There is a lengthy history of explaining presidential greatness through expert surveys. Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger pioneered the practice of surveying academic elites about their attitudes on presidential leadership (Schlesinger 1948; 1962, Bose 2003, 5). Schlesinger (1997) updated these elite surveys in *Political Science Quarterly*. Recent additions to the existing array of explanations for presidential greatness have significantly increased our understanding of how scholars rate and rank presidential success while in office and after they leave office. Presidents and their administrations all confront new challenges and face new technologies. Not surprisingly, presidential ratings and rankings shift over time to reflect those changes. Scholars have taken note of modern developments in the presidency, which reflect new perceptions of presidents, particularly with respect to evolving expectations of presidential leadership of the national economy (Curry and Morris 2010) and progressive policy leadership (Nichols 2012). Mercieca and Vaughn (2014, 6) suggest “the rising preponderance of these polls over time has affected the way that experts and ordinary citizens view presidential greatness as well as our greatest presidents (i.e., great presidents as heroes, not necessarily competent administrators).”

Explanations of presidential greatness are at least as abundant as the number of presidents (Landy and Milkis 2001). Scholars have suggested time in office (Felzenberg 2008), intellectual brilliance (Simonton 2006), policy performance (Curry and Morris 2010), war or war-making (Adler 2003), and even physical height (Sommers 2002) as factors predicting presidential greatness. Other presidential characteristics have also been examined, such as political experience (Balz 2010), but rejected as influential factors, although time elapsed since being in the White House historically changes the ratings and rankings of presidents in most surveys (Kenney and Rice 1988; Pfiffner 2003). Surprisingly,
one factor less explored is the partisanship of the expert raters themselves. Given the influence of partisan polarization, reflections on presidential greatness even among experts may diverge. In this article, we report the results of a 2018 version of a presidential greatness survey (referencing presidents up to and including Donald Trump) of political scientists who study the presidency with a focus on the partisan and ideological divides that separate experts.

**Survey Methodology**

A presidential greatness survey was conducted online from December 22, 2017 to January 16, 2018. Respondents were current and recent members of the Presidents & Executive Politics Section of the American Political Science Association, the foremost organization of social science experts in presidential politics. Three hundred and twenty respondents were invited to participate, and 170 usable responses were received, yielding a response rate of 53%. The primary purpose of the survey was to create a ranking of presidential greatness covering all presidents from George Washington to Donald Trump. We accomplished this in two ways in the survey instrument. First, we asked respondents to rate each president on their overall greatness on a scale from 0 to 100 (0 = failure, 50 = average, and 100 = great). Second, we asked them to indicate the degree of polarization that each president brought to the office.

**Results**

---

1 Responses from respondents who did not confirm that they officially agreed to participate are excluded from the data. In the event that a respondent completed the survey twice, the submission that the respondent spent the least time completing was dropped, as was any submission where the respondent did not answer any questions.

2 Other questions included, for example, who next should be included on Mount Rushmore.
Rating and Ranking the Presidents. We begin by presenting in Table 1 the average rating of each president, ranked from highest rated to lowest. The top of the rankings are similar to those from a prior survey (Rottinghaus and Vaughn 2017): Abraham Lincoln again tops the list ($\mu = 95$), followed by George Washington (93), Franklin Delano Roosevelt (89), Teddy Roosevelt (81), Thomas Jefferson (80), Harry Truman (75), and Dwight Eisenhower (74). After these first seven places, however, several differences emerge. First, recent evaluations are far more favorable to the presidency of Barack Obama, who is now ranked 8th (71), up ten places since 2014. He is followed by Ronald Reagan (69), Lyndon Johnson (69), Woodrow Wilson (67), and James Madison (64). Next is Bill Clinton at 14th (64), who drops five places since the previous survey (Rottinghaus and Vaughn 2017). Clinton is followed by John Adams (63) and Andrew Jackson (62), the latter who drops six places to 15th.

