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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

For nearly half a century scholars have investigated the intricacies of the voting behavior of the American population. These scholars have focused their research efforts on voting behavior because of the importance of elections in the operation of the American representative democracy. Classical democratic theory substantiates the importance of elections in our society. It is through elections that the American electorate select their leaders of government. By exercising the right to vote, Americans can legitimize the authority of the government. Moreover, by using this privilege many Americans can indirectly participate in governmental decisionmaking. Some Americans exercise their right to vote, while others choose not to participate.

The focus of this research project is on those individuals who choose to participate through voting, examining how partisanship serves to influence their vote decision in an election. Many studies have been conducted which have this focus. Two classics in voting behavior literature are The Voter Decides, and, The American Voter. These two works
sought to build on a sociological explanation of the voting act by incorporating psychological variables into the explanation of the vote decision. Essentially the approach used in these two books is called a social-psychological approach to the study of voting behavior and represents a synthesis of sociological and psychological explanations. This introductory chapter will describe the social-psychological approach to the study of voting behavior and will also discuss the rationality of the vote decision. This chapter will emphasize the importance of partisanship and the function it serves for the voter. The second half of this chapter will define the scope of this study.

-----------------------

(1) Two earlier pioneering studies, The People’s Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential election, by P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet, (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944), and, Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign, by B. Berelson, P. Lazarsfeld, and W. McPhee, (University of Chicago Press, 1954), sought to explain the voting decision based on the sociological characteristics of the voter. For example, by being aware of a voter's religion (e.g., Catholic) conclusions can be drawn about his voting preference (e.g., Democratic preference).
A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

In *The Voter Decides* the concept of partisanship was equated with the measurement of party identification. Party identification was defined as a "sense of personal attachment which the individual feels toward the group of his choice...with respect to parties as groups."(2) Thus, party identification or partisanship can be thought of as an individual being a supporter of a political party. More importantly, party identification can be thought of as a psychological identification with a political party.

The presidential choice model used in *The Voter Decides* included three notable variables: candidate attitudes, issue attitudes and party identification. Campbell and Stokes extended this model to include several partisan attitudes: party identification, orientation to the Republican candidate (Eisenhower), orientation to the Democratic candidate (Stevenson), domestic issue partisanship, and foreign issue partisanship.(3) Campbell and Stokes found that these partisan attitudes have a considerable influence on presidential voting choice. They also discovered that

(2) A. Campbell, G. Gurin and W. Miller, *The Voter Decides*, Row, Peterson, 1954. The measurement of party identification will be discussed in detail in chapter 2.

party identification was able to explain more variance in the dependent variable than the candidate or issue attitudes.

Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren Miller and Donald Stokes in *The American Voter* describe a theoretical model of the voting act. This model is called the "funnel of causality." This model delineates short and long term influences upon the individual voting decision. Party identification was conceived as a long term component which was stable and enduring. Party identification was acquired during the formative years of an individual and in later years serves to act as a filtering or screening component through which an individual could sort political information he receives from the political environment. Other long term components included in the "funnel" were sociological characteristics of the voter such as race. However, the authors argued that reliance solely on a social approach to explanation reduces the predictive capacity of the model.

Six variables are included in *The American Voter* model as short term components. They are: Republican candidate, Democratic candidate, domestic issues, foreign issues, parties as managers of government, and the group-related attitude. When these last two attitudes were substituted for party identification, party identification became an
antecedent variable affecting the six specific attitudes. According to the *The American Voter*, party identification remained important, even though it was not part of the regression model in that book. Since this classic study, many voting behavior theorists have monitored the performance of the party identification measure over time. The next part of this chapter will briefly review the party identification concept.

**PARTY IDENTIFICATION**

The attachment that an individual has to a political party should not be equated with an individual having formal membership with the party. Party identification is a psychological identification or rather an attitudinal variable. Campbell, et al., write:

Only in the exceptional case does the sense of individual attachment to party reflect a formal membership or an active connection with a party apparatus. Nor does it simply denote a voting record, although the influence of party allegiance on electoral behavior is strong. Generally this tie is a psychological identification, which can persist without legal recognition or evidence of formal membership and even without a consistent record of party support. Most Americans have this sense of attachment with one party or the other. And for the individual who does, the strength and direction of party identification are facts of central importance in accounting for attitude and behavior." (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, 1960)
Party identification serves the function of filtering political information for an individual. This psychological identification, however, does not allow for an absence of information about the other party, or unfavorable information about one's own party. For example, an individual may identify with the Republican party, but this same individual may also have favorable feelings toward the Democratic party. Additionally, this individual may have some negative feelings about the Republican party or the Democratic party. The fact that the individual identifies with the Republican party means that he has a stronger affective attachment to the Republican party. He uses his party identification to sort the information he receives about an election to come to a vote decision.

Originally party identification was theorized to be a long term component influencing the vote decision. However, researchers have found that though the concept was conceived as a long term component, the measurement of party identification can be affected by short term influences. (Jackson 1975, Page and Jones 1979, Markus and Converse 1979, and Fiorina 1981) In addition, over the years it has been found that the number of independent identifiers has increased, while the number of strong partisans has decreased. (DeVries and Tarrance 1972, Asher 1983) The direction of partisanship has been more stable for the
electorate than the strength of partisanship. Thus, partisanship has changed over time and can no longer be thought of as a long term component immune to short term influences (e.g., issue attitudes). The strength of partisanship for the American electorate has also weakened. Therefore, perhaps we need to refine our conceptualization and measurement of partisanship away from a single scale as is used with the traditional party identification index. The next part of this chapter will describe the research project that will explore alternative measures of partisanship.

THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The important role of partisanship as an attitudinal variable in explaining the vote decision is unquestionable. However, partisanship has been equated with the party identification measurement, and the measurement of party identification suffers from several statistical problems. One problem is that the party identification index is a unidimensional scale where at one pole is the Republican party

(4) The measurement of party identification will be discussed at length in the following chapter. It should be noted though that the measurement of party identification has "problems." See Petrocik 1974, Brody 1977, Keith et al. 1977, Lodge and Tursky 1979, and Miller and Miller 1977 for information about the behavior of the seven point party identification index.
and at the opposite pole is the Democratic party. This scale makes an inherent assumption that the two political parties are polar opposites, but being a Republican may not be the opposite of identifying with the Democratic party. Therefore, the focus of this research project is to further investigate the traditional party identification index along with other measures of partisanship.

Most empirical investigations of voting behavior are Presidential election studies. By contrast this study will focus on the 1983 Mayoral election in Columbus, Ohio. The objective of the study is to investigate the performance of several measures of partisanship and their relation to the vote. Included in the study was a new measure of partisanship which is substantiated more firmly in social psychological attitude theory. It is hoped that this new partisanship measure will contribute more to our understanding of partisanship. The method of investigation for the study is a telephone postelection study of a random sample of respondents in Columbus, Ohio immediately following the November general election.

Since this is a study of a municipal election, the visibility of this election to the voter is much lower than in studies of presidential elections. This lower visibility of local elections means that the individual voter is less likely to have a highly developed image of the mayoral can-
candidates. Thus, in this particular election, the role of partisanship is probably more important than in presidential elections. In presidential elections, there is a high degree of media coverage of the candidates and their campaigns, and the campaign season lasts for at least a year.(5) Local elections receive much less media coverage, and the candidates in local elections clearly have less campaign funds to spend for high levels of media exposure. Thus, candidate awareness should be lower in municipal elections, and partisanship attitudes should play a more important role in voter decisionmaking.

Another interesting feature of the mayoral election in Columbus, Ohio is that the election is nonpartisan. Candidates are not associated with partisan labels on the voting ballot, even if they receive support from one of the parties. Thus, given the low visibility of the local election and the lack of partisan cues on the ballot, the 1983 mayoral election is a most interesting election to investigate various measures of partisanship.

This chapter has briefly described the social-psychological approach to the study of voting behavior. The research objective of this study is to investigate not only the traditional measure of party identification, but also several alternative measures of partisanship. These

---

measures are: the party support scale, the feeling thermometer for the political parties, a new "party beliefs" measure, and a new measure of partisanship based on a social psychological attitude theory. It is hoped that examining the contributions of various other measures of partisanship will aid our understanding of the dynamics of partisanship.

CHAPTER PREVIEWS

Chapter two will review the traditional conceptualization and operationalization of party identification. In addition, it will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of party identification. The social-psychological approach to the study of voting behavior will be contrasted to a rational approach. It will be argued that the two approaches are complementary and can be used simultaneously. This chapter will describe a new measure of partisanship based in attitude theory which satisfactorily satisfies prerequisites of both the social psychological and rational approaches to the study of voting behavior.

Chapter three will describe the local political history of Columbus, Ohio. Specifically it will discuss the structure and political history of Columbus local government.
In addition, it will describe the method of investigation, the sample, and the operationalization of the variables included in the interview schedule. Data quality for the phone survey will also be reviewed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the sample with the 1980 U.S. census data for Columbus, Ohio.

Chapter four will examine the results of the survey by focusing on the behavior of the several partisanship predictors used for the study. The frequency distribution for each predictor will be presented as well as the correlations among the predictors. The analysis in this chapter will also try to discern if there is an underlying pattern among the partisan predictors. Lastly, this analysis chapter will test whether each of the partisan predictors is consistent with the other partisan related variables.

Chapter five will review the performance of the different measures of partisanship as predictors of the mayoral vote. A correlational analysis of each of the predictors with the mayoral vote will be presented. In addition, multiple regression analysis will be used to examine the performance of each of the independent partisan variables relative to other predictors. This chapter will give special attention to the performance of the new measures of partisanship. Through this analysis, the contribution of the new measures of partisanship to our overall understanding of partisanship will also be assessed.
The concluding chapter will summarize the overall contribution of each of the various partisanship variables included in this study to the study of voting behavior. This chapter will also discuss how these measures contribute to our overall understanding of partisanship.
Chapter II

PARTISANSHIP: MEASURES AND THEORY

Party identification is an important concept in the study of voting behavior. The party identification measure is the best single predictor of the vote. For example, if an individual considers himself/herself a Democrat, then one can presume with a high level of probability that this individual will generally vote for the Democratic candidate in a presidential election. Although this may be the case, there are anomalies in the measurement of party identification. The first part of this chapter will review the conceptualization and operationalization of party identification assessing the weaknesses and strengths of its measurement. The second part of this chapter will outline alternative measures of partisanship as well as review two different approaches to the study of voting behavior. It should be noted that the concept of "partisanship" is being used here as a global term to refer to partisan tendencies. In this study it is tapped by five measures: the tradi-
tional party identification measure, two alternative measures in the literature that will be discussed in this chapter, and two new measures that will be presented in the next chapter.

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

The concept of party identification was born out of a study of the 1948 and 1952 Presidential elections by scholars at the University of Michigan. Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren Miller, in The Voter Decides, define party identification as a "sense of personal attachment which the individual feels toward the group of his choice...with respect to parties as groups."(6) A single item is used to measure party identification: "Generally speaking do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, an Independent or what?" If the respondent answers he/she is partisan then the follow up is: "Would you call yourself a strong (Republican or Democrat) or a not very strong (Republican or Democrat)?" If the respondent answers Independent, the follow up is: Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or the Democratic party?" This measurement item makes it possible to use a seven point scale in analyses of voting behavior survey data.

(6) Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, 1954, pp. 88-89.
Pragmatically, this seven point scale creates a typology of partisanship. From this measurement item an individual can be typed as a strong Republican, weak Republican, an independent leaning toward the Republican party, a pure independent, an independent leaning toward the Democratic party, a weak Democrat or a strong Democrat. This typology makes it possible to compare and contrast strong and weak partisans as well as nonpartisans. However, in statistical analysis certain assumptions must be made about this seven point scale.

An assumption often made in social science research is that the distance between the categories are defined in terms of fixed and equal units. (7) This is an interval level measurement assumption made about ordinal level data so that researchers are allowed to utilize more sophisticated statistical techniques. In the study of voting behavior, scholars make this assumption in order to perform multiple regression analysis, factor analysis, etc. Some scholars fear making such an assumption, while others are less concerned about violating the interval level requirement. It would seem however, given research findings about the behavior of the seven point party identification scale that there should be some concern among scholars about making the interval level assumption for this measure.

-------------

For example, for many years it was intuitively assumed that strength of partisanship was related to partisan loyalty. Thus, those individuals who see themselves as strong partisans would be least likely to defect from their party's candidate, weak partisans the second least likely, and independent partisans the most likely. However, Petrocik (1974) reported "intransitivities" in the measurement of party identification in that the behavior of independent leaners was more similar to the behavior of strong partisans than that of weak partisans, especially with regard to political involvement. He found that party was not the dominant stimulus as far as political involvement was concerned. Petrocik argues that if party is a predominant stimulus, then the behavior of the party identification measure is monotonic, however, if party is not the dominant stimulus then other factors can yield intransitivities.

Studies by Brody (1977), Keith et al., (1977), Lodge and Tursky (1979), and Miller and Miller (1977) further suggested that these independent leaners should be combined with weak partisans. Collapsing the leaning and weak categories of partisanship would prevent serious problems in the statistical analysis. In other words, by collapsing the two categories it would seem a violation of the interval level assumption is less grave. This suggests that a five point scale of strong partisans, weak and leaning partisans
and independents would be better than the traditional seven point scale. However, is it appropriate to group leaners and weak partisans together given differences in their political behavior? Some scholars do find it appropriate to group partisan leaners and weak partisans, while other scholars do not.

Regardless of the behavior of the party identification scale, it is still the single best predictor of the vote. The importance of this variable to the study of voting behavior should not be underestimated. Party identification had been theorized to be a long term factor which influenced the vote decision. Individuals acquired their partisanship or party identification in their formative years when the parents of an individual had an overwhelming influence on the party with which the individual chose to identify. (8) It was found that most children obtained their partisan affiliation from their parents and it was believed that this affiliation or party identification was relatively immune to change caused by stimuli in the political environment.

-------------

Over the past decade though some researchers have concluded that party identification cannot be thought of as a long term force immune to changes in the political environment. Models by Jackson (1975), Page and Jones (1979), Markus and Converse (1979), and Fiorina (1981) view partisanship as being affected by short term attitudes as well as long term forces. Jackson (1975) supports a contention that partisanship is changeable dependent upon an individual's evaluations of a party's policies relative to his own political preferences. Page and Jones (1979) specify a nonrecursive simultaneous equation model through which they find policy preferences have more of an influence on vote decisions when compared to party attachments. Markus and Converse (1979) proposed a dynamic nonrecursive model and argue that party identification is "durable" from one election to the next. However, if partisanship is not reinforced by consistent electoral behavior, it may weaken. Fiorina (1981) sketched a model which integrated party identification, retrospective voting, and issue voting into a single decision rule. Fiorina's model represents a rational model through which he conceives of party identification as a running balance of past experiences with the two parties, with short term experiences having more weight than past experiences. Essentially, the findings of these scholars suggest that the relationship between the party
identification measurement and partisanship is more complex or intricate than originally theorized. For example, though party identification had been theorized to be a long term stable factor in voter decisionmaking, a change has occurred in the American electorate which needs explanation.

Through the years the number of strong identifiers (partisans) has decreased while the number of independent identifiers (nonpartisans) has decreased.(9) Given this factor and the findings which support it, party identification cannot be thought of as immune to changes in the political environment. Research findings which demonstrate intransitivities in the measurement of party identification show that further investigation of partisanship is warranted.

A number of scholars have investigated the dimensionality of partisanship. These scholars became concerned about whether partisanship and political independence should be viewed unidimensionally or multidimensionally. Valentine and Van Wingen (1980) show that partisanship and independence could be viewed as separate dimensions. Katz (1979) found a two dimensional horseshoe shaped model of party identification. Howell (1980) also argues for the use of separate dimensions for partisanship and independence. Shively (1980) in a study of an undergraduate class found

---

support for treating independence as a second dimension. Shively writes, "there is good evidence that the seven point scale partakes of more than one dimension and at the very least this should lead us to a fruitful reconsideration of the nature of party identification...there is yet little evidence on the pragmatic question of whether the seven point scale is good enough for most purposes."(10)

Two papers by Weisberg (1979,1980) contrast a unidimensional view with a two dimensional view (i.e., where independence is one dimension and partisanship is another) and with a three dimensional view (i.e., separate dimensions for each political party and a third dimension for political independence). Weisberg found support for a multidimensional view of partisanship. He also found that citizen ratings of the two political parties were uncorrelated, as were citizen ratings of the political parties with political independence. This supports a multidimensional view.

The usual treatment of partisanship therefore suffers from several problems: the "intransitivities" in the measurement of party identification where research has found that independent leaners behave more like strong partisans when compared with weak partisans; partisanship may be influenced by additional variables in the political environment where research has found that party identification

is not immune to changes in the political environment; operationalizing partisanship unidimensionally may be inadequate where research has found support for a multidimensional treatment of partisanship. The focus on partisanship thus far has centered on the inadequacies of the traditional measure of party identification. However, the fact still stands that party identification is the single best predictor of the vote. There are also alternative measures used to predict the vote, though these measures (i.e., the feeling thermometer, and the party support scale) do not have the same historical importance to the study of voting behavior as the traditional party identification index.

ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP

There seems to be some consensus among scholars of voting behavior that the traditional party identification scale is unidimensional and assumes that the political parties are polar opposites with political independence being the midpoint. The point of conflict among scholars seems to be whether to stay with the unidimensional scale, clean up the unidimensional measure or scale, or reconceptualize partisanship as a multidimensional phenomenon. Weisberg's
research on the dimensionality of party identification supports the notion that partisanship should not be treated unidimensionally since public reactions to the parties may not be arrayed along a single dimension. For example, a voter may be favorable to one party, but still be neutral or even positive toward the other party.

Weisberg (1982) develops a model which separates or splits partisanship attitudes into two dimensions. In accomplishing this objective, he relies on the feeling thermometer questions about the two political parties. (11) Also in his model, he demonstrates the relative influence of these attitudes on the traditional Michigan conceptualization of party identification. After separating individuals' attitudes toward the two parties, Weisberg is then able to calculate a party difference value which is theor-------

(11) For further clarification the thermometer measure is as follows: "I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate the person using this feeling thermometer. You may use any number from 0 to 100 for rating. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel too favorable toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. If you do recognize the name, but don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark." After the respondent rates various political leaders he is then asked to assign a temperature rating to a number of political objects such as the Democratic and Republican parties. This measure was developed by Aage Clausen for the National Election Studies in 1964.
ized to influence a comparative candidate evaluation which in turn influences the vote decision. The crux of Weisberg's argument for this model of "separate effects" lies in the fact that available evidence exists which suggests that public reactions to the political parties are not bipolar.

However, Fiorina would criticize this model because of the reliance on the thermometer questions from the National Election Study. Fiorina writes: "Some colleagues have suggested, in particular, that addition of the CPS thermometer scores to the vote equations that follow would provide an extra control for uncaptured influences relating to candidate personality. No doubt it would. It would also provide an extra control for retrospective judgments, party influence, issue positions, and anything else that contributes to evaluations of the candidates. No one knows what thermometer scores measure. While they may be of use as continuous surrogates for vote choice or as measures used as explanatory variables. Their contribution to explanations of voting behavior is purely statistical, not substantive."(12) In response to this position Weisberg writes: "...comments on how many different factors are combined in the thermometer measurement could equally be applied to the usual party identification scale which he

(Fiorina) does use. The party identification scale also measures everything at once, so no one knows what it measures. The party thermometers might not be ideal measures of separate reactions to the parties, but they are as good as any available measure of those separate reactions. Their contribution to explanations of voting behavior is no less substantive than that of the usual party identification scale, while the opportunity they provide for disentangling the effects of separate reactions to the parties may actually permit them to provide a more substantive explanation than we have had to date."(13)

The debate about the thermometer questions raises some concern about the assumption that partisanship is bipolar: that the Republican party is one end of a seven point scale, and the Democratic party is at the opposite end of the scale with political independence being an anchoring point. An important question is: what is it that the traditional party identification measure taps from the individual? And, what do the feeling thermometer questions tap from the individual?

