Farmers	5.9	7.3	11.4	14.0
College	74.6	79.1	23.0	33.1	5. SECTIONAL DIV:*				
3. RELIGION:					East	19.8	23.3	24.4	32.1
Presbyterian	9.2	14.5	3.2	8.0	Mid-West	27.1	30.5	32.5	39.2
Episcopalian	7.3	16.5	2.7	4.7	West	23.0	19.2	17.3	16.7
Congrega-					South	28.1	25.6	25.6	11.6
tional	2.0	6.5	1.3	3.2	Dist.&Terr.	2.0	1.4	0.2	0.5
Lutheran	3.7	4.0	6.3	10.0	+States included in each section are:				
Methodist	13.7	15.4	11.1	15.9	East:Conn.,Del.,Maine,Md.,Mass.,New Hamp.,				
Baptist	7.9	4.7	12.7	9.6	New Jer., NY, Pa., R.I., Vt., West Va.				
Other Pro-					Mid-West:Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kansas, Mich.,				
testants	10.3	12.0	13.1	16.7	Minn., Missouri, Neb., N.D., S.D., Ohio,				
Catholic	26.8	9.7	26.4	15.7	Wisconsin.				
Jewish	5.1	2.5	3.9	0.6	West:Ariz., Calif., Colorado, Idaho, Mont.,				
Other	12.0	13.2	17.7	15.1	Nev., New Mex., Oreg., Utah, Wash. Wy.				
					South:Ala.,Ark.,Fla.,Ga.,Kent.,La.,Miss.,				
					N.C., Okla.,S.C.,Tenn.,Texas, Va.				

Tables 6 through 12 present our data on the background of our respondents. Persons of English, Irish, Scottish and Canadian extraction are more represented among leaders than in the rank and file, while the reverse is true for all other nationalities. Both Republican leaders and followers perceive themselves as slightly higher in social class than the corresponding Democrats, while both leader groups classify themselves in a higher social class, on the average, than their followers. There is little difference in the size of communities from which our respondents come, except for a slight tendency for leaders to come more frequently from urban and metropolitan areas. It is interesting to note in comparing tables 4 and 9 that all samples reflect the national shift away from farming as an occupation. As expected, most people follow the party of their parents, as measured by fathers' allegiance. Leaders appear to conform more closely than followers to their fathers' party, and it is significant that followers are much more likely than leaders not to know their fathers' party affiliation. Similarly, the leaders in both parties are much more likely to know the political opinions of their friends and relatives. It should be noted in Table 12 that the Democratic leaders exhibit the highest percentage of liberals, followed by Democratic followers, Republican followers, and Republican leaders. The order is exactly reversed for conservative percentages, with Republican leaders highest and Democratic leaders lowest. Followers of both parties are less likely than leaders to consider themselves 'middle of the road', but also much more likely not to know their own position. In all these tables, there is a considerable tendency for people to conform to their backgrounds and surroundings.

*In our tables, all percentages are computed on the numbers shown on this line. A few respondents did not indicate their age, education, etc., so some percentages do not add up to 100%.

Dem. Leaders N=1788 %s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %s
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Dem. Leaders N=1788 %s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %s
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

6. NATIONALITY FROM WHICH DESCENDED:

American	0.9	0.9	7.1	3.0
Scandinavian	5.0	6.3	4.3	8.2
English, Scot. & Canadian	48.1	58.8	32.9	42.7
Irish	36.3	25.7	27.0	19.6
North. Europ.	9.8	11.2	8.3	12.4
German,				
Austrian	19.6	25.0	19.7	32.7
Italian	3.1	1.7	3.9	3.7
Russian, East				
European	5.0	1.9	10.7	4.5
Spanish, Mex.,				
Latin America	1.4	1.0	2.2	0.6
Chinese, Jap- anese, Orient.	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.3
Other	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.3

7. SOCIAL CLASS TO WHICH RESPONDENT FEELS HE BELONGS:

Upper	11.7	19.2	1.7	1.9
Upper-middle	40.8	46.4	11.0	15.7
Middle	37.3	29.4	40.2	47.3
Lower middle	2.0	1.2	7.4	7.4
Working	4.3	0.8	35.2	23.6
Don't know	2.3	2.2	3.8	3.4

8. SIZE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH RESPONDENT GREW UP:*

Farm	17.8	15.8	27.6	28.4
Town	19.3	17.7	16.7	18.6
Small city	21.0	21.7	18.4	17.2
Large city	27.1	28.7	26.7	22.6
Metropolitan-Suburban	12.2	14.4	7.8	10.6