[ TABLE 1 HERE ]

The middle third of the ranking is generally consistent with results from a 2014 survey (Rottinghaus and Vaughn 2017), although Ulysses S. Grant climbs seven spots to 18th ($\mu = 53$) place. The bottom third is also largely similar to the previous survey’s ranking, with two important exceptions. First, George W. Bush rises five places (40), moving to 30th in the ranking. Second, Donald J. Trump makes his ranking debut at the very bottom of the list. His average rating of 12 is three points lower than that of James Buchanan (15), who in the 2014 survey occupied the lowest rank. William Henry Harrison (19), Franklin Pierce (23), Andrew Johnson (25), Warren Harding (25), and Millard Fillmore (28) also reside near the bottom of the ranking.
**Partisan and Ideological Differences.** The primary purpose of the survey was to examine variation in presidential ratings between experts according to their partisanship and ideological identification. To capture these identities, we asked respondents two questions. First, experts were asked which political party that they identified with the most. Among the experts, 57% self-identified as Democrats; 13% as Republicans; 27% as Independents; and 3% as “Other.” Second, we asked whether these respondents considered themselves to be ideologically liberal (or somewhat liberal), moderate, or conservative (or somewhat conservative). Among respondents, 58% consider themselves ideologically liberal; 25% moderate; and 17% conservative.

To examine the relationship between partisanship, ideology, and presidential ratings, Figure 1 presents the mean rating of each president broken down by the partisan identity and ideology of presidential experts. For simplicity of presentation, we do not show results for Independents and ideological moderates. In Appendix B, however, we show that neither of these two groups aligns consistently with Democrats or Republicans, nor liberals or conservatives.

[ FIGURE 1 HERE ]

As Figure 1 demonstrates, there are relatively few differences in the overall rankings of presidents by experts who identify as Democrats or Republicans. Furthermore, because presidential experts who identify as Democrats or liberal make up the largest proportion of the sample, there are relatively few differences between the overall rankings and the rankings given by experts who identify as Democrats or liberal. In fact, there is only one noteworthy difference: both groups rank Ronald Reagan as 14th compared to his higher overall ranking of 9th. There is somewhat more variation among experts who identify as
Independents (for details, see Appendix B). This group ranked Barack Obama as 13th, compared to his overall rating of 8th, and ranks George H.W. Bush 14th, compared to his lower overall ranking of 18th. Independents also ranked Jimmy Carter less favorably than the overall list, placing him 29th, down three places from his perch at 26th.

The rankings by Republicans and conservatives, however, show greater differences from the overall list. Republicans were significantly less favorable toward Barack Obama, rating him 16th, as well as to Lyndon Johnson (19th), James Madison (22nd), John F. Kennedy (24th), and Jimmy Carter (32nd). Experts who identified as Republicans also appear considerably more favorable toward other—generally Republican—presidents: William McKinley (9th), George H.W. Bush (11th), James Polk (13th), William Howard Taft (14th), Calvin Coolidge (21st), George W. Bush (23rd), Herbert Hoover (30th), and Martin Van Buren (33rd). Conservatives are largely the same population and thus are generally consistent with the Republican pattern. They were nevertheless especially unfavorably disposed toward Woodrow Wilson, dropping him from 12th place (among Republicans) to 21st, and Ulysses S. Grant (down to 27th from 25th), but more favorable to James Monroe, moving him up from 18th overall to 12th. Both groups are somewhat more favorable, though not overwhelmingly so, to Donald Trump, ranking him 40th in each case, compared to the overall ranking of 44th.

**The Most Polarizing Presidents.** Stark partisan polarization is arguably the defining characteristic of our current political era. Although other periods in American history have featured incivility and deep divides, many argue that the current moment has raised polarization to an “unprecedented degree” (Hetherington and Rudolph 2015; McCarty, Poole, and Rosenthal 2015). As some note, the current divide between parties has not only
encumbered coalition-building and policy-making, but can even influence how ordinary people work and shop (Iyengar and Westwood 2015). Yet some political figures are more polarizing than others, and in the survey we sought to gauge not only who the experts felt were the greatest (and least great) presidents, but also which presidents were perceived to be the most polarizing while in office. To do so, we asked respondents to identify and rank the five presidents they believe to be the most polarizing. We then calculated how often a president was identified as being among the most polarizing, and his average ranking.

