



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

**DATE: March 26, 2004**

**CONTACT:** Adam Clymer at 202-879-6757 or (202) 549-7161 (cell)

**VISIT:** [www.naes04.org](http://www.naes04.org)

**Public Attitudes About Nader Decline Sharply Since 2000  
As He Starts His White House Run, Annenberg Data Show**

Ralph Nader, whose independent candidacy worries Democrats who think he cost them the White House in 2000, has become distinctly unpopular with the American public which held a balanced view of him four years ago, the University of Pennsylvania's National Annenberg Election Survey shows.

In 2000, Annenberg polling showed that 24 percent of the public had a favorable view of Nader and 24 percent an unfavorable opinion. In 2004, 21 percent have a favorable view and 37 percent an unfavorable opinion.

Even liberals, who gave him his most favorable net assessment in 2000, when 33 percent were favorable and 17 percent unfavorable, are now split about evenly. Twenty-nine percent have a favorable opinion and 30 percent an unfavorable view. The margin of sampling error for the 1,596 people asked about Nader between February 23 and March 22 is plus or minus two percentage points.

In 2000, Nader's ratings remained quite steady between July 5 and Election Day, a period in which 37,284 people were interviewed. Along with those who had a positive or negative opinion then, another 20 percent said their view was neutral. The margin of sampling error was one half of one percentage point. (In 2004, 28 percent say their opinion is neutral.)

Four years ago, Republicans and conservatives were the most negative on the longtime consumer advocate. Only 18 percent of Republicans had a favorable opinion of Nader in 2000, and 33 percent an unfavorable one. Among conservatives, 18 percent were favorable and 31 percent unfavorable.

Now Republicans, despite the fact that Nader took far more votes (97,488) in crucial Florida in 2000 than the margin by which George W. Bush won the state over Al Gore (537 votes), display no gratitude as 42 percent of them view him unfavorably, up sharply from 2000.

-More-

While there is no exit poll data available from Florida in 2000, if Gore had received one percent more of the Nader vote than Bush did, he would have won. Nationally, 45 percent of voters leaving polling places said they would have voted for Gore if Nader had not been on the ballot and 27 percent of them would have voted for Bush. Pre-election Annenberg national data showed that 48 percent of prospective Nader voters said they would have gone for Gore if Nader had not been on their ballot, while 25 percent would have gone for Bush. (Of course, Nader has said that in 2004 he expects to cost Bush more votes than he costs John Kerry.)

Seventeen percent of Republicans now have a favorable opinion of Nader, compared to the 42 percent with an unfavorable view. His stock has declined among conservatives, too. Among conservatives, 18 percent still have a favorable opinion while 42 percent hold a negative view, compare to 31 percent in 2000.

Young people, traditionally a core of his admirers, appear to have shifted less in their net assessment than any other age group, though far more of them have opinions this time. In 2000, 15 percent of those 18 to 29 had a favorable view of Nader and 13 percent an unfavorable opinion. Now 22 percent have a favorable opinion and 27 percent a negative view.

The oldest respondents, those 65 and older, have become the most negative group. Four years ago, 25 percent of them had a favorable opinion of Nader and 34 percent an unfavorable opinion. Now 15 percent have a favorable view and 50 percent an unfavorable opinion.

Over the same February 23-March 22, 2004 polling period, 49 percent of the public said they had a favorable opinion of Bush and 38 percent an unfavorable view. Of the lesser-known Kerry, 39 percent had a favorable view and 25 percent an unfavorable opinion. More people were asked about Bush and Kerry than about Nader, and the margin of sampling error for them was plus or minus one percentage point.

(Table will show 2000 and 2004 views by a bunch of demographics.)

That National Annenberg Election Survey, the largest academic election poll, is a project of the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania ([www.AnnenbergPublicPolicyCenter.org](http://www.AnnenbergPublicPolicyCenter.org)). It has been tracking the presidential campaign since October 7, and interviewing will continue until after Election Day. Dr. Kathleen Hall Jamieson is the director of the survey. Ken Winneg is the managing director of the survey. Adam Clymer is the political director of the survey.

Another major election project of the Annenberg Public Policy Center is [FactCheck.org](http://FactCheck.org), a project that tries to hold politicians accountable by exposing false or misleading campaign statements. It is available online at [www.FactCheck.Org](http://www.FactCheck.Org).

-More-

## Questions

A. **2000:** On a scale of zero to 100, how would you rate Ralph Nader? Zero means very unfavorable, and 100 means very favorable. Fifty means you do not feel favorable or unfavorable.

B. **2004:** For each of the following people in politics, please tell me if your opinion is favorable or unfavorable using a scale from zero to ten. Zero means very unfavorable, and ten means very favorable. Five means you do not feel favorable or unfavorable toward that person. On a scale of zero to ten, how would you rate Ralph Nader?