9. FATHER'S OCCUPATION:

Professional	13.6	14.7	3.0	5.0
Minor Prof.	5.9	4.8	2.1	3.2
U. W. C.	7.3	10.4	0.6	1.1
U & M Mgrs.	13.5	14.5	4.5	8.5
Low. Mgrs.	4.6	6.6	0.7	0.5
Cler. & Low				
White Collar	4.4	3.2	3.6	5.5
Skilled Work.	11.5	9.6	18.1	15.4
Farmers	19.9	17.6	25.5	30.5
Semi, unskill.				
Workers	8.2	5.3	18.9	14.0
Retired	3.4	4.0	7.1	5.5

10. FATHER'S PARTY:

Republican	19.0	68.9	14.6	55.7
Democrat	66.5	17.5	57.7	20.2
Sometimes one, sometimes other	8.5	7.5	7.9	9.3
Other party	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.6
Couldn't vote	1.4	1.6	6.3	2.9
Don't know	3.1	3.2	12.2	10.8

11. NUMBER OF ASSOCIATES WHO DISAGREE WITH RESPONDENT'S POLITICAL OPINIONS:

a. Relatives:

No	24.8	34.7	29.1	29.5
Yes, a few	59.0	55.3	44.5	49.6
Yes, a good many	14.3	8.7	5.4	4.0
Don't know	1.5	1.4	20.2	16.9

b. Friends:

No	5.6	8.5	18.9	14.4
Yes, a few	61.5	70.1	53.1	60.7
Yes, a good many	32.1	20.7	6.3	6.4
Don't know	0.6	0.6	20.9	18.0

12. RESPONDENT'S EVALUATION OF HIS OWN POLITICAL OUTLOOK:

Liberal	54.8	10.5	24.4	11.2
Middle of the road	34.2	46.8	30.2	40.9
Conservative	9.7	41.8	16.1	23.6
Don't know	0.5	0.6	26.2	22.1

*Town--under 2,500

Small City--2,500 to 10,000

Large City--10,000 to 100,000

Metropolitan--Suburban--over 100,000

One of the questions often in controversy concerns the amount of support that exists for various public policies. To investigate this question, all respondents were asked whether they wanted to increase, to decrease, or to retain the present level of support for each of 24 important national issues. Our results are shown in the following tables. Although our respondents were presented with 24 separate issues, we have since grouped our issues into the categories shown in tables 13 through 17. In many cases, of course, issues could logically be placed in more than one of these groups. It is at once apparent that Democratic and Republican leaders differ in their opinions far more sharply than their followers do. It is also evident that the leaders and followers do not always see eye to eye on the same questions.

Dem.	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.
Leaders	Leaders	Foll'ws	Foll'ws
N=1788	N=1232	N=821	N=623
%'s	%'s	%'s	%'s

Dem.	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.
Leaders	Leaders	Foll'ws	Foll'ws
N=1788	N=1232	N=821	N=623
%'s	%'s	%'s	%'s

13. PUBLIC CONTROL OF RESOURCES:

Atomic Energy:

Increase	73.2	45.0	64.2	59.4
Decrease	7.2	15.3	7.1	10.0
Same, no ans.	19.6	39.7	28.7	30.6

Natural Resources:

Increase	57.5	12.9	35.3	31.1
Decrease	18.6	51.9	15.0	19.9
Same, no ans.	23.8	35.2	49.7	49.0

14. GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF THE ECONOMY:

Enforcement of Anti-monopoly Laws:

Increase	78.0	44.9	53.2	51.0
Decrease	2.9	9.0	7.9	6.6
Same, no ans.	19.1	46.1	38.9	42.4

Regulation of Public Utilities:

Increase	59.0	17.9	39.3	26.0
Decrease	6.4	17.6	11.1	12.0
Same, no ans.	34.6	64.5	49.6	62.0

Regulation of Trade Unions:

Increase	59.3	86.4	46.6	57.8
Decrease	12.4	4.5	8.9	10.6
Same, no ans.	28.3	9.2	44.5	31.6

Level of Farm Price Supports:

Increase	43.4	6.7	39.0	23.0
Decrease	28.1	67.4	27.6	40.3
Same, no ans.	28.5	25.8	33.4	36.7

Restrictions on Credit:

Increase	24.8	20.6	26.1	25.7
Decrease	39.3	20.6	22.2	23.8
Same, no ans.	35.9	58.8	51.8	50.5

Government Control of Business:

Increase	20.2	0.6	18.6	7.4
Decrease	38.5	84.1	33.4	46.2
Same, no ans.	41.3	15.3	48.0	46.4