Results are presented in Figure 2, which shows the average ranking of each president who was included among the top 5 most polarizing presidents by at least one expert. As the figure shows, Donald Trump is perceived by a large margin to be the most polarizing president, with an average ranking of 4.0 (where 5 is coded as the “most polarizing”).³ Andrew Jackson is the second most polarizing president, with an average ranking of 1.5, and is followed closely by George W. Bush, Lincoln, and Obama, each of whom has an average ranking of 1.3. Donald Trump also stands out as being ranked as the most polarizing president by the vast majority of experts: 63% of experts rank Trump first, as the “most polarizing” president. He is ranked among the top three polarizing presidents by 75% of experts, and among the top five by 83%. At the time of the survey, the Trump White House had pursued fractious policies in seeking to implement a travel ban, dismantling Obamacare, withdrawing from a global climate pact, and agreeing to move the U.S. embassy in Israel to Jerusalem. In comparison to Trump, Andrew Jackson—ranked the second most polarizing president on average—was placed as the “most polarizing” by only

---
³ Presidents are coded as a 5 if they are ranked by an expert as the most polarizing among all presidents; 4 if they are ranked the second-most polarizing; 3 if the third-most; 2 if fourth-most; 1 if fifth-most; and 0 if they are not included among the 5 most polarizing presidents.
7% of experts, and placed in the top 3 by 27%. George W. Bush was ranked as the most polarizing president by only 2% of experts, and ranked in the top 3 by 27%. Results for Lincoln and Obama are similar, although Lincoln is ranked as the most polarizing president by a relatively substantial 13% of experts. Presidents who were not ranked among the “most polarizing” by any of the experts include Washington, Garfield, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Ford.

[ FIGURE 2 HERE ]

We also examine the average rankings of polarization according to the partisan identity and ideology of the experts. Results for the four most recent presidents are presented in Figure 3. As the figure shows, President Trump is ranked, on average, as the most polarizing president regardless of whether the experts identify as Democrats or Republicans. Republicans nevertheless rank President Trump as less polarizing on average than do Democrats. By contrast, President Obama is ranked as similarly polarizing by both Democratic and Republican experts. Interestingly, Independents (not shown) view Obama as more polarizing than those who identify with either of the two major parties. Democrats find President George W. Bush as similarly polarizing as President Obama. For Republican experts, however, George W. Bush is perceived as less polarizing as Obama. The partisan divide on polarizing presidents continues for rankings of President Clinton, with Republicans ranking him as more polarizing on average than either Democrats or Independents. Democrats rank President Clinton in middle of the field among the top five most polarizing presidents (3.8), and roughly the same as President Obama. Similar to the results by party, experts of every ideological orientation found President Trump to be the
most polarizing of all modern presidents. Experts who identified as liberal unsurprisingly rank President Trump the highest on average, but also experts identifying as conservative. [ FIGURE 3 HERE ]

Of course, asking about polarization directly is only one way to get at the role of partisanship in ratings. Like in politics more broadly, experts themselves disagree about presidential greatness, and the data we collected in our survey allow us to identify whether the ratings given by these experts were themselves polarized. To examine this, Figure 4 displays the average rating of each president ordered by the magnitude of the difference in ratings between experts who identify as Democrats and those who identify as Republicans. Clear differences emerge. The difference in ratings between Democratic and Republican experts are largest for President Obama, followed closely by Presidents Johnson and Kennedy. The expansion of government through Obamacare and the Great Society is the likely partisan staking point and an approach to government on which Democratic and Republican experts fervently disagree. Interestingly, although Trump is rated as the most polarizing president, experts who identify as Democrats and Republicans nevertheless agree more about how Trump should be rated in terms of presidential greatness than they do about Obama, Johnson, or Kennedy. [ FIGURE 4 HERE ]

To examine these differences in perceptions of presidential ratings and in perceptions of polarization more systematically, we investigate the extent to which variation in expert perceptions is linked to co-partisanship. Despite the benefits of historical perspective, do presidential experts who identify as Republican tend to rate past Republican presidents
more favorably than past Democratic presidents? Do experts who identify as Democrats tend to rate past Democratic presidents more favorably?

