

PARTISANSHIP AND PARTISAN CHANGE IN OKLAHOMA:
A PARTY IMAGE ANALYSIS

By

ROBERT MIKE TERRY

Bachelor of Arts

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Weatherford, Oklahoma

1972

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July, 1976

Thesis
1976
T329 p
cop. 2



PARTISANSHIP AND PARTISAN CHANGE IN OKLAHOMA:
A PARTY IMAGE ANALYSIS

Thesis Approved:

Thomas G. Kielhorn
Thesis Advisor

Franz A. von Sauer

Harold V. Sme

A. N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

953431

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my mother and father,
Mr. and Mrs. Glen Terry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This author feels fortunate to have found a "behaviorally" oriented scholar who also shared his delight and amazement at what a computer can do with a stack of IBM cards. The author would also like to express his gratitude to this same man for his unlimited patience and invaluable guidance during the writing of this thesis, and also during my years as a graduate student. My deepest appreciation is to that man, Dr. Thomas Kielhorn; may he never go awry on his election prognostications.

Further appreciation is extended to Professor Harold V. Sare and Dr. Franz von Sauer for their suggestions and assistance during the final phases of this study.

When an individual looks back over his educational experiences, there are individuals who have made special contributions and assistance. I would like to express my special thanks to a few of these individuals who have contributed to my educational experience:

Dr. Alan Kosofsky, who showed a special care and concern throughout the author's educational experiences as an undergraduate at Southwestern Oklahoma State University.

Dr. John Bourdette, for his friendship, and humor during the author's early adjustments to civilian life following the Viet Nam conflict, and for his encouragement during my graduate studies at Oklahoma State University.

Mr. Leonard Gillingham, for his encouragement in the earliest years of my life. "Good fences do indeed make good neighbors".

A special recognition is extended to my mother and father, who probably never dreamed twelve years ago that their child who left for college would progress as far as he has; neither did he.

Appreciation is also extended to Harold Laubach, for many years of friendship, good times, and the use of his typewriter.

Last but far from least, a special thanks to a girl named "Puggy" for her understanding, love, and patience over the years and also for her typing of the thesis. I sometimes thought I would never make it. She never doubted that I would not.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	3
Literature Review	8
The Genesis of Partisanship.	8
The Legal Conceptualization of Partisanship.	11
The SRC View of Partisanship	12
Matthews and Prothro's Concept of Partisanship	18
Behavioral Measure of Partisanship	22
Introduction to Attitude Theory	26
Propositions of the Study.	33
Methodology	33
Selection of Subjects.	34
Variables in the Study	34
Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment.	40
Organization of the Study.	40
II. AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP	42
The First Test of the Hypothesis: The 1968 Presidential Election	43
The Second Test of the Hypothesis: The 1970 Gubernatorial Election.	45
The Third Test of the Hypothesis: The 1972 Senatorial Election	48
The Fourth Test of the Hypothesis: The 1972 Presidential Election	50
III. A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP.	55
Party Registration	56
Behavioral Partisanship	56
Party Identification	58
Party Image	75
Findings	76
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	76
Conclusions	76
Final Conclusions	82

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	83
APPENDIX A - BEHAVIORAL PARTISANSHIP	86
APPENDIX B - PARTY IDENTIFICATION	88
APPENDIX C - PARTY IMAGE ITEMS	90
APPENDIX D - CANDIDATE CHOICE	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. A Comparison of Sample Results and Actual Election Statistics for Various Oklahoma Elections	39
II. Relationship Between the Four Measures of Partisanship and Recalled Presidential Voting Behavior of Oklahomans in 1968 (in percentages)	44
III. Relationship Between the Four Measures of Partisanship and Recalled Gubernatorial Voting Behavior of Oklahomans in 1970 (in percentages)	47
IV. Relationship Between the Four Measures of Partisanship and Senatorial Voting Choice of Oklahomans in 1972 (in percentages)	49
V. Relationship Between the Four Measures of Partisanship and Presidential Voting Choice of Oklahomans in 1972 (in percentages).	51
VI. Summary Table of Measures of Association	53
VII. Partisanship of Oklahomans Using Four Measures of Partisanship (in percentages)	57
VIII. Party Images of Oklahomans (in percentages)	61
IX. Party Images of Registered, Behavioral and Self-Identified <u>Democrats Only</u> (in percentages)	63
X. Party Images of Behavioral and Self-Identified <u>Independents Only</u> (in percentages)	65
XI. Party Images of Registered, Behavioral and Self-Identified <u>Republicans Only</u> (in percentages)	67
XII. Elements of Party Image and Net Deviations From Voting Norms Among Oklahomans in the Presidential Election of 1968 and the Gubernatorial Election of 1970	71
XIII. Elements of Party Image and Net Deviations From Voting Norms Among Oklahomans in the Presidential and Senatorial Elections of 1972	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For years advocates of a "behavioral revolution" in Political Science have taken great pride in voting studies as the vanguard of the discipline--an example of the possibility of the "scientific" study of political behavior. Numerous findings emerged as near "laws" from the voting behavior studies. With the advent of survey studies, aggregate data inferences about voting behavior gave way to SES explanations such as race, status, occupation, rural-urban orientations, and class differences. SES explanations for voting behavior were replaced by psychological correlations of voting in The American Voter¹ and The Voter Decides.² One concept in particular seemed to be the most predictive of voting behavior--partisanship. Partisanship was defined as: "The sense of personal or psychological attachment which the individual feels towards the party of his choice."³ While voting is always seen

¹Angus Campbell, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes, The American Voter (New York, 1960).

²Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides (Evanston, 1954).

³Angus Campbell and Warren E. Miller, "The Motivational Basis of Straight and Split Ticket Voting," The American Political Science Review, LI (June, 1957), p. 302.

as an act growing from a complex motivational basis--partisanship seemed to be the most predictive--and at the core of organizing other important predispositions. It has been described by Campbell as "...remarkably constant throughout the life of the individual," and as "...exercising influence on perception, attitudes, and behavior."⁴ The theoretical and predictive import of the concept was such that SRC was led to use the concept as an underlying basis for additional studies.

Phillip Converse in his essay on "The Normal Vote" presents in somewhat technical terms, a concept which provides a basis for evaluating all American elections. Drawing on assumptions from survey experience over a number of elections, the concept is built on the proposition that voter partisanship provides the baseline for individual and group electoral decisions. The results of any actual election can be interpreted, according to Stokes, in terms of the amount of deviation they show from the "normal vote," predicted on the basis of partisanship and turnout levels.⁵

Angus Campbell in "Classification of Presidential Elections" provides a classification for elections based essentially on the idea of the normal vote. An understanding of the variables underlying these classifications enables one to avoid serious misinterpretations of electoral results especially of the elections in which the second party

⁴Angus Campbell, "Voters and Elections: Past and Present," The Journal of Politics, XXVI (1964), p. 747.

⁵Phillip E. Converse, "The Concept of the Normal Vote," in Angus Campbell, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, Elections and the Political Order (New York, 1966), pp. 9-39.

wins, such as was the case in 1952, 1965, 1968 and 1972.⁶ Also Campbell's "Surge and Decline" offers a coherent and complete framework for understanding the recurring phenomenon of mid-term losses for the President's party in the House of Representatives, much of which was based on earlier assumptions in The American Voter.⁷ It is apparent to anyone that scans the voting behavior literature that partisanship is at the core of the voting studies.

Problem

In recent years there have been some problems with the concept of partisanship as used by SRC. It has been noted that there has been a decline in the extent of partisan feeling in the electorate as well as a decline in the impact of partisanship on political behavior. The strongest evidence of the decline of partisanship has come from a study of successive Presidential elections from 1960 to 1972 by Pomper, who found that the relationship between partisanship and the vote had diminished in each successive election.⁸ The same study indicated that the transmission of partisanship between generations had decreased for the same period.⁹

This decline in the predictive capabilities of the SRC measure coupled with an increase in ticket-splitting in the elections of the 1960's

⁶Angus Campbell, "A Classification of the Presidential Elections." *Ibid.*, pp. 63-77.

⁷Angus Campbell, "Surge and Decline: A Study of Electoral Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (1960), p. 397-418.

⁸Gerald Pomper, Voters Choice (New York, 1975), p. 23.

⁹*Ibid.*

prompted other analysts to suggest alternative measures of partisanship. A very harsh criticism of the SRC view of partisanship is advanced by the authors of The Ticket-Splitter.¹⁰ They noted that while it is interesting to note whether a person considers himself a Democrat, Republican, or Independent one should concentrate instead on the actual voting behavior of the individual. Does the individual vote Democratic, Republican or does he vote Independent (for candidates of different parties)? They note:

The disparity between the perceptual approach and the behavioral approach has inevitably created misunderstanding about contemporary voting behavior, many Republicans and Democrats split their ballots regularly, while many so called Independents are disguised partisans.¹¹

Matthews and Prothro, in a rather mild criticism of SRC, note that partisanship as measured by analysts at SRC is rather insensitive to the changing views of the parties that, for example, Southerners have experienced in recent years. They suggest instead that one concentrate on the individual's beliefs about the parties which are much more amenable to change and also more predictive of the vote.¹²

Another important criticism is voiced by Sullivan in reference to the Survey Research Center's studies of the last two decades:

Despite the increasing volumn of studies relating attitudes to voting behavior, political science lacks a psychology of political attitudes. The most important studies of the last decade have demonstrated the advan-

¹⁰Walter DeVries and V. Lance Tarrance, The Ticket-Splitter: A New Force in American Politics (Grand Rapids, 1972).

¹¹Ibid., p. 54.

¹²Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, "The Concept of Party Image and Its Importance for the Southern Electorate," in M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler, eds., The Electoral Process (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 139-174.

tages of carefully contrived questionnaires and well-schooled interviewers in assessing the relationships between attitudes and the vote among randomly selected members of national and community populations. But, more often than not, attention to the development of psychological theories of political attitudes has been post hoc. In the two major works of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan--The Voter Decides and The American Voter--the limited attention to theoretical developments resulted from the fact that the authors could not do all things that needed to be done at once. Thus they chose, to paraphrase their statement, to focus on the forces operating on the individual just prior to the act of voting. Consequently, they gave little attention to the application of general theory of attitude change to the problem of voting.¹³

A close examination of the voting behavior literature indicates that there are now a number of different measures of partisanship presently on the 'market'. Measures of partisanship that have appeared in the literature are: (1) party registration which is a legally determined measure of partisanship, (2) behavioral partisanship which is determined from the self-reported party voting by the respondent in one or several elections, (3) party image which is determined by the respondent's overall evaluative beliefs about the Republican and Democratic parties, and (4) party identification determined by the respondent's self-classification of the nature and intensity of his feeling.¹⁴

As would be expected, the introduction of a number of different concepts all purporting to measure partisanship has been accompanied by a number of counter-claims and contradictory findings some of which are outlined in the following discussion.

SRC analysts suggest that the underlying partisanship of the elec-

¹³Denis G. Sullivan, "Psychological Balance and Reactions to the Presidential Nominations in 1960," *Ibid.*, p. 238.

¹⁴A more detailed discussion of the measures appears later in the Chapter.

torate has been stable over time and Converse suggests that there has been no change in partisanship in the South, despite heavy defections to the Republican party in recent Presidential elections.¹⁵ Other analysts suggest that there have been dramatic changes in the partisanship of Southerners in terms of the erosions of beliefs favorable to the Democratic party.¹⁶

The American Voter indicated that Independents were less concerned about specific elections, less well informed, less active politically, and less apt to vote in a given election than those indicating an attachment to a party.¹⁷ Recent studies show that Independents, behaviorally defined, are more well informed, more active, and just as likely to vote as self-identified Independents.¹⁸

Recent studies have also shown wide discrepancies between the issue orientations of behavioral Democrats and Republicans and self-identified Democrats and Republicans.¹⁹

What then is the present state of the voting behavior literature? Consensus on what has been the major independent variable in voting behavior has broken down. There are now several competing measures of partisanship currently being used in the literature. As a result of

¹⁵Converse, "The Concept of the Normal Vote," p. 27. However, in all fairness to Converse he has modified his stand since then.

¹⁶Matthews and Prothro, p. 172.

¹⁷Campbell, et al., The American Voter, p. 83.

¹⁸DeVries and Tarrance, p. 97.

¹⁹Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., and Charles D. Hadley, "Party Definition and Party Differentiation," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXVI (Spring, 1973), p. 32

measuring partisanship differently, different conclusions are being made about the predispositions and behaviors of the American electorate. The impact of the SRC measure of partisanship on the voting choice has diminished to the point that it is not perceived as important in the determination of voting choice of the individual as it once was. Also the major variable in the voting behavior literature (party identification) is being criticized for a lack of a theoretical basis. Due to the problems that surround the major independent variable--partisanship, the analysis of political behavior suffers. If we as behavioralists, believe that science is self-correcting, it is time to stop proliferating studies defining concepts in different ways and to return to the first priority--to reexamine the concepts of partisanship--to determine their conceptual clarity, their theoretical utility, and their empirical utility. This study is a modest first step in that direction.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate each of the measures of partisanship found in the literature to determine if they have both theoretical and empirical import. By theoretical import, it is meant that the concept is related to other concepts and can be incorporated into a body of theoretical literature.²⁰ In this study, each of the concepts of partisanship will be evaluated to determine if they have a solid basis in theory and also if they are conceptually clear. Empirical import implies "that concepts must be linked to the world of observation."²¹ Can they be directly or indirectly measured? In this

²⁰A discussion of theoretical import appears in Alan C. Isaak, Scope and Methods of Political Science (Homewood, 1969), pp. 65-70.

²¹Ibid.

study the measures of partisanship will be tested for their predictive association to voting behavior to determine their empirical utility. Concepts are not inherently 'good' or 'bad' but are evaluated in terms of their usefulness. In this study this will be determined by assessing the descriptive and analytical utility of the different measures in reference to the explanation and prediction of political behavior. It is hoped that this study might serve to answer the question: what is partisanship, and what is the best measure of partisanship?