	2000 favor	2004 favor	2000 unfavor	2004 unfavor	2000 neutral	2004 neutral	2000 +/-	2004 +/-
<b>Total</b>	24%	<b>21%</b>	24%	<b>37%</b>	20%	<b>28%</b>	0	<b>-16</b>
<b>Republicans</b>	18%	<b>17%</b>	33%	<b>42%</b>	21%	<b>30%</b>	-15	<b>-25</b>
<b>Democrats</b>	27%	<b>20%</b>	21%	<b>40%</b>	20%	<b>27%</b>	+6	<b>-20</b>
<b>Independents</b>	27%	<b>25%</b>	23%	<b>36%</b>	20%	<b>26%</b>	+4	<b>-11</b>
<b>Men</b>	25%	<b>21%</b>	30%	<b>41%</b>	19%	<b>24%</b>	-5	<b>-20</b>
<b>Women</b>	23%	<b>20%</b>	20%	<b>32%</b>	20%	<b>31%</b>	+3	<b>-12</b>
<b>Whites</b>	25%	<b>22%</b>	25%	<b>38%</b>	20%	<b>29%</b>	0	<b>-16</b>
<b>African-Americans</b>	19%	<b>14%</b>	19%	<b>37%</b>	17%	<b>25%</b>	0	<b>-23</b>
<b>Latinos</b>	14%	<b>23%</b>	12%	<b>12%</b>	13%	<b>30%</b>	+2	<b>+11</b>
<b>High school graduate or less</b>	17%	<b>18%</b>	22%	<b>31%</b>	19%	<b>28%</b>	-5	<b>-13</b>
<b>Some college</b>	25%	<b>25%</b>	24%	<b>37%</b>	21%	<b>29%</b>	+1	<b>-12</b>
<b>College degree or more</b>	36%	<b>21%</b>	29%	<b>47%</b>	20%	<b>26%</b>	+7	<b>-26</b>
<b>18-29 years old</b>	15%	<b>22%</b>	13%	<b>27%</b>	16%	<b>32%</b>	+2	<b>-5</b>
<b>30-44</b>	22%	<b>19%</b>	22%	<b>30%</b>	20%	<b>32%</b>	-0	<b>-11</b>
<b>45-64</b>	31%	<b>23%</b>	30%	<b>44%</b>	22%	<b>24%</b>	+1	<b>-21</b>
<b>65 and over</b>	25%	<b>15%</b>	34%	<b>50%</b>	20%	<b>21%</b>	-9	<b>-35</b>
<b>Household income below \$35,000</b>	19%	<b>19%</b>	20%	<b>30%</b>	18%	<b>28%</b>	-1	<b>-11</b>
<b>\$35,000 to less than \$75,000</b>	26%	<b>23%</b>	26%	<b>36%</b>	22%	<b>31%</b>	0	<b>-13</b>
<b>\$75,000 and over</b>	31%	<b>22%</b>	31%	<b>49%</b>	32%	<b>23%</b>	0	<b>-27</b>
<b>Union household</b>	29%	<b>26%</b>	23%	<b>42%</b>	21%	<b>19%</b>	+6	<b>-16</b>
<b>Conservatives</b>	18%	<b>18%</b>	31%	<b>42%</b>	21%	<b>27%</b>	-13	<b>-24</b>
<b>Moderates</b>	25%	<b>19%</b>	23%	<b>37%</b>	21%	<b>30%</b>	+2	<b>-18</b>
<b>Liberals</b>	33%	<b>29%</b>	17%	<b>30%</b>	17%	<b>27%</b>	+16	<b>-1</b>
<b>Northeast</b>	28%	<b>24%</b>	22%	<b>37%</b>	21%	<b>27%</b>	+6	<b>-13</b>
<b>Midwest</b>	23%	<b>19%</b>	26%	<b>40%</b>	21%	<b>26%</b>	-3	<b>-21</b>
<b>South</b>	19%	<b>19%</b>	24%	<b>35%</b>	19%	<b>26%</b>	-5	<b>-16</b>
<b>West</b>	27%	<b>22%</b>	26%	<b>35%</b>	19%	<b>33%</b>	+1	<b>-13</b>

Those with no opinion are not shown.

## Survey Methodology

The National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) is a survey conducted each presidential election by the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania.

The 2004 National Annenberg Election Survey is based on telephone interviews which began October 7, 2003 and will continue past Election Day.

The sample of telephone exchanges called was randomly selected by a computer from a complete list of thousands of active residential exchanges across the country. Within each exchange, random digits were added to form a complete telephone number, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted numbers. Within each household, one adult was designated by a random procedure to be the respondent for the survey. The interviewing is conducted by Schulman, Ronca, Bucuvalas, Inc.

The results have been weighted to take account of household size and number of telephone lines into the residence and to adjust for variation in the sample relating to geographic region, sex, race, age and education.

This report deals with interviewing conducted in 2000, when 37,284 people were interviewed between July 5 and Election Day, and in 2004, when 4,695 people were interviewed between February 23 and March 22, and 1,596 of them were asked about Ralph Nader.

In theory, in 19 cases out of 20 the results for the 2000 interviews will differ by no more than one half of a percentage point, up or down, from what would have been obtained by interviewing all American adults. For the entire 2000 sample, the margin of sampling error would be plus or minus one percentage point, and for those asked about Nader, plus or minus two percentage points. For smaller subgroups, the potential sampling error would be higher.

In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting any survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the poll. Variations in the wording and order of questions, for example, may lead to somewhat different results.

###