Level of Tariffs:

Increase	13.0	19.2	16.6	15.2
Decrease	43.0	26.3	25.3	21.3
Same, no ans.	43.9	54.5	58.1	63.4

15. EQUALITARIAN AND HUMAN WELFARE:

Slum Clearance and Public Housing:

Increase	78.4	40.1	79.5	72.5
Decrease	5.6	21.6	5.8	7.9
Same, no ans.	16.0	38.3	14.6	19.6

Social Security Benefits:

Increase	60.0	22.5	69.4	57.0
Decrease	3.9	13.1	3.0	3.8
Same, no ans.	36.1	64.4	27.5	39.2

Federal Aid To Education:

Increase	66.2	22.3	74.9	64.8
Decrease	13.4	43.2	5.6	8.3
Same, no ans.	20.4	34.5	19.5	26.8

Minimum Wages:

Increase	50.0	15.5	59.0	43.5
Decrease	4.7	12.5	2.9	5.0
Same, no ans.	45.2	72.0	38.1	51.5

15. (Continued)

Enforcement of Supreme Court Decision on Desegregation:

Increase	43.8	25.5	41.9	40.8
Decrease	26.6	31.7	27.4	23.6
Same, no ans.	29.5	42.8	30.7	35.6

Immigration into U.S.:

Increase	36.1	18.4	10.4	8.0
Decrease	27.0	29.9	52.0	44.6
Same, no ans.	36.9	51.7	37.6	47.4

16. TAX POLICY:

Corporate Incomes Taxes:

Increase	32.3	4.0	32.0	23.3
Decrease	23.3	61.5	20.5	25.7
Same, no ans.	44.4	34.5	47.5	51.0

Taxes on Large Income:

Increase	27.0	5.4	46.6	34.7
Decrease	23.1	56.9	13.8	21.7
Same, no ans.	49.9	37.7	39.6	43.6

Taxes on Business Enterprise:

Increase	12.6	1.0	24.6	15.9
Decrease	38.3	71.1	24.1	32.6
Same, no ans.	49.1	27.8	51.3	51.5

Taxes on Middle Incomes:

Increase	2.7	0.8	4.5	3.0
Decrease	50.2	63.9	49.3	44.3
Same, no ans.	47.1	35.3	46.2	52.6

Taxes on Small Incomes:

Increase	1.4	2.9	1.6	2.1
Decrease	79.2	65.0	77.5	69.6
Same, no ans.	19.4	32.1	20.9	28.3

17. FOREIGN POLICY:

Reliance on the United Nations:

Increase	48.9	24.4	34.7	33.4
Decrease	17.6	34.8	17.3	19.3
Same, no ans.	33.5	40.7	48.0	47.3

American Participation in Military Alliances, e.g., NATO:

Increase	41.5	22.7	39.1	32.3
Decrease	17.6	25.7	14.0	15.4
Same, no ans.	40.9	51.6	46.9	52.3

Foreign Aid:

Increase	17.8	7.6	10.1	10.1
Decrease	51.0	61.7	58.6	57.3
Same, no ans.	31.1	30.7	31.3	32.6

Defense Spending:

Increase	20.7	13.6	50.5	45.7
Decrease	34.4	33.6	16.4	15.4
Same, no ans.	44.8	52.8	33.0	38.8

*Between the response of our leaders and our followers, Sputnik I was launched, which may account for the far higher follower support of defense spending.

On certain issues, such as taxes on large incomes and on business enterprise, followers are noticeably more prepared to increase taxes than are leaders, a difference which may partly stem from the fact that the leaders have far higher incomes than the followers. Most of our issues involve some form of government activity or regulation and it is apparent that Democratic leaders are more favorable to such activity and regulation than the Republican leaders are. The Democrats are more favorable to public control of resources, to government regulation of the economy (except regulation of trade unions), to equalitarian and social welfare programs, to taxes (except on middle and small incomes), and to a more internationally oriented foreign policy. It should be noted, however, that there are among the leaders of both parties many people who do not hold the position adopted by most of their colleagues. Some of the differences between party leaders, are, in addition, largely differences of degree rather than fundamental antagonisms. There is a fairly clear controversy, however, on a few issues, such as control of natural resources, farm price supports, and federal aid to education, where Democratic leaders solidly favor increased support while their Republican counterparts strongly favor decreased support. A far more detailed analysis of our issue findings appeared recently in the American Political Science Review for June 1960 (Volume LIV, Number 2, pp. 406-27) under the title "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Party Leaders and Followers" by Herbert McClosky and others.