Both of these measures are highly correlated with the vote. In a path analysis of party and candidate thermometer items, Weisberg (1982) found strong correlations between these measures and the vote. This would seem to

indicate a need for further empirical research on the substantive and statistical contribution of the thermometer measure to our overall understanding of voting behavior.

It could be argued that in using this item in analysis that the temperature assignments the respondent gives to each candidate or political object can be thought of as linear functions of the numeric responses the respondent gives to the party identification question. Thus, with the thermometer measure we may be better able to make an interval level assumption about our measurement than for the traditional party identification index. Essentially, it would seem that further analysis is warranted on the contribution of the thermometer measure to our overall understanding of voting behavior.

Another alternative measure of partisanship which has been used is the party support scale. This measure came to be included in the 1980 and subsequent interview schedules for National Election Studies. (14) Weisberg (1983) developed the five point party support/closeness which is:

(14) The questions asked of respondents are as follows: "In your own mind, do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative he/she is then further asked: "Which political party do you support?" If the respondent answers he/she is not a supporter of a political party he/she is then asked: "Do you ever think of yourself as closer to one of the two major political parties, or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative to this question he/she is then asked: "Which party do you feel closer to?"

-----------------

(14)
Republican supporter, closer to Republicans, not closer to a party, closer to Democrats, and Democratic supporter. In his analysis of CPS NES (Center for Political Studies National Election Study) data, he reported that this scale finds "fewer partisans and more citizens ambivalent between the parties than does the traditional scale (party identification)."(15) For example, looking at respondents who placed themselves as party supporters, Weisberg found that 38% of those in this group gave opposite partisan directions on the two measures of a combined support/closeness/independence and the traditional partisan strength measure. More interestingly though is his finding for weak partisans where 22% of the respondents identify themselves as weak partisans, but place themselves as neither closer to a party nor independent. This finding further highlights the "intransitivities" Petrocik found in the traditional measurement of party identification.

The five point party support scale highlights the problem scholars of voting behavior have in trying to explain the behavior of those individuals who according to the traditional party strength measure identify themselves as weak partisans though on a combined support/closeness/independence classification respond that they are neither closer to a political party not independent. This finding

lends support to Petrocik's identification of "intransitivities" in the measurement of party identification where he found that the party identification index is not monotonic with regard to all types of political involvement and that the behavior of weak and leaning partisans on his measures of political involvement is not what would be expected given the index of party identification. As Weisberg suggests "the problem is with weak partisans—the weak partisan category includes many miscategorized "nonidentifiers" who are low in involvement and who pull down the overall involvement level for weak partisans." (16)

If it is the case that weak partisans are the problem, then a question arises: how can an individual identify himself as a weak partisan and simultaneously place himself as neither closer to a political party nor identify himself as an independent? This question would seem to suggest that for some minority population, partisanship and strength of partisanship is more difficult to assess operationally than the majority population. Moreover, in further examination of the traditional strength measure, Miller and Wattenberg (1983) in an analysis of CPS NES data point out that if one examines how independents have been classified by the traditional index of party identification one will find that respondents who answered "no preference" and respondents who identify themselves as independents are

(16) IBID., 373.
being combined into the same category.

The fact though still remains that there has been a decrease of strong partisans over the years and an increase in the number of independent or no preference respondents. Thus, it would seem that the traditional party identification scale though not flawless, has enhanced our understanding of voting behavior to the extent that it allows researchers to take into consideration elements of continuity between elections as opposed to generalizing across elections utilizing a single election analysis. Moreover, such a scale/index also allows for the investigation of anomalies in the measurement of partisanship and its relationship to political behavior.

The preceding discussion of two alternative means to assess partisanship—thermometer data and the party support scale—has sought to assess the performance of these measures in regard to political behavior as well as to assess the alternative measures' association with the traditional party identification scale/index. More importantly, though a question arises not about our conceptualization of party identification as "a sense of personal attachment which the individual feels toward the group of his choice...with respect to political parties," but about our operationalization of such a partisan attitude. The entire chapter has been so far dedicated to a discussion of
the debates about party identification and alternative measures of partisanship used within a social psychological approach to the study of voting behavior. Though such an approach has had a large influence on explanations of voting behavior, there is another approach to the study of voting behavior—a approach which stresses rationality.

A RATIONAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF VOTING BEHAVIOR

Basically there are two dominant approaches to the study of voting behavior—the social psychological approach and a rational approach. The social psychological approach dates back to *The American Voter*. In this particular approach the voter is seen as uninformed, and uninterested in politics, lacking a developed political ideology and at most weakly political motivated. Moreover, the voter can be thought of as only slightly relying on his policy issue preferences in making his decision about a political candidate. The social psychological approach relies heavily on the traditional party identification index and partisan attitudes to explain the vote decision.

An alternative to the social psychological approach is the rational approach. This approach dates back to Downs' *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. It has been argued that
in this approach there are two schools of thought. Reynolds (1974) argues that "one side defines rational behavior as behavior directed toward the maximization of utilities or rewards."(17) Downs argues that an economic definition of rationality "refers solely to a man who moves toward his goals in a way which, to the best of his knowledge, uses the least possible input of scarce resources per unit of valued output."(18) Thus, in this way the definition of rationality is more concerned with the maximization of utilities rather than the content of the utilities.(19)

An alternative definition of rationality makes reference to a citizen's vote decision being determined rationally by his preferences on public policy. Essentially it is believed that an individual will vote for the candidate who favors the policies that the individual favors. This particular view contrasts with the social psychological approach, in that the voter is seen as aware of issues, with preferences on issues, and also aware of candidate positions on the issues.

-------------------------------


(19) Downs defines utility as "a measure of benefit in a citizen's mind which he uses to decide among alternative courses of actions," Ibid, p. 36.
The point of incongruence between these two sides of rationality seems to be related to the concern of the actor about his knowledge of several policy alternatives in making his preference, and his concern for maximizing his utility. Should rationality in regard to voting assume that the voter seeks out information about several policy preferences before realizing his own preferences? Or, can it be thought of as rational for an individual not to be concerned about all possible policy alternatives in making a decision about his own preferences?

Various scholars have investigated the rationality of the vote decision, though each may use a different definition of rationality. Most interesting is a different attitudinal approach used by Martin Fishbein who argues that the decisionmaking process of the voter is a "highly rational" process. Fishbein proposed an attitude model which incorporates a cognitive and an affective component and found support that this particular model had a fairly strong predictive strength. Fishbein argues that his technique or model for the exploration of voting behavior is based upon an explicit psychological theory.

The best known political application of Fishbein's theory is by Martin Fishbein and Fred Coombs in their analysis of Champagne-Urbana, Illinois voters for the 1964 President---

tial election. Fishbein and Coombs (1974) argue that voters are not irrational, but can be thought of as behaving in congruence with their perceptions and evaluations of political issues and objects. They also argue that this approach to the study of voting behavior is a rational approach. They write: "We do not view rational decision-making as a process that requires the voter to seek out all available information, to be highly motivated with respect to political affairs, highly articulate in discussion, nor strongly ideological in his organization of beliefs. We do see rational voting as a process in which the voter casts his ballot for the candidate he believes to be closely associated with the issue positions, groups and role characteristics which he values. Thus, we would label "irrational" at least two kinds of voters: (1) those who disregard relevant and credible information about a candidate and simply vote, out of habit for the party (or candidate) they have voted for in the past, and (2) those who forget or distort incoming information about a candidate because that information has attitudinal implications inconsistent with their prior evaluation of a candidate or party." (21) Though Fishbein and Coombs find a fairly strong relationship between their attitude model and the vote decision, their theoretical discussion of irrationality can be debated.

------------
In a discussion of irrationality and the basic function of political rationality, Downs argues that it is a most difficult task to distinguish between "rational errors and irrational behavior."(22) For example, to take the first condition of irrationality as outlined by Fishbein and Coombs—where a voter may vote out of habit for a party or a candidate which the individual has voted for in the past—this may in fact be a rational decision for the voter. If it is a mistake for a rational man to vote out of habit for a particular party or candidate, he must first realize that he is making a mistake. Downs writes: "A rational man who is systematically making some mistake will cease to do so if (1) he discovers what the mistake is, and (2) the cost of eliminating it is smaller than the benefits therefrom. Under the same conditions an irrational man will fail to rectify his errors because he has some nonlogical propensity to repeat them. His actions are not primarily motivated by a desire to attain his overt ends efficiently; hence, he fails to do so even when he can."(23) Thus, if an individual votes out of habit for a particular political party or candidate and this is predetermined to be irrational political behavior, then how can it be determined whether this is irrational behavior for the individual?


(23) Ibid., p. 9.
al if the individual simply lacks information? Therefore, it would seem that it may be rational for a particular individual to vote out of habit for a party or candidate which he has voted for in the past, especially if the individual perceives that he has not made a "mistake" in the past by doing so; and, if the individual perceives it would costs him more time and effort to change such a habit.

Fishbein and Coombs' second condition for determining irrationality in voting is also lacking theoretical justification. The second condition is that individuals can be thought of as irrational if they forget or distort incoming information about a candidate because the information has attitudinal implications inconsistent with their prior evaluation(s) of a candidate or party. This condition does not take into account that people tend to be exposed disproportionately to opinions and information that they already agree with, or people tend to be exposed less to information that is discordant with what they already believe. This is called selective exposure.(24) In addition, Brock and Balloun (1967) found that individuals may be more likely to be attentive to supportive messages than nonsupportive messages. This is called selective attention.(25) Thus, it may be the case that such avoidance


(25) T.C. Brock and J.L. Balloun, "Behavioral Receptivity
mechanisms as selective exposure or selective attention may be operating. This implies that the individual may not necessarily be forgetting or distorting incoming information about a candidate or party, rather the individual may only be receiving messages which are congruent with his already existing beliefs about a particular political party or candidate, and this may be rationally supporting that particular individual. It may be the case that what is defined as irrational may in fact be rational to the individual. Downs writes that what may be called irrational behavior according to his definition may in fact be "highly rational in the psychic economy of the individual's personality." (26) Downs further states that he is concerned with "rational political behavior not psychology or the psychology of political behavior." (27) Fishbein and Coombs though are concerned with the psychology of political behavior, developing a theory which can be used in conjunction with a rational approach to the study of voting behavior, though their conditions for irrationality can be debated.

This chapter began with a discussion of the conceptualization and operationalization of party identification and focused on a social psychological approach to the study of


[27] IBID. p. 9-10.
political behavior. Two alternative measures of partisanship—the thermometer and the party support scale—have been discussed. The social psychological approach has enhanced our understanding of voting behavior. However, another approach to the study of voting behavior—the rational approach—has simultaneously enhanced our understanding of such behavior. Both the social psychological and rational approaches to the study of political behavior rely heavily on the use of attitudinal data from which hypotheses are either supported or refuted. (28) However, if one would peruse the literature, one would find that the conceptualization and operationalization of the all important construct "attitude" varies from study to study. The next part of this chapter will review the conceptualization and operationalization of this construct and also review the utility of using Fishbein's attitudinal model in voting behavior research.

--------------------

(28) The rational approach thus far has focused on Fishbein and Coombs' attitudinal model though it has not yet been discussed in detail. This discussion is forthcoming.
ATTITUDE THEORY

What is an attitude? If we go back to *The American Voter*, we find this discussion: "One property of an attitude that is useful to recognize has to do with the specificity of the object that is evaluated. Affect may be aroused by objects as specific as a clause in a House bill or as general as the abstraction "freedom." Attitude structures are often thought of as hierarchies in which more specific attitudes interact with attitudes toward the more general class of objects in which the specific object is seen to belong. In some cases it may be conceptually desirable to divide the layers of this belief hierarchy quite finely. For example, reactions to a new bill appropriating money for public housing may be linked with certain underlying attitudes toward government activity in the area of housing more generally. These attitudes in turn may be conditioned by still more generalized attitudes toward the proper role of government in questions of private enterprise and social welfare. Beliefs at this level may show meaningful congruence with basic values concerning the intrinsic desirability of change in the scope of governmental responsibilities."

(29) Within this discussion we find that these authors purport that there are interrelationships between

what have now been recognized as classic components of an attitude—-affect (or evaluations) and beliefs (or cognitions). Though this discussion does not mention the subsequent relationship between these components and the behavior of an individual, we do know that there is a reliance upon what can be called attitudinal data or partisan attitudes toward the prediction of the vote decision, or the behavioral intention (or conation).

Indeed an attitude is a key concept in the social psychological approach and the rational approach to the study of political behavior generally, and voting behavior specifically. Attitude seems to be all important concept in specifying models in voting behavior, buying behavior or any model which attempts to explain or predict behavior. There have been many definitions for this construct offered. However, the most widespread definition divides the construct attitude into three components—-affect or evaluation (or emotions), cognitions (beliefs or opinions), and conation (action tendencies or behavioral intentions). A typical definition taking into account these three dimensions or components is:

"...attitudes are enduring systems of positive and negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to social objects."

(Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962)
By contrast those scholars of social psychology who choose not to view the attitude as a complex, multidimensional concept consisting of affect, cognition and conative components reduce it to a unidimensional concept that makes reference to the amount of affect for or against a given stimulus. (30) Two examples of this type of definition are:

"Attitude is the affect for or against a psychological object." (Thurstone, 1931)

"Attitudes are predispositions to respond, but are distinguished from other such states of readiness in that they predispose toward an evaluative response." (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957)

Though some scholars view the concept multidimensionally, they have treated the concept unidimensionally when operationalized in terms of a single score as in Likert scaling.

One of the most interesting treatments of attitudes is that of Fishbein and Coombs (1974) who view the attitude concept as consisting of affect and cognition components. It is the affect and cognition components which represent the attitude toward some object which may have a relationship with the conative component (action tendencies or

behavioral intentions). Their model which has come to be called expectancy value is:

\[ A_o = \sum a_i B_i \]

where \( A_o \) = the attitude toward some object "o,"
\( a_i \) = the evaluative aspect of \( B_i \), i.e., the evaluation of or attitude toward the related object "a,"
\( B_i \) = the strength of belief "i" about "o," i.e., the probability the "o" is related to some other object "a,"
\( \sum \) = the summation for \( i=1 \) to \( N \),
\( N \) = the number of beliefs about "o" by the individual.

Expectancy value theory dates back to Tolman (1932)(31) who argued that individuals learn expectations or that individuals will have beliefs that their response will in turn be followed by some event. Moreover, he argued that individuals will learn to exhibit behaviors (or the probability that an individual will exhibit certain behaviors) that are based on the likelihood that such behavior will lead to an expected positive event or outcome. The assumption is that past events have been positive or negative reinforcers which in turn affects the probability of exhibiting certain behaviors. The attitude model used by Fishbein and Coombs (1974) has been labeled an expectancy value

model. Essentially the argument is that the attitudinal model takes into account the beliefs of an individual about performing a certain behavior or toward an object, and the affect or evaluation the individual assigns to the behavior or object in question. This model is therefore labeled an expectancy value model because by taking these two factors into account it can be assumed that the individual perceives that positive consequences or outcomes will occur as a result of holding the beliefs he has. Thus, the individual has certain expectations about the consequences/outcomes of holding certain beliefs.(32)

Fishbein's model views the attitude concept as a function of the person's favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an object (or affect component) and the person's beliefs which represent the information an individual has about the object (or the cognition component). An example of an evaluation is whether an individual believes "liberals are good/bad," and his belief may be about whether he believes "Democrats are liberal." In specific regard to voting behavior, they studied the 1964 Presidential Election using a sample of respondents from Champaign-Urbana, Illinois to test the validity of their expectancy value model. Fishbein and Coombs multiply the person's view by his evaluation of a candidate's position on the same subject (e.g.,

Medicare) and sum these products over twenty-four items. They predicted the respondent would vote for the candidate for whom the sum was greater. They obtained a correlation in the .7 range between the vote for President (i.e., Goldwater or Johnson) and the expectancy value model. This expectancy value model assumes that a person's attitude toward some object is determined by his beliefs that the object has certain attributes and by his evaluation of those attributes. The expectancy value theory assumes that there is a direct relationship between the holding of certain beliefs and evaluations and the subsequent behavior. However, Fishbein and Coombs' model does not make this assumption. Their model specifies that an individual's beliefs and evaluations determine the individual's overall attitude toward performing a certain behavior or toward an object (i.e., a candidate); and this attitude may be related to an individual's intention to perform a certain behavior.

The causal relationship between attitude and behavior (or action tendency) is at best tenuous. Abelson (1972) argues that it is naive to view the relationship between attitude and behavior as one where it is assumed that an attitude elicits a certain behavior given an appropriate situation. Abelson further argues that the causal relationship of attitudes and behavior is tenuous and uncer-
tain, thus, the "situation" must strongly encourage this connection in order for action to occur. The Fishbein and Coombs' expectancy value model's correlation with both the vote intention and the actual vote in 1964 was in the .7 range. That may indicate a fairly strong relationship between attitude defined as an expectancy value and an actual behavior. Perhaps the voting "situation" represents a situation which strongly encourages a strong relationship between attitude and behavior.

Given expectancy value theory, it seems that positive outcomes or events reinforce the associated beliefs and evaluations of an object or behavior. Thus, there would appear to be a nonrecursive relationship between the attitude toward an object/behavior and an actual behavior. However, whether the relationship between attitude and behavior is recursive or nonrecursive will not be debated here, and for now a recursive relationship is assumed between attitude and vote intention.

The utility of the expectancy value model to the study of voting behavior has also been investigated by Williams, et al., (1976). Williams, et al., studied three psychological decision models in order to evaluate their predictive capacity: the expectancy value model, Anderson's averaging model, and Tversky's elimination by aspects model. Anderson's averaging model is operationalized as follows:

\[ A_o = \sum a_i B_i / n \]
The difference between this model and the expectancy value model is that this model proposes that the final evaluation of a candidate is the average of the product of the respondent's evaluation of an issue or attribute and his/her belief that this particular issue or attribute characterizes a candidate. Tversky's decision model represents analysis of choice in terms of covert sequential elimination. This elimination by aspects model assumes that when individuals are faced with a decision they seek out choice alternatives upon which to base their final decision. Williams, et al. write:

choice alternatives are assumed to consist of a set of aspects or characteristics. For example, candidates can be viewed as representing different political positions and personal attributes. It is argued that during this decision process, aspects are selected from those included in the available alternatives in order of their importance for the individual. The selection of a particular aspect such as "being opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam" eliminates all choice alternatives (i.e., candidates), (sic) that do not include that aspect. The selection of a second aspect eliminates other alternatives. This process is assumed to continue until a single alternative is left which becomes the individual's choice.(33)

(33) Williams, et al., "Voter Decisionmaking in a Primary Election," *American Journal of Political Science*, 10,1, February 1976, p. 40. For more on the Tversky model and its operationalization see Amos Tversky, "Elimination by Aspects: A Theory of Choice," *Psychological Review*, July 1972, pp. 341-467. The Tversky model will not be discussed at length here, however, it should be noted that such a model of choice may have considerable value in the study of voter decisionmaking.
Williams et al., in their study of an area cluster sample of registered voters in New Hampshire found that both the expectancy value model and the elimination by aspects model predicted equally well and both models predicted better than the averaging model for the 1972 Presidential primary election.

Both Williams, et al., and Fishbein and Coombs found a fairly strong relationship between attitude and behavioral intention using the expectancy value model. It would seem that the expectancy value model has fairly adequate predictive strength, so this model will be used in developing an alternative measure of partisanship. The operationalization of this proposed new measure will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

CONCLUSION

This chapter began by reviewing the conceptualization and operationalization of party identification which was born out of the early voting behavior studies. In this review several issues about the operationalization of the traditional measure of partisanship were raised: the "intransitivities" in the measurement of party identification where research has found that the party identification
index is not monotonic with regard to all types of political involvement, and the behavior of weak partisans and leaning partisans is not what would be expected; party identification, though believed to be a long term component of the vote decision or intention is not immune to changes in the political environment; party identification index makes an assumption that political parties are bipolar opposites with political independence being a midpoint. It may not be the case that the American electorate makes this assumption, and it may be analytically better to operationalize partisanship as a multidimensional phenomena.