To test this, we exploit within-expert variation in the ratings of presidents. We code a binary variable that indicates, for each expert, whether the president being rated is a co-partisan. We then fit a series of regression models, including control variables from the past literature (see Appendix A), to examine whether co-partisanship is associated with (1) higher presidential ratings, and (2) lower—i.e. more favorable—rankings of polarization that presidents brought to the office. We fit these models first to the full dataset, and second to the subset of the data for modern (post-war) presidents only. The latter allows us to examine whether the relationship between co-partisanship and presidential ratings are higher for presidents who governed during the lifetimes of many of the experts.

Our results (detailed in full in Appendix A) demonstrate that co-partisanship is indeed associated with (1) higher ratings of presidential greatness, and (2) a lower ranking of how polarizing a president is. Furthermore, both of these relationships are stronger for the set of modern presidents. Presidential experts, in other words, perceive the success and polarization of presidents—at least in part—through a partisan lens. Given these results, and the fact that our sample features many more Democrats than Republicans, we re-weight the sample to give half of the weight to Republicans, and half to Democrats. This allows us to provide a sense of what the results would look like if both partisan groups were equally represented among experts. The results are depicted in Figure 5. We see that weighting the results to be equally partisan yields a substantial increase in the ratings of George W. Bush

---

4 To model within-expert variation, we use a respondent-level fixed effects model to model presidential ratings and polarization with (robust) standard errors clustered at the level of the respondent. For details, see Appendix A.
and Donald Trump, with lesser but noteworthy increases for Warren Harding, Herbert Hoover, and Richard Nixon, among others. Meanwhile, Democratic presidents Bill Clinton, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Barack Obama all see their ratings decrease, as does Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican.

[ FIGURE 5 HERE ]

The story here is not, however, only about differences across partisan groups, but although within them. Experts in both parties agree on some presidents such as Harrison, Buchanan, and Washington, whose ratings were uniformly low (Harrison, Buchanan) or high (Washington). Furthermore, although Presidents Lincoln and Jackson are rated relatively high as polarizing presidents, there is general agreement in their overall ratings among presidential experts of both parties. However, disagreement among experts of the same party can also be compared to disagreement between experts of the other party. Which presidents do experts who identify as Democrats disagree about most? Which presidents do Republicans disagree about most? To investigate these questions, we measure the dispersion of ratings for each president by the median absolute deviation, first among experts who identify as Democrats, and then among experts who identify as Republicans. The median absolute deviation simply indicates the average distance that a group’s ratings of a president are from the average rating. A value of 10, for example, indicates that experts give a president a rating that is 10 points on average from the median rating; a value of 0, that all experts give a president the same rating. Higher values thus indicate larger disagreement about a president’s rating; lower values, less disagreement.

---

5 Results using the standard deviation as a measure of rating disagreement (a measure that is more sensitive to outliers) are substantively similar.
Figure 6 presents the results. The first line (Trump) indicates that there is much less disagreement among Democrat experts about the rating of Donald Trump than there is among Republican experts: whereas experts who are Democrats rate Trump similarly (i.e. low), Republicans’ ratings of Trump differ substantially, with some rating him quite high, but others very low. In other words, the polarized presidency of Donald Trump has created disagreements both between the two major parties, but also within the Republican Party.

[ FIGURE 6 HERE ]

Conclusion

The cottage industry spawned by the breathless desire to rate and rank presidents has produced fascinating findings with respect to the predations of presidential success in office and after leaving office. One emergent finding from this most recent survey in that polarized politics does not stop at the water’s edge of expert ratings. Meaningful differences emerge when the partisan and ideological affiliation of experts are examined. Republicans and Democrats diverge in rating the top president and the bottom presidents, and how polarizing recent presidents have been. This span of differences is greater in evaluating more recent presidents, coloring—and possibly compromising—our attempts to write a first draft of presidential greatness for presidents who have recently left office.