When asked if the parties should hold similar or very different views on issues, Democratic leaders and followers felt that the two parties should present very different points of view. The leaders of both parties, furthermore, felt this much more strongly than their followers. The percentages in each group favoring sharp differences between the parties were: Democratic leaders, 53.2%, Republican leaders, 47.7%, Democratic followers, 21.0%, and Republican followers, 18.6%.

We also wanted to know whether the parties regard various organizations and social groups in the same way, or whether they identify with different ones. Each respondent was therefore asked to indicate which organizations he would be most likely to take advice from, and which social groups he felt had too much power. Our results are shown in tables 18 and 19. In many cases, the difference is slight, but Democratic leaders are much more likely than Republicans to take advice from liberal reform organizations, the Farmers' Union, Catholic organizations, and trade unions, while Republican leaders are far readier to listen to the Chamber of Commerce, Protestant organizations, the Farm Bureau, and the National Association of Manufacturers. The followers divide in the same way, but the differences are smaller. Democratic leaders and followers feel businessmen have too much power, while Republican leaders feel trade unions, farmers and intellectuals are disproportionately powerful. Republican followers, however, agree with their leaders only on the power of unions.

	Dem. Leaders N=1788 %'s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %'s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %'s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %'s		Dem. Leaders N=1788 %'s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %'s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %'s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %'s
18. GROUPS FROM WHICH RESPONDENT WOULD MOST LIKELY TAKE ADVICE*					19. GROUPS WHICH RESPONDENT FEELS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER*				
Grange	10.6	13.8	10.1	12.4	Farmers	17.3	33.7	11.4	14.9
Liberal					Labor Unions	56.3	94.0	66.1	84.9
Reform Orgns.	38.1	6.7	12.7	5.8	Businessmen	42.0	8.6	43.2	20.9
Chamber of					Protestants	6.1	5.1	10.1	7.7
Commerce	28.7	63.1	43.0	48.2	Catholics	18.6	22.3	33.4	34.3
Farmers'					Jews	17.9	24.5	35.8	32.3
Union	23.4	2.5	15.1	11.6	Negroes	20.9	20.5	29.8	24.9
Veteran's &					Foreign Born	17.2	20.9	39.1	31.8
Patriot Orgns.	29.2	30.5	41.8	31.1	Intellectuals	13.0	24.4	20.6	18.5
Trade Unions	31.4	3.8	22.9	6.6	No Answer	14.9	4.1	9.1	5.3
Protestant									
Orgns.	29.1	37.3	37.6	54.1					
Conservative									
Reform Orgns.	17.8	39.0	10.8	15.6					
Farm Bureau	12.8	27.4	22.8	24.9					
Nat'l Assoc.									
of Manufac.	11.0	43.4	16.4	21.5					
Catholic									
Orgns.	19.8	8.9	25.6	14.9					
No Answer	6.9	5.0	3.7	3.5					

*The questions on which both these tables are based allowed respondents to make more than one choice, so percentages add to more than 100%.

Our booklet included a page of questions on various aspects of our respondents' political experience. So few of the followers answered these questions that the following summary refers only to leaders. Political work is only a part-time activity for about 85% of the leaders of both parties, over two-thirds reporting that they spend ten hours a week or less on politics. About 60% of each party's delegates held some party office at the time they answered our questionnaire, most often at the county level. About the same percentage have at one time held public office, more often at the local or state rather than the national level. Two thirds of all delegates and alternates were attending their first national convention in 1956. There is little difference between the parties on most of these questions. Both consist of a large proportion of leaders who are not, in the strict sense, professionals.

Our study also included a number of questions on attitudes toward the party system. For example, Republican leaders report that they are, on the average, more interested in national politics, while Democratic leaders are more concerned with the state and local levels. Republican leaders prefer their party to control the Presidency rather than Congress (if it cannot control both), while Democratic leaders prefer to control Congress. On both questions, followers conform to their leaders but the differences are smaller. Democratic and Republican followers and Democratic leaders feel, for the most part, that control of the political parties should rest at the national level, but Republican leaders prefer this control to rest at the state level.

Tables 20 through 23 present our findings on four specific proposals often made for improving the political system. Both sets of followers tend to favor nominating presidential candidates by direct primary, but Democratic leaders are about evenly divided and Republican leaders tend to oppose this device. Except among Republican leaders, there is a strong preference for placing stricter limits on the size of political contributions and for regulating party expenditures for campaign activities. All groups, however, generally oppose a government subsidy for campaign expenses, although Democratic leaders and followers are less opposed than their Republican counterparts.