Literature Review

The literature review is divided into three parts. The first part gives a historical account of the development of partisanship. The second function of the literature review is to critically evaluate the conceptual clarity and theoretical import of each of the concepts. The conclusion of the literature review is an abbreviated introduction to attitude theory.

The Genesis of Partisanship

The first major survey study of a Presidential election was The People's Choice which focused on the 1940 Presidential election in Erie County, Ohio.²² This group of Columbia researchers was interested in how voters were effected by mass media. Their view of the voter at the time was rather naive as this account by Rossi indicates:

The prospective voter, like the new shopper in a supermarket is confronted after the conventions with an

²²Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice (New York, 1944).

array of candidates similar to the many brands in a store. Each candidate has his own particular qualities, some superficial like the packaging of food products, others more intrinsic like his opinions on issues. The predispositions (attitudes) of the voter are acted upon by the mass media, just as advertising acts upon the shopper. The voter vacillates between one and the other candidate as propaganda from both sides filters down to him, finally he comes to a decision, perhaps at the last moment before he enters the polling booth, just as the undecided shopper makes her choice at the food bins in the supermarket.²³

This view of the voter turned out to be wrong on two crucial points. First, most voters had made up their minds very early in the campaign and remained steadfast in their choices through the period of the study. Second, it was discovered that a large number of voters on the "electoral market" had strong "brand loyalties", i.e., most of them had long standing attachments to one or the other political party. While they indicated that there was a brand loyalty or psychological commitment on the part of the voters to political parties, the researchers did not develop the concept of brand loyalties further and they went on to emphasize in their study the social determinants of the voting choice.

A follow up study by the Columbia group in 1948 focused on Presidential voting in Elmira, New York.²⁴ In this study they were not interested in the effects of campaign communication, but focused on the influence of opinions on voting. The researchers inferred that there was a partisan ordering of the issues. Also, in those cases in which

²³Peter H. Rossi, "Four Landmarks in Voting Research," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, American Voting Behavior (New York, 1959), p. 16.

²⁴Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee, Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign (Chicago, 1954).

the respondent's candidate disagreed with the respondent on the issue, the individual voters tended to distort their candidates view of the issue to conform with their own views rather than voting for the other candidates.²⁵ While they indicated that partisan attitudes influenced a persons perceptions of the candidates and his issue orientations, they did not develop the idea further nor did they focus on any underlying psychological dimensions of the vote. Due to their sociological perspective, they saw the voting choice mainly as a group decision. They noticed that there was a tendency for individuals to conform to the pattern of the majority in the community. This led them to conclude: "A person thinks, politically as he is socially²⁶ ...his vote is formed in the midst of a group decision if, indeed, it may be a decision at all."²⁷ Thus, partisanship, while noted, was swamped by the sociological perspective.

V. O. Key and Frank Munger pointed out the weakness in the social determinism of early voting studies: the distribution of social attributes could not explain persistent geographical patterns of voting behavior.²⁸ The problem that stimulated their attention was the distribution of the vote in Presidential elections in Indiana counties. They found that there was a high degree of similarity in the division

²⁵Ibid., p. 321.

²⁶Ibid., p. 27.

²⁷Ibid., p. 321. Pomper, p. 16, indicated rather low statistical correlations between class identification, occupation, education, age, religion, race and the Presidential vote from 1960 to 1972.

²⁸V. O. Key, Jr., and Frank Munger, "Social Determinism and Electoral Decision: The Case of Indiana," in American Voting Behavior, (New York, 1959), pp. 281-299.

of the vote between the election of 1868 and those of 1900, 1920, and even 1948. The weight of the evidence suggested to Key that there was an underlying dimension which he called "standing decisions" to vote that were present over time.²⁹ This led to aggregate studies in which scholars included party registration as a variable in their studies. This idea of a long term political component that was present in one election after another also gave impetus to scholars at the University of Michigan to develop the concept of party identification.

The Legal Conceptualization of Partisanship

Party registration was used extensively by voting behavior analysts prior to the introduction of surveys as a means of determining partisanship. Of all the measures of partisanship evaluated in this study, party registration was the easiest to determine. One merely can go to the local election board and scan the records to determine the legal affiliation of the individual. There is however little theoretical basis for party registration and it is seldom used in survey voting studies. Party registration is also not a very descriptive concept. By knowing the registration of an individual, one knows very little about why the individual chooses to register with one party or the other. The assumption is that there should be a correlation between a person's self-identification and his party registration. Yet there might be circumstances that might influence a person to register with one party but identify with another. In an area that is highly one-party, one would think that there might be a great deal of pressure to

²⁹Ibid., p. 289.

conform to the norm of the community, regardless of self-identification.³⁰ Furthermore, one would assume that there might be more changes in party registration in an area that is electorally competitive with a change in attitudes towards the parties than in an area that is dominated by one party. This would be due to more apparent social support. Another possible reason for the discrepancy between self-identification and party registration in a state that is predominantly one party oriented might be that the primaries would not contain candidates of the minority party. Therefore, the politically efficacious individual might increase his number of voting choices that he could make in any given election by registering contrary to his psychological attachment with the minority party in the area. All of these assumptions could be of course tested empirically.

Party registration has not been found to be very predictive of voting choice as demonstrated by Matthews and Prothro in their study of the Southern electorate.³¹ They also found that in a number of cases the respondent's self-identification conflicted with his party registration. These findings cast serious doubt on the validity of party registration as a measure of partisanship in a one party locale.

The SRC View of Partisanship

The studies of the Michigan group differed from the earlier Columbia studies in that they were socio-psychological in nature and were more interested in the attitudes and perceptual organizations of the

³⁰This was one explanation also given for the high number of registered Democrats by Matthews and Prothro, pp. 147-148.

³¹Ibid., p. 147.

voter's environment rather than social positions or other objective social factors. Their central concern was with party identification which is determined by the response to the following question: "Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a: Democrat, Republican, or what?"³² The strength of the party attachment was determined from the following question: "Would you consider yourself a strong Democrat (Republican), or a not very strong Democrat (Republican)?"³³ From both of these questions, both the direction and strength of partisanship can be determined.

Empirically their studies showed that party identification was moderately related to a number of variables such as: voting, direction of the vote, interest in the campaign, attitudes towards the candidates and issue orientations.³⁴ Descriptively, party identification is somewhat deficient as a concept of partisanship; it does not indicate why a person chooses to indicate a feeling of attachment to either of the parties or why an individual might choose a non-partisan position such as Independent. As Matthews and Prothro point out in reference to party identification, different individuals could identify with the same party and not have the same "mental picture" of the party.³⁵ Further, Coombs and Fishbein note that an individual could conceivably hold negative views of a party and still identify with that party. An analogy would be the Baptist 'back-slider' who never attends church, is highly

³²Campbell, et al., The American Voter, p. 122.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid., Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

³⁵Matthews and Prothro, p. 149.

critical of the church but still calls himself a Baptist.³⁶

Party identification also lacks a basis in theory. While clearly the researchers indicate that party identification functions as a psychological cue for the individual, there is little reference to psychological theory in the SRC literature.³⁷ In an article on the party identifications of Norwegians and Americans, Campbell comments that party identification is an identification with a reference group symbol --the political party.³⁸ This notion is close to the reference group theory of the sociological school of thought. Added weight is given to this assumption as one views the strong resistance to change exhibited by party identification which seems to arise more from reinforcement from the group or fear of group sanctions than from a voter's attitude toward the party.

The American Voter also contained a second measure of partisanship--one that is closely related to contemporary attitude theory. The concept is partisan attitudes which are determined by the responses to a series of eight open-ended questions that ask the respondent to indicate what he "likes" and "dislikes" about the Republican and Democratic parties and candidates. From a content analysis of these open-ended questions, six scores are derived. These have been referred to

³⁶Fred S. Coombs and Martin Fishbein, "Party Attitudes and Party Identification," paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention (New York, 1970), p. 9.

³⁷Sullivan, p. 238.

³⁸Angus Campbell and Henry Valen, "Party Identification in Norway and the United States," in Angus Campbell, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, Elections and the Political Order (New York, 1966), p. 248.

as "six partisan attitude forces,"³⁹ "dimensions of partisan attitudes,"⁴⁰ "dimensions of individual partisan feeling,"⁴¹ and simply "attitudes."⁴² The six scores were: (1) attitude toward the Democratic candidate, (2) attitude toward the Republican candidate, (3) attitude toward the parties as managers of government, (4) attitude on foreign issues, (5) attitude on domestic issues and (6) a group-related attitude.

The attitude toward the Republican and Democratic candidate is based upon responses to the candidate questions which cite a candidate's experience, abilities, personal attributes, or his relation to his party but not responses associating the candidate with issues or groups. Campbell and his associates found that there was a high correlation between voting choice and the number of unfavorable or favorable responses towards the candidates.⁴³

The attitude toward the parties as managers of government is a difference score based only upon responses to the party questions which refer to corruption, to the collective leadership of the parties, and to their capacities to govern, but again it did not refer to responses about a party's association with issues or groups. The Republican party according to Campbell was seen as most favored on this dimension

³⁹Campbell, et al., The American Voter, p. 72.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 69.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 67.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., p. 38. A + .56 correlations was noted.

by the electorate in both 1952 and 1956.⁴⁴

The attitude on foreign issues is a difference score incorporating all references to issues on foreign policy. They found that a sizable number of partisans of both parties believed that the Republican party was better able to preserve the peace and was better able to manage foreign affairs in both 1952 and 1956.⁴⁵

Attitude on domestic issues is a difference score incorporating all references to issues of domestic policy. The researchers found that there was a tendency for Republican identifiers to be unfavorable to government activities in the social and economic sector of the nation, whereas the Democratic identifiers tended to be in favor of government activities in these areas.⁴⁶ It was determined from their data that a pro-Republican attitude on domestic issues and the Republican candidate resulted (in 1956) in a Republican vote.⁴⁷

The group related attitude is a difference score abstracted from comments about the parties or candidates which referred to a group within the population. As Campbell noted:

A large number of respondents in 1956 still approved of the Democratic party and disapproved of the Republican party on the basis of groups each was felt to support...The Democrats were still thought to help groups primarily of lower status: the common people, working people, the laboring man, Negroes, farmers, and (in 1956 only) the small businessman. The Republicans, on the other hand, were thought to help those of higher status: big business, the upper class, the well-to-do.⁴⁸

⁴⁴Campbell, et al., The American Voter, pp. 74-75.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 108.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 115-116.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 38. A +.56 correlation was noted.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 19.

This concept of partisanship seems to be more descriptive than any measures evaluated so far. There are several dimensions to the measure, six in all. As a combined measure of partisanship there was a strong correlation between partisan attitudes and the voting choice.⁴⁹ While it is clearly evident that SRC in this case is using attitudes to measure partisanship, there is no reference to attitude theory in their work.

Coombs and Fishbein are critical of the concept of partisan attitudes from a methodological point of view and they note that:

There is little psychological basis for classifying beliefs about candidates and parties into these six categories and then using the six subsets of beliefs as the basis for deriving separate attitude scores....far from being independent, these measures are highly intercorrelated each loading on a single dimension that might best be labeled "differential bi-partisan feeling."⁵⁰

Secondly, they point out that the attitude toward the Republican candidate, Democratic candidate and the parties as managers of government do not include responses that the individual makes referring to a party's association with issues and groups.⁵¹ However, these beliefs about the candidates and issues do contribute to the respondent's overall attitude toward the candidates and the parties. They conclude by suggesting that the SRC measure is at best an incomplete measure of party attitude. While the SRC concept of partisan attitudes seemed at least promising, later studies by SRC tended to focus on party identification rather than partisan attitudes. Coombs and Fishbein conclude:

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 38. A correlation of +.71 was reported in 1956.

⁵⁰Coombs and Fishbein, pp. 4-5.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 5.

"As a consequence, we are in a position of knowing very little about the attitudes of the electorate toward the two most important institutions in the American electoral system."⁵²

Matthews and Prothro's Concept of Partisanship

The concept of "party image" was first coined by Matthews and Prothro in a study conducted in 1961 that was concerned with Black and White attitudes toward the Republican and Democratic parties.⁵³ They were basically interested in determining if there had been a change in partisanship in the South following a number of Republican electoral victories at the Presidential level in the once solidly Democratic South. Party image was conceptualized as the voter's "mental picture" of the parties.⁵⁴ Operationally, it was determined by an individual's response to the following four questions:

"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 Democratic party? What is that?"⁵⁵

"Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that?"⁵⁶

"Is there anything in particular that you like about the Repub-

⁵² Coombs and Fishbein, p. 1.

⁵³ Matthews and Prothro, pp. 139-174.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 149.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 150.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

lican party? What is that?"⁵⁷

"Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that?"⁵⁸

Pro-Democratic and anti-Republican responses were scored as +1. Pro-Republican and anti-Democratic responses were scored as -1. Since four responses were coded for each question, the scores for each respondent could have ranged from +8 (most favorable Democratic party image) to -8 (most favorable Republican party image). A score of zero indicated that the respondent did not have an overall favorable image of either party.