In an era marked by political polarization, it is unsurprising that partisanship affects how experts rate the greatness of presidents, especially recent ones. Yet, as we have shown, experts who identify with the same party can nevertheless disagree about the performance of our country’s recent presidents. Indeed, if partisanship among experts were a unifying force, those who share the same party affiliation might be expected to rate a president from their preferred party highly, with agreement across those who hold the same partisan identity.
This does not, however, appear to be the case. As Republican experts’ ratings of Trump and Obama, and Democrat experts’ ratings of George W. Bush make clear, opinions about these presidents can vary greatly among experts, even if they share a partisan identity. Thus, although one can tell a simple story to highlight the differences between how Republicans and Democrats understand recent presidential history, it is important also to tell the story of a more encouraging divide: that those who share the same party affiliation can nevertheless healthfully disagree about the presidents who represent their own party and the presidents from the party who do not.
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## Table 1: Overall Presidential Greatness Ratings and Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>2018 Rating</th>
<th>2018 Rank</th>
<th>2014 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFK</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H.W. Bush</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQA</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Harrison</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Johnson</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Harrison</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1: Presidential Greatness Ratings by Expert Partisanship

Note: Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals.
FIGURE 2: Differences in Agreement about Presidential Greatness Between Democrat and Republican Experts

Note: Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals.
FIGURE 3: Most Polarizing Presidents

Note: Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals. Presidents with higher average polarization rankings are considered more polarizing than those with lower average polarization rankings.
FIGURE 4: Most Polarizing Presidents, by Partisanship and Ideology of the Expert

Note: Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals.
FIGURE 5: Ratings of Presidents if Experts were Equally Democrat and Republican

Mean rating among Democrats & Republicans overall
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- Lincoln (95)
- Washington (94)
- F.D.R. (88)
- T. Roosevelt (80)
- Jefferson (76)
- Truman (72)
- Eisenhower (76)
- L.B. Johnson (71)
- Wilson (70)
- Reagan (67)
- Clinton (65)
- Madison (64)
- Kennedy (63)
- Adams (63)
- Jackson (62)
- Monroe (61)
- G.H.W. Bush (60)
- Polk (53)
- Mckinley (53)
- Grant (52)
- J.Q. Adams (52)
- Tait (51)
- Cleveland (50)
- Ford (47)
- Carter (46)
- Van Buren (43)
- Hayes (40)
- G.W. Bush (40)
- Coolidge (39)
- Arthur (38)
- Nixon (38)
- B. Harrison (37)
- Garfield (34)
- Taylor (32)
- Tyler (31)
- Fillmore (27)
- A. Johnson (25)
- Harding (25)
- Pierce (23)
- W.H. Harrison (19)
- Buchanan (16)
- Trump (10)
FIGURE 6: Differences in Presidential Ratings Between Democrat and Experts (sorted by largest partisan difference)
A. Regression models of presidential greatness & polarization

In the article, we provide descriptive analyses of differences in expert ratings of presidential greatness and polarization across partisanship and political ideology. To assess more systematically the extent to which these differences vary by the partisan identity of the expert, we fit a series of regression models to control for the most common covariates used in assessments of presidential greatness. These variables include average GDP growth; number of years in office; intellectual brilliance; the number of years that the country was at war; whether a war was won; whether the president is considered a war hero; whether a scandal occurred during a president's time in office; and whether a president was assassinated (for details, see Curry and Morris, 2010).