	Dem. Leaders N=1788 %'s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %'s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %'s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %'s		Dem. Leaders N=1788 %'s	Rep. Leaders N=1232 %'s	Dem. Foll'ws N=821 %'s	Rep. Foll'ws N=623 %'s
20. PREFERENCE FOR NOMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES BY DIRECT PRIMARY:					22. PREFERENCE FOR CLOSER REGULATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF PARTY EXPENDITURES FOR CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES:				
Favor Adopting	48.5	35.8	61.5	57.9	Favor Adopting	74.9	48.4	65.8	61.2
Do not favor	47.4	59.1	19.2	26.2	Do not favor	21.0	45.4	11.9	18.8
Don't Know	3.5	3.0	16.4	13.6	Don't know	3.2	4.7	19.0	17.5
No answer	0.6	2.1	2.8	2.2	No answer	0.9	1.5	3.3	2.6
21. PREFERENCE FOR STRICTER LIMITS ON SIZE OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS:					23. PREFERENCE FOR FINANCING ELECTION CAMPAIGNS BY GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY:				
Favor Adopting	75.6	44.8	61.5	60.5	Favor Adopting	33.1	9.2	15.5	11.1
Do not favor	20.6	47.7	15.3	15.4	Do not favor	57.8	84.4	56.6	64.4
Don't Know	2.7	5.6	20.0	20.9	Don't know	8.3	5.3	24.8	21.2
No answer	1.0	1.9	3.2	3.2	No answer	0.8	1.2	3.0	3.4

We are certain that most respondents will remember the large number of seemingly unrelated statements which filled the last half of our booklet. You were asked, you may recall, to indicate whether you agreed or disagreed with each. Each of these statements, and certain groups of statements, tell us something about the attitudes people hold. Through these statements we were able to get some idea of your attitudes on a number of economic, social, and political questions,—on many more, in fact, than we have room to present here. In Table 24 we present a few illustrations by giving the average scores on half a dozen different attitudes. Usually scores can range from 0 (low) to 9 (high), and differences of even a point or two may be large enough to signify an important difference in overall attitude.

Dem. Leaders N=1788	Rep. Leaders N=1232	Dem. Foll'ws N=821	Rep. Foll'ws N=623
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

24. AVERAGE SCORES ON SELECTED ATTITUDES

Business Attitudes *(For example--'Most things would run pretty well by themselves if the government just didn't interfere')	3.68	5.31	4.00	4.39
Economic Conservatism (For example--'The more a man learns about our economic system, the less willing he is to see changes made')	5.39	6.83	4.69	5.51
Isolationism (For example--'George Washington's advice to stay out of agreements with foreign powers is just as wise now as it was when he was alive')	3.06	4.20	4.70	4.59
Political Cynicism (For example--'Most political parties care only about winning elections and nothing more')	2.63	2.91	4.93	4.29
Procedural Rights (For example--'No matter what a person's political beliefs are, he is entitled to the same legal rights and protections as anyone else')	6.95	6.26	5.34	5.32
Faith in Democracy (For example--'I think our government is better off when it is run by the average man')	3.08	2.87	2.27	2.29

*We have included for each attitude in this table an example of the statements we used in computing these average scores.

On business attitudes there is little difference between the two groups of followers, but the leaders are widely separated, the Republican leaders being far more favorable to business than either group of followers, while the Democratic leaders are less favorable than the followers of either parties. With respect to economic conservatism, Republican leaders and followers are respectively more conservative than Democratic leaders and followers, but both groups of leaders are noticeably more conservative than their own followers. The political tradition of isolationism receives about the same support from the followers of both parties, but leaders are less isolationist, with the Democratic leaders least isolationist of all four samples. It is interesting to note that leaders (with far more political experience) are much less inclined to be cynical about politics than are followers. The followers of both parties do not differ much in their support for procedural rights, but the leaders of both parties believe more strongly than their followers in the need to protect these rights. There is little difference between parties in their faith in democracy, but we should note that leaders of both parties have much more faith in the average man (to quote our example) than does the average man himself.

We are continuing a detailed analysis of the data presented above, and other items which we have not been able to include in this report. We hope that further results of our study will soon appear in political science and other scholarly journals. Our study will, we hope, eventually permit us to describe with some confidence the similarities and differences between the leaders of the major parties, between the followers, and between the leaders and followers of each party.

Thank you again for your patience and for your cooperation with this project.

Sincerely yours,

Herbert McClosky
HERBERT McCLOSKEY
Project Director