In noting the difference between the concept of party identification and party image they commented:

Party image is not the same thing as party identification, although the two concepts are related to one another. It is quite possible for the two people to identify with the same party but to have very different mental pictures of it and to evaluate these pictures in different ways.⁵⁹

Their study indicated that there indeed was a high correlation between the party identification and party image of the respondents in their survey of the Southern electorate.⁶⁰ Self-identified Democrats tended as a group to have pro-Democratic party images; self-identified Republicans tended as a group to have pro-Republican party images. Independents tended as a group to have neutral attitudes towards the

⁵⁷Matthews and Prothro, p. 150.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 149.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 160.

two parties.⁶¹

Nixon voters (in 1960) tended as a group to have pro-Republican party images, and Kennedy voters tended as a group to have pro-Democratic party images. Those voters who recalled voting Republican in 1956 and 1960 for President tended to have pro-Republican party images and those that voted Democratic in 1956 and 1960 tended to have pro-Democratic party images. Split ticket voters in the 1956 and 1960 elections for President tended to be more pro-Republican in their party image scores as a group.⁶² The researchers noted that:

In terms of voting, the aspects of party images with the biggest pay-offs for the Democrats are the "gut" and group issues--that the party is "good to the workers and the little people" while the Republicans are heartless lackeys of Wall Street and General Motors. For the Republicans, the most productive images are its conservatism and "style" and dislike of Democratic liberalism, "style" and national leaders.⁶³

In reference to the analytical utility of the concept of party image, voters who indicated that they had changed identification from Democratic to Independent or Republican to Independent had mean party image scores as positive towards the Republican party as did self-identified Republicans. Those that indicated that they had changed from Republican to Democratic in their identification were highly pro-Democratic in their attitudes toward the Democratic party.⁶⁴

The descriptive utility of the concept of party image was demon-

⁶¹ Matthews and Prothro, p. 160.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 163.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 165-166.

strated in their study as well. Most White respondents in their study tended to like the Republican party's style of operation, conservatism, leaders and foreign-military policies. White Southerners also indicated that conditions tended to be bad under Republicans, that Republicans were too favorable to big business and the Republican party was bad for workers and farmers. Most of the criticism of the Republican party came from Democratic identifiers in the South as the area is predominantly Democratic in party identification. Black Southerners tended to like most everything about the Democratic party as they saw it. Only on two issues (foreign policy and relationships with big business) was the Negro image of the Democratic party negative.⁶⁵ Thus with the concept of party image, both the "content" of partisanship as well as the direction and intensity can be discovered. These qualities make the concept both analytically useful and descriptive.

While partisanship as measured by party image in Matthews and Prothro's work proved to be both descriptively and analytically useful, there was no attempt to relate the concept to contemporary attitude theory. While the concept certainly deals with psychological variables and motivations, there is a noted lack of psychological terminology in the study. While the study incorporates the concept of an attitude, there is no attempt to define "attitude" and no reference to attitude theory or change in the work. Despite this criticism, the study was important in that it questioned the sensitivity of party identification in relation to the problem of change. While party identification appeared to be stable in the South, they found that there had been an

⁶⁵Matthews and Prothro, pp. 157-158.

erosion in the partisanship of Southerners as measured by party image.⁶⁶

Behavioral Measure of Partisanship

While the American electorate is predominantly Democratic as measured by party identification, the Republicans have captured the Presidency in four out of the last six Presidential elections since 1952.⁶⁷ This fact has led a number of researchers to suggest an alternative measure of partisanship. They suggest that instead of asking a person what he thinks he is, it makes far more sense to ask; how does the individual usually vote? If an individual votes Republican, why not call him a Republican? Conversely, if the individual votes Democratic, why not call him a Democrat? If the respondent votes for both Republicans and Democrats, call him an Independent.⁶⁸

From a common sense standpoint, this approach to the measurement of the partisanship of an individual has a great deal of appeal. However, as one views the literature, it is evident that there are a multiplicity of "flavors" of behavioral partisanship. It can be measured by: (1) the recall of a respondent's vote for a specific level of candidate in the two most recent past election years (inter-election method);⁶⁹ (2) the recall of the respondent's vote for the various

⁶⁶ Matthews and Prothro, p. 168.

⁶⁷ The winners were: Dwight D. Eisenhower (R), 1952 and 1956; John F. Kennedy (D), 1960; Lyndon Johnson (D), 1964; and Richard Nixon (R), 1968 and 1972.

⁶⁸ DeVries and Tarrance, p. 54.

⁶⁹ This method was used by Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., and Charles D. Hadley in "Party Definition and Party Differentiation," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXVI (Spring, 1973), p. 23.

specific candidates in one election year (intra-election method);⁷⁰ or (3) recall of how the respondent generally voted in all elections in the past. If one takes, for example, the elections for President in 1968 and 1972 and asks a respondent how he voted in those elections to determine his partisanship in 1976, one is using the inter-election method. Behavioral Republicans would be comprised of all those who supported (by their vote) the Republican candidate in both 1968 and 1972; behavioral Democrats would be comprised of those respondents that voted Democratic in both elections. Behavioral Independents in this case would be those respondents who indicated that they voted Republican and then Democratic or vice versa in 1968 and 1972. The intra-election method would deal with only one election such as the 1968 election. The individual respondent would be asked to recall whom he voted for in respect to several offices such as for: President, Senator, Congressman or Governor. If one requires 100 percent consistency in party voting to determine partisans in the electorate, this method might be so strenuous as to exclude all but the most loyal as partisans. Does one say that three out of four consistent partisan votes determines whether or not an individual is a behavioral Democrat or Republican? Furthermore, what is a behavioral Independent? Is he one who votes consistently for one party except at the lower levels of the ballot? Or is an Independent one who votes equally for candidates of both parties? These kinds of questions are important because the measure of partisanship determines the nature of the partisan that results and the degree of the relationship of the particular behavioral

⁷⁰This method was noted by DeVries and Tarrance, p. 53.

measure to other variables. If the measure of partisanship is so demanding that only the most loyal are considered partisans, one may find that respondents are highly partisan in their predispositions and behaviors due mainly to the fact that one has narrowed the field down to the party's most intense followers. This would especially be the case if 1972 was used as a focal election in the measure, as there were large numbers of Democrats who deserted the party in the Presidential election of that year.⁷¹ Certainly, as studies have indicated, those that vote most often for their party's candidates tend to be the most intense in their beliefs about and orientations toward their party and its programs.⁷²

The third behavioral measure of partisanship is determined by asking the respondent if he usually supports his party's candidates when he votes or if he votes for candidates of different parties. Another variation of this method would be to ask the respondent that same question with respect to a certain office such as Governor or any other office. This is not as specific a measure of behavioral partisanship as the other measures that have been discussed, but it is certainly the easiest to measure.⁷³

With respect to all of the measures of behavioral partisanship, there is a problem of recall error. Generally studies have indicated that there is a "band wagon" effect that operates with respect to the

⁷¹This was especially true with reference to Oklahoma voters. See Table I, p. 39.

⁷²Campbell, et al., The American Voter, p. 46.

⁷³This method was also noted by DeVries and Tarrance, p. 53.

recall of voting choices. These studies have indicated that the winning candidate tends to get a higher percentage of recalled votes in successive post-election polls over time, over and above the actual election statistics.⁷⁴ This tends to cause one to question the reliability of the measures of behavioral partisanship, especially in reference to the inter-election or general recall method of determining behavioral partisanship.

Proponents of the behavioral method of measuring partisanship often do not cite findings in other studies that are comparable, especially this is true of the authors of The Ticket-Splitter. Only one study by Ladd and Hadley even attempts to relate behavioral partisanship to other variables.⁷⁵ None of the studies cite any body of theory in their analysis, though clearly the behavioral approach is close to the behaviorism of B. F. Skinner which focuses on purely stimulus-response relationships, and generally neglects the "organism's" psychological attributes.⁷⁶ These researchers, as with the Skinnerian analysis, tend not to be concerned with the "why" of voting nor do they offer any motivational or psychological explanations for consistent or inconsistent patterns of voting. Voters just tend to have a "habit" of voting Democratic or Republican is the only inference that can be drawn from their studies. What if the habit suddenly changes and the respondent begins to vote consistently for the other party? Behavioral partisanship cannot

⁷⁴William H. Flanigan and Nancy H. Zingale, Political Behavior of the American Electorate, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1975), p. 195.

⁷⁵Ladd and Hadley, p. 23.

⁷⁶B. F. Skinner, Verbal Behavior (New York, 1957).

discern why the change has occurred but merely that there was a change. This writer's position in this study is that any explanation of why a person votes the way he does would certainly have to ultimately rest with psychological variables.

Introduction to Attitude Theory

Most observers view partisanship as a psychological predisposition that influences an individual to respond to the same stimulus or group of related stimuli in a somewhat consistent manner.⁷⁷ As one views the different measures of partisanship, perhaps the most damning charge against the measures cited is that while partisanship is assumed to be some kind of "psychological predisposition" it has never been successfully integrated into contemporary psychological theory.⁷⁸ Therefore, it seems natural for an analyst to turn to contemporary attitude theory as a framework for evaluating the concepts purported to be measuring partisanship. The function of the last section of the literature review will be to give a brief overview of some of the basic assumptions in attitude theory. It is by no means an exhaustive review of the literature on attitude theory as that would be beyond the scope of this study.⁷⁹ The intent here is to give the reader a general background of

⁷⁷Campbell, et al., The American Voter, especially Chapter 2 on partisan choice. See also Coombs and Fishbein, pp. 2-3.

⁷⁸Sullivan, p. 238.

⁷⁹The following readings provide a good general overview of attitude theory: Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values (San Francisco, 1968). Charles A. Kiesler, Barry E. Collins, and Norman Miller, Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches (New York, 1969). Fred I. Greenstein, Personality and Politics (New York, 1969) contains an extensive bibliography on attitude studies.

knowledge about the subject as it relates to this study.

First, what is an attitude? Bem states that:

Attitudes are likes and dislikes. They are our affinities for, and our aversions to situations, objects, persons, groups, or any other identifiable aspects of our environment, including abstract ideas and social policies.⁸⁰

Rokeach defines an attitude as:

a relatively enduring organization of interrelated beliefs that describe, evaluate, and advocate action with respect to an object or situation, with each belief having cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Each belief is a predisposition which when suitably activated, results in some preferential response.⁸¹

The cognitive component of an attitude consists of "observations of fact or reality."⁸² Examples would be: oranges are round; the sun sets in the West. The affective component of an attitude refers to "personal evaluations--either wishes or preferences--which are integrated with our thought processes."⁸³ Key words that distinguish evaluative statements are: like-dislike, favor-oppose, should-should not, agree-disagree, approve-disapprove, good-bad and so forth. Affective statements would be: I like oranges; I dislike spinach; Exercise is something every one should do.

The third component of an attitude is the conative component. It is that part of an attitude that links that attitude to actual behavior. "Conation is not the same as behavior itself, but rather it is an eval-

⁸⁰Daryl J. Bem, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs (Belmont, 1970), p. 14.

⁸²Jarol B. Manheim, The Politics Within: A Primer in Political Attitudes and Behavior (Englewood, 1975), p. 15.

⁸³Ibid., p. 13.

uation of the potential consequences or the potential impact of the behavior."⁸⁴ An example would be:

Every woman should have a yearly cancer check. If a woman does get a check up, she might detect cancer in the early stages. If a woman does not get a check up, she might not detect cancer until it is in its later stages. Therefore, I will get a yearly check for cancer.

From this example, it is readily apparent that the evaluation of the consequences of a belief are related to the belief and also the behavior. While most attitude theorists agree that there are affective and cognitive components to attitudes, there is some disagreement as to what comprises the cognitive aspect of an attitude and it is seldom used in studies dealing with attitudes.⁸⁵ This discussion also will focus only on the affective and cognitive aspects of attitudes.

Attitude theorists generally recognize that attitudes are linked to objects and that attitudes are a function of the beliefs that one holds about an object.⁸⁶ There is also some evidence that individuals tend to be consistent in their beliefs about objects or related objects.⁸⁷ The following syllogism demonstrates the link between beliefs and attitudes;⁸⁸

⁸⁴Manheim, p. 23.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Martin Fishbein, "The Relationship Between Beliefs, Attitudes, and Behavior," in Cognitive Consistency: Motivational Antecedents and Behavioral Consequences, ed., by Shel Feldman (New York, 1966), pp. 200-223.

⁸⁷William J. McGuire, "The Current State of Cognitive Consistency Theories," Ibid., pp. 1-46.

⁸⁸The use of the syllogism to demonstrate the links between attitudes and beliefs was suggested by Bem. This discussion relies heavily on his approach. See especially Chapter 2 in his study.

"Spinach has a terrible taste. I dislike terrible tastes. Therefore, I dislike spinach."⁸⁹ The first premise is an evaluative belief (cognitive component), and the conclusion is an attitude statement (affective component), an individual's statement about one of his own likes and dislikes. The attitude toward the object, spinach, is related to the underlying beliefs the individual has about spinach.

There may be exceptions to this link between an evaluative belief and an attitude. For example, consider the following "non-syllogism": "Cigarettes taste terrible, cause cancer, make me cough and offend others. I dislike terrible tastes, cancer, coughing and offending others. But I still like cigarettes."⁹⁰ This situation could arise because the individual holds other evaluative beliefs which appear in other syllogisms (e.g., "Cigarettes relax me; I like being relaxed; therefore, I like cigarettes.")⁹¹ This writer will be the first to admit that the syllogistic approach to what goes on inside a person's head is rather crude and may not actually happen however the intent was to demonstrate that attitudes are based on the beliefs that one holds. In actuality there may be numerous beliefs that one may hold about any given object. The next question is: do beliefs and attitudes relate to overt behavior? The relationship of beliefs and attitudes to overt behavior is related to a number of underlying factors: (1) the salience of the attitude or attitude cluster, (2) the centrality of the attitude with respect to its position in a larger system of

⁸⁹Bem, p. 15.

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Ibid.

values, (3) the number of positive and negative beliefs a person holds about the attitude object and (4) the situation in which the behavior occurs.⁹²

"Salience refers to the intrinsic importance of a particular attitude or belief to the individual that holds it."⁹³ For instance, one may like the color red, but this whole matter of color may be insufficiently important to make one feel any deep commitment to his preference. One may however be very strong in his beliefs about whether his children are to be bussed across town to meet some formula for racial integration set down by a Federal judge which leads one to attach a high degree of personal significance to this belief. One would say that the attitude toward bussing is more salient than the attitude toward the color red in this case.

"Centrality refers to the importance attached to a particular attitude because of the position occupied by that attitude in a larger system of values....Presumably each of us has a set of values which we hold dear and which serve to govern an overall sense of the kinds of positive and negative feelings we associate with particular attitude objects."⁹⁴ One such value might be a favorable orientation towards democratic rule or the right to practice one's religion freely without hindrance from the State. These basic values tend to influence our perception of other attitudes and beliefs as well. These central values are very enduring and not amenable to change. They tend to lend

⁹²This discussion was modeled after the discussion of beliefs and attitudes in Mannheim, especially Chapter 2.