Alternative measures of partisanship (i.e., thermometer and party support scale), though, are not better predictors of the vote intention when compared to the traditional party identification index. However, these measures do sensitize voting behavior theorists to the anomalies in the operationalization of the traditional party identification index.

The social psychological approach relies on the use of the party identification index and partisan attitudes in explaining the vote decision. This approach assumes that, though it has been found that voters are uninformed, uninterested and unmotivated toward politics, several variables (such as candidate, issue or partisanship variables) can explain their behavior. Another approach used in the study
of voting behavior is the rational approach which assumes that the voter may seek out knowledge about several policy alternatives in order to make a vote decision; or the voter may only be concerned with maximizing his "utility."

The former approach seems to make an implicit assumption about political behavior. Behavior in the social psychological approach is seen as responsive to the stimuli in the political environment. In contrast the latter—the rational approach—makes the implicit assumption that behavior is purposive, in that individuals seek to maximize their utility. Both approaches are valuable to the study of political behavior. Thus, it is the objective of this research project to develop a new measure of partisanship which has a theoretical foundation in social psychological attitude theory, and also represents a rational approach to the study of voting behavior.

The next chapter will outline the operationalization of the new partisanship measure.
Party identification is the central concept in the voting behavior field. However, a party identification measure has not been developed on the basis of the expectancy value model. The purpose of this research project is to do so, and to compare the performance of the new measure with the traditional party identification index, the thermometer ratings and the party support scale. To test this measure, an interview schedule was designed and administered on the telephone to a random sample of Columbus, Ohio residents immediately following the 1983 Mayoral election.

The first part of this chapter will give a brief description of the structure of Columbus, Ohio local government. This chapter will specifically review the Mayoral and City Council elections over approximately the last three decades. The focus of the study was the 1983 Columbus, Ohio Mayoral election. Therefore, the candidates' educational and political backgrounds will be discussed.
The second part of this chapter will describe the method of investigation (i.e., telephone survey), the sample, and the quality of the data. As stated previously, the primary focus of this research project was to examine the performance of various measures of partisanship. Thus, the final part of this chapter will discuss the measures included in the interview schedule and will describe the operationalization of the expectancy value model as it was used in this research project.

COLUMBUS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL HISTORY

In Columbus local government, administrative power is shared by the Mayor and the City Council. City Council members are elected at large or city wide. In addition, municipal elections in Columbus are nonpartisan. Nonpartisan is defined as the absence of party labels or party cues on the local election ballot. Therefore, the responsibility of making the voters aware of a candidate's partisan affiliation is on the local political party organizations. Thus, the voter may become aware of a candidate's partisan affiliation even though there are no cues on the election ballot to guide his vote decision.
While the municipal elections are nonpartisan, it is argued here that Columbus is a competitive two party city. Neither the Democratic nor the Republican party has held a stronghold on the controlling of both the Mayor's office and the City Council. Table 1 gives the history of Mayoral elections since 1953.

In 1953 Democrat M.E. Sensenbrenner gained office in a run off election to fill an unexpired two year term. He was reelected in 1955 as the incumbent. In 1959 Democrat Mayor Sensenbrenner was defeated by Republican W. Ralston Westlake who held office until 1963. In 1963 Democrat Sensenbrenner was returned to the Mayor's office after receiving 52.2% of the vote to Republican incumbent Westlake's 47.8% of the vote. Sensenbrenner chose to seek reelection in 1967 and defeated Republican candidate Jerry Spears, Jr. winning 70.6% of the vote. It was not until 1971 that Sensenbrenner met another strong challenger for the Mayor's office. Republican candidate Tom Moody defeated the incumbent by receiving 50.3% of the vote while the Democratic incumbent Sensenbrenner received 49.6% of the vote. This was a very close election where the winning candidate only received slightly over a thousand votes more than the losing candidate. Republican Tom Moody was returned to office in 1975 in a race against black Democratic City Councilperson John Rosemond by receiving 63.1% of the votes cast.
Republican Tom Moody was returned to office once again in 1979 in his race against Democrat Bill Boyland by receiving 58.2% of the votes cast. In 1983 Republican three term incumbent Tom Moody chose not to seek reelection. Thus, both political parties have controlled the Mayor's office, though the Republicans have held the office since 1972. We shall find that this pattern does not extend to the City Council.
Table 1
COLUMBUS, OHIO MAYORAL CANDIDATES 1954-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>WINNER</th>
<th>% VOTE</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LOSER</th>
<th>% VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954-1959</td>
<td>Sensenbrenner</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1963</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sensenbrenner*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1967</td>
<td>*Sensenbrenner</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1971</td>
<td>*Sensenbrenner</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spears</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1975</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sensenbrenner*</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1979</td>
<td>*Moody</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Rosemond</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1983</td>
<td>*Moody</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Boyland</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1986</td>
<td>Rinehart</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dorrian</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year denotes tenure of office, % Vote is the percentage of votes received by the candidate, P is the political party affiliation of the winning candidate and * indicates the incumbent in the Mayoral election).
Since local government administrative power is shared by both the Mayor and the City Council some discussion of the City Council is appropriate.

THE COLUMBUS CITY COUNCIL

Prior to 1957 (during the Democratic Mayor Sensenbrenner administration) the Republicans had held a majority for fourteen years on the seven member city council. However, after the 1957 at large election, the Democrats controlled the City Council by a 4-3 majority. Table 2 shows the partisan balance of the Columbus City Council since the late 1950's. In 1961 during the Republican Mayor Westlake's term of office, three incumbent Democrat councilpersons were defeated by three Republicans thus making the majority in City Council 6-1 in favor of the Republicans. In the 1963 elections, the Republicans retained their 6-1 majority on the City Council though Democrat Sensenbrenner was returned to the Mayor's office. The 1965 City Council election brought change to Columbus local politics. In 1965 three incumbent Republican Councilpersons (one of whom was the President of the City Council) were defeated by three Democratic challengers, thus altering the majority on the Council to a 4-3 Democratic advantage. In 1967 the
Democrats increased their margin by one, giving the City Council a 5-2 Democratic majority. The Democrats retained this 5-2 advantage on the City Council until 1979. In the 1979 election the Republicans gained one additional Council seat, cutting the Democratic majority on the Council to 4-3. This 4-3 Democratic majority survived the 1981 election, however, in 1983 all three incumbent Republican Councilpersons were up for reelection and two were defeated. A nonincumbent Republican was elected for one of the four available Council seats. Thus, the Republicans only retained two Council seats, making a 5-2 Democratic majority once again.

Table 2

PARTISAN BALANCE ON COLUMBUS, OHIO CITY COUNCIL
1959-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Republicans on City Council</th>
<th># of Democrats on City Council</th>
<th>Mayor's partisan affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates the majority party on the City Council).
In Table 2 take note that the partisan control of the City Council and Mayor's office have often been different. Republican Mayor Westlake in 1959 began his office with a Democratically controlled City Council, though control of the Council during his administration did switch to a Republican advantage. Democratic Mayor Sensenbrenner also began his tenure of office with a Republican controlled City Council which also switched to a Democratic advantage during his tenure of office. Though Mayors Sensenbrenner and Westlake had this good fortune of having their own party control an important entity of city government for a period of time during their term of office, Republican Mayor Tom Moody did not have such political good fortune. During all three of his terms, the City Council was controlled by the Democrats. And in 1983 though the Columbus electorate chose a Republican Mayor in a close open seat contest, the City Council remained a strong Democratic governing body. Thus, split partisan control of the Mayor's office and the City Council has been common in Columbus, and neither political party has achieved total political dominance. The Columbus voters made this choice for their local government. Thus, the next discussion will examine the partisan affiliation of Columbus, Ohio registered voters.
THE COLUMBUS REGISTERED VOTERS

Since 1971 Columbus voters selected a Republican Mayor, but have chosen to retain a Democratic majority on the City Council. There are data available since 1973 from the Franklin County Board of Elections on the partisanship composition of registered Columbus city voters.

Table 3
THE PARTISANSHIP OF COLUMBUS, OHIO REGISTERED VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>% REGISTERED DEMOCRAT</th>
<th>% REGISTERED REPUBLICAN</th>
<th>% REGISTERED INDEPENDENT OR UNCODED*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983**</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Franklin County Board of Elections labels those individuals who do not specify a political party as uncoded which here is referred to as being an Independent.

** In addition the data from the Board of Elections are rounded to the nearest tenths place, thus rounding errors may cause for percentages in each year to not add up to 100%.
Among registered voters, the largest percentage have declared themselves to be independents. In chapter four, we will compare party enrollment with party identification. We will see that there are many fewer independent identifiers than would be implied by the registration figures. Also Table 3 shows that the Democrats have had a consistent registration lead over the Republicans, but usually by only 10-15%. Therefore, given the nature of party identification, and the Mayoral and City Council electoral history, it would seem that Columbus, Ohio local politics can be characterized as a struggle between the two major political parties for control of local government administrative power. Thus, Columbus, Ohio is a worthy test site to investigate political behavior, and the 1983 Mayor's race is a useful election to examine various measures of partisanship and their statistical relationship with the individual's vote decision.

THE 1983 COLUMBUS, OHIO MAYORAL RACE

Over the past thirty years (1953-1983) there had not been an open contest for Mayor in Columbus. In 1983 the three term incumbent Republican Tom Moody chose not to seek reelection, making the election an open contest between the
Democratic candidate Michael Dorrian, the Republican candidate Dana Rinehart, and independent write-in candidate Charles Ross.

Dana Rinehart completed an undergraduate degree and a law degree at The Ohio State University. He was also a graduate of Florida Military School. In 1976 he was elected Franklin County Treasurer and managed to keep his seat in 1980. Before his reelection in 1980, Rinehart sought a GOP appointment to replace county prosecutor George C. Smith who had resigned from office. However, he lost his fight for the appointment before the party's central committee. In 1982 he had began a campaign for Governor, but pulled back and ran for state treasurer. He narrowly lost his bid for the office to Democrat Mary Ellen Withrow while the Democrats won in landslides for the Governorship and most other statewide offices.

Michael Dorrian graduated at the top of his high school class and attended accounting classes at Franklin University and the Ohio State University. He owns a construction business and has a real estate broker's license which he acquired in 1980. Dorrian began his political career as a Democratic ward committeeperson. He later took a job with the Sensenbrenner administration as assistant safety director. In 1968 Dorrian was elected as Franklin County Commissioner and was reelected in 1972, 1976 and 1980. In
1978 he was the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor on the ticket with now Governor Richard F. Celeste, but they lost in 1978 to the Republican incumbent James Rhodes and George Voinovich (now Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio).

Mr. Charles Ross in his first attempt for political office ran as an independent write-in candidate. Ross is a professor of Social Work at The Ohio State University (OSU) and had been Chairman of the Black Studies Department at OSU. Ross will not be included in the analysis because too few Ross voters were obtained in the sample for statistical analysis.

Rinehart narrowly won the battle for the Mayor's seat by winning 50.8% of the vote. Dorrian received 48.6% and Ross received .6% of the vote. Since the 1983 Columbus, Ohio Mayoral election was a closely contested race, it is an interesting local election for a study of partisanship.

**METHOD OF INVESTIGATION AND THE SAMPLE**

The objective of this research project is to investigate the performance of various measures of partisanship such as the traditional party identification measures, the feeling thermometer, and the party support scale. Another objective of this research is to investigate several new meas-
ures of partisanship based on social psychological attitude theory. The method of investigation in this study was a telephone survey of Columbus, Ohio adult residents following the November 8, 1983 general election.

The sampling frame was the Columbus Telephone Directory. The Ohio State University Polimetrics Laboratory has a computer program that can generate a list of randomly selected phone numbers from the Directory. The Polimetrics Laboratory uses a variation of a random digit dialing procedure which gives listed and unlisted numbers an equal chance of selection, thus adding to the representativeness of the Columbus sample.

Since the Columbus Directory included both Columbus residents and suburban telephone numbers, the first question of the interview screened to ascertain whether or not the potential respondent was a Columbus resident. In addition, a second screening question was used to insure that all respondents were eighteen years or older. A sample size of 320 respondents was chosen. Tallies were kept of the number of male and female respondents, so as to keep the numbers in balance. Interviewers were asked to record the sex of the respondent on the interview file folder. Once the appropriate number of interviews with female respondents were completed, interviewers were instructed to interview only male respondents.
The general election was held November 8, 1983 and the
survey was in the field from November 10, 1983 to November
14, 1983. There were seventeen interviewers who were
recruited from an undergraduate Political Science class.
Interviewers were subjected to a training session which
included reviewing the interview schedule, role playing,
and a discussion of the techniques of interviewing. Hours
of data collection were 5:00-9:00 p.m. weekdays and 10:00
a.m. to 9:00 p.m. weekends. The interview began as stated
previously with two screening questions. In addition,
interviewers read to the respondent a statement regarding
the confidentiality of the interview.

DATA QUALITY

Whenever survey research is used as a method of investi-
gation there are some potential problems. One problem may
be that when the respondent is asked a questionnaire item,
he may give a meaningful response to the question though he
may not have a "developed" attitude on the subject of the
question. Another problem with an election survey is that
respondents may respond that they voted in the election
though they are not registered to vote. Moreover, there
may be some problems with using (in this case study) a
cluster telephone sampling technique. If a high percentage
of the sample refuse to be interviewed, then the sample of
Columbus residents may not be representative of the Columbus population. As to the last potential problem, the response rate for this study is 39.4%. This response rate is relatively low. The response rate is calculated using the total number of refusals and the total number of completed interviews. The refusal category includes any refusal made by a household. Therefore we are not able to distinguish whether the prospective respondent made a refusal or someone in the household made the refusal.

The representativeness of the sample can be assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the chosen respondents with similar data from the 1980 census. Table 4 presents these data.
Table 4
A COMPARISON OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FROM THE COLUMBUS, OHIO SURVEY AND THE 1980 CENSUS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980 Census Data</th>
<th>Columbus Telephone Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5000</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-10,000</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 8 years</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of high school</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School grad.</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of college</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate &amp; post graduates</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table four shows that the Columbus sample is comparable to the 1980 census data as far as age and race are concerned. The Columbus sample though has a higher proportion of high income respondents when compared to the census data. The Columbus sample also appears to be more highly educated when compared with the census data. The sex ratio for the Columbus sample is very comparable to the sex ratio of the census data. Thus, the sample is more educated, and more affluent than what would be expected for the Columbus area.

THE MEASURES

As stated previously the objective of this research project was to investigate alternative measures of partisanship. These measures are the traditional party identification index, the party support scale and the feeling thermometer. In addition, this research will test new measures of partisanship based on Fishbein's attitudinal model which is called an expectancy value model.

The party identification index, the party support scale and the feeling thermometer will be operationalized exactly as in the National Election Study Interview schedule for 1980. (34)

------------------

(34) The operationatization of these measures is discussed
The Expectancy Value Model

Operationalizing the expectancy value model required developing a set of evaluation and belief statements about a variety of party related objects. Four set of objects were chosen as shown in Table 5.
Table 5
OBJECTS EVALUATED ON THE GOOD-BAD SCALE

**Ideological items**
- Conservative
- Political Moderate
- Liberal

**Group-Constituency Favoritism items***
- Attracting industry to Columbus
- Looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community
- Looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus
- Looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks
- Looking out for the needs of neighborhoods in Columbus

**Political Party Orientation items**
- Republicans
- Political Independents
- Democrats

**Partisanship of vote items**
- Voting a straight Republican ticket
- Voting a straight Democratic ticket
- Voting a split ticket
- Deciding on the person, not the party
- Deciding on the issues, not the party label

* These items were developed by Herbert Weisberg.
To measure the evaluative aspect the following statement was used:

"Now I'd like to ask about your attitudes about some political groups and practices. First, Democrats in general. Some people feel that Democrats in general are good. Suppose these people are at one end of the scale at point number 1. Other people feel that Democrats in general are bad. Suppose these other people are at the other end of the scale at point number 7. And of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Where would you place yourself on the scale or haven't you thought much about it?"

Interviewers were asked to use the following probe if necessary: "If 1 is good and 7 is bad, and 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are in between, what do you think about Democrats in general?"

This question format makes use of a seven point scale which is used by Ann Arbor and Berkeley. The seven point scale format was used to obtain evaluations of each of the sixteen objects listed in Table 5. In other words, the respondent evaluates all the items or variables from his or her own perspective.

To measure the belief aspect, the following statement was used:

"Now I would like you to please respond to the following statements keeping in mind a seven point scale where one now means that the statement is extremely likely to be true, and seven means that the statement is extremely unlikely to be true. The first statement is: Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of neighborhoods."
The belief statements asked the respondent to assess beliefs as to whether or not the candidates (Rinehart or Dorrian), the political parties (Republicans in Columbus and Democrats in Columbus) and political independents could be characterized by the three ideological variables and the five group constituency favoritism items in Table 5.

This question format for the expectancy value model made it possible to calculate \( \sum a_iB_i \) three different ways for each political party, each candidate, and for political independence. Specifically, the expectancy value can be calculated using ideological variables only, groups constituency favoritism variables only or both sets together. For example, for the Democratic ideology measure the respondent's evaluation of liberals is multiplied by his or her belief that Democrats are liberal. This multiplication is repeated for the respondent's evaluations of conservative and political moderate and his or her beliefs that Democrats in Columbus are conservative and/or politically moderate. These items are summed to arrive at \( \sum a_iB_i \). (35)

(35) Each 1-7 scale was transformed to a -3 to +3 scale prior to the multiplications.
EXAMPLE:

R'S EVALUATION OF LIBERALS X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS ARE LIBERAL

+ R'S EVALUATION OF CONSERVATIVES X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS ARE CONSERVATIVE

+ R'S EVALUATION OF POLITICAL MODERATES X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS ARE POLITICALLY MODERATE

This same computation was done replacing the ideological variables with the Group constituency favoritism variables. To illustrate:

R'S EVALUATION OF LOOKING OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF NEIGHBORHOODS X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS LOOK OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF NEIGHBORHOODS

+ R'S EVALUATION OF LOOKING OUT FOR COLUMBUS BLACKS X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS LOOK OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF COLUMBUS BLACKS

+ R'S EVALUATION OF LOOKING OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF THE COLUMBUS BUSINESS COMMUNITY X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS LOOK OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF THE COLUMBUS BUSINESS COMMUNITY

+ R'S EVALUATION OF LOOKING OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF WORKING PEOPLE X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS LOOK OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF WORKING PEOPLE

+ R'S EVALUATION OF LOOKING OUT FOR ATTRACTING INDUSTRY TO COLUMBUS X R'S BELIEF THAT DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS LOOK OUT TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY TO COLUMBUS
Thus, this illustration represents the calculation of the expectancy value model for the Democratic group constituency favoritism. It was also possible to sum the three ideological beliefs and evaluations with the five group constituency favoritism beliefs and evaluations, thus, yielding another (total) computation of $\sum a_i b_i$. Therefore, for each political stimulus (i.e., Democrats in Columbus, Republicans in Columbus, Political Independents, Dana Rinehart and Michael Dorrian) it was possible to calculate an expectancy value for ideology, and expectancy value for group constituency favoritism (needs), and an overall total expectancy value consisting of both the ideology and group constituency favoritism (needs) items.

In addition, all respondents were asked their beliefs about supporting each respective political party. Each respondent was asked to assign a number (where one meant that the statement was extremely likely to be true, and seven meant that the statement was extremely unlikely to be true) to the following two statements:

I support the Democratic party.

I support the Republican party.