To assess the relationship between the partisan identity of the expert and ratings of presidential greatness and polarization, we code an indicator variable that takes the value 1 if a given expert shares the same partisan affiliation as the president whom they are rating, and 0 if they do not. Our model exploits the fact that Democratic- and Republican-identifying experts rate presidents from both parties—some of whom they share an affiliation with, and others whom they do not. In other words, we are able to use within-rater variation to examine the extent to which shared partisan-affiliation is associated with differences in presidential ratings and polarization among Democratic and Republican experts. To take advantage of this, we use a fixed effects model with robust standard errors clustered at the level of the respondent. Finally, as we note in the article, because the role of partisanship may vary differently in the modern era when presidencies have stronger partisan resonance, we fit regression models first to the complete sample, and then to ratings and polarization of presidents who came to office
### Table A1: OLS Regression models for respondent ratings of Presidential greatness and polarization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating (1)</th>
<th>Rating (2)</th>
<th>Polarization (3)</th>
<th>Polarization (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared party ID</td>
<td>3.627***</td>
<td>7.745***</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>−0.148***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.759)</td>
<td>(1.240)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td>0.365***</td>
<td>5.239***</td>
<td>−0.037***</td>
<td>−0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.822)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in office</td>
<td>4.148***</td>
<td>5.302***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>−0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.292)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War hero</td>
<td>6.931***</td>
<td>13.624***</td>
<td>0.126***</td>
<td>−0.341*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.727)</td>
<td>(2.815)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandal</td>
<td>−6.853***</td>
<td>−25.621***</td>
<td>0.180***</td>
<td>0.889***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.964)</td>
<td>(3.423)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinated</td>
<td>27.348***</td>
<td>−27.616***</td>
<td>0.571***</td>
<td>1.113***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.834)</td>
<td>(6.263)</td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
<td>(0.431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at war</td>
<td>−1.079***</td>
<td>−2.970***</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>0.143***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won war</td>
<td>−2.209***</td>
<td>4.791***</td>
<td>−0.061***</td>
<td>−0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.378)</td>
<td>(1.200)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual brilliance</td>
<td>4.460***</td>
<td>14.794***</td>
<td>−0.152***</td>
<td>−0.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.414)</td>
<td>(2.928)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors clustered at the respondent-level are in parentheses. *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

in the post-war period.¹

Results from these models are presented in Table A1. Models (1) and (2) present estimates of the relationship between an expert sharing a partisan affiliation with a president and his or her rating of that president. To begin, results from Model (1) demonstrate that sharing a partisan affiliation with a president is associated with an average increase in the rating of a president by 3.6 points (p < 0.01) when using the complete sample of presidential ratings. For the model fit to ratings of presidents from the post-war period (Model (2)), the relationship

¹For data from the post-war period, the variable indicating whether a president was assassinated is coded 1 only for JFK. Results of models that remove this variable do not, however, meaningfully change estimates of the relationship between shared partisanship and presidential ratings.
is even stronger: sharing a partisan affiliation with the president being rated by the expert is associated with an increased rating of 7.7 points (p < 0.01).

We then examine the relationship between co-partisanship and the extent to which a president is perceived by experts as one of the most polarizing. Results are presented in Models (3) and (4). Unlike the results for presidential greatness ratings, the regression results from the full sample (Model (3)) show no strong evidence (p = 0.73) that sharing a partisan affiliation with a president is related to whether that president is rated as polarizing. However, in Model (4), which is fit to data for presidents in the modern (post-war) era, the results provide evidence that experts who share a partisan affiliation with a president rate them, on average, as less polarizing (β = −0.15, p < 0.01) than those with who they do not share a partisan affiliation. In sum, our findings demonstrate that presidential experts rate presidential greatness higher, and polarization lower, when a president shares their own partisan affiliation, especially among presidents in the post-war period.

B. Presidential greatness as rated by political Independents and ideological moderates

In Figure 1 of the article, we provide point estimates and confidence intervals of ratings of Presidential greatness and polarization among those experts who identify as (1) Democrats and Republicans, and (2) liberals and conservatives. In this section, we further extend these comparisons by providing estimates of presidential greatness ratings among both political Independents and ideological moderates. To do so, we present in Figure A1 and Figure A2 estimates of presidential ratings and polarization from Independents and moderates alongside those from Democrats and Republicans, and liberals and conservatives.

Interestingly, there appears to be substantial heterogeneity among both independents and moderates. Neither group appears to clearly rate presidents similar to that of Democratic or liberal experts, or Republican or conservative experts. For example, in Figure A1, independents
Figure A1: Presidential Greatness Ratings by Partisanship (including independents)

Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals

rate Democratic presidents Barack Obama, LBJ, and JFK similar to that of Republican experts (i.e. much lower than do Democratic experts). Like Democratic-identifying experts, however, independents also rate Republican president George W. Bush much lower than do Republican experts.
Figure A2: Presidential Greatness Ratings by Ideology (including moderates)

Horizontal lines indicate 90% confidence intervals
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