⁹³Ibid., p. 24.

⁹⁴Ibid.

stability to the psychological belief systems of the individual. Beliefs and attitudes that are not central to the individual may be altered or changed and not influence the basic beliefs that one holds.

The number of positive or negative beliefs that a person holds about an attitude object may also influence an individual's behavior in a given situation. If a person holds a number of positive beliefs about an attitude object, it is assumed that he has a positive attitude towards that object and would respond favorably to that object. Conversely, if a person holds a number of negative beliefs about an object, one would infer that he has a negative attitude towards the object, and would respond unfavorably to it. For example, if a person likes the color yellow, Chevrolet cars, and convertibles, one would expect that given a choice between a green Ford hardtop and an automobile that fits the former description, most observers would predict that he would choose the more favorable attitude object.

The situation could also tend to influence the relationship between attitudes and overt behavior. For example, if a person likes cherry pie and dislikes peach cobbler, one would expect that given a choice, he would choose the former pastry. However, if a situation arises in which a prize is given for eating the most peach cobbler, one might find this individual behaving contrary to his attitudes.

Since this analyst along with others take the position that partisanship is a psychological predisposition, and it has been shown that attitude theory fits very well into an analysis of psychological predispositions--it follows that the measure of partisanship which is closest to attitude theory should exhibit the greatest theoretical import.

As noted earlier in the discussion of the four measures, behavioral partisanship and party registration were devoid of any psychological content and did not relate directly to any body of theory. Party registration does not give any indication of affective or evaluative beliefs about the parties. One also cannot determine the strength of the attachment to the party from party registration. Behavioral partisanship, while indicating the strength of attachment, also is not a very descriptive concept. There is also no evaluative aspect to the concept.

Although party identification indicates the direction and strength of partisanship, it does not give any clues as to the evaluative beliefs about the Republican or Democratic parties. The second measure of partisanship used by SRC, partisan attitudes, certainly appeared to be a measure of psychological attitudes towards the parties. However, as noted by Coombs and Fishbein, partisan attitudes was an incomplete measure of party attitude as it did not include all of the responses that the respondent made about the two parties.⁹⁵ Further as they noted, SRC tended to use each of the six attitudinal dimensions as independent measures of attitudes towards the parties. If the attitude toward an object is "a function of all the beliefs about the object," then this approach is both theoretically and methodologically unsound.⁹⁶

If an attitude is the "sum of all the evaluative beliefs about an object,"⁹⁷ then the index of party image certainly is consistent with

⁹⁵Coombs and Fishbein, p. 7.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 5.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 10.

attitude theory as the index itself is formulated from all of the respondent's beliefs about the two political objects--the Republican and Democratic parties. Since it is also a multi-dimensionally constructed concept, it seems to be more descriptive than the other measures of partisanship which are uni-dimensionally constructed.

Propositions of the Study

Logically, one would expect a concept that is "best" in terms of theoretical and empirical import to also be highly predictive of other political predispositions and behavior. Therefore, the following propositions will be advanced:

- 1) Party image will relate to a higher degree to voting behavior than measures such as party registration, party identification and behavioral partisanship.
- 2) Party image will exhibit a greater descriptive utility than measures such as behavioral partisanship, party registration and party identification.
- 3) Party image will be more analytically useful in explaining devotional voting among the electorate than measures such as party identification, party registration and behavioral partisanship.

Methodology

In order to test the analytical and descriptive utility of these four measures, one must either design a survey incorporating these measures or conduct secondary analysis on existing survey data. Unfortunately, the best source of data, the Survey Research Center data, do not contain significant measures of party image or party registration.

However, surveys conducted by the Political Science Department of Oklahoma State University in 1972, do contain the needed measures.

Selection of Subjects

The survey consisted of 483 personal interviews which were conducted prior to the Oklahoma primary elections in 1972. The sample technically was a stratified, multistage probability sample (sampled according to size) of registered voters in Oklahoma. The survey was conducted under the supervision of Professor Thomas Kielhorn of Oklahoma State University. The interview schedule contained standard questions that were used to ascertain party identification, party image and behavioral partisanship of each of the respondents. In addition, the party registration of the respondent was independently collected from county election boards. There were also standard questions pertaining to candidate choice included in the questionnaire.

Variables in the Study

Party registration was recorded by the interviewer at the election board at the time the respondent was systematically chosen from county registration lists. At no time during the interview was the respondent aware that his actual party registration was known to the interviewer. Recall of registration was never employed. For this study, party registration was categorized as Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

Behavioral partisanship was determined by asking the respondent how he had usually voted in past elections for Governor and President.⁹⁸

⁹⁸See Appendix A.

Those respondents who recalled that they always voted Republican or Democratic were categorized as behavioral Republicans and behavioral Democrats, respectively. Those respondents who indicated that they mostly voted for Republicans or mostly voted for Democrats were categorized as weak behavioral Republicans and weak behavioral Democrats, respectively. Those respondents who indicated that they voted half and half for candidates of both parties were categorized as behavioral Independents. Respondents who refused to answer or were first time voters were excluded from the analysis in this case. In all fairness, it is admitted that the measure of behavioral partisanship is not a perfect one; it is clearly tautological. However, since intra-election recall of voting in previous elections, or recalled voting in two previous election periods were unavailable, this analyst was forced by the circumstances to choose this method of measuring behavioral partisanship. As noted earlier, all behavioral measures of partisanship are questionable due to recall error in reporting of the vote and this measure is no exception. It is assumed that this measure of behavioral partisanship is as good as any of the many others that could have been used and is satisfactory for the purpose of this study.

Party identification was determined for this study by the respondents self-classification as a Democrat, Independent, or Republican. The respondent was further asked to classify the strength of the attachment. The questions that were asked were the standard ones employed by the SRC for two decades.⁹⁹ Respondents were then categorized in this study as strong Democrats, weak Democrats, Independents,

⁹⁹See Appendix B.

weak Republicans, and strong Republicans.

Conceptually, party image is viewed as a summation of the respondents evaluative beliefs about the parties. To measure party image however structured questions were utilized. This approach results from the unavailability of coded open-ended items. Another reason for using structured items is that open-ended responses may be influenced by: (1) the respondent's level of education, (2) the experience of the interviewer in probing for additional responses, and (3) the fatigue of answering the many questions that appear on voting surveys of this nature.¹⁰⁰ The method chosen for this survey may also be open to a number of criticisms. One of which is that the full universe of beliefs about the parties is not considered. While this may be true, the survey contained a relatively representative sample of belief statements that appeared in the general coding categories of both SRC and the Matthews and Prothro studies. Another problem with structured questions is the possibility of response set. In other words a person may, due to his personality, develop a pattern of "like" responses to the questions. However, one of the evaluative statements (War item) was written in reverse order, and due to the fact that none of the respondents responded with all "Republican party" or "Democratic party" it is not felt that response set was a problem. Another criticism of structured questions such as those used in this study, is that the belief statement may not really be "salient" to the individual, but was merely a result of the question put to the respondent. Some of the respondents chose "neither party" as a category of response, so it is

¹⁰⁰Coomb's and Fishbein mention this also, p. 12.

felt that the beliefs were salient to the individual respondents and were not created by the particular questions put to the respondents.

For the purposes of this study, party image was measured by counting the favorable and unfavorable responses to 11 belief statements that appeared in the interview schedule.¹⁰¹ There were actually 13 belief statements in all but two of the items were written in such a manner that the partisan direction of the response could be determined but one could not from the response ascertain whether it was a positive or negative evaluation of the party. Therefore these items were excluded from the index. Pro-Democratic and anti-Republican responses were scored as +1 and pro-Republican and anti-Democratic responses were scored as -1. By adding these scores together, a "net party image score" was determined. Conceivably, the scores could range from +11 (most favorable Democratic attitude) to -11 (most favorable Republican attitude).¹⁰² Accordingly, the respondents were categorized as strongly pro-Democratic (ranging from +8 to +11), moderately pro-Democratic (ranging from +5 to +7), weakly pro-Democratic (ranging from +2 to +4), neutral (ranging from +1 to -1), weakly pro-Republican (ranging from -2 to -4), moderately pro-Republican (ranging from -5 to -7) and strongly pro-Republican (ranging from -8 to -11).

Voting choice in this study was determined by asking the respondent to recall whom he voted for in the Presidential election of 1968 in which the candidates were: Richard Nixon (Republican), Hubert

¹⁰¹See Appendix C.

¹⁰²Matthews and Prothro calculated party image in the same manner.

Humphrey (Democrat) and George Wallace (American Independent Party).¹⁰³

The respondent was also asked to recall his vote in the 1970 Oklahoma gubernatorial election in which the following candidates were running: David Hall (Democrat) and Dewey Bartlett (Republican).¹⁰⁴

Since the survey was conducted before the Oklahoma party primaries or nominating conventions, it was not clear at that time which candidate was to emerge as the party's standard bearer in the 1972 Senatorial and Presidential races. The intent of the design of the questions at that time was to get an indication of who was the strongest in the field of candidates. Therefore, at that time the respondent was asked to state who was his voting choice at that point in several three way election heats for President and several two way election heats for Senator.¹⁰⁵ For the analysis, this researcher used the respondent's voting choices in those trial heats that included the candidates that were entered in the general elections in the Fall of 1972. For the 1972 Oklahoma Senatorial election, the trial heat used was between: Dewey Bartlett (Republican) and Ed Edmondson (Democrat). For the 1972 Presidential election the trial heat used was between: George McGovern (Democrat) Richard Nixon (Republican) and George Wallace (American Independent Party). Wallace voters at that time were asked to make a further choice between McGovern and Nixon. In accordance with their response, they were then categorized as Republican voters or Democratic voters in the analysis. Wallace voters who refused to make a choice

¹⁰³See Appindix D.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

between Nixon and McGovern were excluded from the analysis as were those respondents who were undecided or refused to answer (The latter was the case in all of the elections used).

One would expect that there would be a larger number of undecided voters in the electorate prior to the primaries or state conventions however the survey percentages did not differ significantly from actual Oklahoma election statistics, as Table I indicates.¹⁰⁶

TABLE I
A COMPARISON OF SAMPLE RESULTS AND ACTUAL
ELECTION STATISTICS FOR VARIOUS
OKLAHOMA ELECTIONS
(in percentages)

Office	Election Statistics			Survey Results		
	Rep.	Dem.	AIP.	Rep.	Dem.	AIP.
1972 Presidential	75.4	24.6	----	78.0	22.0	----
1972 Senatorial	51.9	48.1	----	48.0	52.0	----
1970 Gubernatorial	49.8	50.2	----	54.8	45.2	----
1968 Presidential	47.7	32.0	20.3	58.3	28.4	13.3

¹⁰⁶The election statistics came from the staff of the State Election Board, Directory of Oklahoma 1975 (Oklahoma City, 1975), pp. 503-506.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

As a means to analyze the data, statistical measures used frequently in the social sciences were utilized. Also simple percentage differences were used to describe the relationships between the variables in the data. To assess the relationship between party registration, party identification, party image, behavioral partisanship and the voting choice, a Gamma correlation was used. This method gauges the degree of association between two variables, each arranged in a definite order. Gamma or "G", varies from zero, when there is no relationship, to 1.0 when the two factors are completely associated. A positive valence indicates a direct relationship between variables and a negative valence indicates an inverse relationship between variables. In the social sciences, a $\pm .50$ correlation is considered a strong association.¹⁰⁷ In each tabular presentation, percentages and cell sizes will be reported to help the reader analyze the data. For testing the significance of the relationship, the value of the test required to reject the null hypothesis (that there is not a "real" correlation between the variables) was assigned the .05 level however the probability levels of all of the results were cited in the findings.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II of this study will correlate party registration, party image, party identification and behavioral partisanship to the vote in selected election contests in 1968, 1970 and 1972 with respect to

¹⁰⁷The source for Gamma was William L. Hays, Statistics (New York, 1963), pp. 655-656.

Oklahoma voters. This approach was used to evaluate the empirical utility of each of the four different measures of partisanship. In keeping with the first proposition, it is expected that party image will be the most predictive of the voting choice in each of the elections.

Chapter III of this study will examine the present partisanship of Oklahomans as measured by party image, party registration, party identification and behavioral partisanship to demonstrate the descriptive and analytical utility of each of the measures of partisanship. It is felt that party image will be more descriptive and analytically useful than the other three measures of partisanship in explaining deviatonal voting among Oklahomans.

CHAPTER II

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP

In Chapter I of this study, the following question was proposed: what is partisanship and what is the best measure of partisanship? It was noted that at this time there is not a consensus among voting behavior scholars as to what partisanship is. It was further pointed out that there are presently four measures of partisanship used in the literature: party registration, party identification, party image and behavioral partisanship.

As the development of partisanship was traced, it was noted that most observers consider partisanship to be a "psychological predisposition." The analysis of the different concepts seemed to indicate that party image was the most psychologically oriented of all of the measures of partisanship. It was proposed that the best measure of partisanship would be that measure which exhibited empirical import and which was based on sound theory. An evaluation of the different concepts indicated all of the measures exhibited empirical import, although none of the researchers consciously linked their particular concept to any body of theory. Conceptually, party image seemed to have both empirical import and a strong basis in psychological theory. Therefore, it was proposed that it was conceptually and theoretically the best measure of partisanship. One would expect that that concept which was

conceptually and theoretically superior to also be the most predictive in relation to voting behavior. This proposition was tested in this study by correlating each of the measures of partisanship with the vote for a probability sample of registered Oklahoma voters for the Presidential election of 1968, the Gubernatorial election of 1970 and the Senatorial and Presidential elections of 1972.