These questions make it possible to calculate a party belief difference score by subtracting the score the respondent gave to the first statement from the score the

(36) Hereafter these items will be referred to as "needs."
respondent gave to the second statement. This is a new measure of partisanship, and it is called the party beliefs difference score (measure).

CONCLUSION

The first part of this chapter outlined a competitive two party electoral history for Columbus, Ohio for the Mayor's race and the City Council races. It was argued that Columbus, Ohio is an interesting and adequate test site for a study of partisanship, and of how partisanship relates to the vote. The second half of this chapter outlined the method of investigation (i.e., telephone survey) and discussed various methodological considerations such as sampling technique and operationalization of the measures that were included in the interview schedule for the study of partisanship in the 1983 Columbus, Ohio Mayoral election. The next chapter will review the analysis of the data from the survey and the performances of the various measures of partisanship included in the interview schedule.
Chapter IV
THE BEHAVIOR OF THE PARTISANSHIP MEASURES

The objective of this research project is to investigate the performance of several different measures of partisanship. This chapter will begin by comparing the frequency distribution. This chapter will also explore the possibility of an underlying pattern among the partisan related variables. The second part of this chapter will investigate the consistency of the partisan related variables to discern any possible underlying pattern(s) among the measures.

THE PARTISANSHIP MEASURES

Five measures of partisanship were included in this study. The measures are: party identification, the party support scale, the party thermometer difference score, the party beliefs difference score, and the party total expectancy value difference score. The traditional measure of party identification is very well known, so it need not be described any further.
The party support scale is a scale developed by Weisberg (1983). The questions asked of respondents are: "In your own mind, do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative, he is then further asked: "Which political party do you support?" If the respondent answers that he is not a supporter of a political party, he is then asked: "Do you ever think of yourself as closer to one of the two major political parties, or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative to this question, he is then asked: "Which party do you feel closer to?" The categories for the scale are: Republican supporter, closer to Republicans, not closer to either party, closer to Democrats, and Democratic supporter. (37) Weisberg (1983) found that this scale finds fewer partisans and more citizens ambivalent between the two parties. Note that this scale does not have an independent category, but instead has a neutral (i.e., not closer to either party) category.

A third measure of partisanship is the thermometer party difference score. This measure is based on the feeling thermometer. Respondents are asked to assign temperature ratings for both the Republican and Democratic parties. Ratings between fifty degrees and one hundred degrees mean that the respondent feels warm and favorable toward the

(37) The five point scale of party support/closeness was taken from Herbert F. Weisberg, "A New Scale of Partisanship," Political Behavior, 5, 4, 1983, pp., 363-376.
party, while temperature ratings between zero and fifty degrees indicate that the respondent feels cold and unfavorable toward a party. The thermometer party difference score is based on the arithmetical difference between the thermometer rating the respondent gave for the Republican party and the rating he gave to the Democratic party.

The party beliefs difference score is a fourth measure of partisanship. This item is measured using the Fishbein application. The respondent is asked to respond to the following two statements using a seven point probability scale (where 1 is extremely likely to be true and 7 is extremely unlikely to be true): I support the Republican party, I support the Democratic party. This is a new measure of partisanship, but it is only partially based on Fishbein's model. Fishbein's model takes into account both evaluations and beliefs. This new measure does not have an evaluative component. The party beliefs difference score takes the arithmetical difference between the two belief statements.

The last measure of partisanship included in this study is the political party total expectancy value difference score. This measure takes the arithmetical difference between the total expectancy value (which includes both the needs and ideological items) for the Republican party and the total expectancy value calculation for the Democratic
party. (38)

The analysis of the performance of the five measures of partisanship (i.e., party identification, the party support scale, the political party total expectancy value difference score, the party beliefs measure and the thermometer party difference score) shall first focus on the frequency distribution of each partisan group (i.e., Republican, Democrat and neutral) for each partisanship measure. Table 6 shows these distributions.

Table 6

PARTISAN FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE PARTISANSHIP MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% REPUBLICAN</th>
<th>% NEUTRAL</th>
<th>% DEMOCRAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTY IDENTIFICATION</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY SUPPORT SCALE</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERMOMETER PARTY DIFF.</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY BELIEFS DIFF.</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY TOTAL EXPECTANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE DIFF.</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Diff. = Difference score
Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding errors and missing cases.
N = greater than 305 cases

(38) See chapter three for an example of the computation for the total expectancy value.
The partisanship measures included in Table 6 are all trichotomized. For the party identification index, independents who respond that they are closer to one of the two partisan groups are placed into the partisan category. On the party support scale, those individuals who responded that they are not closer to either political party are placed into the neutral category. Those individuals who gave the same scores to both parties on the feeling thermometer are placed into the neutral category. In addition, for both the party beliefs difference score and the party total expectancy value difference score, once again those individuals who gave the same score to both parties are placed into the neutral category.

The five measures included in this analysis have varying percentages for the number of respondents who are categorized as Republican. The party support scale, the party thermometer difference score, and the party beliefs measure are comparable to each other for the Republican category. These three measures are within approximately two percentage points of each other: the party support scale has 37.6%, the party thermometer difference score has 37.5% and the party beliefs measure has 39.0% Republican identifiers. The party total expectancy value difference (41.3%) and party identification (41.1%) have higher percentages of Republican identifiers than the other three measures of partisanship.
For the Democratic category the party total expectancy value difference score has the highest percentage (53.2%) of respondents who identify themselves as Democratic identifiers. Party identification is second with 49.4%. The party support scale has the next highest percentage of Democratic identifiers (45.9%). The thermometer party difference and the party beliefs measure both have the same percentage (40.0%) of Democratic identifiers.

Thus, across both partisan categories (Republican and Democrat) the traditional party identification index and the party total expectancy value difference have the highest percentage of partisan identifiers relative to the percentage of partisan identifiers found by the other measures for both political parties.

It should also be noted that for all five partisanship measures, more partisan identifiers are found in the Democratic category than in the Republican category. This is expected given that in Columbus, Ohio there are more registered Democrats than registered Republicans. The largest differences are the 11.9% for the party total expectancy value difference (41.3% Republican, and 53.2% Democrat), 8.3% for the party support scale (37.6 Republican, and 45.9 Democrat) and the 8.3% for party identification (41.1% Republican, and 49.4% Democrat). By contrast, the differences

(39) See chapter 3 for further information on the registration records of the Columbus, Ohio electorate.
ences were negligible for the thermometer party difference score (2.5%) and the party beliefs difference score (1%), which raises concerns about whether these are appropriate measures of partisanship.

This finding brings up a question regarding the validity of measurement. Bailey (1982) argues that the definition of validity has two parts: "(1) that the measuring instrument is actually measuring the concept in question, and not some other concept; and (2) that the concept is being measured accurately."(40) Two relevant validation procedures for this study are face validity and criterion validity. Face or content validity is assessed subjectively by the researcher. In other words the researcher must use his own judgment in determining whether or not an instrument is measuring a concept adequately. It is assumed that each of the five partisanship measures have face validity.

Criterion validity procedures involve using a second measure as a criterion by which to judge the validity of a new measure(s). A measure which can be used as a criterion by which to judge the partisanship measures is the official registration data. However, it is misleading to use official registration data as a criterion to judge the validity of the partisanship measures. Finkel and Scarrow (1984) have argued that the official party enrollment of a voter

may not be the same as his party identification, therefore
the use of official registration data as a criterion to
assess the validity of the partisanship measures can be
erroneous. Since no criterion exists to evaluate the
validity of the five partisanship measures, only face
validity is assumed.

The partisanship measures also have varying percentages
of neutrals. The party identification index can have the
largest percentage (32.5%) of independents when independent
partisan leaners are included in the political independent
category. If partisan independent leaners are grouped with
partisan identifiers, the results are as shown in Table 6.
When only pure independents constitute the independent cat-
egory, 9.6% of the respondents fall into this category.
Thus, for the party identification index when partisan
leaners are excluded from the independent category, more
partisans are found, and the party identification index has
fewer independent identifiers than the other partisan
related measures included in this analysis except for the
party total expectancy value difference score (5.4%).

The thermometer party difference score has the second
largest percentage (22.5%) of neutrals, while the party
beliefs measure has the third largest percentage (21.0%).
The party support scale is 4.4% percentage points lower
than the support difference score with 16.6% in the neutral
category. The partisanship variable with the lowest percentage of neutrals is the party total expectancy value difference score with 5.4% of the respondents falling in this category. Each of the partisanship measures find differing levels of identification with the two partisan groups (i.e., Republican and Democrat) and neutrals. Given the variation in the percentages of partisan identifiers for each measure, it appears that each of these measures may be tapping attitudes about political parties in different ways.

From the Columbus survey data two partisanship measures find a small percentage of neutrals, while for the remaining three partisanship measures substantially more neutrals are found. This can be explained by the question format for each of the partisanship measures. Only the party identification measure allows a voter to respond that he thinks of himself as an independent, but the follow up question probes the voter about which party he may feel closer to, thereby encouraging the voter to choose between the two party alternatives. The computation of the total party expectancy value difference score takes into consideration thirty-two variables. The summation of these variables allows for a final determination of an individual's partisanship. Essentially with thirty-two variables involved, it is unlikely to get a difference of exactly
zero with the expectancy value measure. Therefore, fewer neutrals are expected for this measure. The three remaining measures, the party support scale, the feeling thermometer, and the party beliefs measure do not offer an independent category like the party identification question, and do not involve an elaborate calculation using thirty-two variables like the party total expectancy value difference score. It may be the case that these measures are finding a roughly equal balance of partisans with a large number of neutrals due to the operationalization of the respective measures.

The five point party support scale offers the voter the prerogative to respond that he is not closer to either party and this is equated in this analysis with being a political neutral. As Weisberg (1983) makes clear it may not be the case that this individual is an independent; he may have positive, negative or neutral feelings toward each party. It is difficult to ascertain what it means to the voter when he responds that he is not closer to either of the political parties. Thus, this may be a reason why more neutrals are found for this measure than the party identification or the party total expectancy value difference score.

The party beliefs measure and the feeling thermometer for the parties are similar in that the respondent is asked
to assign a numeric response for each of the parties. If it is the case that the respondent gives the same numeric response for both political parties then, this individual is categorized as a neutral on these measures. This may explain why both of these measures find more neutrals than the other partisanship measures. For these measures the individuals may not necessarily be political independents, but may be individuals who do not make sharp distinctions between the two political party alternatives.

By comparison, if one examines the registration data for Columbus, Ohio voters shown in the preceding chapter some disparity is found. For example, the registration data indicates that approximately half of the registered voters in Columbus are political independents. The frequencies for each of the partisanship measures shows that neutrals are clearly the minority for the Columbus sample. This difference between the registration data and the Columbus survey data indicates that there may be a difference between an individual's self description of his partisanship and his enrollment status. This comparison is shown in Table 7.

Finkel and Scarrow (1984) argue a voter's party identification on the traditional question may not necessarily coincide with his official party enrollment.(41) There are

(41) Steven Finkel and Howard Scarrow, "Party Identifica-
Table 7

A COMPARISON OF COLUMBUS REGISTRATION DATA AND SURVEY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Support Scale</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermometer Party Diff.</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Beliefs Diff.</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Total Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Diff.</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding errors.

Several factors which may precipitate this event. One factor is that there may be some degree of voter confusion about the meaning of the label "independent." A voter may be confused about the official status of being a political independent, and may perceive that there is an Independent party. Secondly, it is difficult to determine how an individual responds to the partisan identification questions. For example, is the individual responding to the questions in terms of his official party enrollment, or has he chosen a party enrollment status for "instrumental" reasons that may not be related to feelings of party loyalty? These questions cannot be answered here, so the next part of this chapter will review the relationship among the five partisan measures.

---

Values Diff. 41.3 5.4 53.2

---

THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG PARTISAN PREDICTORS

In order to examine the relationship among the various measures more closely, Table 8 shows the correlations among the measures.

Table 8

PEARSON R CORRELATIONS AMONG PARTISAN PREDICTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Id.</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therm. Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Id. = Party Identification index
Party Beliefs = Party Beliefs Difference score
Therm. Diff. = Thermometer Difference score for the political parties
Exp. Diff. = Political Party Total Expectancy Value Difference score

N = greater than 294 cases

The party support scale and the party identification index have the highest correlation of .780. The party
beliefs measure has roughly the same correlation with both the party identification index and the party support scale. However, the thermometer difference score for the political parties is not as stable in its relationship with the other measures. For example, the thermometer difference score correlates most highly with the party support scale at .774 while the correlation reduces to .723 when correlated with party identification; the correlation further reduces to .693 when correlated with the support difference score, and .508 with the party expectancy value difference score.

The party total expectancy difference score has lower correlations with each of the other measures included in this analysis. The highest correlation for this measure is with the party support scale (.547). The party total expectancy value difference score has comparable correlations with the party beliefs score (.509) and the party thermometer difference score (.508). The lowest correlation found for this measure is with the party identification index (.492). All of the correlations found for the party expectancy value difference score are moderate correlations when compared to the relationships among the other measures. Thus, the party total expectancy value difference score has a weak relationship with the other partisan measures included in this analysis and may therefore be a different measure of partisanship.
It is difficult to determine if any of the alternative measures of partisanship are valid. This study included several measures of partisanship, therefore this allows for the investigation of the validity of the five partisanship measures. Bailey argues that the use of alternative measures lets us to examine whether or not the measures actually measure the same concept. If the measures are highly correlated, then they may be measuring the same concept. But, if the measures have a low correlation, then they may be measuring different concepts. Furthermore, it may be argued that this method of assessing validity through a correlational analysis of the alternative predictors also tests criterion validity. Moreover, there is no measurement of the reliability of the partisanship measures.

All of the partisanship measures are highly correlated, except the party total expectancy difference score. This finding indicates that this expectancy value measure is measuring something different when compared to the other partisanship measures. The adequacy of this measure cannot be assessed from this correlational analysis of the partisan measures. More empirical tests are necessary before making any conclusions about the contribution of this measure.

The next part of this analysis will further examine the relationship among the predictor variables and other possible measures of partisanship through factor analysis. In a factor analysis the presence of an underlying pattern among the partisan related measures can be discerned.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

The next logical step in the analysis of the data is to explore whether there is an underlying pattern among the partisan related variables. To accomplish this objective, eight alternative measures of partisanship were factor analyzed. Of these eight variables, 68.1% of the total variance is explained by one underlying component. All other components were of no importance since their eigenvalues were less than 1.0. Table 9 depicts the results of the factor analysis where the unsquared loading of each measure is given.

The percentage of total variance of each measure accounted for by the single component is equal to the squared value of the loading. Note that for the thermometer differences for the Republican and Democratic party 78.9% of the total variance is explained by the first principal component. For party identification 75.0% of the
Table 9

LOADINGS OF EACH VARIABLE ON THE FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party support scale</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for the Republican party - R's thermometer rating for the Democratic party</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's belief he supports Republican party - R's belief he supports the Democratic party</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for Republicans - R's thermometer rating for Democrats</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican total party expectancy value - Democrat total party expectancy value</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's belief about voting a straight Republican ticket - R's belief about voting a straight Democratic ticket</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's evaluation of Republican as good/bad - R's evaluation of Democrats as good/bad</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: R = RESPONDENT

total variance is accounted for by the first principal component. The first principal component accounts for 74.3% of the total variance in the party support scale, and 74.6% of the total variance of the party beliefs measure.
Thus, of all variables included in this factor analysis, four items have greater than 70% of their total variance accounted for by the first principal component. The items are: the party identification index, the party support scale, the party beliefs measure, and the political party thermometer difference.

The other variables included in the factor analysis have lower factor loadings and may therefore be less adequate measures of the underlying component. The expectancy value measures, political party difference score, the difference score for voting a straight partisan ticket, and the difference score for the evaluation of the political parties as good/bad do not load as highly on the first factor as the other partisanship measures. For the evaluative difference score for the political parties, 64.3% of the total variance is explained by the principal component. The first principal component explains 60.4% of the total variance for the party total expectancy value difference score, and 49.8% of the total variance for the difference score for voting a straight partisan ticket. Of these three measures the evaluative measure has more total variance explained. This presents a problem for determining

\(\text{(43)}\) It should be noted that all the variables included in this factor analysis have relatively high factor loadings. In order to highlight the difference(s) between the new expectancy value measures and the other partisanship measures a decision was made to make an arbitrary 70% variance cutoff in order to show any differences between the partisanship measures.
what the party total expectancy value difference score measures in relation to party identification, the party support scale, the party beliefs measure and the thermometer differences. Still approximately half or more of the variance is accounted for by the single component, so these expectancy value measures are explaining some element of partisanship.

The next step in this analysis will be to factor analyze nine alternative measures of partisanship. In Table 10 note that the total political party expectancy value has been broken up into its component parts—an ideology expectancy value difference score for the political parties and a needs expectancy value difference score for the parties. It is hoped that breaking the party total expectancy value difference score into its component parts will allow them to load more highly on the first principal component. Table 10 presents these results.

For these nine variables in Table 10, 61.2% of the total variance is explained by one underlying component. All other components were of no importance since their eigenvalues were less than 1.0. This factor analysis explains less of the total variance when the political party total expectancy value difference is split up into its component parts—the ideology total expectancy value and the needs expectancy value. In the first factor analysis which
Table 10
LOADINGS OF EACH VARIABLE ON THE FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party support scale</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for the Republican party - R's thermometer rating for the Democratic party</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's belief he supports Republican party - R's belief he supports the Democratic party</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for Republicans - R's thermometer rating for Democrats</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Ideology expectancy value - Democrat Ideology expectancy value</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Needs expectancy value - Democrat Needs expectancy value</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's belief about voting a straight Republican ticket - R's belief about voting a straight Democratic ticket</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's evaluation of Republican as good/bad - R's evaluation of Democrats as good/bad</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

included the political party total expectancy value difference 68.1% of the total variance was explained by one underlying component. Thus, either the needs expectancy
values or the ideology expectancy values (or both are) weaker than the composite total political party expectancy value.

Table 10 shows the results of the factor analysis where the unsquared loading of each measure is given. Squaring these loadings again gives the percentage of total variance of each measure accounted for by the single component. The highest loading is found for the thermometer differences for the Republican and Democratic party, with 79.0\% of the total variance explained by the first principal component. For party identification, 75.0\% of the total variance is accounted for by the first principal component. The first principal component accounts for 73.7\% of the total variance of the party support scale, and 72.8\% of the total variance of the party beliefs difference score. Of all variables included in this factor analysis, the same four items had greater than 70\% of their total variance accounted for by the first principal component.

Both factor analyses find that the same four variables have more than 70\% of their total variance accounted for by the first principal component. This single principal component is defined as a partisanship component. In chapter two, partisanship was defined as a global term to refer to partisan tendencies. This analysis provides an operational definition of partisanship. The factor is best
score. These data indicate that the ideology expectancy value difference score adds less to our understanding of partisanship than does the needs expectancy value difference score. By examining more closely the behavior of each of the partisan measures, it is hoped that similarities and differences among the measures can be determined. The next part of this analysis will attempt to ascertain the consistency of the various alternative partisan measures.

CONSISTENCY OF ALTERNATIVE MEASURES

For additional understanding of partisanship and what partisanship means to the voter this next section of the chapter will discuss findings from an analysis of the consistency of the five measures: party identification, the party support scale, the party beliefs difference score, the difference score for the political parties using the feeling thermometer, and the political party total expectancy value difference score. Ideally one would find that voters would be consistent across all measures which attempt to assess their partisanship. What is meant here by the term "consistent" is that a respondent makes the same partisan response (either Democratic or Republican) across all measures.
defined by the thermometer party difference measure, the party identification index, the party support scale, and the party beliefs difference measure. Neither of the two analyses find that the expectancy value measures make strong contributions in explaining the underlying component which is a partisanship component, when compared to the contribution of the party identification index, the party support scale, the thermometer party difference score and the party beliefs measure. Moreover, note that in the first factor analysis 68.1% of the total variance is explained by one underlying component when the total political party expectancy value difference score is included; however, the percentage of the total variance explained by the partisanship component decreases to 61.2% when the total political party expectancy value difference is broken down into its component parts. This finding presents a problem in determining what the expectancy values measure in relation to party identification, the party support scale, the party beliefs score and the thermometer differences for the political parties.

