



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DATE: November 19, 2004

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

VISIT: www.naes04.org

Party Identification Shifts Toward Republicans, But Democrats Still Lead, Annenberg Data Show

Republicans narrowed the gap in party allegiance in the 2004 campaign, but are still outnumbered by Democrats, the University of Pennsylvania's National Annenberg Election Survey shows.

Polling of 67,777 registered voters from October 7, 2003, through November 16, 2004, showed that 31.8 percent called themselves Republicans and 34.6 percent said they were Democrats, a Democratic edge of 2.8 percentage points. The margin of sampling error on those findings was just over one third of one percentage point, up or down.

The 2000 National Annenberg election Survey, involving 46,697 registered voters interviewed from December 14, 1999 through January 19, 2001, showed that 29.9 percent called themselves Republicans and 33.7 percent said they were Democrats, a slightly larger Democratic advantage of 3.8 percentage points. The margin of sampling error for the 2000 findings was less than one half of one percentage point, up or down.

"We ordinarily do not report tenths of percentage points," said Adam Clymer, political director of the survey, "but with samples this large and sampling errors this small, we feel confident in reporting relatively small changes.

The Annenberg polling, conducted every night except for a few holidays, showed that Republicans started the campaign about even with Democrats, fell behind during the Democratic primary campaign, but caught up briefly at the end of April before slipping again and then were about even before the Democratic convention, which was followed by higher Democratic numbers. From the Republican convention through mid-September, the parties were about even. Then Democrats pulled ahead again before a post-election slump in which the parties were roughly even again.

-More-

Clymer said “Our data reflects steady Republican gains, though both parties gained allegiance from independents in a year of a spirited presidential contest. Republicans have been looking for a party realignment in which they would assume dominant status ever since Ronald Reagan’s victory in 1980, and they moved closer this year.”

“But the narrowing of the gap is more reflective of Democratic losses than Republican gains,” he said. In presidential elections in the 1960s, according to the data of the American National Election Survey, just 27 percent of Americans called themselves Republicans but 48 percent said they were Democrats.

The biggest Republican gains were recorded among evangelical white Protestants. In 2000, 42 percent called themselves Republicans, and 25 percent called themselves Democrats, a 17 percentage point Republican advantage. In 2004, the margin increased to 25 points, as 48 percent said they were Republicans and 23 percent said they were Democrats.

But G.O.P. growth was registered in most population groups, except for blacks and people between 18 and 29 years old. Among people with a high school education or less, where Republican support went from 26 to 30 percent, and among both married women and southerners.

Women are still substantially more Democratic than men are Republican. In 2000, 28.0 percent of women called themselves Republicans and 38.8 percent said they were Democrats, an edge of 10.8 percentage points. In 2004 the advantage slipped to 9.5 percentage points, as 30.1 percent of women said they were Republicans and 39.6 percent said they were Democrats.

Among men in 2000, 32.1 percent said they were Republicans and 28.0 percent said they were Democrats, a Republican advantage of 4.1 percentage points. That grew to 4.9 percentage points in 2004 when 33.8 percent of men said they were Republicans and 28.9 percent said they were Democrats.

Along with tables showing changes in various population groups, attached to this report is a graph which shows variation during the campaign in allegiance to both parties, a clear reminder that party allegiance is not a demographic constant, but ebbs and flows as campaigns progress.

The National Annenberg Election Survey is a project of the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania (www.AnnenbergPublicPolicyCenter.org). 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, a project that tries to hold politicians accountable by exposing false or misleading campaign statements. It is available online at www.FactCheck.Org.

Tables

Changes in Party Identification

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a...	Republican		Democrat		Independent	
	2000*	2004**	2000*	2004**	2000*	2004**
Total	29.9	31.8	33.7	34.6	26.7	25.2
Men	32.1	33.8	28.0	28.9	30.0	28.6
Women	28.0	30.1	38.8	39.6	23.9	22.2
High school or less	26	30	38	38	25	23
Some college	32	34	30	31	27	26
College degree or more	34	33	30	33	29	27
Men high school or less	27	31	34	33	29	26
Women high school or less	26	28	42	42	22	21
Men some college	34	34	24	26	31	30
Women some college	30	33	35	36	25	23
Men college degree or more	38	37	23	26	31	31
Women college degree or more	30	30	37	40	26	24
18-29 years old	29	28	31	34	27	27
30-44 years old	32	35	32	31	26	25
45-64 years old	28	31	35	35	29	26
65 and over	30	32	38	39	24	22
Men 18-29	32	30	24	27	30	30
Women 18-29	27	25	36	40	24	25
Men 30-44	35	37	26	26	28	28
Women 30-44	29	33	37	37	24	22
Men 45-64	30	33	29	30	32	29
Women 45-64	26	29	40	40	25	23
Men 65 and over	31	33	33	34	28	26
Women 65 and over	29	32	42	42	21	20