The First Test of the Hypothesis:

The 1968 Presidential Election

In the 1968 Presidential election, Oklahoma Republicans, using any measure of partisanship, were the most loyal to their party as the percentages in Table II indicate. Behavioral Republicans were the most loyal (87.2 percent), followed by party image Republicans (82.5 percent), registered Republicans (82.1 percent) and party ID Republicans (71.3 percent).¹

Oklahoma Independents were also leaning heavily toward the Republican candidate (Richard Nixon) in 1968. Self-identified Independents gave the greatest percentage of votes to the Republican candidate (83.9 percent), followed by party image neutral respondents (81.6 percent) and behavioral Independents (76.5 percent). There were too few registered Independents in the survey to make an assessment of the relationship between party registration and the vote.²

¹The Republican vote was determined by subtracting the Wallace vote in each case from the "Non-Democratic" vote. The Wallace percentages were as follows: registered Republicans (15.5 percent), behavioral Republicans (9.4 percent), self-identified Republicans (17 percent) and party image Republicans (16.1 percent).

²The Wallace vote for behavioral, self-identified, and neutral Independents was 12.9, 11.8 and 9.2 percent, respectively.

TABLE II

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP
AND RECALLED PRESIDENTIAL VOTING BEHAVIOR OF
OKLAHOMANS IN 1968 (in percentages)

<u>Party Registration</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	33.8	(0)	2.4
Non-Democratic	66.2	(8)	97.6
Difference	-32.4	---	-95.2
(N)	(269)	(8)	(84) (361)
<u>Behavioral Partisanship (Presidential)</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	51.9	10.6	3.4
Non-Democratic	48.1	89.4	96.6
Difference	3.8	-78.8	-93.2
(N)	(185)	(85)	(116) (386)
<u>Party Identification</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	46.4	4.3	11.7
Non-Democratic	53.6	95.7	88.3
Difference	-7.2	-91.4	-76.6
(N)	(211)	(93)	(94) (398)
<u>Party Image</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	51.7	10.2	1.4
Non-Democratic	48.3	90.8	98.6
Difference	3.4	-80.6	-97.2
(N)	(201)	(65)	(143) (409)

For the relationship between the vote and the measures of partisanship, the following Gamma values were indicated: Party identification (.80); Party registration (.86); Party image (.87); and Behavioral partisanship (.88). All associations were statistically significant at greater than the .001 level.

Democrats (by any measure) deviated to the Republican or American Independent Party candidate (George Wallace) as the percentages indicate. The greatest deviation was among registered Democrats as 66.2 percent voted for other than the Democratic candidate. In terms of loyalty, behavioral Democrats were the most loyal to the party with 51.9 percent voting Democratic, next was party image Democrats with 51.7 percent and self-identified Democrats who voted 46.4 percent for the Democratic candidate.³

All of the measures of partisanship were highly related to the recalled vote as indicated by the Gamma correlations. Behavioral partisanship exhibited the greatest correlation (.88) followed by party image (.87), party registration (.86) and party identification (.80). The relationship between the measures of partisanship and the vote in 1968 was also highly statistically significant, as all of the values were greater than .001. This indicates that the probability that one would get these same values by chance is only 1 in 1000.

The Second Test of the Hypothesis:

The 1970 Gubernatorial Election

In the Gubernatorial election of 1970, the candidates were Dewey Bartlett (Republican) and David Hall (Democrat). Due to the fact that in this election there was no third party candidate, the relative predictive relation to voting choice of the measures can be assessed by viewing the percentage differences in each case. A positive difference

³The Wallace vote for behavioral Democrats, self-identified Democrats, registered Democrats and party image Democrats was: 15.7, 12.3, 12.6 and 15.9 percent respectively.

indicates a Democratic surplus and a negative difference indicates a Republican surplus in 1970 (Table III). It is evident from the percentages that Democrats were voting Democratic to a higher degree in 1970 than compared to 1968 (Table II). The greatest number of Democratic votes were exhibited by party image Democrats (net difference was 46.8 percent). This was followed by behavioral Democrats (net 39.4 percent), self-identified Democrats (32.7 percent) and registered Democrats (net of 8.2).

The most predictive measure for Republicans was for behavioral partisanship (net difference -87.0), followed by party image (net of -82.2), party registration (net of -70.6) and last, party identification (net of -45.6).

Oklahoma Independents were also heavily Republican in their voting as net differences indicate. The greatest Republican net differences were from self-identified Independents (-72.0), followed by party image Neutrals (-43.8) and behavioral Independents (-37.4).

One might add that rather than a "band wagon" effect that usually favors the winning candidate in post-election polls, the data indicated a negative effect. While David Hall the Democrat actually won the election in 1970, the 1972 survey indicated that David Hall lost the election according to the recall of the vote in 1972.⁴ This is possibly due to the unfavorable perception of the candidate by the Oklahoma electorate in general which was indicated by the survey.⁵ This also

⁴See Table I, p. 39.

⁵Among self-identified Democrats, Republicans and Independents, the disapproval of Hall's job performance was 54.6, 76.3 and 70.1 percent, respectively.

TABLE III
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP
 AND RECALLED GUBERNATORIAL VOTING BEHAVIOR OF
 OKLAHOMANS IN 1970 (in percentages)

<u>Party Registration</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	54.1	(1)	14.7
Republican	45.9	(6)	85.3
Difference	8.2	---	-70.6
(N)	(244)	(7)	(75)
<u>Behavioral Partisanship (Gubernatorial)</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	69.7	31.3	6.5
Republican	30.3	68.7	93.5
Difference	39.4	-37.4	-87.0
(N)	(178)	(80)	(92) (350)
<u>Party Identification</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	66.3	14.0	27.2
Republican	33.7	86.0	72.8
Difference	32.7	-72.0	-45.6
(N)	(196)	(86)	(81) (363)
<u>Party Image</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	73.4	28.1	8.9
Republican	26.6	71.9	91.1
Difference	46.8	-43.8	-82.2
(N)	(188)	(57)	(124) (369)

For the relationship between the vote and the measures of partisanship, the following Gamma values were indicated: Party registration (.70); Party identification (.73); Party image (.77); and Behavioral partisanship (.81). All associations were statistically significant at greater than the .001 level.

tends to bear out one of the weaknesses of using a general recall question to determine partisanship.

The Gamma correlations found in Table III indicated that behavioral partisanship was highly related to voting choice in 1970, followed by party image, party identification and party registration. The Gamma values were .81, .77, .73 and .70 respectively. All of the relationships in the table were also statistically significant at the .001 level or greater.

The Third Test of the Hypothesis:

The 1972 Senatorial Election

In comparison to the 1968 election (Table II) and the 1970 election for Governor (Table III), the 1972 percentages in Table IV indicated that there were a greater number of Republicans voting for the Democratic candidate than for the two previous elections. Furthermore, a larger percentage of Democrats were staying with their party. The greatest Republican deviations were among registered Republicans (25.3 percent). About the same number of party image Republicans (25.2 percent) as self-identified Republicans (24 percent) deviated from their party's candidate. The least deviation occurred among behavioral Republicans (19.3 percent).

Among Democrats the most loyal were behavioral Democrats who voted 74.6 percent with the party; this was followed by party image Democrats who were 73.7 percent loyal. Party identification Democrats voted about 70.8 percent Democratic, and registered Democrats were the least loyal with only 61.6 percent voting with the party.

Independents tended to vote Republican as the percentages

TABLE IV
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP AND
SENATORIAL VOTING CHOICE OF OKLAHOMANS
IN 1972 (in percentages)

<u>Party Registration</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	61.6	(3)	25.3
Republican	38.4	(7)	74.7
Difference	23.3	(7)	-49.4
(N)	(281)	(10)	(95) (386)
<u>Behavioral Partisanship (Gubernatorial)</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	74.6	44.0	19.3
Republican	25.4	56.0	80.7
Difference	49.2	-12.0	-16.4
(N)	(197)	(84)	(119) (400)
<u>Party Identification</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	70.8	38.8	24.0
Republican	29.2	61.2	76.0
Difference	41.6	-22.4	-52.0
(N)	(226)	(103)	(104) (433)
<u>Party Image</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	73.7	34.8	25.2
Republican	26.3	65.2	74.8
Difference	47.4	-30.4	-49.6
(N)	(228)	(66)	(147) (441)

For the relationship between the vote and the measures of partisanship, the following Gamma values were indicated: Party image (.60); Party identification (.62); Party registration (.63); and Behavioral partisanship (.67). All associations were statistically significant at greater than the .001 level.

show, although the Republican voting was not as great as in 1968 and 1970. The highest percentage voting Republican among Independents were party image neutrals (65.2 percent), followed by self-identified Independents (61.2 percent) and behavioral Independents (56 percent).

The Gamma values in this case indicated that behavioral partisanship was highly associated to voting choice as noted by the .67 value. Gamma coefficients for party registration, party identification and party image were .63, .62 and .60 respectively. All of the measures of partisanship were statistically significant in their relation to the voting choice at the .001 level or greater.

The Fourth Test of the Hypothesis:

The 1972 Presidential Election

Table V portrays the voting preferences of Oklahomans for President prior to the 1972 party conventions. While 17 percent of the sample favored George Wallace in the Spring of 1972, the Wallace voters were asked to make a second choice for President. The Wallace vote was accordingly allocated to Richard Nixon (Republican) and George McGovern (Democrat) on the basis of the respondent's own choice.

George McGovern was not a very popular candidate using any of the measures of partisanship, to say the least. In comparison to Senatorial voting in 1972 (Table IV) and the results of the preferences for McGovern in the Spring, it was apparent that ticket-splitting among Democrats would be the order of the day in the Fall general election. Using any measure of partisanship, there was a surplus of votes for Richard Nixon, the Republican candidate. The most loyal of the party were the party image Democrats (40 percent voted Democratic), followed

TABLE V
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP
 AND PRESIDENTIAL VOTING CHOICE OF OKLAHOMANS
 IN 1972 (in percentages)

<u>Party Registration</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	21.1	(1)	5.1
Republican	78.9	(8)	94.9
Difference	-57.8	---	-89.9
(N)	(298)	(9)	(98) (405)
<u>Behavioral Partisanship (Presidential)</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	32.9	9.0	4.0
Republican	67.1	91.0	96.0
Difference	-34.2	-82.0	-92.0
(N)	(170)	(89)	(124) (383)
<u>Party Identification</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Independent</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	28.5	10.3	3.7
Republican	71.5	89.7	96.3
Difference	-43.0	-79.4	-92.6
(N)	(228)	(117)	(107) (452)
<u>Party Image</u>			
<u>Vote</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Republican</u>
Democratic	40.0	6.8	2.7
Republican	60.0	93.2	97.3
Difference	-20.0	-86.4	-94.6
(N)	(225)	(74)	(150) (449)

For the relationship between the vote and the measures of partisanship, the following Gamma values were indicated: Party identification (.65); Party registration (.69), Behavioral partisanship (.70); and Party image (.74). All associations were statistically significant at greater than the .001 level.

by behavioral Democrats (32.9 percent voting Democratic), self-identified Democrats (28.5 percent Democratic) and registered Democrats (with a 21.1 percent Democratic vote).

The Republicans, following earlier trends, were quite loyal in the voting. The Republican vote was as follows: party image (97.3 percent), party identification (96.3 percent), behavioral partisanship (96 percent) and party registration (94.9 percent).

Among Independents, one can see a very lopsided Republican vote almost as heavy as among Republicans. Most Republican votes emanated from party image neutrals (93.2 percent), then behavioral Independents (91.0 percent) and last party identification Independents (89.7 percent).

The Gamma values for the 1972 Presidential data show that the strongest association to the vote was for party image (.74), followed by behavioral partisanship (.70), party registration (.69) and party identification (.65). The statistical relationship between the measures of partisanship and voting choice was again equal to or greater than .001 indicating that there was a significant association between the measures of partisanship and voting choice in 1972.

Table VI is a summary of the Gamma values for each of the elections that were analyzed in Chapter II. The initial proposition was that party image would be the best predictor of the vote due to its theoretical and empirical import. The Gamma correlations, and the discussions in the Chapter indicated that this was not the case. Party image was most predictive of the vote in only one election, the 1972 Presidential election and even then the differences in the Gamma correlations are not that great. Behavioral partisanship seemed to be the most predictive of the measures of partisanship (in three out of four

elections). Party image was (in three out of four elections) more predictive than party registration or party identification although the Gamma correlations were not significantly different.

TABLE VI
SUMMARY TABLE OF MEASURES
OF ASSOCIATION

Measure	Election			
	1968 Pres.	1970 Gov.	1972 Sen.	1972 Pres.
Party identification	.80 (4)*	.73 (3)	.62 (3)	.65 (4)
Behavioral partisanship	.88 (1)	.81 (1)	.67 (1)	.70 (2)
Party image	.87 (2)	.77 (2)	.60 (4)	.74 (1)
Party registration	.86 (3)	.70 (4)	.63 (2)	.69 (3)

*The numbers in parentheses indicate the rank order of Gamma association for the relationship between the measure and the vote for the respective election.

The data tended to indicate that Republicans were more loyal to their party's candidates than were the Democrats (using any measure). Also Independents as a group tended to vote Republican more often than not. All of the measures of partisanship were related to the vote and the relationships were all statistically significant at the .001 level or greater.

Next in Chapter III, the descriptive utility of each of the

measures of partisanship will be demonstrated in reference to the Oklahoma electorate to further determine: "What is the best measure of partisanship?"

CHAPTER III

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP

The predictive capabilities of the four measures of partisanship were evaluated in Chapter II. The analysis indicated that all of the measures had some predictive capabilities. Behavioral partisanship was the most predictive, followed closely by party image. Party identification was less predictive and party registration was the least satisfactory of the four measures of partisanship. All of the measures also contained some germ of conceptual relevance. In reference to psychological theory, of the four measures, party image was closest to attitude theory.

Concepts should not only be useful analytically; they should also be descriptively useful as well. Therefore, this section of the study will evaluate the descriptive utility of the various measures of partisanship in reference to describing the Oklahoma electorate. Due to the nature of party image, one would expect that it would be more descriptive and analytically useful in explaining why voters deviate from their party than measures such as party registration, party identification or behavioral partisanship.