The first principal component explains 60.4% of the total variance for the party total expectancy value difference score, 49.9% of the total variance for the needs expectancy value difference score, and only 26.3% of the total variance for the ideology expectancy value difference
The consistency analysis is based on a trichotomization of the responses on the measures. The three categories are: Republican, neutral (independent), and Democratic. Party identification was recoded so that strong partisans, weak partisans and leaning partisans were grouped together for both the Republican and Democratic parties; and pure independents were an independent category. On the party support scale the categories of partisan supporter and closer partisan (e.g., a respondent who identified himself as closer to the Democratic party) were grouped together for the two political parties, and those individuals who identified themselves as neither closer to either political party were a third category. The party beliefs measure was recoded into three categories: net positive beliefs about the Republican party, net positive beliefs about the Democratic party, and a neutral partisanship category. The thermometer party difference score is trichotomized in the same way as the party beliefs measure though the categories are warmer toward the Republican party, warmer toward the Democratic party and a neutral category. The party expectancy value difference was also trichotomized into three categories: net positive beliefs x affect about the Republican party, net positive beliefs x affect about the Democratic party, and a neutral partisanship category.
In the first consistency analysis the focus is on four measures—party identification, the party support scale, the party beliefs measure, and the thermometer difference score—because the party expectancy value difference score has a distinctively lower factor loading, and as will be shown later this measure also has the lowest predictive capacity with respect to the vote. Since all four measures are trichotomized it is possible to obtain eighty-one combinations. A total of twenty-nine combinations occurred. Thus, the number of actual combinations which appear in the analysis for each grouping is substantially less than the number of possible combinations.

In this analysis, it was anticipated that a majority of the respondents would be consistent in their partisan responses. Table 11 shows that this expectation was met. Of the Republicans 66%, of the respondents gave a Republican response on all four of the partisanship measures, and 89% gave a Republican response on three or more of the measures. The other partisan response given by the respondent was either an opposite party response (e.g., Democratic) or a neutral response. Of those individuals who identified themselves as Democrats, 69% gave a Democratic response.

The independent or neutral category will not be discussed because only six cases are found. Four of the six cases give a neutral response to each measure. Since so few cases are found I do not feel comfortable drawing any conclusions about the "independent" or neutral category.
response on all four of the measures, and 86% gave three or more Democratic responses. Thus, for both the political parties a vast majority of the respondents gave a single consistent partisan response on the partisanship measures. Also there are no appreciable differences between the two parties.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSISTENCY OF PARTISAN RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 consistent partisan responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more consistent partisan responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next logical step in this consistency analysis was to determine which measures were most consistent with party identification and which measures were not. Party identification is used because of its historical importance in the voting behavior field. Though there are debates about our traditional measurement of partisanship, as will be shown in the next chapter party identification is the single best predictor of the vote. Therefore, each of the partisanship measures will be compared to party identification.
For Republican identifiers, the party support scale is the most consistent measure (87%) with the traditional measures of party identification, the thermometer difference variable is the second most consistent (85%), and the party beliefs measure is the least consistent (79%) with party identification. For the Democratic identifiers the party support scale is the most consistent (89%), the party beliefs measure is the second most consistent (81%), and the thermometer difference variable is the least consistent (78%) with the party identification index. Thus, in this four measure consistency analysis the measure which is most consistent with the traditional party identification index for both political parties is the party support scale.

In the second consistency analysis the party expectancy value difference score is added. Since all measures are trichotomized it is possible to obtain a total of two hundred forty-three possible combinations. However, the total number of combinations that actually occur is only forty-six. (45) In this analysis the number of combinations which appear is substantially less than the number of possible combinations which suggests there is considerable consistency among the partisanship measures.

(45) Once again the neutral or independent category will not be discussed because only six cases are found and a majority of the cases are consistent across four of the measures.
As in the first consistency analysis with four measures, there was an expectation that a majority of cases would be consistent across the five measures included in this second analysis. This expectation is met. Of the Republican respondents, 65% were consistent across all five measures, while for the Democratic respondents 54% were consistent across the partisanship measures (Table 12). Thus, a majority of respondents are consistent in identifying their partisanship in both analyses. However, the percentage of Democrats who were consistent decreases approximately 15% in the second analysis when the party total expectancy value difference is included, whereas the change for Republicans is slight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Four measures of Partisanship</th>
<th>Five measures of Partisanship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% consistent over all measures</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next part of this analysis will examine which partisanship measures were consistent with the party identification index, and which measures were not consistent. This
examination is done using party identification because this predictor has the highest correlation with the dependent variable, i.e., the mayoral vote. For those respondents who selected the Republican party on the party identification index, 87% chose the Republican party on the political party total expectancy value difference variable. In addition, of those respondents who chose the Republican party on the party identification scale, 87% chose the Republican party on the party support scale. Thus, the party support scale and the party total expectancy value measure are both equally consistent with the party identification index, for Republicans. The thermometer party difference variable is the next most consistent with the traditional measurement of partisanship, while the party beliefs measure is the least consistent with the traditional measure for Republicans.

Of those respondents who selected the Democratic party on the party identification index, 72% gave the same response to the party total expectancy value measure. For Democrats the party support scale is the most consistent with party identification. The party beliefs measure is second most most consistent, while the thermometer party difference variable is now the third most consistent measure with party identification. The party total expectancy value difference variable is the measure which is least
consistent with party identification for Democrats. Table 13 shows these data.

Table 13
SECOND CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

| % of Respondents who gave consistent responses with the Party Identification scale |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Party Support                   |                 |
| Republican                      | 87%             |
| Democrat                        | 90              |
| Party Beliefs                   |                 |
| Republican                      | 78%             |
| Democrat                        | 81              |
| Thermometer Party Diff.         |                 |
| Republican                      | 85%             |
| Democrat                        | 80              |
| Political Party Expectancy Value Diff. |     |
| Republican                      | 87%             |
| Democrat                        | 72              |

Thus far the discussion of the second consistency analysis has focused on the consistency of the alternative partisanship measures with the traditional party identification scale. It should be noted that for Republican identifiers in the second analysis 65% gave a Republican response across all five measures, while 81% gave four or more Republican responses, and 93% gave this response
across three or more partisanship measures. For Democratic identifiers, 54% gave a Democratic response over all five measures, 81% gave this response across four or more of the measures, while 89% gave a Democratic response across three or more of the measures in the second consistency analysis. Thus, for Republican identifiers 93% gave three or more Republican responses across the five measures of partisanship, and for the Democratic identifiers 89% gave three or more Democratic responses. The second consistency analysis shows no appreciable difference between the parties. Although the Republicans are generally more consistent, this shows up only at the level of complete consistency across all five measures. Table 14 shows a comparison between the two analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Consistency Analysis</th>
<th>Second Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partisan responses</td>
<td>not possible</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partisan responses</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partisan responses</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Party identification was defined as "...a sense of personal attachment that an individual feels toward a group...with respect to parties as groups."(46) Party identification in a sense has been synonymous with our concept of partisanship. This chapter sought to compare the performance of several various measures of partisanship with the traditional party identification index.

In a comparison of the frequency distributions for the party identification index, the party support scale, the party beliefs measure, the thermometer party difference score and the political party expectancy value difference score, it was found that each of these various measures of partisanship found differing levels of partisan direction. The traditional party identification index found fewer partisans and more political independents than the other measures when independent partisan leaners are included into the independent category. The party beliefs measure and the thermometer party difference measure both have approximately equal percentages of partisans and neutrals. The party identification scale with leaners grouped with partisans, and the political party total expectancy value difference score found more partisans than any of the other measures, and had the smallest percentage of neutrals.

(46) Campbell, Gurin and Miller, The Voter Decides.
Interestingly enough, the party support scale has the highest correlation with each of these various partisan measures included in the analysis and the party total expectancy value difference has the lowest.

All of the partisan measures included in the analysis load on one factor in a factor analysis. From the factor analysis results it is clear that each of these measures represents some element or aspect of partisanship. However, the political party total expectancy value item has less of its variance accounted for by the partisanship component than the other partisanship measures. In addition, when this measure is included in a factor analysis, the underlying partisanship component accounts for more of the total variance (68.1%) than in the second factor analysis (61.2%), where the party total expectancy value is divided into needs and ideology expectancy value scores. None of the expectancy value model measures included in the factor analysis load as highly on the factor when compared to the other partisan measures. These measures are therefore less adequate measures of the underlying component of partisanship.

Further analysis of the measures of partisanship focused on the consistency of the different measures of partisanship included in the study. It was found that the party support scale is the most consistent with the traditional
party identification index. The party beliefs difference score and the thermometer party difference measure are comparable to each other in terms of their consistency with the party identification index. The political party total expectancy value difference score varies by political party. For the Republican party, this measure is tied for the most consistent along with the party support scale. For the Democratic party, on the other hand, the total expectancy value difference score is the least consistent with party identification. Democrats may be less consistent because of partisan dealignment; or, it may be the case that since the Democratic party is a much more heterogeneous grouping when compared to the Republican party, then Democrats may only weakly identify with their party. From all of these tests, one would conclude that the expectancy value measure performs less adequately compared to the other partisan measures included in this analysis. The next chapter will focus on these measures of partisanship as independent variables in an analysis of their relationship with a dependent variable—the mayoral vote.
Chapter V
PREDICTING THE VOTE

The remaining step is to determine how the several measures discussed so far relate to actual political behavior. This chapter will first examine the correlation coefficient for each predictor with the dependent variable which is the mayoral vote decision. The second part of this chapter will focus on the performance of each independent variable relative to other predictor variables in a multiple regression analysis where the mayoral vote decision is the dependent variable. The final part of this chapter will concentrate on the performance of the expectancy value measures.

VOTE ANALYSIS

Correlations

The first aspect of this analysis is a comparison of the various measures of partisanship as predictors of the may-
oral vote. In presenting data a useful index of describing the strength of the relationship among variables is the correlation coefficient. This coefficient can take on values that range from -1 through 0 to +1. The more the correlation between two measures departs from zero and approaches the value of either -1 or +1, the stronger the relationship is between the two measures in question. The Pearson's product moment correlation (r) is an appropriate measure of association to be used in an analysis of interval level variables. This research follows Fishbein and Coombs in making an interval level assumption about the variables since the expectancy value scores are computed as a linear function of the respondent's numeric responses. Table 15 shows the correlations with the mayoral vote decision.
Table 15
PEARSON R PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS

Vote correlated with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Support scale</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's belief that he/she supports the Republican party - R's belief he supports the Democratic party</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican total expectancy value - Democrat total expectancy value</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's evaluation of Republicans as good/bad - R's evaluation of Democrats as good/bad</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's evaluation of voting a straight Republican ticket - R's evaluation of voting a straight Democratic ticket</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for the Republican party - R's thermometer rating for the Democratic party</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's thermometer rating for Republicans - R's thermometer rating for Democrats</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These correlations are all statistically significant (p<.001).

N = greater than 177 cases

NOTE: R = RESPONDENT
As one peruses Table 15, the traditional party identification measure stands out as the best predictor with a correlation of .70 with the vote. The second best predictor as listed in Table 15 is the party support scale which came to be included in the National Election Studies in 1980. This scale has a correlation of .649 with the vote. Thus, it would seem that these two measures are quite adequate.

Also in Table 15 other alternative partisan related measures are correlated with the vote. Four of these measures are based on the expectancy value model, and the two remaining measures come from the feeling thermometer measure. All six of these additional partisan related measures are difference scores. Of these six measures, the difference score with the highest correlation with the mayoral vote decision is the party beliefs score with a correlation of .604. This measure takes into account the difference in the beliefs the respondent has about supporting either of the political parties. Though the measurement of this variable is based on the expectancy value model it should be noted that only one component of the overall attitude for the respondent is taken into account. In other words, this particular variable excludes an evaluative component of the overall attitude. According to Fishbein's theory if both the belief about supporting a political party and the evaluation of the political party are taken together (i.e.,
evaluation x belief), then this would yield an even higher correlation with the mayoral vote decision. As a test of this possibility, I performed such a calculation and this is not the case. When this computation is made, the results are not statistically significant and are therefore not reported here. It should be noted that this measure is different from the party total expectancy value difference. The party total expectancy value difference takes sixteen variables for each party into its computation. This measure, on the other hand, only uses two party support beliefs. The difference between the party beliefs measure and the party total expectancy value is that the latter measure is a more indirect measure of partisanship where thirty-two variables are included in the computation. The party beliefs measure is a more direct measure of partisanship because the target of the belief statement is the individual and the extent to which this individual supports either of the two political parties.

The remaining five partisan related difference scores have moderately high correlations with the mayoral vote decision. The measure with the fourth highest correlation with the vote (.520) is the political party thermometer difference score. The political party total expectancy value difference score has the fifth highest correlation with the vote at .503. The remaining three variables have
slightly lower correlations with the vote, but are the least related to political party affiliation. Two of the three measures are evaluations of members of a party (i.e., evaluations of partisans as good/bad, and temperature assignments given by the respondents for partisans), and the third measure takes into account the respondent's evaluation of voting a straight partisan ticket.

Clearly the party identification index, the party support scale and the party beliefs score are the best predictors of the mayoral vote decision. However, since the support difference score is not wholly based on the expectancy value model, the next part of this analysis will examine more closely the relationship between the expectancy value measures and the mayoral vote decision.

The Expectancy Value Measures

Table 16 depicts the correlation of several expectancy value measures with the mayoral vote decision. In Table 16 a pattern develops for the expectancy value computations. For each political object (i.e., Republicans, Democrats, Rinehart, and Dorrian) the ideology expectancy value has the lowest correlation with the vote, the needs only expectancy value has the second highest correlation, and the total expectancy value (which includes both ideology and
needs statements in the computation) has the highest correlation with the vote (with the exception of Dorrian the Democratic candidate). The total expectancy value (where both needs and ideological variables are included in the computation) correlations with the vote are much higher than those for just the ideology expectancy values, but they do not represent a great improvement over the correlation between the needs expectancy value and the vote. For example, the total expectancy value correlations for Democrats is .410 and for Republicans .382, however, the needs only expectancy value correlation for these political objects are .368 (Democrats) and .362 (Republicans). It seems safe to conclude that the needs expectancy value computation performs quite well when compared to the total expectancy value and the ideological values. (47)

--------------------

(47) The expectancy value correlations obtained for Dorrian are peculiar with the correlation for the ideology items being very low. They will not be discussed because the correlations cannot be fully explained.
### Table 16

**VOTE CORRELATED WITH EXPECTANCY VALUE MEASURES**

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum a_i b_i \text{Republicans} & \quad .38 \quad n=183 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Republicans/ideology} & \quad .189 \quad n=163 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Republicans/needs} & \quad .36 \quad n=183 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Rinehart} & \quad .429 \quad n=180 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Rinehart/ideology} & \quad .269 \quad n=159 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Rinehart/needs} & \quad .387 \quad n=178 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Democrats} & \quad .41 \quad n=186 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Democrats/ideology} & \quad .25 \quad n=167 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Democrats/needs} & \quad .368 \quad n=185 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Dorrian} & \quad .29 \quad n=173 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Dorrian/ideology} & \quad .03^{**} \quad n=150 \\
\sum a_i b_i \text{Dorrian/needs} & \quad .31 \quad n=173 \\
\end{align*}
\]

**All other correlations in the table except for the Dorrian ideology computation are statistically significant at .001.**

*Also note that needs refers to the group-constituency favoritism items.*
The finding that the needs expectancy values have a stronger relationship with the mayoral vote than the ideological expectancy values is understandable. The group constituency favoritism items or needs are more important than ideology, so urban politics may be nonideological. At the local level of government voters are more concerned about whether their trash is picked up, crime is controlled, etc. Essential needs of voters are fulfilled by local government officials rather than national level officials. It may be the case that national level politics is less needs oriented, and is therefore more ideological, whereas needs at a local level are more important than ideology. Thus, ideology within a context of urban politics may be minimal, while group constituency favoritism plays a more important role. (48)

The nonpartisanship characteristic of the Columbus Mayoral election serves to minimize the role of ideological concerns. Adrian (1952) argues that nonpartisan elections help candidates avoid issues of policy in their campaigns. Thus, if it is the case that the Mayoral candidates' ideological positions were nebulous to the voters, then it is not surprising that the ideological variables have low cor--

relations with the vote. The fact that the needs variables have stronger correlations with the vote than the ideological variables demonstrates the strength of Fishbein's attitude theory. The use of ideological variables in an urban context may be inappropriate given the nonideological nature of a nonpartisan local election.

Another interpretation can be derived from Elazar's focus on political culture. He has written that the national political culture is actually a synthesis of three dominant subcultures: individualistic, traditionalistic and moralistic. Moreover, each of these subcultures has specific characteristics. Elazar displays a regional distribution of political cultures within each of the states. Columbus, Ohio according to this distribution has an individualistic political culture. Essentially this means that government is viewed as a "marketplace." The government should respond efficiently to demands, as opposed to government trying to achieve the "good community" (i.e., a moralistic subculture), or attempting to maintain the existing order (i.e., a traditionalistic subculture). Therefore the finding that the needs statements are more highly correlated with the mayoral vote decision when compared to the ideology measure is expected given this theory of political culture. The group constituency favoritism items represent demands constituents or voters may want, and are more indi-
vidualistic items when compared to ideological concerns. Conceivably, this finding could change if, for example, a study was done in the moralistic subculture of central Utah. Thus, the expectancy value measures (ideology and needs) make a worthy contribution to our understanding of the urban political culture. However, since the focus of this research project is on partisanship the next step in this analysis will examine difference scores of expectancy values for both the political parties and the two mayoral candidates.

Table 17 displays the correlations between the mayoral vote decision and party and candidate difference scores. The political party expectancy value difference score has a .503 correlation with the vote. As would be expected the political party needs only expectancy value difference score has a slightly lower correlation of .469 with the vote. The ideology only expectancy value difference score has an even weaker correlation of .289 with the vote. Thus, in the case of political party expectancy values, the party total expectancy value difference score has the highest correlation with the vote.
Table 17

PARTY AND CANDIDATE DIFFERENCE SCORES
CORRELATIONS WITH VOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party or Candidate</th>
<th>Expectancy Score</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican total expectancy value</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican needs expectancy value</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican ideology expectancy value</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinehart total expectancy value</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinehart needs expectancy value</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinehart ideology expectancy value</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All values are statistically significant, p<.001.
The needs only expectancy value difference for the candidates has the largest correlation of .535 with the vote. However, note that the total expectancy value difference for the candidates has a lower correlation of .526 with the vote. This is an odd finding given that the total expectancy value includes more variables in its calculation (i.e., it includes both ideological variables and needs variables) than the needs only expectancy value, and is likely due to the low correlation of the Dorrian ideology measure with the vote. To examine the relationship between some of these predictor variables and the vote is the next step in the analysis. The performance of each independent variable relative to other predictor variables can be assessed in a multiple regression analysis.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

Multiple regression is a statistical technique through which one can analyze the relationship between several independent (or predictor) variables and a dependent variable. It is hypothesized that the political party expectancy value difference would help explain some of the

(49) Probit analysis would be more appropriate for the analysis of vote as a dichotomous dependent variable. However, it is argued here that there are not any grave implications for the analysis of these data by making the necessary assumptions for least square procedures.
variance in vote that party identification does not explain. Thus, vote was regressed on the political party expectancy value difference and party identification. It is found however, that the political party expectancy value difference is not statistically significant in a regression analysis. The party expectancy value does not explain a significant portion of the variance in vote beyond what the traditional party identification scale explains.

