Growing minority holds consistent ideological views

On a 10-item scale of political values, % who are...

1994
- Consistently Liberal: 3%
- Mostly Consistently Liberal: 18%
- Mostly Mixed: 49%
- Mostly Consistently Conservative: 7%
- Consistently Conservative: 23%

2004
- Consistently Liberal: 8%
- Mostly Consistently Liberal: 25%
- Mostly Mixed: 49%
- Mostly Consistently Conservative: 15%
- Consistently Conservative: 3%

2015
- Consistently Liberal: 13%
- Mostly Consistently Liberal: 22%
- Mostly Mixed: 38%
- Mostly Consistently Conservative: 17%
- Consistently Conservative: 10%

More are now on the left and the right, with fewer holding a mix of positions.

Source: Survey conducted Aug. 27-Oct. 4, 2015 (N=6,004). Ideological consistency based on a scale of 10 political values questions.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
Growing partisan gaps in most areas, from immigration to ‘peace through strength’

% who take the more conservative position on each question in the ideological consistency scale

- Government regulation of business usually does more harm than good
- Government is almost always wasteful and inefficient
- Poor people today have it easy because they can get gov't benefits without doing anything in return
- The government today can't afford to do much more to help the needy

- Blacks who can't get ahead in this country are mostly responsible for their own condition
- Immigrants today are a burden on our country because they take our jobs, housing and health care
- Most corporations make a fair and reasonable amount of profit
- Stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy

- The best way to ensure peace is through military strength
- Homosexuality should be discouraged by society

Source: Survey conducted Aug. 27-Oct. 4, 2015 (N=6,004).

Line charts show the survey questions included in the 10-item ideological consistency scale. Questions are forced-choice questions with two options; only the conservative responses are shown here. See 2015 topline for the full question wording and trends for each question.
Which comes closer to your view – immigrants today strengthen our country because of their hard work and talents, OR immigrants today are a burden on our country because they take our jobs, housing and health care?

What do you think is more important – to protect the right of Americans to own guns, OR to control gun ownership?

Partisan Gap Grows While Other Divides Are Stable

Average difference on 48 values questions by key demographics

18 Party
12 Race
11 Education
10 Income
7 Religiosity
6 Gender

1987 2012

PEW RESEARCH CENTER 2012 Values Survey. For more information on the demographic group comparisons see Section 2.
Growing Animosity Across Party Lines

Democratic attitudes about the Republican Party

- 38% Very unfavorable
- 29
- 16
- '94, '04, '14

Republican attitudes about the Democratic Party

- 43% Very unfavorable
- 21
- 17
- '94, '04, '14

27% of Democrats see the other party as a threat to the nation’s well-being

36% of Republicans see the other party as a threat to the nation’s well-being

Note: Republicans include Republican-leaning independents; Democrats include Democratic-leaning independents.

Source: 2014 Political Polarization in the American Public
PEW RESEARCH CENTER
More on Right than Left Say Opposing Party Poses a ‘Threat to the Nation’s Well-Being’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Democrats who see the Republican Party as a threat to the nation’s well-being</th>
<th>Share of Republicans who see the Democratic Party as a threat to the nation’s well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Democrats</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Republicans</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By level of ideological consistency ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistently liberal</th>
<th>Consistently conserv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mostly liberal</th>
<th>Mostly conserv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 Political Polarization in the American Public

Notes: Ideological consistency based on a scale of 10 political values questions. Republicans include Republican-leaning independents; Democrats include Democratic-leaning independents.

Pew Research Center
### Ideological “Silos” More Common on the Right than Left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>It’s important to me to live in a place where most people share my political views</th>
<th>Most of my close friends share my political views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently conservative</td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly conservative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly liberal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently liberal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 Political Polarization in the American Public
Note: Ideological consistency based on a scale of 10 political values questions.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
Liberals Want Walkable Communities, Conservatives Prefer More Room

Would you prefer to live in a community where...

- Consistently liberal: 77% prefer smaller, closer houses.
- Mostly liberal: 57% prefer smaller, closer houses, 40% prefer larger, farther houses.
- Mixed: 47% prefer smaller, closer houses, 51% prefer larger, farther houses.
- Mostly conservative: 33% prefer larger, farther houses, 65% prefer smaller, closer houses.
- Consistently conservative: 22% prefer larger, farther houses, 75% prefer smaller, closer houses.

The houses are larger and farther apart, but schools, stores and restaurants are several miles away.

The houses are smaller and closer to each other, but schools, stores and restaurants are within walking distance.

Source: 2014 Political Polarization in the American Public
Notes: Ideological consistency based on a scale of 10 political values questions (see Appendix A). "Don't know" responses not shown.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
U.S. Political Profile: 
Cable networks viewed past 7 days
U.S. Political Profile: Sports Audiences
Ways the Internet is Used: By Party Identification and Voter Turnout

Sites most likely to reach high-turnout Republicans include sports and financial information. Personal ads and video games skew Democrat and low-turnout.