The first analysis will be on the macro-level. Just what is the makeup of the Oklahoma electorate in terms of Republicans, Independents and Democrats? Just how descriptive are the different measures?

Party Registration

What can one say about an electorate or voter on the basis of party registration? Table VII indicates that in terms of party registration, 74.2 percent of the Oklahoma electorate is legally defined as Democratic, 2.4 percent as Independent and 23.4 percent as Republican. Party registration gives one no idea of the voter's views or beliefs about the parties or the strength of attachment to the parties. Clearly, party registration is lacking in descriptive import.

Behavioral Partisanship

Behavioral partisanship comes in two flavors, gubernatorial and Presidential. What can one say about the Oklahoma electorate in terms of behavioral partisanship? There seems to be more consistency in party voting among behavioral Democrats (18.6 percent) than among behavioral Republicans (9.2 percent) in reference to gubernatorial voting. The same is true for presidential behavioral Democrats (16.5 percent) and behavioral Republicans (9.2 percent). Unlike party registration, which does not indicate the strength of partisanship, behavioral partisanship (both types) does indicate a type of strength in terms of consistency in voting. However, as noted earlier, there is a problem of recall so the measures of behavioral partisanship may be somewhat in error. By using the presidential behavioral method, the Oklahoma electorate was 49.5 percent Democratic, 21.7 percent Independent and 28.8 percent Republican. By the gubernatorial method the electorate was 49.7 percent Democratic, 24.9 percent Independent and 25.2 percent Republican. One can see that in comparison to party registration, Independents have increased approximately 10 fold and

TABLE VII
 PARTISANSHIP OF OKLAHOMANS USING FOUR
 MEASURES OF PARTISANSHIP
 (in percentages)

Category	Measure of Partisanship				
	Party Registration	Behavioral Partisanship Gubernatorial	Presidential	Party Identification	Party Image
Strong Democrat	----	18.6	16.5	22.3	10.6
Moderate Democrat	(74.2%)	---- (49.7%)	---- (49.5%)	---- (53.0%)	21.3 (51.6%)
Weak Democrat	----	31.1	33.0	30.7	19.7
Independent (Neutral)	(2.4%)	24.9 (24.9%)	21.7 (21.7%)	25.2 (25.2%)	16.6 (16.6%)
Weak Republican	----	16.0	19.6	13.7	18.4
Moderate Republican	(23.4%)	---- (25.2%)	---- (28.8%)	---- (21.9%)	10.8 (31.9%)
Strong Republican	----	9.2	9.2	8.2	2.7
Total (%)	100%	99.8%*	100%	100.1%*	100.1%*
Total (N)	(423)	(424)	(425)	(476)	(483)

*The percentages do not equal 100 per cent due to the rounding errors.

Democrats are cut nearly in half. Behavioral partisanship does not indicate what a person's beliefs about the party are and does not give any indication as to why the individual votes consistently or inconsistently for one party or the other. From a descriptive standpoint, behavioral partisanship is not very satisfactory.

Party Identification

On the basis of party identification, one can determine both the direction and the strength of partisanship. However, one cannot, from the measure, determine why the person identifies with the party. By this measure, Oklahoma Independents numbered about 25.2 percent (greater than by any other measure). Democrats now make up about 53 percent of the Oklahoma electorate and Republicans about 21.9 percent by this method. As with the measures discussed earlier, party identification is not a very descriptive measure of partisanship.

Party Image

In viewing party image, it was clear that there were a larger number of Republicans in the Oklahoma electorate (31.9 percent) than there were by partisanship as measured by party registration, behavioral partisanship or party identification. There were fewer Neutral (Independent) respondents (16.6 percent) using this measure. One can also see that a large number of Oklahomans (51.6 percent) were Democratic by this method. Drawing from the analysis of the voting behavior of Oklahomans in Chapter II, it was demonstrated that Independents tended to vote heavily for the Republican candidates. Weak Democrats also tended to be swayed by strong, appealing Republican candidates. This

may indicate that there may be a larger Republican voting base in Oklahoma than is suggested by party image alone. Assuming no one defected among strong to mild Democrats, weak party image Democrats, Neutral respondents and party image Republicans make up a large majority (68.2 percent) of the Oklahoma electorate. This may explain, in part, the successes of the Republicans at the higher levels of the ballot in recent years in Oklahoma.

While the other concepts of partisanship were lacking in descriptive import, party image seemed potentially to be descriptively useful. Since it is determined from the sum of beliefs about the parties, one can approach the question of deviational voting and descriptive analysis with 13 different belief dimensions. In the following analysis, these items were used to describe the Oklahoma electorate at the micro-level as well. One can, using party image, address the following questions with respect to the Oklahoma electorate: How do registered, self-identified and behavioral partisans differ in respect to their beliefs about the parties? Which beliefs are most prominent in the Oklahoma electorate and how does the Oklahoma electorate (in the aggregate) view the parties? Furthermore, which beliefs contributed the most to the voting strengths of the candidates in the elections surveyed earlier in this study?

First, how does the Oklahoma electorate view the two political parties? Table VIII shows the beliefs of all Oklahomans toward the Republican and Democratic parties. The net scores on the extreme right of the table were determined by subtracting the percentage favoring the Republican party on each of the belief items from the percentage favoring the Democratic party on each of the items. A minus net indicates

a percentage difference favorable to the Republican party; a positive net indicates a percentage difference favorable to the Democratic party. On one item (the war item) the question was worded so that a Democratic response was actually a negative evaluation of the party and it was labeled with a minus (indicating a pro-Republican net). The net percentages favored the Republican party on seven of the belief items: manages government (-1), foreign affairs (-21), states rights (-8) law enforcement (-17), businessman (+33), conservative (+43) and war (-30).

The Democratic net differences were on those six items dealing with prosperity (+34), integration (+21), common man (+44), poor, sick and elderly (+40), leaders (+4) and farmers (+33). Two of the items (businessman and conservative) were written in such a manner that one could determine the direction of the beliefs of the individual, but not the evaluative context of the responses (i.e. whether the response was a positive or negative evaluation of the party). Therefore, both of these items were preceded by a plus and minus sign.

One can see from Table VIII that Oklahomans hold many of the beliefs about the parties that studies have indicated were modal beliefs held by most of the American electorate. Traditionally, since the Roosevelt era and the Depression, the Democratic party has always been perceived as the party of prosperity, as better for the common man, as more likely to aid the poor, sick and elderly and as better for the farmer.¹ The Oklahoma electorate was similar in these respects.

¹Angus Campbell, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes, The American Voter (New York, 1960), p. 19. Also see Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, "The Concept of Party Image and Its Importance for the Southern Electorate," in M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler, eds., The Electoral Process (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 162 and 164.

TABLE VIII
 PARTY IMAGES OF OKLAHOMANS
 (in percentages)

Belief Dimension	Favors:	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)
Best manages <u>government</u>		-30	31	-1
Gives us jobs, <u>prosperity</u>		53	19	+34
Best handles <u>foreign affairs</u>		20	41	-21
Get us into <u>war</u>		41	11	-30
Speeds integration		39	18	+21
Protects <u>states rights</u>		22	30	-8
Good for <u>common man</u>		58	14	+44
Aids <u>poor, sick, elderly</u>		52	12	+40
Gives strict <u>law</u> enforcement		17	34	-17
Best <u>leaders</u>		33	29	+4
Best for <u>farmers</u>		48	15	+33
Best for <u>businessman</u>		20	53	+33
Most <u>conservative</u>		16	59	+43
N=483				

National surveys have also indicated that the Republican party is usually perceived as the best managers of government, as better at handling foreign affairs and as more conservative.² The beliefs of the Oklahoma electorate tended to be somewhat consistent with this.

²Ibid.

In the previous discussion, the beliefs of the total Oklahoma electorate with reference to the two parties were examined. Next the study will investigate the relationship between the measures of partisanship and the beliefs themselves. This should give some insight into why Republicans have been so successful in recent Oklahoma elections and why Democrats have been less than loyal to their party.

Table IX shows the beliefs of registered, behavioral, and self-identified Democrats towards the Republican and Democratic parties. Among registered Democrats there was a surplus that was favorable to the Democratic party on nine items: manage government (+16), prosperity (+52), war (+12), integration (+22), states rights (+3), common man (+55), poor, sick and elderly (+50), leaders (+19) and farmer (+42). The items favorable to the Republican party were on foreign affairs (-12), law enforcement (-9), businessman (+28) and conservative (+34). One peculiar item was that a surplus of registered Democrats thought that the Republicans were more likely to get us into war. This is contrary to the beliefs of most Oklahomans (by any measure).

Among self-identified Democrats, one can see that on three items the nets were favorable to the Republican party: that the Democrats are more likely to get us into war, that the Republicans are more conservative and are better for the businessman. The net differences were -16, +25 and +29, respectively. Those items favorable to the Democrats were: manage government (+36), prosperity (+68), foreign affairs (+4), integration (+21), states rights (+12), common man (+72), poor, sick and elderly (+64), law enforcement (+1), leaders (+37) and farmer (+54). One can see that the percentage differences tended to be larger on the belief dimensions among self-identified Democrats than

TABLE IX

PARTY IMAGES OF REGISTERED, BEHAVIORAL
AND SELF-IDENTIFIED DEMOCRATS ONLY
(in percentages)

Beliefs Favorable to:	Registered Democrat			Party ID Democrat			Behavioral Democrat		
	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)
Manage government	39	23	+16	48	12	+36	53	11	+42
Prosperity	63	11	+52	74	6	+68	77	5	+72
Foreign affairs	24	36	-12	33	29	+4	33	25	+8
War	24	36	+12	32	16	-16	31	17	-14
Integration	41	19	+22	40	19	+21	38	23	+15
States rights	28	25	+3	33	21	+12	35	20	+15
Common man	66	11	+55	77	5	+72	81	6	+75
Poor, sick, elderly	59	9	+50	70	6	+64	67	6	+61
Law enforcement	20	29	-9	26	25	+1	26	21	+5
Leaders	41	22	+19	50	13	+37	54	11	+43
Farmer	54	12	+42	61	7	+54	67	6	+61
Businessman	24	52	+28	27	52	+25	27	5	+22
Conservative	20	54	+34	23	52	+29	27	50	+23
	(N=314)			(N=250)			(N=212)		

among registered Democrats with respect to favorable beliefs about the Democratic party.

Among presidential, behavioral Democrats, one can see that there tended to be more beliefs favorable to the Democratic party than among other Democrats (self-identified and registered). There were three net differences favorable to the Republican party among behavioral Democrats on the items dealing with war (-14), conservative (+ 23), and businessman (+28). Net differences favorable to the Democratic party were on the following items: manage government, prosperity, foreign affairs, integration, states rights, common man, poor, sick and elderly, law enforcement, leaders and farmer. (The net differences were +42, +72, +8, +15, +15, +75, +61, +5, +43 and +61, respectively.)

In most cases, the net deviations favorable to the Democratic party (among behavioral Democrats) were larger than for the other measures and the net differences favorable to the Republican party were smaller than among the other measures. The fact that those respondents who tend to support the party's candidates tend also to be more intense in their beliefs about their party, is born out in Table IX. While some of the net differences tended to be strong among self-identified Democrats, they tended to be less intense as a group in their beliefs about their party. The net differences among registered Democrats also tend to shed some light on why party registration was not very predictive of the vote for Democrats.

Table X tends to indicate that Independents were somewhat mixed in their beliefs about the parties. Behavioral Independents (presidential) were favorable to the Republican party, as indicated by net differences, on 8 out of 13 of the belief items. The only items that showed a net difference favorable to the Democratic party was that the Democratic

TABLE X
 PARTY IMAGES OF BEHAVIORAL AND SELF-IDENTIFIED
INDEPENDENTS ONLY (in percentages)

Belief Dimension	Favors:	Measure of Partisanship					
		Behavioral * Independents			Party ID Independents		
		Dem.	Rep.	(Net)	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)
Manages government		19	38	-19	17	40	-23
Prosperity		44	24	+20	41	20	+21
Foreign affairs		16	43	-27	8	42	-34
War		45	5	-40	48	6	-42
Integration		40	15	+25	37	18	+19
States rights		15	32	-17	15	36	-21
Common man		46	19	+27	48	15	+33
Poor, sick, elderly		44	14	+30	44	11	+33
Law enforcement		14	44	-30	10	41	-31
Leaders		21	31	-10	18	35	-17
Farmers		34	19	+15	43	15	+28
Businessman		19	46	+27	14	55	+41
Conservative		7	63	+56	9	64	+55
				(N=96)			(N=118)

* Behavioral partisanship in this case refers to those respondents who indicated that they voted equally for Presidential candidates of both parties.

party: gives us prosperity (+20), speeds integration (+25), is good to the common man (+27), aids the poor, sick and elderly (+36) and is better for the farmers (+15). Eight items were favorable to the Republican party as indicated by the nets. The items were on managing the government (-19), foreign affairs (-27), war (-40), states rights (-17), law enforcement (-30), leaders (-10), businessman (+27) and conservative (+56).

Self-identified Independents were favorable to the Democratic party on five of the belief items: prosperity, integration, common man, poor, sick and elderly and farmers. The net differences were: +21, +19, +33, +33, and +28, respectively. The items favorable to the Republican party as shown by the negative nets were: manages government (-23), foreign affairs (+34), war (-42), states rights (-21), law enforcement (-31), leaders (-17), businessman (+41) and conservative (+55). This tends to give some insight into why the Independents (using two measures) in Oklahoma have tended to vote Republican in the elections studied.