In addition, as part of the analysis it seemed logical to regress vote on the political party needs expectancy values, and the total expectancy value for each political party with the various measures of partisanship (i.e., party identification, party support scale and the party beliefs difference score). However, the party expectancy values did not achieve statistical significance in regression equations with the other party measures, therefore, the equations are not shown here.

Table 18 reports the results of the regression equations in which the new measures are statistically significant (p=.001). (50) Each set of three variables in the table represents one regression equation with vote as the dependent variable. For each equation the standardized regression coefficient (beta) is given for each predictor along with the proportion of variance explained by the equation.

(50) To avoid multicollinearity, only regressions with correlations among predictors below .5 are included in the table.
(R squared). Measures of partisanship which achieved statistical significance are: party identification, the party support scale, and the party beliefs difference score. The expectancy value measures which achieved statistical significance in these regression equations are two candidate variables: candidates needs only expectancy values and candidate total expectancy values. In addition, regressing vote on the thermometer candidate difference score and the needs expectancy values for each candidate is statistically significant.
### Table 18

**REGRESSION RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>R SQUARED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorrian total expectancy value</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.509 n=164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinehart total expectancy value</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Support Scale</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dorrian needs expectancy value               | .224 |          |
| Rinehart needs expectancy value              | .274 |          |
| Party Support Scale                          | .523 | .519 n=164|

| Dorrian total expectancy value               | .203 |          |
| Rinehart total expectancy value              | .288 |          |
| Party Beliefs Difference Score               | .426 | .426 n=162|

| Dorrian needs expectancy value               | .274 |          |
| Rinehart needs expectancy value              | .288 |          |
| Party Beliefs Difference Score               | .431 | .440 n=159|

| Dorrian total expectancy value               | .155 |          |
| Rinehart total expectancy value              | .246 |          |
| Party Identification                        | .585 | .561 n=159|

| Dorrian needs expectancy value               | .217 |          |
| Rinehart needs expectancy value              | .267 |          |
| Party Identification                        | .577 | .575 n=159|

| Rinehart needs expectancy value*             | .157 |          |
| Dorrian need expectancy value                | .160 |          |
| Candidate thermometer difference             | .545 | .471 n=162|

All coefficients are statistically significant (p = .001)  

*Results are not significant for total expectancy value with candidate thermometer difference.
The regression results in Table 18 show that the regression equation which includes party identification and the needs expectancy values for each candidate explains the highest proportion of variance (57.5%) compared to the other alternative measures of partisanship (i.e., the support scale, and the party beliefs difference score). However, note that vote regressed with the candidates total expectancy values and party identification decreases the proportion of variance explained (to 56.1%) in the vote. Thus, ideology (which is included in the candidate total expectancy value) decreases the proportion of variance explained in the vote. This however is not a peculiar finding given the nature of the Dorrian ideology expectancy value which most likely helps to decrease the proportion of variance explained in the vote. Moreover, among all alternative measures of partisanship, the regression equations which include party identification as a predictor variable explain the highest proportion of variance in the dependent variable. Also note the simple r for party identification is .705 which means that party identification alone explains 49.7% of the variance in the vote. With the addition of the needs expectancy values for the candidates the proportion of explained variance increases 7.8%. Thus, it seems the needs expectancy values for the candidates are valuable additions to the regression equation.
The regression equation which includes the party support scale explains the second highest proportion of variance in the vote. The party support scale alone explains 43.2% of the variance in the vote (simple r=.658). With the addition of the needs expectancy values for the candidates the proportion of explained variance increases 8.7%. When ideology is added (in each candidate's total expectancy value) the proportion of explained variance (50.9%) is less than the proportion of variance explained by the needs expectancy values for the candidates and the party support scale (51.9%).

The regression equation using the party beliefs difference score and the needs expectancy values for the candidates as predictors also explains more variance in the dependent variable than the regression equation which includes the party beliefs difference score and the candidates total expectancy value. The party beliefs difference score alone explains 33.5% of the variance in the vote. With the addition of the needs expectancy values for the candidates the proportion of explained variance increases 10.5%. However, the inclusion of ideology in the candidates total expectancy value decreases the proportion of variance explained in the dependent variable 1.4% when compared to the proportion of variance explained by the party beliefs difference score and the needs expectancy values.
for the candidates. Given the party beliefs difference score is the weakest of these three independent predictors of the vote, it seems to explain an adequate proportion of the variance in the dependent variable.

For all three alternative measures of partisanship (i.e., party identification, party support scale, and the party beliefs difference score) note the beta weights in Table 18. Beta weights are standardized regression coefficients which provide a way to compare the relative effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. In each of the first six regression equations in Table 18, the partisanship measure has a stronger effect on the vote than the candidacy measures. And in each of these equations, the term for the winning candidate (Rinehart) is somewhat higher than that for the losing candidate (Dorrian).

A final significant finding is for the candidate thermometer difference score. The thermometer difference for the candidates (simple r=.668) explains 44.7% of the variance in the vote. With the addition of the candidates needs expectancy values, the proportion of explained variance increases 2.4%. While it is significant, this increase in the proportion of explained variance seems slight when compared to the increases in the proportion of explained variance for the regressions of party identification, the party support scale, and the party beliefs dif-
ference score with the needs expectancy values for the candidates. The regression results for the candidate thermometer difference and the candidate total expectancy value are not reported because the candidate total expectancy coefficients are not statistically significant.

Another interesting finding is from a regression equation which included the traditional party identification index and the candidate thermometer difference score with the mayoral vote decision as a dependent variable. This equation is not reported in Table 18. In this particular equation the two predictors have a correlation of .635 which shows that there is a possibility of a multicollinearity problem. Beyond this problem the two predictors together explain 60.5% of the variance in the vote decision, and this finding is statistically significant. In this equation party identification has a simple $r$ of .720 which indicates that this predictor alone explains 51.8% of the variance in the dependent variable. Furthermore, the candidate thermometer difference score has a simple $r$ of .684 which indicates that this predictor alone can account for 46.8% of the variance in the vote decision. Moreover, the beta weights for each respective predictor (.478 for party identification and .380 for the candidate thermometer difference score), show that the party identification index has relatively more influence on the dependent variable.
than the candidate thermometer difference score. This is expected given the findings in Table 18 where in each of the first six regression equations, the partisanship measure has a stronger effect on the vote than the candidacy measures. However, the candidate thermometer difference score does make a significant contribution in explaining a high proportion of the variance in the dependent variable.

THE PARTY BELIEFS DIFFERENCE SCORE

Since the focus of this research project is on the examination of the performance of several partisan predictors of the vote decision, this discussion will now turn to an analysis of the expectancy value measures and the mayoral vote. Fishbein and Coombs' (1974) model views the attitude concept as a function of the person's favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an object (or affect component) and the person's beliefs which represent the information an individual has about the object (or the cognition component). Essentially the crux of Fishbein's expectancy value model lies in a multiplicative relationship between the affect and cognition components of the overall attitude. However, in the preceding discussion it was found that among all the
different expectancy value measures computed from the available data that the party beliefs score obtains the highest correlation (.604) with the mayoral vote decision. This measure though is not based on the $a \times b$ equation outlined within Fishbein's theory. Moreover, when evaluations of the political parties as being good/bad are multiplied by the beliefs the respondent has about supporting either of the two political parties, the results are not statistically significant. The support difference score does perform quite adequately in relation to the traditional party identification index and the party support scale. The correlation coefficients between the vote and the two belief statements which are included in the computation of the party beliefs score are shown in Table 19.

For comparison, Table 19 also gives the correlation coefficients for the party identification index with the mayoral and the presidential vote. From the 1983 mayoral study, a 1984 presidential vote intention was measured. All respondents were asked the following question: "Now I'd like to ask you about the Presidential election next year. Do you plan to vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate?" Table 19 shows the correlation between this measure and the partisan predictors. Additionally, Table 19 includes data from an Ohio statewide post election telephone survey which was collected immedi-
ately following the 1984 U.S. Presidential election. From these data collected by the Ohio State University Polymetrics Laboratory, it was possible to correlate the respondent's actual vote in 1984 with the partisan predictors. These correlations are shown in Table 19.
### Table 19

**CORRELATIONS WITH THE VOTE FOR BELIEF STATEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Id.</th>
<th>Support DP</th>
<th>Support RP</th>
<th>Party Beliefs</th>
<th>Diff. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Mayoral Vote, 1983</td>
<td>.70 n=112</td>
<td>.586 n=180</td>
<td>.604 n=177</td>
<td>.604 n=177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Vote Intention, 1983</td>
<td>.821 n=114</td>
<td>.697 n=173</td>
<td>.706 n=174</td>
<td>.783 n=174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Presidential Vote, 1984*</td>
<td>.672 n=365</td>
<td>.616 n=363</td>
<td>.564 n=359</td>
<td>.623 n=359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations coefficients are statistically significant \( p = .0001 \).

DP = Democratic Party
RP = Republican Party

*The correlation coefficients in this column are taken from an Ohio post election study dataset conducted and made available by the Ohio State University Polimetrics Laboratory.

In Table 19 note that the correlations for the beliefs that the respondent has about supporting either political party are lower than the correlation for the party beliefs score across all three dependent variables. Also in Table 19 the correlations between the partisan measures and the presidential vote intention are higher than the correlations for actual mayoral and presidential vote. This is expected given the wording of the presidential vote intention question. The correlations between mayoral and actual presidential vote are comparable and are moderately high.
correlations. This indicates that the Columbus voters clearly recognize the Republican and Democratic candidates in the mayoral election. Therefore, in spite of the non-partisan character of the mayoral election the Columbus voters are able to discern the party affiliation of each of the candidates.

The party beliefs score is a good predictor of the vote though it is not firmly based within Fishbein's expectancy value model. Since the two probabilistic belief statements do well in predicting the mayoral and presidential vote decisions, the next part of this analysis will look specifically at the correlations between belief statements, evaluative statements and the multiplicative relationship between beliefs and evaluations, using the mayoral vote as the dependent variable in order to examine the expectancy value model in more detail.

THE EXPECTANCY VALUE MODEL

Fishbein's expectancy value model takes into account both the beliefs an individual has about an object or behavior and the affect the individual has about the object or behavior. These two components together comprise the overall attitude the individual has about an object or
behavior. If each of the components (affect and belief) is correlated with the vote, the expectation is that each of these components would have a lower correlation with the dependent variable than the multiplicative model (affect x belief). Table 20 shows correlations with the vote for evaluations (i.e., affect), beliefs and the multiplicative relationship between the belief and the evaluation for the group constituency favoritism items included in the Columbus survey.
Table 20

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MAYORAL VOTE WITH BELIEFS AND EVALUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>evaluation</th>
<th>belief</th>
<th>evaluation x belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Blacks</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = Democratic party  
R = Republican party

N = 188 cases

All correlation coefficients without asterisks:  p<.0001

* All correlation coefficients with this sign:  .05<p<.08

** Indicates that the correlation is not statistically significant and is not reported here.
It was hypothesized that the belief correlations and the evaluation correlations would be lower than the correlations for the beliefs multiplied by the evaluations. However, this is not consistently the case. The correlation coefficient for the Democratic party actually decreases for two variables—business and workers. (51) Also for the Republican party the correlation coefficient for the evaluation x belief decreases for the neighborhoods, blacks and workers variables.

Table 20 shows that the evaluations for each needs variable (i.e., group constituency favoritism items) have lower correlations with the mayoral vote when compared to the belief statements for each political party. (52) For exam-

(51) For further clarification respondents are asked to evaluate good/bad on a seven point scale the following statements:
How do you feel about looking out for the needs of Columbus neighborhoods?
How about looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks?
How about looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community?
How about looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus?
How do you feel about attracting industry to Columbus?
For the seven point probabilistic statements the subject of the statements are: Democrats in Columbus and Republicans in Columbus. See the interview schedule in Appendix A for further clarification.

(52) It should also be noted that when the respondent is asked the probabilistic statements about the needs items, the subject in each statement is the political party. For example, the respondent is asked to give a numeric response to the following statement: Democrats in Columbus look out the needs neighborhoods. The respondent is asked the same about Republicans in Columbus.
ple, the correlation between the evaluation of looking out for the needs of neighborhoods and the vote is .231, while the correlation between the belief that each party looks out for the needs of neighborhoods and the vote is higher in value (i.e., .343 for the Democrats in Columbus, and .316 for the Republicans in Columbus). The evaluations of looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks, the Columbus business community, and Columbus working people all have lower correlations with the vote when compared with the correlations found between the beliefs for each political party and the vote. The correlation between the evaluation of attracting industry to Columbus and the vote is not statistically significant and is therefore not reported here.

The fact that the evaluative components all have lower correlations with the vote when compared to the correlations between belief statements and the vote is not expected. What is expected is that the evaluative component would contribute more as an independent variable. The expectancy value model takes into account both the evaluative aspect (or affect) toward an object or behavior, and the cognitive element (or beliefs) about the object or behavior. In the attitude theory literature, affect is seen as the most essential part of the overall attitude concept. In addition, the fact that the correlations actually reduce on various needs items for each political party
when the multiplicative relationship (i.e., evaluation x belief) is correlated with the vote cannot be wholly explained.

Table 21

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Changes In The Correlation For Evaluations x Beliefs For Each Political Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Blacks</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Increase in evaluation x belief correlation compared to correlation between beliefs and evaluations.

D = Decrease in evaluation x belief correlation compared to correlation between beliefs and evaluations.

It should be noted though that the correlation between the multiplicative model and the vote does increase on some of the needs statements for both political parties. Table 21 shows on which needs items the correlation with the vote increases or decreases for each political party. These results are interesting. Though the affect component correlates lower with the vote when compared to the correlation between the beliefs about the parties and the vote, the findings in Table 21 are expected. Given the nature of
the demographic composition of each political party organization the findings fit with theory. For example, the Democratic party is a heterogeneous party which traditionally has been conceptualized as an organization which looks out for the "common man," and minorities. Note in table 21 that the correlation with the vote for the Democratic party increases for neighborhoods, and Columbus blacks (evaluations x beliefs), while these correlations decrease for the Republican party. Also for the Democratic party the correlation between industry (evaluation x belief) and the vote increases.

The Republican party has been known to be a homogeneous party in terms of the demographic composition of its membership. The Republican party has been associated with catering to the needs of the higher income, the higher educated, and the business interests in American society. Note in Table 21 that the correlation of the vote with business (evaluation x belief) increases for the Republican party, while this correlation decreases for the Democratic party. In addition, the correlation between industry and the vote increases for the Republican party also.

From this analysis it seems that the relationship between the affect component and the vote is weaker, than the relationship between the belief or cognition component and the vote. However, when the multiplicative relation-
ship between the cognition and the affect are taken into account for each political party, for some needs items the correlation between the vote and the expectancy value model increases, while for other items the correlation decreases. The actual increases and decreases which do occur are expected given our theoretical understanding of the political parties. In these cases, therefore, the multiplicative model (i.e., evaluation x belief) makes a larger contribution to our understanding of the dimensionality of partisanship than the affect or the cognition component alone.

The next part of this analysis will examine correlations with the vote. Table 22 depicts the correlations between the affect component, the cognition (or belief) component, the multiplicative model (i.e., evaluation x belief) and the mayoral vote for the candidates.

Table 22 presents findings similar to the data for the political parties. Once again the evaluations or affect component correlations are lower than the cognitive or belief component correlations. Also the correlations increase on some of the needs items for the Democratic candidate, while decreasing on other needs items when comparing the separate belief or affect correlations with the multiplicative model correlations. The same is also true for the Republican candidate. Table 23 summarizes on which
Table 22

PEARSON R CORRELATIONS

Correlations between the vote and the Expectancy value components for the Mayoral candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evaluation</th>
<th>belief</th>
<th>evaluation x belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DN*</td>
<td>RT*</td>
<td>DN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.157*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Blacks</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.170*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DN = The Democratic Candidate, Michael Dorrian
RT = The Republican Candidate, Dana Rinehart

N = 188 cases
All correlation coefficients without an asterisk: p<.001
* All correlation coefficients with an asterisk: .05<p<.09
** indicates that the correlation is not statistically significant and is not reported here.

items the multiplicative model correlations increase for each candidate.

In Table 23 note the pattern is very similar to the pattern in Table 21 for the political parties. Though for the Democratic party candidate the correlation between the workers variable and the vote now increases, while the correlation between the industry variable and the vote decreases. The pattern for the Republican candidate is the
Table 23

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Summary of correlation changes between the components and the multiplicative model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Dorrian</th>
<th>Rinehart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Blacks</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Increase in evaluation x belief correlation compared to correlation between beliefs, evaluations and the vote.

D = Decrease in evaluation x belief correlation compared to correlation between beliefs, evaluations and the vote.

same pattern found in Table 21 for the Republican party for the multiplicative model. Thus, it appears that the Democratic candidate is associated with groups, such as neighborhoods, blacks and workers; while the Republican candidate is more strongly associated with private interests, such as the business community and industry.

From this analysis of the component parts of the expectancy value model and the multiplicative relationship between the component parts (i.e., evaluation x belief), once again the multiplicative model makes a stronger contribution to our overall understanding of political party and candidate attitudes of the voter than the component parts of the model (i.e., evaluations or beliefs).
The expectancy value measures do contribute to our understanding of political behavior generally, but make a limited contribution to our understanding of partisanship.

**VOTER TURNOUT**

This research project has focused on the consistency, adequacy, and relationship of several partisan predictors. In this chapter the relationship with the vote was examined. However, there has been no discussion of nonvoting. Flanigan and Zingale (1975) write: "we have implied the need for an explanation of nonvoting; we have assumed voting is 'normal' or to be expected. However, this topic could be approached quite differently. The question could be asked, 'Why do people bother to vote?' as if nonvoting were the natural pattern or expected behavior and voting required explanation."(53)

From the data collected for this research project it was possible to examine a possible explanation for voter turnout. Turnout is whether or not an individual chooses to go to the polls, perform his civic duty and cast a ballot in an election. Each of the five partisanship variables included in this study were dichotomized. Party identifi-

cation, the party support scale, the party beliefs score, the thermometer party difference score, and the party total expectancy value difference score were coded into two categories—partisan and nonpartisan. For the party identification scale pure independents were categorized as nonpartisan while the remaining categories of this measure were coded as partisan. For the party support scale only those individuals who responded that they were not close to either party were coded as nonpartisan, while the other categories were coded as partisan. For the party beliefs score, the thermometer party difference score, and the party total expectancy value difference score were all coded similarly. Those individuals who gave the same score for both parties were treated as nonpartisans, and all other individuals were coded as partisans.

In order to answer the question of 'why do people bother to vote?' the data from the 1983 mayoral election show that partisans are more likely to vote than nonpartisans. The Pearson $r$ correlations for each partisan predictor with turnout as a dependent variable, are relatively weak. Table 24 shows these correlations.

These correlations are relatively low which indicates that it is most difficult to answer why people bother to
Table 24
PEARSON R CORRELATIONS WITH TURNOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Support Scale</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Total Expectancy Value</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermometer Party Difference</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Beliefs Difference Score</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coefficients: .05<p<.09

vote. Partisan affiliation though does exert some relative influence on the individual to go to the polls. The only conclusion which can be drawn from the available data is that partisans are more likely to turnout than nonpartisans.

CONCLUSION

In a correlational analysis between the various partisan predictors and the mayoral vote it was found (as expected) that party identification is the best predictor of the vote decision. The party support scale is the second best single predictor, while a new measure, the party beliefs score, is the third best single predictor of the vote. The thermometer party difference scores and the expectancy value model measures have moderate correlations with the vote. For the expectancy value measures it was found the the
needs expectancy value performed almost as well as the total expectancy value (which includes both needs and ideology in its computation) as a predictor of the vote.