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a...	Republican		Democrat		Independent	
Household income below \$35,000	24	25	40	42	25	24
\$35,000 to less than \$75,000	33	33	31	33	28	26
\$75,000 and over	37	38	28	29	28	26
Men below \$35,000	25	26	35	36	29	28
Women below \$35,000	23	24	44	45	23	22
Men \$35,000 to \$75,000	34	35	26	28	30	29
Women \$35,000 to \$75,000	31	32	36	38	25	23
Men \$75,000 and over	39	40	23	25	30	29
Women \$75,000 and over	35	37	33	35	25	23
Whites	33	36	29	30	28	26
African Americans	5	5	68	69	19	17
Hispanic/Latinos	22	23	46	44	21	23
Asians	23	25	39	37	28	28
Native Americans	20	22	34	36	31	28
White Men	35	38	24	25	31	29
White Women	32	35	34	34	25	24
African American Men	6	7	62	61	23	24
African American Women	5	4	72	75	15	13
Hispanic/Latino Men	23	26	43	39	24	26
Hispanic/Latino Women	21	20	50	49	19	21
Union Household	23	24	40	44	27	24
Union Men	25	25	35	39	29	27
Union Women	21	22	45	49	24	21
Married	33	36	31	31	27	25
Single	24	24	39	41	27	26
Married Men	35	38	27	27	29	28
Married Women	31	35	36	36	24	22
Single Men	26	25	31	33	31	30
Single Women	23	22	44	46	23	23

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a...	Republican		Democrat		Independent	
Northeast	27	28	36	38	30	28
Midwest	29	31	30	33	29	27
South	31	35	35	34	25	23
West	33	33	33	33	24	34
Northeast Men	28	31	31	31	33	31
Northeast Women	26	24	40	44	27	25
Midwest Men	31	33	25	28	32	31
Midwest Women	27	29	35	38	26	24
South Men	33	36	30	29	28	26
South Women	29	34	40	39	21	20
West Men	36	35	26	28	27	28
West Women	30	31	39	38	22	22
Urban	25	26	40	42	26	24
Suburban	32	34	31	32	27	26
Rural	31	34	32	32	27	25
Urban Men	28	28	33	35	29	28
Urban Women	22	24	46	47	23	21
Suburban Men	34	36	26	26	30	29
Suburban Women	31	32	36	37	25	23
Rural Men	32	36	28	28	30	27
Rural Women	29	33	37	36	24	23
White - Born Again/Evangelical Protestants	42	48	25	23	23	21
Men	43	49	21	20	26	24
Women	41	48	29	26	21	19

*Asked of 46,697 registered voters between Dec. 14, 1999 and Jan. 19, 2001

**Asked of 67,777 registered voters between Oct. 7, 2003 and Nov. 16, 2004

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 concluded on November 16, 2004.

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 two sets of interviews. The 2004 campaign interviewing was conducted from October 7, 2003 through November 16, 2004, reaching 67,777 registered voters. The 2000 campaign interviewing began on December 14, 1999, and continued through Jan. 19, 2001, reaching 46,697 registered voters.

In theory, in 19 out of 20 cases, results for all registered voters in 2004 will differ will differ by just over one third of one percentage point, up or down, from what would have been obtained by interviewing all American adults. For smaller subgroups the margin of sampling error would be higher. For 2000, the margin of sampling error would be less than one half of one percentage point, up or down.

For smaller groups, the margin of sampling error would be higher. The findings for all men and all women in 2004 would be subject to sampling of one half of one percentage point, up or down. In 2000, the potential sampling error for men and women would be about six-tenths of one percentage point, from what would have been obtained by interviewing all American adults.

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.

If you would like to be removed from this press release list, please call or email Jennifer Wilhelm at jwilhelm@asc.upenn.edu or (202) 879-6747.

For a printer-friendly version of this release please visit www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org.

###