Next the party images of registered, behavioral and self-identified Republicans will be examined. Registered Republicans have more pro-Democratic nets than the other measures of partisanship as indicated by Table XI. They were favorable to the Democratic party on the integration item (net +26), the poor, sick and elderly item (net +11) and the common man theme (+5). They were favorable on eight of the items to the Republican party as the following net differences show: manages government (-50), prosperity (-20), foreign affairs (-49), war (-53), states rights (-31), law enforcement (-40), leaders (-42), businessman (+43) and conservative (+69). The Democratic net differences in this case were not as great as for Democratic partisans using any measure

TABLE XI

PARTY IMAGES OF REGISTERED, BEHAVIORAL
AND SELF-IDENTIFIED REPUBLICANS ONLY
(in percentages)

Belief Dimension	Favors:	Measure of Partisanship								
		Registered Republicans			Behavioral Republicans			Party ID Republicans		
		Dem.	Rep.	(Net)	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)	Dem.	Rep.	(Net)
Manages government		7	57	-50	3	62	-59	6	64	-58
Prosperity		20	40	-20	19	43	-24	21	48	-27
Foreign affairs		8	57	-49	5	62	-57	5	66	-61
War		57	4	-53	57	4	-53	59	3	-56
Integration		41	15	+26	40	15	-25	41	19	+22
States rights		12	43	-31	8	50	-42	8	43	-35
Common man		31	26	+5	27	27	0	23	35	-12
Poor, sick, elderly		31	20	+11	31	24	+7	22	28	-6
Law enforcement		10	50	-40	8	49	-41	9	46	-37
Leaders		11	53	-42	6	63	-57	9	60	-51
Farmers		30	30	0	28	27	+1	24	34	-10
Businessman		13	57	+43	13	30	+17	12	55	+43
Conservative		5	74	+69	6	73	+67	7	73	+66
		(N=99)			(N=124)			(N=107)		

(Table IX). On all of the other belief items with the exception of the item on farmers (net of 0), the registered Republicans evidenced Republican net differences. The number and magnitudes of the net differences favoring the Republican party seems to give some insight into why party registration was predictive for Republicans.

Among party identification Republicans, there was only one net difference favorable to the Democratic party, the item on integration (+22). Differences favorable to the Republican party were on the following items: manages government, prosperity, foreign affairs, war, states rights, common man, poor, sick and elderly, law enforcement, leaders, farmers, businessman and conservative. The nets were: -58, -27, -61, -56, -35, -12, -6, -37, -51, -10, +43, and +66, respectively.

Presidential behavioral Republicans exhibited three net differences favorable to the Democratic party on the items dealing with integration (+25), poor, sick and elderly (+7), and farmers (+1). Those items that had Republican surpluses were: manages government (-59), prosperity (-24), foreign affairs (-57), war (-53), states rights (-42), law enforcement (-41), leaders (-57), businessman (+17) and conservative (+67). Behavioral Republicans were evenly split on the common man item (27 percent favorable to both parties).

The analysis of the beliefs of Republicans tended to indicate that there was a greater consensus on the beliefs among Republicans (using any measure) about their party than among Democrats with respect to their party in Oklahoma. This is especially true of behavioral and self-identified Republicans. In this case, however, self-identified Republicans tended to be stronger in their beliefs in a comparison with behavioral Republicans. Although a direct causal link cannot be

established, it does appear that self-identification may mean more to Republican partisans.³ Also behavioral Republicans may be made up of a number of persons who have stronger Democratic beliefs (the number of nets favorable to the Democratic party indicate this). The intensity of the Republican beliefs about their party also tends to suggest why Republicans (using any measure) were more loyal to their party in the Oklahoma elections that were surveyed in this study.

Next the belief dimensions themselves will be correlated with the vote to demonstrate the importance of the different beliefs in respect to voting choice. In order to estimate the relative importance of the various aspects of party image, this analyst has examined the group of respondents who mentioned various attitudes toward the parties and how their votes divided between Republicans and Democrats in the elections of 1972, 1968 and 1970. The percentage point deviation of the Democratic vote above and below the normal division for each race indicates the extent to which people holding a particular attitude voted abnormally in 1972, 1968 and 1970. A large deviation--plus deviations indicate a surplus of Democratic votes, while minus deviations indicate more votes than normal for the Republican (non-Democrat in 1968)--does not prove a causal connection between party image and the vote. But it does show that those with a stipulated party image voted, for a variety of reasons, more heavily for one candidate or the other than did other

³The Coombs and Fishbein study was similar in this respect. They suggested the intensity of the beliefs about the Republican party among Republicans was due possibly to the "minority status" of the party which induced a greater intensity on the beliefs about the party. Fred S. Coombs and Martin Fishbein, "Party Attitudes and Party Identification," paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention (New York, 1970) p. 24.

members of the Oklahoma electorate.

Tables XIII and XIII show the net deviations from the Democratic voting norms among Oklahomans for the 1968 Presidential and 1970 Gubernatorial elections and the 1972 Presidential and Senatorial elections, respectively. The sample percentages of Oklahomans voting Democratic in the elections of 1968, 1970, 1972 (Senatorial) and 1972 (Presidential) were as follows: 28, 45, 52 and 22 respectively. To determine the actual Democratic vote in each case, one can add the net deviation under "Dem." to the Democratic norm for the particular election. To determine the number of Republican image holders who voted Democratic, one can subtract the net deviation under "Rep." from the Democratic norm. The numbers under (N) indicate the number of respondents who favored the party on each of the items.

Table XIII shows that the beliefs about the parties were related to the voting choice in 1968 and 1970. Those respondents who indicated they were favorable to the Republican party on the belief items tended to vote Republican (or non-Democratic in 1968) as indicated by the negative deviations in each case. Those respondents who favored the Democratic party on the belief items tended to vote in excess of the Democratic norm for the Oklahoma electorate.

In terms of raw percentages, those items resulting in the greatest vote above the norm for the Democratic candidate in 1968 were that the Democratic party best manages the government, gives us prosperity and has the best leaders. In terms of the non-Democratic vote, those items that favored the Nixon and Wallace candidacy were on manages government, prosperity, common man and leaders. These raw deviations are somewhat misleading. While there was a net deviation of -26 percent

TABLE XII

ELEMENTS OF PARTY IMAGE AND NET DEVIATIONS FROM VOTING
NORMS AMONG OKLAHOMANS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL
ELECTION OF 1968 AND THE GUBERNATORIAL
ELECTION OF 1970

Democratic voting norm		28%				45%			
Election		1968				1970			
Belief Dimension	Dem.	(N)	Rep.	(N)	<u>Favors</u>	Dem.	(N)	Rep.	(N)
Manages government	+23	146	-27	149		+14	146	-33	147
Prosperity	+19	258	-26	92		+ 4	257	-38	90
Foreign affairs	+10	95	-19	198		+10	95	-23	197
War	+ 5	51	-14	201		- 8	51	-19	199
Integration	- 3	188	- 2	86		- 9	186	-13	86
States rights	+11	108	-12	144		+ 6	108	-24	142
Common man	+ 8	277	-25	69		+ 6	274	-33	69
Poor, sick, elderly	+ 8	251	-19	59		+ 4	249	-31	59
Leaders	+17	157	-23	142		+ 5	157	-32	141
Farmers	+ 9	229	-17	72		+ 6	227	-27	71
Businessman	+ 2	99	- 2	256		+ 4	99	- 8	254
Conservative	+12	77	- 8	286		+ 2	77	-11	283
Law enforcement	+ 9	84	-17	166		+ 6	83	-24	164

on the item indicating that Republicans give us prosperity, there were only 92 respondents who mentioned this belief. In terms of actual Democratic voting strength, the items on manages government, leaders, prosperity, farmers and common man contributed the most to the vote for the Democratic candidate in 1968. Among Republican image holders the greatest non-Democratic voting strength came from those who indicated that the Republican party best manages government, has the best leaders, best handles foreign affairs, is most conservative and that the Democrats get us into war.

In the 1970 voting, the net deviations were smaller in reference to Democratic image holders. This indicates that the beliefs were not as highly related to the vote as was the case in 1968. Among Republican image holders in 1970, the nets indicated that there was a greater relationship between the beliefs about the Republican party and the vote. Among those voters who had Democratic beliefs in 1970, the manage government item and foreign affairs item, showed the greatest Democratic deviations. Among Republican image holders, the greatest deviations were by the items indicating that the Republican party best manages government, gives us prosperity, is best for the common man, aids the poor, sick and elderly, and has the best leaders. In terms of Democratic voting strength the beliefs that contributed the greatest vote to the Democratic candidate were on the items dealing with government management, common man, farmers, prosperity and poor, sick and elderly. Those contributing the greatest strength to the Republican candidate were on the conservative, foreign affairs, leaders, government management and war items.

Table XIII shows the net deviations for the Presidential and

Senatorial elections of 1972. In the Senatorial election it is evident that the beliefs were associated with the vote as indicated by the negative deviations among respondents with favorable Republican beliefs and positive deviations among respondents with favorable Democratic beliefs. Raw deviations among that group favoring the Democratic party were greatest on the following items: manages government, leaders and foreign affairs. Those deviations favorable to the Republican party were greatest on the items dealing with manages government, common man, leaders, farmers and law enforcement. In terms of Democratic voting strength the most important items were that the Democrats best manage government, have the best leaders, give us jobs, are good for the common man, are best for farmers and aid the poor, sick and elderly. In terms of Republican voting strength the most important items were that the Republican party is best for the businessman, is most conservative, best handles foreign affairs and best manages government.

As one views the 1972 Presidential election deviations it is apparent that the beliefs were not very important in relation to the vote for those with Democratic beliefs. In terms of raw percentages those deviations favorable to the Democratic party's candidate were greatest on manages government, foreign affairs, leaders and that the Republican party gets us into war. However, if one considers the N's in the table, it is apparent that few respondents (51) actually labeled the Republican party as the "war" party. Among those groups who favored the Republican party, the greatest net deviations were related to the items on manages government, prosperity, common man and leaders.

Those images which contributed most to the voting strength of the

TABLE XIII

ELEMENTS OF PARTY IMAGE AND NET DEVIATIONS FROM VOTING
NORMS AMONG OKLAHOMANS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL
AND SENATORIAL ELECTIONS OF 1972

Democratic voting norm	52%				22%				
1972 Elections	Senatorial				Presidential				
Belief Dimension	Dem.	(N)	Rep.	(N)	<u>Favors</u>	Dem.	(N)	Rep.	(N)
Manages government	+20	148	-30	145		+15	146	-18	150
Prosperity	+ 9	258	-26	90		+ 5	257	-18	92
Foreign affairs	+12	94	-18	193		+13	95	-12	199
War	+ 6	52	-14	196		+25	51	-12	201
Integration	+ 2	188	- 2	86		0	188	-11	85
States rights	+13	110	-12	141		+ 8	108	- 7	144
Common man	+ 9	274	-26	69		+ 5	277	-18	69
Poor, sick, elderly	+ 6	250	-19	58		+ 3	250	-15	58
Leaders	+16	158	-26	139		+15	156	-19	142
Farmers	+ 8	228	-27	72		+ 3	229	-14	72
Businessman	+ 2	98	- 4	253		- 5	98	- 1	257
Conservative	+10	78	-10	283		- 1	77	- 3	286
Law enforcement	+10	85	-21	163		+ 3	84	-11	166

Democratic candidate in 1972, were the beliefs that the Democratic party has the best leaders, best manages government, is good for the common man, gives us prosperity and aids the poor, sick and elderly. Those items contributing to the voting strength of the Republican candidate were that the Republican party was most conservative, Democrats get us into war, Republicans best handle foreign affairs, best manage government and have the best leaders.

Findings

- 1) Party image exhibited the greatest descriptive and analytical utility of the four measures.
- 2) There was a larger Republican base in Oklahoma when the partisanship of Oklahomans was measured by party image.
- 3) Democrats tended to be mixed in their beliefs about the two parties with registered Democrats the least consistent, followed by Party ID Democrats. Behavioral Democrats tended to be more consistent in their beliefs about the Democratic party and were more intense.
- 4) The party image items were related to voting choices in the four elections though in varying degrees.
- 5) Independents were slightly pro-Republican as a group in their beliefs about the parties.
- 6) Republicans, no matter what the measure, tended to be consistently pro-Republican in their beliefs about the parties.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This study was deemed necessary because there have been a number of findings in the voting behavior literature that were conflicting in reference to the political behavior and makeup of the American electorate.¹ Most differences, it was felt, were not so much due to the differences in the electorates in the studies, or the different time frames used as they were due to the differences in the way the independent variable--partisanship--was measured. Moreover, while most scholars of voting behavior view partisanship as a psychological variable, few scholars have successfully integrated psychological theory into their works.² Due to the lack of consensus on, and lack of theoretical basis for the major independent variable--partisanship--the analysis of political behavior is deficient. It was, therefore, suggested that it was time to reevaluate the measures of partisanship in order to determine: what is partisanship and what is the best measure of partisanship? This was resolved by a critical theoretical and conceptual analysis of the

¹For a review of some of the conflicting findings, see Chapter I, pp. 5-6 in this study.

²Denis G. Sullivan, "Psychological Balance and Reactions to the Presidential Nominations in 1960," in M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler, eds., The Electoral Process (Englewood Cliffs, 1960), p. 238.

four measures of partisanship: party registration, party image, party identification and behavioral partisanship. Pragmatically, this was determined by correlating each of the measures of partisanship to the voting behavior of respondents in four Oklahoma elections to assess the empirical utility of the measures. In addition to this, each measure of partisanship was used to ascertain the makeup of the Oklahoma electorate to demonstrate the descriptive utility of each of the measures.

In the conceptual and theoretical portion of the study, the writer began with the assumption, along with other scholars, that partisanship is a psychological variable which influences the individual's perception of his political world and tends to influence the individual to respond to similar political stimuli in a somewhat consistent manner.³ To evaluate the measures of partisanship, this study relied on assumptions in contemporary attitude theory used by social psychologists.⁴ Of the four measures of partisanship, party image seemed to be the most closely related to attitude theory. This is especially true in reference to its conceptualization; it is determined from the sum of all the evaluative statements about two objects--the Republican and Democratic parties. Since party image was the only concept that seemed to have a strong basis in psychological theory and also had empirical import, it was proposed that party image would be most predictive of the vote in the four elections studied. It was also expected that party image would exhibit the greatest descriptive utility and would provide the

³Angus Campbell and Warren E. Miller, "The Motivational Basis of Straight and Split Ticket Voting," The American Political Science Review, LI (June, 1957), p. 3.