The utility of the needs variables for both the political parties and candidates was assessed in multiple regression analyses. In the multiple regression analyses it was found that the partisanship measures which achieved statistical significance were: the traditional party identification index, the party support scale, and the party beliefs score. The regression equations which included party identification as the partisan predictor with the candidate expectancy values explained more variance in the vote than any other regression equation included in the regression analyses. The party support scale with the candidate expectancy values explained the second highest proportion of the variance in the vote; and the party beliefs score explained the third highest proportion of variance in the vote when regressed with the candidate expectancy values. Moreover, in these analyses it was found that each of the partisanship variables—party identification, party support scale, and the party beliefs measure—had more relative impact on the dependent variable when compared to the expectancy value predictors for the candidates included in each of the regression equations.
The expectancy value model measures make a contribution to the analysis of partisanship. However, the party beliefs difference score, which is not wholly based on the theoretical model, makes a stronger contribution as a predictor of the vote. Interestingly enough, this measure takes into account two belief or cognition statements without affect and correlates quite highly with the mayoral vote. When affect is added into its computation the results are statistically insignificant. In addition, it was also found that the belief statements about the group constituency favoritism items (needs) correlated more highly with the vote than the evaluative or affect measures. Moreover, it was also found that when the multiplicative model is taken into account, varying results are found for each political party and candidate though the findings are theoretically substantiated.

In conclusion, it appears that party identification wins an award once again for being the best single predictor of the vote, but is it the best measure of partisanship? The concluding chapter will address this question in detail.
Chapter VI

CONCLUSION: PARTISANSHIP AND ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR

Many studies of electoral behavior have emphasized the importance of partisanship in explaining the vote decision. A majority of Americans have an attachment to one of the two major political parties. Moreover, these Americans use their partisan psychological identification as a basis on which to make their vote decisions.

One approach to the study of voting behavior stresses the importance of partisanship and partisan attitudes. This "social-psychological" approach takes into account both long term influences (i.e., partisanship) and short term influences (i.e., candidates and issues) upon the voting decision.

An alternative approach to the study of voting behavior stresses rationality. Some who use this approach define rational behavior as directed toward the maximization of utilities. (54) This view of rationality assumes that man is a purposive being, seeking to maximize his own goals.
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There are others who conceptualize rationality in a much narrower sense. Rather than being concerned with the maximization of utilities, they are more specific in their definition of rationality. Essentially they argue that a rational voting decision is a decision determined by the voter's preferences on public policy. (55)

The social psychological approach and an approach which stresses rationality are not complementary. In this concluding chapter I will attempt to show that these two approaches are complementary in furthering our understanding of partisanship. In addition, I will summarize the research objective for the 1983 Columbus, Ohio Mayoral election and the major findings from this study.

TWO APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF VOTING BEHAVIOR

If one peruses the literature in voting behavior in order to learn about the nature of the American electorate, one finds competing arguments. One argument is that many voters are politically unsophisticated in terms of ideological awareness, slightly interested in politics, uninformed about issues or public affairs and vote out of habit

in accordance with their partisanship. The voter is seen as attached to one of the two major political parties, making his voting decision based on this affiliation or attachment.

A second view or argument about the American electorate is that the voter is capable of viewing politics ideologically and is politically sophisticated. The voter is aware of issues and is able to make electoral choices based on his knowledge of these issues. Since the voter is aware of issues, he makes a decision based not only on his partisanship, but also based on his position on the issues, as well as his perceptions of the candidates' positions on these issues.

The key difference between these two views is whether or not issues enter the voter's decisionmaking calculus. Some scholars of political behavior have argued that issues are important. Issues may influence not only the vote decision, but also the individual's partisanship.

(56) Campbell, et al., 1960, p. 541, and P. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in D. Apter, Ideology and Discontent. (New York: Free Press) 1964, pp. 202-261. Of course, some voters are more politically sophisticated. The authors of The American Voter found that 30% of the respondents were "very much interested" in the campaign, and a third of the respondents could express "attitudes" on fourteen of sixteen issues. (Campbell, et al., 1960, p. 103).

scholars have argued that the methods employed to investigate issue voting have served to overestimate the extent of issue voting in the American public. (58)

Whether or not issues are important explanatory variables will not be resolved here. It is argued though that issues do play a role in voter decisionmaking. However, it may be the case that voters are not able to correctly identify the issue positions of a candidate or party. Additionally, the individual may perceive that the party and candidate's position on a particular issue is in agreement with his own position. It is likely that the voter uses his party identification to sort information he receives about a party or candidate.

The extent to which the voter's perceptions of party and candidate issue positions are filtered by his self identification with a party is difficult to determine. It is also difficult to accurately measure an individual's position on an issue without taking into consideration the influence of partisanship. Therefore, both partisanship

---


(58) There are other scholars who argue that the revisionists have not taken methodological considerations into account when arriving at their conclusions about the rationality of the voter.
and issues may influence the vote decision, though partisanship is the most influential.

Partisanship has been a very important explanatory variable, although there are scholars who have argued that the overall importance of partisanship is declining. Trends in the national electorate indicate that partisanship for the American voter is waning. Over the years the number of strong partisan identifiers has decreased, while the number of independent identifiers has increased. The amount of split ticket voting has increased. (59) This trend supports an argument for partisan dealignment. (60) However, it is argued here that though there is some decline of partisanship at the aggregate level, the relevance of partisanship as a critical variable cannot be denied.

The social-psychological approach to the study of voting behavior has found that partisanship and partisan attitudes are the most important determinants of the vote. In con-

------------------


trast, an approach which stresses rationality reduces the importance of partisanship as a key variable. A rational view of voting behavior emphasizes that behavior is either directed toward the maximization of utilities, or a rational voter is one who takes into consideration his preferences on public policy. (61) Though these two approaches are contradictory they are also complementary. However, before we can discuss how these approaches are complementary we must define irrational behavior.

Fishbein (1974) has argued that it is irrational for a voter to rely on one variable (e.g., partisanship) without consciously taking into consideration other variables (e.g., candidates and issues), in making his vote decision. It is difficult to define rationality. What is rational for one individual, may be irrational for another individual. In other words, what is rational within the psychic economy of one individual may be irrational within the psychic economy or another individual. Anthony Downs writes that "if a man exhibits political behavior which does not help him attain his political goals efficiently, we feel justified in labeling him politically irrational, no matter how necessary to his psychic adjustments this behavior may be." (62) However, can we determine what political behavior


(62) Anthony Downs, An Economic Theory of Democracy, New
is efficient for an individual while seeking his political goals? Can we make another assumption defining what the political goal(s) are for an individual? I am arguing that it is difficult to answer these two questions. It is a hard task to define irrationality, so I have made an assumption that voters make rational decisions when casting their ballots. These rational vote decisions are based on the goal(s) of maximizing their utility or voting their policy preferences.

Voters may maximize their utilities by having preferences on policies or by voting in accordance with his/her partisanship. Downs (1957) defines utility "as a measure of benefits in a citizen's mind which he uses to decide among alternative courses of action. Given several mutually exclusive alternatives, a rational man takes the one which yields him the highest utility, ceteris paribus; i.e., he acts to his own greatest benefit."(63) Thus, a voter may perceive that he/she is acting to his/her own greatest benefit by voting in accordance with his/her partisanship or by voting his/her policy preferences.

Therefore, though the social-psychological and rationality approaches are contradictory, they are also complementary. If the major difference between these two approaches


is related to the extent to which issues are important to
the voter, then it is argued here that it is rational for
some voters not to be informed about the issues. Thus, a
voter may vote out of habit in accordance with his/her self
identification with a party and this behavior is at least
rational to the individual though this behavior may be
defined by some investigators as irrational.

The initial primary focus of this research project was
to develop a partisanship measure which was based in atti­
tude theory and also incorporated an operational definition
of rationality. However, the broader research objective of
this dissertation was to investigate five measures of par­
tisanship in the Columbus, Ohio 1983 mayoral election. The
five measures are: the traditional measure of party iden­
tification, the party support scale, the thermometer party
difference score, the party total expectancy value differ­
ence score, and the party beliefs difference score.

The traditional measure of party identification has
played an important role in our analyses of electoral
behavior. This measure allows us to examine an individu­
al's self identification with a party, as well as his per­
ceptions of a party. The traditional seven point scale of
party identification comes from the following questions:
"Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a
Republican, Democrat and Independent or what?" If the
respondent answers he is partisan then the follow up is: "Would you call yourself a strong (Republican or Democrat) or a not very strong (Republican or Democrat)?" If the respondent answers Independent, the follow up question is: "Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or the Democratic party?" The seven point scale which comes from these questions is: Strong Republican, Weak Republican, Independent Republican, Pure Independent, Independent Democrat, Weak Democrat, and Strong Democrat.

The party support scale is a relatively new scale of partisanship which was included in the 1980 National Election Study interview schedule. Weisberg (1983) developed a five point scale from a series of questions asked of respondents in the questionnaire. The questions asked of respondents are: "In your own mind, do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative he is then further asked: "Which political party do you support?" If the respondent answers he is not a supporter of a political party he is then asked: "Do you ever think of yourself as closer to one of the two major political parties, or not?" If the respondent answers in the affirmative to this question, he is then asked: "Which party do you feel closer to?" The five point scale which comes from these questions is: Republican supporter, closer to Repub-
licans, not closer to either party, closer to Democrats, and Democratic supporter.

Another measure of partisanship used in this study is the thermometer party difference score. This measure comes from the feeling thermometer measure. The instructions given to the respondent for the feeling thermometer are to use any number from 0 to 100 for rating a political leader or a political object (i.e., Republican or Democratic party). Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that the respondent feels favorable and warm toward the attitude object, while ratings between 0 and 50 degrees indicate that the respondent does not feel too favorable toward that particular attitude object. In addition, the respondent is told that if he does not feel particularly warm or cold toward an attitude object, he should rate that object at the 50 degree mark. The thermometer party difference score is the arithmetical difference between the ratings the respondent gave for each of the two major political parties.

A new measure of partisanship based on a social psychological attitude theory proposed by Fishbein was also used in the study as a measure of partisanship. The Fishbein model makes the assumption that an individual's beliefs and evaluations imply his attitude. Fishbein's model is a summative model where a number of beliefs about each party
along with a number of evaluations are taken into account in order to measure an individual's attitude. Additionally, this attitude may be related to a behavior. The Fishbein theory states that individuals will vote rationally, or in congruence with, the beliefs and evaluations they have of the relevant political issues and objects. This leads to an expectancy value measure of partisanship whose contribution will be discussed later in the chapter. (64)

This attitudinal model helps to bridge the gap between a social-psychological approach and an approach which stresses the rationality of the voter. This model has the advantage of examining rationality from the respondent's point of view, rather than the investigator's point of view. As Reynolds (1974) notes this model also "ties in nicely with the definition of rationality as the maximization of utilities." (65)

The fifth measure of partisanship included in this study is the party beliefs difference score. This is also a new measure of partisanship. Respondents are asked to give a numeric response where one means that the statement is extremely likely to be true, and seven means that the statement is extremely unlikely to be true. The belief

(64) For further clarification on the operationalization of this model in the study see chapter three (i.e., pp. 17-23).

statements are: I support the Republican party; and, I support the Democratic party. The party beliefs difference score takes the arithmetical difference between the ratings the respondent gave to the statements.

Again the focus of this research project was to investigate these five measures of partisanship. The following discussion will summarize the contributions of each of the measures to our understanding of voting behavior.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PARTISANSHIP MEASURES

Party Identification

Party identification has been a central concept in the study of voting behavior. Asher (1983) writes, our "standard measure has the advantages of familiarity, availability, and comparability over time and to give it up would impose hardships in many analyses."(66) Party identification is a psychological identification with a partisan group. This measure is also a reference group identification. As Kessel (1984) writes: "It is important to note that the party identification question invokes two types of

attitude objects. The first is the self in the part of the question that asks 'Do you think of yourself...?' The second set of attitude objects is comprised of Republicans, Democrats, and independents in the subsequent phrases of the questions. What this implies is that the respondent is in fact being asked: What is your self-perception? What are your perceptions of Republicans, Democrats, and independents? And given your self-perception and your perception of each of these political groups, how do you relate to them?"(67) Thus, the richness of our traditional psychological measure of partisanship should not be understated because of the inadequacies of our traditional operationalization of the concept.

The traditional measurement of party identification has two components—strength and direction. The strength component allows us to categorize respondents as strong, weak, or independent partisans. The direction component lets us place the respondent into one of the two partisan categories (i.e., Republican or Democrat). In this study it was found that the party identification measure found more partisans and fewer independents than the other partisanship measures (except for the party total expectancy value difference measure). However, 11% of the respondents who identified themselves as strong, weak, or leaning partisans

also replied that they were not closer to either of the two political parties on the party support scale.\(^{(68)}\) This finding illustrates some of the inadequacy in our traditional measurement of party identification.

This study also found "intransitivities" in the traditional measurement of party identification. Petrocik (1974) has shown that the behavior of leaning partisans is more similar to the behavior of strong partisans than weak partisans.\(^{(69)}\) In this study it was found that independent Republicans were more likely to turnout to vote than weak Republicans.\(^{(70)}\) This finding also highlights some of the inadequacy in our traditional measurement of party identification.

Though there are inadequacies in our traditional measurement of party identification, there are also strengths. This study found that party identification was highly correlated with three of the other four measures of partisanship: the party support scale, the party beliefs measure, and the thermometer party difference score. Party identification also had a high factor loading on the partisanship component. As a predictor variable, party identification

(68) These data are not reported in the text of the dissertation.


(70) These data are not shown in the text of the dissertation.
has the highest correlation with the vote, compared to the correlations found for the other partisanship measures. Additionally, in the regression analyses this measure explains the highest proportion of variance in the vote, and also has the strongest affect upon the vote (beta = .58). Thus, these findings clearly indicate that though our traditional measurement of party identification may have problems, it is an excellent predictor of the vote.

The Party Support Scale

The party support scale is a new scale of partisanship developed by Weisberg (1983). This five point scale does not have an independent category, but has a category for respondents who do not feel closer to either of the two political parties. The categories for the scale are: Republican supporter, closer to Republicans, not closer to either party, closer to Democrats, and Democratic supporter.

The party support scale makes an interesting contribution as a measure of partisanship. This measure correlates highly with party identification, the party beliefs measure, and the thermometer party difference score. The party support scale also loads highly on the partisanship component. This measure is also the most consistent with the
traditional measurement of party identification. As a predictor, the party support scale has the second highest correlation with the vote. In the regression analyses, this measure explained the second highest proportion of variance in the vote.

Weisberg (1983) found that this scale finds fewer partisans and more citizens ambivalent between the parties than the traditional party identification scale. In this study the party support scale also produces more independents or neutrals (16.6%) than the party identification measure (9.6%).

Thus, the major difference lies in the neutral or independent classification where respondents who identified themselves as a strong, weak, or leaning partisan on the party identification measure, can be categorized from the party support scale as not closer to either party. Of the respondents, 11% responded that they were a partisan on the party identification questions, while responding that they were not closer to either party to the party support questions. To clarify 11% of the respondents who responded that they were either a strong partisan, weak partisan or an independent leaning partisan also said that they were not closer to either of the two major political parties. This finding highlights the intransitivities in our traditional measurement of party identification. For example,
strong partisans were least likely to respond that they were not closer to either party. However, weak Democrats were more likely than independent Democrats to respond that they were not closer to either party. In contrast, independent Republicans were more likely than weak Republicans to respond that they were not closer to either of the two major political parties. One would expect that Independent partisans would be more likely than weak partisans to respond that they are not closer to either political party. The Republicans meet this expectation. On the other hand, the Democrats do not meet this expectation because they only weakly identify with their party. Essentially, their attachment to their party is weaker than the attachment the Republicans have to their party.

This difference found for party identification and the party support scale may be due to the question wording for each of the measures. The idea of supporting a political party is much different than a self identification with a party. It seems conceivable that an individual may psychologically identify with a party, but not perceive that he is a supporter of a party. The respondent may think that if he is a supporter of a party, then this may mean that he contributes time, money or effort to a party. Thus, an individual may reply that he identifies with a party, but may not perceive that he is a supporter of a party, and
this may explain why some partisan identifiers respond that they are not closer to either party. This may also explain why the party support scale finds fewer partisans and more "independents" (neutrals) than the party identification scale. This argument is strengthened by finding that some strong partisan identifiers were neutral (i.e., not closer to either party) on the party support scale.

The Feeling Thermometer

The feeling thermometer ratings for the two political parties were also used as a measure of partisanship. The arithmetical difference between the numeric responses given for the Republican and Democratic parties was used in this study. The thermometer party difference score takes into account an individual's warm and favorable feeling about a party, and/or his cold and unfavorable feeling about a party.

In my study, the thermometer party difference score correlates highly with the party support scale, party identification, and the party beliefs difference measure. It also had a very high factor loading on the partisanship component.

Fiorina (1981) has argued that the party thermometers do not make a substantive contribution to our explanations of
voting behavior because we do not know what the thermometer taps from the individual and it may be measuring everything at once. Thus, he argues that party thermometers may be contaminated measures. Fiorina is incorrect in his conclusion about the party thermometers. As Weisberg (1982) argues, the party identification measure also measures everything at once, therefore no one knows what it measures. He further states that the party thermometers contribution to explanations of voting behavior is no less substantive than the traditional seven point party identification scale. The data in this study indicate that Fiorina may be incorrect. The high factor loading of this measure on the partisanship component indicates that the thermometer party difference measure may be as good a measure of partisanship as any of the other measures included in this study.

Though the party thermometer difference measure performs well in the factor analyses, it has moderate correlations with the vote relative to three other partisanship measures: party identification, the party support scale, and the party beliefs difference score. This measure made no statistically significant contribution in the regression analysis. These findings were not expected.

The thermometer party difference measure also found roughly equal percentages of partisan identifiers compared
to the party identification scale, the party support scale, the party total expectancy value difference score, and the official Columbus party registration data. In addition, this measure found more individuals who were neutral toward the parties. We know that most voters do identify with one of the two parties, though a voter may identify himself/herself as an independent for instrumental reasons, and we know that more voters identify with the Democratic party. Thus, the question arises about what is it that the thermometer party difference measures.

It is argued here that the thermometer party difference may be a measure of affect/evaluation toward the two political parties, rather than a measure which has the respondent make a self-identification with a party. Since affect is only one component of an overall attitude toward an object, lower correlations would be expected between this measure and a dependent variable (i.e., the vote). Still, affect is the most central part of an attitude; therefore if the thermometer is a measure of affect, one would expect a high factor loading on the partisanship factor. Thus, this would explain both the low correlations between the thermometer party difference and the vote, and the high factor loading of this measure on the partisanship component.
The thermometer party difference may be a measure of affect because of the instructions given to the respondent. Essentially the respondent is asked to assign temperature ratings from 50 to 100 degrees if he/she feels favorable toward the attitude object (e.g., Republican party); ratings from 0 to 50 degrees if he feels unfavorable toward the attitude object; and, a 50 degree rating if he/she does not feel particularly warm/cold toward the attitude object. This measure has the respondent evaluate the two parties, but does not have the respondent select which party he/she identifies with or feels closer to. Thus, a favorable/unfavorable feeling on the thermometer scale is a measure of affect toward the attitude object (i.e., political party).

The Party Beliefs Difference Score

The party beliefs difference measure is a new measure of partisanship which is partially based on Fishbein's model. Fishbein's attitudinal model takes into account both beliefs and evaluations. The party beliefs difference measure is based only on the beliefs the respondent has about supporting either the Republican or the Democratic party. This measure does not have an evaluative component. The party beliefs difference score is the arithmetical difference between the beliefs that the respondent has about supporting the two political parties.
The party beliefs measure is correlated highly with the party identification scale, the party support scale and the thermometer difference measure. This measure also has a high factor loading on the partisanship component. Additionally, the party beliefs measure is consistent with the party identification scale.

As a predictor, this measure has the third highest correlation with the vote. The party beliefs measure also explains a high proportion of variance in the mayoral vote. This measure was also highly correlated with the Presidential vote in 1984. Thus, in two elections (i.e., mayoral and Presidential) the new party beliefs measure is a strong predictor of the vote. Though this measure is not firmly based in attitude theory, it is still a good predictor of the vote.