Internet usages in the upper right are most likely to attract high-turnout Republicans. Larger bubbles indicate larger numbers of users. Because Republicans overall tend to spend more time on the Internet, more bubbles skew Republican.

NMRPP analysis of Scarborough Research data. Scarborough USA+ Aug 07- Sep 08; N=222,964
Overwhelming majority says country is more politically divided than in the past

Do you think the country is more politically divided these days than in the past, or not? (%)

- Yes, more politically divided
- No

% who say the country is more politically divided

- Rep/Lean Rep
- Dem/Lean Dem

Notes: Don’t know responses not shown. Q52.
Source: Survey conducted Jan. 4-9, 2017.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
Idaho ranks twenty-eighth among the states in number of local governments with 1,168 active as of June 30, 2012.

**COUNTY GOVERNMENTS (44)**
There are no areas in Idaho lacking county government. The county governing body is called the board of county commissioners.

**SUBCOUNTY GENERAL PURPOSE GOVERNMENTS (200)**

**Municipal Governments (200)**
The municipal governments in Idaho are cities, although the terms “town” and “village” are used on occasion in the statutes. Any unincorporated, contiguous area containing at least 125 qualified electors may file a request to the board of county commissioners to become a city.

**Township Governments (0)**
Idaho has no township governments.

**PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS (118)**

**School District Governments (118)**
The following types of school districts in Idaho are counted as separate governments for Census Bureau purposes:
- Elementary school districts
- School districts
- Joint school districts
- Specially chartered school districts
- Community college districts
Select State:
Idaho

Idaho General Purpose Governments

Source: U.S. Census Bureau: Census of Governments
SPECIAL DISTRICT GOVERNMENTS (806)

Idaho statutes authorize the creation of a variety of special districts or authorities that are counted as governments. These are discussed in detail below.

**County**
- Ambulance service districts
- Aquifer protection districts
- Burn seeding areas
- Community infrastructure districts (county)
- County hospital boards
- County irrigation, drainage, and reclamation projects
- County museum boards
- County-based intermodal commerce authorities
- *Extermination Control districts (agricultural pests)*
- *Fair districts*
- Herd districts
- Joint powers boards for the operation of emergency communications services (county)
- Local improvement districts
- *Mosquito abatement districts (county)*
- Noxious weed control districts
- Public health districts
- Stumpage districts
- Television translator districts
- *Weather modification districts*

**Municipal**
- Business improvement districts—1980 law
- Business improvement districts—1987 law
- City-based intermodal commerce authorities
- Community infrastructure districts (municipal)
- Joint powers boards for the operation of emergency communications services (municipal)
- Local improvement districts
- *Mosquito abatement districts (municipal)*
- Urban renewal agencies
Total Number of Special Districts

- Taxing Districts: 556
- Non-taxing Districts: 900
ADA COUNTY 2012 TOTAL DISTRICT APPROVED BUDGETS $851,761,723

- Miscellaneous: $20,552,782
- Sewer and Water District: $7,740,672
- Library District: $7,529,255
- Highway District: $89,211,700
- School District: $327,848,078
- Fire District: $16,937,442
- Cemetery District: $2,189,814
- City: $233,024,349
- County: $146,727,631

Approved Budget: $0 to $400,000,000
Total General Purpose Governments, 2012

- 0 - 500
- 501 - 1,000
- 1,001 - 2,500
- 1,501 - 2,000
- 2,001 - 3,000
General Purpose Governments Per 100,000 Residents, 2012

Legend:
- 0 - 10
- 11 - 20
- 21 - 30
- 31 - 40
- > 40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>MPDI</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Joliet-Naperville, IL-IN-WI</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City-Nampa, ID</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene, ID</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls, ID</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley, ID</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello, ID</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston, ID-WA</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston, ID-WA</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls, ID</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexburg, ID</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow, ID</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot, ID</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Home, ID</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 5 Conditions of Collective Impact

1. **Common Agenda**
   - Common understanding of the problem
   - Shared vision for change

2. **Shared Measurement**
   - Collecting data and measuring results
   - Focus on performance management
   - Shared accountability

3. **Mutually Reinforcing Activities**
   - Differentiated approaches
   - Coordination through joint plan of action

4. **Continuous Communication**
   - Consistent and open communication
   - Focus on building trust

5. **Backbone Support**
   - Separate organization(s) with staff
   - Resources and skills to convene and coordinate participating organizations
The 5 Boundaries of Leadership

FROM THE GREAT DIVIDE TO THE NEXUS EFFECT
The spiral depicts how boundary spanning leaders increase intergroup collaboration — by first managing boundaries, then forging common ground, and ultimately discovering new frontiers at the nexus between groups.