⁴See Chapter I, pp. 23-26 in this study.

best explanation of deviational voting with respect to the Oklahoma electorate.

It was demonstrated, using party registration, that one can crudely determine the makeup of the Oklahoma electorate but one cannot ascertain either the respondent's beliefs about the parties or the strength of attachment.⁵ Using the behavioral method, one can discern the strength of attachment to the party in terms of consistency in voting, but one cannot find out the psychological content of the beliefs about the parties. From party identification the direction and strength of attachment can be educed, but not the content of the beliefs about the party or why the individual chooses to attach himself to the party.

Party image seemed to be far superior to the other concepts of partisanship in terms of descriptive and analytical utility. Party image on the macro-level enables one to ascertain not only the makeup of the electorate in terms of partisanship (Table VII, p. 57), it also gives an aggregate picture of the beliefs about the parties in respect to the electorate (Table VIII, p. 61). Party image also allows one to ascertain which beliefs are more important in terms of voting.⁶ The party image components were also used to find out the beliefs of registered, self-identified and behavioral Republicans and Democrats.⁷ In respect to micro-analysis the content of the beliefs, as well as the strength of attachment to the parties and the number of favorable or unfavorable beliefs that each person holds could be educed.

⁵See Chapter III, pp. 56-59 in this study.

⁶See Table XII (p. 71) and Table XIII (p. 74).

⁷See Tables IX and XI, pp. 63 and 67, respectively.

The findings indicated that the four measures of partisanship were all significantly associated to voting choice in the four separate Oklahoma elections, as indicated by the Chi-square statistical measures of association. The Gamma correlations also indicated that the four measures of partisanship were strongly related to the voting choice in the four elections. In terms of actual predictions however behavioral partisanship was the most predictive of the vote; party image tended to be more predictive of the vote than either party identification or party registration.⁸

While the strengths of party image have been emphasized in this study, there are also weaknesses that should be pointed out with reference to party image, as well as, certain limitations to the study. First, the study was a case study of Oklahomans only. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized beyond the Oklahoma electorate. One cannot be sure that the Michigan voters, for example, hold the same beliefs about the two parties as Oklahoma voters. Two, the study was a cross-sectional study in one time frame, so inferences about the stability of party image cannot be made from this study. Three, the measure of party image was not the most rigorous that could have been devised. There were some problems with some of the image items due to the fact that the responses to the questions were somewhat ambiguous. These limitations and weaknesses should be kept in mind by the reader when generalizing from the findings in the study.

It is felt, even with limitations placed on the study, that party image is the "best" conceptualization of partisanship due to the fact

⁸See Table VI, p. 53.

that it is well grounded in psychological theory, is highly descriptive and analytically useful. However, it did not reach the expectations of the author in respect to the prediction of voting behavior. If prediction is what is important, perhaps one should concentrate on behavioral partisanship as a measure of partisanship. However, if one wishes to explain voting behavior, behavioral partisanship is glaringly deficient. This suggests one of two things: party image is not a good measure for prediction of voting behavior or possibly the measure of party image is in need of refinement. It is this writer's opinion that the latter is true.

As mentioned in the discussion of attitude theory, beliefs have certain qualities that are related to how well they predict other attitudes and behaviors--salience and centrality.⁹ Since the index of party image in this study was determined by summing all the respondent's beliefs about both the Republican and Democratic parties, all beliefs that the individual had were treated with equal weights. It would probably be more correct to determine the strengths of the evaluative beliefs, as two individuals scoring the same on the index and responding similarly on the same items might not vote the same way due to the strength of the beliefs or centrality of the beliefs about the parties in each case. However, as the questions were worded it was not possible to determine the strength of the evaluations of the parties (or the valence in some cases). Centrality of the beliefs was also not considered.

To alleviate these problems, the following types of revisions are

⁹See pp. 27-31 in Chapter I.

suggested for the items:

The Democratic party is more conservative than the Republican party?

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

What is your attitude towards conservative politics in government?

Very Favorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Unfavorable

The respondent would be asked to circle the number which best locates him on the continuum. By using this method, one can determine not only the direction of the belief but also the strength and evaluative valence of the beliefs about: "Which party was more conservative?" Similar revisions could be made on the other questions that were used in the study.

It was not possible to determine which of the beliefs was more important in reference to the other beliefs (centrality). For instance, a respondent's belief that "the Democrats were better for prosperity" may influence his beliefs about "which party is more conservative", or "which party is more likely to help the poor, sick and elderly". One could determine this from several paired questions about which beliefs tend to be more important by asking the following types of questions:

Which is more important to you: ___ better government management by the political parties or, ___ the instituting of conservative policies by the parties?

Which is more important to you: ___ better government management by the political parties or, ___ the parties helping the poor, sick and elderly?

Which is more important to you: ___ the instituting of conservative policies or, ___ the parties helping the poor, sick and elderly? By asking a battery of questions pairing all of the beliefs like this

one could ascertain the relative importance of each of the beliefs in respect to the other beliefs. All of these revisions should enhance the predictive capabilities of the party image index.

Final Conclusions

The justification for this study was to: provide a sound psychological basis for the study of political behavior; evaluate current measures of partisanship for their conceptual and empirical utility, demonstrate the utility of the different approaches and shed some light on interesting electoral behavior in Oklahoma. This study established that party image seemed to be linked more closely to a body of psychological theory than the other measures of partisanship. It appeared to be conceptually sound in reference to attitude theory. Party image was not as predictive of voting behavior as behavioral partisanship in most cases and was, therefore, somewhat disappointing in this respect. Party image demonstrated a greater analytical utility in analyzing deviational voting in Oklahoma. It was helpful in assessing recent Republican successes at the polls using a descriptive analysis of the Oklahoma electorate. The results of this study suggest that greater attention should be given to this concept by scholars interested in the prediction and explanation of political behavior.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bem, Daryl J. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont: Brooks Cole, 1970.
- Berelson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. Voting, A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. The Voter Decides. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954.
- Campbell, Angus, "Surge and Decline: A Study of Electoral Change." In Angus Campbell, et al. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, pp. 40-62.
- Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, Warren W. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.
- Campbell, Angus. "Voters and Elections: Past and Present." The Journal of Politics, Vol. XXVI (1964), pp. 747-757.
- Campbell, Angus. "The Motivational Basis of Straight and Split Ticket Voting." The American Political Science Review, Vol. LI (June 1957), pp. 293-312.
- Campbell, Angus, and Henry Valen. "Party Identification in Norway and the United States." In Angus Campbell, et al. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, pp. 245-268.
- Converse, Phillip E. "The Concept of the Normal Vote." In Angus Campbell, et al. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, pp. 136-157.
- Coombs, Fred S., and Martin Fishbein. "Party Attitudes and Party Identification." Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention, New York, 1970.
- DeVries, Walter, and V. Lance Tarrance. The Ticket-Splitter: A New Force in American Politics. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1972.

- Fishbein, Martin, and Icek H. Ajzen. "The Relationship Between Beliefs, Attitudes, and Behavior." In Cognitive Consistency: Motivational Antecedents and Behavioral Consequences. Shalom Feldman, ed. New York: Academic Press, 1966, pp. 200-223. In M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler eds. The Electoral Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Flanigan, William H., and Nancy H. Zingle. Political Behavior of the American Electorate. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Greenstein, Fred I. Personality and Politics. Chicago: Markam Publishing Co. 1969.
- Hays, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Isaak, Alan C. Scope and Methods of Political Science. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Key, V. O., and Frank Munger. "Social Determinism and Electoral Decision: The Case of Indiana." In Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, American Voting Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 281-299.
- Kiesler, Charles A., et al., Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches. New York: John Wiley, 1969.
- Ladd, Everet Carll, Jr., and Charles D. Hadley. "Party Definition and Party Differentiation." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXXVI (1973), pp. 21-34.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Manheim, Jarol B. The Politics Within: A Primer in Political Attitudes and Behavior. Englewood: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Matthews, Donald R., James W. Prothro. "The Concept of Party Image and Its Importance for the Southern Electorate." In M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler eds. The Electoral Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 139-174.
- Pomper, Gerald. Voter's Choice. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1975.
- Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Rossi, Peter H. "Four Landmarks in Voting Research." In Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck. American Voting Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 5-54.
- Skinner, B. F. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

State Election Board. Directory of Oklahoma. Oklahoma City, 1975.

Sullivan, Denis G. "Psychological Balance and Reactions to the Presidential Nominations in 1960." In M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler eds. The Electoral Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 238-264.

APPENDIX A

BEHAVIORAL PARTISANSHIP

APPENDIX A

BEHAVIORAL PARTISANSHIP

My name is _____ from Oklahoma State University.
 My class in public opinion is conducting a short survey on what kind of
 things are on the Oklahoma voters minds. I would like to ask you a few
 questions:

- 29b. Have you always voted for the same party for President
 or have you voted for different parties? IF DIFFERENT:
 would you say you most often vote for the Republican or
 Democratic candidates for President? IF SAME; ASK:
 Which party is that?

Always Dem....1 Mostly Dem....2
 Half/Half.....3 Mostly Rep....4
 Always Rep....5 Refused.....6
 Voted once....7

- 29c. How about for candidates for Governor? Have you always
 voted for the same party for governor or have you voted
 for different parties? IF DIFFERENT: Would you say you
 most often vote for the Republican or for the Democratic
 candidates? IF SAME; ASK: Which party is that?

Always Dem....1 Mostly Dem....2
 Half/Half.....3 Mostly Rep....4
 Always Rep....5 Refused.....6
 Voted once....7

APPENDIX B

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

APPENDIX B

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

My name is _____ from Oklahoma State University.
My class in public opinion is conducting a short survey on what kind of things are on the Oklahoma voters minds. I would like to ask you a few questions like:

- 17a. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a: Democrat, Republican, an Independent, or what?
- (32) IF DEMOCRAT OR REPUBLICAN, ASK: Would you call yourself a strong Democrat/Republican or a not very strong Democrat/Republican? IF INDEPENDENT ASK: Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?
1. Strong Dem.
 2. Weak Dem.
 3. Ind/Dem.
 4. Ind.
 5. Ind/Rep.
 6. Weak Rep.
 7. Strong Rep.
 8. Other

APPENDIX C

PARTY IMAGE ITEMS

APPENDIX C

PARTY IMAGE ITEMS

Here is a question that I think you will find very interesting. I am going to read you a group of statements---like "which of the two parties do you think can best manage the government in Washington" and ask you to tell me which party you think can best do this job. On some of the statements you might think that there are no differences between the parties--that maybe both the parties can do this job well--or maybe that neither of the parties do this well. Just tell me that. On other statements you might not be sure or have no opinion which of the parties can best do something or is more likely to do something. That's fine too--just tell me that.

Let's try the first one: In your opinion which of the two major parties--the Democrats or the Republicans--do you think:

1. can best manage government in Washington--that is can give us a more efficient, honest, and dignified government?
2. is more likely to give us prosperity--that is give us good times when we have more jobs, higher wages, and better living conditions?
3. can best handle our affairs with foreign countries?
4. is more likely to get us into War?
5. is more likely to speed up the integration of the races?
6. most strongly believes in states rights--that is not having the federal government interfering in state affairs?
7. is better to the common man, the working man?
8. is more likely to give more help to our poor, the sick, and the aged?
9. will give us more strict law enforcement against the criminals and the protestors?
10. usually has the best leaders?

11. is more likely to help the farmer?
12. is more likely to help the businessman?
13. is more conservative?

Each response was coded as follows:

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Both
4. Neither
5. Don't know
6. Refused to answer

Question 6 and question 9 were not used in the determination of the party image index.

APPENDIX D

CANDIDATE CHOICE

APPENDIX D

CANDIDATE CHOICE

My name is _____ from Oklahoma State University.
 My class in public opinion is conducting a short survey on what kind of
 things are on the Oklahoma voters minds. I would like to ask you a few
 questions like:

22. If the election were being held today, who would be your choice for
 President if the candidates were:

FOR WALLACE VOTERS:

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|
| a. | 1. Nixon | 2. Muskie | 3. Wallace | 4. Nixon | 5. Muskie |
| b. | 1. Nixon | 2. McGovern | 3. Wallace | 4. Nixon | 5. McGovern |
| c. | 1. Nixon | 2. Humphrey | 3. Wallace | 4. Nixon | 5. Humphrey |
| d. | 1. Nixon | 2. Jackson | 3. Wallace | 4. Nixon | 5. Jackson |
| e. | 1. Nixon | 2. Kennedy | 3. Wallace | 4. Nixon | 5. Kennedy |

27. If the election were being held today for U.S. Senator, who would
 be your choice in a race between: (circle)

- a. Dewey Bartlett v. Fred Harris
- b. Dewey Bartlett v. Ed Edmondson
- c. Dewey Bartlett v. John Rogers
- d. Dewey Bartlett v. Jed Johnson
- e. Dewey Bartlett v. Charles Nesbitt

28. A lot of people were not able to vote in the 1970 election for
 Governor in Oklahoma because they weren't registered or they were
 sick or they just didn't have the time. How about you? Did you
 get to vote or did something keep you from voting? IF VOTED, ASK:
 Who was your choice for Governor between Dewey Bartlett and David
 Hall?

29. Did you remember for sure if you were able to vote in the 1968
 Presidential election? IF YES: Who was your choice for President
 between Mr. Nixon, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Wallace?

VITA

Robert Mike Terry

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: PARTISANSHIP AND PARTISAN CHANGE IN OKLAHOMA: A PARTY IMAGE ANALYSIS

Major Field: Political Science

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Orange, California, September 27, 1946, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Glen W. Terry.

Education: Graduated from Oney High School, Albert, Oklahoma, in May, 1964; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Southwestern Oklahoma State University in 1972; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1976.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department Political Science, Oklahoma State University, 1972-1974.