The Expectancy Value Measures

A new measure of partisanship based on Fishbein's expectancy value model is the party total expectancy value difference score. This measure is the arithmetical difference between the expectancy value computations for each party. The expectancy value computations include eight evaluations and eight beliefs about each party. The beliefs and evaluations are the group constituency favoritism items and ideological items.
In the Columbus study, this measure is only moderately correlated with the other partisanship measures. The party expectancy value difference also has the lowest factor loading on the partisanship component. The party expectancy value difference has moderate correlations with the vote. In the regression analysis this measure made no statistically significant contribution. Thus, this measure is a less adequate measure of partisanship compared to the party identification scale, the party support scale, the party beliefs difference score, and the thermometer party difference score.

The party total expectancy value difference score is a measure based on Fishbein's attitudinal model. It was used in this study as a measure of partisanship. Since so many variables are included in the calculation of the Fishbein model, it is difficult to sort out the contribution of the belief and evaluative components. However, when the component parts of the party total expectancy value (i.e., group constituency favoritism items and ideological items) were examined separately, it was found that the group constituency favoritism (needs) had a stronger relationship with the vote than the ideological items. This is understandable since group constituency favoritism plays a more important role in urban politics than ideology.
At the local level of government voters are more concerned about whether their needs are met. For example, neighborhoods want to be protected from crime, Blacks want development in their neighborhoods, workers want safe working conditions, etc. These groups make their demands to their local elected officials, not their nationally elected officials. As Elazar argues, government may be viewed as a marketplace and government should respond efficiently to demands in the Ohio individualistic subculture. (71) In addition, the nonpartisan characteristic of the Columbus Mayoral election also serves to minimize the role of ideology in an urban context. Candidates in nonpartisan elections can avoid issues of policy and ideology in their campaigns. Therefore, Columbus local politics may be more needs oriented than ideologically oriented, and this explains why the group constituency favoritism items (i.e., needs) have a stronger relationship with the vote than the ideological items.

In a further analysis of the evaluative and belief components of an attitude for the needs variables, (72) it was


(72) Needs is a shortened name for the group constituency favoritism variables which are: looking out for the needs of neighborhoods, looking out for the needs of Columbus blacks, looking out for the needs of workers, looking out to attract industry to Columbus, and looking out for the needs of the Columbus business commu-
found that the evaluative component had lower correlations with the vote than did the belief component. This was unexpected given that affect/evaluation is the most central part of an attitude. Additionally, when the multiplicative relationship between the two components was compared to the separate correlations for evaluation and belief with the vote, it was found that the correlation fell on some variables while increasing for others. This correlational pattern was also true for the candidates.

The contribution of Fishbein's attitude model to our understanding of partisanship is weak given that the measure has moderate correlations with the vote, does not load as highly on the partisanship component as other partisan variables included in the study, and the total party expectancy value difference measure has only moderate correlations with the other predictors.

Though the Fishbein model does not perform well as a measure of partisanship, the simple Fishbein model (evaluation x belief) does contribute to our understanding of attitudes about the two political parties. It was found that the Democratic party expectancy value (evaluation x belief) was strongly associated with groups like neighborhoods, and blacks; whereas, the Republican party was more strongly associated with private interests such as the needs of business and industry.

----------
nity.
The finding that each party is associated with specific groups shows that voters do perceive differences between the parties. Moreover, parties project images to the voters. (73) As Matthews and Prothro (1966) write:

American political parties speak with many voices. Not only are the national Democratic and Republican parties loose confederations of state and local organizations, but they are normally divided into competing wings and factions at each level of government. The understandable tendency for all these party groups to avoid clear-cut or extreme policy stands contributes to the confusion. Confronted with this ambiguity, voters can have quite different pictures of what the parties are like. Either party might be thought liberal or conservative, honest or venal, internationalist or isolationist, and so forth, depending upon which aspects of the party the voter chooses to see and evaluate. It is the voter's picture of the party which we shall call party image.

Matthews and Prothro also state that party image is not the same as party identification. Party identification is based on a relationship between one's attitude about one's self and attitudes about parties as reference groups. Party image, on the other hand, is not used to refer to partisan loyalty, but is used to refer to attitudes about the two political parties. Matthews and Prothro use open-ended questions to investigate party images. (74)

---


(74) Matthews and Prothro used the following questions to ascertain party attitudes: "I'd like to ask you what are the good and bad points about the two parties. Is there anything in particular that you like about the
The original intent for the use of the Fishbein attitude model was for the development of a measure of partisanship. But, we found another use where the simple multiplicative model lets us find the "images" the Columbus sample has of the political parties. This analysis differs in method from Matthews and Prothro, but the findings are similar. For example, in regard to voting these authors found the most productive image for the Democratic party was related to group-related issues, while for the Republican party the image was related to private interests. This study found that the Democratic party and the Democratic candidate were more strongly associated with group-related issues, while the Republican party and the Republican candidate were more strongly associated with private interests. Thus, the Fishbein simple multiplicative model does contribute to our understanding of party images.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research project was to investigate various measures of partisanship. It was found that the traditional measure of party identification remains the Democratic party? What is that? Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that?" The same question format is repeated for the Republican party.
best single predictor of the vote. The party support scale and the party beliefs measure are also strong predictors of the vote. The thermometer party difference score though not a strong predictor of the vote, had the highest loading on the partisanship factor, and may therefore be a measure of affect toward the political parties. The Fishbein attitude theory based measures of partisanship did not perform as well as the other measures of partisanship. However, the components of the Fishbein model do contribute to our understanding of voter attitudes or "images" about the two political parties.

The complexities of partisanship have been shown through the different analyses incorporated in this study. Partisanship is a social group phenomenon and a psychological identification. The findings in this study indicate that our traditional conceptualization of party identification seems adequate, but our measurement may be in need of some modification. The findings from this study indicate that our traditional measurement wins awards as a predictor variable. No other partisanship measure tied with party identification for first place.
Appendix A

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ID #__________________________

Date________________________

Time Interview begins____________________

Hello my name is ____________________. I am calling to interview you as part of a research project at the Ohio State University. Your phone number was randomly selected from the Columbus Telephone Directory. I would appreciate your answering some questions relating to political groups and practices. Also anything you say will be held in strict confidence. Would you answer some questions?

1. yes (PROCEED TO QUESTION 2)
2. no (TERMINATE INTERVIEW AND THANK RESPONDENT)

1. First, are you a resident of Columbus and 18 years old or older?

1. yes (GO TO NEXT QUESTION)
2. no (TERMINATE INTERVIEW - THE INTERVIEWER SHOULD SAY THE FOLLOWING TO THE RESPONDENT: THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION HOWEVER, THIS IS A STUDY ABOUT THE COLUMBUS MAYOR'S RACE SO OUR INTERVIEWS ARE LIMITED TO COLUMBUS VOTERS).
In this interview I will be talking to you about the general election held on Tuesday, November 8, 1983 as well as a number of other things. First I would like to ask you some questions about the political campaign for Mayor.

2. Some people don't pay much attention to campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?

1. very much interested
2. somewhat interested
3. not much interested
8. dk
9. na

(INTEVIEWERS SHOULD WRITE DOWN ANY COMMENTS THE RESPONDENT MAY MAKE TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS TO THE RIGHT OF THE CODED RESPONSES).

3. Have you seen anything on any television programs about the Mayoral candidates or their campaigns?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

4. Have you read anything in the newspapers about either candidate or their campaigns?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

5. Have you heard anything on the radio about either candidate or their campaigns?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na
6. Have you had any conversations about either candidate or their campaigns?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

7. Have you been contacted by anyone working for one of the candidates or a political party?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

7a. Did you happen to see any of the debates between the candidates for mayor?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

(INTROVERTORS SHOULD READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS TO THE RESPONDENT SLOWLY AND SHOULD USE THE PROBE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES IF NECESSARY).

8. Now I'd like to ask about your attitudes about some political groups and practices. First, elections in general. Some people feel that elections in general are good. Suppose these people are at one end of the scale at point number 1. Other people feel that elections in general are bad. Suppose these other people are at the other end of the scale at point number 7. And of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Where would you place yourself on the scale, or haven't you thought much about it?

(INTROVERTORS IF NECESSARY USE THE FOLLOWING PROBE: IF 1 IS GOOD AND 7 IS BAD, AND 2, 3, 4, 5, AND 6 ARE IN BETWEEN, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT ELECTIONS IN GENERAL?).

(INTROVERTER SHOULD RECORD EXACT NUMBER THE RESPONDENT USES
8. dk
9. na
9. How about politicians in general? (PROBE IF NECESSARY: IF 1 IS GOOD AND 7 IS BAD, AND 2, 3, 4, 5, AND 6 ARE IN BETWEEN, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT POLITICIANS IN GENERAL?)

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

10. How about the Republican party? (USE PROBE IF NECESSARY: IF 1 IS GOOD AND 7 IS BAD, AND 2, 3, 4, 5, AND 6 ARE IN BETWEEN, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT POLITICIANS IN GENERAL?)

_______ (record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

11. How about the Democratic party? (USE PROBE IF NECESSARY)

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

12. How about political independents?

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

13. How about liberals?

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

14. How about conservatives?

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

15. How about political moderates?

_______ (Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na
16. How about voting a straight Republican ticket?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

17. How about voting a straight Democratic ticket?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

18. How about voting a split ticket?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

19. How about deciding on the person, not the party?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

20. How about deciding on the issues, not the party label?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

21. How do you feel about attracting industry to Columbus?  
________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na

22. How about looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community?  

INTERVIEWERS, IF NECESSARY USE THE FOLLOWING PROBE: \_HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT LOOKING OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF THE COLUMBUS BUSINESS COMMUNITY?  

________(Record exact number)  
8. dk  
9. na
23. How about looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus? (INTERVIEWERS: IF NECESSARY ASK THE RESPONDENT "HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT LOOKING OUT FOR THE NEEDS OF WORKING PEOPLE IN COLUMBUS?)

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

24. How about looking out for the needs of neighborhoods in Columbus?

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

25. How about looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks?

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

26. How about the job that President Ronald Reagan has done in office?

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

27. How about the job that Governor Dick Celeste has done in office?

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

28. How about the job that Mayor Tom Moody has done in office?

__________(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na
29. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or what?

1. Republican
2. Independent
3. Democrat
8. dk
9. na

30. (IF PARTISAN) Would you call yourself a strong (Republican, Democrat) or a not very strong (Republican, Democrat)?

(IF INDEPENDENT) Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

1. strong partisan
2. not strong partisan
3. leans toward Republican party
4. leans toward Democratic party
5. not close to party
8. dk
9. na

(INTERVIEWERS SHOULD LOOK AT THE PRECEDING TWO QUESTIONS AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY BELOW)

1. Strong Republican
2. Weak Republican
3. Independent Republican
4. Independent
5. Independent Democrat
6. Weak Democrat
7. Strong Democrat

Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news today. I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using a feeling thermometer. You may use any number from 0 to 100 for rating. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. If you do recognize the name, but don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rating</th>
<th>dk</th>
<th>doesn't recognize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ronald Reagan</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Dick Celeste

c. Tom Moody

d. Howard Metzenbaum

e. John Glenn

f. Walter Mondale
g. Michael "Mike" Dorrian

h. Dana Buck Rinehart

i. Charles Ross

j. Alan Cranston

k. Jesse Jackson

l. George Bush

Still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following?

m. The Republican Party

n. The Democratic Party

o. People who call themselves political independents

p. Democrats

q. Republicans

(Interviewers should read the following instructions slowly to the respondent).
Now I would like you to please respond to the following statements keeping in mind a seven point scale where one now means that the statement is extremely likely to be true and seven means that the statement is extremely unlikely to be true. The first statement is:

31. Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of neighborhoods. (INTERVIEWERS IF NECESSARY USE THE FOLLOWING PROBE: If 1 means the statement is extremely likely to be true and 7 means that the statement is extremely unlikely to be true and 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are in between, how would you respond to the statement that Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of neighborhoods).

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

32. Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

33. Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of the Columbus business community.

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

34. Democrats in Columbus look out for the needs of working people in Columbus.

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

35. Democrats in Columbus look out for attracting industry to Columbus.

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

36. Democrats are liberal.

_______(Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na
37. Democrats are political moderates.

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na

38. Democrats are conservative.

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na

39. Dana Rinehart is in favor of looking out for the needs of the neighborhoods. (INTERVIEWERS IF RESPONDENT DID NOT RECOGNIZE RINEHART ON THE THERMOMETER SKIP TO QUESTION 47).

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na

40. Dana Rinehart is in favor for looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na

41. Dana Rinehart is in favor of looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community.

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na

42. Dana Rinehart is in favor of looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus.

   ___(Record exact number)
     8. dk
     9. na
43. Dana Rinehart is in favor of looking out to attract industry to Columbus.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

44. Dana Rinehart is liberal.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

45. Dana Rinehart is moderate.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

46. Dana Rinehart is conservative.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

47. Political Independents in Columbus look out for the needs of neighborhoods.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na

48. Political Independents in Columbus look out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.

_______(Record exact number)
8. dk
9. na
49. Political Independents in Columbus look out for the needs of the Columbus business community.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

50. Political Independents in Columbus look out for the needs of working people in Columbus.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

51. Political Independents in Columbus look out for attracting industry to Columbus.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

52. Political Independents are liberal.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

53. Political Independents are moderate.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

54. Political Independents are conservative.

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na

55. Charles Ross is in favor of looking out for the needs of neighborhoods. (INTERVIEWERS IF RESPONDENT DID NOT RECOGNIZE ROSS ON THE THERMOMETER SKIP TO QUESTION 63.)

    (Record exact number)
  8. dk
  9. na
56. Charles Ross is in favor of looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

57. Charles Ross is in favor for looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

58. Charles Ross is in favor of looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

59. Charles Ross is in favor of looking out to attract industry to Columbus.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

60. Charles Ross is liberal

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

61. Charles Ross is moderate.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

62. Charles Ross is conservative.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na

63. Republicans in Columbus look out for the needs of neighborhoods.

     (Record exact number)

     8. dk
     9. na
64. Republicans look out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

65. Republicans in Columbus look out for the needs of the Columbus business community.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

66. Republicans in Columbus look out for the needs of working people in Columbus.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

67. Republicans in Columbus look out for attracting industry to Columbus.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

68. Republicans are liberal.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

69. Republicans are moderate.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

70. Republicans are conservative.
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na

71. Mike Dorrian is in favor for looking out for the needs of the neighborhoods. (INTERVIEWERS IF RESPONDENT DID NOT RECOGNIZE DORRIAN ON THE THERMOMETER SKIP TO QUESTION 79).
   ______ (Record exact number)
   8. dk
   9. na
72. Mike Dorrian is in favor of looking out for the needs of Columbus Blacks.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

73. Mike Dorrian is in favor of looking out for the needs of the Columbus business community.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

74. Mike Dorrian is in favor of looking out to attract industry to Columbus.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

75. Mike Dorrian is in favor of looking out for the needs of working people in Columbus.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

76. Mike Dorrian is liberal.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

77. Mike Dorrian is moderate.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

78. Mike Dorrian is conservative.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na

79. I support the Democratic party.

_______(Record exact number)

8. dk
9. na
80. I support the Republican party.

8. (Record exact number)
9. dk

81. In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have the time. How about you —— did you vote in the May or elections on November 8?

1. yes, did vote (GO TO QUESTION 82)
2. no, did not vote (GO TO QUESTION 83)
8. dk (GO TO QUESTION 84)
9. na

82. Who did you vote for as Mayor, Dorrian or Rinehart?

1. Rinehart or the Republican candidate
2. Dorrian, or the Democrat candidate
3. Ross, or the write-in candidate
6. other mayoral candidate
7. voted, but not for a Mayoral candidate
8. dk
9. na

INTERVIEWERS: GO TO QUESTION 84 AFTER THIS QUESTION. 83. If you had voted would you have voted for Rinehart, Dorrian, Ross or someone else?

INTERVIEWERS: GO TO QUESTION 84 AFTER THIS QUESTION

1. Rinehart
2. Dorrian
3. Ross
4. other candidate
8. dk
9. na

84. Now I'd like to ask you about the Presidential election next year. Do you plan to vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate?

1. Republican candidate
2. Democratic candidate
3. will not vote
8. dk
9. na
85. Are you registered to vote at this address?
   1. yes
   2. no
   8. dk
   9. na

86. In your mind, do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties or not?

   INTERVIEWERS IF RESPONDENT ASKS WHAT WE MEANS BY "SUPPORTER" SAY THE FOLLOWING: THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO FEEL THEY SUPPORT A POLITICAL PARTY BECAUSE THEY DO THINGS FOR THE PARTY, LIKE ATTENDING PARTY MEETINGS OR CONTRIBUTING MONEY. OTHER PEOPLE, HOWEVER, FEEL THEY ARE PARTY SUPPORTERS EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE NOT ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN DOING THINGS FOR THE PARTY. HOW ABOUT YOU? (IF NECESSARY REPEAT THE QUESTION)

   1. yes, supporter (go to question 87)
   2. no, not supporter (go to question 88)
   8. dk
   9. na

87. Which political party do you support? (INTERVIEWERS GO TO 89)

   1. Republican
   2. Democratic
   3. other
   8. dk
   9. na

88. Do you ever think of yourself as closer to one of the two major political parties, or not?

   1. yes (go to question 88a)
   2. no (go to question 89)
   8. dk
   9. na

88a. Which party do you feel closer to?

   1. Republican
   2. Democratic
   3. other
   8. dk
   9. na
89. Do you ever think of yourself as a political independent or not?

1. yes
2. no
8. dk
9. na

Now I'd like to ask you what you think are the good and bad points about the two national parties.

90. Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party?

1. yes (go to question 90a)
2. no (go to question 91)
8. dk
9. na

90a. What is that?

Anything else?

91. Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party?

1. yes (go to question 91a)
2. no (go to question 92)
8. dk
9. na

91a. What is that?
Anything else?

92. Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party?
   1. yes (go to question 92a)
   2. no (go to question 93)
   8. dk
   9. na

92a. What is that?

Anything else?

93. Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party?
   1. yes (go to question 93a)
   2. no (go to question 94)
   8. dk
   9. na

93a. What is that?
Anything else?

Before we finish the interview I need to get some information about you. Remember that everything you say will be held in strict confidence.

94. Do you own your (home, apt.) or do you rent?
   1. own
   2. rent
   3. dk
   4. na

95. Roughly, how long have you lived in Columbus?
    _______(Record exact number of years)

96. What is the month and year of your birth?
    _______(month)
    _______(year)

97. What is the highest grade of school or year of college you completed?
    _______(Record number of years)

98. What is the occupation of the head of your household?
    ________________________________(Record exact occupation)

99. Does anyone in your household belong to a labor union?
   1. yes
   2. no
   3. dk
   4. na
100. What is your religious preference?
   1. Protestant
   2. Catholic
   3. Jewish
   4. other
   5. no church membership
   8. dk
   9. na

101. About what do you think your total income will be this year before taxes for yourself and your immediate family? (INTERVIEWERS: READ THE CATEGORIES)
   1. under 5000
   2. 5,000-10,000
   3. 10,000-15,000
   4. 15,000-20,000
   5. 20,000-30,000
   6. 30,000 or more

102. Finally what is your race?
   1. white
   2. black
   3. other
   9. na
103. Sex of Respondent (DO NOT ASK THE RESPONDENT THIS QUESTION)

1. male
2. female
9. na

Time Interview ends ________ Thank you so much for the interview. Would you be willing to give us your name so we may contact you to see if your attitudes have changed? Also remember everything you have said will be held in strict confidence.

1. yes (GET NAME AND RECORD PHONE NUMBER OF RESPONDENT)
2. no (THANK RESPONDENT AND HANG UP)

INTERVIEWERS SHOULD RECORD NAME AND PHONE NUMBER OF RESPONDENT.

_______________________________________ NAME

_______________________________________ PHONE NUMBER
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